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Sicilian epigraphy is neither widely, nor easily studied. The primary reason for this is the lack of an up-to-date corpus, although several excellent thematic and museum corpora do exist. This absence contributes to the only partially correct view that Sicily is epigraphically barren. One basic aim of this paper is therefore to present an overview of the material pertinent to the period of the Republican province, loosely defined as the last three centuries BC. Such an overview is one necessary part of making sense of the Verrines, not least so that we might increase our knowledge of the Sicilian context with which the speeches are so often concerned. In certain respects, this paper is intended as a companion piece to the archaeological overview recently provided by Roger Wilson.

1. I am most grateful to Sylvie Pittia for the invitation to participate and the efficient organisation of the colloquium and to Julien Dubouloz for spotting my mistakes; and to the Centre Gustave Glotz for financial assistance. The work presented here has benefitted above all from the earlier support of University College London graduate school.
2. Introduction to Sicilian epigraphy: GulettA 1999; see further the quinquennial survey articles in Kokalos and the relevant sections of AE, Bull. ép. and SEG. Corpora exist for the museums of Palermo, Termini Imerese and Catania, as well as of the material found on Lipara; archaic Greek inscriptions have been collected by R. Arena in Istruzioni greche archaiche di Sicilia e Magna Grecia (1, Pisa, 1994, work is ongoing); dialectical Greek inscriptions in Dubois 1989. CIL 10.6976-7493 and IG 14.1-599 remain fundamental, but severely outdated. Phoenicio-Punic epigraphy, some of which is relevant to this period, is mostly collected in Amadasi Guzzo 1967 and 1986.
3. Davies (2003, p. 338) has characterized Syracuse as «intermittently democratic but epigraphically inert». Without full publication this is hard to quantify.
This study focuses principally on c. 215 lapidary inscriptions from the Sicilian mainland, which can reasonably be dated to within, or partially within the period of the 3rd–1st cent. BC. Inscriptions on metal will be treated more selectively, although metal was a significant epigraphic support in Sicily. Given the apparently low level of the lapidary habit, the number of surviving texts on metal is considerable (especially in light of metal’s generally low survival rate). The Syracusans’ eagerness to honour Cicero with a bronze plaque hints at a preference for this material, although we should also keep in mind the poor quality of much Sicilian stone. The difficulty lies in determining to what extent the distribution of the surviving sample can be attributed to accidents of survival, or to ancient choices.

My basic question is threefold: what is the relevant epigraphic material, what does it tell us about Ciceronian Sicily and what does it contribute to interpretation of the Verrines? However, in order to answer these questions, we must first confront some methodological considerations. The underlying question is, what can we learn from a set of epigraphic data – or, how do we write history from epigraphy? But in this case, this is complicated by the question of how we should relate a set of epigraphic material to a parallel set of literary material, the Verrines: does either set of material take priority? Is it possible to ask compatible questions of both sets of material? This is not unique to this case, but the nature of the material gives the problem greater clarity than normal.

It is possible to give some sense to these questions by examining the different ways in which we could approach the original task outlined above, namely to survey the epigraphic aspects of Ciceronian Sicily:

1. We can examine the specific references to epigraphic practice in the Verrines (and then go on to compare these with the surviving material).
2. We can search the epigraphic material for specific points of contact with the Verrines: events, people, places which are attested by Cicero and for which the epigraphy provides some sort of support, or further information. Vice versa, we can search the Verrines for specific points of contact or overlap with what we have in the epigraphic material, or use them to elucidate things we find in the epigraphic material. This should be a simultaneous, two-way process; assigning priority is

---

5. Mangano 2000a has brief comments on the topic; Prag 2002 contains a more extensive breakdown of Sicilian epigraphy.
7. The most obvious omission in this paper is the varied category of material loosely classed as instrumentum domesticum. This material is much harder to control; additionally, space limits what can be covered here.

---
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excessively artificial. It is however worth considering whether the underlying premise involves giving priority to one or the other: it has probably been the more traditional pattern in Ancient History to proceed from the literature to the epigraphy.

3. Similar to approach 2, we can try to use the epigraphic data or the Verrines to provide relevant, parallel, or illustrative material for the other in order to broaden the picture. This is a less narrowly specific activity than approach 2, but the agenda is still determined by whichever « text » we are seeking to elucidate: in other words, we still search the one data set for material of relevance to the other, rather than thinking more widely.

4. We can seek to write the context (i.e. a « history », in the loosest sense, of Sicily in this period) from one or other of these data sets. This poses the fundamental question: is there an essential difference between history written from epigraphy and history written from literature and, if so, how can we integrate the two?

5. We can ask specific questions, with one or more of these sets of material in mind, for example: what do we know about Roman presence in Sicily? What evidence do we have for types of labour in Ciceronian Sicily?

Necessary to approach 4, if not to approaches 1-3, is a global survey of all the epigraphic material. It seems to me that the first three (ancient references to inscriptions, direct overlap between literature and epigraphy, illustration of one by the other) require a process of trawling for specific instances of data, which is a methodologically distinct process. The final approach (historical questions) entails something in between and is dependent upon neither source specifically. In fact, I think that options 1–3 are typically driven by the literary text(s), option 4 by the epigraphy and option 5 is either independent of both, or alternatively dependent upon a complete grasp of both (and more).

It is difficult to find direct discussion of these issues, although there is a parallel debate over the interface between archaeological data and literary sources. The basic subject of epigraphy’s contribution to ancient history (i.e. the types of data which epigraphy can generate and the questions which it can answer) is regularly addressed in manuals on – and introductions to – epigraphy. Additionally, the presence and use of inscriptions in ancient authors (option 1 above) is frequently

---

9. e.g. Robert 1961; Millar 1983; Boidel 2001. One common theme is an insistence on the need to study inscriptions in bulk, or as a series; Robert 1961, p. 473, echoed by e.g. Millar 1983, p. 92 and p. 110; Finley 1985, p. 44; Calabi Limentani 1991, p. 112-114.
discussed, as is the interaction of specific inscriptions and specific literary texts (in recent years especially with the publication of various senatorial decrees which overlap with Tacitus’s Annales)\textsuperscript{10}.

However, a preliminary discussion can be traced in English scholarship of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries\textsuperscript{11}. In response to the rapid growth of epigraphy as a discipline and the enormous increase in published material which accompanied the development of the great corpora, a debate developed over the value of epigraphy. Opposing emphases upon epigraphy and literature are apparent already in essays by C. T. Newton and B. Jowett. For Newton, epigraphy was primary and should be studied in the same way as the literary texts. By contrast, Jowett, in a notorious essay, with which he prefaced his Thucydides translation, consigned epigraphy to the lesser realm of antiquities (as opposed to history): inscriptions must be illustrated by literature, are of little independent value and serve merely to confirm, e.g. Thucydides\textsuperscript{12}.

The debate is partly foreshadowed by that amongst the humanists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries over the relative weight of literary and epigraphic sources. Epigraphic texts were frequently favoured from the sixteenth century onwards as being in some way of higher authority, or more reliable, than literature\textsuperscript{13}. I. Calabi Limentani distinguishes three ways in which inscriptions tended to be used by historians in this period: firstly as mere ornamentation to work based upon literary texts; secondly to supplement or elucidate material in the literary texts; and thirdly as the primary basis for a study, considered either as individual texts or series of texts\textsuperscript{14}.

The humanist perspective is echoed, in the discussions which followed the essays of Newton and Jowett, by those who advocated a greater level of authority and / or objectivity for inscribed texts over literary texts. E. A. Freeman criticized Jowett, but, although he considered inscriptions to be of higher authority than most literary texts, nonetheless they remain subsidiary to the narrative and serve only to

\textsuperscript{10} On the former, STEIN 1931 ; CHEVALLIER 1972 ; HIGBIE 1999 and the regular section « Rapports avec la littérature » in Bull. ép.; on the latter e.g. GRIFFIN 1997 ; ROWE 2002.
\textsuperscript{11} I owe my knowledge of this debate entirely to Dr Peter Liddel, Department of Classics and Ancient History, University of Manchester; he is not responsible for my use of it.
\textsuperscript{12} NEWTON 1880, p. 97 ; JOWETT 1900, I, « On Inscriptions of the Age of Thucydides », p. IX-CII, esp. p. XV ; XXXII and p. C-CII.
\textsuperscript{14} CALABI LIMENTANI 1991, p. 88 ; STENHOUSE 2005, p. 123-148 for a detailed analysis of methodological development across five scholars of the later 16th cent.
illustrate or correct – and they can only be so used by virtue of the existing narratives. P. Gardner attacked Jowett’s emphasis on literature alone, noting that corrections from inscriptions to historical fact are but a small part of the epigraphic contribution, the greater being the fields where the ancient writers are silent; he himself undertook several studies based upon series of epigraphic texts. M. Cary, while accepting that one cannot dispense with literary sources (the «flesh and blood» of ancient history), nonetheless believed epigraphic documents to be «objective», in contrast to the subjective literary texts. M. N. Tod combined the views of Gardner and Cary, arguing that epigraphy is objective and that it covers fields which the literary texts ignore. However, he also agreed that although history can be written from literary texts alone, the same cannot be done from epigraphic texts alone: for this reason, the two sources are inextricably intertwined, not mutually exclusive. Throughout this debate, the proximity of epigraphic documents to the actual events and the continuous increase in known epigraphic material are both regularly cited as factors in epigraphy’s favour.\(^{15}\)

Jowett’s distinction between «history» and «antiquities» has long since faded (L. Robert observed that there is no such thing as historical and non-historical documents) and few today would argue for the «objectivity» of epigraphic documents. Nonetheless, M. I. Finley’s reports of the death of literature-based history were perhaps exaggerated\(^{16}\). In more recent studies which have explicitly confronted the two elements, the emphasis still lies with the literary texts, although examples of a more nuanced view exist: G. Rougemont demonstrates one such approach, by employing a body of epigraphic material as a means to enable the use of available literary texts in a (more) historical fashion.\(^{17}\)

One thing upon which almost all of these writers agree, is that epigraphy cannot itself provide a framework, or narrative. Without a continuous literary text (preferably a contemporary or near-contemporary one), a framework remains a vain hope.\(^{18}\) It might however be argued that this continues to give priority to «political» history, or «histoire événementielle». The more nuanced view of Robert, echoed by

---

\(^{15}\) FREEMAN 1886, esp. p. 169-170; GARDNER 1892, p. 12-13, cf. chs. 12 and 14; CARY 1927, p. 3-9; TOD 1932, ch. 1.

\(^{16}\) ROBERT 1953, p. 10; FINLEY 1985, p. 7.

\(^{17}\) ROUGEMONT 1998; compare the papers in the panel organised by Sartori in Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik (München, 1972), Munich, 1973.

\(^{18}\) e.g. FREEMAN 1886, p. 169-170; TOD 1932, p. 23-24; ROBERT 1961, p. 463; MILLAR 1983, p. 82; FINLEY 1985, p. 11.
J. Ma, is that while literary narratives provide the general and the framework, epigraphy can serve to produce «a closely textured history», which can mesh with the narrative record. It is no coincidence that epigraphy has served above all in the areas of social and economic history and in local and provincial history, where in general literary history is of less direct application, or wholly absent. This brings out the very unusualness of the situation presented by the Verrines, namely that the Verrines do not provide us with a typical narrative framework, but they do provide an extensive literary source on Roman Republican Sicily, which runs parallel to the epigraphy. It is for this reason that the methodological questions posed here seem particularly pertinent, although I do not think that they are in any way restricted to this case.

I do not intend to explore this question further in this paper, but I raise it here because Ciceronian Sicily seems one particularly apt area for a serious case study. The rest of this paper will combine a preliminary case study of these issues with a survey of the potential of epigraphy for the study of Ciceronian Sicily and the Verrines, proceeding through each of the five methodological avenues outlined above.

**Epigraphy in Cicero’s Verrines**

Cicero cites epigraphic material rather more frequently than most ancient writers. In light of the recent emphasis upon documentary evidence in the Verrines by S. Butler, the fact that Cicero explicitly mentions at least ten inscriptions in the Verrines (of which at least two in Rome), as well as graffiti in Syracuse, should come as no surprise. However, this relatively high number (balanced by the length of the

---

21. Return of booty to Segesta from Carthage by Scipio Aemilianus Africanus in 146 (Ver. 4.74) and to Engrinum (Ver. 4.97 ; 5.186), cf. Tyndaris (Ver. 4.84 ; 5.185), Agrigentum (Ver. 4.73 ; 4.93), Gela (Ver. 4.73), Thermae (Ver. 2.85-87 ; 4.73) ; honorific decree on bronze of *hostium publicum* (Syracuse) for L. and M. Tullius Cicero (Ver. 4.145) ; honorific decree on bronze (Thermae) for Sthenius, taken by Cicero to Rome (Ver. 2.112) ; honorific inscription for Verres, Syracuse (Ver. 2.154, cf. Ver. 2.137-135 without explicit mention of inscriptions) ; inscribed statue bases in Rome set up by the Sicilians (Ver. 2.114 : 2.150 ; 2.154 ; 2.167-168) ; artist’s signature on a silver statue of Apollo, Agrigentum (Ver. 4.93) ; silver Cupid, dedicated at Eryx by Verres, bearing Sthenius’s name (Ver. 2.115) ; Greek inscription on base of a statue of Sappho in Syracuse *prytaneion* (Ver. 4.127) ; ivory tusks from the sanctuary of Juno on Melita, restored by Masinissa with a Punic inscription (Ver. 4.103) ; graffiti lampooning Pipa, wife of Aeschrion the Syracusan (Ver. 3.77). BUTLER 2002, p. 48-51 has a comparable list.
Verrines) is worth keeping in mind when we are usually so negative about the Sicilian epigraphic habit. As Butler observes, the bronze honorific decree which the Syracusans dashed off for Cicero and his cousin suggests, on the contrary, «a rather obsessive epigraphic habit»\(^{22}\). Only in the case of the dedications set up by Scipio in 146 do we have the inscription described (almost)\(^{23}\), but parallel material can nonetheless be offered in almost every case. However, the search for parallels, as for example in the case of statues commemorating patronage and soteria, belongs under approach 3 above, to which we shall come shortly\(^{24}\).

Two points are worth making on the basis of Cicero’s citations. Firstly, that several of the categories of inscription on which Cicero spends the most time are either Roman-created or Roman-inspired. This is however one of the least well attested categories of epigraphic material from Republican Sicily. We could either explain this discrepancy as being due to Cicero’s own very partial focus, or else dismiss it as a mere accident of survival. Either way, it should give pause for thought. Secondly, although the surviving epigraphic material of this period in Sicily, created by Sicilians, is almost entirely Greek (which is in line with what Cicero says here and elsewhere about Greek linguistic practice on the island)\(^{25}\), nonetheless, the Sicilians erected Latin texts in Rome and elsewhere (as we know from a surviving epigraphic text at Auximum) and the Romans erected Latin texts in Sicily (starting with a milestone of 252)\(^{26}\).

**Epigraphic Points of Contact with the Verrines**

The search for more information on a particular person, institution, event etc., across the different data sets is a rather limited activity, but an important one nonetheless for explicating a text. Direct overlaps are quite infrequent, for two reasons touched on already: the total body of epigraphic material is quite limited and in particular the surviving Roman-oriented or -inspired material is extremely limited, in contrast to the Ciceronian focus.

---

24. These particular Sicilian examples are discussed and contextualized in Tanner 2000, p. 32-35 and p. 40-41.
25. e.g. Ver. 2.50; 2.154; 3.84; 4.127; 4.147; 5.148, cf. allusions to Greek institutions, e.g. Ver. 2.36-37; 2.50; 2.54; 4.50.
Individuals mentioned by Cicero are occasionally attested in the epigraphic record, both Romans (C. Norbanus, praetor in Sicily from 90; C. Claudius M. f. Marcellus, praetor in Sicily in 79; Cn. Pompeius Magnus, propraetor in Sicily in 82) and famous Sicilians (Hieron II of Syracuse; Athenion the slave king). At the same time, it may be worth noting that, for example, individual governors upon whom Cicero (and in turn we ourselves) places much weight, such as P. Rupilius, are absent from the epigraphic record\(^{28}\). Additionally, an individual whom we consider important – on the basis of Livy’s account – but who is almost entirely absent from both Cicero and the Sicilian epigraphic record, is M. Valerius Laevinus\(^{29}\). The point may be banal, but arguments from silence generally will not suffice: Verres himself is absent from the surviving epigraphic record, as is Cicero\(^{30}\). Equally salutary is the comparison of evidence for Roman roads in Republican Sicily, which consists of two

---

27. Norbanus: CIL 12.2951 (now in Syracuse museum); Marcellus: IG 14.435 (Tauromenium); Pompeius: ILLRP 380 (Rome) and possibly IG 14.955 (Kaibel ad loc. and Manganaro 1963a, p. 215-216); Hieron II: Bull. ép. 1953.282; IG 14.2; 14.3; 14.7; (14.216); 14.240; SEG 17.196; 34.979; Athenion’s name appears on glandes from the slave wars, Manganaro 1982, p. 241 and 2000b, p. 130.

28. On Rupilius, cos. 132, to whom a lex provinciae for Sicily is sometimes (questionably) attributed, cf. esp. Ver. 2.32-44; 4.125. The only epigraphic attestation is a hypothetical attribution to Rupilius of stamped tiles found in the vicinity of bouleuterion II at the site of Ietas (Monte Iato): the stamps are read as PR (right to left) and dated to the imperial period by Müller 1976, p. 64-65 and Daehn 1991, p. 46, n. 55; Isler (1979, p. 64-65) reads PR and suggests the identification with Rupilius. Such speculation is quite legitimate, but can only be speculation: simply because we know of Rupilius’s existence, it does not follow that a stamp which can be attributed to him should be attributed to him – the further hypothesis of Isler that we might therefore infer reorganisation at Ietas by Rupilius on a parallel to that at Heraclea Minoa (Ver. 2.125) risks converting the original speculation into established fact.


30. On arguments e silentio, compare the observation of Millar (1983, p. 92), that what is legitimate is «that form of reasoning which deploys a double negative – [an epigraphic example] will show that it is not the case that there are no examples of x from a particular time or place». 

---
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non-overlapping sets of evidence. Except for very speculative associations, the individual Sicilians to whom Cicero refers do not appear in the epigraphic record.

Specific events, such as the slave wars or Norbanus’s activities in the Social War also feature in both types of material. Occasionally, specific institutions appear in both, such as the Syracusan Όμωπολος referred to by Cicero and attested in the cult inscriptions from Buscemi near Acrae, or the more problematic case of the Agrigentine ἄγγιμνος described by Cicero and visible in a proxeny decree on bronze of the Agrigentines. As with individuals, one institution for which we might expect evidence is the lex Hieronica, but the only possible epigraphic reference lies in a fragmentary honorific decree from Agrigentum, which may conceivably contain a reference to the procedure of ἄπογωρ[απά]. This is a further clear reminder not only of the accidents of survival, but also of the differing focus in the types of evidence and thus of a fundamental weakness in this approach.

To reverse the argument, what should we make of the fact that Cicero places great emphasis upon the cult of Demeter in Sicily and that on this occasion the epigraphic evidence apparently provides support for his claims? If the absence of evidence cannot by itself prove that something lacks significance, how far is it legitimate to believe Cicero’s own claims for something’s significance, when they happen to be supported by another equally partial set of evidence? One simple control lies in the observation that there is, in absolute terms, good epigraphic evidence:


In the literature: Ver. 2.169 refers to a uiia Pompeia, probably from Messina southwards; Strab. 6.266 is usually taken to attest to a uiia Valeria built by Laevinus in the Second Punic War (cf. Liv. 24.36.5-6) along the north coast of the island. The best summary of the Republican road network is UGGERI 1997-1998, p. 299-308.

32. E.g. Eubulidas Grusphus of Centuripae (Ver. 3.56), to whom has been attributed a lead « mercantile label » bearing the monogram E and Y at its centre (MANGANARO 1992, p. 459, n. 28 and fig. 14b, cf. SEG 42.838).


34. Ver. 2.126 (D.S. 16.70.6) and SEG 42.832, cf. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1951.


36. SEG 37.757, with the speculation of CALDERONE 1985, p. 17.

evidence surviving for other cults also\(^{38}\). But a fuller response will move us on to the other methodological options, to be considered below: neither type of evidence alone, nor both together, is necessarily sufficient to validate such a claim and it would also be wrong to consider such material in isolation from, for instance, the archaeological evidence.

Instances of real, direct illumination of Cicero’s text by the epigraphic material are rare: one such example is Cicero’s passing reference to the *cognatio* of Centuripae with Rome, for which we now have the act of «kinship diplomacy» with Lanuvium and Rome attested by a fragmentary decree of Centuripae\(^{39}\).

**Epigraphic parallels**

A more constructive and wide-ranging approach to the epigraphy is to use epigraphic material in order to fill in the background to things we encounter in the *Verrines*. The possibilities increase significantly at this point. For example, although, as we saw above, the honorific decrees which Cicero describes in the case of both Sthenius of Thermae and himself do not survive, nonetheless, we can generate a clear idea of the sort of text and object involved, as well as of other individuals engaged in these kinds of activities, from the documents which do survive. Relevant epigraphic texts on bronze include a pair of decrees recording the activities of a Syracusan, Demetrius, son of Diodotus, on behalf of the Agrigentines and the Maltese; honours for a Roman at Rhegium and the slightly earlier Entella tablet honouring one Ti. Claudius Antiatas\(^{40}\). The case of C. Norbanus, honoured on stone at Rhegium, serves to bring out a further footnote to the *Verrines*, namely Cicero’s passing reference to Verres’ interaction with Rhegium: Sicilian praetors apparently acted across the Straits on a regular basis and this generally went unremarked\(^{41}\). The

\(^{38}\) For example, Apollo: IG 14.575; SEG 15.578 (but cf. 34.977); 34.978; 42.832; 42.833; 42.836; 42.854 (?); ViETTER 1953, no. 196; Isis: IG 14.14a; 14.433; SEG 42.852 etc. More material in MANGANARO 1977.

\(^{39}\) Ver. 5.83, cf. 2.163. Decree: SEG 42.837 (text); AE 1990.437 (French transl.), cf. MANGANARO 1963b and 1976, p. 87-88 (photo); CEBELLAC-GERVASONI 1989 (photo).


\(^{41}\) Ver. 5.47; SEG 1.418 = BUONOCORE 1989, p. 58, no. 11. On governors acting outside their provinces, LINTOTT 1993, p. 24-27. Magistrates retained *imperium* during their return to Rome (Cic. *Fam.* 1.9; *Lex de provinciis praetorius*, CRAWFORD 1996, 1, no. 12, Cnidos Copy, col. IV, l. 31-39, p. 242, with
search for parallels can take us well beyond the Sicilian material, as in the case of the (united) Sicilian honours for Verres at Rome, for which only one, indirect, Sicilian parallel survives, that previously cited from Auximum – although this is also important possible corroborative evidence for Cicero’s hint at some sort of provincial assembly or council⁴⁶. Non-Sicilian parallels from Italy and the Greek East on the other hand are abundant⁴⁵.

In an attempt to contextualize and broaden our understanding of the lex Hieronica, Sicilian taxation and agriculture we can make use of both the financial inscriptions from Tauromenium and the cadastral inscription(s) from Halaesa⁴⁶. The former cast light on the ways in which local civic finances operated, only very indirectly suggested by Cicero, and indicate the importance of produce other than grain, such as pulses, as well as the value of timber as a natural resource. The latter opens a very different window on patterns of land-holding and the organisation of the local landscape⁴⁶.

If the search of the epigraphic record for individuals named in the Verrines is largely unsuccessful, the quest for parallels is much more productive: several Roman magistrates emerge from the period, in most cases not otherwise directly attested (although a total of five named and one anonymous for the minimum of 178 years (i.e. 227–49) of Republican magistrates in Sicily is hardly impressive)⁴⁶; individual

---

commentary p. 265), which renders unproblematic the appeal of Valentina to Verres, as Cicero notes (Ver. 5.40-41). This does not however explain Verres’ orders to the Rhegines for timber.

42. Bell, in this volume, p. 000-000. Besides the Auximum inscription and several passages of Cicero (e.g. Ver. 2.10-11: 2.103; 2.112: 2.146-148: 2.154; 3.18-19: 3.204: 4.138; Alt. 10.12.2), the only direct evidence for a provincial council is of much later imperial date: IG 14.1078a = ILS 8843 and Symmachus Ep. 1.17. As Sartori 1981, p. 404-405 observes, this cannot safely be taken to prove anything about the earlier period. Karlsson (1993, p. 37-38; 1996, p. 85) has argued for an earlier Hieronian koinôv, but the evidence is wholly inconclusive (reference to a koinôv in IG 14.7 cannot securely be so restored, cf. Bull. ép. 1966.515 and Mangano 2005; the Δικελαντίου coinage (Buttrey - Ermi - Groves - Holloway 1989, p. 31-33) belongs in a unique wartime context).

43. Lintott 1993, p. 41, n. 89-90 and p. 124 (takes the Sicilian case to be certain).


46. Cf. p. 000-000 for a list of Roman officials attested in Sicily: e.g. ILLRP 1277 = CIL 12.2877 (C. Aurelius Cotta, cos. 252, cos. II 248); CIL 10.7258 = 12.843 (anonymous quaestor propraetore, 1st cent. (?)); CIL
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Roman **equites** and **negotiatores** are not identifiable in the epigraphic record, but more generic indications of their presence exist, such as Italic or Latin names and possibly the earliest instance of an *Italic qui negotiantur* inscription⁴⁷; individual Sicilian **aratores** and **principes** may not match on a one-to-one basis, but patterns of naming are confirmed and in particular the distinctively Sicilian use of a **cognomen** within Greek nomenclature, to which Cicero alludes and of which he gives repeated examples, is well-attested⁴⁸. The epigraphic data in fact takes us considerably further, once we go beyond seeking to elucidate what is in the *Verrines* alone: a sizeable body of evidence is now in place for the existence of demotics and other civic subdivisions in Sicilian civic life and nomenclature⁴⁹.

Institutions similarly gain greater focus: Cicero makes loose references to **Siculus magistratus**, since the details do not interest him, or his Roman audience⁵⁰; by contrast, the relatively rich set of civic inscriptions testifies to a broad range of eponymous priests and magistrates⁵¹; dedications of annual lists of magistrates, as at Thermae, Acrae, or Syracuse give a hint of what is lost, as does an almost complete list of **stratagoi** from Tauromenium (which covers most of the period of the

---

⁴⁷.**Examples of Italic or Latin names:** *IG* 14.336 (Gaius Seius Ptolemaius); 34.951 (M. Valerius Chorton, *cf. IG* 14.273; 14.277); *SEG* 34.981 (Gaius Orceius, Gaius Sulpicius, Lucius Caullius); 36.847 (Decimus Laeldius Magnus); 37.761 (Marcus Aimitius Rho---, Kipos ἕ′); 42.849 (Pompeia Rufus ἕ'); 42.873.2 (Salvius ὦ'); *DI STEFANO* 1984, p. 178, no. 193 (Publius), p. 179, no. 194 (Gaius Rug - Rouma[---]).


⁴⁸.**Examples of cognomina in the Verrines:** Apollodorus Laphiro (Ver. 2.19); Posides Macro Soluntinus (Ver. 2.102); Apollodoros, cui Pyragro cognomen est (Ver. 3.74); Diocles (...) Panhormitanus, Phimes cognomine (Ver. 3.93); Diocles (...) Popilius cognomine (Ver. 4.35); Apollonius, Diocli filius, Panhormitanus, cui Gemino cognomen est (Ver. 5.16). Epigraphic examples of cognomina: *IG* 14.311 (Antallos Ornichas), *cf. SEG* 41.836; *IG* 14.574 = *DUBOIS* 1989, no. 188 (Artemiskos Kaballos), *cf. IG* 14.576; *IG* 14.354 (Diogenes) Laphiron), *cf. IG* 14.355; *SEG* 37.739 (Dion) Laphiron). See further *MASSON* 1981; *CORDANO* 1997.


⁵⁰.**Ver. 3.34; 3.117; 4.146, cf. 2.162; 3.68; 3.105; 3.120. For a more specific interpretation of the **Siculus magistratus** as a particular category of magistrate, *cf. BELL*, this volume, p. 000-000.


---
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Republican province, interestingly with a six-year gap almost certainly at the time of the First Slave War\textsuperscript{52}.

What emerges most clearly from both of the preceding approaches is the difference in focus between the two types of source; but what should also be obvious is that we risk missing a great deal if the only questions which we ask are those which are prompted by the \textit{Verrines}. Either we must ask questions independently of the sources (but risk getting a limited answer), or else we must approach the epigraphy on its own terms.

**Sicilian « Hellenistic » Epigraphy**

The epigraphic culture of Sicily in this period is essentially a Greek civic culture, dominated by public inscriptions. Not only is Greek the dominant language, epigraphically, until the Augustan period, but the types of inscription are predominantly public also and this contrasts with other periods of Sicilian epigraphic activity. Of the 1 817 inscriptions on stone from ancient Sicily which can be classified by content, funerary inscriptions predominate (c. 70 %); of the 1 160 of these which can be reasonably tightly dated, funerary epigraphy still constitutes 58.3 % of the total. However, when the sample is restricted to the last three centuries BC, the proportion of funerary epigraphy falls to a mere 20 %, with honorific, dedicatory and « public » documents rising to c. 45 % of the total\textsuperscript{53}. It is worth examining the overall geographical distribution of the (dated) material (fig. 1, p. 000): the spread is relatively even (although the numbers are small in absolute terms), but clearly concentrated upon the towns of the north and east coast. The difference between the locations generating inscriptions in this period and those places referred to in the \textit{Verrines} by Cicero (fig. 2, p. 000) is not great: the epigraphic distribution covers c. 75 % of that of Cicero. On the other hand, the subset of places which Cicero explicitly claims to have visited (as opposed to simply mentioning them in the speeches) differs by a significantly greater margin, the overlap being only c. 50 %. This latter subset perhaps reflects specific issues of ease of

\textsuperscript{52}\textit{Acrae}: IG 14.208-214; 14.214a; \textit{Bull. ép.} 1959.546 = Pugliese Carratelli 1956, no. 3 (not 4 as printed in \textit{Bull. ép.}); \textit{Thermae}: IG 14.313; Syracuse (attribution not certain): IG 14.8 = Mani
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access (Cicero boasted that he took only fifty days in Sicily to collect his evidence)\textsuperscript{54}, or those areas which produced the most grain. The places visited by the Delphic \textit{theo}ploi around the end of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} / beginning of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. presents an interesting alternative epigraphic view of the island in this period (fig. 3, p. 000)\textsuperscript{55}. The differences are worth plotting if only as a reminder of the differently partial nature of each set of evidence.

The most active towns epigraphically in this period (or at least those with the best epigraphic survival rates) are, in descending order, Syracuse, Tauromenium, Acrae, Lilybaeum, Segesta and Halaesa. However, the Syracuse and Acrae material mostly belongs to the beginning of this period (much appears to be Hieronian), the Tauromenium material is dominated by the large dossier of civic records and much of the Lilybaeum material belongs at the end of the period (Augustan). In this regard, the Segesta and Halaesa material is perhaps the most interesting. Neither site underwent significant occupation after antiquity and in both cases the \textit{agora} has been excavated\textsuperscript{56}: the image of an active civic centre which the material presents is therefore perhaps reassuring (contrast however the absence of material from Ietas / Monte Iato, also well-excavated and not reoccupied) and potentially paradigmatic: formal \textit{agora}, statue bases, honorifics, \textit{gymnasium}-related material, building inscriptions, the presence of Romans etc.

Cicero naturally has specific interests and biases. The epigraphy has a set of biases of its own, but the concerns which the epigraphy represents are independent of those of Cicero. Besides funerary epigraphy, the principal categories of epigraphic material are: public honorifics and other public inscriptions, associated, for example, with the \textit{gymnasium}; a significant number of lists of civic magistrates; occasional building inscriptions; and a range of religious dedications\textsuperscript{57}. There is of course a range of anomalous inscriptions – the difficulty in these cases is to know how to integrate them into any sort of overall picture or context, either Ciceronian

\footnotesize{54. Ver. 6.  
55. SGDI 2580, variously dated late 3\textsuperscript{rd} or early 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. (cf. Bull. ép. 1994.432); for the Sicilian section, MANGANARO 1964b, p. 419-429; 1996, p. 131-138 (although attempts to infer status in relation to Rome should be treated with caution).  
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or Sicilian: an oracular text from near Acrae\textsuperscript{58}; a text allocating market-stalls, perhaps in the context of a festival (Acrae)\textsuperscript{59}; the Halaesa cadastral inscription noted earlier, with a mode of dispute resolution not dissimilar to the procedures outlined in the Nakone inscription from among the Entella tablets\textsuperscript{60}; the painted library catalogue from Tauromenium\textsuperscript{61}; or the Tauromenium financial accounts\textsuperscript{62}. No less problematic are the infrequent, 3\textsuperscript{rd} cent. Oscan texts from Messana\textsuperscript{63}; or the occasional Punic text and graffito in the west of the island\textsuperscript{64}. The difficulty of generalizing from single instances is constantly present (the same difficulty of course applies to a unique literary text such as Cicero’s).

Outward looking inscriptions, such as the consular Fasti and Roman calendar from Tauromenium\textsuperscript{65}, or the record of the kinship embassy from Centuripae\textsuperscript{66} mostly belong to the very end of this period. By contrast, the infrequent Latin epigraphy is mostly the work of outsiders making statements of either a public and/or a religious nature, reflecting the activities of Roman magistrate, or dedications at sanctuaries\textsuperscript{67}, or the familiar category of negotiatores inscription\textsuperscript{68}, outsiders talking to outsiders in front of locals. It is only at the end of the period that Latin funerary epigraphy begins to appear\textsuperscript{69}. There are however a few exceptions,

60.\textit{Cf.} n. 44; \textit{SEG} 31.825, for the relevant part of the Halaesa inscription; Nakone inscription: \textit{SEG} 30.1119, \textit{cf.} \textit{Ampolo} 2001.
61.\textit{Blanco} 1997.
62.\textit{Cf.} n. 44.
63.\textit{Mastelloni} 2005; \textit{Crawford}, in this volume, p. 000-000. The texts on stone are: \textit{Vetter} 1953, nos. 196; 197 and 197a; \textit{Parlangeli} 1956, no. 1B (separate text from \textit{Vetter} 1953, no. 196).
66.\textit{Cf.} n. 39.
68.\textit{Cf.} n. 47.
69. One of the earliest is probably an unpublished funerary stele from the Syracuse necropolis of Canalicchio, now on display on the upper floor of Syracuse museum (inv. 43118) with a relief carving of a plough on the upper half, \textit{cf.} \textit{Wilson} 1990, p. 356 n. 97.
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such as the inscription of Cn. Host(ilius?) from Ietas (Monte Iato), found in association with a tribunal dais in the agora portico, or the Italic temple dedicated in Latin at Agrigentum, the «Oratory of Phalaris» 70.

The overall sense, however, is one of strong individual civic identity and autonomy, rather than the blanket Siculus of Cicero’s account. This is reinforced when placed alongside the rise in civic mints in the period and by a wide range of epigraphic elements not considered here, but which imply a strong civic focus and civic identity, such as civic tile stamps and other such monogrammed objects 71. A similar concern with civic identity in this period and subsequently, is attested outside the island, primarily in funerary epigraphy, but also in Plautus, by a mode of external presentation in the form of Siculus + civic ethnic 72, which implies an interesting tension between the externally imposed «Sicilian» of, for instance, Cicero and the internal emphasis in the epigraphy on civic or sub-civic identity.

QUESTIONS RATHER THAN SOURCES: A HOLISTIC APPROACH?

One conclusion which has been stressed throughout is that we cannot sensibly consider the epigraphic material in isolation and perhaps the most interesting conclusions can be obtained by attempting to integrate multiple sources of evidence in pursuit of a particular question and the particular light which

---


71. Useful summary of coinage in FREY-KUPPER 1999, p. 411-414; civic activity in MANGANARO 1996; civic document seals in lead (Halaesa and elsewhere) in MANGANARO 1999, p. 76-77 and p. 141, fig. 170; civic monogram (Halaesa) on boundary stones, IG 14.352; lead weight or seal, with ethnic ERBIT[il](ai) and monogram Dullieson (?) in MANGANARO 1999, p. 77 and p. 141, fig. 172-173; lamp from Agrigentum, SEG 38.920; tiles from Cefalù, SEG 31.832; tiles (Icloidiou) in SICHEL 2001; tiles reading IAP[OY] from M. Iato in BLOESCH 1971, tav. 8.2.

72. Examples of Sicilians with civic identities: IG 2/32.10291 (Athens, 1st cent.): Αἰσχυλός | Ἀπολλοδόρου | Σκελός ἀπὸ Κολύμβη | Ἀττήτις; IG 2/32.10292 (Athens, 1st cent. AD): Ξένων Νεμηνίου | Σκελός ἀπὸ Νεαίτου; IG 2/32.10293 (Athens 1st / 2nd cent. AD): Ἐρμωνίνα | Ἀθηνίσκου | Σκελός | ἀπὸ Τονάκριδος; IG 7.416 (Oropos, Boiotia), l. 40: Ζάπτορος Ἐμμενίδας Σκελός ἀπὸ Κοτόπον; IG 7.420 (Oropos, Boiotia), l. 46; l. 56 and l. 62: Ἐμμενίδας Βενιάου Σκελός ἀπὸ Κεννορίποιο; IG 14.2023, l. 2-3 (Rome): Σύμφωνος Σκελός | Ποινομίτης, cf. CIL 6.20105; 6.25351 (Rome); 11.915 (Mutina); 12.178 (Antipolis, Gallia Narbonensis). In PL.MES. 1069: (Menachmus): Siculus sum Syracusanus; (Sosicles): Ea domus et patria est mihi; Rud. 49: Ei erat hospes par <><ui, Siculus senex | scelestus Agrigentinus, urbis proditor. Civic ethnics do occur in the Verrines, e.g. Ver. 2.102 (Soluntinus); 3.53 (Centuripinus); 3.56 (Murgentinus); 3.93; 5.16 (Panormitanus).
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different sources can throw on it. It remains true that the question must be one which the evidence is capable of addressing and the ability to frame such questions generally presumes a certain level of familiarity with the available evidence. One obvious example of this and where it has perhaps been applied most productively to date, is in the study of Roman migration into the island.

I conclude this paper with the briefest of summaries of another example, to which I shall return in more detail in a forthcoming article.

In the Fifth Verrine, Cicero attacks Verres’ military record in defence of the island. In doing so, Cicero alludes to the use of local Sicilian manpower, both by sea and on land. However, while he implies a regular practice, Cicero is, in the speech, only concerned with one instance of abuse and failure on Verres’ part. On the other hand, several dedications, both by the garrison at Eryx and elsewhere (especially at Halaesa), suggest a more widespread and regular level of local military activity, as do inscribed glandes and various forms of naval commemoration. It is however possible to suggest an even broader context, in the light of the civic epigraphic material and the emphasis upon civic identity and civic life already demonstrated. Epigraphy, but by no means epigraphy alone, attests to the existence of gymnasium across the island in this period.

The link between these two elements is made possible through one particular inscription, from Soluntum (IG 14.311), in which local soldiers honour a gymnasiarch. In the light of the discussion of the role played by the gymnasium which has taken place, especially in relation to Macedonia and Asia Minor and the relationship of the gymnasium to citizen soldiery, it is tempting to suggest that Rome made use of existing local institutions (as they did in the sphere...
of taxation) in order to garrison the island – another inscription, from Netum, suggests what has been argued elsewhere by F. Ferruti and G. Cordiano, that gymnasia were fostered by Hieron II, quite possibly with manpower in mind. By doing so, the Romans in fact fostered the further growth of a lively civic hellenistic culture, some of the evidence for which we have already seen.

There is not the space to explore this particular suggestion in more detail here; my point is rather that to get the most from the epigraphy – or from Cicero – we must engage in a more complex process of dialogue between the different stories told by the different sets of material than that suggested in the earlier parts of this paper. But perhaps that was already obvious.
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