THE "PERFORMATIVE FUTURE" IN THREE HELLENISTIC INCANTATIONS AND THEOCRITUS' SECOND *IDYLL*

CHRISTOPHER A. FARAONE

ONE OF THE MANY IMPORTANT ADVANCES in Pindaric criticism in the last twenty-five years has been the growing appreciation of his peculiar use of first-person future verbs of singing, praising, or testifying, which all seem to refer to the present activity of performing the ode in which they appear.[1] Thus, for example, when Pindar says νῦν . . . κελαδησόμεθα (*Ol.* 10.78–79), νῦν . . . κελαδήσω (*Ol.* 11.11–14) or ἐγὼ . . . ἐπασκήσω (*Nem.* 9.9–10), he is not promising to sing another poem at some future time, but rather he is talking about the poem he is in the process of performing.[2] In recent years scholars have noted that this peculiar use of the future is not, in fact, limited to the epinician genre, but occurs regularly in παρθένεια,[3] paeans,[4] other literary and cult hymns,[5] and in choral

1. E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (1962; reprint ed., Berkeley, 1986), 20–22 with a list of more than a dozen examples on the bottom of page 21, a discussion that has remained canonical, see, e.g.: Erich Thummer, *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte,* vol. 1 (Heidelberg, 1968), 128; W. J. Slater, "Futures in Pindar," *CQ* 19 (1969): 86–94; Staffan Fogelmark "Futures in Pindar," in his *Studies in Pindar in Reference to Paean VI and Nemean VII* (Lund, 1972), 93–116; Giovanni Cerri, "A proposito del futuro e della litote in Pindaro *Nem.* 7.102 sgg.," *QUCC* 22 (1976): 83–90; Christopher Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York, 1981), 46, 85–86, 93, 159, and 177–78; and D. E. Gerber, *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary* (Toronto, 1982), 43, 73, and 158. Bundy's work was motivated in part by his desire to stress the formulaic or typical elements of encomiastic poetry, particularly in the case of *Ol.* 11, where the future tense had spawned an influential theory that this poem was promising another future poem, namely *Ol.* 10. Prior to Bundy, scholars acknowledged the existence of these Pindaric futures (see Fogelmark, "Futures," 93–94, for the earlier bibliography) but did not consider them remarkable, probably because the grammars allow for the use of the "future for the present" as a way of expressing a present possibility or intention. See e.g., Schwyzer 2.290–91 ("voluntatives Futur"), Smyth §1915, Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses* §71–72, or Victor Magnien, *Le futur grec,* vol. 2 (Paris, 1912), 151–64 passim. The whole question is further complicated by the frequent similarity and confusion between first-person forms of the future and the aorist subjunctive, for example the so-called "Homeric subjunctive" (see n. 18 below) or the problem of short-vowel subjunctives in Pindar, for which see Slater (n. 5 below) and most recently D. E. Gerber, "Short-vowel Subjunctives in Pindar," *HSCP* 91 (1987): 83–90, who argues that several of the apparent first-person plural future verbs at the beginning of Pindaric odes (e.g., *Nem.* 9 or *Ol.* 6) are in fact hortatory subjunctives.

2. The same phenomenon occurs when he uses an image metaphorically to refer to his own singing, for example, the end of *Isthmian* 6, where he offers that ode as a drink to Lampon using the future tense (πίσω σφε Δίρκας ἀγνὸν ὕδωρ), or the use of ἀγγελίαν πέμψω in *Ol.* 9.25.

3. Pindar's Theban *Partheneion* (= frag. 94b [S-M]) 11 (ὑμνήσω) and 13–15 (σειρῆνα δὲ . . . μιμήσομ' ἀοιδαῖς) and Alcman frag. 89 (Calame) = frag. 29 (Page): ἐγὼν δ' ἀείσομαι. See Max Treu, "Von der Weisheit der Dichter," *Gymnasium* 72 (1965): 445–46, and M. R. Lefkowitz, *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic "I"* (Oxford, 1991), 15–20, for the cultic setting and the importance of self-referential descriptions in the παρθένεια of Pindar and Alcman.

4. Pindar *Paean* 2.4 (τόνδε [παι]ᾶνα [δι]ώξω, see Lefkowitz, "First-Person Fictions," 15–16 for discussion) and 4.2 (χορε]ύσομαι); Sophocles *Paean* 1.2 (*PMG* 737 σέθεν ἄρξομαι) and a victory paean sung in honor of Lysander (*PMG* 867 ὑμνήσομαι ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν). See Lutz Käppel, *Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung,* Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 37 (Berlin, 1992), 95–96.

5. Fogelmark, "Futures," 93–94, draws attention to the frequent usage of this type of future in the Homeric *Hymns* (e.g., μνήσομαι at 3.1 and 6.2; ἀείσομαι at 10.1 and 15.1), in Aristonous' *Hymn to Hestia* 1–2

0009-837X/95/9001-0001$01.00

passages of Attic tragedy that mimic or evoke special ritual songs like the θρῆνος or the paean.[6] Until quite recently there was considerable scholarly agreement that such future verbs do indeed refer to present performance, but that they simply represent some poetic convention peculiar to lyric odes and literary hymns.[7] Calame and Henrichs have, however, recently put the question in a new light, by stressing that this type of the first-person future is not limited to verbs concerned with singing, but can also be used to describe other ongoing, non-verbal actions, such as cultic dancing, supplication, or even the act of witnessing a divine epiphany.[8] Calame, moreover, suggests helpfully that the phenomenon be labeled the "performative future" to encompass all instances where first-person futures are used to describe an ongoing performance, be it verbal or non-verbal.[9] In this essay I hope to

---

([ὑμ]νήσομεν) and in brief embedded hymns such as the one to (Athena?) Parthenos in *PMG* 917b, a drinking song: πλέξομεν ὕμνοις. See also the opening lines of a fragmentary cult hymn to Dionysus (*PMG* 929b ἀ[εί]σομεν or α[ὖ]σομεν; but see W. J. Slater, "Symposium at Sea," *HSCP* 80 [1976]: 165, n. 12, who identifies the form as a short-vowel subjunctive), a hymn to Pan by Castorion of Soli (*Supp. Hell.* 310, line 3 κλήσω) and a Roman-era hexametrical hymn to Attis: Hipp. *Ref.* 5.9.9 = Ernst Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*[2], vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1963), no. 44.3 ὑμνήσω. A new fragment of a previously known Epidaurian hymn (also in hexameters) contains the verb ἀείσω (*SEG* 30.390.5). Francis Cairns, "Theocritus *Idyll* 26," *PCPS* 38 (1992): 14, suggests in passing that the future tenses in a cult hymn to Adonis at Theocritus 15.133 (οἰσεῦμες) and 135 (ἀρξεύμεθ' ἀοιδᾶς) are part of this same tradition.

6. Eduard Norden, *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern* (Lund, 1939), 199–203, in his discussion of the future tense in the early Latin cult hymn of the Arval Brotherhood, gives a detailed analysis of the final *kommos* of Aeschylus' *Persians* (935–1077) where the chorus refers to their own dirge-in-progress as follows: πέμψω πολύδακρον ἰαχάν (935 and 938), ἥσω (sc. ἰαχάν: 944), κλάγξω δὲ γόον (947), καὶ τάδ' ἔρξω (1049), and πέμψω τοί σε δυσθρόοις γόοις (1076, the final line of the play). See also the comments of R. Kannicht, *Euripides Helena,* vol. 2 (Heidelberg, 1969), ad 1107–8 (ἀναβοάσω), and the passages discussed by Calame and Henrichs (see n. 8 below for both). There is one possible non-choral example of this type of future in tragedy. Nearly all nineteenth-century commentators thought that when the Watchman says αὐτός τ' ἔγωγε φροίμιον χορεύσομαι (Aesch. *Ag.* 31) he has started dancing on the roof; see Ed. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus: Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1950), ad loc., who discusses the history of interpretation on this line and gives his own influential rebuttal. The heavily emphatic pronouns that accompany the verb (αὐτός τ' ἔγωγε) and the performative present a few lines earlier in the speech (σημαίνω, 26) suggest, however, that the nineteenth-century consensus may have been correct in this instance. For a similar use of future verbs of dancing, see notes 4 and 8.

7. Bundy, *Pindarica,* 21, calls it "a conventional element of encomiastic style" and suggests that the future indicates an intention or offer that is instantly fulfilled by its utterance; Slater, "Futures," 88 (followed by Danielewicz [n. 10 below], 15, and William Mullen, *Choreia: Pindar and Dance* [Princeton, 1982], 27), points out that from a temporal perspective, these future verbs have the same effect as an imperative (see n. 11 below) and he suggests that Pindar formulates his song "by convention" at the moment before the song is to be sung and that the future tense works as a kind of "stage direction." Fogelmark, "Futures," 99–100, prefers the designation "conventional future," but agrees with Slater that such futures have a special effect in an epinician because they signal that the praise of the *laudandus* is not restricted to the moment of the song, but is continuing and general.

8. Albert Henrichs, "Why Should I Dance? Choral Self-Referentiality in Greek Tragedy," *Arion* (1995): forthcoming, notes the use of the "performative future" by Sophocles (*Trach.* 216 οὐδ' ἀπώσομαι) and Euripides (*El.* 874–75 τὸ δ' ἀμέτερον χωρήσεται . . . χόρευμα [= χορεύσομεν]). Claude Calame, "Legendary Narration and Poetic Procedure in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo,*" in *Callimachus,* ed. M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Walker, Hellenistica Groningana 1 (Groningen, 1993), 48, compares the use of ὀψόμεθ' (a future first-person reference to the poet's vision-in-progress at *Hymn to Apollo* 11) to "the 'performative' future used by *choreutai* of archaic melic poetry." See also idem, "From Choral Lyric to Tragic Stasimon: The Pragmatics of Women's Voices," *Arion* (1995): forthcoming, where he argues that in the *parodos* of Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes,* the chorus use a future tense to refer to the supplication they are in the midst of performing.

9. Calame, "From Choral Lyric," citing the scholarship of Austin and others on the performative utterance and the pragmatics of speech-acts. I owe many thanks to Prof. A. Henrichs for drawing my attention to Calame's ongoing work on this subject.

extend this line of inquiry into the realm of magical ritual, where very similar future verbs occur in a handful of early Greek spells—most notably in three hexametrical incantations of Hellenistic date—and in Theocritus' second *Idyll*. I shall argue that in nearly every case the force of the verb is most likely a "performative" one—that is, it effects some action simply by its utterance. Like the peculiar use of the future tense by Pindar and other early poets, these future verbs are always first-person statements that are marked clearly as "deictic speech" by the use of special vocabulary, for example: the intensive personal pronoun ἐγώ, the adverb νῦν, or demonstrative pronouns that refer to the words or materials employed in the ongoing ritual.[10] There is also, as in Pindar, a tendency to interweave these future tenses with second-person imperatives addressed to human or divine helpers in the ceremony.[11] These instances of the performative future in magical texts differ, however, from their more literary cousins, as they are almost exclusively concerned with non-verbal actions such as binding, throwing, or burning. I shall close my essay by arguing that ritual context is probably the significant motivation for the use of these peculiar future verbs, and that their use in Hellenistic magical texts reveals a very old (but unfortunately lost) Greek tradition of metrical incantations, which probably had its origin in the same performance-oriented poetic milieu as the other, more literary genres in which they occur.

The largest and most geographically diverse corpus of early Greek magical texts[12] is that of the inscribed lead tablets known as "binding

10. Deictic language is, of course, a traditional part of a performative utterance, as it is crucial for evoking the "here and now" of the ongoing performance, as in, e.g., Austin's well-known example from the wedding rite: "With *this* ring I thee wed." On the "deictic field of language," its importance in the self-conscious awareness of performance and its application to archaic Greek poetics, see Jerzy Danielewicz, "*Deixis* in Greek Choral Lyric," *QUCC* 34 (1990): 7–17, who draws on recent work in linguistics, most of it originating with Karl Bühler's *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache* (Jena, 1934). For a survey of subsequent work on the subject, see the essays collected in R. J. Jarvella and W. Klein, eds., *Speech, Place and Action: Studies in Deixis and Related Topics* (New York, 1982) and Barbara Kryk, *On Deixis in English and Polish: The Role of Demonstrative Pronouns* (Frankfurt am Main, 1987).

11. Slater, "Futures," 86–88, notes the alternation of the "encomiastic future" with the second-person imperative, e.g., *Nem.* 3.1–11, where the address to the Muse (two imperatives: ὄπαζε . . . ἄρχε δ') is followed by ἐγὼ δὲ κοινάσομαι. He further suggests that such imperatives often have the same effect as a first-person future, e.g., ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα λάμβανε might have just as easily been expressed as φόρμιγγα λήψομαι. Fogelmark, "Futures," 94–95, concurs. We shall see that the verb δήσω in one of the metrical charms discussed below is the equivalent of δῆσον in another spell and that in Theocritus 2 imperatives addressed to Hekate and Simaetha's servant alternate freely with verbs in the performative present and future.

12. The following abbreviations for the basic corpora and surveys of ancient Greek magical texts will be used throughout:

PGM = Karl Preisendanz [and Albert Henrichs], *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*^{2} (Stuttgart, 1973–74).

PGM Hymn = Ernst Heitsch, apud *PGM*, vol. 2, pp. 237–66, most of which is a reprint of idem, *Griechischen Dichterfragmente,* 179ff.

DT = A. Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae* (Paris, 1904).

DTA = R. Wünsch, *Defixionum Tabellae Atticae,* Appendix to *Inscriptiones Graecae,* vol. 3 (Berlin, 1897).

SGD = D. R. Jordan, "A Survey of Greek Defixiones Not Included in the Special Corpora" *GRBS* 26 (1985): 151–97.

Suppl. Mag. = R. W. Daniel and Franco Maltomini, *Supplementum Magicum,* 2 vols., Papyrologica Coloniensia 16.1 and 2 (Opladen, 1990 and 1991).

The numbers following these abbreviations indicate the number of the text in the corpus, unless otherwise specified.

spells" (κατάδεσμοι or *defixiones*).[13] The future tense occurs infrequently in these spells,[14] which generally prefer the first-person performative present tense ("I bind so-and-so") or the second-person imperative addressed to a supernatural being ("[You] bind so-and-so!").[15] Of the *defixiones* published to date, I know of only seven that employ a first-person verb in the future tense and they all date to the third century B.C.E. or perhaps somewhat earlier.[16] Of these, three are "futures-more-vivid" of the regular type, occurring in the context of conditional votive promises or in threats given to a god or ghost in hopes of persuading it to help bind the victim.[17] With one possible exception the remaining four examples seem to refer to the magical action in progress and thus appear to be indistinguishable from the more traditional performative present tense mentioned above. The possible exception is a text from an Attic grave that twice uses the binding formula καταδῶ καὶ οὐκ ἀναλύσω, which—

13. More than six hundred have been published to date and hundreds of others have been unearthed and are awaiting study. The earliest examples are found in Sicily, Olbia, and Attica and date to the fifth century B.C.E.; by the second century C.E. they begin turning up in every corner of the Greco-Roman world. In the classical period, they are usually small, inscribed sheets of lead that have been folded up, pierced with a bronze or iron nail, and then either buried with a corpse or placed in chthonic sanctuaries. In later periods they are more often placed in underground bodies of water (e.g., wells, baths, fountains). *DTA* and *DT* are the basic collections. See K. Preisendanz, "Die griechischen und latienischen Zaubertafeln," *APF* 9 (1930): 119–54 and 11 (1933): 153–64, for a full bibliography to that date. His work has now been updated and replaced by SGD and Maria Del Amor López-Jimeno, *Las tabellae defixionis de la Sicilia griega,* Classical and Byzantine Monographs 22 (Amsterdam, 1991). Aside from the prolegomena to the abovementioned corpora and surveys, comprehensive discussions of *defixiones* include E. G. Kagarow, *Griechische Fluchtafeln,* Eos Supplementa 4 (1929), K. Preisendanz, *RAC* 8 (1972): 1–29, s.v. "Fluchtafeln," and C. A. Faraone, "The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells" in *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion,* ed. C. A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink (Oxford, 1991), 3–32.

14. By "early" I mean Classical and Hellenistic. These curses undergo a distinct change in the first century B.C.E., when their originally defensive posture of binding rivals and opponents is altered and they become a very popular medium for "all-purpose" magical spells very similar to those found in the magical papyri. See Faraone, "Early Greek Binding Spells," 14–15.

15. Ibid., 4–10.

16. The vexed dating of those Attic *defixiones* unearthed in the nineteenth century warrants my caution here (" . . . or perhaps somewhat earlier") and, I think, further explanation. *DTA* (published in 1897) provides the most extensive collection to date of Attic curses, but its editor Wünsch was exceedingly cautious, almost agnostic, in his dating of the corpus, assigning them all to the third century B.C.E.—and then only tentatively—unless some overwhelming evidence pointed to an earlier or later date (see his introduction, p. i). Adolf Wilhelm, "Über die Zeit einiger attischer Fluchtafeln," *ÖJh* 7 (1907): 105–26, argued that Wünsch greatly underestimated the antiquity of the *DTA* curses and by way of example he redated a number of them to the fourth century and a few to the fifth century using a combination of palaeographic and prosopographic evidence. Unfortunately Wünsch was killed in World War I and the tablets themselves (which were apparently in his personal possession) have disappeared. As a result the great majority of them have never been properly redated along the lines that Wilhelm has suggested.

17. *DTA* 109 (Μανο[ῦς] κακῶς πράξαντος εὐαγγέλια θύσω); SGD 115 (ἂν ἐ(κ)δεικήσσῃς με, ποίσω ἀργύρε[ο]ν σπάδικα); and an Olbian *defixio* published by Benedetto Bravo, "Une tablette magique d'Olbia pontique: les morts, les héros et les démons" in *Poikilia: Études offertes à Jean-Pierre Vernant,* Recherches d'histoire et de sciences sociales 26 (Paris, 1987), 189, lines 10–13: ἢ[ν] δέ μοι αὐτοὺς κατάσχῃς . . . ἐ(γ)ὼ δέ σε τειμήσω καί σο[ι] ἄριστον δ[ῶ]ρρον παρασκε[υῶ]. For examples from later Greek magical papyri, see *Supp. Mag.* 45.12–15 (ἐὰν δὲ ἄξηταί [read ἄξητέ] μοι Εὐφημίαν . . . δώσω ὑμῖν Ὄσιριν . . . καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ὑμῶν τὰς ψυχάς. ἐ[ὰ]ν δέ μοι μὴ τελέσητε ἃ λέγω ὑμῖν, κατακαύη ὑμᾶς ὁ Εωνεβυωθ), a bilingual *defixio* from Hadrumentum (*DT* 270 *si minus, descendo in adytus Osyris et dissolvam* τὴν ταφὴν *et mittam ut a flumine feratur*), and *PGM* IV 2094 (τέλεσον, δαῖμον, τὰ ἐνθάδε γεγραμμένα τελέσαντι δέ σοι θυσίαν ἀποδώσω). For discussion see Bror Olsson, "Drohungen an die Götter: Religionsgeschichtliche Streifzüge" in *DRAGMA Martino P. Nilsson A.D. IV Id. Iul. Anno MCMXXXIX Dedicatum,* Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae 1 (Lund, 1939), 374–78, esp. 377, and H. S. Versnel, "Beyond Cursing: The Appeal to Justice in Judicial Prayers" in Faraone and Obbink, *Magika Hiera,* 64, with n. 19.

although it generally follows a pattern known elsewhere in performative statements in hymnic invocations—has no precise parallel.[18] We do find, however, a crystal clear example of a performative future verb on a lacunose lead tablet found in Attica, which begins with κ]αταδήσω ἐγώ—followed by a list of the names of the victims—and then at line 25 reiterates the same statement in the performative present (καταδ[ῶ]),[19] revealing that the present and future forms of this verb are interchangeable in this simple text. A similar interchangeability in Pindar's poetry between the present and future tense of the verb πέμπω prompted Bundy (see note 7) to identify the use of the future to refer to the ongoing performance of the ode: ἐγὼ δέ τοι φίλαν πόλιν μαλεραῖς ἐπιφλέγων ἀοιδαῖς . . . ἀγγελίαν πέμψω ταύταν (*Ol.* 9.23–27) and ἐγὼ τόδε (sc. πόμα) τοι πέμπω (*Nem.* 3.74). In each case the demonstrative pronoun seems to refer to the "message" or "draught" at hand, which is the ode that the poet is singing.

The most interesting examples of the "performative future" occur in a handful of metrical incantations. A *defixio* from a grave in Attica is comprised of five passably good hexameters, two of which begin with a future verb of binding:[20]

18. SGD 18 (fourth century B.C.E.); see Wilhelm, "Fluchtafeln," 121, for date. The parallels from hymns, e.g., οὔποτε σεῖο λήσομαι . . . ἀλλ' αἰει . . . ἀείσω (Theognis 1–4, an invocation to Apollo) or μνήσομαι καὶ οὐδὲ λάθωμαι (*Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 1), are not precise because they have *both* verbs in the future or the so-called "Homeric" aorist subjunctive that is virtually indistinguishable from the future; see Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses,* §97, Magnien, *Futur grec,* 165, and Pierre Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique,* vol. 1 (Paris, 1958), 440–41. The best parallel to the expression in SGD 18 is the nearly identical construction at Soph. *Trach.* 216 (ἀείρομ' οὐδ' ἀπώσομαι τὸν αὐλόν), an odd phrase that Norden, *Priesterbüchen,* Henrichs, "Ritual Self-Referentiality," and Malcolm Davies, *Sophocles Trachiniae* (Oxford, 1991) ad loc., all identify as a future tense used to describe present activity. In this case, however (since the first half of the statement is in the present tense), I fail to see why the second half of the statement cannot be a vow extending into the future, e.g., "I take up the *aulos* and I shall not (i.e., never) reject it." One might, I suppose, interpret the verb καταδῶ in SGD 18 as the second aorist subjunctive of καταδίδημι, itself a rare Attic and Boeotian form of καταδέω (see E. Schwyzer, "Die Vulgärsprache der attischen Fluchtafeln," *NJbb* 5 [1900]: 258, for the form), in which case we would have the more usual (for archaic poetry) pairing of a future verb with an aorist subjunctive (as in the example quoted at the start of this note). From the late Classical period onwards the verb ἀναλύω seems to be a technical term of sorts for the release from a magical incantation; see Hesychius, s.v. ἀναλῦσαι, who quotes Menander frag. 5 Sandbach (a bewitched woman is released from a spell) and Lucian *Vit. Auct.* 25 (a man convinced he has been magically turned to stone, begs to be released).

19. *DTA* 95a, which Wilhelm, "Fluchtafeln," 119, dates to the second half of the fourth century B.C.E. I put the *omega* in square brackets, because (as Prof. D. Martinez points out to me *per litteras*) Wünsch's edition is contradictory at this point. His diplomatic text of lines 25–26 reads ΗΣΚΑΤΑΔ . . . /ΚΑΙΤΟΣ, but he prints: .ης καταδῶ / καὶ το(ὺ)ς.

20. *DTA* 108. The meter of the first line is marred (as is often the case in, e.g., funerary epigrams) by the name of the victim Sosikleia. The curse begins on the inner surface of the rolled-up tablet and the last three words spill over onto the outer surface. I give here the reconstruction of Georg Kaibel, *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus conlecta* (Berlin, 1878), no. 1136, who dates the text to the third or second century B.C.E., and rightly assumes that it is hexametrical throughout and that the last half of line 4—perhaps yet another prepositional phrase of σύν with the name of a deity—was accidentally left out by the scribe. Wünsch (*DTA* 108) tries unsuccessfully to render this same text as a pair of elegiac couplets. Echoes of traditional hexametrical language and usage include (in order of appearance): the metrical/syntactical pattern δήσω (ἐγὼ) at the beginning of a line (Hom. *Il.* 23.591–92 δώσω, *Il.* 17.232–33 ἕξω ἐγὼ, or Apollonius *Arg.* 2.290–91, where Iris says ὅρκια δ' αὐτὴ / δώσω ἐγὼ); καὶ κτήματα after the weak caesura (I count four instances, e.g., Hom. *Il.* 3.285); γένοιτο appears dozens of times at line end and it is used many times, as here, in blessings and curses (e.g., Hom. *Il.* 4.289, 13.233, 22.287, *Od.* 8.339); δεσμοῖς ἀργαλέοις at the beginning of the line (Hes *Th.* 522 δῆσε . . . / δεσμοῖς ἀργαλέοισι [the binding of Prometheus] and cf. idem frag. 239.4 M-W, which describes the effect of wine: σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε δέει γλῶσσάν τε νόον τε / δεσμοῖς ἀφράστοισι); (εἰς) Τάρταρον ἀερόεντα at line end (Hom. *Il.* 8.13; Hes. *Th.* 721 and frag. 30.22 [M-W] and *Hymn.*

δήσω ἐγὼ Σωσικλείαν κα[ὶ κ]τήματα καὶ μέγα κῦδος
καὶ πρᾶξιν καὶ νοῦν. ἐχθρὰ δὲ φίλοισι γένοιτο.
δήσω ἐγὼ κείνην ὑπὸ Τάρταρον ἀερόεντ[α
δεσμοῖς ἀργαλέ{ι}νοις ⟨⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – x⟩
σύν θ' Ἑκάτ(η)ι χθονίαι καὶ Ἐριννύσιν ἠλιθιώναις.

I shall bind Sosiklea, her property, her great reputation, her activity, her mind. May she be hateful to her friends! I shall bind her under murky Tartarus in painful bonds . . . with the help of Hekate Chthonia and the distracting[21] Furies.

This text is difficult to interpret if we take the future tense of the verb δήσω at face value and understand that the author is merely promising to bind the victim at some later date, since in every other aspect of its production, deposition, and syntax it is identical to tablets that use the present tense of this verb. The especially emphatic force of the pronoun ἐγώ, moreover, appearing as it does close to the beginning of the verse and repeated twice in five lines, also defies explanation if it is simply a statement of intention.

As my final example of a *defixio* employing the "performative future," I adduce a somewhat similar text from Cyrene, which dates to the second half of the third century B.C.E.[22] The first three lines of this curse—and probably all of it—also seem to have been composed originally in hexameters.[23]

δεῦρ[ο] Τύχαν καλέω· νῦν δὴ τύ ⟨γα⟩ τῆδε παρῆμεν
σύν τε Ζηνί, ⟨Τύχα,⟩ σὺν ⟨καί⟩ τε δυοῖσ⟨ι⟩ Χάρισσιν.
Πραξιδίκα κώρα μεγαλήτο⟨ρος⟩ Ἀγλαοκάρπου,
δῆσόν μοι Φερονίκας γλῶσ⟨σ⟩αν χῆρας τε {πόδας τὰ}·
ταῦτα δ{ὲ} ἐγὼ ἐρησῶ ⟨τὰ γράμματα? – ⏑ ⏑ – x⟩
ἐν βοέωι κέρατι πολιᾶς ὑπένερθέ τε γαίας.

Hom. Merc. 256); and Ἐριννύσιν (cf. Hom. *Od.* 20.78: Ἐρινύσιν in the same line position). The phrase μέγα κῦδος is entirely epic (e.g., Hom. *Il.* 8.176 and 233, 9.303 and 673), but it never appears at line end (although κῦδος does by itself, e.g., Hom. *Od.* 3.313 and 18.165). The phrase σύν θ' Ἑκάτ(η)ι χθονίαι in the first half of the line resembles Theoc. *Id.* 2.12 τᾷ χθονίαι θ' Ἑκάτ(η)ι (see below for a detailed discussion of the whole passage) and 2.25 ἐγὼ σὺν δαίμονι (= Ἑκάτηι) τάκω, where Simaetha melts wax as part of the ceremony.

21. The adjective here (ἠλιθιώναις) is a *hapax*, which means something like "who makes (sc. another) foolish" or "who distracts." See LSJ, s.v., and Wilamowitz *apud* Kaibel, *Epigrammata graeca,* ad loc., who compares similar words used to describe the binding song of the Erinyes at Aesch. *Eum.* 326–29. This binding song itself reflects early Attic binding spells; see C. A. Faraone, "Aeschylus' ὕμνος δέσμιος (*Eum.* 306) and Attic Judicial Curse Tablets," *JHS* 105 (1985): 150–54.

22. SGD 150. For a detailed discussion of the text, see Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli, "Supplemento epigraphico cirenaico," *ASAtene* 23–24 (1961–62): 324 no. 193; idem, "Praxidika a Cirene," *Rend. Accad. Linc.* 18 (1963): 340–44; Carlo Gallavotti, "Una defixio dorica e altri nuovi epigrammi cirenaici," *Maia* 15 (1963): 450–55; and Louis Robert, *Bull. Epig.* (1964), no. 574. I print Gallavotti's text with his reconstruction of the hexameters, with one suggestion for the missing text at the end of line 5: ⟨τὰ γράμματα? – ⏑ ⏑ – –⟩. Although νῦν δὴ, coming as it does after the strong caesura, gives ample motivation for Gallavotti's punctuation of the first line, I cannot help speculating whether the first two lines (in their original, uncorrupt state) may have formed a single sentence in which the infinitive παρῆμεν depends on καλέω, as in Hom. *Il.* 3.390 δεῦρ' ἴθ', Ἀλέξανδρός σε καλεῖ οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι or *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 462–63 δεῦρο, τέκος, καλέει σε . . . Ζεὺς ἐλθέμεναι. In the specific context of a prayer see the request made to Athena in Ar. *Lys.* 346–49 σε καλῶ ξύμμαχον . . . φέρειν ὕδωρ and that made to the Erinyes at Soph. *Aj.* 835–38 (the prelude to Ajax' curse against the sons of Atreus) καλῶ . . . σεμνὰς Ἐρινῦς τανύποδας μαθεῖν ἐμὲ . . . ὡς διόλλυμαι.

23. As in the case of the Attic curse against Sosikleia, the line containing the victim's name (line 4) is irreparably unmetrical. Echoes of traditional hexametrical language and usage include (in order of appearance):

> I summon[24] Tyche hither. You, ⟨Tyche⟩, come here right now with Zeus and the two Graces. Praxidika,[25] daughter of great-hearted Aglaokarpos, bind for me the tongue, hands, and feet of Pheronika. I shall deposit (ἐρησῶ = ἐρεισῶ) these ⟨words? . . . ⟩ in an ox-horn and (then?) beneath the hoary earth.

It is tempting to interpret the last two lines of this curse paratactically as a conditional promise of future reward (like those votive formulae quoted above in note 17); thus we might paraphrase: "Bind Pheronika, and I shall (i.e., at some later date) deposit these things (offerings in hand?) in an ox-horn beneath the earth." Indeed, the use of an imperative as the protasis of a votive formula is not unheard of; see, for example, Philocleon's comic promise to a local hero named Lycus (Ar. *Vesp.* 389–94): ὦ Λύκε δέσποτα, . . . ἐλέησον καὶ σῶσον νυνὶ τὸν σαυτοῦ πλησιόχωρον, κοὐ μή ποτέ σου παρὰ τὰς κάννας οὐρήσω ("O Lord Lycus, . . . pity and save your own neighbor now and I shall never urinate on your wicker fence"). In *defixiones,* however—and in other magical texts as well—demonstrative pronouns (such as the ταῦτα used here) nearly always refer either to some

---

δεῦρο is frequently found at the beginning of a line (e.g., Hom. *Il.* 1.53, 3.130, 3.162, 10.95, etc.) and later on at the beginning of entire texts, especially short hymns, such as *Orph. Hymn* 72.1 δεῦρο, Τύχη, καλέω σε (clearly the closest parallel to the first hemistich of this curse) or *PGM* Hymns nos. 2 and 21; καλέω is rare in early hexametrical literature (only Hom. *Od.* 14.147) but it appears twice in this line position in Nonnus' *Dionysiaka* 18.286 and 46.221; for παρῆμεν (or παρεῖμεν) at line end, I can find only Theoc. *Id.* 2.116 (see also ἦμεν at the end of 2.41); the adjective μεγαλήτο⟨ρος⟩ appears fairly frequently in this position (e.g., Hom. *Il.* 5.468, *Od.* 7.17 and 213, and 8.464), always, as here, in an extended phrase that is equivalent to a matro- or patronymic (the closest parallel to our text is Hom. *Od.* 4.797 Ἰφθίμη κούρη μεγαλήτορος Ἰκαρίοιο); ἀγλαοκάρπου is used at line end as an epithet of Demeter at *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 4 and Orph. frag. 48 (Kern); δῆσον only appears once and very late (Nonnus *Dionysiaka* 45.249 in the same line position); the phrase γλῶσ⟨σ⟩αν χῆρας τε πόδας τε is rather prosaic, but compare Hes. frag. 239.4 M-W (which describes the effect of wine: σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε δέει γλῶσσάν τε νόον τε) and the end of a hexametrical line in a late-antique hymn: κεφαλήν τε πόδας τε (*PGM* Hymn 22.5); ταῦτα appears often at the beginning of the line in Homer and Hesiod and ταῦτα δέ is found at the beginning of *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 149; the adjective πολιᾶς appears in the feminine genitive form many times in Homer in this position of the line, but with one exception (*Od.* 24.317, where it refers to Priam's head) it always modifies words for sea and never the earth (e.g., *Il.* 1.359 πολιῆς ἁλός, 4.248 πολιῆς ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης); the word γαίης frequently appears at line end in epic hexameter and the whole phrase ὑπένερθέ τε γαίας may be a combination of other phrases found at line end, e.g., ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης (*Il.* 22.482 or *Od.* 24.204) or ὑπὸ κεύθεα γαίης (*Hymn. Hom.* 2.415 and 3.40)—the closest parallel, however, occurs in Pind. *Nem.* 10.87 γαίας ὑπένερθεν.

24. Or perhaps one should translate it as "will summon," since the future and present tenses of this verb are identical. If I am correct that ἐρησῶ is another case of the performative future tense, one could argue for the sake of consistency that καλέω here is also a performative future, especially since (as has been noted in Pindar and the Homeric *Hymns;* see nn. 1–5 above) first-person verbs of speaking at the beginning of a ritual text are especially prone to this construction. For the use of καλέω in tandem (as it is here) with a future verb, see *PGM* Hymn 11.37–38 ὑμνήσω . . . σε καλέω.

25. Carratelli, "Praxidika," argues that Tycha and Praxidika are alternate names for Persephone and that Aglaokarpos is Demeter, pointing out that the worship of the Two Goddesses was especially important at Cyrene and that a chthonic deity such as Persephone would be the perfect recipient for a text buried in the earth. The only parallels he can adduce for these equations, however, are from later Orphic texts. In Pindar, however, there are some curious connections with the sea: Tycha appears at the beginning of *Ol.* 12 as a sea nymph associated with Cretan Himera (see Gildersleeve's remarks *ad loc.*) and Thetis is given the epithet Aglaokarpos (*Nem.* 3.97, where according to LSJ ad loc. it has a unique meaning "with fair wrists"). Praxidika may also have had aquatic connections in the Doric world; Pausanias describes a joint temple to the sea nymph Thetis (MSS; Schubart and others emend to "Themis") and a Thea Praxidika at Sparta (the MSS indicate a singular goddess, but Hermann emended to the plural, pointing to the plural Praxidikai at Haliartus in Boeotia [Paus. 9.33.3]), which Menelaos allegedly built after he had returned home safely from Troy (3.22.2).

physical object near at hand or employed in the ongoing spell[26] or to the text that is itself inscribed backwards, trampled, or otherwise manipulated.[27] As the neuter plural is limited in our extant texts to references to the words inscribed on a tablet or a papyrus (compare the examples in notes 26 and 27), it seems prudent to assume that some plural noun such as τὰ γράμματα once stood in the lacuna at the end of line 5, and to interpret as I suggest above: "I shall deposit these (sc. "words") in an ox-horn and (then?) beneath the hoary earth."[28] Here, once again, we can much more easily understand the force of the emphatic pronoun ἐγὼ if we interpret the fourth line as a performative utterance employing a future verb.

One last hexametrical charm of Hellenistic date uses a first-person future verb in what might be interpreted as a performative statement—an erotic incantation preserved in one of the earliest extant fragments of a papyrus

26. *DTA* 68b (Attica, fourth century B.C.E.: οὗτος [ὁ νεκρός]); *DTA* 105b (Attica, fourth century B.C.E.: οὗτος ὁ μόλυβδος); *DT* 241 (Carthage, first century C.E.: οὗτος ὁ ἀλέκτωρ); *DT* 111 and 112 (Aquitania, second century C.E.: *hic catellus*). In the latter two cases, the small animals (rooster and puppy) were apparently buried with the lead tablet, see C. A. Faraone, "Hermes without the Marrow: Another Look at a Puzzling Magical Spell," *ZPE* 72 (1988): 282. References to materials manipulated or burnt in a magical ritual: Theoc. *Id.* 2.28 (τοῦτον τὸν κῆρον) and 30 (ὅδε ῥόμβος); *Suppl. Mag.* 56 (τοῦτο τὸ πιττάκιον) and *PGM* XV (τὴν παρακαταθήκην ταύτην).

27. SGD 40 (Attic, late fifth or early fourth century B.C.E., inscribed in retrograde: ὥσπερ ταῦτα (sc. τὰ γράμματα) ἀνένπαλιν, οὕτ[ω] ἐκείνει ‹ἀ›νένπαλιν καὶ ἔπη καὶ ἔργα τὰ πάντα γένοιτο); *DT* 43–44 (Megarian, second century B.C.E.: τὰ γράμματα ταῦτα); SGD 24–38 (Attic, third century C.E.: ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα); *PGM* X 40 (Egypt; fourth century C.E.: ταῦτα τὰ ἅγια ὀνόματα); and Roy Kotansky, "A Silver Amulet for Pain," *J. P. Getty Museum Journal* 11 (1983): 172 (fourth century C.E.: ταῦτα τὰ γραπτά).

28. Carratelli "Praxidika," 341, correctly understands ταῦτα to indicate the imprecation itself inscribed in the lead, but he wrongly interprets ἐρείδειν to refer to an act of nailing ("l'uso di chiodi"). There is, however, no sign of any perforations in the tablet; see the photograph and the drawing which he provides in his "Supplemento," (p. 325, figs. 141–42). On the other hand, there are very few parallels for inserting *materia magica* into an animal horn and then burying it in the ground. The verb ἐρείδειν (meaning "to fix" or "deposit") occurs in the well-known Cyrenean "Cathartic Law" in a section that describes the ritual actions designed to remove an evil spirit or ghost from a private house. According to the directions given there, after the construction of a pair (male and female) of wood or mud statuettes (κολοσσοί), the householder is to "deposit" (the verb is ἐρείδειν) them in some uncultivated spot. In *Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Early Greek Myth and Ritual* (Oxford, 1992), 79–83, I follow Burkert in arguing that this Cyrenean ritual is very similar to a Neo-Assyrian ghost-banning ritual that involves the manufacture of an effigy that is subsequently inserted "into a gazelle horn" and buried. The specific combination of *lead* placed within an *ox*-horn may, however, arise from a different source. When Iris plunges into the sea to deliver a message to the sea nymph Thetis, her action is described in a unique metaphor (Hom. *Il.* 24.81–83): "Like a lead weight . . . which, mounted in the horn of a field-ox, comes bringing death to the ravenous fishes" (ἡ δὲ μολυβδαίνῃ ἰκέλη . . . / ἥ τε κατ' ἀγραύλοιο βοὸς κέρας ἐμβεβαυῖα / ἔρχεται ὠμηστῆσιν ἐπ' ἰχθύσι κῆρα φέρουσα). The precise meaning of the passage was disputed in antiquity (see the scholia and Plut. *Mor.* 976–77), but it is fairly certain that the lead was inserted into the horn; see C. F. Haskins, "On Homeric Fishing-Tackle," *Journal of Philology* 19 (1891): 238–40, esp. 239. If we combine this peculiar design of the ancient Greek fishing weight with the other "aquatic" connections discussed above with regard to the formulaic incongruity of the phrase πολιᾶς ὑπένερθέ τε γαίας (where πολιᾶς should modify the *sea* not the earth, see n. 23) and to the possible connection of Tycha, Praxidika, and Aglaokarpos with sea-deities (see n. 25), I am tempted to speculate that this curse was originally designed to be tossed into the sea and that at some point in its undoubtedly long textual history, the last line of SGD 150 read ἐν βοέωι κέρατι πολιᾶς ὑπένερθε θαλάσσας, a reading that is closer to earlier hexametrical formulae and removes the otiose τε towards the end of the line. The change in ritual from deposit in the sea to burial in the earth might have been prompted by the later assimilation of Persephone and Tyche, the growing importance of her worship at Cyrene, and the practice evidenced elsewhere in the Greek world of leaving curse tablets in Demeter shrines, for which see D. R. Jordan, "Two Inscribed Lead Tablets from a Well in the Athenian Kerameikos," *AM* 95 (1980): 231, n. 23.

magical handbook. Unfortunately, the two verbs in question appear at the very beginning of the charm, which is rather corrupt:[29]

ἐπὶ μήλο̣[υ] ἐ̣πῳδή· τρίς·

βα[λ]ῶ μή̣[λ]ο̣ις [c. 4] δ̣ώσ̣ω τόδε φάρμακ[ον] καίριον αἰεὶ
βρωτὸν θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν.
ᾗ ἂν δῶ μήλῳ τε βάλω μήλῳ τε πατάξω
πάντα ὑπερθεμένη μαίνοιτ' ἐπ' ἐμῆι φιλότητι
εἶτ' ἐν χειρὶ λαβο[ῦ]σ̣α φάγοι ⟨⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – x⟩
ἢ ἐν κόλπωι καθίσαι ⟨καὶ⟩ μὴ παύσ̣ᾳτο φιλῶν με.
⟨πότναι⟩ Κυπρογένεια τέλει τελέαν ἐπαοιδήν.

Incantation over an apple. (Say it) three times:

I shall strike with apples . . . I shall give this *pharmakon,* always timely ‹and?› edible to mortal men and immortal gods. To whomsoever I give (this *pharmakon*) or at whomsoever I throw the apple or hit with it, setting everything aside, may she be mad for my love—whether she takes it in her hand and eats it . . . or sets it in her bosom—and may she not stop loving me. O lady Kyprogeneia bring to perfection this perfect incantation.

This papyrus dates palaeographically to the time of Augustus, but the corruption of the meter and the fact that it appears in a collection of spells suggests that this individual incantation probably dates originally to the Hellenistic period if not earlier.[30] Like the Cyrenean *defixio* quoted above, this apple-spell is hexametrical and uses a first-person future verb and a deictic pronoun (δώσω τόδε φάρμακ[ον]) in tandem with an imperative addressed to a deity (Κυπρογένεια τέλει)—a combination that once again seems to signal a performative utterance equivalent to the present. Given the corruption at the beginning of the text, however, one must sound a note

29. *Supp. Mag.* 72, col. 1, lines 5–14. The text of the metrical incantation itself is set off from the rest of the recipe by indentation and paragraphoi. I print the hexameters as they are reconstructed by the editors of *Suppl. Mag.* on p. 110. For other possible reconstructions of the first two lines, see William Brashear, "Ein Berliner Zauberpapyrus," *ZPE* 33 (1979): 267, Reinhold Merkelbach apud Brashear ibid.; Richard Janko, "Berlin Magical Papyri 21243: A Conjecture," *ZPE* 72 (1988): 293, and Ludwig Koenen apud Janko ibid. n. 1.

30. Brashear, "Zauberpapyrus," 267, discusses the date of the papyrus and its significance in tracing the origins of Greek magical handbooks. *PGM* XX (the so-called "Philinna Papyrus") and *P.Mon. Gr.* inv. 216 (= *Supp. Mag.* 72) are also first-century B.C.E. texts that, despite their very fragmentary state, clearly represent similar, pre-Christian testimonia to a handbook tradition. For a full discussion of the importance of these new finds for the earlier dating of the handbook tradition, see Franco Maltomini, "*P. Mon. Gr.* Inv. 216: Formulario magico" in *Papiri letterari greci,* ed. Antonio Carlini et al., Biblioteca degli Studi Classici e Orientali 13 (Pisa, 1978), 237–66—republished in Carlini, ed., *Papiri letterari greci della Bayerische Staatsbibliothek di Monaco di Baviera* (Stuttgart, 1986), 40–55. The very nature of these handbooks, however, points to a long period of accretion, and A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus,* vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1952), 35–36, pointed out long ago that the many parallels between the *PGM* rituals and those performed by Simaetha in Theoc. *Id.* 2 are manifest and they suggest that individual spells or at least isolated details within the spells of the *PGM* handbooks must date at least as early as the beginning of the Hellenistic period. More recent research has shown in particular that hexametrical charms preserved even in late antique papyri can be traced back to texts composed in the classical period. D. R. Jordan, "A Love Charm with Verses," *ZPE* 72 (1988): 256–57, reconstructs a seven-line erotic incantation on a fourth-century C.E. *defixio,* using an unpublished late-classical lead phylactery in the Getty Museum as his guide, and C. A. Faraone, "Aristophanes *Amphiaraus* Frag. 29 (Kassel-Austin): Oracular Response or Erotic Incantation?," *CQ* 42 (1992): 320–27, argues that a tradition of hexametrical love charms reflected in several *PGM* texts is parodied by Aristophanes and may even have been known to Sappho.

of caution here. As I understand the rite, this incantation is uttered as the apple is tossed at or handed to the victim; thus the future verbs would seem to enact in speech the ongoing actions.[31] But since no detailed instructions (aside from the laconic ἐπὶ μήλο[υ] ἐπῳδή· τρίς·) accompany the incantation, one might just as easily interpret the rite as a preparatory one in which the apple is enchanted at one stage and then given to the victim at a later time. In this reconstruction, the verbs would then be true futures.

The performative future is relatively unknown in later Greek magical spells and when it is securely attested it is usually in an originally metrical charm that—like the apple-incantation quoted above—has found its way in corrupted form into a later handbook. An anger-stopping spell in iambic trimeters, for instance, combines the first-person future tense with imperatives addressed to an unnamed deity.[32] Closer in content and metrical form to the binding-spells discussed above are the opening lines of a third-century C.E. erotic spell from Alexandria:[33]

ἐ[π]ιδήσω σε, Νῖλε, τὸν καὶ Ἀγαθὸν Δαίμονα, ὃν ἔτεκε Δημητρία, κακοῖς μεγάλοις, οὐδὲ θεῶν οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπων εὕρω σοι καθαρὰν λύσιν, ἀλλὰ φιλήσεις με Καπετωλίναν, ἣν ἔτεκε Πεπεροῦς, θεῖον ἔρωτα καὶ ἔσῃ μοι κατὰ πάντα ἀκόλουθος, ἕως ἂν ἐγὼ βούλομαι . . .

I shall bind you, Nilos, also known as Agathos Daimon, whom Demetria bore, with great evils. Neither from gods nor men shall I obtain for you[34] a pure release, but you will love me, Capitolina, whom Peperous bore, with (?) a divine love and you will be my companion in everything, as long as I wish . . .

31. C. A. Faraone. "Aphrodite's ΚΕΣΤΟΣ and Apples for Atalanta: Aphrodisiacs in Early Greek Myth and Ritual," *Phoenix* 44 (1990): 233–36, gives a detailed discussion. There are indications both in much earlier Greek myth and wedding ritual, and in Neo-Assyrian magical ritual as well, that the particular type of ritual employed here (the throwing or presentation of apples) was exceedingly old.

32. *PGM* IX 12–13 is embedded in a scrap of a magical handbook that dates to the fourth or fifth century C.E. The iambic text is mildly corrupt as transmitted, but has been reconstructed as *PGM* Hymn 30 θυμοῦ σε παύσω καί σε πραϋνῶ χολῆς / σῖγ' ἐλθὲ καὶ διακράτει σιγὴν φέρων· / θυμοὺς φρενῶν στῆσόν τε πάντας καὶ σβέσον / ὀργὰς ἁπάσας ὀργίλων (⏑ – ⏑ –). This charm is called a πρόλογος and is part of a much longer incantation addressed to the demon Bainchoooch. For a few other examples of iambic trimeters inscribed on phylacteries to stop (again the imperative verb is στῆσον) pain or discomfort, see D. R. Jordan, "Choliambs for Mary in a Papyrus Phylactery," *HTR* 84 (1991): 343–46. None of the examples collected by Jordan, however, employ the future tense. *DT* 198 (a second-century C.E. *defixio* from Cumae) probably provides another late example of the performative future in the phrase διακόψ[ω . . . τὴ]ν ὀργὴν, yet another spell designed to quell someone's anger.

33. *PGM* XV. For detailed commentaries, see: Karl Preisendanz, "Ein neuer Liebeszauber," *Philologus* 69 (1910): 51–58; Mariangela Vandoni, "Un incantesimo amatorio," *Acme* 13 (1960): 245–49; Albert Henrichs, "Zum Text einiger Zauberpapyri," *ZPE* 6 (1970): 193–203; and idem, "Nochmals *PGM* XV," *ZPE* 7 (1971): 150. I follow Henrichs (see his German translation in *PGM* ad loc.) in rendering the apparent aorist subjunctives in this spell (εὕρω here and ἐνθῶ below in note 34) as futures. For the repeated confusion over the form and function of these two forms in late-antique non-literary papyri, see, e.g., B. G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri* (Athens, 1973), 246–47. Since the compound ἐπιδέω is (as far as I can tell) unknown in extant magical texts, I suggest restoring the lacuna at the beginning of the text as follows: ἐ[γ]ὼ δήσω (in the photograph published by Henrichs in "Zauberpapyri," the beginning of the papyrus is too blurred to be conclusive either way).

34. The papyrus reads ευρωσι here and I translate Henrichs' ("Zauberpapyri") conjecture εὕρω σοι. Roy Kotansky suggests *per litteras*, however, that ευρωσι is an error for εὑρήσι (= εὑρήσει) and that we translate the lines as follows: "Neither from gods nor men will you find for yourself a clean getaway." This interpretation stresses the parallel with φιλήσεις ("Neither from . . . will you find . . . but you will love"), while Henrichs' interpretation connects the verb more closely with the preceding part of the spell ("I shall bind you . . . and neither from . . . shall I obtain a clean getaway for you"), a connection that is supported by phrases such as καταδῶ καὶ οὐκ ἀναλύσω (see note 18).

Previous scholars have noted that this spell contains scraps of hexametrical verse,[35] and it seems fairly clear that we have a very late, corrupted copy of a text that was most likely composed originally in hexameters, like the three longer incantations discussed above. Its kinship with these texts is most obvious from the hexametrical phrases and the formula ἐ[π]ιδήσω σε . . . οὐδὲ . . . εὕρω σοι λύσιν, which seems to be a somewhat extended poetic equivalent of the phrase in SGD 18 (καταδῶ καὶ οὐκ ἀναλύσω) and the other formulae discussed in note 18. Towards the end of this spell, moreover, we find yet another first-person future verb that refers (like ἐρησῶ in the Cyrenean tablet) to the act of inserting the written text itself into a small box that is then presumably buried in a grave: ἐνθῶ τὴν παρακαταθήκην ταύτην, ἵνα μοι τελέσητε πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ πιττακίῳ γεγραμμένα ("I shall insert this commission, in order that you [i.e., the "*daimones* in this place" mentioned earlier in the text] might accomplish all that is inscribed on the chit"). The future verb ἐνθῶ ("I shall insert"; see n. 32 for the form) seems to refer to the ongoing act of placing the πιττάκιον (i.e., the papyrus itself) into a small container that is called a πυξίδιον at lines 17–18 (ἵνα μοι τελέσωσι τὰ ἐν τῷ πυξιδίῳ ὄντα; cf. lines 19–20: ἵνα ἐλθόντες τελέσωσι τὰ ἐν τῷ πυξιδίῳ τούτῳ καὶ καταδήσωσι Νῖλον).[36]

Theocritus in his *Pharmaceutria* is probably drawing on this same popular tradition of hexametrical binding incantations[37] when he has Simaetha employ the future tense four times (thrice with the adverb νῦν) to indicate the ongoing activity of the magical ritual.[38] Certainly the two occurrences at line 33 (νῦν θυσῶ τὰ πίτυρα) and line 159 (νῦν μὲν τοῖς φίλτροις καταδήσομαι) are embedded within the rite itself and must refer to the ritual actions being performed at that very moment by Simaetha herself or by

35. Preisendanz, "Leibeszauber," 53–54, suggests—citing Wünsch's comments *per litteras*—that these opening lines preserve some older scraps of Orphic hexametrical poetry. He is intrigued by the mention of the καθαρὰ λύσις, which recalls an Orphic doctrine discussed by Plato (*Phd.* 81D), who describes the fates of those who μὴ καθαρῶς ἀπολυθεῖσαι. He (following Wünsch) identifies the following phrases as displaying "kunstmässiges Metrum": κακοῖς μεγάλοις; οὐδὲ θεῶν οὐδ{ὲ} ἀνθρώπων; εὕρω σοι καθαρὰν λύσιν, ἀλλὰ φιλήσεις; and θεῖον ἔρωτα.

36. The use of the future to indicate the victim's actions as well (φιλήσεις με) is odd, but not without parallel. A pair of nearly identical Megarian *defixiones* of Hellenistic date (*DT* 43–44) address the corpse in whose grave they were inserted: "But you will never read these words, nor will Akestor [presumably the victim] bring his lawsuit (δίκαν ἐποίσει) against Eratophanes [presumably the *defigens*]."

37. The affinity of this poem with the *defixiones* was obscured for a long time because the manuscripts uniformly read καταθύσομαι at lines 1, 10, and 159 (a verb that stresses the burning action of the ritual). These readings were, however, overturned by the discovery of early papyri that have καταδήσομαι in all three places. Hans Schweizer, *Aberglaube und Zauberei bei Theokrit* (Diss., Basel, 1937), 16–17 and 2–25, discusses the new readings and emphasizes the importance of binding throughout this spell.

38. LSJ s.v., and R. J. Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* (Glasgow, 1924), 282, allow for a special use of νῦν with the future and the former suggests we translate it in a special manner as "presently." This claim of a special usage is suspicious when one notices that nearly all of the examples cited of νῦν with the future involve first-person verbs, e.g.: Hom. *Il.* 5.279 νῦν . . . πειρήσομαι, *Od.* 1.200 νῦν τοι ἐγὼ μαντεύσομαι, and Eur. *El.* 975 νῦν φεύξομαι. This raises the question whether we should talk about a special use of the adverb or rather a special use of the first-person future verbs (such as we see in the parallels amassed here).

her servant.[39] The first two instances, however, appear near the beginning of the poem and are usually explained as statements of intention, which refer to an imminent future action (lines 10–17):[40]

> νῦν δέ νιν ἐκ θυέων καταδήσομαι. ἀλλά, Σελάνα,
> φαῖνε καλόν· τὶν γὰρ ποταείσομαι ἄσυχα, δαῖμον,
> τᾷ χθονίᾳ θ' Ἑκάτᾳ, τὰν καὶ σκύλακες τρομέοντι
> ἐρχομέναν νεκύων ἀνά τ' ἠρία καὶ μέλαν αἷμα.
> χαῖρ', Ἑκάτα δασπλῆτι, καὶ ἐς τέλος ἄμμιν ὀπάδει,
> φάρμακα ταῦτ' ἔρδοισα χερείονα μήτε τι Κίρκας
> μήτε τι Μηδείας μήτε ξανθᾶς Περιμήδας.
> ἴυγξ, ἕλκε τὺ τῆνον ἐμὸν ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἄνδρα.

Now I shall bind him down with spells of burnt offerings. Appear in beauty Selene! For to you, goddess, I shall chant softly, and to Hekate Chthonia, before whom even dogs tremble as she moves along the graves and the dark blood of the dead. Hail, grim Hekate! Accompany us to our goal and make these *pharmaka* no less potent than those of Circe or Medea or golden-haired Perimede. O Iynx, draw that man to my house!

The future tenses here (καταδήσομαι and ποταείσομαι) have been thought to refer to the incantation that allegedly begins at line 17 with the refrain (ἴυγξ, ἕλκε τὺ. . .), but is this, in fact, the case? In Simaetha's invocation of Selene and Hekate she uses the future (ποταείσομαι) in a manner precisely like that of Pindar and the authors of the Homeric *Hymns,* where (as here) no subsequent invocation occurs and the future tenses must refer to the words that are being spoken. In fact, lines 8–11, with their alternation between first-person future verbs and second-person singular imperatives (νῦν . . . καταδήσομαι . . . φαῖνε . . . ποταείσομαι . . . ἐς τέλος ἄμμιν ὀπάδει, φάρμακα ταῦτ' ἔρδοισα), are very much like the first three lines of the Cyrenean *defixio,* where we find καλέω (perhaps a future, see n. 24 above) . . . νῦν παρῆμεν . . . δῆσον . . . ταῦτα δ{ὲ} ἐγὼ ἐρησῶ ⟨τὰ γράμματα?⟩. Simaetha's plea, moreover, that Hekate help bring the spell to fruition echoes traditional magical charms, as does the use of a demonstrative pronoun to refer to her *pharmaka,* i.e., the *materia magica* at hand or perhaps even the hexametrical "incantations" that Simaetha is in the process of performing: φάρμακα ταῦτ' ἔρδοισα (compare δώσω τόδε φάρμακον in the apple-spell and ταῦτα δ{ὲ} ἐγὼ ἐρησῶ ⟨τὰ γράμματα?⟩ in the Cyrenean spell).[41] It is also significant that

39. The verb καταδήσομαι with the adverb νῦν at line 159 has caused some disagreement among commentators. August Meineke, *Theocritus Bion Moschus*[3] (Berlin, 1852), 213, for instance (working with the old manuscript reading καταθύσομαι, for which see n. 37), wished to emend the text to κατέθυσά νιν, since in his view the incantation proper (to his mind indicated by the *iunx*-refrain) had already ended at this point in the poem. K. J. Dover, *Theocritus: Select Poems* [Glasgow, 1971], ad loc., evades the problem by separating the time of the performance of the spell from the time of its effect: "the binding spells which I *have* performed *will* take effect" (his italics). Gow, *Theocritus,* notes ad loc., however, that Simaetha has just sent Thestylis away to smear some *materia magica* on her lover's door as part of the rite, and at this point in the spell she cannot know if the operation has been completed. From a formal point of view, moreover, since the ritual begins with the invocation of Selene at line 10, I fail to see how it can be said to conclude until Simaetha bids farewell to the same goddess in the final line of the poem.

40. I print Gow's (*Theocritus*) text.

41. Faraone, "Aristophanes *Amphiaraus* Frag. 29," points out how Simaetha's plea in line 14 reflects a traditional hexametrical coda, which is usually addressed to Aphrodite (Κυπρογένεια τέλει τελέαν ἐπα-

in three of four instances in which Theocritus uses the performative future, he employs the adverb νῦν to anchor the action in the present, a "deictic" marker used elsewhere by poets in tandem with the performative future.[42]

The late Classical and Hellenistic charms surveyed here are (or once were) hexametrical, share traditional vocabulary and syntax with extant literary hexameters (see notes 20, 23, and 34), and employ constellations of deictic language that regularly appear in archaic choral poems (such as hymns, ἐπινίκια or παρθένεια) performed at important public ceremonies and that refer self-consciously to the on-going performance of the poem in which they appear. How does one explain this peculiar combination of traits? Given the small number of examples discussed above, it might be tempting to suggest that they simply represent the individual idiosyncracies of four somewhat literate individuals living in Cyrene, Athens, and Egypt who self-consciously and independently combine epic vocabulary, performative syntax, and traditional Greek magical *praxis* in a very similar manner. Given the limits of our evidence one cannot, I suppose, rule out such an explanation. In each case, however, these authors—despite their alleged knowledge of arcane archaic poetics—have produced texts that are marred by gross metrical and syntactical infelicities. Throughout this essay I have suggested another way of looking at the evidence: these charms represent some late phase of a half-forgotten genre of hexametrical incantation that in the classical period or earlier combined these three somewhat diverse elements into a pleasing and ritually powerful unity. Such an approach can, I think, make better sense of the similarities between texts from places as distant as Cyrene and Athens and can also help explain the battered state of the extant incantations, which—as discussed in detail in the notes to this essay—show all the signs of a long period of textual degeneration as they were misremembered or miscopied over several generations. This suggestion of a centuries-old tradition of hexametrical charms, moreover, makes better sense of the fact that the performative future, still a living poetic

---

οιδήν) and which appears in a number of magical texts, including the apple-spell discussed above. The word φάρμακα in line 15 often refers to "magical herbs" and one might agree with Gow that here the word refers explicitly to the bay-leaves (lines 1 and 23), the *hippomanes* (line 48) and the *throna* referred to in line 59. LSJ, however, under definition I 3 for this word, suggest a more general meaning ("enchanted potion," "philtre": hence "charm," "spell") and cite this line of Theocritus as an example, where indeed φάρμακα will more naturally refer to all objects (vegetable and other) employed in the rite: the herbs, the dead lizard, the *iunx* and *rhombus*, the wax and even the singing of the charm itself. For a good discussion of the wide range of meanings for the word φάρμακον and the similarly ambiguous Latin word *venenum*, see Clyde Pharr, "The Interdiction of Magic in Roman Law," *TAPA* 63 (1932): 269–95, esp. 272–75, where he discusses the difficulty legal scholars often have in distinguishing between the charges of poisoning and sorcery in law codes and other public inscriptions, for instance, the fifth-century B.C.E. *Dirae Teiorum*, where scholars have debated whether the phrase φάρμακα δηλητήρια means noxious drugs (e.g., Buck) or harmful sorcery (e.g., Dittenburger).

42. Danielowicz, "*Deixis*," 11, points out that in the poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides νῦν is a common marker in the deictic sphere of language, which is generally concerned with the "here and now" of a performance. He also suggests that νῦν is comparable to the phrase τῷδ' ἐν ἄματι "on this day" that begins Pindar's fifteenth *Paean* (frag. 52p [S-M]). For the further ritual possibilities of this temporal marker, see the similar phrase (used in tandem with νῦν) in the first hexameter of the newly discovered gold tablets from Pelinna: νῦν ἔθανες καὶ νῦν ἐγένου, τρισόλβιε, ἄματι τῶιδε (the text is discussed in detail by Fritz Graf,

form in the time of Pindar, Aeschylus, and Sophocles, generally falls into disuse in the actual cult poetry of the Hellenistic and later periods.[43]

In conclusion, we can, I think, talk about an early Greek tradition of hexametrical incantation that employs the future tense in a performative manner, precisely as it is used by Pindar and other early poets. This usage, moreover, properly belongs to the larger category of deictic ritual language that can be identified by the following criteria: 1) a first-person future verb; 2) the use of ἐγώ; 3) the use of νῦν; and 4) the use of demonstrative pronouns. It would appear, moreover, that this peculiar use of first-person future verbs to indicate an ongoing present activity is a special one that regularly signals a ritual or ceremonial context for the performance of the poem, whether the rite is an elaborate erotic incantation like Simaetha's, the important public ceremony at which a victory ode or paean is sung, or the somewhat simpler act of inscribing a binding curse and burying it in the horn of an ox. Previous commentators describe the so-called "encomiastic" or "conventional" future as a poetic expression of present intent or as a dramatic touch that vivifies the moment just prior to the performance of the ode. This approach provides an explanation that may perhaps be plausible for the sophisticated poems of Pindar and Theocritus, but one that is far less convincing when we are confronted with the magical texts discussed above, where the first-person future seems to replace the performative present and where one cannot imagine a locution as weak as a mere expression of future intent. I shall leave it to specialists

---

"Dionysian and Orphic Eschatology: New Texts and Old Questions" in *Masks of Dionysus,* ed. T. H. Carpenter and C. A. Faraone [Ithaca, 1993], 239–58). The aorist tense here (ἔθανες and ἐγένου) is as peculiar as the future discussed in this essay (Graf, for instance, translates it as a perfect: "Now you have died and now you have come into existence . . . ") and suggests, perhaps, the existence of a "performative aorist" as well in ritual or otherwise emphatic speech. Two nearly identical Attic *defixiones* (*DTA* 96 and 97) used against a man named Mikion employ the following formula that clearly refers to the ongoing action of the spell: Μικίωνα ἐγὼ ἔλαβον καὶ ἔδησα. Here, too, there are possible parallels in the Pindaric corpus and other poetic texts. Slater, "Futures," 87, Fogelmark, "Futures," 94, and Danielewicz, "Deixis," p. 15, n. 23, all recognize the use of "conventional" aorist first-person verbs of motion that refer to the poet's arrival at the scene of the performance, e.g., ἔλυθον ἐς χορόν (*Parth.* 2.38), κατέβαν (*Ol.* 7.13), or ἔμολον (*Isthm.* 5.25). Here, too, the aorists appear with deictic language and there is a tendency to translate them as perfects to preserve their focus on the present moment of performance. Elsewhere Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses,* 18, notes a colloquial poetic usage (especially in Attic tragedy and comedy) "when a sudden action which *is just taking place,* is spoken of as if it had already happened" (his italics). Recent commentators on individual Greek tragedies have added to our understanding of this peculiarity. W. S. Barrett, *Euripides' Hippolytus* (Oxford, 1964), 214, suggests, for example, that the aorist ἀπέπτυσα is employed at line 614 (and at Eur. *Hec.* 1276 and *Hel.* 664) and ᾤμωξα at line 1405 because the "speaker, in voicing a sudden emotion, thinks of the moment (just past) of the access of that emotion." He notes Hom. *Il.* 17.173 (ὠνοσάμην) as an example in epic, but concedes that it is chiefly used in Attic drama. Mark Griffith, *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge, 1983) ad loc., also identifies what he calls "instantaneous aorists" at lines 181, 245, 400, and 1070. Here, too, note that all the examples that Barrett and Griffith discuss (except *PV* 181) or cite as parallels (e.g., Soph. *Aj.* 536 and *El.* 668) are *first-person* aorist verbs.

43. Fogelmark, "Futures," 94. Cairns, "*Idyll* 26," 10–13, suggests that the occasional use of choral conventions like the "performative" future by court poets like Callimachus and Theocritus is part of a very self-conscious process of archaizing that goes on in the Hellenistic period, whereby the formal conventions of much older choral poetry are assimilated into hexametrical verse. We have seen above, however, that Theocritus (at least in the second *Idyll*) may simply reflect a living tradition of monodic hexametrical binding curses. Performative futures are also attested sporadically in the Hellenistic and Roman period in what appear to be hexametrical hymns; see note 5 above.

in linguistics to divine precisely how this performative future (or for that matter the performative aorist discussed in note 42) came to be used in such ritual situations, but it seems to me that we have the same phenomenon at work in encomiastic poetry, hymns, and magical incantations, and that we should no longer assume that this use of the first-person future verb is merely a poetic convention or that it is limited solely to sophisticated literary genres, such as epinicians, paeans, and παρθένεια.[44]

University of Chicago

44. I began composing this article at the Center for Hellenic Studies during the winter of 1992. I owe many thanks to Z. and D. Stewart, the other junior fellows, and the staff for making my stay a particularly enjoyable and productive one. I returned to the essay with renewed interest and vigor after participating in a panel at the 1992 Annual Meeting of the APA entitled "The Performance and Ritual Context of Early Greek Poetry," where the papers and comments of A. Henrichs and D. Obbink provided me with yet more parallels and some important new insights. I am especially grateful to K. J. Dover, A. Henrichs, R. Janko, R. Kotansky, D. Martinez, L. Slatkin, and an anonymous referee, who all offered detailed and valuable comments on various drafts of this essay.