REVUE

DE

PHILOLOGIE

DE LITTÉRATURE ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNES

REVUE

DE

PHILOLOGIE

DE LITTÉRATURE ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNES

————

Retrouvez les sommaires de la *Revue de philologie*
et les nouveautés Klincksieck sur
www.klincksieck.com

LANGUE POÉTIQUE ET FORMES DIALECTALES DANS LES INSCRIPTIONS VERSIFIÉES GRECQUES

Partie thématique coordonnée
par Alcorac Alonso Déniz et Eleonora Santin

Ce dossier rassemble les contributions issues de la journée d'étude « Langue poétique et formes dialectales dans les inscriptions versifiées grecques » qui a eu lieu à Lyon le 15 juin 2018 et que nous avons organisée sous l'égide du Laboratoire *HiSoMA* et de la *Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée.*

Pendant cette rencontre nous avons souhaité nous focaliser sur les aspects linguistiques de la poésie épigraphique, un sujet qui n'a été traité que sous des angles de vue partiels ou dans le cadre d'études de plus large ampleur. Dans le volume collectif *Dialect, Diction and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram* publié en 2016 sous la direction de E. Sistakou et A. Rengakos, la question de l'apparence linguistique tient une place marginale dans un ensemble hétérogène de réflexions sur la langue, l'énonciation et le style de l'épigramme de tradition littéraire et épigraphique. En revanche, notre regard s'est porté plus spécialement sur la langue des inscriptions métriques, des épigrammes en particulier, mais aussi, incidemment, d'autres typologies d'inscriptions versifiées. Nous n'avons pas imposé des restrictions chronologiques. Les auteurs se sont appuyés notamment sur des textes d'époque archaïque et classique, période pendant laquelle les traits et les diversités dialectaux sont plus profondément marqués. Néanmoins, puisqu'au IVe siècle av. J.-C. la stabilisation graduelle de la koinè entraîne un changement marquant, sans pour autant constituer une barrière linguistique, les documents d'époque hellénistique ont été également pris en compte. Afin de brosser un cadre évolutif complet et de ne pas négliger les phénomènes de persistance et de résurgence du dialecte, les inscriptions d'époque romaine n'ont pas été exclues.

Des spécialistes internationaux d'épigraphie, littérature et linguistique de régions différentes du monde grec s'interrogent sur le rapport entre langues littéraires de traditions diverses et dialectes épichoriques dans les inscriptions versifiées. Les huit contributions de ce dossier essaient de déterminer les motivations des choix linguistiques des auteurs de poèmes conçus pour être affichés et lus dans un contexte local ou international et de discerner la relation de ces choix avec l'identité culturelle des poètes, des commanditaires et des destinataires des inscriptions. Les contributeurs s'interrogent également sur l'existence de spécificités propres à chaque région étudiée (Attique, Eubée, Péloponnèse, Crète, Cyrénaïque et Sicile) et sur la présence de traits communs au genre épigrammatique.

Existe-t-il une seule langue de la poésie épigraphique ou plusieurs ? Ces huit articles essaient de répondre à cette question.

Nous souhaitons remercier les collègues qui ont contribué à la pleine réussite de la journée d'étude et de sa publication, Véronique Chankowski, ancienne directrice de notre laboratoire, Françoise Le Mort, directrice de la *MOM*, et nos collègues Julien Aliquot, Alain Blanc, Isabelle Boehm, Richard Bouchon, Pascale Brillet-Dubois, Jacques Cazeaux et Bruno Helly. Nous tenons à exprimer également notre reconnaissance à Philippe Hoffmann, directeur de la *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*, et aux membres du Comité éditorial, qui ont accepté de publier notre dossier, ainsi qu'aux relecteurs de la revue, dont les nombreuses observations et corrections ont amélioré les contributions.

Alcorac ALONSO DÉNIZ
Eleonora SANTIN
(*CNRS/HiSoMA*)

ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL
INSCRIBED EPIGRAMS FROM SICILY:
LANGUAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT [1]

1. Ancient Sicily and its epigraphy

At first sight, Sicily represents the ideal field of investigation for the study of the language of inscribed epigrams and its interaction with local dialectal varieties. Ever since the 8th century BC the island was home to different Greek dialects, experienced intense language contact, produced its own poetry (Stesichorus, Empedocles and Epicharmus, to mention only a few obvious names) and welcomed all the most prominent Classical Greek authors: from Pindar to Aeschylus and Plato. Within this rich historical, cultural and linguistic context, a study of Sicilian epigrams should ideally aim at unravelling the evolution of the genre from the archaic and Classical periods down to the Hellenistic and Roman ages. The study of the earlier periods should ascertain, on a general level, the structural, thematic and rhetorical elements that characterise Sicilian epigrams vis-à-vis those from other Greek areas, particularly Attica. On the linguistic level, it would be necessary to analyse the interaction between the literary language employed by the genre and the local dialect(s), as already done for other regional corpora. [2] In the case of Sicily, such a linguistic analysis would find a further element of interest in the fact that the island was home to both Euboean Ionic (at Naxos, Leontinoi, Zancle and Himera) and *mitior* Doric (at Syracuse and her sub-colony Camarina, at Megara Hyblaea and her sub-colony Selinous, at Gela and her sub-colony Akragas) and that these Greek varieties came into contact with non-Greek languages such as Sicel and Elymian. Thus, it would be necessary to investigate whether the language of epigrams shows any differences according to the *polis* where they were produced, as is the case with prose inscriptions.

The study of Hellenistic epigrams, for its part, should first take into account a profoundly changed linguistic context, produced by multiple and complex

2. *E.g.* Mickey 1981 on Thessaly, followed by Passa 2016; for a critique of this methodology, see Alonso Déniz and Nieto Izquierdo 2009 on epigrams from Argolis and Guijarro Ruano 2016 on epigrams for the Peloponnese: these scholars make the case for a different approach to the presence of local dialects in epigrams down to the end of the Classical age.

historical events, the most prominent of which are first the rise of Syracuse and then the Roman conquest. The Syracusan hegemony triggered the development of a regional variety, the so-called Doric *koina*. [3] Just like Magna Graecia, Sicily resisted the penetration of the Attic-Ionic koine and employed this Doric standard until the early Imperial age. [4] Given this new linguistic context, the first aspect that a study of Sicilian Hellenistic epigrams should tackle is whether the disappearance of dialectal differences and the spread of the Doric *koina* is reflected in the language of epigrams. In the Hellenistic age, across the whole Greek world, stone epigrams abandoned the use of local dialects in favour of an Ionic-based literary language in which, however, the odd Doric feature could be employed. [5] In principle, one might expect that in an area such as Sicily, where Doric was still used as an official variety, epigrams too would be more likely to include Doric features. More generally, the ideal study of Sicilian epigrams should compare the two chronological periods I have just described, in order to tackle broader issues – for instance, whether changes in the historical and political context affect epigrammatic practices and the rituals which they accompany, from honorific dedications to cemetery and sanctuary contexts.

Interactions between literary and local language, linguistic evolution over the Hellenistic age, the impact of language change on the epigraphic habit: these are the prominent issues which emerge when we approach the topic of Sicilian epigrams. However, it is often difficult to analyse these issues in depth. We have a discontinuous knowledge of both the epigraphy of certain *poleis/*areas (a case in point is Syracuse before the Hellenistic age) and certain categories of texts. For instance, there are very few laws and institutional texts from the archaic and Classical periods and even the two most important ones (the fragmentary text on land-distribution from Himera, *IGDS* II, 15, and the *lex sacra* from Selinous, *IGDS* II, 18) are fraught with interpretative problems, given our very scarce knowledge of the institutional landscape of these two *poleis* and the silence of ancient historical sources on the topic. To date, the most extensive epigraphic corpus from Classical Sicily comes from Selinous, but this is also the outcome of the great number of *defixiones* unearthed in the area, a textual category which of course has its own features and is hardly informative on the history of the city. In the light of all these difficulties, it is

---

3. The reference study is now Mimbrera Olarte 2012a, which discusses the *koina* in the context of her investigation of Sicilian Doric. For an overview, see too Mimbrera Olarte 2012b and 2012c.

4. C. Consani has contributed much to the definition of the interaction between koine and *koina* in southern Italy: see especially Consani 1995, 1996, 1999 and 2016. A new linguistic investigation of the Doric *koina* in both Magna Graecia and Sicily is being undertaken by Livia Tagliapietra: see Tagliapietra 2018a and 2018b.

5. This can be also observed in many Hellenistic literary epigrams. On their meaning, see Coughlan 2016.

hard to say whether the few official texts or, for instance, the few Syracusan inscriptions result from unsystematic archaeological investigation or reflect a specifically Sicilian epigraphic habit.

2. Sicilian epigrams: interpretative issues

This last question arises also when one focuses on the textual typology of inscribed epigrams in the Sicilian corpus as a whole. P. A. Hansen's *Carmina epigraphica Graeca* contain only eight Sicilian epigrams dated between the 7th and the late 5th century BC: four dedicatory epigrams (*CEG* 392, 393, 397 and 398) and four funerary epigrams (*CEG* 147, 148, 149 and 663). [6] *CEG* 663 (cf. *IGDS* I, 27) from Megara Hyblaea, dated to the early 5th century, is a strange text, which can only be included among verse inscriptions by assuming that it is composed in iambics (specifically six iambic feet: see Hansen's scansion). This reading is not impossible but not particularly appealing either: the text (τᾶς hαγίᾱ θυγατρός εἰμι Καπρογόνō) is very short, consisting of the mere name + εἰμί + patronymic formula and seems to me more likely to have been in prose than in verse. [7] For these reasons, I will not include it in the present analysis. New publications that appeared after *CEG* have added only a possible ninth epigram, namely the inscription engraved on the so-called 'Castiglione Warrior' (*IGDS* II, 44). Although it is debated whether this text makes up a hexameter or not, in this paper I will consider it a likely example of verse inscription, one that is all the more interesting since it hails not from a major Greek *polis*, but from an isolated indigenous centre in the middle of south-east Sicily (see Section 3.2 below).

Compared to late-archaic and Classical epigrams, Hellenistic and Roman epigrams from Sicily are harder to study as a group. We have no epigraphic corpus for these periods, which one must therefore produce by crossing the data in the obsolete *IG* XIV with those in *SEG* and in museum *corpora* (such as *IGPalermo*). [8] A collection and full (linguistic, archaeological and epigraphic) study of post-Classical Sicilian epigrams still awaits to be undertaken. [9]

6. I do not consider here the epigrams dated to after the end of the 5th century, *i.e. CEG* 830, 832 and 896 (all engraved after the middle of the 4th century). See note 9 below.

7. The inscription had previously been thought to be unmetrical, hence its absence from *CEG* I (Hansen later admitted it into the addenda published in *CEG* II): see *LSAG*, p. 270. It is telling that Guarducci, *EG* I, p. 316, thought that the inscription was in iambic trimeters, while Dubois (*IGDS* I, 27) limits himself to describing it as an "épitaphe métrique" without further metrical analysis. The interpretation of the text too is far from plain: it requires taking Καπρογόνō as the genitive of a neuter name used for a woman (Καπρόγονον, according to O. Masson's suggestion: see Dubois *ad IGDS* I, 27, Hansen *ad CEG* 663). The patronymic hαγίᾱ would then show Doric genitive ending.

8. The Oxford *ISicily* database (http://sicily.classics.ox.ac.uk/, retrieved 06.06.2019) is far from being complete and cannot be used to obtain reliable results.

9. For a foray, focusing on Hellenistic epigrams only, see the Venice MA thesis of Pratali Maffei 2018, which analyses seven epigrams (*SEG* 41, 837; *CEG* 662a, 830, 832, 896; *SEG* 34,

Apart from *CEG* 663, the *corpus* of Sicilian inscribed epigrams dating from the 5th century BC therefore consists in *CEG* 147, 148, 149, 392, 393, 397, 398 with the likely addition of the Castiglione Warrior inscription. Three of the four dedicatory epigrams (some of which very fragmentary) have been unearthed in the Panhellenic sanctuaries of Delphi and Olympia and it is doubtful whether their language reflects the local dialect. This paper will therefore particularly focus on funerary epigrams, the language of which will be analysed vis-à-vis the archaeological context in which their supporting monuments or stone were first erected and then unearthed, in the light of recent works which have made the case for approaching inscribed epigrams 'holistically' (*e.g.* Kaczko 2016) or 'three-dimensionally' (*e.g.* Santin and Foschia 2016, p. 16-17). Funerary contexts, which are so dense with cultural implications, represent an ideal case-study to assess the interaction between epigrams and their contexts of production.

3. A look at the archaic and Classical dedicatory epigrams from Sicily

Three of the four Sicilian dedicatory epigrams celebrate agonistic victories and make similar linguistic choices. *CEG* 397 is inscribed on the Charioteer of Delphi: it celebrates a member of the Deinomenid family and is dated to 478 or 474 BC. The version *post rasuram* mentions Polyzelus; it is debated whether he was the dedicator of the text *ante rasuram* as well. [10] Be that as it may, the epigram must be attributed to Syracuse or Gela. I will give the text from *CEG* with the only addition of the macron on epsilon and omicron to avoid ambiguity.

CEG 397 (Delphi < Syracuse/Gela, 478 or 474 BC), see also *IGDS* I, 133, *ISic.MG* II², 44

> *Ante rasuram*:
> [– ‿‿ – ‿‿ – ‿] Γέλας ἀνέ[θε̄κ]ε Ϝανάσσ[ο̄ν]
> [– ‿‿ – ‿‿ – τ]ὸν ἄεξ’ εὐόνυμ’ Ἄπολλ[ον].
>
> *Post rasuram*:
> [– ‿‿ – ‿‿ – ‿ Π]ολύζαλός μ’ ἀνέθηκ[ε]
> [– ‿‿ – ‿‿ – τ]ὸν ἄεξ’ εὐνο̄́υμ’ Ἄπολλ[ον].

954; *IG* XIV, 433) dated from the period 4th-1st century BC, though none is actually dated to the 1st century. She also mentions, without studying them, six further dubious or very fragmentary texts (*IG* XIV, 11, 56, 219, 411; texts nos. 22 and 24 in Manganaro 1994). The larger Roman-age corpus still awaits to be treated in a comprehensive manner.

10. Jeffery, *LSAG*, p. 266, advances the hypothesis that the original dedication made by Polyzelus was altered when Gela expelled its tyrants. Alternatively, the original text may have contained the names of Hiero or Gelo. For a historical overview and the still unsolved issues, see the recent summaries in Day 2010, p. 214-215 and Morgan 2015, p. 75-80.

This epigram features the traditional elements of dedicatory texts. In the text *post rasuram* Polyzelus' name is marked through Doric /aː/.[11] This linguistic choice is accompanied by the innovative orthography in ἀνέθηκε.

CEG 398 comes from Olympia, is dated to 525 BC and was incised on a bronze plinth, once supporting a little statue, dedicated by Pantares son of Menecrates, the father of Geloan tyrants Cleander and Hippocrates:[12]

CEG 398 (Olympia < Gela, *ca* 525 BC), see also *IGDS* I, 132, *ISic.MG* II² 4

Παντάρε̄ς μ' ἀνέθε̄κ[ε] Μενεκράτιος Διὸ[ς – –]
[– ⏗ – ⏗ – ⏗ – ⏗]τô Γελοαίō.

The poor state of conservation of the text does not allow any clear-cut conclusions on its dialect. The genitive Μενεκράτιος is perhaps a local feature. The other genitive, Γελοαίō, is more noteworthy because it seems to point to the existence of an alternative form for the ethnic Γελῶιος.[13] The remaining parts of the epigram are completely formulaic.

CEG 393 too comes from Olympia and was dedicated by the Himerean athlete Ergoteles, whom Pindar celebrated in the twelfth Pythian ode. It is dated to around 464 BC[14]:

CEG 393 (Olympia < Himera, *ca* 464 BC), see also *ISic.MG* III, 52

Ἐργοτέλης μ' ἀνέθηκ[ε ⏑ – ⏗ – ⏑ ⏑ – –]
  Ἕλλανας νικῶν Πύθι[α – ⏑ ⏑ –],
καὶ δύ' Ὀλυμπιάδας, δ[⏗ – ⏗ – ⏑ ⏑ – –]],
  Ἱμέραι ἀθάνατον μν[ᾶμ(α) (⏑) ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –].

The only secure dialectal element of this text is Ἕλλανας of l. 2. The remaining part employs the typical expressions of dedicatory epigrams commissioned by Olympic winners.[15]

11. Hansen edits the participle ϝανάσσ[ōν] of the text *ante rasuram* with digamma, but there is no trace of this letter on the stone.

12. The type of victory celebrated by this dedication remains unknown. For the interpretation of the plinth, see *LSAG*, p. 273 n. 1 and Day 2010, p. 215.

13. Dubois 1989, p. 151, interprets it as the etymological form of the ethnonym, but does not clarify its formation. From Γέλα one would expect perhaps Γελαῖος, a form only attested in Stephanus of Byzantium and never employed in epigraphic and numismatic sources (the genitive Γελῶων being the standard form on coins). An alternative explanation was put forward by Bechtel 1923, p. 639, according to whom the ethnonym Γελοαῖος derives "vom Namen der Stadtgenie Γελώ" through the intermediate form Γελοία. Although this is not impossible, there is no evidence in its favour.

14. For the alphabetic variety employed in the text, see Kaczko's article in this volume, p. 41.

15. A short commentary on this text in Day 2010, p. 212.

Taken together, these three texts from Panhellenic sanctuaries do not provide us with any linguistic evidence to seriously discuss the language of the Sicilian epigrammatic genre. The only Doric feature of *CEG* 398, while notable in a Panhellenic context, is not striking, while those of *CEG* 397 and *CEG* 393 are ambiguous. They could certainly be due to the dialect of Syracuse/Gela and Himera (the latter had been repopulated with Doric people in the 5th century), but it is not unlikely – indeed, in my opinion it is very probable – that the general Doric veneer of both epigrams is due to a variety of reasons: first of all, the Delphic and Olympian contexts (both West Greek areas) and secondly the wish to evoke the language of epinician odes. The linguistic choice, that is, could be due to motivations which are not dissimilar to those that brought the Athenian Alcmeonides to dedicate an epigram employing a mixture of Attic and Doric in the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoios in Boeotia (*CEG* 302, in iambic trimeters): its use of Doric /aː/ is a homage to both the dialect of the region and to the epinician tradition, as S. Kaczko has recently stressed.[16] Another hint in favour of this interpretation is the use of ἀέξω in the invocation to Apollo of *CEG* 397. In the whole of the Greek epigraphic corpus (investigated through the *PHI* online database), the imperative form of this verb is only found in three inscriptions: this epigram, a funerary epigram from Acarnania (*IG* IX 1² 2, 408, 2nd century BC), and an epigram from Cos (*GVI* 1158, 1st century AD). However, ἀέξω is a common verb in the language of victory odes, especially Pindaric ones, where the imperative or optative form is employed in the invocation to a god at the end of the ode.[17]

In conclusion, the dialectal mixture of these three epigrams, their content and their contexts are not very helpful when it comes to studying the relationship between local dialects and the language of the epigrammatic genre.[18] From the archaeological point of view too they are not useful for the purpose of defining Sicilian epigrammatic practices: while they testify to the Sicilian tyrants' penchant for Panhellenic displays, they tell us very little about whether the tyrants and their entourage sought the same kind of public visibility in Sicily itself.[19]

CEG 392 is a different case. This is a common dedication, incised by one Θρίπυλος (or Θριπύλος)[20] on the foot of an Attic vase dedicated in 'D' temple on Himera's acropolis around the end of the 5th century BC:

16. Kaczko 2016, p. 442 and 446. See also her paper in this volume, p. 42-43.

17. In Pi., *O.* 6, 105 and 8, 88 the verb occurs (in the imperative and optative) in the invocation to a god at the very end of the ode, just as in *CEG* 397. The rare occurrences in Simonides and Bacchylides do not belong to invocations.

18. Dubois does not include *CEG* 393 in his *IGDS* I because he does not consider this text truly representative of the dialect of Himera. This choice may perhaps seem too extreme: see the different approach of Arena in *ISic.MG* III, 52.

19. On this point, which is beyond the scope of this paper, see the recent work by Morgan 2015.

20. For the name and its accentuation, see Dubois 2008, p. 111, n. 17; Dell'Oro 2010, p. 17 and 2013, p. 312.

CEG 392 (Himera, end of 5th c. BC), see also *IGDS* I, 8; *ISic.MG* III, 45:

Ζ͆νὸς ἐριγδούποιο κόρͅι γλαυκόπι Ἀθένͅι
 Θρίπυλος εὐξάμενος τένδ᾽ ἀνέθͅκε θεᾶι.

To the daughter of the thundering Zeus, the gleaming-eyed Athena,
Thripylos dedicated this (*sc*. cup) to the goddess having made a vow.

The text adheres to the conventions of the epic *Kunstsprache* both in terms of word-choice (see especially the two divine epithets) and of morphology (see the genitive in -οιο). However, it also admits a non-epic feature, *i.e.* the lack of the third compensatory lengthening in κόρη: unless one thinks that this word is an Atticism, it can only be a local element, because Euboean has both [ε:] from [a:] and the lack of the third compensatory lengthening. [21] Θεά (l. 2) too could be gesturing towards the local language. Although this may simply be another epic feature, it is not unlikely that it was the form for 'goddess' in the dialect of Himera at this chronological stage: θεά is the normal form in post-Classical Sicilian Greek and may have circulated outside originally Doric colonies well before the rise of the Doric *koina*. [22] The dative γλαυκώπι is more mysterious. Dell'Oro 2010 has explained it as a case of hypercorrection which arose in the Euboean dialect and led to the coining of an analogical dative based on *i*-stems. [23] In spite of this ingenious hypothesis, I am inclined to think that what we have here is a simpler case: a poor ending of the hexameter, in which the odd dative γλαυκώπι (with its last syllable abbreviated in hiatus) represents a maladroit adaptation of the epic accusative formulae γλαυκώπιδ᾽ *vel* γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην. [24]

Overall, the *corpus* of Sicilian dedicatory epigrams is limited. Most of the epigrams come from the Panhellenic sanctuaries, with the only exception of

21. The same form, κόρη, is also attested in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* (l. 439), as A. Alonso Déniz points out to me: it could be a local feature there as well. For the avoidance of local κόρη in Attic epigrams, see Kaczko's article in this volume, p. 48-49.

22. On the influence of epic language θεά soon spread to Attic epigrams, but remained rare in other areas. There are only two non-Attic attestations in *CEG* I (353, from Corinth, and 400, from Antipolis) and three in *CEG* II (840, from Keos, 876, from Pergamum, and 888, from Lycia). At this chronological stage Himerean inscriptions testify to the arrival of Doric-speaking people in the city. I discuss the issue of the 'mixed' character of the dialect of Himera in Tribulato 2018, where I also deal with this epigram.

23. According to Dell'Oro's interpretation, since in Euboean *i*-stems had developed the analogical genitive -ιδος, a standard dental-stem dative such as γλαυκώπιδι would have been felt to be too 'local' and hence avoided and replaced with γλαυκώπι (hence the accentuation, because the last syllable would be originally long). But see now Dell'Oro 2013, p. 312-316, with a more nuanced approach. A possibly comparable case of a local feature replacing an epic element is discussed by Guijarro Ruano in this volume p. 115-117.

24. The mistake cannot be due to confusion between alpha and delta because the latter has the normal Chalcidian shape (<D>) in this graffito. See my discussion in Tribulato 2018.

the local example *CEG* 392. We get the impression of an epigraphic habit that reserved metrical inscriptions for important dedications, while more common ones were non-metrical. [25] Hypothetical as this conclusion might be, it is worth noting that the distribution is also reflected in the linguistic choices: the adherence to literary language in the first three texts makes it hard for us to perceive the contribution of the local dialect.

3. Archaic and Classical funerary epigrams from Sicily

Let us now turn to the three confirmed epigrams from the archaic and Classical periods, and to the more ambiguous inscription of the Castiglione Warrior. These are analysed below according to a chronological criterion and considering the archaeological context of their discovery and the type of monument on which they are inscribed. This broader approach will help us define these texts in relation to Sicilian epigraphic habits and analyse their linguistic choices against a clearer historical and material background.

3.1. CEG *148: a fragmentary but unique funerary monument from Selinous*

Selinous, end 6th – mid-5th century BC [26]

[– ⏗ – ⏗ π]αῖδ' οἴκτιρ' Ε[(⏑)– ⏑ ⏑ – –]
   [–]μορον h[– ⏗ – – ⏗ δακ]ρυόες.

1. μοίρ]αι δ᾽ οἰκτίρε[τε ὦ παροδεῖται] Manni Piraino 1966 (*ed. pr.*) and 1972; [hίλο π]αῖδ᾽ οἴκτιρ' Ἐ[ρασίστρατον, ὄντα γάμοιο] Peek 1976. 2. [ἄμ]μορον h[ε̄βέτε̄ν κεῖται ἐκεῖ κ]ρυόες Manni Piraino 1972; [ἄμ]μορον h[όντε Ἀίδας hάρπασε δακ]ρυόες Peek 1976.

If we exclude for the moment the Castiglione Warrior inscription, *CEG* 148 is the oldest Sicilian funerary epigram known to us. The inscription is very fragmentary and is distributed on the front side of the pedestal of a little monument in local sandstone with traces of a cornice, on which according to Manni Piraino two juxtaposed leonine paws were visible. The right side of the inscription is intact, while the text is fragmentary on the left side of the stone. The script used is Selinuntine, but the shape of individual letters and the bad state of the stone do not allow accurate dating; the *ductus* of the inscription is irregular; the size of letters progressively increases from

---

25. See for instance the large corpus of dedicatory inscriptions from the sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios at Selinous (*IGDS* I, 41-50).
26. Although the *editio princeps* dates back to 1966, this epigram is puzzlingly not included in *IGDS* and *ISicMG*.

line to line. [27] Because of the fragmentary state of the stone, it is impossible to establish the name of the deceased or why he died. Even so, both Manni Piraino 1966 and 1972 and Peek 1976 propose bold restorations of the text: Peek 1976, p. 93 even produces an 'apograph' of his restored text as if it were really engraved on the stone.

Taking a soberer approach, it may be useful to start the linguistic analysis of this text from the compound adjective in -μορος of l. 2. This is one of two attestations of an adjective in -μορος in Greek verse inscriptions before the end of the 5th century, and certainly the oldest (the other being αἰνόμορος of *CEG* 94, dated to *ca* 410-400 BC). In this same line, the final adjective is more likely to be δακρυόεις (which Hansen indeed restores) and not κρυόεις as suggested by Manni Piraino ('chilling', with reference to Hades or death, according to a well-known motif in archaic poetry). [28]]ρυόες is certainly the last word of the epigram, because there is a clear empty space after its sigma and the part of the stone below does not bear any traces of letters. [29] It follows that the epigram was in elegiacs.

The most interesting aspect of this text is that it contains the only attestation of the verb οἰκτίρω in Sicily, here employed in the funerary motif of the dialogue with the passer-by, who is invited to mourn the deceased. [30] This use of οἰκτίρω is typically Attic: it is first documented in Tettichos' epigram (*CEG* 13), from the second quarter of the 6th century, but after a time of relative popularity (cf. *CEG* 27, 28, 51, 68) the verb completely disappears from funerary epigrams. The Selinuntine epigram might therefore bear witness to a tardy revival of an Attic model in a colonial context. [31] The motif of the epigrammatic mourning for the dead could also have found particularly fertile soil in Selinous, which has yielded the highest number of so-called *oimoi*-inscriptions, unmetrical epitaphs which begin with this mourning interjection. [32]

If this epigram is not particularly useful to assess how literary language and local dialect interacted at Selinous, the typology and location of its medium in the archaeological landscape of the city may provide additional interesting

27. The photo of the inscription is provided by Manni Piraino 1966, tab. LVIII, and 1972, tab. LVIII. For the apograph, see Peek 1976, though with the *caveats* expressed below.

28. In *CEG* I the adjective characterises θάνατος (*CEG* 46), πόλεμος (*CEG* 47) and μνῆμα (*CEG* 58). This epigram from Selinous may therefore attest to its first use as an attribute of Hades.

29. As shown by the photo (see note 27 above), the text in Wallace 1970, p. 105, which posits a lacuna after κ]ρυόες, is wrong.

30. On this epigraphic motif, see Lattimore 1942, p. 230-234; Day 1989, p. 17-20; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, p. 174-179; Tonini 2003; Tueller 2010.

31. Tueller 2010, p. 47, includes the Selinuntine epigram among those which show Attic influence.

32. The texts are collected in *IGDS* I, 63-69 and *IGDS* II, 25. See Brugnone 2008 for the epigraphic study and Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, p. 152-160, for their connection with Sicilian funerary practices. Burkhardt 2013, p. 221-222 and 234, advances the hypothesis that the *oimoi*-inscriptions were a local phenomenon, which Selinous inherited from Megara Hyblaea and further developed.

information. The monument on which the epigram is inscribed was found by chance in 1953 during field clearing on the north side of the Timpone Nero necropolis, which is part of the vaster Manicalunga necropolis. [33] This is the most extensive cemetery in Selinous and extends to the north-west of the Gàggera hill, the site where the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros and Zeus Meilichios is located and where chtonic cults used to be performed. The necropolis was used without interruption from the last quarter of the 6th century to the end of the 5th. The material unearthed in the official archaeological campaigns still awaits to be fully published and this, coupled with the well-known Sicilian problem of illicit excavations, makes it difficult to gain a precise idea of the correlation between types of graves and the social status of the deceased. [34] To date, Selinous' necropoleis give us a very different picture from that of the wealthy Athenian cemeteries which we instinctively turn to for a comparison. Both the typology of the tombs and their grave goods are modest, although there is a slight difference between the sector of the Manicalunga near the Gàggera and the Timpone Nero part. The former, which is closer to the city and to the sanctuary of Demeter, seems to have functioned as a higher-status cemetery for members of the same family. [35] To the contrary, the Timpone Nero is characterised by graves of a poorer kind: the unearthed goods have not yielded any precious metals or refined import ware. [36]

Given this archaeological context, the monument of *CEG* 148, which Manni Piraino 1966, p. 202, described as "accurate and elaborate", is noteworthy. [37] Funerary stones decorated with reliefs (regardless of whether inscribed or not) are rare in Sicily, while in this case we have a stele with a little cornice and a leonine statue. The most common types of grave in the Timpone Nero are the monosomatic tomb and the one covered by large stones, while terracotta sarcophagi are rare. Hence, a tomb marked by a little monument might be taken to have been of a certain importance. It is not possible to identify what kind of lion this monument had – or indeed, whether it *was* a lion and not another kind of funerary animal – but it must have been quite a highlight in a context where funerary stones were generally plain, and mostly decorated with geometric

---

33. See Manni Piraino 1966, p. 202.

34. The other two necropoleis are Galera-Bagliazzo to the north and Buffa to the east, the latter studied by Meola 1996. An overview of the Selinuntine cemeteries is provided by Isler 1994. The in-depth study of Manicalunga necropolis, one of the most important areas of Selinous' archaeological park, is hampered by the fact that excavations have not been regular and have crossed paths with illicit digs.

35. The complete study of the Gàggera sector is that by Kustermann Graf 2002.

36. The comprehensive study of 563 graves from this necropolis, that of Leibundgut Wieland 1994, is unpublished. See Leibundgut Wieland 1995 for an overview.

37. This interpretation is reiterated in Manni Piraino 1972, no. 91. However, concerning the decoration, Leibundgut Wieland 1995, p. 196 states: "lo stato di conservazione è pessimo e il soggetto non è più determinabile con certezza. I resti conservati sono forse da interpretare come piede di leone".

motifs. [38] All these elements suggest that this monument constitutes an important exception in the Selinuntine funerary context. Unfortunately, since this was a sporadic discovery there is no contextual information (*e.g.*, grave goods) that allows us to define the age, sex and social status of the deceased. In her *editio princeps* M.T. Manni Piraino noted that the later 1965 archaeological campaign attempted to find other fragments of the same monument but to no avail. [39] On that occasion, archaeologists investigated a child's tomb, which however cannot be related to the stele. [40] The whole necropolis area, just like most of Selinous, had already been illicitly excavated before the beginning of the official dig.

It would certainly be far-fetched to draw conclusions about what message this monument was meant to convey, given its fragmentary and isolated status. However, my hunch is that what we have here is the tomb of a young man (see παῖδα, l. 1), probably from an important family, whose aristocratic and perhaps military virtues were expressed through both the epigram and the lion iconography, which is usually associated with high social status. [41] The hypothesis that this grave was an important one receives further support from an analysis of the text chosen to accompany the monument. The choice of an elegiac couplet which imitates the Attic motif of dialogue epigrams characterised by οἰκτίρω contributes to isolating this monument within both the Selinuntine and the Sicilian context. None of the other epitaphs from Selinous are in verse. The common types are the simple name in the genitive followed by the patronymic, or σᾶμα (with or without εἰμί) followed by the name of the deceased in the genitive, or the typical *oimoi*-formula.

Putting together the evidence from both monument and epigram, I would conclude that this monument celebrated a young man who died at war (see too Hansen's conclusion). Two of the archaic epigrams inviting the passer-by to "pity" (οἰκτίρειν) the deceased commemorate young men who died in battle (*CEG* 13, 27). δακρυόεις, the adjective that most probably must be restored in l. 2, often occurs as an epithet of πόλεμος (*e.g.*, *CEG* 47). Although I would not wish to press this interpretation further here, I just wish to point out that the final pentameter could easily contain πόλεμος or Ἄρης (Hansen's guess) and not Ἀίδας, followed by a 'killing verb'. [42]

---

38. To the best of my knowledge, there is no comprehensive study of Selinuntine funerary sculpture. Burkhardt 2013, p. 220, mentions Ionic capitals, albeit ones unearthed outside of any clear archaeological context, simple stelai bearing the name of the deceased, stelai decorated with shields (see Burkhardt 2013, p. 222), and remains of buildings dated to the 4th century. With regard to the Buffa necropolis Meola 1996, p. 11, notes: "ad eccezione di rozzi cippi e di una stele […] non sono documentati segnacoli in materiale durevole al di sopra dell'antico livello del terreno."

39. See Manni Piraino 1966, p. 202 n. 9.

40. The excavation journal, which Leibundgut Wieland 1995 later studied, does not link the monument to any grave.

41. Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, p. 273.

42. The syntagm with πόλεμος + a verb is not attested in archaic inscriptions. Tueller 2016 provides an essential overview of killing verbs in funerary epigrams.

3.2. CEG *147 and* IGDS *II, 44: two Greek inscriptions from the indigenous site of Castiglione di Ragusa*

CEG 147 (Comiso / Camarina, but *re vera* Castiglione di Ragusa, end of the 6th century BC), see also *IGDS* I, 127, *ISicMG* II, 150

> τεῖδε Χορṑι κα[ὶ] Ἔλος κεῖ<ν>ται θα[ν]άτοιο λαχόντες
> ἀνφοτέρōς δὲ καλōͅͅ hυιὸς ἔθαπσε φίλος.

Here lie Choro and Elos having been allotted death. Their son buried both honourably.

1. Κατελός Pugliese Carratelli (1942); κα[ὶ] Ἔλος *vel* Ἔλōς Margani 1946, Hansen *CEG*, κα[ὶ] Ἔλος Friedländer *Epigrammata*, Peek *GVI* 322 (*sed etiam* δ' Ἕκαλος, *dubitanter*), Dubois *IGDS* I, 127; κα`Ἔλōς Pepe 1952; κ' Ἄπελος Guarducci 1959-1960; κὰτελός Jeffery, *LSAG*, p. 276.17, Arena *ISicMG* II, 150. 2. καλούς Pugliese Carratelli 1942, Guarducci 1959-1960; Κάλως Vogliano *apud* Pugliese Carratelli 1942, Margani 1946; καλῶς Friedländer *Epigrammata*, Peek *GVI*, Hansen *CEG*, Dubois *IGDS* I, 127 │ Φίλος Pugliese Carratelli 1942.

CEG 147 consists of an elegiac couplet engraved on a limestone stele erroneously attributed to Comiso: already in the *editio princeps,* Pugliese Carratelli 1942, p. 321, clearly stated that the stone had been found "nella regione montuosa ai margini dell'antica Camarina, in una località dove si son già avuti molti ed importanti rinvenimenti di antichità sicule." This anonymous location has now securely been identified as the Hellenised Sicel centre of Castiglione di Ragusa, situated along the southern stretch of the Hyblaean mountain range. Castiglione strategically controlled the road which lead from Syracuse to her colony Camarina through Sicel centres and minor Greek outposts such as Casmenai. [43]
    The inscription, with quite a regular *ductus*, is in the Chalcidian alphabet (arrow-shaped khi, looped rho), which had spread to the whole of eastern Sicily and had then reached Camarina and smaller adjacent centres from Syracuse. The script is partly innovative, both in some letter shapes and in the use of a rather good *stoichedon*. [44] Both Pugliese Carratelli 1942 and Guarducci 1959-

---

43. Cordano 1984, p. 33, clarifies that B. Pace, to whose attention the stone was first brought, did not know its exact provenance. Although it cannot be excluded that it originally belonged to one of the necropoleis situated in the mountain areas around Camarina, but not necessarily to Castiglione di Ragusa, recent scholarship agrees in attributing it to this centre: see Cordano 2012, p. 167, and Di Stefano 2012, the latter going as far as to locate it within a monumental funerary complex: see below p. 228.

44. Some letter-forms are noteworthy: the four-stroke sigma tends to have a much larger shape than the other letters and to invade the line below, so that the engraver is forced to adopt a diagonal and confused *ductus* in the last two lines of the inscription. In l. 1 however sigma is regular and

1960 defended a dating within the 6ᵗʰ century, while Jeffery, *LSAG*, p. 268, preferred to move it into the 5th century, after the first Geloan occupation of Camarina (492-485 BC); Mingazzini 1950-1951, p. 259, suggested the second phase at Camarina, after the 461 BC re-founding. It seems to me that these later dates were inspired by the belief that the text must necessarily be linked with Camarina because it is a *Greek epigram*. Our much more advanced knowledge of the exchanges between the Sicels and the Greeks in this area now makes it possible to envisage a different cultural scenario, which may not necessarily have been a backward or traditional one, and where innovative epigraphic features might therefore have found a way already at the end of the archaic age. [45]

The epigram presents some very interesting stylistic and contextual elements. It commemorates the double burial of a man and a woman on the part of their son, who remains anonymous: the attempts to see his name in φίλος or the preceding ΚΑΛΟΣ of l. 2 are not convincing. To the contrary, φίλος must be interpreted as the generic epithet of the anonymous υἱός. The sequence ΚΑΛΟΣ may instead represent the adverb καλῶς, qualifying the act of burying (ἔθαψε: thus Hansen, whom I follow here), or alternatively a 'decorative' adjective qualifying his parents (καλούς). [46] The latter are named at the very beginning of the epigram. The mother has a Greek name, Χορώ: a *Kurzname* attested (in either the form Χορῶι or Χορώ) four other times in the database of the *LGPN* online. The father's name is debated. The letter sequence on the stone is ΚΑ[.]ΕΛΟΣ, which Hansen reads as κα[ὶ] Ἔλος, with the iota occurring in the lacuna at the end of the first line of the stele, which is damaged on the right-hand side: for a comparison, consider the restored ny of θα[ν]άτοιο and the epsilon of λαχόντες, which Pugliese Carratelli 1942, p. 322, could still partly see. However, Ἔλος is a *hapax*.

In the *editio princeps,* Pugliese Carratelli 1942 proposed Κατελός, a non-Hellenic name corresponding to the Latin *Catulus*. Although ideal on the onomastic level, this interpretation clashes with the metre: the parents' names would occur in asyndeton and moreover it would be necessary to restore a tau at the end of the first line of the text. M. Guarducci, on her part, proposed to read κ' Ἄπελος, a hypothesis that Hansen rejects because it requires eliding καί. [47] On balance, I think that Guarducci's hypothesis is still better than all the others. Ἄπελος is a well-attested name in Sicily, cf. for instance the

has the Classicising form with upper and lower stroke almost parallel; in l. 4 on the other hand this letter is retrograde. Neither lambda nor delta are of the Chalcidian type, while rho is looped.

45. A dating within the 6th century is also defended by Dubois (*IGDS* I, 27) and F. Cordano, the latter in a personal communication to Francesca Dell'Oro: see Dell'Oro 2013, p. 325.

46. Thus Pugliese Carratelli 1942, p. 326-328, with speculations on the religious beliefs of the Sicels and their underworld cults.

47. Although καί can be elided before a vowel in prose inscriptions, in poetic texts it usually undergoes crasis; however, elision in itself is possible phonologically speaking: see Alonso Déniz 2015.

'great *defixio*' of Selinous (*IGDS* I, 38). Contrary to the *asyndeton* postulated by Pugliese Carratelli, the extraordinary elision of καί finds an explanation in the well-known tendency of local poets to take some poetic license in order to fit personal names into the metre.

Whatever name one may choose to give this dead man, scholars agree on the fact that his family was characterised by cultural mixing, at least on the onomastic level. This agrees with everything we know about Castiglione di Ragusa from an archaeological point of view, as here indigenous practices mixed with those imported from the Greeks. However, it would be otiose to indulge in further speculation as to the specific meaning of this epigram in terms of 'acculturation', 'Hellenisation', 'hybridity', etc. The only clear fact is that we have an epigram in perfect Greek script and language in a context where Sicel individuals too were dwelling (and supposedly made up the majority of the population).

Sicilian indigenous contexts yield funerary inscriptions consisting of mere names.[48] Therefore, the choice of a longer Greek inscription, in verse, points in the direction of a message that was meant not just for speakers of Greek, but for individuals who were familiar enough with poetic practices (be they of an oral or written nature) and who could therefore appreciate this message also from the point of view of its poetic form. It has not been sufficiently stressed that this text enacts a fascinating mediation between consolidated poetic motifs and unique choices, through which it avoids the kind of repetitiveness and slavishness that distinguishes many other epigrams.

The consolidated motifs of this text include the formula with a spatial adverb (τεῖδε) and κεῖμαι, the epic genitive θανάτοιο, and the use of λαγχάνω to refer to human destiny. However, in the way this verb is construed at the end of the hexameter one finds a first trace of originality. The choice of construing λαγχάνω with the genitive rather than the accusative, its default case in poetry, is another recherché element.[49] Another original element in the pentameter is its emphasis on the 'beautiful' burial of *both* (ἀνφοτέρōς) parents: a statement that finds no parallel, however small, in the whole of archaic epigraphy.[50]

---

48. Cf. Cordano 2012, p. 168, particularly as concerns epitaphs on tomb "portelli" (rectangular stones sealing the entrance).

49. F. Dell'Oro, whom I thank, pointed out to me that the same syntagm, with the feminine participle, occurs in an Imperial epigram from Rome (*IG* XIV, 1612). In her analysis of *CEG* 147, Dell'Oro 2013, p. 327, proposes that the syntagm may have been influenced by some epic funerary contexts in which λαγχάνω governs the genitive. Her interpretation would support my idea that the composer of *CEG* 147 was able to employ lesser known poetic motifs, and re-shape them in an original manner.

50. *CEG* 26, as E. Santin points out to me, describes the 'beautiful' (καλόν) funerary monument of Archias and his sister. However, in my opinion, this epigram is only partially comparable with *CEG* 147, where the use of ἀμφοτέρους emphasises the double burial.

This last element can perhaps be explained by turning to the archaeological context. The medium of this inscription is a large stone (82 × 55 cm) which may have functioned as the door ("portello") of a chamber tomb, a common type in Sicel areas of eastern Sicily. [51] Since indigenous burials often contain more than one body, [52] the interaction between burial and inscription communicates cultural choices that are not too dissimilar from those testified to by the inscription of the so-called 'Castiglione Warrior' inscription: [53]

IGDS I 44 (Castiglione di Ragusa, end of the 7th century-beginning of the 6th)

> ← τôι Πυτίκα
> ← Πυρίνōι
> ← ἐποίēσε
> ← Σϙύλ(λ)ος

The iconography and making of this mysterious bas-relief are reminiscent of an indigenous context, but its retrograde inscription is Hellenic down to the syntactic arrangement of its elements and its likely hexametric shape. This is obtained by reading the text from the bottom up, [54] a likely interpretation because the bas-relief was probably situated on the architrave of a monumental gate, perhaps pertaining to a funerary monument: [55]

> Σϙύλ(λ)ος ἐποίēσε Πυρίνōι τôι Πυτίκ(κ)ᾱ

For Pyrrhinos, son of Pytik(k)as, Skul(l)os made this (*sc.* tomb)

Just like for the Castiglione Warrior inscription, in the case of *CEG* 147 too the medium gives us an interpretative key for the text, in an interplay of communicative codes that is not unknown in Greek funerary epigraphy. [56] I suggest that the emphasis on the 'beautiful' burial of both parents in line 2

---

51. Other *portelli* from indigenous areas are known, some of them with inscriptions: see *e.g.* the *portello* from the Sicel centre of Licodia Eubea (not too far from Comiso), discussed by Cordano 2012, p. 167.

52. In Greek contexts the tendency is to have monosomatic burials, but there also are examples of tombs with two or more bodies: cf. Burkhardt 2008, p. 336. The conclusion that the type of burial is exclusively Sicel, as suggested by Pugliese Carratelli 1942, may therefore be too hasty. The interpretative approach to these issues has considerably changed over time: see for instance Cordano 1984, p. 33, according to whom the tomb pertains to "una famiglia siceliota, con possibili commistioni etniche, ma non certo linguistiche".

53. *Ed. pr.* Manganaro 2001, p. 63-65. Ample study in Cordano and Di Salvatore 2002.

54. The first interpretation can be found in the volume edited by Cordano and Di Salvatore 2002. For the second, see below n. 55.

55. Cf. Cordano 2002, at the end of which one can find the discussion concerning the possibility to read the inscription from the bottom up.

56. Cf. Bruss 2010.

could be interpreted not (only) as a homage to filial *pietas*, but as a concrete reference to the tomb which the reader of the inscription faced: [57] the 'traditional' Sicel burial of Choro and her husband is 'beautiful' because it is accompanied by a stele inscribed with an elegiac couplet, according to typically Hellenic practices which were, as far as we can tell, not very common in Sicily, let alone in indigenous contexts.

The hypothesis that the epigram was meant to draw attention to its very existence on that particular local tomb can find further support in another archaeological element. On the opposite face from the inscribed one, the stone has a sort of step, 33 cm high, that made the *portello* more stable. By preventing the stone from accidentally falling, this step also guaranteed the durability of the inscription. This detail may account perhaps for the pride displayed by the anonymous son, who does not tell us his name but advertises the beauty of the tomb he has built for his parents.

Such a profession of pride can also be better understood if we consider the wider archaeological context of the area. The necropoleis of Camarina and surrounding indigenous sites testify to an original tradition of aristocratic burials which has been linked to the presence of high-status Greek individuals who married indigenous women. One of the Camarina funerary monuments was marked by a group sculpture composed of a lion, a sphinx and a horse. [58] Castiglione itself has yielded another monumental tomb which G. Di Stefano has described as "princely" because of its size, multiple burials, rich goods (including fine Greek ware), and the elaborate funerary ritual which it evokes. Di Stefano has also suggested that the bas-relief with the Warrior was the architrave of the tomb, so that its inscription would no longer belong to the category of artists' signatures (as still maintained in *IGDS* II, 44), but rather to that of (verse) funerary texts. [59]

In the light of all these contextual elements, it becomes less and less surprising that the son of Choro and her husband, while giving his parents a more modest burial, may still have wished to make it stand out in the cemeterial context of the area by accompanying it with a high-level inscription. The really extraordinary element that emerges from this epigram and its context is the presence of Greek poetic practices in an area that only twenty years ago we would not have hesitated to define as 'peripheral' and 'marginal'. This fact, combined with the observation that the other two epigrams I have considered come from areas characterised by intense exchanges between Greeks and non-Greeks, allows us to appreciate the exceptional character of the Sicilian

57. Among other parallels, cf. *CEG* 87, 161 and 165 in which καλόν occurs as the epithet of μνῆμα (the same *iunctura* must be posited for *CEG* 18, even though the noun is in a lacuna) and *CEG* 26 (where καλόν is the epithet of σῆμα: the same can be said of *CEG* 70, although the adjective is in a lacuna).

58. Cf. Di Stefano 2012, p. 258-259.

59. Di Stefano 2012, p. 260.

colonial context and at the same time highlights the need to acquire a more fine-grained interpretative framework in order to understand epigrammatic practices in archaic and Classical Sicily.

3.3. CEG 149: a funerary epigram (?) from Motya

Motya (in the Birgi area, *ca* 475-450 BC), see also *ISic.MG* I², 72 (not in *IGDS*)

> [– ‿‿ – ‿‿ – ‿‿ – ‿‿ – ‿ ‿ – –]
> [?Α]ἴσχυ[λλο]ν Τιμετō[ς? ἄ]νδρα θαγ[ό]ντ᾽ ἀγα[θόν].

1. [τὼς θεὼς ἱλάως (*sic*) μ᾽ ἦμεν ἄλλον] Comparetti *apud* Gabrici 1917. 2. εἰς τύ[μβον θέ]ντι μήτ᾽ ἐ[ξέγοντι] ἄνδρα θαν[ό]ντ᾽ ἀγα[θόν Comparetti *apud* Gabrici 1917: ἄνδρα (AN *cum ligatura*); Ἀστύλον Τιμετο? Jeffery *LSAG*, p. 411; Ἀστύ[οχον] τιμήτω Gallavotti 1985; [- -]ιστυ[- -] τιμε̄τō Arena *ISicMG* I², 72; Ἀστύ[οχον]; Τιμετō[ς Hansen ("pro genetivo nominis ignoti patris indigenae post Jeffery praebeo").

CEG 149 presents a kind of cultural mixture which is even more complex than the one we can reconstruct for Castiglione di Ragusa. This fragment of a funerary inscription, perhaps in verse, was unearthed in Birgi, a place facing the islet of Motya. It is here, in the vicinity of the now underwater road that once linked Motya to the mainland, that one of the two necropoleis of Motya was situated. [60] The epigram is part of a group of three funerary inscriptions in the Greek alphabet first published by Gabrici 1917. They attest to the Hellenisation of Phoenician Motya, or at any rate to the fact that its necropoleis were frequented by individuals who spoke and wrote Greek. Our epigraphic knowledge of this multicultural community was enhanced at the end of the 1990s by the discovery of an almost complete abecedary which testifies to the importance of Greek writing in indigenous contexts where cultural and commercial exchanges with the Greeks thrived. [61]

In the last part of this fragmentary inscription it is possible to read ἄ]νδρα θαν[.]ντ ἀγα[, remains that can be reconstructed as the final part of a pentameter: ἄνδρα θανόντ᾽ ἀγαθόν. Even though the inscription is broken both on the right-hand side and at the top, the lack of traces on the left-hand margin of the likely last line shows that the inscription ended with whatever followed ΑΓΑ: it is not possible, therefore, to think that the final part of the

---

60. Apograph in Gabrici 1917, p. 46, repetated in *LSAG*, tab. 52 no. 45, and in Ampolo 2012, p. 52.

61. The Motya abecedary is the most complete of the three abecedaries from Sicily, all found in indigenous areas (the other two come from Montagna di Marzo and Manico di Quarara): cf. Tribulato 2017.

epigram was a hexameter. [62] This also suggests that the pentameter was pre-
ceded by a hexameter, though nothing survives on the stone.

The main problems which arise from this text concern the reconstruction
of the first part of the pentameter, where the name of the deceased probably
occurred. The letter traces induced L. Jeffery to propose the names Ἀστύλος
and Τίμετος: the former in the accusative, the latter in the genitive. [63] Hansen
(*CEG* 149) was not happy with Ἀστύλος on metrical grounds, given that the
metre requires a second long syllable, and also because Gabrici's apograph
shows that the first legible letter has a vertical stroke which is not compatible
with alpha. He therefore proposed Αἴσχυλλος/Αἰσχύλος; another possibility
would be Ἴσχυλλος/Ἰσχύλος. Both suggestions are preferable from a metrical
point of view and are also more compatible with the traces of the first letter,
but present some problems on the epigraphic level. [64]

P. A. Hansen's reading has some consequences for the interpretation of
the alphabetic variety employed in the inscription. L. Jeffery (whom Ampolo
2012 follows *verbatim*) defined it as "presumably Selinountine." [65] This howe-
ver clashes with Hansen's reading, since Αἴσχυλλος implies the presence
of a Chalcidian arrow-shaped khi, the vertical stroke of which is shown in
the apograph. This kind of khi is never attested at Selinous, not even in the
defixiones, which preserve the cross-shaped khi of blue varieties. [66] Now,
since this 'blue' Selinuntine khi is attested in another inscription from Motya
published by Gabrici, [67] I think it preferable to interpret the letter in *CEG* 149
as a tau, as Jeffery supposed. The metrical problem raised by Hansen against
interpreting the name as Ἀστύλος (with /u/) could easily be solved by positing
that the name used in the pentameter was actually Ἀστυλλος: that is, a name
in which the common hypocoristic suffix -λ(λ)ος has undergone expressive
gemination. [68] A large number of oscillations of this kind – where one must

---

62. In theory, one could posit that the line continued on the right-hand side, but this does
not comply with the reconstructions that scholars have advanced so far. Gallavotti 1985, p. 34,
proposes that ἄνδρα θανοντ᾿ ἀγαθόν was the beginning of the pentameter, to be completed with
πατρίδι μαρνάμενον. This suggestion however requires restoring twenty-one letters to the right,
which is in contradiction with the fact that Gallavotti himself proposes restoring the part of the first
line that can be read after <ΣΤΥ> only with <ΟΧΟ> (according to him, the name Ἀστύοχος).

63. *LSAG*, pl. 51 no. 45, p. 411.

64. Arena (*ISic.MG* I², 72), who does not solve the problem of the metre used in this inscrip-
tion, proposes Ἀρίστυλλον in a footnote. This name, though attested in Selinous, cannot however
be reconciled with the interpretation of the line as a pentameter, unless one thinks that the first
syllable of the name was *extra metrum* because of a maladroit insertion of the name into the verse.

65. See Jeffery, *LSAG*, p. 272; Ampolo 2012, p. 25.

66. Note that in *IGDS* II, 34, <ΧΟΛΟΤΟΣ> must not be interpreted as χωλοτός, but as an
adjective derived from ψωλός: see Dubois 2008, p. 86.

67. See Gabrici 1917, p. 347, no. 9.

68. The real segmentation of the name is open to speculation. It could be a monothematic name
derived from ἄστυ through the suffix -λ(λ)ος, or it could the short form of a compound such as
Ἀστύλαος (Ἀστύλ-ος like Πάτροκλ-ος) which has undergone expressive gemination. This suffix

obviously take the archaic tendency to not write geminates into account – are attested precisely in Selinuntine epigraphy. [69] On balance, this is the most economical solution. However, it clashes with the fact that the initial letter of the name (at least judging from the apograph, on which all scholars have worked) cannot be identified with alpha, but preferably with iota. [70] It is hard to settle this issue since the original photograph of the stone is not of good quality and the stone itself is now very damaged. The top part of this line of the text is so fragmentary that the interpretation of the letter as an alpha is not so impossible. Also, judging from the layout of the preceding lines in the inscription, this line may have contained 2-3 extra letters, which perhaps were part of the preceding hexameter.

The second name has been recognised in the sequence TIMETO. Following Jeffery ("some non-Greek patronymic"), Hansen interprets it as the genitive of a patronymic. [71] The non-Greek interpretation may perhaps be explained by taking into account that not only does a name Τίμετος not exist in Greek, but a form in -ετος deriving from a noun like τιμή – since this would, in all likelihood, be the lexical basis – would be bizarre: of the numerous Greek names in -ετος (many of which deriving from -έω verbs such as αἱρέω), only Ἄρχετος can be linked to a feminine basis (ἀρχή), even though one cannot exclude a derivation from ἄρχω. It remains impossible to further determine this name: non-Greek inscriptions from Sicily do not contain any *comparanda*. The proposal advanced by Gallavotti 1985 – and followed by Arena (*I.Sic. MG* I², 72) – that we read the imperative τιμήτω (with epsilon rendering the long open vowel resulting from the Doric contraction of *a + e*) is even less likely: who would be the subject of this active imperative?

While these meagre linguistic notes do not allow us to gain a better understanding of the content of the epigram, this inscription (just like *CEG* 147 from Castiglione di Ragusa) still enables us to posit that Motya hosted a community which was not only in contact with Greek language and culture, but whose members were deemed capable of deciphering the literary motifs of this (for us fragmentary and puzzling) epigram.

4. Conclusions: funerary inscriptions and the Sicilian epigraphic habit

As I anticipated in the Introduction to this paper, a linguistic analysis of Sicilian epigrams produces meagre results. Both the distribution of the eight epigrams (Gela, Himera, Selinous, Castiglione di Ragusa, Motya – plus Megara

---

and its expressive variants are discussed by Masson 1986, p. 226-228, while the interchangeability of the two suffixes is addressed in Locker 1934, p. 65-67. On the same issue, see now Mathys 2017.

69. Cf. *e.g.* the discussion of names by Bettarini 2005, p. 70-71.

70. The photograph can only be found in Whitaker 1921, p. 287.

71. *LSAG*, p. 272 n. 5.

Hyblaea if one accepts *CEG* 663) and their linguistic choices do not allow us to reach any conclusive knowledge concerning the relationship between dialect and literary language, as well as the epigrammatic practice of these areas. All the funerary epigrams come from areas of intense cultural and linguistic contact between Greeks and non-Greeks, but it would be far-fetched to draw clear-cut conclusions from this distribution, claiming for instance that the wish to represent one's identity according to Greek customs is higher where there is a higher level of cultural interaction. We simply do not know enough about the wider epigraphic habit of the island to single out Castiglione di Ragusa as a paradigmatic case.

Keeping the analysis to language and the lexicon, it is noteworthy that, as far as we can tell, none of the funerary epigrams mentions the monument itself, *e.g.* by resorting to standard terms such as μνῆμα, στήλη, σῆμα, etc.[72] The indeterminacy in which the monument is left necessarily makes any interpretation of the relationship between text and medium more subjective. Bearing this in mind, in the case of the first two funerary epigrams, *CEG* 148 and *CEG* 147, the typology of the monument and its archaeological context provide helpful insights. In my discussion of *CEG* 148 I have advanced the hypothesis that the monument, with its extraordinary decoration (extraordinary, at least, given our present knowledge of Selinuntine funerary practices), may have enhanced the significance of the epigram, which perhaps commemorated a youth who had died at war. In the same way, in the funerary context of the indigenous centre of Castiglione di Ragusa the epigram of *CEG* 147 may have interacted with the monument for the purpose of signalling and marking out the 'beautiful burial' of a couple. In other words, in both cases the message would be limited to the *hic et nunc* of the context in which the monuments were built and their epigrams inscribed: a message, that is, which does not aspire to be universal or eternal and which is, for this very reason, extremely difficult to unravel outside of its historical and spatial context.[73]

Other general considerations can be made on the type of narration that these epigrams enact in their interaction with their medium.[74] In all cases readers are given a very succinct narrative (though in the case of *CEG* 149 we cannot be sure, given its very fragmentary status). There are, however, some noteworthy elements. In *CEG* 148 the narrative concerning the circumstances

---

72. At present, there are only nine attestations of σᾶμα in unmetrical epitaphs: *IGDS* I, 21 (Megara Hyblaea, mid-6th century); *IGDS* I, 26 (*ibidem*, beginning of the 5th century); *IGDS* I, 71 (Selinous, end of 7th century BC); *IGDS* I, 4 (*ibidem*, second half of 6th century BC); *IGDS* I, 75 (*ibidem*, second half of 6th century BC); *IGDS* I, 77 (*ibidem*, *ca* mid-5th century BC); *IGDS* I, 88 (Syracuse, end of 6th century BC); *IGDS* I, 103 (Monte Casale/Casmenai, 6th century BC); *IGDS* I, 128 (Gela, end of 6th century BC).

73. This is the action by which, according to Baumbach, Petrovic and Petrovic 2010, p. 15, some epigrams "limit their effect to the actual place where the epigram is inscribed."

74. On narration in stone epigrams and the development of its structural elements, see Bowie 2010.

in which the deceased met his death (which, though lost to us, is still hinted at by the adjective δακ]ρυόες at the end of the epigram) accompanies the invitation to mourn him that the epigram directs at the passer-by, according to a three-way dialogue between the deceased, the epigrammatic voice and the reader which is paralleled by Attic epigrams. The use of οἰκτίρω is remarkable because no other attestations of this verb are known in Sicilian epigraphy of the Classical period.

The dynamics at play in *CEG* 147 from Castiglione di Ragusa is very different. The deceased couple is mentioned by name, but in fact left in the shadow. The epigram draws attention to the son and his act of burial and both become the real protagonists of the text; the adverb καλῶς (according to the reading I accept) represents an ecphrastic element *in nuce*. [75]

Leaving linguistic and narrative considerations aside, it may be useful to conclude with some thoughts on the testimony that all these Sicilian epigrams can give us on the Sicilian epigraphic habit. The low number of funerary epigrams finds an only partial and unsatisfactory explanation in the archaeological situation, *i.e.* in the fact that the necropoleis, which are usually located outside inhabited centres, have been insufficiently investigated. [76] The reasons for the low number of funerary epigrams must therefore be sought in the Sicilian epigraphic habit itself. [77] One may speculate whether this could be compared to the low number of public documents. Did the Siceliotes perhaps shy away from public display (an interpretative key which has been used to explain the great flourishing of funerary epigrams in Attica)? [78]

On another level, one may consider the material cost of erecting an inscribed funerary monument in an area where epigraphy on stone is limited, owing to the dearth of marble and the high porosity of local limestone (as shown by the bad conservation of all the objects considered in this paper). Similarly, Sicilian texts of a certain public or institutional importance were

75. Bruss 2010, p. 390-391, interprets in this way a few occurrences of καλός in funerary epigrams.

76. The interaction between space reserved for the necropolis, sacred space and the space of the *polis* is discussed by Burkhardt 2008, p. 337-341.

77. This had already been noticed by Wallace 1970, p. 97, whose conclusion "Magna Graecia [*i.e.* including Sicily] had no native sepulchral poetry in the archaic period" may however be too drastic. It is probable that there existed a connection between poetic practices and metrical inscriptions, but this also opens up a huge debate: recent and less recent studies tend to regard the epigram as the heir of (lost) threnodic elegy. This does not perfectly explain the late-archaic Attic boom in funerary poetry.

78. I refer to Meyer 1993, p. 109, who observes that the transition from the archaic to the Classical age produced the transition in epigrams from the celebration of "members of the group as 'best men' to members of the civic group, the *polis*, as a whole". Her hypothesis is that epigrams mainly served to express and define the Athenian identity of the deceased. A similar approach cannot be adopted for Sicily, because both the epigraphic context and historical sources are too laconic on institutions. It remains impossible therefore to clearly define the cultural, political and social motivations that lead the whole island to avoid, or at least limit, the use of epigrams.

entrusted to metal, probably because limestone was considered unsuitable for messages that were meant to be readable and unalterable. For instance, in the case of Selinuntine temple sculpture, which requires more reliable material than architectural parts to ensure the correct modelling of fine details, the problem posed by the unevenness of local limestone was solved through *ad hoc* solutions. In some cases, sculptures employed imported marble, for instance for limbs or the drapery of clothes in the metopes of temple E. In most cases, however, the inhabitants of Selinous resorted to limestone extracted from mines situated in the area of Menfi (to the north-east). In spite of their distance (some 20 kilometres away), these quarries had the advantage of providing a much more reliable and purer limestone than that produced by Selinous' own quarries (Cave Latomie Landaro and Cave di Cusa) – a more porous and uneven limestone with a higher percentage of quartz.[79] Resorting to these means was probably not problematic for large public works such as the Selinountine temples, but could have been very costly for private citizens who wished to put up an inscribed monument.

The exact reasons for the low number of funerary epigrams in Sicily down to the end of the Classical period are destined to remain unknown. However, paying attention to the interaction between text and object, and to the role of both in the wider context of archaeological excavations and epigraphic practices of the area, as I have done for some epigrams in this paper, can certainly contribute to clarifying certain details in such elusive dynamics. I believe that, at present, this is the only way forward.

Olga TRIBULATO
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

Abbreviations

CEG = Hansen P. A., *Carmina epigraphica Graeca* I: *saeculorum VIII-V a. Chr. n.* II: *saeculi IV a. Chr. n.*, 1983-1989, Berlin – New York.
EG = Guarducci M., *Epigrafia greca* I-IV, 1967-1978, Rome.
Friedländer, *Epigrammata* = Friedländer P., *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars*, 1948, Berkeley.
IGDS I = Dubois 1989.
IGDS II = Dubois 2008.
IGPalermo = Manni Piraino 1972.
ISic.MG I² = Arena R., *Iscrizioni greche arcaiche di Sicilia e Magna Grecia* I: *Iscrizioni di Megara Iblea e Selinunte*, 1996, 2nd edition, Pisa.
ISic.MG II = Arena R., *Iscrizioni greche arcaiche di Sicilia e Magna Grecia* II: *Iscrizioni di Gela e Agrigento*, 1992, Milan.

---

79. On the whole issue, see Carapezza *et al.* 1984.

ISic.MG III = Arena R., *Iscrizioni greche arcaiche di Sicilia e Magna Grecia* III: *Iscrizioni delle colonie euboiche*, 1994, Pisa.
LSAG = Jeffery L. H., *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C.*, rev. ed. with a supplement by A.W. Johnston, 1990, Oxford.
GVI = Peek W., *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, 1955, Berlin.

Bibliography

Alonso Déniz A., 2015: "Elision", in G. K. Giannakis *et al.* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Greek Language and Linguistics*, vol. 1, p. 545-546.
Alonso Déniz A. and Nieto Izquierdo E., 2009: "Dialecto local y dialecto épico en las inscripciones métricas de la Argólide", *Minerva* 22, p. 83-105.
Baumbach M., Petrovic A. and Petrovic I. (eds.), 2010: *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge.
Baumbach M., Petrovic A. and Petrovic I., 2010: "Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram: An Introduction", in Baumbach, Petrovic and Petrovic (eds.) 2010, p. 1-19.
Bechtel F., 1923: *Die griechischen Dialetke* II: *Die westgriechischen Dialekte*, Berlin.
Bettarini L., 2005: Corpus *delle* defixiones *di Selinunte*, Alessandria.
Bowie E., 2010: "Epigram as Narration", in Baumbach, Petrovic and Petrovic (eds.) 2010, p. 313-384.
Brugnone A., 2008: "A proposito di un'epigrafe sepolcrale da Selinunte", *MEFRA* 120, p. 21-28.
Bruss J. S., 2010: "Ecphrasis in Fits and Starts? Down to 300 BC", in Baumbach, Petrovic and Petrovic (eds.) 2010, p. 385-403.
Burkhardt N., 2008: *Zwischen Tradition und Modifikation: Kulturelle Austauschprozesse in den Bestattungssitten der griechischen Kolonien in Unteritalien und Sizilien vom 8. bis zum 5. Jh. v. Chr.*, Diss. Cologne.
Carapezza M. *et al.*, 1984: "I materiali e l'ambiente delle sculture di Selinunte", in V. Tusa (ed.), *La scultura in pietra di Selinunte*, Palermo, p. 32-41.
Consani C., 1995: "I dialetti greci di età ellenistica e romana: la documentazione epigrafica della Magna Grecia e di Sicilia", in P. Cuzzolin (ed.), *Studi di linguistica greca*, Milan, p. 73-89.
—, 1996: "Koinai et koiné dans la documentation épigraphique de l'Italie méridionale", in C. Brixhe (ed.), *La koiné grecque antique* II: *La concurrence*, Paris, p. 113-132.
—, 1999: "Considerazioni su testi magici siciliani vecchi e nuovi", in A. C. Cassio (ed.), *KATA DIALEKTON. Atti del III colloquio internazionale di dialettologia greca*, Naples, p. 215-232.
—, 2016: "The Greek of Italy between Archaism, Internal Evolution and Contact Phenomena", *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 21, p. 99-115.
Cordano F. 1984: "Camarina VII. Alcuni documenti iscritti importanti per la storia della città", *Bollettino d'arte* 26 (Serie VI), p. 31-54.
—, 2002: "L'iscrizione", in Cordano and Di Salvatore (eds.) 2002, p. 51-58.
—, 2012: "Iscrizioni monumentali dei Siculi", *Aristonothos* 4, p. 165-184.
Cordano F. and Di Salvatore M. (eds.), 2002: *Il Guerriero di Castiglione di Ragusa: greci e siculi nella Sicilia sud-orientale. Atti del Seminario, Milano 15 maggio 2000*, Rome.

Coughlan T., 2016: "Dialect and Imitation in Late Hellenistic Epigram", in Sistakou and Rengakos (eds.) 2016, p. 37-69.

Day J. W., 1989: "Rituals in Stone: Early Greek Grave Epigrams and Monuments", *JHS* 109, 1989, p. 16-28.

—, 2010: *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance*, Cambridge – New York.

Dell'Oro F., 2010: "Zur sprachlichen Bedeutung einer Inschrift für Athena in der Stadt Himera (*CEG* 392). Das Fehlen der dritten Ersatzdehnung und andere Merkmale des euböischen Dialekts", *ZPE* 175, p. 15-19.

—, 2013: "Après l'inscription de la coupe de Nestor: disposition du texte et formes de transtextualité dans les épigrammes de l'époque archaïque en Grande Grèce et Sicile", *Gaia* 16, p. 307-332.

Di Stefano G., 2012: "Convivenza e ostentazione: tombe 'aristocratiche' greche nei centri siculi. I casi dell'entroterra di Camarina", *Aristonothos* 7, p. 255-280.

Dubois L., 1989: *Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile: Contribution à l'étude du vocabulaire grec colonial*, Rome.

—, 2008: *Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile* II, Geneva.

Gabrici E., 1917: "Selinunte e Motye. Frammenti epigrafici", *NSA* 14, p. 341-348.

Gallavotti C., 1985: "Revisione di testi epigrafici", *BollClass* 6, p. 28-57.

Guarducci M., 1959-1960: "Nuove note di epigrafia siceliota arcaica", *ASAA* 21-22, p. 259-278.

Guijarro Ruano P., 2016: *La lengua de las inscripciones métricas del Peloponeso (siglos VII-IV a. C.)*, Diss. Universidad Complutense de Madrid, https://eprints.ucm.es/39779/ (retrieved 05.06.2019)

Isler P., 1994: "Les nécropoles de Sélinonte", in J. de la Genière (ed.), *Nécropoles et sociétés antiques (Grèce, Italie, Languedoc). Actes du Colloque international du Centre de recherches archéologiques de l'Université de Lille III (Lille 2-3 décembre 1991)*, Naples, p. 160-163.

Kaczko S., 2016: *Archaic and Classical Attic Dedicatory Epigrams: An Epigraphic, Literary, and Linguistic Commentary*, Berlin – Boston.

Kustermann Graf A., 2002: *Selinunte. Necropoli di Manicalunga. Le tombe della contrada Gaggera*, Soveria Mannelli.

Lattimore R., 1942: *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana.

Leibundgut Wieland D., 1994: *Selinunt: Nekropole Manicalunga. Gräber im Gebiet Timpone Nero*, Diss. Zürich.

—, 1995: "Necropoli di Manicalunga. Tombe della contrada Timpone Nero (Selinunte)", *ANSP* 25 (serie III), 1995, p. 189-218.

Locker E., 1934: "Die Bildung der griechischen Kurz- und Kosenamen", *Glotta* 22, p. 43-100.

Manganaro G., 1994: "Iscrizioni, epitaffi ed epigrammi in greco della Sicilia centro-orientale di epoca romana", *MEFRA* 106, p. 79-118.

—, 2001: "Tre principii della epigrafia greca: l'autopsia, la 'serie', il contesto", *ZPE* 135, p. 63-72.

Manni Piraino M. T., 1966: "Quattro iscrizioni greche nel Museo di Palermo", ΚΩΚΑΛΟΣ 12, p. 200-206.

—, 1972: *Iscrizioni greche lapidarie del Museo di Palermo*, Palermo.

Masson O., 1986: "Géminations expressives en grec", *BSL* 81, p. 217-229 (= *Onomastica Graeca Selecta* I-II, Nanterre, 1990, p. 549-561).

Mathys A., 2017: "Anthroponymes et morphologie dérivationnelle: les anthroponymes en -λος, -ιλ(λ)ος et -υλ(λ)ος et la gémination expressive", *in* A. Alonso Déniz, L. Dubois, Cl. Le Feuvre and S. Minon (eds.), *La suffixation des anthroponymes grecs antiques (SAGA). Actes du colloque international de Lyon (17-19 septembre 2015, Université Jean-Moulin – Lyon 3)*, Geneva, p. 333-377.

Meola E., 1996: *Necropoli di Selinunte* I: *Buffa*, Palermo.

Meyer E. A., 1993: "Epitaphs and Citizenship in Classical Athens", *JHS* 113, p. 99-121.

Mickey K., 1981: "Dialect Consciousness and Literary Language: An Example from Ancient Greek", *TPhS* 1981, p. 35-66.

Mimbrera Olarte S., 2012a: *Fonética y morfología del dorio de Sicilia: siglos VII.-I. a. C.*, Madrid.

—, 2012b: "Sicilian Greek before the Fourth Century BC: An Overview of the Dialects", in Tribulato (ed.) 2012, p. 191-222.

—, 2012c: "The Sicilian Doric Koina", in Tribulato (ed.) 2012, p. 223-250.

Mingazzini P., 1950-1951: "Archäologische Grabungen und Funde in Italien (Oktober 1942 bis Oktober 1948)", *AA* 1950-1951, p. 152-280.

Morgan K. A., 2015: *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford.

Passa E., 2016: "L'elegia e l'epigramma su pietra", in A. C. Cassio (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche* (2nd ed.), Florence, p. 260-288.

Peek W., 1976: "Grabepigramm aus Selinus", *ZPE* 23, p. 93-94.

Pepe L., 1952: "Tracce di orfismo fra Greco-Siculi del VI secolo", *GIF* 5, p. 193-197.

Pratali Maffei D., 2018: *Il corpus degli epigrammi iscritti della Sicilia ellenistica: un'analisi linguistica*, MA thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, http://hdl.handle.net/10579/13754 (restricted access).

Pugliese Carratelli G., 1942: "Comiso – Epigramma sepolcrale greco del VI av. Cr.", *NSA* 3 (serie VII), p. 321-334.

Santin E. and Foschia L., 2016: "Introduction", in E. Santin and L. Foschia (eds.), *L'épigramme dans tous ses états: épigraphiques, littéraires, historiques*, Lyon, p. 10-22.

Sistakou E. and Rengakos A. (eds.), 2016: *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Literary and Inscribed Epigram*, Berlin – New York.

Sourvinou-Inwood C., 1995: *'Reading' Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period*, Oxford.

Tagliapietra L., 2018a: *Greek in Early Hellenistic Magna Graecia: Dialect Contact and Change in South Italy*, Diss. Cambridge.

—, 2018b: "Il declino del dialetto dorico nelle iscrizioni di Sicilia del periodo tardo repubblicano: una nuova ipotesi", *Linguarum Varietas* 7, 2018, p. 93-112.

Tonini M. T., 2003: "Iscrizioni funerarie greche: l'apostrofe al passante", *Acme* 2003, p. 62-71.

Tribulato O., 2017: "Learning to Write in Indigenous Sicily: A New Abecedary from Manico di Quarara (Montelepre, South-West of Palermo)", *ZPE* 201, p. 117-122.

—, 2018: "Il dialetto di Himera nel contesto dell'area dello Stretto", *Linguarum Varietas* 7, p. 163-178.

Tribulato O. (ed.), 2012: *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily*, Cambridge.

Tueller M. A., 2010: "The Passer-By in Archaic and Classical Epigram", in Baumbach, Petrovic and Petrovic (eds.) 2010, p. 42-60.

—, 2016: "Words for Dying in Sepulchral Epigram", in Sistakou and Rengakos (eds.) 2016, p. 215-233.

Wallace M. B., 1970: "Notes on Early Greek Epigrams", *Phoenix* 24, p. 95-105.

Whitaker J. I. S., 1921: *Motya: A Phoenician Colony in Sicily*, London.

RÉSUMÉS

ABSTRACTS

Eleonora SANTIN. – Les « langues » de la poésie épigraphique (p. 11-25)

Cet article ouvre le dossier « Langue poétique et formes dialectales dans les inscriptions versifiées grecques » qui se compose de sept contributions centrées sur les aspects linguistiques des poèmes épigraphiques. L'objectif de cette introduction est de poser les termes du débat actuel sur un sujet qui n'a jamais été abordé en tant que tel dans un ouvrage collectif et de présenter les apports de la discussion menée lors d'une journée d'étude qui a eu lieu à Lyon le 15 juin 2018. L'intérêt d'un tel dossier réside dans l'approche originale de ses contributions qui ne cherchent pas une norme à tout prix, mais observent une réalité extrêmement nuancée pour y découvrir éventuellement des tendances d'ordre général ou propres à un cadre local ou régional ; le thème des aspects linguistiques des inscriptions versifiées nécessitait d'être exploré à nouveau à la lumière des découvertes archéologiques plus récentes, des nouvelles contributions scientifiques et notamment des acquis sur l'importance des contextes géographique, chronologique, monumental et culturel des textes.

Eleonora SANTIN. – The "Languages" of Epigrammatic Poetry (p. 11-25)

This contribution is intended as a foreword to a collection of seven papers dealing with the linguistic aspects of epigraphic poems. The goal of this introduction is to present the *status quaestionis* of a topic that has never been treated as such in a collective work and to present the results of the discussion conducted during a workshop held in Lyon on June 15th 2018. The works under examination are characterized by the originality of their approach and their balanced analysis of the general and local trends of epigraphic poetry. A fresh study of the linguistic aspects of the versified inscriptions is both timely and necessary, because of recent archaeological findings, new scientific hypothesis, and new research trends dealing with the importance of the geographical, chronological, monumental and cultural contexts of texts.

Sara KACZKO. – Si loin, si proche : traits locaux et aspirations "internationales" dans les épigrammes grecques archaïques (p. 27-56)

Les poèmes épigraphiques montrent des liens très étroits avec le contexte local dans lequel ils étaient « exposés » et pour lequel ils étaient conçus. Les différents contextes locaux exerçaient, tant en termes visuels que littéraires, une influence sur la langue de ces monuments gravés. Le contexte épichorique était d'une telle importance que même les formules homériques étaient adaptées pour refléter la phonétique locale. Parallèlement, dans des occasions différentes et sous des conditions variables, qui normalement sont associées à une aspiration au prestige et/ou au « cosmopolitisme », les aspects autochtones d'une inscription, dans son apparence archéologique, épigraphique ou littéraire, étaient minimisés en faveur des caractéristiques non locales. Cette contribution se concentre sur quelques cas qui illustrent ce phénomène de manière saillante.

Sara KACZKO. – Faraway So Close: Epichoric Features and "International" Aspirations in Archaic Greek Epigram (p. 27-56)

Archaic epigraphic poems show strong ties with the local contexts in which they were displayed and for which they were conceived. The various local contexts influenced the language of these inscribed monuments in both visual and literary terms; thus, the epichoric context tended to be so strong that even Homeric formulas were adapted so as to reflect epichoric phonetics. At the same time, in a variety of occasions and considerations, usually related to prestigious and / or "international" aspirations, the local element of an inscription was deliberately downplayed in favor of extra-local elements, be they archaeological, epigraphic, or literary. This paper focuses on a few illustrative case studies.

Albio Cesare CASSIO. – L'épigramme pour Théotimos d'Atrax, *CEG* 637 (457 av. J.-C.) : mise en page, dialecte, ambiguïtés (p. 57-72)

L'épigramme pour Théotimos d'Atrax (Thessalie), tombé sur le champ de bataille de Tanagra (457 av. J.-C.), présente des particularités très intéressantes tant du point de vue du contenu que du point de vue formel : élimination des traits dialectaux thessaliens, réinterprétation quasi-panhellénique de la réalité de la bataille de Tanagra et surtout construction raffinée du texte, dont la lecture dans l'ordre inverse, c'est-à-dire (1) pentamètre (2) hexamètre, n'est pas préférable, mais n'est pas exclue non plus.

Albio Cesare CASSIO. – The Epigram for Theotimos of Atrax, *CEG* 637 (457 BCE): Layout, Dialect, Ambiguities (p. 57-72)

The epigram for Theotimos of Atrax (Thessaly), fallen in the battlefield at Tanagra (457 BCE) presents some very interesting features both formally and thematically: elimination of Thessalian dialectal characteristics, a Pan-Hellenic reinterpretation of the battle of Tanagra and, most importantly, a sophisticated construction of the text, in particular the possibility of reading the text in reverse order, *i.e.* (1) pentameter, followed by (2) hexameter, a reading which is not preferable, but not excluded.

Francesca DELL'ORO. – Épigramme et identité étrangère en Eubée : entre disparition des traits locaux et développement de langues de genre (p. 73-101)

Dans cette contribution on aborde la question de la manière dont des étrangers ont exprimé leur altérité à travers des moyens linguistiques (alphabet, dialecte, adjectifs indiquant la provenance, etc.) dans les épigrammes épigraphiques au fil des siècles. Comme première étude de cas, on a choisi l'Eubée antique. Cette région offre sur un total de 38 épigrammes un sous-corpus de 8 poèmes (funéraires) pour lesquels l'origine étrangère des défunts est explicitée. Si, dans les inscriptions les plus anciennes (vᵉ siècle av. J.-C.), alphabets et dialectes semblent être chargés d'une valeur identitaire, la disparition ultérieure des traits locaux n'est pas compensée par un autre moyen d'expression de l'identité locale et culturelle dans les siècles suivants. À l'époque hellénistique, l'épigramme acquiert véritablement la dimension d'un genre littéraire et les dialectes ont commencé à être utilisés comme l'une des caractéristiques de ce genre. Bien que ces traits dialectaux aient pu être employés pour exprimer l'identité, nous n'avons pas d'exemples de cette pratique dans le corpus.

Francesca DELL'ORO. – Epigram and Foreign Identity in Euboea: Between the Disappearance of Local Features and the Development of Generic Languages (p. 73-101)

This paper addresses the question of how foreigners found a way to express their diversity in inscriptional epigrams through linguistic means (alphabet, dialect, adjectives of provenance, etc.) across the centuries. Ancient Euboea was chosen as a first case-study. This region offers a sub-corpus of 8 (funerary) epigrams for which the foreign origin of the deceased is certain, out of a total corpus of 38 epigrams. While in most epigrams of the 5th century BCE alphabets and dialects seem to provide a means to express an identity associated with a specific locality, in subsequent centuries specific epichoric features disappeared and were not replaced by other means of expressing origin and cultural identity. In the Hellenistic age, as epigram became a literary genre, dialects started to be used as generic features. Although it was then possible to use these dialectal features to express an identity, there are no examples of such a use in the corpus.

Paloma GUIJARRO RUANO. – À la recherche d'une langue poétique : les épigrammes préhellénistiques du Péloponnèse (p. 103-135)

L'objectif de cette étude est d'examiner le contact linguistique qui se produit entre la tradition littéraire ionienne-épique et les dialectes doriens dans la poésie épigraphique péloponnésienne. L'analyse repose sur l'étude des inscriptions votives versifiées datées avant la diffusion de la koinè ionienne-attique (VIIe-IVe siècles av. J.-C.). L'examen de ce corpus nous amène à postuler qu'à la base de ces compositions se trouve une langue mêlée, qui constituait une tentative de création d'une langue poétique différenciée de la langue quotidienne. Mais contrairement à l'opinion la plus répandue, cette langue de compromis ne supprime pas les traits épichoriques. Ainsi, il s'avère que les caractéristiques poétiques héritées de l'épopée ne se justifient que par les contraintes métriques. Inversement, les traits épichoriques affleurent, même dans des contextes où ils altèrent la structure prosodique.

Paloma GUIJARRO RUANO. – In Search of a Poetic Language: the Pre-Hellenistic Epigrams of the Peloponnese (p. 103-135)

This paper deals with the linguistic interaction between the Epic-Ionic literary tradition and Doric epichoric dialects in epigraphic poetry from the Peloponnese. It focuses on votive metrical inscriptions dated prior to the arrival of the Attic-Ionic *Koine* (8th-4th c. BCE). The examination of this specific regional corpus provides evidence that a mixed language was at the basis of these compositions. As a matter of fact, this blended language constitutes a local attempt to create a poetic language differentiated from everyday speech. Despite a widespread opinion, this poetic language does not avoid epichoric forms. Linguistic features inherited from epic are thus always justified by metrical constraints and, conversely, local traits arise even when they do not fit in the prosodic structure.

Alcorac ALONSO DÉNIZ. – Πετροκόλαπτον ἔπος : dialecte et langue poétique dans les inscriptions versifiées crétoises (p. 137-187)

S'étendant du Ve siècle av. J.-C. jusqu'au Ve siècle de notre ère, le corpus crétois d'inscriptions en vers est constitué, d'une part, de quelque 120 épigrammes (pour la plupart funéraires et votives) trouvées dans l'île et dans d'autres régions du monde hellénique et, d'autre part, de quelques compositions métriques non épigrammatiques, toutes de thématique sacrée. Dans cette contribution, j'analyse les points communs et les traits spécifiques qui caractérisent la langue de compositions en vers des diverses cités crétoises dès le Ve jusqu'au Ier siècle av. J.-C. Le nombre d'épigrammes funéraires et votives antérieures à *ca* 300 av. J.-C. étant très réduit, on ne peut déterminer avec certitude si les poètes préféraient composer dans leur dialecte local, quoique les dialectalismes ne soient pas évités. Les épigrammes de la période hellénistique offrent, à une exception près, une langue très standardisée et peu innovante par rapport aux modèles bien établis du genre littéraire, le choix des formes linguistiques locales étant

Alcorac ALONSO DÉNIZ. – Πετροκόλαπτον ἔπος: Dialect and Poetic Language in Cretan Verse Inscriptions (p. 137-187)

The Cretan corpus of verse inscriptions consists of some 120 epigrams (mostly funerary and dedicatory) found on the island and in other regions of the Greek world, as well as of a few non-epigrammatic metrical compositions related to sacred matters. In this paper I study the common points and specific features that characterize the language of verse compositions of the various Cretan cities from the 5th down to the 1st century BCE. Since the number of funerary and dedicatory epigrams previous to *ca* 300 BCE is very small, there is no possibility to determine with certainty whether poets preferred to compose mainly in their local dialect (though dialectalisms are not avoided). Hellenistic epigrams offer, with only one exception, a highly standardized and poorly innovative language with regard to the established paradigms of this literary genre; they also exhibit a punctual and asystematic choice of local linguistic forms. Conversely, Cretan texts belonging to other

ponctuel et asystématique. En revanche, les textes crétois appartenant à d'autres traditions poétiques sont plus perméables à l'influence des variétés dialectales locales.

poetic traditions are more permeable to the influence of local dialectal varieties.

Catherine DOBIAS-LALOU. – Langue poétique et formes dialectales dans les inscriptions versifiées grecques : le cas de la Cyrénaïque (p. 189-212)

Catherine DOBIAS-LALOU. – Poetic Language and Dialectal Forms in Greek Verse Inscriptions: the Case of Cyrenaica (p. 189-212)

Le corpus des inscriptions métriques de Cyrénaïque, constitué de 55 entrées, comprend des textes de types variés et s'étale du VIe siècle av. J.-C. au VIe siècle apr. J.-C., avec un pic très net au IIe siècle apr. J.-C. Comme le dialecte reste encore vivace pendant toute la période hellénistique, on peut étendre l'enquête jusqu'au début de notre ère. Après un catalogue systématique des traits dialectaux retenus ou évités, que ceux-ci relèvent de la phonétique, de la morphologie ou du vocabulaire, la prise en compte des conditions d'énonciation permet d'affiner l'appréciation de la bigarrure linguistique à la lumière d'une étude détaillée de quelques textes représentatifs.

The corpus of verse inscriptions from Cyrenaica includes 55 texts of various types and dates, ranging from the sixth century BCE to the 6th century CE, with a distinct peak in the 2nd century CE. As the dialect was still in use during the whole Hellenistic period, all texts dated up to the beginning of the Common Era were taken into account in the present study. After listing all the dialectal features that were kept or avoided, be they pertinent to phonetics, morphology or vocabulary, this paper focuses on the performance/reading conditions of these texts and seeks to gain a better understanding of their blended language through selected case studies.

Olga TRIBULATO. – Les épigrammes inscrites archaïques et classiques de Sicile : contexte linguistique et archéologique (p. 213-238)

Olga TRIBULATO. – Archaic and Classical Inscribed Epigrams from Sicily: Language and Archaeological Context (p. 213-238)

La Sicile ancienne, terre grecque riche en manifestations culturelles et littéraires, a fourni un nombre réduit d'épigrammes épigraphiques. L'objectif de cette contribution est de présenter le panorama des huit épigrammes réalisées entre la période archaïque et classique, ainsi que de signaler leurs choix linguistiques. Les épigrammes votives étant pour la plupart formulaires, et deux des épigrammes funéraires étant fragmentaires, les résultats de l'étude des choix dialectaux par rapport à la langue littéraire traditionnelle du genre épigrammatique sont limités. Afin de surmonter ces problèmes interprétatifs, cette contribution considère le contexte archéologique des quatre épigrammes funéraires comme une clé fondamentale pour comprendre comment elles s'insèrent dans l'habitus épigraphique de la Sicile archaïque et classique.

Ancient Sicily, a Greek land rich in cultural and literary manifestations, has yielded a small number of inscribed epigrams. The aim of this paper is to present an overview of the eight epigrams surely produced in the Archaic and Classical periods and to pinpoint their linguistic choices. Since dedicatory epigrams are mostly formulaic, and two of the funerary epigrams are fragmentary, a study of their dialectal choices *vis-à-vis* the traditional literary language of the epigrammatic genre yields limited results. To overcome these interpretative problems, this paper considers the archaeological context of the four funerary epigrams as a fundamental key for understanding how they integrate into the epigraphic habits of Archaic and Classical Sicily.

SOMMAIRE