

# Further Notes on *IG* xiv 268 and Other Tufa Inscriptions from Selinus

*William M. Calder III*

## I. Introduction

ON AUGUST 27–29, 1963, because of the generous coöperation of the Superintendent of Antiquities for the Provinces of Palermo and Trapani, Dr Vincenzo Tusa, the author was able to inspect at the Museo Archeologico in Palermo the famous inscription from Temple G at Selinus, *IG* xiv 268, and of the tufa inscriptions from Gàggera, Gàbrici nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, and 11. The new funerary inscription,<sup>1</sup> which may conveniently be called “the shield inscription,” and the remarkable Herakles dedication from Poggioreale,<sup>2</sup> allegedly Selinuntine, were also examined. It was not possible to locate the tufa inscriptions, Gàbrici nos. 5, 6, 7, and 10. None of the lead inscriptions edited by Gàbrici (nos. 12–21) could be found; nor the two (including the *Great Defixio*) more recently edited by Ferri.<sup>3</sup> All these have been either lost or misplaced. On 1–2 September 1963 the original site of *IG* xiv 268, Temple G at Selinus, was visited and efforts made to specify the position of the stone. The purpose of this paper is to amplify and where necessary to correct the description of the stone and site and the epigraphical commentary presented in my edition of the inscription.<sup>4</sup> Some further additions and corrections to the monograph, my own and those drawn to my attention by other scholars, will be recorded. Finally an appendix contains several corrective remarks on the tufa inscriptions, Gàbrici nos. 1, 2,

<sup>1</sup> J. Bovio Marconi, “Epigrafe Funeraria Selinuntina,” *ΚΩΚΑΛΟΣ* 7 (1961) 109–112 with plate; noted with the text reprinted by L. and J. Robert, *REG* 76 (1963) 192 No. 322. See further my “A New Verse Inscription from Selinus,” *AJA* forthcoming.

<sup>2</sup> M. T. Piraino, “Iscrizione inedita da Poggioreale,” *ΚΩΚΑΛΟΣ* 5 (1959) 159ff. See further M. Guarducci, *Annuario* 37–38 (1959–1960) 272ff and V. Tusa, *ΚΩΚΑΛΟΣ* 8 (1962) 158.

<sup>3</sup> S. Ferri, “Nuova ‘defixio’ greca dalla Gàggera,” *Notizie degli Scavi* 5–6 (1944–45) 168–174. See further my “The Great Defixio from Selinus,” *Philologus* 107 (1963) 163–172.

<sup>4</sup> William M. Calder III, *The Inscription from Temple G at Selinus* [Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monographs 4] (Durham, N.C. 1963), henceforth cited: GRBM 4. For other authors the abbreviations at GRBM 4 pp. 5–7 are followed.

4, 8, and 11.<sup>5</sup> This was thought useful because no scholar since Gàbrici has examined the stones.

## II. Examination of the Stone

### *Physical Description and Measurements*

The stone was described (GRBM 4 p. 3) as “lightish grey.” It is so only when weathered or soiled. The natural color of the clean tufa is reddish-brown, a sand color.<sup>6</sup> The stone crumbles rather easily. Autopsy confirms the suggestion (GRBM 4 p. 14) that handling could have caused loss of stone, especially at joins and edges, since 1871.

The eight preserved fragments have been set into concrete and their spacing is sometimes misleading. The large right fragment especially should be more to the left. One should recall that nowhere is the width of the stone complete. Therefore, an exact measurement of the width is impossible. The following measurements are meant to correct those of O. Benndorf (*Metopen* p. 27), followed by Hulot-Fougères (p. 101), Santangelo-Railsback (p. 31 n.1) and GRBM 4 p. 3. The width from end to end of the block at its widest point is 1.39m (Benndorf: 1.40m). The discrepancy is due probably to a new mounting. The width of the inscribed surface (*sc.* margin to margin) is 1.075m. The left frame is slightly wider (*ca* 2cm) than the right. The height of the inscription, when one measures the large right fragment where the stone is preserved from top to bottom, is 0.435m (Benndorf: 0.43).<sup>7</sup> Its thickness varies. The large right fragment, the thickest piece, is .285m; the left and thinnest fragment is .235m. Benndorf provides one measurement for the thickness, 0.60m. This is over twice the actual size of the thickest piece. It was followed by Hulot-Fougères and Santangelo-Railsback, who are now proven not to have independently measured the stone. The source of Benndorf’s error is obscure. Probably he based his measurement on supposedly similar and more fully preserved blocks in the adyton wall. This is dangerous. The dimensions of blocks there today are by no means uniform. Less probably a piece from the back of the block was available in 1871 and the original

<sup>5</sup> The standard edition of these inscriptions is that of E. Gàbrici, *Monumenti Antichi* 32 (1927) 379–384. They are henceforth cited Gàbrici with inscription number.

<sup>6</sup> The recent description of the stone by Bovio Marconi, *op.cit.* (n.1 *supra*) 111 as “una iscrizione ufficiale su marmo” is wrong.

<sup>7</sup> G. Ugdulena, *Rivista Sicula* 6 (1871) 201 measured the height of the stone 0.435m. His measurement for the width is 1.40m. He provides no measurement for the thickness.

thickness could be determined. This is highly dubious as no more than eight pieces are ever mentioned by the editors. The right end of the stone is not rounded. This is an illusion of the photograph (GRBM 4, plate 1). Even unpainted the elegant letters are easily legible at twenty feet. Cuttings are as deep as 2.5 cm. The left margin is deeper than the right. With the exception of *theta* in line 6, all *thetas* are clearly cross-barred.

*Epigraphical Commentary* (see GRBM 4 pp. 10ff)

LINE 1: There is no trace of the third sigma on the stone. The origin of Ugdulena's NIKOM becomes clear. He mistook the grain of the stone for a stroke. The left transversal of the *tau* is clear but there is no trace of the vertical. The stem of *tau* in TOI is preserved and the break allows the transversal but there has been loss of stone since the squeeze. The right leg of *lambda* is on the stone and secures the letter. The subsequent *nu* is certain. Final *nu* is as reported on the squeeze.

LINE 2: The *omicron* should not be dotted. There is no trace of a cross-bar.

LINE 3: The first *delta* is very damaged. The left lower corner of the letter alone is certain. There is no trace of the start of the top stroke which has either been covered by cement or lost since the squeeze. The break gives the wedge for *kappa* of the first KAI but loss of stone makes the letter uncertain today. Any trace of cross-bar for the following *alpha* has been obliterated. For final *pi* the stone is not so certain as the squeeze but a trace of the horizontal exists.

LINE 4: For the first *alpha* add to S. Dow's observation that the tip of the left leg is visible on the top of the lower fragment. On the odd problem of  $\Delta$ AP autopsy convinces me that *delta* is right. The mark that resembles (photograph and squeeze) the left of a *tau*'s horizontal is indubitably a later gouge, not made by the chisel that did the original lettering. It is deeper and narrower than the original cuttings.

LINE 5: It is not true that the first strokes of lines 5, 7, and 10 are noticeably more lightly inscribed than other letters but is an illusion of the photograph. Of the next *alpha*, the second letter in the line, only the bottom third of the first stroke is on the stone. The *iota*, first reported at GRBM 4 p. 12, is certain on the stone. Of the *alpha* of MAA only the right stroke is discernible. The cross-bar of the final *alpha* is obliterated by a gouge on the stone. Its sides and top are certain. The

final *sigma* and (as Roehl) the base of the subsequent *iota* are certain. There is no trace of final *kappa*.

LINE 6: *Alpha* of the first KAI is certain on the stone. Of the dubious *tau* only the right tip of the horizontal is visible. Cement obliterates the stem. A gouge has obliterated all traces of the next delta and today it is better printed in brackets than dotted.

LINE 7: The left base of the second *alpha* is discernible on the stone. There is no doubt about *delta* of ΔΕ. Ugdulena's *rho* must be printed as a restoration. The stone is badly gouged and no certain trace of the letter remains.

LINE 8: Examination of spacing convinces me that Ugdulena's restored *iota* is right. Of the *nu* in ONVMATA cement has covered the break and one can no longer distinguish the cross-stroke.

LINE 9: *Psi* and *nu* are exactly as reported from the squeeze. A trace of the base of Ugdulena's restored *tau*<sup>8</sup> is visible and one may read σ]τὸ.

LINE 10: The top of the second *alpha* has apparently been covered by cement. The following *nu* is as reported but at GRBM 4 p. 13 line 32 for "right leg" read "left leg" and at line 37 for "cross-strokes" read "cross-stroke."

LINE 11: In regard to the vexed third letter, although the stone has been gouged, the top of *epsilon* and the beginning of the perpendicular are certain. The letter should be dotted and not bracketed; and so was published correctly at GRBM 4 p. 15. Of the fourth letter the top of the first stroke and a trace of the second confirm *kappa*. I can specify no certain traces of the first *alpha* of AAA on the stone. The break is compatible with the base of the first *epsilon* of EMEN. *Mu* is certain.

### III. The Site

At the site Benndorf's classic report (*Metopen* p. 27: see GRBM 4 p. 3) becomes dogmatic and ambiguous. There are two reasons for this. First, the inscription is said to have come from the fourth row of blocks to the left of the entrance to the adyton. The facing of the blocks on the third and fourth rows, however, is not smooth and the wall has been clumsily reconstructed. Probably only the first and second levels are original. Second, Benndorf reports that the inscription was set "in einer Höhe von 2.40m. vom Fussboden." Hulot-Fougères simply

<sup>8</sup> It ought to have been noted at GRBM 4 p. 17 line 11 that *tau* had been restored by Ugdulena.

translate “à 2.40m. du sol.” Benndorf nowhere reveals that the entrance to the adyton is raised from the floor of the temple by two great steps. The first is .45m high; the second .24 m. The width of the second step from its front to the wall of the adyton is .74m. Benndorf’s “Fussboden” could be either the true floor of the temple or the top of the second step where one would stand and read the inscribed block. He observes that the block belonged “zur vierten Steinlage.” Again an ambiguity. Is it the fourth level of stones from the top step? Or are the two layers of stones that make the two steps included and so the “fourth” layer really means the “second” layer from the top of the second step? Most easily Benndorf has mixed two “Fussboden.” In specifying the fourth layer of stones he omits the two layers that make up the steps but in calculating the height of the inscription he includes the combined height of the two steps and the wall. The base of the present (obviously reconstructed) block that makes the fourth level in the restored adyton wall is 1.77m above the top step. By adding this to the combined heights of the two steps (.45m and .24m) one has 2.46m. Benndorf’s measurement was 2.40m. That the measurements of the block(s) one now finds at the fourth level from the step do not coincide with the measurements of what remains of the inscribed block in Palermo is irrelevant. No parts of the inscribed stone are discernible at the site; and the third and fourth levels of the adyton wall have been crudely reconstructed with chance blocks that never belonged there.

Therefore, the inscription was originally 1.77m above where one could easily stand to read it, *sc.* at eye-level of a tall Greek (correct GRBM 4 pp. 51–52). A sizeable votive could still be attached below the inscription; but one hesitates. The width of the top step from front to wall is merely .74m and a bulky votive would crowd a reader. It is more probable that the costly gold votive was installed above the inscription.<sup>9</sup> Compare the gold shields from Plataea in the architraves of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi (Paus. 10.19.4) and the gold shield of Hasdrubal “*supra fores Capitolinae aedis*” (Pliny, *HN* 35.14). There would be ample room. The columns of Temple G were over forty-eight feet high. The walls of the adyton, naturally, may have been considerably lower. Certainty on the matter is not attainable. Finally it is salutary to recall that today there is no way of knowing why Benndorf (or perhaps earlier Cavallari) specified the *fourth* level, rather

<sup>9</sup> This had earlier been suggested to me by Professor Homer A. Thompson.

than the third or fifth; for apparently only two levels survived intact. Therefore, we have simply explained Benndorf's 2.40m whatever the figure may be worth.

#### IV. The Shield Inscription

The recently discovered Selinuntine funerary inscription,<sup>10</sup> dating to the second half of the fifth century and found *ca* 800m NNW of the sanctuary of Malophoros, is relevant in two ways to the study of IG XIV 268. Excluding the elegiac couplet preserved at Plu. *Mor.* 217F, the text provides the third bit of extant Selinuntine lapidary verse. It is a lame iambic trimeter and deserves citation at GRBM 4 p. 22. One may also notice the sculptured shield that has been put below the soldier's epitaph. It proves that the Selinuntines shared the tradition of using a shield as a military memorial. This strengthens the argument (GRBM 4 pp. 45–49) that the 60-talent gold votive of IG XIV 268, commemorating a military victory, may have been in the form of a gold shield.

#### V. Corrections and Additions to GRBM 4

Attention may be drawn to the following details in GRBM 4 (numbers refer to page and line of the monograph).<sup>11</sup> 3.16: for "lightish grey" r. "reddish brown," 6.25: r. "1924". 13.23: for "right" r. "left." 13.37: r. "cross-stroke." 21.26ff: It may be relevant to compare the archaic Europa relief from Selinus with Stesichorus frg. 195 PMG, on which see W. Bühler, "Die Europa des Moschos," *Hermes Einzelschriften* 13 (1960) 18. 22.23: SIG<sup>3</sup> 11 may possibly be early fifth rather than sixth century; see M. Guarducci, *Annuario* 37–38 (1959–60) 255 n.5. 22.26: Kirchhoff's discovery was first made at *SBBerl* (1887) 708 n.1. 22.30: Add references to the new shield inscription (see n.1 *supra*). 26.19–20: for "Präsentformen" r. "Präsenformen." 28.4–5: for "die Selinuntier" r. "dass . . . die Selinuntier." 29.1ff: Add a reference to the new Herakles dedication from Poggioreale; see n.2 *supra*. 41.8: for "Das" r. "Dass." 42.19: for "possible" r. "probable." 42.24ff: Attention should be drawn to genitive song-titles; D. M. Lewis cites Ar. *Vesp.* 1225, *Lys.* 1237, and Men. *Dys.* 433. For ellipsis of μέλος before a genitive, A. L. Boegehold compares Ar. *Vesp.* 269 with Starkie's note. 42.28: r.

<sup>10</sup> See n.1 *supra*.

<sup>11</sup> For the following I am especially indebted to Professors A. L. Boegehold (Brown University), G. Highet (Columbia University), G. N. Knauer (Freie Universität, Berlin), and D. M. Lewis (Christ Church).

“Pi. N. 2.1.” 43.10ff: The late Professor Joshua Whatmough discusses nominatives absolute in Greek at *CP* 59 (1964) 111–112, where, however, the Thucydides passage is not relevant. There are further examples collected by P. Groeneboom on *A. PV* 200–202 (p. 132). 56 n.17: Explicit reference may now be made to *Philologus* 107 (1963) 163ff. 61.16ff: For the sum of two mnai per man D. M. Lewis notices the fine (not a ransom) imposed on the Lacedaemonians by the Eleans in 420 B.C. at Th. 5.49.1.

## APPENDIX

### Gàbrici Numbers 1, 2, 4, 8 and 11

The following notes are intended to supplement Gàbrici’s standard edition of the tufa inscriptions from Gàggera (see n.5 *supra*). Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, and 11 were located and studied at Palermo in August 1963. No. 3 will be discussed at greater length elsewhere.

GÀBRICI 1 (= *IG* XIV 270; Collitz-Bechtel 2048): The inscription is on the stuccoed surface of a tufa pillar-base that was found in 1874. Much of this surface has flaked off, apparently even since Gàbrici’s time. Because the inscription is shallow and rarely penetrates through the stucco to the tufa beneath, where the stucco has flaked off it is impossible to determine the original lettering, even after moistening the stone. Only the following letters are legible.

1. Ζ . ΑΣΗΟ.ΕΝΟΝΟΣ
2. ΤΕΛΟΙΤΑΙΗΕΚΑΤΑΙ
3. Α . . . . . Ε

There is no trace of the first *epsilon* reported by Gàbrici as the second letter of line 1 nor of his *kappa* in line 3. On the crucial problem of the first letter of line 2 (*gamma* or *tau*) conviction is impossible. One can no longer determine whether the left of the transversal is part of an original letter or a flaw in the stone. If a flaw, it is exceptionally prominent and fortuitously located. On the other hand, if it is the left of *tau*’s transversal, it is less than half the length of the right of the transversal and has an odd curvature at its end. The ruling factor should be that a *gamma* would mean Γ and not the normal epichoric ζ and would become the sole Selinuntine example of this form. For this reason I

incline to *tau* (cf. A. frg. 387N<sup>2</sup>), but traces on the stucco are not determinative.

Miss Jeffery's remark (*Local Scripts*, p. 271; cf. p. 277 apparently after M. Guarducci, *La Parola del Passato* 8 [1953] 209–211) that this inscription is a dedication “by an Arkadian Alexeas son of Xenon to Hekate” is thoroughly tendentious and must have been written without examination of the stone. There is no trace of any ethnic and both “Alexeas” and “Xenon” are at best simply probable restorations.

GÀBRICI 2 (= Collitz-Bechtel 5213; Roehl<sup>3</sup> 56.14; Schwyzer 167.1): Of particular note is the sloppiness of *thetas*, *omicrons*, and *phis*. Miss Jeffery's *rho* 2 (*Local Scripts*, p. 262) is used throughout. There is reluctance to break a word between lines. ΜΑΛ could fit into line 2 but instead is carried to line 3 so that *Μαλοφόρωι* can fall on one line. In line 1 Roehl<sup>3</sup> is more accurate than Gàbrici. For the second letter there are distinct traces of the base of *epsilon*, which should be read but dotted. In vexed line 4, Gàbrici reads EVΡΑΗ. Stemless *upsilon* is correct (Roehl<sup>3</sup> could mislead). Dotted epichoric *chi* is easier than Gàbrici's *rho*. The traces are nearer +. The letter is not as large as earlier *rhos*. The loop so-called would be too small and the second leg too near the perpendicular. On close inspection the apparent loop appears as a flaw in the surface of the stone rather than part of the original lettering. The *nu* is not backwards as oddly printed by Gàbrici. In short, read εὐχάν. Although part of the final *alpha* (line 4) is lost, the left base, top and right side are clear; and the start of the right of the cross-bar insures the letter, which need not be dotted. Salinas' restored [*γει*], must be rejected on spatial grounds.

GÀBRICI 4 (= Jeffery, *Local Scripts*, p. 271): In this early *boustrophedon* votive, notice particularly wedgeless *kappa*, stemless *upsilon*, retention of *qoppa*, and the itacism ΜΙΑ. Gàbrici's *gamma* is highly dubious. I doubt if it is a letter at all, and there is not the slightest reason to believe that it is an abbreviation for the patronymic. The text is simply: *Λυκίσqō ἐμὶ Μιλίχιος*.

GÀBRICI 8: The printed text is accurate (simply AINEA<sub>4</sub>). The cross-bar of *alpha* slants downward and the right leg of the letter is extended. Notice especially three-bar *sigma*, apparently only here on stone at Selinus. Elsewhere the letter form is confined to coins in Selinuntine and the lead *defixio*, Gàbrici 13 (b). Jeffery, *Local Scripts*, p. 263, must be corrected.

GÀBRICI 11: Gàbrici prints AIDION. But *alpha* (if *alpha* it be) rests on



its left side, and what looks like the start of the cross-bar may be a later gouge. A clumsy *gamma* is more probable. Even the first two strokes of four stroke *sigma* would not be impossible.<sup>12</sup>

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

*June, 1964*

<sup>12</sup> At the end I wish to express my gratitude for much help both at Palermo and Selinus to Miss Audrey V. Jackson.