

## **A new bronze honorific inscription from Halaesa, Sicily, in two copies<sup>1</sup>**

In September 2004 a remarkable pair of bronze inscriptions was excavated on the site of ancient Halaesa Archonidea. The bronzes were recovered in an emergency excavation at the end of a scheduled season of excavation, in response to evidence of illegal interventions on the site. Publication was delayed for reasons beyond the control of the excavators; restoration and conservation work was carried out in the meantime.<sup>2</sup> The two bronzes (hereafter distinguished as ‘Nemenios A’ and ‘Nemenios B’, after the honorand) are now on display in the Museo Archeologico “Giacomo Scibona”, at the site of ancient Halaesa (inv. ME 21924 and ME 21925). The bronzes were first published, posthumously, in 2009 by the late Giacomo Scibona (with the assistance of Giacomo Manganaro) in a volume co-edited by Gabriella Tigano, reporting excavations on the site between 1970 and 2007. Giacomo Manganaro in turn briefly discussed the inscriptions, with text and translation of Nemenios A, in articles published at the beginning of 2010 and in 2011.<sup>3</sup> Both of these scholars confined their discussion to the text presented in the better preserved of the two bronzes (Nemenios A). A further discussion was published by Laurent Dubois in 2013, which reproduced the text of A, together with a French translation.<sup>4</sup> All discussions to date are based upon the text of A produced by Scibona/Manganaro, without an accurate text of the second tablet, B. Commentary has focused primarily on the onomastics of the text(s) and the broader institutional and historical problems which they raise. After autopsy of the two bronzes in April 2010, it seemed appropriate to present a full critical edition of both bronzes, together with further discussion to elucidate specific points and the Sicilian epigraphic context. The texts that are presented here were made available, based upon an earlier draft of

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to express my immense gratitude to Dott.ssa Gabriella Tigano and arch. Rocco Burgio of the Messina Soprintendenza per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, for their generosity in granting me access to the inscriptions while in storage in Messina (19-20 April 2010) and their support throughout; also to Prof. Lorenzo Campagna of the University of Messina for his constant assistance, advice, and friendship. What follows owes much to discussion at seminars in Oxford, in Pisa in 2010 (at the invitation of C. Ampolo), in Ghent in 2011 (invitation of K. Verboven), in Copenhagen (invitation of V. Gabrielsen) and Pisa in 2012 (C. Ampolo) and I am grateful for all the suggestions made by participants on those occasions, and in particular to Prof.ssa Anna Maria Prestianni Giallombardo, as well as Professors Michael Crawford and Jean-Louis Ferrary for freely offering their own thoughts on other occasions. I am of course solely responsible for the use I have made of such advice.

<sup>2</sup> Scibona 2009a: 99 n. 5 and now in detail, Burgio (forthcoming). There is no reason to question the authenticity of the bronzes, which were recovered through documented archaeological excavation (cf. Dubois 2013: 2).

<sup>3</sup> Scibona 2009a; Manganaro 2009a: 21-28; brief notice in Manganaro 2009b: 90 n. 26; further discussion of various aspects, including the demotics, and reproduction of text and translation of A, in Manganaro 2011: 52-60 (minor corrigenda to 2009a at p. 49 n. 47). Brief notice in Prestianni Giallombardo and Facella 2012: 256-7, and brief discussion in Prestianni Giallombardo 2012: 178-9, cf. 182, 185-7. Scibona and Manganaro’s initial publications were noted, with succinct observations, by L. Dubois in *BE* 2010.646.

<sup>4</sup> Dubois 2013 with *BE* 2014 no.546.

this paper (prepared in 2012), for inclusion in the substantial lemma with discussion edited by Rolf Tybout in *SEG* 59.1100 (2009), published in late 2013. I first describe the archaeological context of discovery and the physical form and state of the tablets, before presenting the texts and an English translation. An extended commentary on various aspects of the texts follows.

## 1. Archaeological Context

Ancient Halaesa Archonidea is securely identified with the ruins located on a hill *c.* 1.5 km inland from the north coast of Sicily, above modern Castel di Tusa, in the province of Messina. The city was founded *c.* 403 BC, with mixed traditions recording either a Sikel/Greek or a Punic foundation. According to Diodorus Siculus (23.4.1) Halaesa was the first city to go over to Rome in 263 BC, and this may explain its subsequent privileged tax status under the Republic (Cic. *Verr.* 3.12). Cicero accords the city high praise in several passages (*Verr.* 2.122; 3.170; *Fam.* 13.32.1). In describing the city's foundation, Diodorus (14.16.3) attributes the city's later wealth to seaborne commerce and the *immunitas* (ἀτέλεια) granted by Rome. Cicero twice emphasizes Halaesa's role as a port (*Verr.* 2.185, 3.192). Faced with internal *stasis*, the city received *leges de senatu cooptandu* at its own request from the Roman Senate, through the praetor *de repetundis* of 95 BC, C. Claudius Pulcher (*Verr.* 2.122). Cicero and his cousin visited the city in 70 BC, attending its *senatus* (*Verr.* 3.170). The city acquired the status of a (Latin) *municipium* by the end of Augustus' reign. The urban site was largely abandoned by the fifth century AD and was never reoccupied.<sup>5</sup>

The site has been subject to archaeological excavations since the 1950s; in addition to the Hellenistic city walls, the main focus of attention has been the agora and its immediate surrounds; the temple platform and sanctuary on the northern summit of the site were briefly explored in 1956, and a new study commenced in 2016.<sup>6</sup> The site has yielded a significant number of inscriptions, including what may be the earliest Latin inscription from Sicily, a third-century dedication to Apollo (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup>.2219 and p. 1096; provenance not secure); and the earliest honorific for a Roman magistrate erected by *Italici* abroad (*ILLRP* 320, probably 193

---

<sup>5</sup> For a historical study of Halaesa with earlier bibliography, Facella 2006; on municipal status Vera 1996.

<sup>6</sup> For recent archaeological work, with earlier bibliography, see A. Burgio 2008, Scibona and Tigano 2009; a full survey of primary evidence and past scholarship in Prestianni Giallombardo and Facella 2012.

BC, now lost).<sup>7</sup> Most important is the famous cadastral inscription, variously dated between the third and first centuries BC.<sup>8</sup>

The two bronzes were found lying close together within a sealed destruction layer in what appears to have been a ground-floor store-room in a larger building of uncertain character (the rest of the building is unexcavated). The building lies within Insula XIII West, to the north-west of the junction between what the excavators designate *cardo* I and *decumanus* XII (see fig. 13). The *insula* is of irregular outline, lying at the northern end of the main terrace of the site, just within the city wall, and by its location stands at a key point of connectivity within the urban site: it is bordered on the south side by *decumanus* XII which is of unusually broad dimensions, constituting the primary route from the *agora* (via *cardo* I), along the top of the so-called ‘contrafforti’, to the acropolis – a sort of ‘*via sacra*’ in the view of the excavators.<sup>9</sup> The building therefore occupies a potentially significant location within the urban plan. The room itself contained two rows of large *pithoi*, or *dolia* (hence the building named ‘*casa dei dolii*’ by the excavators), one of which contained white mosaic *tesserae*; there was also at least one amphora, identified by the excavators as a Dressel 2-4. The bronzes formed part of a layer of material that appears to have fallen from an upper floor in the course of a catastrophic fire; one of the bronzes (B) shows extensive heat damage, the other (A) less. The material in the destruction layer included charred wood, fragments of wall-painting (late 1<sup>st</sup> or early 2<sup>nd</sup> style) and large fragments of *opus signinum* flooring, both of which are taken to suggest a general dating of first century BC / first century AD.<sup>10</sup>

A number of additional elements can be reported which do not appear in the original publication of Scibona, but which are of some significance for the inscriptions themselves.<sup>11</sup> At the time of recovery, on the reverse side of each of the two bronze tablets were traces of burnt wood, to which the tablets were attached by means of iron nails, the oxidised and

---

<sup>7</sup> See Prag and Tigano 2018 for a catalogue of all but the most fragmentary inscriptions from the site (excluding the cadastral inscription).

<sup>8</sup> *IG* XIV.352 (now lost) + *Arch. Stor. Sic.* 10 (1885), p. 123-9 (now lost) + *SEG* 31.825 (not necessarily the same stone); full texts in *IGSI* 2 and *IGDS* I.196-7.

<sup>9</sup> Detailed description in Burgio (forthcoming); see the general plan in Scibona and Tigano 2009: Tav. A, and cf. Scibona 2009a: 110 fig. 8.

<sup>10</sup> The excavation is reported summarily in Scibona 2009a: 98-9, more fully in Burgio (forthcoming). The suggestion of destruction caused by an earthquake in Manganaro 2009a: 28 and 2011: 51 appears to be without foundation; Burgio (forthcoming) suggests a ‘*causa bellica*’, but this seems very speculative without further evidence given the apparently isolated nature of the event on the site and the lack of evidence for a violent transition in the Civil Wars.

<sup>11</sup> Burgio (forthcoming), with a reconstruction of the sequence of the collapse.

corroded remains of which were also still observable when excavated. In addition, three bronze hinges (and the fragments of a fourth and other bronze elements) were found in the same destruction layer. It appears that the two bronzes were fixed by means of nails to the two leaves of a large wooden door on the first floor (the ‘piano nobile’) of the building. Rocco Burgio observes that none of the metal elements show significant signs of wear, suggesting that they had not been long in place prior to the destruction. *Prima facie*, an obvious parallel for what might be a large, multiple-storey, rich, private residence, with store-rooms or *tabernae* at the street-level, can be found in the late-Hellenistic houses at Solunto, further along the north coast of Sicily;<sup>12</sup> but it has also been suggested that this building might constitute a workshop, or the headquarters of an association. Two significant questions arise: firstly, why was the building apparently never reoccupied or restored? And secondly, why were both copies found together in this context when, as we shall see, the decree envisaged their separate display, at least one in public?

## **2. Physical form and state of preservation**<sup>13</sup>

The two bronzes (Figs. 1-6) each take the form of a substantial bronze plate over 5 mm thick, to which were affixed, by means of rivets, a number of relief elements creating the form of a temple facade: crepidoma, a framing pair of Corinthian columns, an entablature containing a frieze with triglyphs and metopes surmounted by a cornice with dentils, and a pediment, the tympanum of which is undecorated. It seems likely that some form of circular decoration was present, originally, on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> metope (counting from the viewer’s left) of A, and the outermost metopes (1<sup>st</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>) of B, but only the marks of these remain (less certain on B).<sup>14</sup> The relief elements differ in detail between the two tablets, although not in essentials. The inscription occupies the large field between the two columns; the upper part of the inscribed field also contains an engraved laurel-wreath, with the text of the initial lines arranged in and around the wreath (again, the precise arrangement differs slightly between the two bronzes). In the case of A, the main plate in fact consists of two pieces of bronze, welded together horizontally at a point equivalent to the second line of the inscribed text; this join is only visible on the reverse, which itself presents a very rough, unfinished appearance. Although found together, the constituent elements had become detached from one another, and so part of the work of restoration entailed reattaching the relief elements to the main plate. In the

---

<sup>12</sup> See Wolf 2003, Portale 2006.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Burgio (forthcoming).

<sup>14</sup> Such decoration would have served to obscure the heads of the nails which attach the pediment to the back-plate and are suggested by the traces on the bronze. Rosettes are most likely; cf. Fraser and Rönne 1957: 48-9, who note such decoration particularly common in western Greece and Italy.

case of B, it should be noted that the left-hand column has been reattached such that it partially obscures the first letter of several lines: this is an unavoidable consequence of the heat distortion suffered by the main plate to which it is fixed and should not be considered an original feature; the overlap does not appear in the drawings.

Both tablets suffered from the heat of the fire in antiquity. The damage is minimal in the case of A, consisting of a few small patches of surface damage in the field of the inscription. By contrast, B suffered extensive damage. B appears to have landed on the shoulder of an amphora (on which it was lying when found) in its fall from the upper floor, and was then subjected to intense heat from the fire, doubtless fed by timbers from the floor and roof above.<sup>15</sup> The damage is compatible with a period of exposure to a temperature in excess of 600 °C, but below the actual melting point of bronze, which is closer to 1,000 °C. At such temperatures the bronze would begin to deform, either under its own weight or through the additional pressure of objects pressing on it from above: this explains the tablet's deformed shape, compatible with its position across the shoulder of the amphora. Additionally, at such temperatures the surface of the bronze begins to oxidise. A large area in the centre of tablet B now presents a completely smooth surface; surprisingly, however, letters are still visible on this area, contrary to what was reported in the original publication (Fig. 8). These letters have a grey-white colour, and present what can only be described as a 'fuzzy', or unfocused appearance. All of the reportedly missing text is in fact present in this fashion, and almost entirely legible. The explanation for this feature appears to lie in the consequences of oxidation. The process of oxidation penetrates deeper into the bronze the longer that the metal is exposed to the necessary temperature and a sufficiently oxygen-rich atmosphere. When one or both of these prerequisites is removed, the process is halted. Subsequent cleaning and conservation removed the layer of oxidised bronze. In this instance, that layer of oxidation appears to have been approximately equivalent in depth to the depth of the original engraving of the letters; hence the surface of the bronze in this area is now smooth. However, the process of cleaning has had an effect equivalent to that of the process of etching, with the result that the underlying deformation of the bronze consequent upon the original process of engraving has now been revealed, and it is this which can now be read on the smooth surface

---

<sup>15</sup> For what follows I am indebted to the advice of Dr Peter Northover, Dept. of Materials Science, University of Oxford; he is of course not responsible for the conclusions drawn. Cf. Eck 2015: 131 n.16 on the partial melting of bronze.

of the bronze. As noted, small patches of similar damage, but of a lesser degree of severity, are observable on the surface of A.

### 3. The texts

I present edited texts of both bronzes, based upon my own autopsy. In the apparatus I indicate divergences from the existing editions of Scibona and Manganaro for text A only (other published texts are derivative). Manganaro does not report text B, and text B in the edition of Scibona bears no relation to the bronze, reproducing A with the inaccurate insertion of square brackets. I do report the readings presented by the drawings executed by Maurizio Badali, originally published in the edition of Scibona, since these demonstrate a very high degree of accuracy (Figs. 3-4).<sup>16</sup> In the case of text B, and in the absence of an established convention in such situations, I have chosen to indicate those sections of the text which are heat damaged but still legible, as described above, by means of underlining.<sup>17</sup>

#### Nemenios A (Figs. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11-12)

Tablet A measures H 47.3 cm x W 24.5 cm (33.4 cm across the base) x D 0.5 cm overall; the pediment W 36.3 cm x H 8.3 cm; the columns (incl. base and capital) 31.5cm high. The field available for inscription is 21 cm wide (measured at line 8) by 32 cm high.

Lines 1-7 are roughly centred, arranged in and around an engraved laurel wreath with fillets (lines 1-2 are above the wreath, line 3 entirely within, lines 4 and 5 split to the left and within the wreath, line 6 split within and to the right of the wreath, line 7 below). Line 8 begins one letter space to the left of the normal left margin; lines 31-34 are indented from the left margin by the equivalent of three letter-spaces, thereby avoiding a nail-hole.

The letters of line 1 are largest (c. 7-12 mm high); those of lines 2-7 smaller (4-7 mm), and those of lines 8-34 smaller again (generally 3-4 mm).

The inscribed face is pierced by four nail-holes: two in blank space to either side of the wreath in the upper part of the field; a third to the bottom left of the inscribed field, forcing the indentation of the text at the beginning of lines 31-2 (and perhaps therefore preceding the inscription of the text); a fourth to the bottom right of the inscribed field, in empty space.

Letters of line 1 are quadrate, with standard closed *omega* (E, Σ, Ω), and are broadly comparable to letters of monumental Hieronian inscriptions (i.e. c. 265-215 BC Syracuse);<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Scibona 2009a: 100-1, figs. 6-7.

<sup>17</sup> This duplicates conventions for recording earlier readings of text now lost; but is the least intrusive and clearest way of distinguishing the relevant sections of the text.

<sup>18</sup> Dimartino 2006 surveys Hieronian inscriptions and letter-forms on stone; closed *omega*, and the fully extended right hasta of the *pi* are however more typical of the following period.

letters of lines 2-34 are lunate ( $\epsilon$ ,  $\varsigma$ ,  $\omega$ ). There are two instances of broken-bar *alpha*, in lines 3 and 7. *Eta* is frequently, if not consistently, rendered in a form comparable to a reversed *nu* (described by Scibona as a cursive type). The *xsi* in form of a Z with cross-bar is a distinctive variation of the more common form in Sicily of a vertical with three cross strokes; the form is attested in other Hellenistic Sicilian inscriptions.<sup>19</sup> The form of the letter *pi* is also distinctive (in lines 2-34): the right hasta regularly bent outwards at the lower end; the left hasta occasionally similarly bent outwards also.

The letters are engraved throughout by means of chasing with a chisel (with a curved rather than triangular profile); there is no evidence that any of the letters were engraved by means of punching. Straight or long strokes on many letters, especially the larger letters of the first few lines, are frequently terminated by means of a punched point (whether executed with the same tool I cannot tell), presumably done to mark out and control the extent of the individual strokes. Circular letters such as *omicron* are engraved freely, generally formed by two semi-circular strokes; consequently they vary somewhat in form and size throughout the text. In general however the craftsman seems to display considerable skill, control, and consistency and engraves circular and curved letter forms throughout with a free hand.<sup>20</sup>

Lightly incised lines, perhaps intended as guide lines, although they are not followed consistently by the text, are visible on the lower right portion of the text, in particular in lines 20-30.

There are clear traces of a previous inscription underlying the existing text, and likewise most of the inscribed face shows the traces of having been beaten smooth prior to re-use.<sup>21</sup>

Apparent traces of the earlier text are visible on the upper left between lines 2 and 3, to the lower right, at the end of line 33, and to the lower left, below line 34 (see below in the textual notes, comments to lines 2a, 11, 33, and 34a-b). No evidence for this is visible on the reverse.

---

<sup>19</sup> Visible in *IG XIV.256* (Phintias), ll. 27, 40 (where the more typical form also appears in ll. 4, 7, 16); and *I.G.Palermo* no.106, l. 8 (Larfeld 1902: II, 481 notes the appearance of the form in Attic inscriptions from 100 BC); cf. Dubois 2013: 4, who thinks the form unparalleled.

<sup>20</sup> On techniques of engraving in metal see, e.g., Casson 1935, Sartori 1992. For comparison (all personal observation): *IG XIV.952* (Agrigentum) is also engraved by chasing, but without the terminal dots to the strokes (and so more similar to 'Nemenios B', below, except that its engraver resorts to, e.g., rhomboid *omega* in order to avoid having to free-cut some circular forms); *IG XIV.953* (Malta) is more deeply chased, retaining circular forms throughout, and makes some use of terminal dots (but not as pronounced as in line 1 of 'Nemenios A'); contrast, e.g., Entella VI (*SEG* 30.1122 = Ampolo 2001: C1), which is entirely engraved by means of four different punch-tools, but still with terminal dots to the strokes (see Loomis 1994: 158-9); likewise *IG XIV.612* (Reggio) is engraved with a mixture of straight and circular punches, but without terminal dots. For a third technique (lost-wax casting, the text engraved in the wax), with different consequences, see Knoepfler and Pasquier 2006: 1282 and fig. 3 (Naryka, E. Locris), or the Egadi *rostra* (Prag 2014).

<sup>21</sup> Prestianni Giallombardo 2012: 178 n.75 also notes evidence for re-use.

I have recorded *vacats* within the text where they appear: they are used to separate out names in lines 10-14, but also at several points appear to act in the role of punctuation.

1 Ἐπὶ ἱερέων Διὸς  
 2 Δωροθέου Ἀπολλωνίου Λαβ  
 3 Ἀπόλλωνος  
 4 Ἀπελλᾶ Ζωπ<ύ>ρου Κρα  
 5 Διογένη Διοδώρου  
 6 Ἐλωρείου νεμηνία  
 7 προ(στάτας) Διόδωρος Δάζου Περ ·  
 8 Ἔδοξε τᾶ ἀλία καθὰ καὶ τᾶ βουλᾶ τᾶ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος  
 9 καὶ συνεβούλευσαν Διογένης Καλλίππου Καλ, Φιλίαρχος Φαλάκρου  
 10 Ἀρχ, ν Ἡρέας Δίωνος Υςγ, ν Νίκιππος Φιλίαρχου Περ, ν Ἀπολλώνιος  
 11 Ἡλιοδώρου Κρα, ν Ἴστέϊος Θράκωνος Τηλ, ν Δάμων Β Λο<γ>, ν Ἀρτέμων  
 12 Δάμωνος Ερι, Σωσίπολις Ταυρίωνος Λογ, ν Δίων Β ν Λογ, ν Ἴστέϊος Νυα  
 13 Υπα, νν Ἀπελλᾶς Θέστωνος Νητ, Δίων ν Νικοκλέος Νητ, ν Ἰππίας Δαμᾶ  
 14 Λαβ, ν Ἴστιδώρος Εὐθύμου Υπα · νν Ἐπειδὴ Νεμήνιος Νεμηνίου Υςγ Δά-  
 15 φνις ν φανερός ἐστι ε<ϛ>νους ἐὼν τοῖς ἱερέοις τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ καλῶς  
 16 πεποικῶς τυγχάνει τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἱερέων τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος παντὶ τρό-  
 17 πῳ καὶ λέγων καὶ πράσων τὰ κράτιστα καὶ συμφορώτατα τοῖς ἱερέοις τοῦ  
 18 Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ κοινᾶ καὶ κατ'ἰδίαν ἄξια πράσων τᾶς τ<ε> αὐτο<ϛ> ἀνδρείας  
 19 καὶ καλοκάγαθίας καὶ τᾶς τῶν προγόνων ἀρετᾶς, δίκαιον δέ ἐστι τοὺς ἀγαθοῦ[c]  
 20 τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ τὰν αὐτῶν εὐνοίαν ἐνδεικνυμένων τειμᾶν καὶ προεδρι-  
 21 αν τυγχάνειν καὶ ἀθάνατον αὐτῶν μνάμαν παρὰ τοῖς εὔ παθόντεσσι διαμέ-  
 22 νειν, ὧν ἔνεκεν δεδό<χθ>αι τᾶ ἀλία τῶν ἱερέων τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καθὰ καὶ τοῖ[c]  
 23 βουλευταῖς εὐεργέταν εἶμειν νν Νεμήνιον Νεμ<η>νίου Υςγ Δάφνιν, ν καὶ  
 24 σταῖσαι αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα χαλκῆαν καὶ <ἀ>ναθέμειν ἢ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἢ ἐν  
 25 τᾶ βασιλικᾶ, ἐν ᾧ κα τόπῳ αὐτὸς βόληται, ἐπιγράσαντα <θε>οῖς πᾶσι τὸ κοινὸν  
 26 τῶν ἱερέων τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος Νεμήνιον Νεμηνίου Υςγ Δάφνιν τὸν εὐερ-  
 27 γέταν ἀρετᾶς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας τᾶς εἰς αὐτὸν, ὅπως φανερόν ἢ τοῖς ἐπιγει-  
 28 νομένοισι ὅτι οἱ ἱερέες τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος δύνανται χάριτ<α>ς καὶ τειμᾶς ἀπο-  
 29 νέμειν τοῖς εὐεργέταις ἀξίας τᾶν εὐεργεσιᾶν · οἱ δὲ ταμίαι οἱ Διοδωρεῖοι  
 30 ἐξοδιαξάντον τὸ χρῆμα ἐς τὰν εἰκόνα καὶ τόδε τὸ δόγμα κολάσαντες  
 31 νν ἐς χαλκῶματα δύο, τὸ μὲν ἐν ἀναθέντον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος  
 32 νν ἐς τὸ πρόναον τοῦ Διὸς, τὸ δὲ ἐν ἀποδόντον α<ϛ>τῷ · νν ψάφοι *vacat*  
 33 νν αἰ κελομένοι εὐεργέταν εἶμειν ν Νεμήνιον Νεμηνίου Υςγ Δάφνιν  
 34 νν πέντε εἰκοσι ὀκτακόσια νν καὶ κωλύουσα οὐδεμία *vacat*  
*vacat*

### Textual notes and apparatus

Key: *S* = Scibona 2009a; *M* = Manganaro 2009a; *B* = drawing by Badalì in Scibona 2009a: fig.6, here fig. 2; *P* = autopsy 19-20/04/10.

2a: a Δ is visible towards the left margin between lines 2 and 3; I take this to belong to a previous text, subsequently erased from the bronze (cf. ll. 11, 33, 34a-b).

4: Ζωπύρου, *S*, *M*; ΖΩΠΤΡΟΥ, *B*, *P*; in general the engraver clearly distinguishes *upsilon* from *tau*; however, here and at ll. 15, 17, 18 and 32 the letter appears indistinguishable from *tau*; Scibona's general observation that *upsilon* appears 'quasi a forma di tau' (2009a: 99) is however too sweeping and misleading.

5: Διογένη(ος), *M*; there is no trace of any letter after the final *eta* (for the form, which lacks Sicilian examples and foreshadows a common late type with nom. -γένης, acc. -γένην, gen. (dat., voc.) -γένη, and ultimately modern Greek (-ης, -η), see Dubois 2013: 7-8 nn.28-30, Gignac 1981: II, 69-75, Schwyzer 1939: I, 579; cf. Horrocks 2010: 117, 120-21, 286-7).

8: ἱεροῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, *S, M.b*

10: Υστ, *S, M*; this form is consistent at each iteration on the bronze, and the engraver clearly distinguishes *gamma* and *tau*; cf. ll. 14, 23, 26, 33 (see fig.12). Scibona reads Υστ without explanation; Manganaro (2009a: 27) claims to read Υστ from the photograph. The implied justification in both cases would appear to be the overlapping list of such abbreviations in *IGDS* II.40 (cf. Manganaro 2009a: 27 n. 52; Scibona 2009a: 104 n. 6 and below); however neither Υστ nor Υσγ appear in that text, so the emendation of the *gamma* on the bronze appears arbitrary. ΑΠΘΛΛΩΝΙΟC, *B*; the cross-stroke of the ‘*theta*’ reported by Badali is a flaw on the bronze, not a deliberate stroke.

11: Τηλ, *S, M*; ΤΚΛ, *B*; the visible traces of left vertical hasta and upper right sloping hasta, together with a point bottom right are entirely compatible with the common form of *eta* in this text (similar to a reversed *nu*, see e.g. l. 5). Λογ, *S, M*; ΛΟΙ, *B, P*; but in tablet B this instance appears clearly as ΛΟΓ (and cf. l. 12). ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΑ, *B*; a horizontal stroke is visible on the bronze after the final *nu*, but it is not obviously part of a letter (unless part of the underlying earlier text), and there are no further traces to suggest a letter.

14: Υστ, *S, M* (cf. l. 10).

15: ΦΑΝCΡΟC, *B*. εὔνοῦς, *S, M*; ΕΤΝΟΥC, *B, P* (cf. l. 4).

16: ΙΕΡCΩΝ, *B*.

17: final *upsilon* poorly executed (cf. l. 4).

18: κοινᾶ, *M*. τε, *S, M*; ΤC, *B, P*. αὔτοῦ, *S*; αὔτοῦ, *M*; ΑΥΤΟΤ, *B, P* (cf. l. 4).

19: No traces of the final *sigma* are visible on the bronze, the surface of which is very uneven at the far right margin (cf. l. 22).

20: ἐνδεικνυμένων, *S, M, B*; traces compatible with *kappa*, but the actual letter is scarcely visible on the bronze.

21: εὔπαθόντεccι, *S, M* (εὔ normally only compounded with nouns and adjectives, verbs generally written *divisim* (*LSJ*, s.v. εὔ)).

22: ΔΕΔΟΛΤΑΙ, *B, P* (and Scibona 2009a: 105 n. 35). τοῖ[c], *S, M*; ΤΟΙ, *B*; traces compatible with *iota* are visible; no traces of final *sigma* visible on the bronze, the surface of which is very uneven at the far right margin (cf. l. 19).

23: Νεμηνίου Υστ, *S, M*; ΗΕΜΝΝΙΟΥ ΥΣΓ, *B*; ΝΕΜΝΝΙΟΥ ΥΣΓ, *P*; the initial *nu* is merely poorly formed; the third letter is partially obliterated but traces compatible with *mu*; for ΥΣΓ cf. l. 10.

24: ἀναθέμειν, *S, M*; ΑΝΑΘΕΜΕΙΝ, *B, P*.

25: κα, *S, M, B*; traces compatible with *kappa*, but the bronze has suffered some heat damage at this point. θεοῖς, *S, M*; ΟΟΙΟΙ, *B, P*.

26: Υστ, *S, M* (cf. l. 10). εὐερ-, *S, M*; ΕΥΕΡ, *B*; traces compatible with *rho*, but the surface is very uneven at the far right margin and the letter is far from clear.

27: ΤΟΙΟΙ, *B*; right side of the *omicron* is faint but visible.

28: χάριτας, *S, M*; ΧΑΡΙΤΕΣ, *B, P*.

29: ἄξια, *S*; ἄξια(ς), *M*. εὐερχεσιᾶν, *M*.

32: αὐτῷ, *S, M*; ΑΤΤΩ, *B, P* (cf. l. 4).

33: Νενηνίου Υστ, *S, M* (cf. l. 10). ΔΑΦΝΙΝΘ, *B*; there is a small circle above the line to the right of the final *nu* (whence Badalì's symbol similar to a 9); this is not obviously part of the text, and not consistent with *omicron* elsewhere in this text; it could be part of the previously erased text (cf. ll. 2a, 11, 34a, 34b).

34a-b: I read traces of the beginning of two further lines below the main body of the inscription (see fig. 11); these presumably belong to a pre-existing text, erased prior to the inscription of the main text (cf. ll. 2a, 11, 33). The letters at the start of two lines are visible (note the use of lunate epsilon and sigma):

34a: ο[---]

34b: εϛτ[---]

### **Nemenios B (see Figs. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10)**

B is only summarily reported by Scibona, and the text presented by Scibona (2009a: 103) is in fact identical to the text presented for A, with the sole exception of the inaccurate insertion of square brackets; other than in the first seven lines, Scibona's text bears no relation to the actual disposition of the text on the bronze. Manganaro offers no comments or observations on the second tablet, other than statements that the two have the same form (2009a: 21), and that the layout differs (2011: 52). Prestianni Giallombardo (2012: 178 n.75) merely notes that B is less well preserved (and arbitrarily assumes that this is the copy intended for the honorand, Nemenios). The only published report of any value for B is the drawing by M. Badalì (in Scibona 2009a: 101, Fig. 7; reproduced as Fig. 4 here); Badalì, however, leaves blank the area damaged in the fire (reported with underlining in the text below).

The tablet measures H 46.3 cm x W 29.6cm (32.7 across the base) x D 0.5 cm overall.

The pediment W 36.6 cm. The field available for inscription is 22.8 cm wide (measured at line 8) by 31.5 cm high. In other words, the tablet is slightly wider, with the difference increasing slightly over the length of the text. As a consequence of the wider available field for inscription, B requires two lines fewer than A for the same text. Average number of characters per line on A (for lines 8-30; I exclude lines 31-34 because of the indentation due to the nail-hole) is 54 (range 46-61); average per line on B (for lines 8-29; I exclude lines 30-32 as the disposition of the text alters) is 59 (range 51-67).

As with A, lines 1-7 are arranged around an engraved laurel-wreath. As with A, ll. 1-2 are above the wreath and centred; however thereafter the arrangement is somewhat different: l. 3 is to the left of the wreath; l. 4 has elements to the left, within and to the right of the wreath; l. 5 (as in A) is split to the left of the wreath and within the wreath; l. 6 has elements to the left, within and to the right of the wreath, taking over some text which is in l. 7 on A; l. 7 is split to the left and within the wreath (on A this line was below the wreath).

Letters of B are similar in size to those on A: line 1, 7-11 mm; lines 2-7, 3-7 mm; lines 8-32, 3-5 mm.

B is pierced by three nail-holes (contrast four on A): a pair to the upper left and upper right in the space before and after l. 2; and a third centred in the *vacat* below the text.

In l. 1, *epsilon* and *sigma* are quadrate (Ε, Σ), but *omega* is lunate (Ω) – contrast A with closed *omega*; in ll. 2-32 all three letters are lunate (ε, σ, ω), as in A. There are a number of minor variations in letter-form compared with A: *delta* shows a marked tendency to include an apex, which is found irregularly also in *alpha* and *lamda*; *eta* almost always takes the standard form in B (in contrast to the ‘reversed *nu*’ form in A); the *xsi* is similar; the tendency in A for *pi* to show curvature in the tail of one or both of the vertical hastas is not generally visible in B; broken-bar *alpha* is wholly absent from B (with the possible exception of line 4); the occasional equivalence between *tau* and *upsilon* in A is not found in B.

B is inscribed by means of chasing with a chisel, like A. Terminal points at the end of strokes are however much less pronounced, or absent, which finds its counterpoint in the presence of apices or serifs on some of the letters made up of long strokes: as in stone inscriptions, serifs in part serve a functional purpose in assisting in the termination of the chisel stroke and its extraction from the surface. At the same time, the letters of B are generally thinner and so slightly more lightly chased (in so far as this is not simply a consequence of partial loss of the surface following damage in the fire and cleaning). In other words, there are grounds for thinking that, although the tools are the same, the technique and stylistic choices of the



### Textual notes and apparatus

Key: *B* = drawing by Badalì in Scibona 2009a: fig.7 (fig. 4 here); *P* = autopsy 19-20/04/10.

Note that underlining in the text above serves to indicate text that is legible but heat damaged.

1: ΛΙΟΣ, *B*, *P*.

2: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ, *B*; the horizontal of the initial *alpha* is visible.

6: ΕΛΩΟΕΙΟΥ, *B*; the tail of the *rho* is visible.

9: ΦΛΛΑΚΡΟΥ, *B*; the cross-bar of the initial *alpha* is visible.

11: Initial *iota* is (now) concealed under the left column (cf. A.11). Τηλ, the visible traces of *eta* are similar to those at the same point in A.11.

12: ΤΑΥΡΙΩΝΟC, *B* (who records only a trace of a letter in place of the *alpha*, which I here represent with an underdot); the *alpha* is wholly visible.

13: ΙCΤΙΟCΩΠΟC, *P* (cf. A.14).

14: ΝΕΛΛΗΝΟC, *B* (seemingly struggles to resolve the *mu* and the *nu-iota* letters).  
ΝΕΜΝΝΙΟΥ, *P*.

15: ΠΕΠΟCΗΚΙΟC, *P* (cf. A.16). ΤΩΝ ΙΕΡΩΝ, *B*.

18: Α[-]ΤΑC, *B*; traces of the *rho* and *epsilon* are visible.

19: ΔC ΕCΤΙ, *B*; middle bar of *epsilon* is visible.

20: ΠΑΡΑ, *B*; cross-bar of both *alphas* is visible.

21: The visible traces at this point are difficult to reconcile with the necessary letters for δεδόχθαι. ΤΟΝ ΙΕΡΕΟΝ, *P*.

22: ΚΑΟΑ, *B*; middle bar of *theta* is visible. [--]ΙΟΥ ΥCΓ, *B*; both *upsilons* only partially visible.

23: Η CΝ ΤΑ, *B*; middle bar of *epsilon* is visible.

25: ΑΠΟΛΛΩ[-]ΟC, *B*; traces of *nu* are visible. ΤΑΝ Α[.]ΕΤΑC Ε-, *B*; *rho* is visible.

26: ΕΥΝΟΙΑ[-], *B*. ΟΙ Ι[---]ΕC, *B*.

27: ΧΑΡΙΤΕC, *P* (cf. A.28). ΑΖΙΑC [-]ΑΝ, *B*.

28: ΕΙΚΟΝΑ [--], *B*.

29: Τ[.] ΔΟ[.]ΜΑ, *B*. ΤΩ ΙΕ[--], *B*.

30: ΤΟΥ Δ[---]ΤΟ ΔΕ Ε[--<sup>10-12</sup>--]ΑΥΤΩΙ, *B*.

32: ΠΕΝΤΕ ΕΙΚΟCΙ[---]ΚΤΑΚΟCΙΑΙ[---]ΚΑΙ ΚΩΛΥΟΥCΑ Ο[-----], *B*.

**The following formal differences between A and B can be observed:**

A16-17 τρόπω : B16 τρόπωι

A20 τειμᾶν : B20 τιμᾶν

A24 εἰκόνα : B23 ἰκόνα

A32 αὐτῷ : B30 αὐτῶι

#### 4. Translation

The translation proposed below is based upon tablet A.

In the priesthoods of Zeus, of Dorotheos son of Apollonios, Lab., (and) of Apollo, of Apelles son of Zopyros, Kra., (and) Diogenes son of Diodoros, on the first day of Eloreios, Diodoros son of Dazos, Per., presiding.

It seemed good to the Assembly as also to the Council of the Sanctuary of Apollo, and those who acted as councillors were Diogenes son of Kallippos, Sal., Philiarchos son of Phalakros, Arch., Hereas son of Dion, Hysg., Nikippos son of Philiarchos, Per., Apollonios son of Heliodoros, Kra., Histeios son of Thrason, Tel., Damon son of Damon, Log., Artemon son of Damon, Eri., Sosipolis son of Taurion, Log., Dion son of Dion, Log., Histeios son of Nysas, Hypa., Apellas son of Theston, Net., Dion son of Nikokles, Net., Hippias son of Damas, Lab., Histiodoros son of Euthymos, Hypa.:— Since Nemenios Daphnis son of Nemenios, Hysg., is known to be well-disposed towards the priests of Apollo and since he happens to have treated well the *Koinon* of the priests of Apollo in every way, both saying and doing the best and most useful things for the priests of Apollo, both collectively and individually,<sup>22</sup> acting worthily both of his own manliness and nobility and of the excellence of his forebears; and since it is right that the good among men,<sup>23</sup> especially those displaying their goodwill, meet with honour and privilege and that an undying memory of them endures amongst their beneficiaries – for these reasons, let it seem good to the Assembly of the priests of Apollo, as also to the councillors, that Nemenios Daphnis son of Nemenios, Hysg. be a benefactor, and that they set up a bronze statue of him and dedicate it either in the sanctuary of Apollo or in the Basilica, in whichever place he should wish, having inscribed (on it): ‘The *koinon* of the priests of Apollo (dedicates) to all the gods Nemenios Daphnis son of Nemenios, Hysg., their

---

<sup>22</sup> Not ‘public and private’ (Ma 2000: 188, with examples from both civic decrees and royal letters: ‘benefaction extends both to the public sphere and to individuals (NB not necessarily the same as ‘public and private’), each of whom ideally benefits from the benefactions.’); cf. Scibona 2009a: 106 ‘sia in pubblico che in privato’; Manganaro 2009a: 23 ‘e in pubblico e in privato’.

<sup>23</sup> The Greek is awkward, even if the general sense seems clear: the first *καὶ* is most easily taken in the copulative sense of adding a limiting or defining expression (*LSJ* s.v. *καὶ*, A.2), so that the phrase *καὶ ... ἐνδεδεικνυμένων* qualifies the partitive genitive of *τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνδρῶν* (one might have expected repetition of the article with the participle, after *καὶ*). Cf. Scibona 2009a: 106: ‘è giusto che gli uomini dabbene, che dimostrano la propria benevolenza ...’; Manganaro 2009a: 23: ‘è giusto che gli uomini dabbene e che dimostrano la loro benevolenza ...’.

benefactor, on account of its services and goodwill towards him,<sup>24</sup> in order that it should be obvious to future men that the priests of Apollo are able to apportion favours and honours to their benefactors, in a manner appropriate to their good services. The Diodoran treasurers are to pay out the money for the statue and having engraved this decree on two bronze tablets, let them dedicate one in the sanctuary of Apollo, in the *pronaos* of Zeus,<sup>25</sup> and let them give the other to him.

The votes: those urging that Nemenios Daphnis son of Nemenios, Hysg. be (recognised as) a benefactor, eight hundred and twenty-five and no vote forbids it.

## 5. Commentary

Rather than an exhaustive, line-by-line commentary, the discussion which follows is deliberately selective, and aims to elucidate the Sicilian epigraphic context in particular. I begin with some general observations on (1) Sicilian decrees, (2) the use of bronze, (3) the physical form and engraving of the tablets, and (4) the dating of the tablets. This is followed by (5) more specific observations on the onomastics, ethnics and demotics in the text and on the complex of honours proposed (multiple copies, the title of *euergetes*, the statue), and concludes (6) with an extended discussion which unites various observations on elements in the text relating to the overall and fundamental problem of the nature of the *koinon* responsible for the decree, the sanctuary, and the relationship of both to the city.

### 5.1. Sicilian decrees

The Halaesa bronzes add to the steadily increasing dossier of epigraphically attested Hellenistic decrees of the Sicilian cities, which by my count now number 14 complete or largely complete inscriptions, excluding the pair here under discussion; to these may be

---

<sup>24</sup> The construction may seem counter-intuitive, but is well paralleled (Ma 2007: 94 and Robert 1965: 39-41 after Nachmanson 1911; *contra* Bresson, Brun and Varinlioglu 2001: 116-18). Frequently the direction of the thanks is obscured by grammatical ambiguity when both subject and object are masculine singular entities; this is the first clear example from Sicily of the reciprocity being expressed in this direction (cf. *SEG* 37.759, 32.936). Robert counselled against emendation to fit our own expectations, and noted the positive / deliberate potential of this ambiguity, which might even encourage (but hardly require) a translation along the lines of ‘on account of his (i.e. Nemenios’) virtue and their (i.e. the priests’) goodwill towards him’.

<sup>25</sup> The formulation ἀνατίθημι τι + ἐς, rather than + ἐν, is common in prose to signify placing ‘in’ (*LSJ* 9<sup>th</sup> edn revised, s.v. ἀνατίθημι). Scibona 2009a: 106 translates ‘nel santuario di Apollo (rivolta) verso il pronao di Zeus...’, as does Manganaro 2009a: 25 (omitting ‘(rivolta)’), which is to give false significance to the use of εἰς; cf., rightly, Dubois (*BE* 2010.646), ‘au pronaos de Zeus dans le sanctuaire d’Apollon’. The Nakone tablet offers an exact parallel: ἐς τὸ πρόναον τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου | ἀναθέντω (*SEG* 30.1119, ll.34-5, corrected reading). The usage is standard in Sicilian decrees with reference to the placing of a metal copy: at Entella (εἰς τὸ ἱερόν: *SEG* 30.1117, l.14; 1118, l.17; 1122, l.18; εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον: *SEG* 30.1120, l.16; 1121, ll.30-1; 30.1123, l.21; 35.999, l.21), Phintias (εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον: *IG* XIV.256 l.25), Agrigentum (εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον: *IG* XIV.952 l. 23), and Reggio (εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον: *IG* XIV.612 l.5). The restoration of line 12 of the Kaleakte decree as [τὸ μὲν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος by Battistoni (2010b: 116), Manganaro (2011: 50) and Arena (2016: 349) should perhaps be amended to [τὸ μὲν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος.

added texts from Malta and Reggio (both arguably part of the same cultural region), several fragmentary texts, and a small dossier of decrees by Syracusan associations.<sup>26</sup>

Agrigentum: *IG XIV.952 = IGUR 2 = IGDS I.185*

Camarina (at Cos): *SEG 12.379 = IGDS I.117 = IG XII.4.1.222*

Centuripae: *BE 1965.499 = IGDS I.189 = AE 1990.437 = SEG 42.837, 52.888, 56.1083*  
= Battistoni 2010a: 147-8.

Entella: *SEG 30.1117 = IGDS I.204 = Ampolo 2001: C2*

Entella: *SEG 30.1118 = IGDS I.205 = Ampolo 2001: C3*

Entella: *SEG 30.1120 = IGDS I.207 = Ampolo 2001: B1*

Entella: *SEG 30.1121 = IGDS I.208 = Ampolo 2001: A1*

Entella: *SEG 30.1122 = IGDS I.209 = Ampolo 2001: C1*

Entella: *SEG 30.1123 = IGDS I.211 = Ampolo 2001: A2*

Entella: *SEG 35.999 = IGDS I.212 = Ampolo 2001: A3*

Gela (at Cos): *SEG 12.380 = IGDS I.160 = IG XII.4.1.223*

Halaesa: *SEG 59.1100 = Scibona 2009a (the text(s) under discussion here)*

Kaleakte: *SEG 59.1102 = Manganaro 2009b: 87 = Battistoni 2010b: 116 = Manganaro 2011: 47-50 = Arena 2016*

Nakone: *SEG 30.1119 = IGDS I.206 = Ampolo 2001: Nakone A*

Phintias / Licata: *IG XIV.256 = IGDS I.161*

Syracuse (at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander): *I. Magnesia 72 = IGDS I.97*

### **Sicilian region:**

Malta: *IG XIV.953 = IGUR 3 = Bonanno 2017*

Reggio: *IG XIV.612 = IGDGG I.40 = I.Reggio Calabria 1*

### **Fragmentary:**<sup>27</sup>

Agrigentum: *SEG 37.757*<sup>28</sup>

Agrigentum: *IG XIV.954 + add. = Coll. Froehner, no. 84 = J. De Waele, *Acragas Graeca* (1971), 37 no. 6*

Akrai: *SEG 49.1268 = Manganaro 1999: 55-57 no.B, fig.126*

Halaesa: *SEG 31.825 = IGDS I.197 = Manganaro 2009a: 14-15*<sup>29</sup>

Phintias / Licata: *IG XIV.257 (cf. 258)*

<sup>26</sup> For a survey of Sicilian decrees in their broader institutional context, see Rhodes and Lewis 1997: 314-21.

<sup>27</sup> Manganaro 1999: 62 no. 52 is a fragment of bronze in private hands (provenance unknown) which the editor speculatively restores as a decree.

<sup>28</sup> Extensive *exempli gratia* restoration offered in Manganaro 2011: 51.

<sup>29</sup> This fragment describes a process of land assignation and / or dispute resolution, presumably deriving from a civic decree.

Tauromenium: *IG XIV.432 = IGDS I.187* (decree of the *neaniskoi*; cf. *IG XIV.422* with *SEG 33.755*)

Sicilian (?): *IG XIV.955 = Tozzi 2012*, cf. Manganaro 1963: 215-16

**Decrees of Associations:**

Syracuse, *technitai* of Dionysus: *IG XIV.12 = Le Guen 2001: 319 no. 73 = Aneziri 2003: 401 F2*

Syracuse, *technitai* of Dionysus: *IG XIV.13 = Le Guen 2001: 320 no. 74 = Aneziri 2003: 401 F3*

Syracuse, *technitai* of Dionysus: *SEG 34.974 = I.G. Palermo 106 = Le Guen 2001: 321 no. 75 = Aneziri 2003: 400 F1*

Syracuse, *technitai* of Aphrodite Hilara: Gentili, *ASSir 7* (1961), 11 B1 = Le Guen 2001: 323 no. 76 = Aneziri 2003: 402 F4a = Dimartino 2010: 22-26 A

Syracuse, *technitai* of Aphrodite Hilara: Gentili, *ASSir 7* (1961), 15 B2 = Le Guen 2001: 325 no. 77 = Aneziri 2003: 402 F4b = Dimartino 2010: 27-30 B

The majority of these are honorific in purpose, although only one other includes the honour of a statue (*SEG 37.757*, lines 8-9, plausible restoration). Allowing for minor variations in civic institutions and terminology, these reflect a very similar overall pattern, including a strong tendency towards continued Doricism (with the notable exception of the Maltese text), and a scattering of Rhodian dialectical elements.<sup>30</sup> With the exception of the Camarina, Gela, and Syracuse inscriptions, responding to *asylia* appeals from Cos in c. 242 BC (Camerina, Gela) and Magnesia-on-the-Maeander in 207/6 BC (Syracuse), and the honours decreed by the Syracusan *technitai* of Aphrodite Hilara for the Roman consul of 46 BC (Dimartino 2010: 22-26 A), none of these texts can be securely dated beyond the broad range of third-to-first centuries BC - although a consensus has emerged for a First Punic War date for the Entella texts, and of c. 100 BC for the Rhegium text (*IG XIV.612*), while one of the fragmentary texts from Agrigentum (*IG XIV.954*) must belong after 44 BC (Agrigentum as *municipium*) but is probably not later than the reign of Augustus.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> The one regular departure from 'typical' practice in some other parts of the Greek world is the universal absence in the civic decrees of an identified proposer for the decree (Rhodes and Lewis 1997: 321, 492-3) – the only exception being the decrees of the Syracusan *synodos* of the *technitai* of Aphrodite (proposal of the Archons). On the language of Sicilian inscriptions in this period, see e.g. Sicca 1924, Giangulio 1982, Biondi 2001, *IGDS I-II*, and especially now Mimbriera 2012; on Sicilian Greek more generally, Willi 2008, and the papers by Mimbriera, Cassio, and Willi in Tribulato 2012.

<sup>31</sup> For Entella, see the remarks of Ampolo 2001: xi-xiii; for *IG XIV.612*, Manganaro 1963: 208-9; for *IG XIV.954*, *ibid.*: 215.

## 5.2. Use of bronze

Strikingly, the majority of these texts are preserved on bronze (all seven from Entella, one from Nakone, two from Agrigentum, one from Malta, one from Rhegium, as well as the new Halaesa pair) and, notwithstanding the fact that the surviving copy is on stone, the new text from Kaleakte (Caronia) contains the instruction for its inscription in two bronze copies. Earlier excavations at Halaesa identified a number of additional fragments of bronze plaques from the vicinity of the *agora*, although no epigraphic fragments were reported; such fragments are known from other sites, but rarely reported.<sup>32</sup> The extensive use of bronze in Sicily for public epigraphy, in particular in the Hellenistic period, but also earlier, has been noted before; the extent of the phenomenon is in part obscured by very fragmentary survival.<sup>33</sup> Louis Robert long ago made the case that the inscribing of public documents on bronze was a regional feature, principally to be found in Thessaly and central Greece, the Peloponnese (especially Arcadia, Elis, and the Argolid), western Greece, southern Italy, and Sicily.<sup>34</sup> The number of examples known has steadily increased over the last century, and the narrowness of that distribution begins to look increasingly suspect.<sup>35</sup> The argument from silence / lack of evidence, in the face of bronze's obvious portability and value in reuse, is clearly a dangerous one.<sup>36</sup> The growing volume of archaeological evidence for display of such texts makes the point emphatically.<sup>37</sup> Isolated but very striking examples from Asia

---

<sup>32</sup> Carettoni 1961: 303, reporting finds from the vicinity of the monumental wall which borders the unexcavated, area immediately north of the *agora*, notes, *inter alia*, 'frammento di lastra di bronzo (lunghezza cm. 12,5; altezza cm. 6) decorata con ovoli, fascia a spirale e dentelli a rilievo' and 'una diecina di altri frammenti di vari oggetti bronzei fra cui asticciuole, lastrine e ganci.' Isler reports fragments of both Latin and Greek bronze texts from Monte Iato (2012: 234 with n.41).

<sup>33</sup> E.g. Dubois, *BE* 1990, 858; Manganaro 2000 (cf. 1999: 61-3). See Arena, *Iscrizioni* I, no. 76 for an early C5 BC bronze (?eastern Sicily); *Nomima* I.1 = Arena, *Iscrizioni* III, no.84 for bronze fragments of an archaic law on homicide (Monte San Mauro, Sicily).

<sup>34</sup> See esp. Robert 1936: 47-48; *Hellenica* X (1955), 289-90; the point was reprised, e.g., in *BE* 1956.15, 1961.154, 1968.251, 1969.266, and Robert 1963: 469; cf. Guarducci 1967-78: I, 434-7; Ritti 1969: 329-31. De Hoz 1999 and Poccetti 1999 offer wide-ranging discussions of the use of metal in general in Italy and the western Mediterranean.

<sup>35</sup> See previous note for extensive examples collected by Robert; Crema 2007: 249-52 adds further examples. Robert was insistent in 1936 that the phenomenon was not found, e.g., at Athens or Delphi, nor in the Aegean islands in general; he stuck to this view despite the emergence of examples from these areas (so e.g. *BCH* 1899: 514 (Delphi); *BCH* 1904: 271 no. 1, 1947-8: 236-8 and allusions to more in *IG* XI.2.199 B 87 and *I.Délos* 1409 BA II 113 (Delos) were all dismissed as 'isolated' examples; note also, for Athens, Stroud 1963 (no comment on the use of bronze in *BE* 1964.118) and *BE* 1972.105 (remarked as strange)).

<sup>36</sup> Robert himself (*REG* 1966: 735-6) was prepared to make this point in relation to Corinth, arguing that much of the missing epigraphy of pre-Roman Corinth could have been on bronze; cf. Haensch 2009: 177 with Eck 2015: 144 n.63.

<sup>37</sup> For archaeological evidence of display of such tablets (the tablets themselves now lost): Bell 2007: 122 with n. 34 and fig. 2 (Morgantina, Sicily); Maniscalco and McConnell 2003: 173 with fig. 22 (Palike, Sicily); Agrigentum (De Miro and Fiorentini 2010: 82). Beyond Sicily, Argos provides a particularly striking case, a single bronze text surviving (*BCH* 1953: 395-7), but the archaeological evidence shows the ghosts of over 100 plaques (des Courtils 1981, cf. Crema 2007: 251). Literary sources reinforce the point: e.g. Cic. *Verr.* 2.112, cf. 4.145.

Minor, such as the Hanisa decree and the Lycian treaty with Rome, should serve as a clear warning, since it is difficult to imagine that they are not representative of a wider phenomenon.<sup>38</sup> Nonetheless, it remains true that certain regions, particularly from mainland Greece westwards, produce greater quantities of public epigraphy on bronze (just as, in the Roman period, the surviving material from Spain stands out), and explanations need to be sought out for this, whether historical or archaeological. It is also of note that certain categories of inscription are more widely inscribed on bronze: in particular honorific texts (of all sorts) and legal texts.<sup>39</sup> In relation to the Roman tradition, the clear existence of such practice already in regions such as western Greece, Sicily, and southern Italy is of very obvious significance, but just as the Roman practice should not be treated in isolation from the Greek, nor should any of these regions be treated in isolation.<sup>40</sup>

### 5.3. Physical form and engraving

Beyond the basic use of bronze, the majority of these Sicilian texts (all those on bronze and in all likelihood the fragmentary stone decree from Agrigentum, *SEG* 37.757) are also interesting because they adopt a more or less explicit architectural form, variations in greater or lesser elaboration on the theme of a temple façade or *naiskos*. The principal Sicilian parallels for the Halaesa pair are the texts from Agrigentum (*IG* XIV.952) and Malta (*IG* XIV.953), although the elements of relief appliqué are lost in the case of the former (only the back-plate with the inscription survives) and the latter is somewhat cruder in form (Bonanno 2017: figs. 1-3). The Entella tablets have only the most basic form, without any decorative elements other than the application of strips to mark out borders and pediment.<sup>41</sup> Outside of Sicily, besides the rather alternative ‘table’ form of the decree from Rhegium (*IG* XIV.612),

---

<sup>38</sup> Hanisa decree, second-/ first-century BC: Robert 1963: 457-523 with plate 1; Lycian treaty with Rome, 46 BC: Mitchell 2005. The Lycian treaty undercuts the previous emphasis upon the Hanisa text’s uniqueness, and, observed from the other side, the Halaesa examples likewise show the Hanisa text not to be the *unicum* it is often claimed to be. Similarly noteworthy, the Hadrianic bronze stele from Naryka in E. Locris (C. P. Jones 2006, with at 1 n. 2 a typically minimising view of bronze in the Greek world; Knoepfler 2006; Knoepfler and Pasquier 2006). Note Tac. *Ann.* 3.63 for passing reference to Roman bronze decrees in temples in Asia Minor. Ferrary 2009: 64 is less negative than most, whereas Eck (2015: 144-147) adopts a strong, negative, and remarkably universalising view of the (none-)use of bronze in ‘the Greek world’.

<sup>39</sup> Note, for instance, the prevalence of bronze in the material collected by Ritti 1969 (honorifics, especially *proxenia*) and by Van Effenterre and Ruzé in *Nomima* (legal texts); Williamson 1987 for Roman legal texts on bronze.

<sup>40</sup> Specifically on the Roman tradition, see Mitchell 2005: 178-85 with bibliography, Ferrary 2009, and Eck 2009 (publishing two new Latin fragments on bronze from Sagalassos, with comments on Roman publication practices at 111-12) and 2015. The use of bronze for public documents in general still deserves further discussion.

<sup>41</sup> Ampolo 2001; recent work at Entella has also uncovered two Latin *defixiones* of perhaps the C1 AD, both of lead, but unusually adopting the same basic form of a rectangular plaque surmounted by a tympanum (Ampolo and Erdas 2016).

the best parallels come from Corcyra (*IG IX.1<sup>2</sup>.4.786*, 789-92, third / second century BC), Olympia (*IvO 39*, third / second century BC), and Hanisa in Cappadocia (Robert 1963: plate 1, second / first century BC).<sup>42</sup> The Hanisa bronze is much the closest parallel, despite being geographically the most remote, and is the only one to match the Halaesa bronzes in elaborateness: fluted Corinthian columns on both sides are topped by male telamon-type figures (surviving on the right) supporting a now lost pediment. From the published photograph it appears however that the columns were cast as one with the main plate (or else soldered on?), rather than attached by rivets as in the Sicilian cases – unfortunately, none of the existing discussions seem to discuss these physical aspects.<sup>43</sup> The examples from Olympia and Corcyra are less elaborate, but still close. *IG IX.1<sup>2</sup>.4.790* is the only one of the Corcyra examples (all of which have a pediment with acroteria) on which the borders to left and right are rendered as columns with capitals; the others have more in common with the more familiar form of stele with acroterion, which itself shows a frequent crossover from stone to bronze. A more explicit rendition in the style of a temple façade is more frequently encountered in inscriptions on stone from Corcyra (e.g. *IG IX.1<sup>2</sup>.4.912*, 913, 914, 918, 928, 936, etc.). However, these stone examples are all funerary inscriptions, with a much more limited text which does not normally appear in the field between the columns, but instead on the entablature or else entirely below the façade.<sup>44</sup> Examples of funerary *naiskoi* in stone or plaster are well attested elsewhere, including in Sicily.<sup>45</sup> Both the widespread use of the form in stone and the above suggestion that these occasional bronze texts should be thought of as merely the tip of an otherwise long-melted iceberg, should discourage attempts to infer imitation of a specific building in any of these examples, notwithstanding the visual game involved in the act of displaying such a model façade in the *pronaos* of a temple (as intended in both the Halaesa and Hanisa examples).<sup>46</sup> In the case of the Halaesa pair, that point is

---

<sup>42</sup> Manganaro 1963: 206-7 (with fig. 3) and 2009a: 90 (with n. 20 and figs. 9-10) noted the Corcyra parallels, and 2011: 52 (with fig. 12) the Hanisa bronze. Some of the much thinner bronze fragments of decrees from Lousoi in Arcadia also show evidence for pediments (Reichel and Wilhelm 1901: esp. 65 no. 1, fig. 144, and 69 no. 4, fig. 147, which has a pediment clearly marked out and visible on the top left of the frag., and traces of the relief of an animal within it).

<sup>43</sup> Besides Robert 1963: 498-9, see especially Curtius 1894 [1881] on the form of the Hanisa bronze.

<sup>44</sup> For typologies of the Corcyra material see Mela *et al.* 1998: 282-3 (type III are ‘naiskos stele’), discussing the possible evolution of the types; also Strauch 1997: 228-9.

<sup>45</sup> Fraser and Rönne 1957 collect a wide range of material from central and western Greece; see esp. 37-38, 48, 50-52, and note the parallels in Italy and Sicily also (cf. Prag 2017 for a different Sicilian epigraphic example of connections with western Greece). Papapostolou 1993: 46-56 for Achaean examples. Sicilian examples include the *aediculae* to be found in Hellenistic Akrai (e.g. Bernabò Brea 1956: 85, with tav. XVI.11), or the painted examples from Lilybaeum (Vento 2000).

<sup>46</sup> Hanisa, line 31; Halaesa A, line 32; cf. Manganaro 1963: 206 (on *IG XIV.953*, Malta), ‘rappresenta forse la facciata di un tempio di Malta’, repeated by Crema 2007: 252 n. 110; Scibona 2009a: 99 (Halaesa), ‘si può ipotizzare inoltre che raffigurino il frontone del tempio di Apollo in *Halaesa*.’

reinforced by the visible variation in architectural detail between the two versions, although it is the case that the style of the column capitals resembles that of actual examples recovered from the site.

Both the Halaesa bronzes have very carefully executed laurel wreaths, with ribbons suspended from the top, and on which the leaves alternate with berries. This latter feature appears to distinguish the wreaths as laurel, rather than olive, and similar wreaths are observable on Halaesian coinage of the first century BC:<sup>47</sup> the Apolline reference is unavoidable and unsurprising given that the honouring body is the *koinon* of the priests of Apollo. The Maltese bronze has a rather cruder depiction, consisting of a circle rimmed on the outside with leaves, also with a ribbon. By contrast, the Agrigentine bronze has blank space precisely matching the location of such a wreath; however, the metal shows no traces of any decoration. It has also been proposed that the blank space between header and main text of two of the decrees published by Syracusan associations was intended for a painted crown, while in the case of a third there are traces of what may have been an engraved crown above the main text (all three are on stone). A much later (220-250 AD) honorific found at Mazara del Vallo, and set up by the otherwise unattested κοινὸν Κιννακῶν, includes a crude depiction of a crown.<sup>48</sup> None of these texts refer to the act of crowning (see below §5.6.1 on honours).

One unusual aspect of the crown/header deserves further comment: the fact that the text of the inscription's header not only surrounds the crown (differently on A and B) but also occupies the space within the crown. The inclusion of specific text elements within a crown, typically the body responsible for the honour (e.g. *boule* or *demos*), or else the honorand him/herself, is a common occurrence. But in the Halaesa example it is arbitrary elements of

---

<sup>47</sup> For the distinction (although probably neither absolute nor universal), see e.g. *I.Délos* 1498 (Athenian *kleruchoi* honour Eubulos of Marathon, 159/8 BC), with a laurel wreath between two olive ones, in the first of three lines of three crowns (Guarducci 1942: 10; cf. Butz 2007). Apolline types are common in Halaesian coinage (cf. Carbè 2008: 60), and early Augustan bronze issues from Halaesa (*RPC* I, nos. 630-631) bear a laurel wreath with berries on the reverse that is very similar to that depicted on the two bronze tablets.

<sup>48</sup> Both decrees of the *synodos* of the *technitai* of Aphrodite Hilara have blank space between title and main text, in parallel fashion to the Maltese bronze (cf. Dimartino 2010: 29); since only fragments of the body of the text survive in the case of two of the three decrees of the *koinon* of the *technitai* of Dionysus from Syracuse (*IG* XIV.12, 13) nothing can be said about these; in the case of the third (*SEG* 34.974), Maria Teresa Manni Piraino (*IGPalermo*, p. 133) identifies incised marks above the dating formula as 'parte di un fregio (*hedere distinguens?*)', and Alessia Dimartino (2009: 371) speculates that this might in fact be part of a crown, between (missing) title and dating prescript, on the model of the Aphrodite texts. In default of autopsy (the text has not yet been located in the Museo Archeologico Regionale "Paolo Orsi"), I remain agnostic on the interpretation of the incised marks (best photograph in Manni Piraino 1966: tav. LIX). For the late text from Mazara see now *SEG* 58.1047.

the header that spill into the interior of the crown. The most obvious conclusion is simply that the engraver was endeavouring to fit the header of the text around the crown as best he could.<sup>49</sup> This view is complicated by the example from Agrigentum, where there is no crown, but that text is likewise seemingly carelessly disposed around and within a crown-sized space (the definite article in line two, the final syllable of a magistrate's title in line three).

Assuming that a crown was to be engraved in the space, the Agrigentine example clearly shows that the text was engraved first, with space left for the crown. An Attic example on stone parallels this layout very effectively, with the name of the honorand split in two, leaving a gap on the stone; as Wilhelm noted, the explanation for that seeming oddity was a probably a painted crown, or other emblem.<sup>50</sup> The Attic example illustrates that concern for sense in layout was not necessarily the overriding consideration. However, that example does not resolve the question of sequence, since the crown could have been painted on first and simply have worn off. A painted crown on bronze, however, seems rather less likely, so the Agrigentine text at least demonstrates that the text could precede the crown.<sup>51</sup>

#### 5.4. Date

The archaeological evidence for deposition noted above (§1) suggests a broad *terminus ante quem* of the first century AD. There is no specific element internal to the text sufficient for the purposes of dating, although two elements do suggest a Hellenistic date, rather than Augustan or later: neither the three-letter abbreviations associated with the personal names in the inscription (see below, §5.5, for discussion), nor the distinctively Sicilian ascending numeral written out in full in the final line are found in inscriptions later than the first century BC. Ascending numerals, whether written out in full, or using a distinctive acrophonic system, or employing alphabetic numerals, are a distinctive feature of Greek Sicilian epigraphy, with very few exceptions attested.<sup>52</sup> Two hypotheses have been advanced thus far by way of explanation: Giuseppe Nenci proposed that the phenomenon was a sign of cultural

---

<sup>49</sup> Peter Thonemann suggests to me that it implies that the header was engraved last of all, after the body of the inscription. Several of the Entella tablets (Ampolo 2001: A1-A3) provide a partial parallel: the introductory dating formula is inserted into the pediment and, in the case of A2 and A3, continues awkwardly onto the metal strip separating pediment from the body of the tablet, so as to avoid continuing into the main epigraphic field.

<sup>50</sup> Ritti 1969: 330-31 compares the Attic and Maltese examples; Wilhelm 1909: 11 for the Attic example (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup>.63 of 378/7 BC).

<sup>51</sup> Colour could be applied to bronzes (see e.g. Born 2004), although I have not found an exact parallel thus far. In the case of the Agrigentine tablet one could alternatively speculate that the hole immediately above the centre of the header served to suspend a relief decoration in the form of a crown: relief decoration of various sorts on bronze stelai is attested on several later Roman examples, although not crowns specifically (see Knoepfler and Pasquier 2006: 1284-9 with figs. 4-8).

<sup>52</sup> Full survey of the phenomenon now in Brugnone 2005b. Examples: written in full, *IG* XIV.422 (Taormina); acrophonic, *SEG* 30.1121 = *IGDS* 208 = Ampolo A1 (Entella); alphanumeric, Manganaro 1997: 321-2 (SE Sicily?); rare exception, *IG* XIV.952 (Agrigentum).

and graphical interference from Phoenician / Punic (in which all text is written right to left), arising most obviously from a mercantile context;<sup>53</sup> Anna Maria Prestianni Giallombardo has suggested that it is instead the graphical fixation of indigenous oral practices, which thesis Antonietta Brugnone has further developed, noting the early tendency to write numerals in ascending fashion in archaic epigraphy and early classical literature more generally.<sup>54</sup> The practice is already attested at Halaesa in the numbering of the allotments in the lost cadastral inscription, which employs alphabetic numerals written in the ascending fashion.<sup>55</sup> All the documents in which the phenomenon appears belong to the period between the fifth and first centuries BC, principally the third to first centuries; in the case of the Taormina financial inscriptions, the numerals are consistently in the ascending format with the exception of the two more recent inscriptions, which display a number of Romanizing features (e.g. magistrates entitled *duo andres*, and the pre-Julian Roman calendar) and which are commonly dated to the period 44-36 BC.<sup>56</sup> In other words, the phenomenon does not so far appear to be attested after the mid-first century BC.

Such an argument risks circularity, however, and can only be suggestive. Two further elements are relevant: letter forms and the absence of iota adscript. Letter forms, particularly on metal and in a region that has produced a relatively small corpus of comparable material (most of which is itself undated), are of very limited value for dating. The most distinctive features are the presence of lunate sigma, omega and epsilon, together with the contrasting use of ‘quadrate’ forms in the first line. The earliest datable example of lunate sigma in Sicilian lapidary epigraphy is in the newly discovered honorific for Sex. Peducaeus from Soluntum, which belongs between *c.* 84 and 75 BC;<sup>57</sup> but undoubtedly some of the undated Sicilian examples on stone could be dated earlier than this. Examples on metal are found at least as early as 200 BC, and likewise in stamps on ceramic.<sup>58</sup> Lunate sigma in general is

---

<sup>53</sup> Nenci 1995, 1996.

<sup>54</sup> Prestianni Giallombardo 1999: 453; Brugnone 2005b: 904-6.

<sup>55</sup> *IG XIV.352*, e.g. col. I, lines 51, 59, 64; cf. Brugnone 2005b: 903 n. 38.

<sup>56</sup> Specifically *IGSI 13* and Manganaro 1964: 53-55; on the dating see Manganaro 1988a (cf. Carroccio 2008 for the less plausible suggestion of a date in the mid-C2 BC).

<sup>57</sup> See Calascibetta and Di Leonardo 2012. Sex. Peducaeus was praetorian governor of Sicily 76-75 BC; the fragmentary inscription refers to him as ἀντιστρά[τηγον], which would be anomalous as the formal title of a praetorian governor in this period; however the disposition of the text on the surviving fragment is against restoring ταμίαν at the end of the preceding line. We know nothing of Peducaeus’ quaestorship, but prorogation of a Sicilian quaestorship in place of an absent praetor in, perhaps, the late 80s BC, would be entirely possible (cf. Prag 2007: 303-4). A cautious reading therefore suggests a date between *c.* 84 and 75 BC.

<sup>58</sup> E.g. lead *defixio* from Lilybaeum with archaeological context of *c.* 200 BC, *IGDS II.80.i*; and on a stamped grain measure from Morgantina, pre-211 BC (Walthall 2011: 163 with n. 23).

unremarkable from at least the third century BC onwards.<sup>59</sup> Examples of internal slippage between lunate and four-bar sigma (and likewise lunate and non-lunate epsilon, straight- and broken-bar alpha) are widespread in Sicilian Hellenistic epigraphy; what is noticeable is the tendency to use the ‘quadrate’ forms in the more monumental parts of an inscription, either at the start of a line or name, or in the header of a document, as here.<sup>60</sup> However, none of these documents are closely dated, with possible dates ranging in most cases from the later third through to first centuries BC. Of greater significance therefore is the total absence of iota adscript from text A and the near-total absence from text B (but see B.16, B.30). Iota adscript is generally present in Sicilian early Hellenistic inscriptions. It is consistently present in inscriptions datable to the third century BC. The situation becomes fluid in inscriptions clearly datable to the first century BC (unfortunately there is no text of relevance securely datable to the second century).<sup>61</sup> Texts datable to the first century BC display any one of three possibilities, viz. complete presence,<sup>62</sup> complete absence,<sup>63</sup> or a mixture of presence and absence.<sup>64</sup> From this it seems reasonable to conclude that our text could be dated to the first century BC, especially given the variation in text B, but that an earlier date would be difficult (although the absence of datable second-century texts means that formally a second-century date cannot be ruled out).<sup>65</sup> If the presence of both demotics and ascending numerals is granted any weight, as well as the general use of the language of Hellenistic civic institutions in a city which, from the Augustan period onwards, presents itself very clearly as a (Latin) *municipium*, then a date in the first half of the first century BC seems most likely.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Robert 1963: 481-2 on the use of lunate letters in the Hanisa decree; besides references there, see also, e.g., Bresson 1997: 493; *BE* 1981.270; Gorissen 1978.

<sup>60</sup> See, e.g., *IG XIV.256 = IGDS I.161* (decree from Gela/Phintias), with four-bar sigma and rhomboid omega in the larger first three lines, lunate sigma and standard closed omega thereafter; *IGDS II.40* (lead tablet, region of Syracuse?), a list of names with quadrate forms for initial letters, lunate thereafter; *IG XIV.423* (Tauromenion financial inscription), where the hanging first line of the inscription has quadrate epsilon as the first letter, followed by lunate thereafter in the body of the text; *IGDS I.189* (Centuripae) employs broken-bar alpha in the larger first two lines, normal straight-bar alpha thereafter (cf. lines A.3, A.7 and B.3 in the Halaesa texts).

<sup>61</sup> Sicca 1924: 49-50 offers a similar analysis, noting the fluidity; he allows that the transition may have already begun in the second century; cf. Clarysse 1976 for the beginnings of variation in practice only in the second century BC in Egyptian papyri, and the main period of ‘confusion’ being the last century BC and first century AD.

<sup>62</sup> E.g. Gentili 1961: 11-15 B1 (46/5 BC, Syracuse).

<sup>63</sup> E.g. Gentili 1961: 15-18 B2 (C1 BC, Syracuse); *IGSI* 13 and Manganaro 1964: 53-55 (the later Tauromenion financial inscriptions, probably (but not certainly) 44-36 BC).

<sup>64</sup> E.g. *IG XIV.612* (Rhegium, c.100 BC); *IG XIV.954* (Agrigentum, after 44 BC); a number of the Tauromenion financial inscriptions show a mixed situation, e.g. *IGSI* 6, 7, 12 (all assumed to be pre-44 BC).

<sup>65</sup> Note that the now-lost cadastral inscription from Halaesa, *IG XIV.352*, also lacks iota adscript, which would seem to favour a later rather than earlier date for that text (the two more recently discovered fragments lack relevant diagnostic grammatical forms).

<sup>66</sup> Manganaro 2009a: 26 and Dubois 2013 suggest a similar dating; Scibona leaves vague the choice between C1 BC and C1 AD (e.g. Scibona 2009a: 106-7). For municipal coinage, see *RPC* I, nos. 628-633, and cf. *CIL*

## 5.5. Onomastics and demotics

Twenty individuals are named in the inscription. In eighteen cases this is in the form: name + patronymic + three-letter abbreviation. In one case the individual lacks such an abbreviation (Diogenes, son of Diodoros, A.5), and in another the individual has an additional ‘third name’ (Nemenios, son of Nemenios, Daphnis Hysg. A.14).<sup>67</sup> It should be noted that no individual bears any sort of ethnic, civic or otherwise. Scibona and Dubois have already discussed the individual names present in the inscription in some detail, noting an extensive range of Sicilian or south Italian parallels for almost all of them, including Halaesan examples in several cases.<sup>68</sup> The one clear exception is Dazos (A.7), which appears to be of Illyrian origin. Although not otherwise attested in Sicily, it is extensively attested in S. Italy in the Hellenistic period, and connections between the Adriatic region, S. Italy, and Sicily were considerable.<sup>69</sup> The frequent overlap with Locrian onomastics similarly speaks to the maritime orientation of a north Sicilian coastal city such as Halaesa, emphasised already by Diodorus Siculus (14.16.3).

More challenging for interpretation is the fact that across nineteen individuals, eleven different abbreviations are attested:

- ΛΟΥ: x3 (*bouleutai*)
- ΛΑΒ: x2 (one priest in header, one *bouleutes*).
- ΚΡΑ: x2 (one priest in header, one *bouleutes*).
- ΠΕΡ: x2 (*prostatas* and *bouleutes*)
- ΥΠΑ: x2 (*bouleutai*)
- ΝΗΤ: x2 (*bouleutai*)
- ΥΣΥ: x2 (*bouleutes*, honorand).
- ΣΑΛ: x1 (*bouleutes*)
- ΑΡΧ: x1 (*bouleutes*)
- ΤΗΛ: x1 (*bouleutes*)
- ΕΡΙ: x1 (*bouleutes*)

Such ‘sigla’, anywhere between two and six letters in length (sometimes written out in full), are widely attested in Hellenistic Sicilian epigraphy. Broadly speaking, they fall into two

---

X.7458; see in general Facella 2006: 258-78. Almost all the Halaesan epigraphy of the imperial period is Latin: see Prag and Tigano 2018.

<sup>67</sup> On Sicilian ‘third names’, see Manganaro 2010, Cordano 1997, and Masson 1981.

<sup>68</sup> Scibona 2009a: 104-6, nn. 6-34; Dubois 2013: 6-9; further comments in Manganaro 2009a: 27-8. The parallels can be extended through *LGPN*.

<sup>69</sup> *LGPN* III.A., s.v. Δάζος; on Dionysian colonisation Lombardo 2002; cf. Manganaro 2002.

categories: those which look to be akin to (topographic) demotics, as in this case, and those which are, sometimes explicitly, *phratriai*, usually numerical in form and subordinate to a basic division into three tribes.<sup>70</sup> However, the distinction is far from absolute, since there is one set of documents from Troina where non-numerical subdivisions are explicitly referred to as *phratriai*, and another text (region of Syracuse?) in which both the numerical and topographical subdivisions appear side-by-side.<sup>71</sup> Interpretation of the Halaesa examples is complicated by the presence of two abbreviations (Υπα and Νητ) which are also found in the Camarina *tesserae*. The latter contain numerical abbreviations, and in these two cases denote a relative position within a numerical sequence, sometimes interpreted to include a spatial aspect, and to be expanded as ὑπά(τα) and νήτ(α). Both Dubois and Manganaro suggest a similar interpretation for the Nemenios examples, adding that Ὑστ might stand for Ὑστέρα, thereby offering a third numerical form of this sort. However, as noted above (apparatus to A.4) the form Ὑστ is not what is written on the tablet and, contrary to what they suggest, the abbreviation Ὑστ is in fact unattested elsewhere. The two Camarina parallels do not provide the basis for emendation and extrapolation in this third case, nor do they provide sufficient grounds on which to attempt to interpret the remaining Halaesan abbreviations as numerical; consequently it should not be automatically assumed that Ὑπα and Νητ should be so resolved in this instance.<sup>72</sup> Evidence from the (lost) cadastral inscription from Halaesa supports the view that in this case the sub-divisions are essentially topographical (although the names themselves may not always be derived from toponyms), relating either to quarters of the city or to sub-regions in the city's *chora*.<sup>73</sup> As noted by previous commentators, there is additionally substantial overlap between the *sigla* attested here and those in a recently published lead tablet of uncertain provenance (also originally said to be from the region of

---

<sup>70</sup> Manganaro 2011 is the most recent discussion; see also Brugnone 2005a; survey of the evidence in Ghinatti 2000 (without resolving the problems of significance or classification); overview in Cordano 1999: 152-4. N. F. Jones 1987: ch. 4 discusses within the wider context but much of the relevant Sicilian material has come to light after that publication.

<sup>71</sup> For the inscribed *glandes* from Troina see Manganaro 2011: 33 and 1999: 29-30. The second text is *IGDS* II.42 (ed. pr. Manganaro 1997: 310-13) of which the provenance is much disputed (e.g., Ghinatti 2000: 33 n. 14). Manganaro 2011: 42 and 60 now suggests that this comes from Halaesa, but this appears to be based solely upon the overlap of the abbreviations with those in the Nemenios tablets; as he notes himself, typologically it has affinities with other sales-contracts from Camarina; the presence of an *amphipolos*, unattested at Halaesa, likewise implies the Syracusan region.

<sup>72</sup> Dubois 2013: 9-10 and *BE* 2010.646; Manganaro 2009a: 27, 2011: 58. For the Camarina lead tokens, cf. *IGDS* II, p. 112 and Cordano 1992, and Brugnone 2005a. Manganaro 2011: 58-60 works through all the abbreviations in the Halaesa bronzes exploring possible resolutions and origins, and indeed notes in passing (58 n. 73) that Steph. Byz. 649 M attests to a city called Ὑπάττη.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Manganaro 2011: 58, 60 and 2009a: 17 on *IG* XIV.352 col. II, lines 23 and 75; cf. already *idem* 1980: 432-4, usefully contextualizing such civic organization in relation to agrarian organization. There are indications of similar urban locales in some of the sales-contracts from south-east Sicily (e.g. *IGDS* II.51 and 59).

Syracuse), containing a list of 52 names which share twelve different *sigla* between them.<sup>74</sup> Nine of the eleven *sigla* in the Halaesa inscription occur also in the lead tablet (assuming that Ερι, at A.12, is equivalent to Εριμ in the ‘Syracusan’ text), while the latter has three *sigla* not attested at Halaesa. However, six of the *sigla* in the Halaesa text can also be found in other Hellenistic Sicilian inscriptions of more or less certain provenance elsewhere on the island:<sup>75</sup> in particular, the clear overlap with inscriptions securely attributed to Akrai appears to be fatal to any attempt to claim that the overlaps between the new Halaesa inscription, the Kaleakte text, the Apollonia text, and the lead plaque possibly from Syracuse constitute proof of a common origin. In the present state of knowledge it seems appropriate to conclude that the evidence is very far from sufficient to permit attribution of any particular text to a particular city on the basis of presence or absence of these *sigla* alone.

In one instance, the second priest of Apollo, Diogenes son of Diodoros (A.5), no such abbreviation is present. This is not a unique phenomenon: many of the inscriptions which record such abbreviations show occasional ‘omissions’ of this sort, including the aforementioned lead-tablet; omissions are frequent in the *fasti* and account inscriptions from Taormina (including for the city’s eponymous magistrates / priests); more generally, the abbreviations are not consistently present across the epigraphy of those cities where they are attested.<sup>76</sup> In the absence of clear evidence one way or another, it does not seem legitimate to try to draw strong conclusions about the omission’s possible significance.

---

<sup>74</sup> Ed. pr. Manganaro 1997: 313-16 and now *IGDS* II.40, repeating the original attribution to the region of Syracuse. Scibona 2009a: 104 n. 6 incorrectly states that all of the *sigla* of the Halaesa text are to be found in this inscription, and comments of its provenance that ‘ora potrebbe essere legittimamente attribuita ad *Halaesa...*’, presumably on the basis of this overlap. Manganaro 2009a: 27 claims all but one of the Halaesa *sigla* are found in the text (including ‘Υστ, which is not!) and implies reattribution of the lead document to Halaesa; Manganaro 2011: 58 compares more accurately and is explicit in proposing reattribution to Halaesa (p. 60), followed by Dubois 2013: 10. The only explicit grounds for the reattribution appears to be this overlap.

<sup>75</sup> Σαλ, found at A.9, does not occur in *IGDS* II.40, but is found at both Halaesa (*SEG* 37.759) and Akrai (*IG* XIV.212); Υσγ (A.10, A.14) is not so far attested anywhere else (and, *pace* Manganaro 2009a: 27, the same would be true even if one were to read this as Υστ). Of the other *sigla* attested in both *IGDS* II.40 and the Halaesa inscription, Λαβ is also attested at Apollonia (*IG* XIV.359, an inscription walled into a church on the site of Apollonia (mod. S. Fratello), which today reads ΛΑΒ (autopsy, 2006)); Κρα, Περ, Νητ are also found in *IG* XIV.217 (Akrai); Τηλ is also found in the new inscription from Kaleakte (Caronia; Manganaro 2009b; Battistoni 2010b). Additionally, three *sigla* in *IGDS* II.40, Πλη, Μακ, Φελ, are not found in the Halaesa text, although the first of these is also found in the Kaleakte inscription.

<sup>76</sup> The final name in *IGDS* II.40 lacks a demotic (a clear *vacat*); Manganaro 1997: 315 suggests it may have been forgotten, perhaps because identical to that of the previous name on the list; but this did not happen in the other, frequent, cases of repetition in that list. Manganaro 1988a: 164 suggests that omissions in the Taormina inscriptions might be due to a temporary exclusion from the distributions of grain which he considers to be one of the primary functions of the sub-division in that *polis*; Antonetti 1985: 14-15 attributes the Taormina omissions to arbitrary practices in public recording.

On the other hand, it may be legitimate to speculate on the significance of the abbreviations for the fifteen *bouleutai* listed in A.9-14. It is arguably surprising that in a total of nineteen individuals, as many as eleven different abbreviations are attested. Furthermore, all the abbreviations are attested within the *bouleutai*: in other words, those abbreviations attested for the priests and the *prostatas* in the prescript, as well as for the honorand, are also found among the *bouleutai*. The distribution is uneven: one occurs three times, six twice, and four once each, with the triple occurrence being found entirely among the *bouleutai*; but all those which occur singly are found only among the *bouleutai*. This might encourage the hypothesis that those listed as *bouleutai* in A.9-14 were a deliberately representative selection of the wider community. Following such a hypothesis, the uneven proportion of representation could then be explained by the differing size (territorially, or numerically) of those sub-units.<sup>77</sup> Several assumptions are implicit in such a hypothesis: firstly, if the assumption is that these demotics relate to the civic territory, then this may have implications for any hypothesis about the body responsible for the decree (see below, §5.7), and in turn assumes that Halaesa is the source of the decree; secondly, if the assumption is that the *bouleutai* are representative of all the sub-regions, then the further assumption is that this list is a complete list of the demotics for Halaesa, which has implications for the preceding discussion about overlap of demotics between texts.

## 5.6. Nature of the honours for Nemenios

The honours decreed for Nemenios while not spectacular are in various ways unusual and deserve to be contextualised within the Sicilian and wider Hellenistic landscape. At the same time, their interpretation has consequences for the larger problem of interpretation of this decree and the *koinon*, to which I turn at the end (§5.7).

### 5.6.1. Two copies

In the first place, the decision not only to engrave the decree on bronze in two copies but to present the second copy to the honorand stands out, as it has few exact parallels. Leaving aside the (later, Roman) *tabula patronatus*, the direct parallels for this particular honour are all from the Sicilian orbit: the honorifics cited previously from Agrigentum, Malta, Rhegium, and Kaleakte.<sup>78</sup> The engraving of texts in multiple copies for display in diverse locations is in

---

<sup>77</sup> Compare the uneven distribution of lots to groups noted by Manganaro in the cadastral inscription (2009a: 17-18); *cf.* also the Athenian *boule* within which ‘demes were given seats in proportion to their size,’ notwithstanding the equal distribution across the tribes (Rhodes 1972: 4, 8-12, quotation from p. 11).

<sup>78</sup> *IG* XIV.952 (Agrigentum), 953 (Malta), 612 (Rhegium), and Arena 2016 (Kaleakte, relevant clause partially restored); *cf.* Cic. *Verr.* 4.145 (bronze copy of honorific decree from Syracuse for Cicero and his cousin).

itself unremarkable;<sup>79</sup> the extent of the practice of engraving on bronze has been considered already above (§5.2). The specific practice at issue is that of providing an engraved copy of the text to, and for display by, a private individual.<sup>80</sup> It is a commonplace to find cities sending a record of the honours that they have decreed for an individual to the city of the honorand (usually described as either τὸ ψήφισμα, or ἀντίγραφον), although these are generally imagined to be portable and perishable copies on papyrus, painted board, etc. Such records are commonly entrusted to special ambassadors, and on occasion those ambassadors are further charged with requesting that the city of the honorand in turn erect an inscription recording the honours.<sup>81</sup> Similar acts are occasionally (but less frequently) recorded as directed to individuals; as Louis Robert observed, these are generally individuals of high status (royal officials in particular) for whom their *polis* of origin is essentially irrelevant in the context.<sup>82</sup> Common to almost all of these acts, and made explicit to varying degrees, is the assertion that the purpose of this is both so that the euergetism of the individual should be recognised and honoured, and so that the body decreeing the honours should be seen to be capable of honouring its benefactors. The ambassadors concerned are often charged with making this explicit.<sup>83</sup> The crucial term, often repeated, is ὑπόμνημα.<sup>84</sup> The relationship at

---

Beltràn Lloris 2010 suggests a direct connection between the practice visible in this Sicilian material and the later Roman *tabulae patronatus*; but the latter are wholly unattested in Sicily (see now Díaz and Cimarosti 2016) and, as argued here, a wider Hellenistic context is more relevant.

<sup>79</sup> Examples of public decrees such as treaties would be otiose; multiple inscription (in public locations) of honours for individuals, all Hellenistic in date, in e.g. Ma 2000: Dossier no. 23 (Xanthos); Helly 1973: no. 18 (Gonnoi); *I.Histriae* 1-3 (Histria).

<sup>80</sup> In contrast to the Hellenistic examples which follow, Roman practice in relation to individuals, as in the *SC de Asclepiade*, is clearly different: see Ferrary 2009: 66-7.

<sup>81</sup> E.g. *IG IX.1<sup>2</sup>.3.750* (Amphissa to Skarpheia, first half C2 BC); *IG XI.4.1054* (Theangela to Delos, second half C3 BC); Dunant and Pouilloux 1957: no. 170 (Assos to Thasos, early C1 BC); *ibid.* nos. 169-172 are all examples of such honours publicly engraved in the honorand's home city (Thasos); cf. Marek 1984: 141; Boffo 1995: 100 (on Demosthenes 36, 64, etc.).

<sup>82</sup> E.g. Helly 1973: no. 40 (Gonnoi, first half C2 BC, honours for two citizens of Phalanna, with letter and *antigraphon* sent to both the honorands and their city); Robert and Robert 1983: 194 collect examples; see also Knoepfler 2001: no. XIII (Eretria, very end of the C4 BC) with discussion pp. 223-5. Mack 2015: 108-109 notes the potential for private display of such copies and suggests it to be more commonplace than we perhaps assume, pointing explicitly to the Halaesa examples.

<sup>83</sup> E.g. Robert 1936: 90, ll. 10-14 (Theangela), ἐλέσθαι δὲ | καὶ πρεσβευτὰς τρεῖς οἵτινες τό τε ψή-|φισμα ἀποδώσουσιν καὶ παρακαλοῦ-|σιν αὐτὸν τὴν εὐνοίαν παρέχεσθαι | τῆι πόλει; Helly 1973: no. 18, ll. 13-17 (Gonnoi), [διαπροστεῖ]λαὶ δὲ καὶ ἀντίγραφον τῶν δεδω-|μένων τιμῶν Σιμά...| πρὸς τὴν Ὀλοσσονίω[ν] πόλιν, ἵνα ἡ φανερ]ὸν πᾶσιν ὅτι ἀνταπ[ο]δ[ι]-|δόναι ἐπίσταται ἡ πόλις ἡ Γοννέων [τὰς κατα-|ξίας χάριτας τοῖς εὐεργετ]οῦσιν; Robert and Robert 1983: no. 16, ll. 4-7 (Amyzon), [ἐλέσθαι δὲ ἀνδρ]ας οἱ ἀθφικόμενοι πρὸς Νικομήδ[ην] | [τὸ] ψήφισμα ἀποδώσουσιν καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι αὐτ[ὸν] | [παρ]ὰ τοῦ δήμου παρακαλέσουσιν ὄντα εὐεργέτην πει-|ρ[ᾶ]σθαι ἀεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ παραίτιον γίνεσθαι τῶι δήμωι.

<sup>84</sup> E.g. Dunant and Pouilloux 1957: no. 169, ll. 24-30 (Thasos), ὅπω(ς) δ' ἂν εἰδῶσιν καὶ Θάσιοι τὴν το[ῦ] | Ἐστιαίου πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐσέβειαν καὶ τῆμ | πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ἐκτένειαν [καὶ τῆν] τῆς πόλ[ε]-|ως ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίαν, ἐλέσ[θαι] πρεσβευτὴν ὅσ-|τις ἀναδώσει τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ παρ' ἑαυ-|τοῖς, ὅπως ἂν ὑπάχῃ ὑπόμνημα καὶ [τούτων] | παρ' ἐκείνοις (decree of Samothrace, C1 BC). Explicit in the Agrigentine example, *IG XIV.952*, ll. 23-25: τὸ δὲ | ἄλλο ἀποδόμειν Δημητρίω Διοδότου Συρακοσίω ὑπό-|μνημα

stake is precisely the reciprocal one of euergetism, and is of a part with the very act of engraving such decisions, itself ‘an act which publicized and perpetuated the decisions, and thus played a self-conscious role in the honours offered by the cities.’<sup>85</sup>

Many of the honours conferred in such decrees, such as statues and crowns, are intended to sustain this relationship, not least through the expectation of display. Crowns are particularly relevant, since they are commonly destined for private display, as is one of the bronze copies of the decree under consideration here. Aeschines was explicit on the point: ‘The crown that is proclaimed in the assembly, no one dedicates, but he is permitted to keep it, that not only he, but also his descendants, having the memorial in their house, may never become disloyal to the democracy.’<sup>86</sup> The Halaesa text itself makes no reference to the crowning of the honorand and indeed surviving Sicilian honorifics very rarely mention crowning, notwithstanding their depiction on several surviving copies of decrees (for which see above, §5.3).<sup>87</sup> On the other hand, there appears to have been a widespread practice in Sicily of granting the honorand a personal copy in bronze of the decree in their honour, and the function of this particular honour cannot have been radically different.

The honorands in the Sicilian examples fit well into this general pattern. The honorand of the Agrigentine and Maltese decrees is resident not in his home town of Syracuse, but at Rome, where the display value will be greater, and it is his activity at Rome, not Syracuse, which is the source of the honours. The honorand in the Rhegine case is a Roman praetor, but he is here in receipt of personal / individual honours, and the (request for) public inscription of such honours in Rome, as might be expected from the wider Greek parallels noted above, is very rare.<sup>88</sup> If we are to assume that Nemenios is a citizen of Halaesa (a reasonable assumption – see further below, §5.7), then our text is in this respect remarkable for the

---

τᾶς ποτὶ τὸν δᾶμον εὐνοίας· Similarly restored in the Kaleakte decree, Battistoni 2010b: 113 ll. 13-14: τὸ δὲ δόμενα[ι | (τῶι δειῖνα) μνᾶμα τᾶς πο]τὶ τὸν δᾶμον ε[ὐνοίας].

<sup>85</sup> Ma 2000: 184.

<sup>86</sup> Aeschin. 3.47 (Loeb transl.).

<sup>87</sup> On crowns generally, see e.g. Guarducci 1967-78: II, 20-22, with examples at 22 n. 5; McLean 2002: 239 with bibliography; Henry 1983: 22-42 for Attic examples (note Henry’s assumption that any drafting secretary would be sure to include such an element in the text, 23 n. 9). Only two Sicilian texts, both later Hellenistic and gymnasial in context, make explicit reference to the crowning of individuals: *BE* 1953.279 (Centuripae, crowning of what are perhaps epebes); *IG* XIV.256 = *IGDS* I.161 (Phintias, crowning of a gymnasiarch for his actions in office); cf. *IG* XIV.411 (funerary, Messina) and Manganaro 2005: 184-5 no. 1 (Imperial-period, fragmentary Latin text, vicinity of Piazza Armerina); reference to crowns is usually restored in the *technitai* of Dionysus decrees *IG* XIV.12 and 13 (Syracuse), and was suggested by Kaibel for *IG* XIV.955.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Berrendonner 2007: 217-8; and on the specific case of Verres, see further Prag 2012: 279-80; Mack 2015: 108-109 comments on these examples also.

extent of the honours being decreed to a fellow citizen, including a bronze copy for private display to complement the publicly displayed copy of the decree, the title of *euergetes*, and the honorific statue with choice of location granted to the honorand.

### 5.6.2. *Euergetes*

The granting of the formal title of *euergetes* (A. 23: εὐεργέταν εἶμεν) is of some significance (although hardly decisive) for the overall interpretation of this text. As Philippe Gauthier has observed, in general the actual title is not granted to fellow citizens by a community during the Hellenistic period.<sup>89</sup> However, the absence of any ethnic in the text – and, vice versa, the attribution of civic sub-divisions to all but one of those named in the text – strongly suggests that the action related in this text all pertains to a single *polis* community.<sup>90</sup> Furthermore, as Dubois observes, the honorand has the same demotic as one of the *bouleutes* (Hereas son of Dion, A.10), suggesting that all belong to the same community.<sup>91</sup> Gauthier emphasised that this ‘rule’ was hardly universal, and indeed in the Hellenistic period a number of communities across the wider Greek world can be seen to operate differently.<sup>92</sup> By way of preliminary explanation, he suggested that these examples might be considered exceptional honours; and furthermore, he noted that the limited evidence from these communities suggested that their wider range of honorific practices was possibly anomalous also. There is therefore a need, briefly, to consider the evidence for Sicilian practice in order to contextualize this text, not least since existing studies only consider the generic practice of euergotism, not the ascription of the title.<sup>93</sup> The bronze texts from Agrigento and Malta (and Reggio) provide clear examples of the standard civic honours of *proxenos kai euergetes*, in all cases granted to members of other communities.<sup>94</sup> There are five further instances of individuals designated as *euergetes* in Sicilian epigraphy in public honorifics, and most or all of these come from statue bases.<sup>95</sup> In all five cases, the individual honoured appears to be

---

<sup>89</sup> Gauthier 1985: 7-39, esp. 19-20 for the point that the title entails a reciprocity that is not readily compatible with membership of the same community; 31 for the general pattern outside Athens.

<sup>90</sup> Fraser 2009: 56 and 78 §2 for the basic point that ethnics are normally omitted within the native city and conversely that demotics *vel sim.* are not normally found outside the native city.

<sup>91</sup> Dubois 2013: 6.

<sup>92</sup> Gauthier 1985: 32-9, noting exceptions at Istros, Lissa, Amyzon, and Hanisa (the bronze noted above).

<sup>93</sup> Campagna 2007 offers a survey of Hellenistic-period euergotism in Sicily – although as comments on 123 and 126 indicate, he does not take into account the specific significance of the formal title as opposed to generic euergotism; cf. Bivona 1992-93 and Manganaro 1988b: 44-6 for imperial-period euergotistic practice, not titles.

<sup>94</sup> *IG XIV*.952 and 954 (Agrigentum), 953 (Malta), and 612 (Rhegium).

<sup>95</sup> *IG XIV*.273, 277 (with *CIL X*.7240), and *SEG* 34.951 (all from Lilybaeum), all for a father and son, the latter apparently having Roman citizenship; *AE* 1997.740 (Segesta) in Latin (whether a paving-stone or part of a monument is unclear); *BE* 1953.277 (Tyndaris). Note also *IG XIV*.367 (Haluntium), dating to the Civil Wars or the Augustan period, in which the honorand is described as the descendant of *euergotai* (although Manni Piraino (*IGPalermo* 44) reads εὐεργέτην in line 4 against the *communis opinio* of εὐεργ[ε]τ[ῶν]); and *IG XIV*.316 =

local. Although none can be closely dated, they are mostly late: the three from Lilybaeum all seem to belong to a date around the Augustan period, and the unusual Latin instance from Segesta is suggested to be second half of the first century AD.<sup>96</sup> Only the example from Tyndaris might be earlier (a range between later second and mid-first century BC seems likely, although certainty is impossible). Individuals honoured with the title of *euergetes* are also found in the honorific decrees of the two Syracusan associations, the *technitai* of Dionysus and of Aphrodite Hilara, at least once in combination with the title of *proxenos*. In the case of the honours granted by the *technitai* of Aphrodite Hilara, the honorands are eminent Romans and presumably therefore not local citizens;<sup>97</sup> in the case of the *technitai* of Dionysus, the honorands are only partially identifiable, lacking ethnics in two cases, explicitly described as Syracusan in the third.<sup>98</sup>

The pool of comparable material is therefore limited. The surviving civic decrees on bronze illustrate the typical Hellenistic practice of conferring titles of *euergetes* and *proxenos* on non-citizens. By contrast, the surviving civic statue-bases, none of which are earlier than the later second century BC and most of which are early Imperial in date, show the extension of the title of *euergetes* to members of the local community. That such a shift takes place at the end of the Hellenistic period would not in itself be particularly remarkable; however, the lack of earlier material makes any attempt to argue for a particular pattern of development in the Sicilian case an argument from silence. In relation to the Halaesa bronzes, the clearest parallels come from two of the honorific decrees of the *koinon* of the *technitai* of Dionysus at Syracuse, in which it appears that local individuals are honoured as *euergetai*, on the same pattern therefore as the Halaesan *koinon*'s honours for Nemenios.<sup>99</sup>

---

*IGDS* I.203 (Thermae), a private honorific, probably late Hellenistic, set up by an individual for his family and their *euergetes*. Additionally, Manganaro 1999: 62 no. 51 speculates that a bronze fragment from Morgantina is a list of those designated *euergetai* by the city; certainty is impossible.

<sup>96</sup> For the Lilybaeum texts, see further Di Stefano 1984: 125-6; *ead.* 2006: 547; Wilson 1990: 317, 361; for Segesta, Nenci 1997: 1193.

<sup>97</sup> See now Dimartino 2010 for texts, photographs, bibliography, and discussion. Dimartino 2010: 22-26 (text A = Aneziri 2003: F4a) honours a Roman proconsul of 46/5 BC as *proxenos kai euergetes*; Dimartino 2010: 27-30 (text B = Aneziri 2003: F4b) honours an unknown Roman, perhaps earlier first century BC, as *proxenos* and probably *euergetes* (the latter term is however restored and seems never to have been included in the title of the prescript).

<sup>98</sup> Aneziri 2003: 400 F1 (*SEG* 34.974), later Hellenistic, in which both officials and honorand are designated as Syracusans; only reference to *proxenos* survives in this text, but much is lost; Aneziri 2003: 401 F2 (*IG* XIV.12), later Hellenistic, an unknown son of Skymnos crowned and honoured as *euergetes*; Aneziri 2003: 401 F3 (*IG* XIV.13), later Hellenistic, Apollodotos son of Leukios crowned and honoured as *euergetes*.

<sup>99</sup> See the comments of Aneziri 2003: 218-20 on the use of the titles *proxenos kai euergetes* in *technitai* texts: there are clear overlaps with standard civic practice, but the two titles are actually quite rare within the honours granted in surviving texts (making the Sicilian examples significant among *technitai* texts in this respect).

### 5.6.3. The statue, statue base and its location

The honour of a bronze statue is not in itself remarkable, although this is the first explicit mention of such an honour in a Hellenistic decree from Sicily (statue bases on the other hand are well attested). Cicero's *Verrines* attest to such honours in Sicily for several Romans, but not for a Sicilian (more likely a function of the speeches' audience and purpose, than a reflection of reality). The physical honorific landscape of Sicilian *agorai*, including that of Halaesa itself, is increasingly well attested.<sup>100</sup>

The general formulation of the statue-base inscription (A.25-7: <θε>οῖς πᾶσι τὸ κοινὸν | τῶν ἱερέων τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος Νεμήνιον Νεμηνίου Υγυ Δάφνιν τὸν εὐερ-|γέταν ἀρεταῖς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας τᾶς εἰς αὐτόν) is well attested in Sicily, and at Halaesa itself, as well as in the wider Hellenistic world. From the area of the agora in Halaesa there are exact parallels erected by ὁ δᾶμος τῶν Ἀλαισίνων as well as an incomplete parallel erected by what is probably the same *koinon* (although whether the latter was also a dedication to 'all the gods' is unknowable).<sup>101</sup> Honorific dedications to 'all the gods' are attested from other cities in Sicily in this period, predominantly from the North and East of the island;<sup>102</sup> and a pair of dedications from the agora of Soluntum provides an interesting parallel for our inscription (since one might *prima facie* expect a dedication to Apollo), in so far as two *amphipoloi* (presumably of Zeus Olympios) are honoured with a dedication to both Zeus Olympios and 'all the gods'.<sup>103</sup>

Rather less common is the inclusion of choice in location for the honorand (A.24-25: στᾶσαι αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα χαλκῆαν καὶ <ἀ>ναθέμειν ἢ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἢ ἐν τᾷ βασιλικῷ, ἐν ᾧ κα τόπω αὐτὸς βόληται). The inclusion of a choice of location on the part of the honorand for

---

<sup>100</sup> See now the papers collected in Ampolo 2012, as well as Burgio 2011 specifically on Halaesa.

<sup>101</sup> *SEG* 37.759 (the *damos*) is essentially identical in formulation; *IG* XIV.353 also to 'all the gods', with slight variation; *IG* XIV.354 (incomplete, now recognised and restored by Scibona (2009a: 108) as another *koinon* dedication: [---κοι]νὸν τῶν ἱερέω[ν---], cf. Prestianni Giallombardo 2012: 179); *IG* XIV.355 and *SEG* 37.760 honour military commanders with dedications to 'all the gods'; *SEG* 37.761 is a dedication to 'all the gods' by a private individual. Two similar honorifics for Romans however appear to lack the dedication to 'all the gods': *IG* XIV.356 and Scibona 2008: 26 (Inv. Me 20222; revised edition in Prag and Tigano 2018: no.5). The Halaesa examples are discussed and re-edited in Prestianni Giallombardo 2012: 174-180, 187.

<sup>102</sup> *IG* XIV.359 (*damos* honours an individual, San Fratello, anc. Apollonia; Bonanno 2008: 14 fig. 3); *IG* XIV.368 = *IGPalermo* 41 (for an individual, dedicant missing, Haluntium); *SEG* 32.936 (*damos* honours an individual, Taormina); and *IG* XIV.2 (Syracusans honour Hieron II); *I.Catania* 236 (Messina, either a Roman or more recent 'invention'; cf. *SEG* 52.893 an antiquarian invention attributed to Drepanum). Similar list offered by Prestianni Giallombardo 2012: 196 n.136, who omits the Soluntum example in the next note, and includes *IG* XIV.452 (Catania), which is however a funerary inscription of the Roman period (see *IGPalermo* 6 and *I.Catania* p. 89) and should not be restored in this way.

<sup>103</sup> Tusa 1963.

one or more elements of the honours conferred is certainly not unparalleled, and indeed is itself a mark of further honour.<sup>104</sup> Inscribed decrees containing variations on the phrase ὅπου ἂν βούληται are quite numerous. Several Attic decrees grant the honorand choice of location within the agora, subject to various restrictions.<sup>105</sup> Such a prescribed choice, whether defined by the agora, or the most visible location, is reasonably common.<sup>106</sup> Less tightly defined options also appear, notably at Iasos and Eretria, where the choice extends to ‘whichever sanctuary he wishes, or public place’, multiple statues ‘in whichever sacred or public places he wishes’, or even ‘wherever he wishes in the sanctuaries in Eretria or the city’.<sup>107</sup> A specific choice between two clearly defined alternatives, as here, left in the hands of the honorand, is however not directly paralleled in the examples I have observed.

The first choice, the sanctuary of Apollo, is unproblematic, given that the honours originate with the *koinon* of the priests of Apollo (on both of these, see below §5.7). The second, the ‘basilica’, is not. I shall first consider the unusual use of the term itself, and the question of possible identification of the building to which it might refer, before examining the implications of this for the fundamental problems surrounding the nature of this decree and the body which produced it.

Assuming that a date for this inscription in the first part of the first century BC is approximately correct, then ἐν τῇ βασιλικῇ constitutes the earliest example of the use of the word *basilica* without qualification in Greek apparently for the purposes of defining a specific building. The evolution of both the building-type and its designation is a vexed question.<sup>108</sup> The term is fairly obviously a Greek one in origin, that at some point was calqued into Latin (the essential *terminus ante quem* is 184 BC, the construction of the

---

<sup>104</sup> Jeremy Tanner aptly comments (in relation to Roman examples attested in Cic. *Phil.* 5.41 and Pliny, *HN* 34.24-5) that, ‘It is, of course, only in the context of some set of institutional rules or broadly shared expectations that the physical placing of portraits can take on these specifically relational, honorific overtones’ (Tanner 2000: 15-16).

<sup>105</sup> See Henry 1983: 294-303, esp. 295 on *IG* II<sup>2</sup>.450b.7-12, which grants Asandros permission to set up a statue of himself in the agora, wherever he wishes, except close to the statues of Harmodios and Aristogeiton.

<sup>106</sup> Other examples include *I.Histriae* 1-3 (Histria), *IG* XII.2.506 (Lesbos); *I.Magnesia* 94; *IG* XII.7.231 and 235 (Amorgos); *IG* XII.9.196, 198 (Euboia). Phrases such as ἐν τῷ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ ὅπου ἂν βούληται τόπῳ (*I.Iasos* 98, lines 38-9) are perhaps deceptive, since the ‘most visible’ location is probably relatively narrowly defined by custom and expectation, and generally equates to ‘the agora’. On the phrase, see Battistoni 2012; note the examples included there from Priene where the choice of exact location (of an inscription) is instead left to the architect (e.g. *I.Priene* 108 and 119).

<sup>107</sup> *I.Iasos* 99, line 15; 248, lines 33-4; *IG* XII.7.196 (cf. 198; both now in Knoepfler 2001: nos. VII, XIII).

<sup>108</sup> Among recent discussions note esp. Gaggiotti 1985; Welch 2003; Gros 2003; Wilson 2005; Russell 2015 esp. 52-55.

*basilica Porcia*, although examples in Plautus imply an earlier date).<sup>109</sup> However, the usage is not Greek, and the subsequent use of *basilica* in Greek to designate a building would seem to be a conscious readoption of the Latin term; and the specific coupling βασιλική στοά - itself quite rare and only found in the Imperial period – would seem to mark ‘a later borrowing back of the word ‘basilica’, as it was understood in Italy and the West, to describe a stoa in the Greek East set aside largely or wholly for basilical functions.’<sup>110</sup> The earliest instances of the word’s use in this sense in Greek (the Halaesa text aside), come from translations of Latin documents referring to buildings in Rome: a consular letter of 112 BC (ἐν τῇ βασιλικῇ τῇ Πορκίᾳ), an SC of 73 BC (ἐμ βασιλικῇ Πορκίᾳ), and the Greek versions of Augustus’ *Res Gestae*; Strabo provides the earliest instance of βασιλική στοά, describing buildings in Rome. An Ephesian bilingual of AD 4-14 provides the earliest example of the term’s use with reference to a building outside Rome (the qualification στοά is on this occasion a restoration in a very fragmentary text).<sup>111</sup> The debate over the origins of the Roman basilica does not directly concern us here, except in so far as it assists with explaining the use of the word in this context. At its heart is a question over whether the term is intended to designate, or originally evolved to designate, primarily form or function. Buildings termed ‘basilica’, especially in the earlier period, have considerable variety of form; but they also have considerable variety of use.<sup>112</sup> Jean-Michel David makes the case for *basilicae* performing a judicial role (alongside others), and hosting (at least on occasion) the tribunals of Roman officials. Significantly, the primary evidence for such use of *basilicae* at Rome in the Republican period comes from the epigraphic evidence for the use of the original *basilica Porcia*; but David also noted the evidence of Cicero’s *Verrines* for the use of porticoes in the *agorai* of the cities of Sicily by Verres and his subordinates for the administration of provincial government.<sup>113</sup> To this, one might add the material evidence from Monte Iato (anc. Ietas) in western Sicily, where a tribunal was installed in the north stoa of the agora some time in the second century BC, on the moulding of which is inscribed the name of a Roman, one *Cn. Host[ilius]*, in Latin letters. As the excavator, Hans-Peter Isler, comments, ‘Sembra che il portico settentrionale abbia, in epoca repubblicana, assunto, almeno parzialmente, la

---

<sup>109</sup> See Livy 26.27, 39.44; Plautus, *Curculio* 470-82, *Captivi* 813-15. Gaggiotti 1985 offers the fullest discussion of this aspect.

<sup>110</sup> Quotation from Wilson 2005: 130; and see esp. Coulton 1976: 180-1; cf. Gros 1996: 235-40.

<sup>111</sup> *RDGE* 14, ll. 76-7 (Letter of L. Calpurnius Piso, cos. 112 BC, to Itanos in Crete); *RDGE* 23, l. 6 (*SC* concerning Oropos, 73 BC); *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 20; Strabo 5.3.8; *I.Ephesos* 404.

<sup>112</sup> See Gros 1996: 238-55 and 2003.

<sup>113</sup> David 1983: 219-28, noting *RDGE* 14 and 23 (see above), as well as Plut. *Cat. min.* 5; Cic. *Verr.* 3.77, 4.85-6.

funzione di una basilica...’. A similar masonry podium stands at the north-east corner of the East Stoa at Morgantina.<sup>114</sup>

The question remains, if there was a building in Halaesa which the community had come to call the ‘basilica’, which one was it? The findspot of the Nemenios bronzes is of no immediate assistance. The most obvious candidate is precisely the porticoed building in the city’s agora. The identification of the ‘basilica’ with the agora stoa was suggested already in 1971 by Scibona, in light of a fragment of an imperial-period Latin inscription found there which mentions a *basilica*.<sup>115</sup> This hypothesis is reinforced by the subsequent discovery among the epigraphic material recovered from the rooms at the rear of the *stoa* of a monumental fragment bearing the same word, also in Latin.<sup>116</sup> The *Pi*-shaped stoa of the Halaesa agora is a single-storey edifice (except for one section in the north-western corner where it had a second storey), dating to the end of the second century BC, its first main phase of use being in the first century BC / first century AD.<sup>117</sup> The structure is the source of the majority of the epigraphic and sculptural remains from the site, and seemingly the focal point of the honorific and dedicatory activity in the late Hellenistic and Roman city.<sup>118</sup> It should be noted however that there is a substantial, unexcavated area immediately to the north of the main agora (often arbitrarily referred to as the ‘lower agora’), which could conceivably contain another structure that might warrant such a title.

If the identification with the main stoa is correct, what is the significance of its designation as a *basilica* by the inhabitants of Halaesa? The most obvious implication is that the town was heavily subjected to Roman / Italian influence, both through the activities of the governor on his administrative and judicial rounds of the island, and through the presence of Italians in the city. Halaesa is the source of the earliest example of an honorific set up in the name of the *Italici*, and so would be an unsurprising candidate for the earliest attested adoption of the

---

<sup>114</sup> Ietas: Isler 2012: 230 for quotation; reconstruction in Isler 1994: abb. 2. Morgantina: Bell 1993: 332 with figs. 7a and 9; the podium is said to belong to the original (mid-third-century BC) construction of the stoa (Bell 2010: 735), although to my knowledge no evidence to support this has yet been published (no indication in Sjöqvist 1964: 138, the preliminary report), and the numismatic evidence cited for ‘abandonment’ of the structure before the second century appears to be weaker than allowed (*ibid.*).

<sup>115</sup> Scibona 1971: 15-16 no. 5: white marble fragment, Latin letters 7-8 cm high [---]εϰου[---|---]basiliç[--- |---]re..[---] (inv. ME 20225, now Prag and Tigano 2018: no.24).

<sup>116</sup> Inv. ME 30591, Prag and Tigano 2018: no.11, six joining fragments of marble 27.7cm high by 89 cm wide, letters 15-15.5 cm high: [---]M · BASILICAE · [---] (presumably from the building facade?).

<sup>117</sup> Scibona 2009b: 42-3.

<sup>118</sup> For which see now Prag and Tigano 2018, Prestianni Giallombardo 2012.

term *basilica* by a Greek-speaking community.<sup>119</sup> But one might also speculate that Hellenistic (Hieronian) Sicily was itself the original source for the adoption of the term *basilica* by the Romans, in the course of the third century BC. The tendency in scholarship is to look to the Ptolemies for a likely source of inspiration for this development in Rome;<sup>120</sup> but as Jim Coulton noted back in 1976, ‘it must also be remembered that the nearest and most familiar source of Greek ideas in early second century Rome was South Italy and Sicily. Agathokles, Hieron, and Gelon of Syracuse all took the title of king ...’. Coulton also noted that Cato the Elder’s prototype for the Basilica Porcia was unlikely to be Egyptian, and we might add that Cato did spend time in Sicily.<sup>121</sup> Unfortunately we know almost nothing about the relevant Syracusan public architecture; but the presence of a podium / tribunal in the probably Hieronian stoa at Morgantina (see above) is perhaps suggestive.

Finally, we must consider the significance of the statue’s alternative location for our interpretation of this decree. If the ‘basilica’ is indeed the stoa in the *agora*, or a similar public building, it raises the question as to on what authority the *koinon* of the priests of Apollo was apparently able to erect a statue there. The wording of the alternatives makes clear that the basilica is not within the sanctuary. Normally, however, when honours are decreed beyond the remit of an intra-*polis* body, such as by the members of the *gymnasium*, further authorisation is required from the *polis* as a whole. Examples are well known of honorific decrees in which this two-stage process is conflated into a single document, often in an unclear or confused fashion.<sup>122</sup> It is, however, difficult to see such an ‘error’ of drafting as an explanation in this particular case, since there is no mention anywhere in the document of the city or the people, and lines 8 and 22 variously qualify both the *boule* and the *halia* explicitly as being that of the sanctuary or priests of Apollo. Other such parallels either make the civic element explicit at some point, or at the least contain lacunae where this is assumed by editors; our text is very clearly complete. One alternative would be that the *koinon* had the right to grant such honours in Halaesa. At this point it becomes necessary therefore to

---

<sup>119</sup> *ILLRP* 320 (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup>.612 = X.7459 = *ILS* 864): *Italicei / L. Cornelium Sc[ip]i[one]m / honoris caussa*, now lost; probably to be dated to 193 BC (fullest discussion in Frascchetti 1981: 56). Note also that the city requested *leges de senatu cooptando* from the Roman senate in 95 BC, elaborated by the praetor C. Claudius Ap. f. Pulcher (Cic. *Verr.* 2.122). For the city in relation to Rome in this period see Facella 2006: 181-282.

<sup>120</sup> So, independently, both Welch 2003 and Wilson 2005.

<sup>121</sup> Coulton 1976: 182 with n. 7; Cato in Sicily, see esp. Plut. *Cat. mai.* 3. Zevi 1991: 484-5 suggested Hieron II’s visit to Rome in 237 BC (Eutrop. 3.1) as one possible context; cf. Welch 2003 (esp. 15, 26).

<sup>122</sup> See, e.g., Gauthier 1996: 9-15 discussing the granting of honours by the *neoi* of the Xanthos *gymnasium* preserved however on a stele in the civic sanctuary of the Letöon; it is argued by Gauthier (p.15) that a clause reflecting the request of the *neoi* to the people for this particular honour stood in the lacuna at the end; see p.10 n. 18 for reference to further examples and discussion by L. Robert.

consider the full problem of the nature and status of the *koinon* and the decree, which discussion forms the final part of this study.

### **5.7. The institutional problem: the sanctuary, the *koinon* and the decree**

The text under discussion presents itself as issued by a *koinon* of the priests of Apollo, albeit one with a highly complex institutional structure which, it should be emphasised, finds no direct parallel amongst existing decrees of associations, but only in civic decrees. Besides the absence of explicit reference to a city in the text (Halaesa, or another), the institutional structures of the decree present a number of novelties and ambiguities (such as the relationship to public space just noted), which require consideration in any attempt to assess this decree and the association.

The text contains no reference to a city, and none of the individuals named is referred to by means of an ethnic. Both copies were found in a sealed destruction layer within the city of ancient Halaesa. Formally, however, this is not proof that the texts were produced in Halaesa. As noted above, the absence of any ethnics and the presence of demotics in such a list of people ordinarily would only be found in a document produced within a city. Four further more or less circumstantial elements make the production of the text in Halaesa itself extremely likely. Firstly, the language of the inscription, which shows many of the familiar characteristics of Hellenistic Sicilian texts (Doric dialect, with a variety of Rhodian forms). In particular, the engraving clause contains several unusual third-person plural imperative forms (ll. 30-32: ἐξοδιαξάντων, ἀναθέντων, ἀποδόντων). This particular formation in -ντων is principally Aeolic (Lesbian, Pamphylian), but also found in a Rhodian context. The form is otherwise only attested in Sicily in another text from Halaesa, which adds weight to the presumption that this text was produced at Halaesa.<sup>123</sup> Secondly, Scibona has convincingly restored a fragmentary Greek inscription from the *agora* of Halaesa as a similar honorific dedication by a *koinon* of priests; the clear parallelism between the formula of the statue-base honorific inscription in the bronzes and that attested in the second text, as well as the other honorifics from Halaesa, adds weight to the implication that the *koinon* operates from Halaesa.<sup>124</sup> Thirdly, Halaesa is the only Sicilian city where a building explicitly known as the ‘basilica’ is attested, not only in these bronzes, but in two further texts, noted above.

---

<sup>123</sup> On the language of Sicilian inscriptions, see n. 30 above, and Dubois 2013: 6 for the language of this inscription. For this form, Buck 1955: 106, and on the other example from Halaesa (*SEG* 31.825) see Calderone 1961: 130-1 and *IGDS* I.197 (comm. at p. 247).

<sup>124</sup> *IG* XIV.354 with Scibona 2009a: 108 and Prestianni 2012: 179; cf. n. 101 above.

Fourthly, the existence of a sanctuary of Apollo in the city, as implied by the bronzes, is securely attested by other evidence.

The existence of a substantial sanctuary of Apollo at Halaesa was already known from its mention as a significant landmark within the cadastral inscription from Halaesa.<sup>125</sup> Diodorus Siculus also singles out the Apollonion of the city, and implies that it had ancestral significance for the city.<sup>126</sup> The references in the cadastral inscription appear to imply a sanctuary – and associated buildings - within the city walls, and are usually so interpreted. The Apollonion is commonly linked with the substantial late Hellenistic temple platform on the summit of the site, which was very briefly explored by Carettoni in 1956, and excavation of which recommenced in 2016. There is nonetheless no secure basis as yet for the identification of this site with the Apollonion, however plausible it may appear. Additional evidence for the significance of Apollo in the city comes from frequent Apolline references in the city's coinage, and from a third-century Latin dedication to Apollo which said to have come from Halaesa.<sup>127</sup>

The precise nature of the sanctuary is complicated by the reference in the engraving clause to the placing of one copy ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκ τὸ πρόναον τοῦ Διὸς (A.31-2; see note to the translation above). The clear import of the phrase is that there is a temple of Zeus located within the sanctuary of Apollo. The presence of other deities within the sanctuary of one deity is hardly unparalleled, if rarely directly discussed. The ambivalent relationship of the sanctuary of Athena Pronaos (the epithet is linked to the physical relationship at the site) to the primary sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi is perhaps the most obvious example, if not a perfect parallel, since Athena in this instance was situated within a distinct sanctuary; the co-location of various deities on the Athenian acropolis, and in particular at the Erechtheion is another; Zeus, Hera, and the Great Mother at Olympia is a third. Other texts which give some

---

<sup>125</sup> *IG XIV.352*, col. 2, ll. 53-4: ...ἔστε ποτὶ τὸν ροίσκον τὸν ρέοντα ἐκ τᾶς ῥινὸς τᾶς κα-|τὰ τὸ ἱερόν, εἴ τὰ χάλκια, κατὰ τὸ μαγειρικὸν καὶ κατὰ | τοῦ ροίσκου... ('...as far as the rill which flows out of the culvert below the temple, where there is the forge(?) below the cookshop(?), and down along the rill...'; ll. 63-4: Ἀπὸ τᾶς ῥινὸς τᾶς κατὰ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τᾶς κα-|τὰ τὰ χάλκια τὰ ποτὶ τῷ μαγειρικῷ ὑπὸ τὸν πύργον... ('From the culvert below the temple of Apollo, below the forge(?) next to the cookshop(?) along beneath the tower...').

<sup>126</sup> *Diod. Sic. 14.16.4*: ... καὶ τὰς κατὰ τὸ Ἀπολλώνιον θυσίας τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἔθεσι διοικοῦσιν ('...and they (sc. the Halaesans) administer their sacrifices at the Apollonion with the same customs (sc. as the people of Herbita)') – Halaesa was founded by Archonides of Herbita.

<sup>127</sup> *Facella 2006*: 318-22 collects the evidence for Apollo cult at Halaesa; full discussion in *Prestianni Giallombardo 2003*: 1075-81; notes on the temple excavation in *Carettoni 1961*: 313-18; the Latin inscription is *CIL 1<sup>2</sup>.2219* and p. 1096. The new excavation is a joint project of Oxford and Messina Universities, by concession of the Soprintendenza BCA di Messina, directed by L. Campagna and J. Prag.

sense of the possibilities include a decree from Anaphe of the second century BC, which concerns the building of a temple of Aphrodite within a sanctuary of Apollo; and a regulation from Miletus of c.300 BC, which attests to the presence of two differently dedicated priests in the same sanctuary.<sup>128</sup> The bronzes provide the principal evidence for a cult of Zeus at Halaesa (assuming that the text is accepted to refer to Halaesa), both in the prescript's evidence for a priest of Zeus and in this line's attestation to a temple. Otherwise evidence is limited to the appearance of Zeus Eleutherios on bronze coinage of the fourth century BC and of Zeus on bronze coinage of the Roman Republican period; an extra-urban sanctuary of (Zeus) Meilichios is also attested in the cadastral inscription.<sup>129</sup> Scibona speculated that the temple of Zeus could be the substantial building ('edificio B') which Carettoni partially uncovered in the late 1950s, down the slope to the south-east of the high point where the presumed temple of Apollo stands, and just inside the city wall.<sup>130</sup> The building was associated with primarily late Hellenistic material; Carettoni speculated that its size suggested a public building, and perhaps a temple. The identification as a cultic building is however wholly speculative, and its location is not obviously within the putative sanctuary. Furthermore, current work on the temple platform suggests that there may in fact have been more than one building there (the main platform, c.18 x 40 m, has at least two smaller platforms raised upon it). Additionally, there is a substantial level area immediately to the south of the temple platform, which *prima facie* offers the most likely location for the *temenos*, but until further archaeological exploration has been undertaken it is impossible to resolve the topographical implications of the text itself, nor to know whether there were other buildings in the vicinity of the platform on the summit.

From an institutional perspective, the peculiarity which is implied in the text is that the temple of Zeus is internal to the sanctuary of Apollo, and so presumably secondary; and yet the priest of Zeus appears first in the prescript of the inscription, notwithstanding the fact that one would expect priority to lie with the priests of Apollo in a text produced by the *koinon* of the priests of Apollo. Consideration of the status of the priests in the prescript brings us to the first of several institutional elements which it is necessary to analyse, in order to begin to clarify the nature of the *koinon* and its relationship to the city.

---

<sup>128</sup> On Delphi, Jacquemin 1999: 24-27, especially with reference to Demosthenes 25.34; for the general point, with reference to Athens, Garland 1992: 21-22 and 92; for Anaphe, see *LSCG* no. 129; and for Miletus, *LSAM* no. 46. I am grateful to Michael Scott and Beate Dignas for help on this point.

<sup>129</sup> Cultic evidence is collected in Facella 2006: 322. The *Meilichieion* is attested in *IG XIV.352*, col. I, ll. 15-16, and fully discussed in Prestianni Giallombardo 2003: 1063-70.

<sup>130</sup> Scibona 2009a: 110 with fig. 8; Carettoni 1961: 319-21.

The formulation of lines 1-5 implies a double eponym, both a priest of Zeus and a double priesthood of Apollo. No Sicilian city explicitly records a *ἱερεὺς* as its eponym (as opposed to other priestly titles): but given firstly that we do not know the title of the eponym in many cases, and secondly that the single use of the simple term *ἱερεὺς* could be deliberate compression consequent upon the listing of the two different priesthoods (the formulation is decidedly awkward), we should perhaps not place too much weight upon this fact.<sup>131</sup> The eponym for Halaesa is not otherwise known. In so far as the evidence permits, Sicilian eponymous officials in this period tend to be priests rather than magistrates (attested titles are: ἀμφίπολος, ἱεραπόλος, ἱεροθύτης, ἱερομνήμων). In the case of Syracuse, the *amphipolos* was priest of Olympian Zeus; but usually, even when we know the title, we are not informed about the relevant deity.<sup>132</sup> We might speculate that we are presented here with the city's eponym, the priest of Zeus, alongside the eponymous priests of the *koinon* of the priests of Apollo which is the source of the decree. Robert Sherk has noted that associations generally make use of their parent city's eponym for dating, even if they record their own eponym; however, as he also notes, this is not universally true, and one clear exception is a Syracusan text, set up by the *koinon* of the Dionysiac *technitai*, where the *koinon*'s own priest (*ἱερεὺς*) is the eponym.<sup>133</sup> On the other hand, given that, as emerges from A.32, the *pronaos* of Zeus was itself situated within the sanctuary of Apollo, the Halaesan *koinon* (and/or the city) might simply have a triple eponymous priesthood as is apparently presented in the text.

A second institutional peculiarity is the nature of the *boule*, described as τᾶ βουλᾶ τᾶ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος (A.8) – in other words, explicitly that of the sanctuary, not e.g. of the city. Qualification of the *boule* in this fashion is most obviously paralleled in Athenian decrees of the first century BC onwards, where the *boule* of the Areopagus is distinguished from the full citizen *boule* of 500 in a similar fashion: ἡ βουλή ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου.<sup>134</sup> Indeed, other parallels are hard to find. In Athenian decrees, when the meeting place of the

<sup>131</sup> Sicilian eponyms: Sherk 1993: 267-71, supplemented by Di Veroli 1996; cf. Ghinati 1964-5. An *amphipolos* is also attested in a sale-contract on lead of uncertain provenance (possibly Syracusan), *IGDS* II.42; as noted above Manganaro 2011: 42-3 speculatively assigns this text to Halaesa on the basis of the overlapping demotic abbreviations, and consequently – and equally speculatively – restores mention of an *amphipolos* to line 1 of the text from Kaleakte (Caronia), which he likewise attributes to Halaesa because of the demotics (Manganaro 2011: 48, 60). As noted already, this line of reasoning is not sustainable.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. Guarducci 1967-78: II, 344-6, after Manganaro 1963: 20-22, on the case of Tauromenion (where the individual is named, but not given a title: perhaps a priest, perhaps of Apollo).

<sup>133</sup> Sherk 1993: 293-5 on eponyms of associations; *SEG* 34.974 (Syracuse, c. 100 BC).

<sup>134</sup> Examples in Geagan 1967: Appendix I, pp. 143-4, as well as pp. 32-36; an example already in *IG* II<sup>2</sup>.479 of c. 305/4 BC.

*boule* of 500 is specified, this is commonly done through the preposition ἐν + dative.<sup>135</sup> In other words, it is more straightforward to understand this phrase as identifying the *boule*, or form of the *boule*, in question – most obviously, from the rest of the decree, the *boule* of the priests of Apollo, or the *boule* of the Koinon of the priests of Apollo - rather than simply signifying that the ‘ordinary’ *boule* of the city met on this occasion in the sanctuary of Apollo.

In relation to the *boule*, a further point of interest is provided by the word συνεβούλευσαν (A.9). I can find no clear parallels for this usage. The verb συμβουλεύω is typically used to refer to the giving of advice (and as such is more normally found in relation to the activities of the honorand, who is typically thanked for having given good advice to the city);<sup>136</sup> alternatively it is used to describe the beginning of the process of *probouleusis*, most obviously at Rome when a magistrate consults the Senate as the preliminary to drawing up a *senatus consultum*; one example of this usage is also now attested in a Hellenistic decree.<sup>137</sup> However, there is a clear difference between both these ‘typical’ usages and the example under discussion. In both the former cases, the verb takes an indirect object (usually in the dative) and means specifically either ‘advise *x*’ (also with infinitive of action advised), or ‘consult *x*’ (as part of a probouleutic process). In the Halaesa text, the verb is used intransitively, followed by the list of names in the nominative who form its subject, and this phrase appears after the actual enactment formula. This fact, combined with the unusually long list (fifteen names), and the further point that in the motion formula at lines A.22-3 this list seems to be alluded to by the unusual use of δεδόχθαι τᾶ ἀλίᾳ ... καθὰ καὶ τοῖς βουλευταῖς (rather than simply τᾶ βουλᾷ, which is the typical Sicilian formula), all encourage me to suggest that the function of the verb and the list is to specify the members of the *boule* itself, rather than any sort of sub-group undertaking a (pre-)probouleutic function, or a group responsible for drawing up the decree itself, for which a compound of γράφω would be more normal.<sup>138</sup> That is not of course to deny the evidence for *probouleusis* itself, which would seem to be clearly implied by the typical Sicilian formulation of ἔδοξε τᾶ ἀλίᾳ

<sup>135</sup> References in Rhodes 1972: 35-6.

<sup>136</sup> A Sicilian example in *SEG* 30.1119, ll. 8-9 (Nakone A): (οἱ πρέσβεις) τοῖς πολίταις συνεβο[ύ]-|λευσαν.

<sup>137</sup> Roman examples (all second century BC) include *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 612 (*RDGE* 1.C, ll. 1-2); 646 (*RDGE* 2, l. 2); 664, l. 17; 674 (*RDGE* 9, l. 9); 688 (*RDGE* 10.B, l. 2). An example from Kalindoia, Macedonia (late C2 or early C1 BC) in *SEG* 42.578, ll. 2-4: οἱ πολιτάρχαι, συνβου-|[λευσάμενοι τῇ βουλῇ καὶ συναγαγόντες ἐκκλη-|[σίαν εἶπαν · ἐπεὶ---] (the restoration of the editors is itself premised upon the Roman parallels).

<sup>138</sup> Cf. Rhodes and Lewis 1997: 494, as well as the Roman examples cited above.

καθὰ καὶ τᾶ βουλᾶ.<sup>139</sup> A membership of fifteen (not counting eponyms or *prostatai*) is perfectly plausible for a *boule* in a small, late Hellenistic *polis* or equivalent, i.e. a body whose total membership is at least 825 (see further below).<sup>140</sup>

The financial officers (*tamiai*) responsible for providing the bronze for the statue and for the engraving of the decree add another element to this discussion.<sup>141</sup> *Tamiai* are already attested at Halaesa, in the surviving fragment associated with the lost cadastral inscription.<sup>142</sup>

However, that instance is in the context of ‘normal’ civic institutions, and the title of the office is unqualified;<sup>143</sup> whereas the qualification of title given here, ‘the Diodoran quaestors’ (A.29, οἱ δὲ ταμίαι οἱ Διοδορεῖοι), is unparalleled, not only in Sicily but elsewhere.

Qualification of colleges of financial officers, in order to identify their year of office, usually in relation to the presiding civic magistrate(s), can readily be illustrated at Athens and elsewhere. However, the typical way of doing this involves a prepositional phrase.<sup>144</sup> Various further permutations can also be identified, using relative clauses or the genitive case (the latter particularly in the case of specifying the officers of some group below the level of the city).<sup>145</sup> But I know of no parallel for qualification of magistrates through the creation of an adjectival form of a personal name in this way, even if the existence of such adjectival forms of personal names (including this particular one) is itself unproblematic.<sup>146</sup> That said, the

---

<sup>139</sup> Cf. Rhodes and Lewis 1997: 320-1.

<sup>140</sup> See, e.g., Rhodes and Lewis 1997: 478-81 for a convenient survey of *boulai* in the Greek world, and the range in size from fewer than 10 to 1,000+, with little direct correlation between overall population and council size. In passing, I note that D. S. 16.73.2 describes Timoleon executing the 15 strongest supporters of Carthage when he took over the city of Entella in western Sicily. The only explicit evidence for a Sicilian council’s size in this period is *IG XIV.952*, recording a σύγκλητος of 110 (at l. 10), from the larger city of Agrigentum.

<sup>141</sup> Sicilian parallels: *IG XIV.952*, ll. 25-7 (Agrigentum) and *IG XIV.256*, ll. 26-9 (Phintias; see commentary in *IGDS I.161*).

<sup>142</sup> *SEG 31.825 (IGDS I.197)*. *Tamiai* are also attested at Tauromenium in all but the most fragmentary of the financial inscriptions of later Hellenistic/Republican period (*IGSI 5-13* and Manganaro 1964: 42-52 and 53-68); in a bronze fragment of a financial document from Morgantina (*IGSI 14* = Manganaro 1999: 61 no. 47); and a single *tamia* is recorded in the Nakone inscription (*SEG 30.1119* = *IGDS I.206*).

<sup>143</sup> Granted, the restoration of line 6 of *SEG 31.825* ([-<sup>-5</sup>]ε καὶ συγκλήτου) is uncertain and several institutional alternatives are possible (see Battistoni 2010b: 114), the essential point stands.

<sup>144</sup> From Athens: *IG II<sup>2</sup>.1388 A.8* (390s BC): πα]ρέδοσαν ταμίαις τοῖς ἐπὶ Σονιάδο | [ἄρχοντος . . . 8 . . . ]; from Delos, *I.Délos 453* (174 BC), A.17: ἔθεσαν οἱ ταμίαι[ι οἱ] ἐπὶ Τελεσαρχίδου Παρμενίων καὶ Μνησις; from Nesos, *IG XII.2.645*, l. 45: Ἄ-|νάγραψαι δὲ τοῖς ταμίαις τοῖς μετ’ Ἡρα-|κλείτω . . .; from Cos, *IG XII.4.1.135* (c. 280 BC), l. 51: τοὺς δὲ | [ταμίαις τοὺς πε]ρὶ Εὐφάνην καὶ Μνησεάν δοῦναι. . .; from Naxos, *IG XII.5.35*, ll. 12-13: τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον παρ[α]σχῆν τοῦ[ς] ταμίαις(?) τοὺς | ἀμφὶ Δημύλον.

<sup>145</sup> E.g. the treasurers of Athena at Athens, *IG I<sup>2</sup>.232* (434/3 BC), ll. 4-5: . . . τοῖς ταμίαισιν ἡοῖς Κ[ράτες] | [Λαμπτρῆυς ἐγραμμ]άτευσε . . .; the treasurer of the Sarapiasts at Athens, *IG II<sup>2</sup>.1292* (mid-C3 BC), l. 2: [ἐπει]δὴ ὁ ταμίαις τῶν Σαραπιαστῶ[ν Ζώπυρος]; the treasurer of Rhamnous, *SEG 25.155* (236/5 BC), l. 42: τὸν ταμίαν τὸν Ῥαμουσιῶν; temple treasurers at Samos, *IG XII.6.1.261*, ll. 57-8: οἱ τα-|μίαι τῆς θεοῦ οἱ ἐπὶ Θεοκλέους ἄρχοντος.

<sup>146</sup> The specific formation can be paralleled from private associations named after their founders, but the use is different, e.g. Maiuri, *Nuova Silloge 40* (letters of C1 BC), l. 2: τιμαθέντος ὑπὸ Διοδορεῖων; *ibid.* 41, ll. 3-4:

variety of modes of qualification already noted makes clear the frequent desire and need to specify the particular category or identity of the financial officers being addressed in these texts, be it in order to specify the relevant financial period in question or to clarify the hierarchical relationship that applies; consequently the formulation here employed is readily comprehensible. The most obvious explanation is that the purpose of the qualification is to specify the *tamiai* in office under the current *prostatas*, named in A.7, viz. Diodoros son of Dazos. By itself, therefore, this phrase does not allow of certainty as to whether these are the city *tamiai* (as presumably those mentioned without qualification in *SEG* 31.825) or rather the *tamiai* of the *koinon* itself (which must be the more natural presumption within the formulation of this inscription), since the qualification need only be for the purposes of specifying the financial period in question (i.e. the period while Diodoros was in office), irrespective of whether the *prostatas* was that of the city or of the *koinon*.

Lastly in this discussion, we come to the voting formula at A. 32-34 (ψάφοι αἱ κελομένα εὐεργέταν εἴμειν Νεμήνιον Νεμηνίου Ὑγγ Δάφριν πέντε εἴκοσι ὀκτακόσια καὶ κωλύουσα οὐδεμία). The only Sicilian parallel for a record of voting comes from the Agrigentine decree on bronze for Diodotos of Syracuse, which simply records a unanimous vote.<sup>147</sup> Records of voting numbers in decrees of the Hellenistic period are widely attested.<sup>148</sup> The precise formulations vary from city to city; a near parallel for the Halaesa formulation can be observed in a second-century BC decree from Cos.<sup>149</sup> Gauthier has argued strongly that such vote records are suggestive of the widespread presence of quorum rules in civic institutions (although quorum figures themselves are only rarely attested), and in turn should be understood to signify continued strong levels of civic participation.<sup>150</sup>

---

τιμαθέντος ὑπὸ Ἀθαναῖστᾶν Λιν-|διαστᾶν Διοδώρ[εῖ]ων....; likewise, e.g., the naming of the *temenos* in honour of Diodoros Paspáros as the *Diodoreion* (*IGR* IV.292, l. 41); cf. Dubois 2013: 13 who emphasises the Rhodian parallels, recalling the Rhodian linguistic aspects already noted.

<sup>147</sup> *IG* XIV.952, l. 28: ὁμογνώμονες τοῦ συνεδρίου πάντες. Dubois (*IGDS* I.185 comm ad loc.) observes that the formulation ‘ne semble pas avoir de parallèle’; this may be true of the specific verbal construction, but not of the general idea, for which, e.g., *SEG* 12.373 (Amphipolis) and 375 (Aenus); discussion of statements of unanimity in Moretti 1967-68 (but cf. Gauthier 2011: 448-50).

<sup>148</sup> Examples collected in, e.g., Gauthier 2011 (esp. 435-48, c. 30 texts between C5 and C1 BC from across the Greek world); Rhodes and Lewis 1997: 510-12; Robert 1963: 304-7.

<sup>149</sup> Robert 1963: 305 (‘chaque cité préfère telle ou telle formule, que varie, par exemple à ...’); Robert cites the Cos example as unpublished at 305 n. 3, but see now *SEG* 41.680 (Halasarna), at lines 53-5: ψάφοι ταὶ κυροῦσαι τὰν γνώμαν τῶν ναποιαῶν | στερεαί · ν διακόσια τεσσαράκοντα ὀκτώ · ἐναντία | οὐδεμία *vacat*. Dubois 2013: 15 notes an Athenian parallel in *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1104, l. 45.

<sup>150</sup> Gauthier 2011: 448-54; cf. Gauthier 2000 on counting procedures.

While the format of the number has already been noted in consideration of the likely date of this text (§5.4), it is the size of the number, 825, which presents the final challenge to any attempt to what remains the most natural reading of this text as a decree of a somewhat exceptional *koinon* and not the city of Halaesa itself. As Manganaro has observed, such a figure is most easily understood as representative of the community as a whole, and the range assembled by Rhodes and Lewis is comparable: Athens (C1 BC) 3616 voters, but also 1051 and 1053; Colophon in decrees of C3/C2 BC, between 903 and 1342 votes; Ceramus 1045 votes (or 1095); Iasos, [8]58 and 841 in the assembly; Magnesia between 2133 and 4678; Theangela between 620 and 1000+. <sup>151</sup> At the same time, it is worth noting that no *koinon* for which the voting numbers are recorded offers a figure close to this magnitude (a small set in any case, and mostly supra-*polis koina*, such as that of Asia and that of Thessaly).

Although it is hardly proof of the proposition, the number can be shown to be compatible with likely population estimates for a *polis* such as Halaesa. Manganaro suggested that the figure implies a population for the *polis* of 5-6,000 (assuming a wife, 2.5 children, and 2.5 slaves per male citizen), excluding foreigners. Broadly similar estimates result from model-life tables: using one of the Coale-Demeny model life tables considered most applicable to the ancient Mediterranean (model West level 3, life expectancy at birth of 25), if the 825 were assumed to be all the adult males over 20, the minimum population across all ages would be c.3,881, not including slaves or non-citizens; if the voting group were limited to all adult males between 30 and 65, then the minimum population across all ages would be c. 4,547, not including slaves or non-citizens. <sup>152</sup>

However, against this move towards identification with the civic population is the apparently explicit application of the term ἱερεῦς to all 825 members of the *koinon* (the *halia* is explicitly that of the priests, A.22, just as *boule* is that of the sanctuary). If it is to be taken literally, this is not easily resolved, unless it is intended to be the identification of the *halia*, signifying only

---

<sup>151</sup> Manganaro 2009a: 28, comparing the example of Cos; Rhodes and Lewis 1997: 510-12.

<sup>152</sup> Manganaro 2009a: 28 (the reference to L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions publiques...*, in n. 61 is misleading, as the latter merely reports at p.160 a couple of earlier population estimates for Cos). My calculations follow Parkin 1992: 147, Table 9 (Coale-Demeny model West level 3 female), noting Parkin's comments on applicability of 'male'/'female' models (at 102-3) and on the problems of inferring the sex ratio for antiquity (at 98-9), for which I have erred on the side of conservatism by assuming a sex ratio of 100, and taking a life expectancy of 25 as a working average (cf. 84-5).

that under the control of the priests.<sup>153</sup> Manganaro suggested that all citizens were eligible to be elected for a year as priests of Apollo (or other cults in the city), and (I infer) that those having previously held such office then constitute the assembly referred to in the decree. If those elected annually numbered at least 30 (and so, hypothetically, constitute all the different priesthoods of the city), this model might just about generate a total of c.825, but it would of necessity be equivalent to more or less the entire adult male population. The Cyrene parallel which Manganaro cites, however, records the priesthood of a single cult and by itself does not generate anything like comparable numbers.<sup>154</sup> This hypothetical model requires that the ‘priests of Apollo’ in fact incorporate all priests, past and present, from all the cults of Halaesa, which goes well beyond anything otherwise implied by this text. Moreover, set against the likely size of the population of a *polis* like Halaesa (without doubt well below 10,000), this would further entail that every adult male at Halaesa would serve (for one year) as priest of one or other cult in the city’s territory. The model does not stand up to scrutiny.

Scibona instead suggested that the *koinon* could be made up of ‘un insieme di sacerdoti di vari *hierá* dislocati in un’area contigua alla città, sulla costa ed all’interno, facenti capo allo *hierón* alesino’. Scibona was motivated by the limited earlier evidence, principally from Timoleontic-period coinage, for a regional *symmachia* in this part of the island, which he believes finds a later echo in a pair of late Hellenistic inscriptions from Halaesa which record joint military activities on the part of several *poleis* in the immediate area, including Halaesa.<sup>155</sup> However, in the first place the presentation of individuals in the text is strongly against any sort of supra-polis, regional interpretation (presence of demotics, absence of ethnics); and in the second place, the mathematics are against such a construct, since it would require several hundred sanctuaries in the surrounding territory of Halaesa (or an abnormally large number of ‘priests’ from each sanctuary), as well as the assumption that the ‘priests of Apollo’ served as a catch-all title for a body that in fact united priests of all divinities from an undefined area. Even if one were to extend the *koinon* to the whole of Sicily, the maths are still difficult: assuming, as in the prescript of this text, a pair of priests for any one sanctuary, and assuming that the commonly accepted figure of c.65 *poleis* for Sicily in this period is

---

<sup>153</sup> Prof. Carmine Ampolo is currently studying an antiquarian report of an inscription noted with some scepticism by Kaibel in his comment to *IG XIV.367* (Haluntium) which, intriguingly, appears to refer to ἡ πόλις τῶν ἱερέων.

<sup>154</sup> Manganaro 2009a: 26, cf. Laronde 1987 (note the alternative interpretation of Tybout in *SEG 59.1100*).

<sup>155</sup> Scibona 2009a: 107; for the *symmachia*, see Scibona 2009a: 109-10 and esp. Facella 2006: 160-9 with earlier bibliography; for the inscriptions, *SEG 37.760* = Prag and Tigano 2018: no.8 and Scibona 2009a: 108 (brief mention, as yet unpublished).

correct, in order to achieve 825 voting priests, one would require the attendance of all the priests from over 400 sanctuaries, at a distribution in excess of 6 sanctuaries per city, from across the entire island, which is surely stretching the bounds of credibility (especially in the absence of any other evidence for such a substantial organisation).<sup>156</sup>

In considering the possibilities of a geographically larger *koinon*, it should be noted that there is a limited amount of Ciceronian evidence for the existence of a Sicilian provincial *koinon* at this date, and again at the time of Symmachus. Additionally, a new inscription from Solunto honouring a Roman magistrate (between c.84 and 75 BC) also attests to a *koinon* (the identification of which is lost).<sup>157</sup> It is, nonetheless very difficult to see how the Halaesa text could be assigned to such a body, both given its seemingly local frame of reference, and given its explicit framing, in contrast to any such provincial organisation, in religious terms.

While there is no good reason to deny the text's production in the environment of Halaesa, we are nonetheless left with the problem presented by the conflicting implications of this most unusual text. On the one hand, the institutional format of the decree is inherently civic (attested *koina* do not produce decrees with quite such complete institutional machinery as this, even if it is clear that *koina* do mimic familiar civic institutions);<sup>158</sup> the number of individuals involved, both in total and in the *boule*, is on a scale only matched by a *polis*; and the authority implied over use of public space (the basilica, assuming it is under civic control) appears to be that of the *polis*. On the other hand, there is absolutely no ambiguity in the basic formulation of the decree, which makes no mention whatsoever of the city, but only of the *koinon*: both *boule* and *halia* are individually and explicitly described as those of the *koinon*; the formula used to describe the *boule* seems to serve explicitly to distinguish it from any 'ordinary' *boule* of the city; and the honours decreed to what must be a fellow citizen are considerable, and, in the application of the title *euergetes* may be exceptional if emanating from the city itself. Other elements of the text are in themselves ambiguous and do not allow of easy resolution of the problem, such as the apparently triple eponym and the uniquely

---

<sup>156</sup> The recent suggestion by Attilio Mastrocinque that this text constitutes the earliest evidence for a sort of 'Internazionale apollinea', an empire-wide league of priests of Apollo, in which the 15 *symbouleutai* are the Halaesan representatives, with the other 810 voting members instead coming from across the empire is extremely far-fetched and without foundation (2014: 224-226; the partial translation on 224 is not without errors).

<sup>157</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.154 (cf. 114, 145, 168) refers to statues *a communi Siciliae data*; Symmachus, *Ep.* I.17 writes of a *Siciliae commune*: see Prag 2013a: 49 and especially F. Sartori 1981; for the Solunto inscription, Calascibetta and Di Leonardo 2012, with n.57 above.

<sup>158</sup> cf. most recently Gabrielsen 2009, esp. 181-183; also e.g. Aneziri 2003: 218-20.

identified *tamiai*. The fundamental stumbling block, nonetheless remains the numbers involved, and it is this, and the use of the apparently public space of the *basilica*, which underpins the analysis of Rolf Tybout in the extended commentary to *SEG* 59.1100 (written in part in response to an earlier draft of this paper). Acknowledging the absence of evidence for any sort of conflation of texts, Tybout reasonably suggests that a separate civic decree granting the association the right to erect a statue in the public space of the *basilica* should be assumed, and that it is this which is attested in the final voting record; he remains neutral on the question of whether the prescript should also be assumed to derive from such a civic decree.<sup>159</sup> On this reconstruction, he suggests that the association itself would have had a much smaller membership, perhaps in the range of 75-125.

This reconstruction is clearly plausible, but, on the grounds that the simple fact that something is without exact parallel is not itself a valid argument for rejection, I offer one alternative suggestion. We know that there was a significant, indeed seemingly preeminent, sanctuary of Apollo in the city of Halaesa. One might supplement that observation, as others have done in the past, by noting the existence both in archaeological examples and within the cadastral inscription, of a monogram which combines the letters *alpha*, *pi*, and *omicron*. This is found both on brick stamps from the agora and elsewhere on the site, and is attested as being in use as a boundary marker in parts of the city's *chora*. As with most monograms, multiple resolutions are possible; the three principal suggestions being: Πό(λις) Ἀ(λαισίνων), Ἀπό(λλωνος), or Ἀπο(λλωνίου).<sup>160</sup> The last of these, attribution to a private individual, is generally rejected (although perhaps only because it produces the least interesting result). Choice between the first two comes down on the one hand to subjective judgements about the relative significance of letters in the monogram (all agree that the tiny *omicron* surmounting the *pi* / *alpha* combination is least significant, but beyond that we are guessing); and on the other to a very similar set of problems to those presented by the Nemenios inscription – how plausible is it that bricks stamped with this monogram could be used in the construction of the agora, if the stamp indicates the sanctuary of Apollo? If the monogram is so interpreted, it also implies that at some point (prior to the erection of the cadastral inscription) areas of territory were marked out as property of the sanctuary; and that

---

<sup>159</sup> Dubois 2013: 16-17 (published more or less simultaneously with the *SEG* lemma) more briefly sketches a similar hypothesis.

<sup>160</sup> Summary in Facella 2006: 319, leaning in favour of the Apollo attribution; recent restatement of the civic attribution in Prestianni Giallombardo 2012: 185-6.

the sanctuary controlled a (perhaps the) brick-works in the area. In itself that is surely not impossible.

If, then, the sanctuary was also a major economic force within the city, might we not imagine a situation in which the sanctuary came to dominate the city more generally? This text would then mark a moment when the city and the sanctuary were parallel, perhaps even co-extensive entities (compare the tantalising reference to a ‘city of the priests’ noted by Carmine Ampolo in a lost inscription from the region, n.153 above). In such a scenario, all the citizens might be active participants in both city and *koinon*, meeting variously as one or the other (hence the specification of the *boule* as that of the *koinon*). Indeed, as Angelos Chaniotis has suggested, the citizens might even have ‘designated themselves as “priests of Apollo”, possibly because they had dedicated their city and territory to Apollo, just as the Teians did in the late 3rd cent. B.C., when they dedicated their city and its territory to Dionysos.’<sup>161</sup> Such dedications and declarations of *asylia* are not formally attested in Sicily, although Sicilian cities are attested recognising the claims of Cos and Magnesia-on-the-Maeander (see above §5.1); such a move to raise the status of the Halaesan sanctuary would hardly be inconceivable.<sup>162</sup> It is perhaps worth bearing in mind that the people of Halaesa sought assistance from the Roman Senate in 95 BC in resolving a dispute over *boule* membership, and received extensive *leges* from the Roman *praetor* assigned to arbitrate.<sup>163</sup> If the Halaesa cadaster itself is also first-century BC in date, then one might be tempted to link all of these texts, for example in a sequence beginning with the Nemenios text, passing to the dispute attested by Cicero, and then placing the cadaster within the context of reorganisation; but other reconstructions could be imagined just as easily. Without indulging in excessive speculation, the overall unusualness of the text (not itself unusual in Sicilian epigraphy) should be accepted, rather than used as an argument for its subversion, and we should remain open to other possibilities.

By way of conclusion, a final word is required on the questions posed at the outset regarding the unusual circumstances of the bronzes’ final resting place, placed side-by-side on the door of a building. There is no reason to assume that this marks their original location in antiquity.

---

<sup>161</sup> A.Chaniotis, *EBGR* 2010, in *Kernos* 26 (2013): no. 116.

<sup>162</sup> Rigsby 1996 on the wider practice of *asylia* (cf. 6 n.17 for Sicilian sanctuaries) and 20 n.73, after Robert, noting that dedications of the city and territory as a whole generally occur when the temple stands within the city.

<sup>163</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.122.

Indeed, the disjunction between their discovery and the instructions for display in two separate locations requires us to conclude either that the tablets were never distributed as originally intended, or else that their findspot marks a later stage in their history in antiquity. The possibility that the tablets were subsequently (re)united and redisplayed in the building in which they were found is compatible with the suggested epigraphic date of the earlier first century BC and the archaeological *terminus ante quem* for deposition of some time in the first century AD - as much as a century could have elapsed between original production and final deposition. The observation of Rocco Burgio that the elements of the door seem to show minimal use/wear might encourage this interpretation. One could reconstruct any number of hypothetical scenarios to account for this gap in time and space, and although I offer one such, it is intended purely *exempli gratia*: if the tablets were produced in Halaesa, and if the honorand Nemenios was himself resident in Halaesa, and if the publicly displayed copy was also displayed in the religious or civic space of Halaesa (sanctuary or basilica), and if all that took place in the first half of the first century BC; then, perhaps, in the context of the civic reorganisation of the period of the civil wars and Augustan reorganisation, when Halaesa became a Latin *municipium*, the public copy was taken down from its public location, and transferred to the honorand or his descendants; the final resting place could then be inferred to be the house of the honorand or his descendants, in which both copies of the decree were reunited, to be displayed side-by-side (in pride of place on a substantial door on the main floor of the house). Alternatively, the building was perhaps the headquarters of the *koinon* itself (recalling its location at a key point on the route from agora to acropolis), or even a workshop (the materials found in the *dolia*). Perhaps the greatest challenge to any reconstruction is to understand the nature of this building (further excavation is needed) and the reason why it was not rebuilt after its destruction in the first century, given its apparently prominent location and the fact that there is no other evidence for a violent episode in the city's life at this date, and the public areas of the city clearly flourished in the early Empire.

## Bibliography

### Abbreviations of epigraphic publications follow the consolidated list of *SEG*, except for the following:

- IGSI*: Arangio-Ruiz, V. and Olivieri, A. 1925. *Inscriptiones Graecae Siciliae et infimae Italiae ad ius pertinentes*. Milan.
- IGPalermo* = Manni Piraino, M. T. 1973. *Iscrizioni greche lapidarie del Museo di Palermo (Sikelika 6)*. Palermo.
- RPC I* = Burnett, A., M. Amandry, et al. 1992. *Roman Provincial Coinage. Volume I. From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius (44 BC-AD 69)*. London.

## Bibliography

- Ampolo, C. (ed.) 2001. *Da un'antica città di Sicilia. I decreti di Entella e Nakone*. Pisa.
- Ampolo, C. (ed.) 2012. *Agora greca e agorai di Sicilia*. Pisa.
- Ampolo, C. and D. Erdas. 2016. Notizia preliminare su due laminette plumbee con defixiones. In F. Spatafora (ed.), *Il Thesmophorion di Entella. Scavi in Contrada Petrarò, 295-297*. Pisa.
- Aneziri, S. 2003. *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte, Organisation und Wirkung der hellenistischen Technitenvereine*. Stuttgart.
- Antonetti, C. 1985. Sigle epigrafiche greche di Tauromenio. *Memorie dell'Istituto Veneto. Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti* 39(3): 7-67.
- Arena, E. 2016. Il decreto onorario tardoellenistico da Caronia (*SEG LIX*, 1102): per una nuova edizione, in F. Collura (ed.), *Studia Calactina I* (BAR International Series), Oxford, 347-368.
- Battistoni, F. 2010a. *Parenti dei Romani. Mito troiano e diplomazia*. Bari.
- Battistoni, F. 2010b. Note al nuovo decreto dall'area di Caronia. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 174: 113-117.
- Battistoni, F. 2012. *Eis ton epiphanestaton topon?* Collocazione di documenti nell'agora. In Ampolo 2012: 71-75.
- Bell, M. 1993. Observations on western Greek stoas. In R. T. Scott and A. R. Scott (eds), *Eius virtutis studiosi: classical and postclassical studies in memory of Frank Edward Brown (1908-1988)*. Washington. 327-341.
- Bell, M. 2007. Apronius in the agora: Sicilian civil architecture and the *lex Hieronica*. In J. R. W. Prag (ed.), *Sicilia nutrix plebis romanae: rhetoric, law, and taxation in Cicero's Verrines*. London. 117-134.
- Bell, M. 2010. Serra Orlando. In *Bibliografia Topografica della Colonizzazione Greca in Italia e nelle isole tirreniche*, vol. XVIII. Pisa. 724-51.
- Beltrán Lloris, F. 2010. El nacimiento de un tipo epigráfico provincial: Las tábulas de hospitalidad y patronato. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 175: 273-286.
- Bernabò Brea, L. 1956. *Akrai*. Catania.
- Berrendonner, C. 2007. Verrès, les cités, les statues, et l'argent. In J. Dubouloz and S. Pittia (eds.), *La Sicile de Cicéron, lectures des Verrines*. Besançon. 205-227.
- Biondi, L. 2001. La Lingua. In C. Ampolo (ed.), *Da un'antica città di Sicilia: i decreti di Entella e Nakone. Catalogo della Mostra*. Pisa. 81-88.
- Bivona, L. 1992-93. Considerazioni su euergetismo ed euergeti della Sicilia romana. *Scienze dell'antichità. Storia archeologia antropologia* 6-7: 105-110.
- Boffo, L. 1995. Ancora una volta sugli «archivi» nel mondo greco: conservazione e «pubblicazione» epigrafica. *Athenaeum* 83(1): 91-130.
- Bonanno, A. 2017. A friend in high places: Demetrios, son of Diodotos, the Syracusan. *Melita Classica* 4: 11-58.

- Bonanno, C. (ed.) 2008. *Apollonia. Indagini archeologiche sul Monte di San Fratello - Messina, 2003-2005*. Rome.
- Born, H. 2004. ... Auch die Bronzen waren bunt ... In V. Brinkmann and R. Wünsche (eds), *Bunte Götter. Die Farbigkeit antiker Skulptur*. Munich. 127-131.
- Bresson, A. 1997. De Marseille à Milet: lettres lunaires et associations culturelles. *REA* 99: 491-506.
- Bresson, A., Brun, P. and Varinlioglu, E. 2001. Les inscriptions grecques et latines. In P. Debord and E. Varinlioglu (eds.), *Les hautes terres de Carie*. Bordeaux. 81-305.
- Brugnone, A. 2005a. Divisione dello spazio e organizzazione del corpo civico. In P. Minà (ed.), *Urbanistica e architettura nella Sicilia greca*. Palermo. 11-14.
- Brugnone, A. 2005b. Considerazioni sui sistemi numerali greci in uso in Sicilia. In A. Spanò Giammellaro (ed.), *Atti del V Congresso Internazionali di Studi Fenici e Punici* (3 vols.). Palermo. II, 899-906.
- Buck, C. D. 1955. *The Greek Dialects. Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary*. Chicago.
- Burgio, A. 2008. *Il paesaggio agrario nella Sicilia ellenistico-romana. Alesa e il suo territorio*. Rome.
- Burgio, R. 2011. Contributo allo studio dei monumenti minori dell'Agorà di Alesa: Le esedre curve. In *Da Halaesa ad Agathyrnum. Studi in memoria di Giacomo Scibona*. Sant'Agata di Militello. 87-124.
- Burgio, R. (forthcoming). Alesa Arconidea: gli elementi in bronzo del portone della casa di Nemenios o casa dei *dolia*. In C. Scibona (ed.), *Studi in memoria di Giacomo Scibona*.
- Butz, P.A. 2007. Inscribed wreaths: the interaction between text and monument in two euergetic stelae from Delos. In M. Mayer i Olivé, G. Baratta, A. Guzmán Almagro (eds.), *Acta XII Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae*. Barcelona. I: 211-16.
- Calascibetta, A. M. G. and Di Leonardo, L. 2012. Un nuovo documento epigrafico da Solunto. In C. Ampolo (ed.), *Sicilia occidentale. Studi, rassegne, ricerche*. Pisa. 37-47.
- Calderone, S. 1961. Un nuovo frammento di I.G. XIV 352. *Kokalos*: 7: 124-36.
- Campagna, L. 2007. Architettura pubblica ed evergetismo nella Sicilia di età repubblicana. In C. Miccichè, S. Modeo and L. Santagati (eds), *La Sicilia romana tra Repubblica e Alto Impero*. Caltanissetta. 110-34.
- Carbè, A. 2008. The Coinage. In G. Scibona and G. Tigano (eds), *Alesa Archonidea. Guide to the Antiquarium*. Palermo. 58-61.
- Carettoni, G. 1961. Tusa (Messina). Scavi di Halaesa (seconda relazione). *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità* ser. 8, vol. 15: 266-321.
- Carroccio, B. 2008. Roma in Sicilia. I cambi tra valute: per una cronologia numismatica delle tavole di Tauromenio. *Minima Epigraphica et Papyrologica* 13: 29-43.
- Casson, S. 1935. Early Greek Inscriptions on Metal: Some Notes. *AJA* 39.4: 510-17.
- Clarysse, W. 1976. Notes on the use of the iota adscript in the third century B.C. *Chronique d'Égypte* 51: 150-166.
- Cordano, F. 1992. Note sui gruppi civici sicelioti. *Miscellanea Greca e Romana* 17: 135-144.
- Cordano, F. 1997. Considerazioni sull'uso greco del terzo nome in Sicilia. In *Atti seconde giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima (Gibellina 22-26 ottobre 1994)*. Pisa-Gibellina. I, 401-413.
- Cordano, F. 1999. Le istituzioni delle città greche di Sicilia nelle fonti epigrafiche. In M. I. Gulletta (ed.), *Sicilia epigraphica. Atti del convegno internazionale Erice 15-18 Ottobre 1998* (2 vols.). Pisa. I, 149-158.
- Coulton, J. J. 1976. *The Architectural Development of the Greek Stoa*. Oxford.

- Crema, F. 2007. Dalla collezione Nani al Museo archeologico di Venezia: un *chalkoma* corcirese di prossenia. In G. Cresci Marrone and A. Pistellato (eds), *Studi in ricordo di Fulviomario Brolio*. Padova. 237-63.
- Curtius, E. 1894 [1881]. Die Telamonen an der Erztafel von Anisa. *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*. Berlin. II, 271-85 (originally *Archäologische Zeitung* 39 (1881)).
- David, J.-M. 1983. Le tribunal dans le basilique: évolution fonctionnelle et symbolique de la République à l'Empire. In AA.VV. *Architecture et société de l'archaïsme grec à la fin de la république romaine (Rome 2-4 décembre 1980)* (CEFR 66). Rome. 219-241.
- De Hoz, J. 1999. Los metales inscritos en el mundo griego y periférico y los documentos celtibéricos en bronce. In F. Villar and F. Beltrán (eds), *Pueblos, lenguas y escrituras en la Hispania prerromana. Actas del VII Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas paleohispánicas, Zaragoza 1997*. Salamanca. 433-470.
- De Miro, E. and Fiorentini, G. 2010. *Agrigento romana. Gli edifici pubblici civili* (= Agrigento VI). Pisa, Rome.
- Des Courtils, J. 1981. Note de topographie Argienne. *BCH* 105: 607-10.
- Díaz, B. and Cimarosti, E. 2016. Las tábulas de hospitalidad y patronato. *Chiron* 46: 319-360.
- Di Stefano, C. A. 1984. *Lilibeo. Testimonianze archeologiche dal IV sec a.C. al V sec. d.C.* Palermo.
- Di Stefano, C. A. 2006. Lilibeo: contributo alla rilettura dell' *insula I*, in *Guerra e pace in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (VIII-III sec. a.C.)* (2 vols.), Pisa. II, 545-53.
- Di Veroli, P. 1996. Nuovi eponimi della Sicilia ellenistica. *ZPE* 110: 309-310.
- Dimartino, A. 2006. Per una revisione dei documenti epigrafici siracusani pertinenti al regno di Ierone II. In C. Michelini (ed.), *Guerra e pace in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (VIII-III sec. a.C.)*. *Arte, prassi e teoria della pace e della guerra*. Pisa. 2: 703-717.
- Dimartino, A. 2009. *Indagine paleografiche e prospettive storiche sulle iscrizioni greche di Sicilia (IV-I sec. a.C.)*. Tesi di perfezionamento, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Unpublished.
- Dimartino, A. 2010. *Venus Felix* a Siracusa? Per una rilettura dei decreti della *synodos* di *technitai* di Afrodite *Hilara*. *Epigraphica* 72: 21-49.
- Dubois, L. 2013. Une inscription sicilienne déconcertante. *REG* 126(1): 1-19.
- Dunant, C. and Pouilloux, J. 1957. *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*. II. *De 196 avant J.-C. jusqu'à la fin de l'Antiquité*. Paris.
- Eck, W. 2009. Epigraphische Texte auf Bronze aus dem Osten des Imperium Romanum. Zwei neue Inschriftenfragmente aus Sagalassos in Pisidien. In *Espacios, usos y formas de la epigrafía hispana en épocas antigua y tardoantigua : homenaje al Dr. Armin U. Stylow*. Mérida. 109-115.
- Eck, W. 2015: Documents on bronze: a phenomenon of the Roman West?. In J. Bodet and N. Dimitrova (eds), *Ancient Documents in their Contexts. First North American Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy(2011)*. Leiden. 127-151.
- Facella, A. 2006. *Alesa Arconidea: ricerche su un'antica città della Sicilia tirrenica*. Pisa.
- Ferrary, J.-L. 2009. La gravure de documents publics de la Rome républicaine et ses motivations. In R. Haensch (ed.), *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation*. Munich. 59-74.
- Fraschetti, A. 1981. Per una prospografia dello sfruttamento: romani e italici in Sicilia (212 - 44 a.C.). In A. Giardina and A. Schiavone (eds.), *Società romana e produzione schiavistica. L'Italia. Insediamenti e forme economiche*. Rome, Bari. 51-77.
- Fraser, P. 2009. *Greek Ethnic Terminology*. Oxford.
- Fraser, P. M. and Rönne, T. 1957. *Boeotian and West Greek Tombstones*. Lund.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2009. Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning: The Non-Public Associations of the Greek World. In I. Malkin, C. Constantakopoulou and K.

- Panagopoulou (eds), *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*. London. 176-203.
- Gaggiotti, M. 1985. Atrium Regium – basilica (Aemilia): una insospettata continuità storica e una chiave ideologica per la soluzione del problema dell'origine della basilica. *Analecta Romana* 14: 53-80.
- Garland, R. 1992. *Introducing New Gods. The Politics of Athenian Religion*. London.
- Gauthier, P. 1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*. Athens.
- Gauthier, P. 1996. Bienfaiteurs du gymnase au Létôon de Xanthos. *REG* 109: 1-34.
- Gauthier, P. 2000. “Juges des mains” dans les cités hellénistiques. In P. Flenstead-Jensen, T. Heine Nielsen, L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Polis and Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek history*. Copenhagen. 421-9.
- Gauthier, P. 2011. Quorum et participation civique dans les démocraties grecques. In *Études d'histoire et d'institutions grecques. Choix d'écrits* (édité et indexé par Denis Rousset). Geneva. 421-54.
- Geagan, D. J. 1967. *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla* (Hesperia Supplement XII). Princeton, NJ.
- Gentili, G. V. 1961. Nuovi elementi di epigrafia siracusana. *Archivio Storico Siracusano* 7: 5-25.
- Ghinati, F. 1964-65. Sacerdozi greci eponimi nella Sicilia romana. *Memorie Accademia Patavina. Scienze Morali, Lettere, Arti* 77: 331-355.
- Ghinatti, F. 2000. Le organizzazioni civiche siceliote. *Kokalos* 46(1): 31-73 (published 2004).
- Giangiulio, M. 1982. Di una particolarità dialettale rodia nei decreti da Entella e in altre iscrizioni di Sicilia e Magna Grecia. *Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa* ser. 3, vol. 12: 801-814.
- Gignac, F. T. 1981. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, II, Morphology*. Milan.
- Gorissen, P. 1978. Litterae lunatae. *Ancient Society* 9: 149-62.
- Gros, P. 1996. *L'architecture romaine au début du III<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. à la fin du Haut-Empire*, vol. 1, *Les monuments publics*. Paris.
- Gros, P. 2003. « Basilica » sous le Haut-Empire: ambiguïtés du mot, du type et de la fonction. *BABesch* 78: 191-204.
- Guarducci, M. 1942. Le iscrizioni greche di Venezia, *RIASA* 9: 7-53.
- Guarducci, M. 1967-78. *Epigrafia greca*, 4 vols. Rome.
- Haensch, R. 2009: Die Städte des griechischen Ostens. In R. Haensch (ed.), *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation: Die Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der Römischen Welt*. Munich. 173-187.
- Helly, B. 1973. *Gonnoi. II. Les inscriptions*. Amsterdam.
- Henry, A. S. 1983. *Honours and privileges in Athenian decrees : the principal formulae of Athenian honorary decrees*. Hildesheim.
- Horrocks, G. 2010. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn). Chichester and Malden, MA.
- Isler, H. P. 1994. Grabungen auf dem Monte Iato 1993. *Antike Kunst* 37: 31-42.
- Isler, H. P. 2012. L'agora ellenistica di Iaitas. In *Ampolo* 2012: 229-37.
- Jacquemin, A. 1999. *Offrandes monumentales à Delphes* (BEFAR 304). Athens.
- Jones, C. P. 2006. A letter of Hadrian to Naryka (Eastern Locris). *JRA* 19: 151-62.
- Jones, N. F. 1987. *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study*. Philadelphia.
- Knoepfler, D. 2001. *Eretria, fouilles et recherches. XI. Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté*. Lausanne.

- Knoepfler, D. 2006. L'inscription de Naryka (Locride) au Musée du Louvre. *REG* 119(1): 1-34.
- Knoepfler, D. and Pasquier, A. 2006. Un don des amis du Louvre au département des antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines: la lettre d'Hadrien aux gens de Naryka (Locride). *CRAI* 150(2): 1281-1313.
- Larfeld, W., 1902. *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik*. Leipzig.
- Laronde, A. 1987. Prêtres d'Apollon à Cyrène au I<sup>er</sup> siècle ap. J.-C. In A. Mastino (ed.), *L'Africa Romana. Atti del IV convegno di studio, Sassari, 12-14 dicembre 1986*. Sassari. II, 469-84.
- Le Guen, B. 2001. *Les associations de Technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique*. Nancy.
- Lombardo, M. 2002. La colonizzazione adriatica in età dionigiana. In N. Bonacasa, L. Braccresi and E. De Miro (eds), *La Sicilia dei due Dionisî*. Rome. 427-442.
- Loomis, W. T. 1994. Entella Tablets VI (254-241 BC) and VII (?C20th AD). *HSPH* 96: 127-160.
- Ma, J. 2000. *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford.
- Ma, J. 2007. Observations on honorific statues at Oropos. *ZPE* 160: 89-96.
- Mack, W.J.B.G., 2015. *Proxeny and Polis: Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*. Oxford.
- Manganaro, G. 1963. Tre tavole di bronzo con decreti di proxenia del Museo di Napoli e il problema dei proagori in Sicilia. *Kokalos* 9: 205-220.
- Manganaro, G. 1964. Iscrizioni latine e greche dal nuovo edificio termale di Taormina. *Cronache di archeologia e di storia dell'arte* 3: 38-68.
- Manganaro, G. 1980. La provincia Romana. In E. Gabba and G. Vallet (eds.), *La Sicilia antica*. Naples. II, ii, 415-461.
- Manganaro, G. 1988a. Le tavole finanziere di Tauromenion. In D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque: actes du colloque international d'épigraphique tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en l'honneur de J.Tréheux*. Neuchâtel. 155-190.
- Manganaro, G. 1988b. La Sicilia da Sesto Pompeo a Diocleziano. *ANRW* II.11.1: 3-89.
- Manganaro, G. 1997. Nuove tavolette di piombo iscritte siceliote. *PdP* 52: 306-348.
- Manganaro, G. 1999. *Sikelika: studi di anitichità e di epigrafia della Sicilia greca* (Biblioteca di QUCC 8). Pisa.
- Manganaro, G. 2000. L'impiego epigrafico di lamine e tavole di bronzo e di piombo nella Sicilia antica (greca e romana). In C. C. Mattusch, A. Brauer and S. E. Knudsen (eds), *From the Parts to the Whole. Vol. 1. Acta of the 13th International Bronze Congress, held at Cambridge, MA, May 28 - June 1, 1996*. *JRA Supp.* 39. Portsmouth RI: 272-275.
- Manganaro, G. 2002. Epiro "Adriatico" e Sicilia: colonizzazione timoleontea e monete. *Hesperia* 15: 113-122.
- Manganaro, G. 2005. Note storiche ed epigrafiche per la villa (praetorium) del Casale di Piazza Armerina. *Sicilia Antiqua* 2: 173-191.
- Manganaro, G. 2009a. Il paesaggio agrario di Halaesa Archonidea. *Epigraphica* 71: 9-28.
- Manganaro, G. 2009b. Un frammento iscritto erratico dall'area di Caronia (Kaleakté). *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 170: 87-98.
- Manganaro, G. 2010. Soprannomi nella Sicilia ellenistica osservazioni e aggiunte. In R. W. V. Catling and F. Marchand (eds), *Onomatologos. Studies in Greek Personal Names Presented to Elaine Matthews*. Oxford. 285-287.

- Manganaro, G. 2011. Il sistema anagrafico nella Sicilia in epoca ellenistica. In AA.VV. (ed.), *Da Halaesa ad Agathyrnum. Studi in memoria di Giacomo Scibona*. Sant'Agata di Militello. 33-68.
- Maniscalco, L. and B. E. McConnell. 2003. The sanctuary of the divine Palikoi (Rocchicella di Mineo, Sicily): fieldwork from 1995 to 2000. *American Journal of Archaeology* 107: 145-180.
- Manni Piraino, M. T. 1966. Quattro iscrizioni greche del museo di Palermo. *Kokalos* 12: 200-206.
- Marek, C. 1984. *Die Proxenie*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Masson, O. 1981. Noms et surnoms de Grecs de Sicile (Ciceron, Verrines, etc.). *Sileno*: 7-14 (repr. in *Onomastica graeca selecta* II, 379-86).
- Mastrocinque, A. 2014. I sacerdoti di Apollo e il culto imperiale. In G. Urso (ed.), *Sacerdos. Figure del sacro nella società romana*. Pisa. 223-238.
- McLean, B. H. 2002. *An introduction to Greek epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman periods from Alexander the Great down to the reign of Constantine (323 B.C.-A.D. 337)*. Ann Arbor.
- Mela, P., Preka, K. and Strauch, D. 1998. Die Grabstelen vom Grundstück Andrioti auf Korkyra. *AA* 1998: 281-303.
- Mimbrera, S. 2012. *Fonética y morfología del Dorio de Sicilia (siglos VII-I a.C.)* (Manuales y Anejos de "Emerita" 52). Madrid.
- Mitchell, S. 2005. The Treaty between Rome and Lycia of 46 BC (MS 2070). In R. Pintaudi (ed.), *Papyri graecae Schøyen*. Florence. 165-258.
- Moretti, L. 1967-68. Sui rapporti fra cittadino e polis nell'età ellenistica. *Cultura e Scuola* 23: 53-63.
- Nachmanson, E. 1911. Zu den Motivformeln der griechischen Ehreninschriften. *Eranos* 11: 180-96.
- Nenci, G. 1995. Il sistema numerale acrofonico pseudoascendente nella Sicilia greca. *ASNP* ser. 3, 25: 1-5.
- Nenci, G. 1996. Pluralismo e interferenze grafiche nella Sicilia occidentale greca e romana. *Scrittura e civiltà* 20: 7-19.
- Nenci, G. 1997. Novità epigrafiche dall'area elima. In *Seconde Giornate Internazionali di studi sull'area elima (Gibellina, 22-26 ottobre 1994)*. Atti (3 vols.). Pisa. III, 1187-1202.
- Papapostolou, J. A. 1993. *Achaean Grave Stela*. Athens.
- Parkin, T. G. 1992. *Demography and Roman Society*. Baltimore.
- Pocchetti, P. 1999. Il metallo come supporto di iscrizioni nell'Italia antica: aree, lingue e tipologia testuale. In F. Villar and F. Beltrán (eds.), *Pueblos, lenguas y escrituras en la Hispania prerromana. Actas del VII Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas paleohispánicas, Zaragoza 1997*. Salamanca. 545-61.
- Portale, E. C. 2006. Problemi dell'archeologia della Sicilia ellenistico-romana: il caso di Solunto. *Archeologia Classica* 57: 49-114.
- Prag, J. R. W. 2007. Roman Magistrates in Sicily, 227-49 BC. In J. Dubouloz and S. Pittia (eds), *La Sicile de Cicéron, Lectures des Verrines*. Besançon. 287-310.
- Prag, J. R. W. 2012. Provincials, patrons, and the rhetoric of *repetundae*. In C. E. W. Steel and H. van der Blom (eds), *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*. Oxford. 267-283.
- Prag, J. R. W. 2013a. Sicilian Identity in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods: Epigraphic Considerations. In P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas (eds), *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis. Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*. Oxford. 37-53.

- Prag, J. R. W. 2014. Bronze *rostra* from the Egadi Islands off NW Sicily: the Latin inscriptions. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 27: 33-59.
- Prag, J. R. W. 2017. Un unpublished funerary inscription with bichrome painted relief lettering from Hellenistic Syracuse (I.Sicily 3387). *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 203: 119-130.
- Prag, J. R.W. and Tigano, G. 2018. *Alesa Arconidea: il lapidarium*. Palermo.
- Prestianni Giallombardo, A. M. 1999. Le Tabulae Halaesinae: alcuni aspetti grafici e linguistici. In M. I. Gulletta (ed.), *Sicilia Epigraphica* (2 vols.). Pisa. II, 449-463.
- Prestianni Giallombardo, A. M. 2003. Divinità e culti in Halaesa Archonidea: tra identità etnica ed interazione culturale. In A. Corretti (ed.), *Quarte Giornate Internazionali di studi sull'area elima (Erice, 1-4 dicembre 2000)*. Atti. Pisa. III, 1059-1103.
- Prestianni Giallombardo, A. M. 2012. Spazio pubblico e memoria civica. Le epigrafi dall'agora di Alesa. In C. Ampolo (ed.), *Agora greca e agorai di Sicilia*. Pisa. 171-200.
- Prestianni Giallombardo, A. M. and A. Facella. 2012. s.v. 'Tusa'. In G. Nenci and G. Vallet (eds), *Bibliografia Topografica della colonizzazione greca in Italia e nelle isole tirreniche XXI*. Pisa. 251-311.
- Reichel, W. and Wilhelm, A. 1901. Das Heligthum der Artemis zu Lusoi. *Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 4: 1-89.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1972. *The Athenian Boule*. Oxford.
- Rhodes, P. J. with Lewis, D. M. 1997. *The Decrees of the Greek City States*. Oxford.
- Rigsby, K.J., 1996. *Asylia : territorial inviolability in the Hellenistic world*, Berkeley, London.
- Ritti, T. 1969. Sigle ed emblemi sui decreti onorari greci. *Memorie (Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche)*, ser. 8, v. 14, fasc. 5, 257-360 (*Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei*, anno 366).
- Robert, J. and Robert, L. 1983. *Fouilles d'Amymon en Carie. Tome I. Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions*. Paris.
- Robert, L. 1936. *Collection Froehner I. Les inscriptions grecques*. Paris.
- Robert, L. 1963. *Noms indigènes dan l'Asie-mineure gréco-romaine. Première partie*. Paris.
- Robert, L. 1965. *Hellenica XIII*. Paris.
- Russell, A. 2015. Domestic and civic basilicas: between public and private space. In K. Tuori and L. Nissin (eds.), *Public and Private in the Roman House and Society* (JRA Suppl. 102). Portsmouth, RI. 49-61.
- Sartori, F. 1981. Il commune Siciliae nel tardo impero. *Klio* 63: 401-409.
- Sartori, A. 1992. Tecniche di scrittura sulle tabelle bronzee di Locri. In F. Costabile (ed.), *Polis ed Olympieion a Locri Epizefiri*. Catanzaro. 91-97.
- Schwyzler, E. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik*. Munich.
- Scibona, G. 1971. Epigraphica Halaesina I. *Kokalos* 17: 3-20.
- Scibona, G. 2008. Le epigrafi. In G. Scibona and G. Tigano (eds.), *Alesa Archonidea. Guida all'antiquarium*. Palermo. 25-7.
- Scibona, G. 2009a. Decreto sacerdotale per il conferimento della *euerghesia* a *Nemenios* in *Halaesa*. In G. Scibona and G. Tigano (eds), *Alaisa-Halaesa. Scavi e ricerche (1970-2007)*. Messina. 97-112.
- Scibona, G. 2009b. L'Agorà (scavi 1970-2004). In G. Scibona and G. Tigano (eds), *Alaisa-Halaesa. Scavi e ricerche (1970-2007)*. Messina. 9-43.
- Scibona, G. and Tigano, G. (eds). 2009. *Alaisa-Halaesa. Scavi e ricerche (1970-2007)*. Messina.
- Sherk, R. 1993. The eponymous officials of Greek cities V: the register. *ZPE* 96: 267-295.
- Sicca, U. 1924. *Grammatica delle iscrizioni doriche della Sicilia*. Arpino.

- Sjöqvist, E. 1964. Excavations at Morgantina (Serra Orlando) 1963. Preliminary Report VIII. *AJA* 68: 137-47.
- Strauch, D. 1997. Aus der Arbeit am Inschriften-Corpus der Ionischen Inseln: *IG IX 1<sup>2</sup>*, 4. *Chiron* 27: 211-254.
- Stroud, R. S. 1963. A Fragment of an inscribed bronze stele from Athens. *Hesperia* 32: 138-43.
- Tanner, J. 2000. Portraits, Power, and Patronage in the late Roman Republic. *Journal of Roman Studies* 90: 18-50.
- Tozzi, G. 2012. IV.5. Un decreto onorario. In R. Friggeri, M. G. Granino Cecere and G. L. Gregori (eds.), *Terme di Diocleziano: la collezione epigrafica*. Rome: Electa: 206.
- Tribulato, O. (ed.) 2012. *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily*. Cambridge.
- Tusa, V. 1963. L'anfipolia a Solunto. *Kokalos* 9: 185-194.
- Vento, M. 2000. *Le stele dipinte di Lilibeo*. Marsala.
- Vera, D. 1996. Augusto, Plinio il Vecchio e la Sicilia in età imperiale. A proposito di recenti scoperte epigrafiche e archeologiche ad Agrigento. *Kokalos* 42: 31-58.
- Walthall, D. A. 2011. Magistrate stamps on grain measures in early Hellenistic Sicily. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 179: 159-169.
- Welch, K. 2003. A new view of the origins of the Basilica: the Atrium Regium, Graecostasis, and Roman diplomacy. *JRA* 16: 5-34.
- Wilhelm, A. 1909. *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*. Vienna.
- Willi, A. 2008. *Sikelismos : Sprache, Literatur und Gesellschaft im griechischen Sizilien (8.-5. Jh. v. Chr.)*. Basel.
- Williamson, C. 1987. Monuments of Bronze: Roman Legal Documents on Bronze Tablets. *Classical Antiquity* 6: 160-183.
- Wilson, R. J. A. 1990. *Sicily under the Roman Empire: the archaeology of a Roman province, 36 B.C. - A.D. 535*. Warminster.
- Wilson, R.J.A. 2005. On the origin of the Roman civic basilica: the Egyptian connection. In S. T. A. M. Mols and E. M. Moorman (eds), *Omni pede stare, saggi architettonici e circumvesuviani in memoriam Jos de Waele*. Naples. 128-139.
- Wolf, M. 2003. *Die Häuser von Solunt und die hellenistische Wohnarchitektur*. Mainz am Rhein.
- Zevi, F. 1991. *L'Atrium Regium*. *Archeologia Classica* 43: 475-87.

**List of illustrations:**

Figs. 3-6 and 13 are provided by the Soprintendenza BB. CC. AA. di Messina; Figs. 1-2, 7-12 are taken by the author, with the kind permission of the Soprintendenza BB. CC. AA. di Messina and the Museo Regionale delle Tradizioni Silvo Pastorali di Mistretta.

Figure 1: frontal view of Tablet A.

Figure 2: frontal view of Tablet B.

Figure 3: drawing of Tablet A (Badali).

Figure 4: drawing of Tablet B (Badali).

Figure 5: drawing of reverse of Tablet A (Badali).

Figure 6: drawing of reverse of Tablet B (Badali).

Figure 7: detail of the main text of Tablet A.

Figure 8: detail of the main text of Tablet B.

Figure 9: detail of lines 1-7 and the wreath on Tablet A.

Figure 10: detail of lines 1-7 and the wreath on Tablet B.

Figure 11: detail of bottom left of A, with traces of letters in previous use.

Figure 12: detail of bottom right of A, including Nemenios YSG and letter forms.

Figure 13: plan of the urban area of Halaesa. The findspot of the tablets is marked by the red circle.