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ABSTRACT

This thesis presents a study of the metrics and prosody of the carmina latina epigraphica from the Roman provinces of North Africa, the purpose of which is to test the prevailing but unsubstantiated view that these carmina exhibit especially poor versification, and that in them can be observed a chronological decline in quality of versification.

A representative corpus of dated carmina latina epigraphica africana is established, the inscriptions are subjected to an analysis of their metrics and prosody, and conclusions are drawn concerning the nature, extent and chronology of their deviation from classical standards of versification.

The corpus of inscriptions has four introductory chapters, which form Part II of the study. The first describes the criteria according to which the texts have been chosen. The second, third and fourth present three premises on which analysis and interpretation of their versification are based; these concern the authorship of the carmina, the educational background of the authors, and the linguistic milieu in which they were composed.

The core of the thesis is Part III, which comprises the texts of eighty-six dated carmina, analyses of their versification and commentaries on several features of their composition. Observations are offered regarding: the nature and possible causes of unclassical metric and prosodic phenomena; the extent to which an author deviates from literary norms, and the effect of his errors on a quantitative reading of the poem; a brief assessment of each author's understanding of and competence in the composition of classical quantitative verse; the graphic disposition of the text and its effect on the reader's recognition and recitation of the poetic content.

Conclusions drawn from the data compiled in Part III include the following. Unclassical metric features characteristic of the corpus include the combination of different meters in one poem, the composition of hypermetric and hypometric lines and the intermixture of prose with lines of verse. Such phenomena are found in about one-half the texts. Prosodical irregularities fall into two main types: those that can be considered classical (ascribable to an author's application of classical licences); and those that are errors, most of which are attributable to the intrusion of certain unclassical phonological features of an author's everyday speech. Prosodical errors occur in about three-quarters of the texts.

Four main observations are offered regarding the distribution of errors in the corpus. The extent to which individual authors adhere to literary norms varies widely; the majority of versifiers, however, have adhered sufficiently well that their works can be read quantitatively without serious hindrance. The presence of metric deviations in a poem carries no chronological significance, for these are fairly evenly
distributed throughout the corpus; a general chronological decline in adherence to classical prosody is discernible from the first century to the fifth, with a reverse in the decline seen in poems dated to the last three centuries of the period. The presence in the corpus of several poems of unsound versification of very early date and of poems of sound versification of very late date proves that the practice of some scholars of dating otherwise undatable carmina according to their quality of versification is unsafe. Pagan authors tend to adhere slightly more closely than their Christian counterparts to classical metrics and prosody. Poems of reasonably sound metrics and prosody tend to be inscribed in such a way as to facilitate the reader's recognition and recitation of their poetic content, while poems of poor quality of versification tend to be inscribed haphazardly.

Appendix I provides full scansion of each carmen. Appendix II lists initia carminum.
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A STUDY OF THE VERSIFICATION OF THE AFRICAN CARMINA LATINA EPIGRAPHICA

PART I. INTRODUCTION

The Carmina Latina Epigraphica

The Carmina Latina Epigraphica is the name given to a collection of verse inscriptions that were composed by men and women from all strata of Roman society, both by pagans and by Christians, in funerary and dedicatory commemorations, from the third century BC to the end of antiquity. Of the approximately four thousand two hundred known to date, most use dactylic verse (about 80%), most are funerary (about 80%), and most are pagan (about 60%). Although they have been discovered in all parts of the Roman empire, most come from Italy (about 60%). Some are firmly dated to the third century BC and some to very late times, but the majority are undatable.¹

The collection was first assembled by F. Buecheler, Carmina Latina Epigraphica, 1895 and 1897, supplemented by E. Lommatzsch, 1926. Although the corpus has since nearly doubled in size, no up-to-date edition has been published. The Buecheler-Lommatzsch volumes comprise mainly pagan inscriptions; for Christian inscriptions the primary source is E. Diehl's Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres, 1925, 1927, 1931, supplemented by J. Moreau and H. I. Marrou, 1967. For verse inscriptions discovered after Buecheler-Lommatzsch and Diehl, one must consult the various regional collections and such journals as L'Année épigraphique.

One of the most striking features of the verse inscriptions is their versification.

The Versification of the Carmina Latina Epigraphica

The carmina exhibit a wide range in quality of
versification. Although some poems preserve perfectly the shape of the classical hexameter, pentameter and senarius, the meters most commonly used by popular versifiers, most exhibit deviations from classical standards, and some are virtually unscannable. Certain unclassical metric and prosodic features have long been identified as characteristic of the popular epigraphic muse: in metrics, the composition of hypermetric and hypometric lines, the combination of different meters in one carmen, and the intermixture of prose with lines of verse; in prosody, the alteration of classical syllabic quantities, both quantity by nature and quantity by position.

Such popularisms have been attributed generally to individual authors' inexpert adherence to, or imperfect recall of, the principles and practices of classical quantitative versification that they had learned in school, and that they had observed in the classical texts that served as their models.

For some specific metric popularisms different hypotheses have been advanced. According to E.Galletier, hypermetricism in funerary inscriptions is sometimes produced by adherence to the quasi-ritual exigencies of sepulchral epigraphy, such as the recording of the name and age of the deceased, for example,

\[
\text{sic tu coepisti primo formossa Anna videri}\\
\text{(BL 1040.3, Rome)}
\]

\[
\text{nam ter denos egi natales dum vita remansit}\\
\text{(BL 1310.3, Pannonia Superior).}^2
\]

Other cases of hypermetricism can be attributed to an author's unwillingness to resist the addition of an affective epithet or phrase, for instance,

\[
\text{hos tibi versiculus cum lacrimis fecerunt ipsi parentes}\\
\text{(BL 607.6, Rome)},
\]
or to his inept melding of common epitaphic formulae, for example,

Parcae crudeles, nimium properastis rumpere fata mea
(BL 1156.4, Dalmatia).

For the combination of two or more different meters in one carmen several possible reasons have been discerned. In the case of poems composed of two distinct parts, such as a series of elegiac couplets followed by a series of hexameters, attempted artistry may be discerned in suiting meter to content; the first portion of BL 1549 (Rome), for example, expresses in nine couplets the personal lament of the eulogist, and the second portion describes in five hexameters the sympathy of nature. Where one or two introductory or concluding lines differ in meter from the rest of a poem, occasionally the difference can be attributed to the author's use of formulaic lines to enhance a composition of his own; in BL 1545 (Rome), for instance, the first two lines present in hexameters the very common invocation of the passerby, while the last four lines express in elegiac couplets the personal lament of the bereaved. Where different meters are randomly mixed throughout a single carmen, the author's intention may be a display of his metric virtuosity, as appears the case in BL 1554 (Sicca Veneria, Africa); of the nine lines of the text, verses 1 and 2 are iambic dimeters, verse 3 an ionic dimeter, verses 4 and 5 iambic dimeters catalectic, verses 6 and 7 iambic trimeters, verses 8 and 9 indeterminable.

Many cases of popular deviation from classical metrics are doubtless to be attributed to their authors' ignorance and inexpertise; some, perhaps, are instances of a popular poet's deliberate disregard of classical conventions in order to suit his own immediate purposes.

Popular deviations from normal classical prosody fall into two broad categories; those that are produced by an author's application of a classical poetic licence, such as the
lengthening in arsis of a precaesural syllable,⁷ and those that are produced by the intrusion of features of an author's everyday Latin, the phonology of which may have differed significantly from that of his classical model. Examples of features of popular speech that interfere with an author's recall and practice of quantitative verse are the muting of final m and the general tendency under influence of the stress accent to lengthen accented vowels and to abbreviate unaccented vowels, which led eventually to the obliteration of any distinction in spoken Latin between long and short vowels.⁸

Deviations attributable to licence are presumably deliberate, and attest the author's recall of the prosody he learned in school; deviations due to the interference of unclassical colloquial linguistic features are presumably inadvertent.

Errors both metric and prosodic can occasionally be attributed to an author's use of a structural feature found in some epigraphic carmina, the acrostic or telestic arrangement of lines of verse so that the first or last letters spell out a name, an epithet or a brief address to the passerby. The incorporation of such graphic devices limited the lexical possibilities at line-start or line-end, and, sometimes, if an author's resources were insufficient to meet the restriction imposed, he can be seen to have compromised his adherence to classical metrics and prosody in order to produce a clever acrostic.⁹

From the earliest studies of Latin epigraphic verse to the present, scholars have observed in the corpus differences both chronological and geographical in adherence to classical prosodical norms. Galletier, for instance, sees an "evolution" of popular features in epigraphic verse, increasing with distance from the classical age, and eventually obliterating the form of the classical model; he notes that verse inscriptions composed in the provinces exhibit poorer versification than those from Rome and Italy. "Telle est donc la tendance qui se
manifeste dans un certain nombre d'épitaphes: on la voit naître et gagner de proche en proche. C'est à Rome même que se trouvent dès le premier siècle (sc. examples of the alteration of syllabic quantities under influence of the tonic accent) .... On pourra relever quelques exemples analogues en Gaule, mais la romanisation plus complète de cette province paraît l'avoir préservée de l'ignorance où sont les habitants des autres parties de l'Empire. C'est en Espagne dès le second siècle et surtout en Afrique au troisième siècle que se propage l'oubli de la prosodie classique et que l'accent dispose en maître de la quantité des syllabes."

Modern scholars share this impression of a general chronological decline in adherence to classical norms of versification, and this assumption enters into discussions of dating. N.Horsfall, for example, in suggesting a date for the Roman elogium of Allia Potestas (BL 1988), asserts that the metric evidence is "a good deal less ambiguous" than the epigraphic, paleographic and linguistic. He finds hypermetric or hypometric lines and faulty prosody in unfamiliar proper names to be "signs of inadvertence or incompetence, without chronological significance", but the abbreviation of long final vowels and of long pretonic and posttonic syllables, and the lengthening of short open syllables in arsis, cumulatively to be indications of a date "not earlier than c.3rd". P.Cugusi appears to expect good classical versification throughout the second century, with rapid deterioration in the third and especially in the fourth. Quality of versification is then used to establish dating and to confirm or to challenge the previous dating of several inscriptions. An African carmen, for example, "presenta alcune sviste prosodiche ... ma nel complesso è di fattura accettabile, congrua al periodo di composizione del carme stesso, che credo si possa fissare al sec. II d.C." Regarding an undated Roman inscription, "i vv. 1 ..., 4..., 5... fanno registrare sviste metriche piuttosto pesanti, che spingono a collocare il carme nel III – IV secolo d.C." And concerning
another Roman poem, "considerata la rilevanza degli 'errore', se effettivamente il passo dovesse essere metrico, bisognerà datarlo al sec. III avanzato, a mio parere, non gia al sec. II come vorrebbero (sc. the editors)".\(^\text{15}\) Of another African inscription, "la (metrica) è scorrettissima ... penso che si possa collocare il carme ... nel IV secolo".\(^\text{16}\)

Modern scholars also share Galletier's impression that popular adherence to classical standards of versification varies in the provinces according to distance from Rome and degree of Romanization. Cugusi, for instance, thus explains the presence of prosodical errors in a Pannonian inscription, "Queste incertezze metriche, indubbiamente assai fastidiose in un 'poeta', trovano la loro spiegazione nella difficoltà di romanizzazione delle province danubiane periferiche, e quindi nell' incompleta romanizzazione del poeta ... stesso".\(^\text{17}\)

The African Carmina Latina Epigraphica

It is a commonplace among scholars of Latin epigraphic verse that the inscriptions from the Roman provinces of North Africa exhibit especially poor versification, and that a marked decline in quality of prosody can be observed from the third century AD on. This view appears to be based on an uncritical acceptance of the statements of four early commentators. A century ago L.Vernier introduced his study of the African metric inscriptions with the following statement, "On a dit, en parlant de l'Afrique romaine, que nulle part il n'y a autant de vers sur les monuments publics et privés, et que nulle part peut-être on n'en a fait de plus mauvais".\(^\text{18}\) Fifteen years later P.Monceaux summarized his examination of the African epigraphs thus, "les documents où le mètre est irréprochable sont jusqu'ici fort peu nombreux" ... "la plupart des inscriptions métriques africaines sont d'une barbarie invraisemblable".\(^\text{19}\) A contemporary of Monceaux, H.Bianchi, was the first commentator to chart a chronological decline in popular versifiers' adherence to
classical prosodical norms. He discerned four specific and distinct stages of decline. "Est unicuique aetati quaedam forma atque figura": from the first to the early third century, the inscriptions maintain classical standards, "metra numeris decurrunt rectis"; from the early third to the late fourth, authors appear uncertain about quantities by nature, first of final vowels, then of middle vowels; from the late fourth to mid-sixth, lines are sometimes hypermetric or hypometric, errors of quantity by position appear, and there is often no caesura, "numerus ad aures accommodatus accentum tantum et syllabas respicit"; from the mid-sixth on, the only remnant of classical versification is the accentual rhythm of the hexameter cadence, "verba prosa fere oratione composita". Galletier's assertion that unclassical prosody is particularly common in the African inscriptions, and is widespread from the third century, is cited above.

The same general view regarding the quality and chronology of adherence to classical prosodical norms in African carmina prevails today. R. Chevallier, for example, remarks that in the verse epigraphy of Africa "... les vers populaires n'ont conservé des vers classiques que le rapport des accents et des temps forts." H. LeBonniec is surprised to find good versification in third century Africa; "si on considère l'origine et la date de cette inscription, on ne manquera pas d'être frappé par sa relative correction: nous avons vu que la prosodie à deux exceptions près ... reste classique".

In the works of Vernier, Monceaux, Bianchi and Galletier, there are three weaknesses that make them unreliable as bases for modern assumptions regarding the African inscriptions. First, the corpus of carmina latina epigraphica africana known to them comprised only about two hundred poems, that is, approximately one-third the number known today. This raises the question whether consideration of the texts discovered since the early years of this century would alter or corroborate their impression of the African popular muse. Second, the observations
made by these commentators are general in nature, illustrated by a small selection of examples, and unsupported by a statistical accounting. Would the data provided by detailed analyses and comparative study of all the verse inscriptions affect their conclusions? Third, the observations of Bianchi and Galletier regarding a chronological decline in quality of versification are unsoundly based. As Galletier states in his introduction, only a few inscriptions can be dated securely; for the rest, "on est réduit à fixer approximativement leur âge par la forme des lettres, des considérations de style ou de métrique." But to observe a chronological decline in quality of versification in texts that are even in part dated (or arranged in relative order of date) on the basis of quality of versification is surely to risk a circular argument. Furthermore, some of the dated material adduced both by Bianchi and by Galletier proves, according to the more stringent dating criteria formulated and applied in recent studies, to be either undatable or incorrectly dated. Would the common assumption regarding a chronological decline in quality of versification in the African inscriptions withstand an examination based on the current corpus of datable inscriptions? And if such a decline in quality of versification is in fact discernible, are its lines clear and consistent? Are they sufficiently clear and consistent to serve as dating criteria for otherwise undatable verse inscriptions?

The question of the religious milieu in which a verse inscription was composed is raised in the studies both of Monceaux and of Galletier. Their assertions regarding a difference in the quality of versification exhibited by pagan and Christian carmina, however, differ. Galletier, on the one hand, who deals in his study principally with pagan verse inscriptions, adducing a Christian example only occasionally for comparison, expresses the opinion that Christian texts exhibit closer adherence than their pagan counterparts to classical standards and practices in versification, because they tend to be composed by educated men, such as priests. Monceaux, on the
other hand, who deals only with the African inscriptions, both Christian and pagan, finds no difference between the two in quality of versification.26

There is a need, therefore, for a reconsideration of the versification of the African texts in the light of an up-to-date corpus of dated inscriptions.

**Purpose and Method of the Dissertation**

The purpose of this study is to attempt such a reconsideration, and, in particular, to test the generally accepted but unsubstantiated view that the *carmina latina epiqraphica africana* exhibit (1) especially poor quality in versification, and (2) a chronological decline in the adherence of their authors to classical standards and practices in versification. The procedure followed in the study will be to establish a representative corpus of African verse inscriptions that have been dated on reasonably secure grounds, to subject these inscriptions to an analysis of their versification, and to draw conclusions concerning the nature, extent and chronology of their deviation from classical standards of versification.

**Outline of the Study**

The corpus of dated *carmina latina epiqraphica africana* is prefaced by the four introductory chapters that form Part II of this study. The first chapter describes the criteria according to which the texts have been chosen. The second, third and fourth discuss three premises on which analysis and interpretation of the versification will be based; these concern the authorship of the *carmina* and the educational and linguistic milieux in which they were composed. Part III comprises the texts, analyses of their versification and commentaries. Part IV draws conclusions from the study of the texts regarding the nature, extent and chronology of their deviation from classical standards of quantitative versification.
PART II. PREFACE TO THE CORPUS OF TEXTS

Chapter 1. Criteria for the Selection of Texts


Six criteria have been applied in the selection of texts suitable for use in the present study.

1. The inscriptions must be composed in Latin and come from the Roman provinces of North Africa: from Proconsularis, Byzacena, Numidia, Tripolitania and the Mauretanias.

2. The inscriptions must be true *epigraphica*, that is, be inscribed, or be known to have been inscribed, on stone or in mosaic. Excluded are those texts purported to be inscriptions, but which are found only in certain ancient literary works, such as the *Anthologia Latina*.

3. The texts must be true *carmina*. Not included are the so-called *commatica*, that is, inscriptions in which lines of prose are enhanced by brief portions of quantitative verse, or by fixed quantitatively or accentually rhythmic cadences.

4. The *carmina* must be preserved with sufficient textual security and length to support analysis of their versification. Excluded are inscriptions of fewer than two complete or nearly complete verses.

5. The *carmina* must be composed in dactylic verse, that is, in continuous hexameters or in elegiac couplets. This restriction has been imposed in order to produce a corpus manageable in size and homogeneous in nature.

6. The texts must be dated on reasonably secure grounds. The seven chief means of dating for the African inscriptions are:
notation in the text of the consular year or of the provincial year; notation of an indictional year; reference to a historical figure; implication of a specific political or religious setting; indication of certain details of military service; the architectural context of the inscription; and the chronologies that have been established for several individual regions. In the case of inscriptions for which approximate dates have been proposed, only those datable to a period not exceeding two centuries have been included.

An exception to the latter criterion has been made for a few very late inscriptions, the estimated date for which spans two and one-half or three centuries. This exception is justified on the following grounds. The reason for restricting the inscriptions under study to those for which a date has been established is to test the widespread assumption of a chronological decline in quality of versification; the few inscriptions that are dated to a period exceeding two centuries belong to the fifth or mid-fifth to seventh centuries; for the purposes of comparison of quality of versification, therefore, it will matter little whether they were composed in the fifth, sixth or seventh centuries.

Of the eighty-six dated verse inscriptions, eight are dated to a consular year, or, in the case of inscriptions from the Mauretanias, to a provincial year.

Two texts are dated to an indictional year. Since, as N. Duval has shown, the custom of dating by indiction was not adopted in Roman Africa until the Byzantine era, notation of indiction will serve to date an inscription to the sixth or seventh centuries.

Fourteen can be dated to the lifetime of a historical figure. Emperors are named in five inscriptions; imperial or municipal officials in five; a native chieftain in one; Christian priests in two; a Vandal prince in one.

For the composition of two inscriptions, a specific historical setting has been inferred and an approximate dating
assigned from their political terminology or religious content. Not included are inscriptions for which historical contexts have been proposed on the strength of a single imprecise textual reference.\textsuperscript{30}

Three inscriptions are dated by mention of certain details regarding the military service of the dedicator or of the deceased.

Seventeen inscriptions, found \textit{in situ} in catacombs, baths, private houses, basilicas, mausolea and a cemetery wall, share the date of the architectural context in which they were inscribed.

Twenty-six verse inscriptions rely for their dating on the chronologies established for individual regions by the works of P-A.Février, who studies the dated funerary inscriptions of eastern Mauretania Caesariensis;\textsuperscript{31} G-Ch.Picard, the inscriptions of Mactar;\textsuperscript{32} J-M.Lassère, the pagan funerary inscriptions of seven communities in Proconsularis, Numidia and Tripolitania;\textsuperscript{33} L.Ennabli, the Christian funerary inscriptions from the basilica of Saint Monica in Carthage;\textsuperscript{34} N.Duval and F.Prévet, the Christian inscriptions of Ammaedara;\textsuperscript{35} and F.Prévet, the Christian inscriptions of Mactar.\textsuperscript{36} Criteria considered in the establishment of these regional chronologies, which discern an evolution in style of commemoration, are: type and style of monument (stele, cippus, altar, mosaic); use and form of the invocation to the \textit{di manes} or \textit{memoria} (\textit{dis manibus sacrum}, \textit{dms}, \textit{memoriae}); formulation of the identification of the deceased or dedicator (case of the name, use of certain adjectives such as \textit{pius}, expression of longevity, formulae such as \textit{h(ic) s(itus) e(st)}, \textit{s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis)}), and, for slaves and freedmen, the evolution from designation as \textit{Caesaris servus} or \textit{libertus} to \textit{Augusti servus} or \textit{libertus}; onomastics (presence of a \textit{praenomen}, abbreviation of the \textit{nomen}, multiplication of \textit{cognomina}, notation of \textit{signa} and tribe); and, for the Christian inscriptions, style of cross (Constantinian monogram, monogrammatic cross, Greek cross, Latin cross).
Several inscriptions have been dated by Pikhaus using the criteria and chronologies established in the studies described above. Although it is in general unsafe to rely on only one or two dating criteria, or to apply the chronology framed for one area to an inscription from a different area, examination and comparison of the results of the various regional studies reveal the presence of certain features that are common to all the areas of Roman North Africa; these can, therefore, serve as reasonably secure termini post quos and termini ante quos in the dating of other inscriptions. On the basis of such termini, Pikhaus has proposed a date for many otherwise undatable inscriptions, three of which have been added to the present study. In the case of the pagan inscriptions, one custom, the invocation to the di manes, whether inscribed in full, dis manibus sacrum, or abbreviated, dms, is found in no community of Proconsularis, Numidia or Tripolitania before about AD 100 and in no Mauretanian community before AD 169. The invocation to the Manes, therefore, provides a useful terminus post quem for dating, that is, the beginning of the second century for an inscription from the eastern provinces, and the second half of the second century for a Mauretanian inscription. Two other customs, the notation of tribe with the name of the deceased or dedicator, and the type of monument chosen to bear the inscription, can serve as termini ante quos. According to I. Kajanto, the designation of tribe is not found anywhere in Roman Africa after the third century, and, according to Février, everywhere in the Mauretanias the stele had given way to the cippus or altar by the mid-third century. Thus inscriptions that both invoke the di manes and mention tribal affiliation can be dated second or third century, and a Mauretanian text that invokes the di manes and is inscribed on a stele can be dated mid-second to mid-third century.

For the dating of Christian epitaphs and dedications, one factor contributing to the establishment of the regional chronologies is the style of cross inscribed on some texts.
Again, although individual studies reveal regional idiosyncracies in the inscription of the different crosses, some features common to all regions may be extrapolated and applied to the dating of Christian inscriptions from elsewhere. All the regional studies reveal the same progressive appearance of the different types of cross, that is, first the Constantinian monogram, then the monogrammatic cross, the Greek cross, and finally the Latin cross, all inscribed with or without the apocalyptic letters. The Constantinian monogram appears in the fourth century, the monogrammatic cross in the early fifth century, the Greek cross a little later but still early in the fifth, the Greek cross with apocalyptic letters not before the mid-fifth, and the Latin cross not earlier than the end of the fifth century or beginning of the sixth. Since all types, once introduced, continue to be used concurrently with former types, with the single exception of the Constantinian monogram, which does not appear after the end of the fifth century, the use of a particular cross will constitute only a terminus post quem for that inscription. However, since no Christian inscriptions are found in Roman Africa after the seventh century, it follows that each cross type can serve to date an inscription to a period within two or three centuries. Thus the Constantinian monogram occurs on inscriptions of the fourth to fifth centuries, a monogrammatic cross or a Greek cross will date a text to the fifth to seventh centuries, a Greek cross with apocalyptic letters will indicate a date of mid-fifth to seventh centuries, and a Latin cross will indicate texts of the late fifth or early sixth century to the seventh. Eleven inscriptions have been dated on the basis of this criterion.

A few inscriptions dated only by their style of writing have been rejected on the grounds that paleography alone is an insufficiently secure dating criterion.

The application of the above six criteria to the Latin inscriptions of Roman North Africa yields a corpus of eighty-six verse texts suitable for the present study. They range in date
continuously from the first century AD through the Byzantine age; fifty-eight are funerary, twenty-eight nonfunerary; forty-nine derive from pagan, thirty-seven from Christian milieux.
Chapter 2. Authorship of the Texts

It is commonly assumed that authors of the carmina latina epiqraphica, many of whom lacked the learning or talent required to compose an epitaph or dedication, made use of the manuals of formulae and anthologies of verse that were available in the shop of the local lapicida, or, if they had the means, commissioned an original work from a professional poet or perhaps from the town grammaticus. It is possible that such aids were available and that some dedicators of inscriptions resorted to their use; recent reexamination of the evidence, however, suggests that the extent of the use of handbooks and hired professionals has been exaggerated, and that many dedicators, at least in the African provinces, were both able and inclined to create their own epigraphic carmina. We shall be justified, therefore, in considering each verse inscription as the individual and personal expression of the one who purports to have composed it.

The hypothesis that manuals of formulae and anthologies of epigraphic carmina existed for the use of lapicidae and their clients was advanced in the last century to explain the presence in the corpus of Latin verse inscriptions of several "duplicates", that is, similar or identical verses that come often from different areas of the empire. E.LeBlant,46 studying the Christian inscriptions, and R.Cagnat,47 studying the pagan, saw no other way to account for such "copies" as,

sedem victuris gaudens componere membris ...
corporis hospitium sanctus metator adornat
(BL 1427.4,6, Gaul),

sedem vivacem moribundis ponere membris
corporis hospitium laetus metator adornat
(BL 302.10-11, Gaul),
and,

quod par parenti fuerat facere filium
mors immatura fecit ut faceret pater
(BL 164, Italy),

quod parenti facere debuit filia
id immature filiae fecit pater
(BL 173, Baetica),

quod filia patri facere debuerat
mors immatura fecit ut faceret pater
(BL 1546.3-4, Italy),

quod fas erat filium facere parentibus
morte immatura Q Serv et Sex R filio fecere parentes
infelicissimi
(CIL 5.312, Gaul).

"... il n'y a guère moyen d'expliquer autrement que par la
présence d'un manuel, entre les mains du lapicide, la similitude
des pièces de vers que l'on rencontre sur des tombes dans les
parties les plus différentes de l'empire romain."\textsuperscript{48} Both LeBlant
and Cagnat attributed the mediocrity and the errors found in
many duplicates to incompetence on the part of the adapter or
inscriber of a stock epigram.

The suggestion that some of the better verse inscriptions are
perhaps the work of local talents hired for the occasion is
H.Focillon's. He argued that grammatici, for example, might have
been glad to enhance their income in this way, and imagined even
"specialistes du genre, grammairiens pauvres, logés dans des
rues étroites, au dernier étage, comme le Codrus de Juvenal,
fournisseurs attitrés ... (des) sociétés de mutualité funéraire
qui, moyennant une cotisation annuelle, se chargeaient de faire
ensevelir honorablement leurs membres".\textsuperscript{49}
Both hypotheses have persisted to the present. G. Susini, for example, concludes from his observation of identical or nearly identical texts that "there can be no doubt that collections of ... verses were put at the disposal of the customer by the more elegant and better equipped establishments". And H. LeBonniec, expressing surprise at the relative correctness of a third century African *carmen*, asserts that "le veuf a dû avoir recours ... j'allais dire aux services de l'instituteur du bourg; disons qu'il a fait appel au *magister* de Mactar."

Alternative views regarding the authorship of the verse inscriptions, however, have been proposed. First, as B. Lier notes, completely identical poems are rare, and the abundance in similar poems of various metric, prosodic, and syntactical errors argues against, not for, the use of manuals and anthologies. If handbooks had in fact existed and had been consulted as extensively as is sometimes suggested, the corpus of extant verse inscriptions would surely include many more identical poems of good quality and many fewer poems of similar content but varying quality. Second, as G. Munno and E. Galletier observe, duplicates often express a brief moral, philosophical or religious commonplace, and no source other than a shared culture need be sought. The multiple inscriptions, for instance, of the lamentation cited above, "what the child should do for the parent, premature death has caused the parent to do for the child", are simply several individual expressions of a thought that was the common property of inhabitants throughout the empire. Third, as E. Lissberger demonstrates, epigraphs of similar or identical content most often come from the same or a neighbouring town; duplication may, therefore, be attributable simply to autopsy. An "author" saw an inscription, admired it and copied it for his own use. Lissberger also shows that when similar poems originate from widely separate areas of the empire, usually one copy will come from Rome, and another from Italy or one of the provinces; he proposes that the mobility of certain segments of the population, for example, military and
administrative personnel or private citizens in pursuit of pleasure or business, may sometimes be responsible for the dispersion of epigraphic themes. The duplication of verse inscriptions, therefore, may be considered sometimes to have occurred without the intermediate aid of an anthology.

Furthermore, the need for aids such as handbooks of verse and hired professionals has perhaps been overestimated. The authors of many verse inscriptions express enthusiasm for learning, literature and composition, and, since we know that at all times in the empire a portion of the population was well educated, familiar with classical poetry, and devoted in their leisure time to the composition and recitation of occasional verse, it seems safe, as J.Zarker suggests, to take at face value the claims of personal authorship of the dedicators of inscriptions.

The arguments described above regarding the use of anthologies and hired help have been reexamined and their validity for the African verse inscriptions tested in a recent article by D.Pikhaus. The results of her study of three aspects of the composition of epigraphic verse - the geographical distribution and frequency of occurrence, the social strata to which dedicators belonged, and the phenomenon of similar carmina - lead her to abandon altogether the hypothesis that authors resorted to the use of anthologies and hired professionals, and to assert the likelihood that most dedicators did in fact compose their own works.

Pikhaus tallies the absolute numbers of verse inscriptions found in the various cities and villages, determines for each location what portion of the total epigraphic production is represented by the verse inscriptions, and compares the relative frequency of occurrence of verse epigraphy throughout Roman Africa. She finds that in all locations, regardless of size or importance, the frequency of production of verse inscriptions is uniform and very low; in 90% of the locations that have left enough inscriptions to allow a statistical accounting, whether
large urban centers or small rural habitations, only .25% - 4.25% of the total number of inscriptions are composed in verse. If manuals had been available, she reasons, it is surprising that more dedicators did not use them, and that the great metropolises like Carthage, which presumably boasted several stonemasons' shops, replete with specialized anthologies, did not produce a relatively higher number of verse inscriptions than the smaller towns with their fewer resources.

In attempting to determine the composition of the very small minority who preferred verse to prose for their epigraphic dedications, Pikhaus uses two sources of information, the biographical details provided by dedicators themselves, either in the body of their poem or in a prose prescript or subscript, and the monumental context of the inscription, for such edifices as basilicae, mausolea and private villas imply the social importance of their dedicators. Although not all dedicators record explicit personal details, and the original architectural context of many epigraphic poems is unknown, examination of the available data indicates that the great majority of inscriptions belongs to *honestiores*. Of the pagan poems that offer biographical details, for example, 85% belong to local notables[^61] and only 15% to *humiliores*; of the Christian poems that provide personal details, none at all belong to *humiliores*. Pikhaus concludes that the tiny minority who produced the African verse inscriptions comprised not the "illettrés" assumed by Cagnat,[^62] but rather the municipal elite, a segment of the population in whom we may expect a good education, the capability of practising and the leisure to enjoy the composition of occasional verse, and the interest in commemorating themselves or their families by an epigraphic poem of their own creation.

Finally, Pikhaus deals with the phenomenon of identical or similar verse inscriptions in the African provinces, conducting an exhaustive investigation of the frequency and distribution of their occurrence, and examining closely the circumstances of
their composition. She demonstrates not only that duplicates are rare, but also that their identity may be easily accounted for without recourse to hypothetical manuals or anthologies. Of the approximately six hundred extant African verse inscriptions only twenty-two are duplicated in another inscription. In three cases the similarity between inscriptions is confined to a formulaic phrase or two and is attributable simply to a common cultural heritage. For fourteen more, duplicates of which occur in the same or a neighbouring town, autopsy and private copying will account for the similarity.

For the remaining five inscriptions, three of which replicate poems from Rome, while two are similar or identical to poems from distant African towns, individual explanations are offered. First, an epitaph from the vicinity of Sicca (BL 966) seems to have been copied from a longer epitaph found in Rome (BL 965). Both commemorate a liberta and Pikhaus hypothesizes mobility of the population as the source of similarity. Two other examples are dedications of Christian buildings, one a church in Henchir Adjedj (CIL 8.10698), the other a memorial chapel in Ain Ghorab (CIL 8.10707-10708, with 17615); the texts of both were taken from Roman churches. Pikhaus suggests that members of the African clergy had travelled to Rome, the bishop of Henchir Adjedj perhaps on a pilgrimage, the priest from Ain Ghorab perhaps in flight from the Arian persecutions, and returned bearing inscriptions for their own sanctuaries. A fourth duplicate, a dedication that commemorates the bishop Cresconius' erection of a new basilica in Cuicul (AE 1922.25), is a composite of two inscriptions from the basilica of Alexander in Tipasa. Its first thirteen lines repeat almost verbatim the verse dedication that celebrated Alexander's provision of a new basilica (ILCV 1825); its last nine lines duplicate the bishop's verse epitaph (ILCV 1103). As Pikhaus notes, the many topical allusions in these inscriptions tell against the use of an anthology; much more likely is that Cresconius travelled to Tipasa, admired Alexander's inscriptions
and appropriated them for his own glory. A fifth pair of identical poems commemorates the construction of two fortifications by the praetorian prefect Thomas in the late sixth century, one a wall at Thibaris (AE 1948.108), the other a citadel at Mascula (ILCV 795). Both belong to the series of defense works commissioned by the Byzantine emperors after the expulsion of the Vandals; both express the official policy. The uniformity of the poems is due simply to the similar, specific nature of the structures dedicated. Pikhaus concludes from her study of all these aspects of the composition of the African verse inscriptions that there is no need to hypothesize the use of handbooks of verse or hired professionals. For the few identical poems that do occur, other explanations are available; for the rest, their dedicators were educated men and women capable of composing epitaphs and dedications for themselves, their families and their towns.

It is not impossible that manuals of verse existed and that some dedicators, lacking learning or talent, resorted to their use, or, if they were able, hired professional poets. Pikhaus' alternative explanation, for example, of the apparent dependency of the African epitaph BL 966 on the longer Roman epitaph BL 965, "here it is only the hypothetical mobility of the population which could be put against the traditional explanation through anthologies", seems forced. On the whole, however, the evidence that has been presented to document the scarcity of identical verse inscriptions, and to correct the preconceived impression of their authors as "illetrés", strongly favours consideration of each epigraphic poem as the composition of the one who purports to have written it.
Chapter 3. Educational Background of the Authors of the African Verse Inscriptions

Authors who attempted to compose their epitaphs or dedications in verse may be assumed to have received at least some education in the principles and practices of classical versification. The many dedicators of African verse inscriptions who belonged, as Pikhaus has shown, to the privileged strata of Roman provincial society may have attained a relatively advanced level of education. Since education in Africa, as elsewhere in the empire, was based at every stage on the scrutiny of language and literature, it is not surprising that an alumnus should have acquired some understanding of the elements and laws of the Latin language, some familiarity with the great works of Latin literature, both prose and poetry, and some experience in producing compositions of his own. An examination of the content and method of instruction in schools, however, suggests that the educational system may be considered not only to account for our authors' knowledge of the composition of classical poetry, but also to explain some of the unclassical features of their own versification.

Of the three stages of education, the elementary, in which a student learned to read, write, and do simple arithmetic, the secondary, in which he studied grammar and literature, and the advanced, which was devoted to rhetoric, the second is the focus of this chapter. The aims, content and methods of this stage of instruction are known from the works of the grammatici, theoreticians and teachers of language and literature, from Varro in the first century BC to Bede in the seventh century AD, as well as from scattered references in other ancient authors. Several grammarians, from Terentianus Maurus in the second century AD to Priscian in the sixth, are known to have come from the African provinces, but since the linguistic and literary perceptions expounded by grammatici throughout the empire were remarkably uniform, any of their treatises may safely be cited
as evidence for the educational background of the authors of the African verse inscriptions.

The twofold task of the grammaticus was to teach the correct use of the Latin language, recte loquendi scientia, and to provide an exposition of the great works of literature that exemplified its artistic employment, poetarum enarratio.\(^7^1\) The grammaticus, in other words, taught grammar and literature. The former comprised the analysis and classification of letters, syllables and parts of speech, an explanation of the principles of versification, and an enumeration and description of virtues and vices in the use of the language. The literature lesson comprised a detailed exposition by the grammaticus of the great works of poetry, with analysis, memorization and recitation by the student.\(^7^2\)

From the first century AD on, the instruction both of grammar and of literature was based on a fixed syllabus of works, the chief exponents of which were Vergil, first and foremost, Terence, Horace and Ovid.\(^7^3\) The Vergilian corpus, which began to be studied in schools even in the poet's lifetime,\(^7^4\) quickly became established as the textbook of choice.\(^7^5\) For the grammatici a phrase or line from Vergil served on almost every point as example of and authority for correct usage. All questions of correctness in language and literary composition were, from the first century to the end of the empire, referred to the auctoritas of these canonical writers. Augustine, for example, warns a pupil that if he makes an error in vocalic length,

\[
\text{te reprehendet grammaticus, custos ille videlicet historiae, nihil aliud asserens cur hanc (syllabam) corripi oporteat, nisi quod hi qui ante nos fuerunt, et quorum libri exstant tractanturque a grammaticis, ea correpta, non producta, usi fuerint (de Musica 2.1.1).}
\]

Instruction in grammar seems to have been by lecture, followed by review through question and answer.\(^7^6\) In the literature component of the lesson, the student was more
directly involved. After a praelectio, or preliminary recitation of a passage by the grammaticus, the pupil prepared his own copy of the text. This entailed punctuating the sentences,\textsuperscript{77} noting word cohesions, divisions and abbreviations,\textsuperscript{78} and marking the linguistic accents and vocalic lengths.\textsuperscript{79} With the help of this codex distinctus, he proceeded to memorize and then to recite the passage in question. The recitation, or lectio, of the prepared passage by the student was followed by a detailed exposition, or enarratio, by the grammaticus, in which both form, verborum interpretatio, and subject matter, historiarum cognitio, were treated.\textsuperscript{80} Noteworthy items of orthography, morphology, syntax, and scansion received comment, as did features of style such as tropes and figures, and various aspects of the content. Of this portion of the instruction the commentaries of Servius on the works of Vergil are considered to be representative.\textsuperscript{81}

The emphasis placed on memorization in Roman education is clear in the ancient sources; Quintilian, for instance, prescribes that

\begin{quote}
pueri ... quam plurima ediscant et ... quaecumque aetas operam iuvandae studio memoriae dabit, devoret initio taedium illud et ... lecta saepius revolvendi et quasi eundem cibum remandendi. quod ipsum hoc fieri potest levius, si pausa primum et quae odium non adferant coeperimus ediscere, tum cotidie adicere singulos versus, quorum accessio labori sensum incrementi non adferat, in summam ad infinitum usque perveniat (11.2.41).
\end{quote}

And Augustine recalls having been obliged to "learn by heart the wanderings of a hero named Aeneas",\textsuperscript{82} and attests the remarkable ability of his friend Simplicius to recite Vergil backwards.\textsuperscript{83} This aspect of Roman education accounts for a feature of some specimens of popular epigraphic verse, namely, the enhancement of an original composition by hemistiches or whole lines taken from the classics, for the commitment to memory of large
portions of classical poetry, practised over several years under the gramma
cus, will have provided students with a store of passages of prosodically sound and polished verse, upon which they might draw, later in life, in the composition of an epitaph or dedication.

From the extant works of the grammatici, therefore, can be reconstructed a clear view of the general aims, content and methods of this stage of education; what is more valuable, however, is their documentation of the specific information that was imparted to the student. Of particular interest, in terms of the purposes of the present study, is the grammarians' exposition of the elements of the Latin language, that is, the letters and syllables, and of the principles of versification, especially of dactylic verse.

"Letters", by which the grammarians meant both the graphs used in writing and the sounds that they symbolized, were classified either "vowel" or "consonant", the phonemes that belonged to each of these two categories were listed, and certain properties that were relevant to their use in quantitative verse were discussed. Students were taught that the vowels, a, e, i, o, u, and y, borrowed from the Greek, each possessed two possible lengths. Some grammatici perceived qualitative differences between long and short vowels and instructed their students in precise enunciation, perhaps in the hope that this would aid their retention of correct vocalic lengths.

The consonants were subdivided into two classes, semivocales, f, l, m, n, r, s, x, and mutae, b, c, d, g, h, k, p, q, t. An important subsection of the Latin semivowels was formed by the liquids, liquidae or liquentes, so called because when placed after mutes, they seemed to "melt" and "disappear", a phenomenon of consequence in quantitative versification. A subsection of the mutes, which was noted by some grammatici, was formed by the letters c, p and t, because in words of Greek origin they could be followed by the aspirate h. Confusion
regarding this foreign phenomenon is manifested in the African carmina epiigraphica in a few orthographical inversions, for instance, Crhistus.

This classification and description of the vowels and consonants formed the foundation of the grammarian's teaching of the syllable, the linguistic unit on which classical quantitative versification was based. The syllable was defined simply and rather mechanically,

syllaba est coniunctio litterarum cum vocali vel vocalibus sub uno accentu et spiritu continuata (Marius Victorinus K6.26.15-16),

and instruction was given in the criteria that determined one of its key prosodical features, quantity.

Syllabic quantity was understood as a temporal property, and syllables classified as long, short and "common". The distinction between the types of syllables was described in terms of vowel length and number of constituent consonants. Thus a short syllable was explained as one that contained a short vowel not followed by two consonants, a long syllable as one either containing a long vowel or diphthong (long by nature), or having a short vowel followed by two consonants (long by position). The elaboration and exemplification given by the grammarians reveal that the convention of length by position applied not only within the syllable but also across syllable boundaries. Marius Victorinus, for example, explains that

fiunt positione longae modis octo: primo si correpta vocalis desinit in duas consonantes, ut "ars"; secundo, si excipitur a duabus consonantibus, ut "Acrisioneis Danae"; tertio, si desinit in consonantem et excipitur ab alia vel ab eadem consonanti, ut "arma" "Anna"; quarto, si desinit in duplicem litteram, ut "nox"; quinto, si excipitur a duplici, ut "axis"; sexto, si desinit in consonantem, quae duarum sonum praebet, ut "hoc erat"; septimo, si desinit in consonantem et excipitur a vocali loco consonantis posita, ut "arvum";
octavo, si excipitur ab i littera duplicata, ut "Troiia" "aiio" "Graiius" "Aiiax". (K6.27.2-10).

Although the grammatici might have presented their accounts of syllabic quantity more succinctly, they did provide the student with a sufficiently accurate working knowledge of "long" and "short" syllables. Ancient accounts of "common syllables", however, appear in some cases to be misleading, in other cases incomplete or even inaccurate, and may be considered to have caused some of the unclassical features found in popular versification. Common syllables were defined as those the quantity of which might be altered under certain conditions. Nine were described: (1) lengthening of a syllable containing a short vowel followed by a consonant sequence "mute + liquid", for example, pātris; (2) lengthening of a syllable containing a short vowel followed by the sequence "consonant + consonantal i or u", for example, tenuis; (3) correction of word-final o, for example, modō; (4) lengthening of a short syllable in arsis before a caesura, for example, ómnia víncit amôr || et ...; (5) lengthening of a short syllable followed by the sequence "consonant + h", for instance, fatiqamūs hasta; (6) correction of a syllable ending in a long vowel in hiatus, for instance, Iliō alto; (7) correction of a syllable ending in a diphthong in hiatus, for example, insulaē Ionio; (8) lengthening of a syllable containing a word-final short vowel followed by word-initial consonant sequence "s + consonant", for example, pro segetē spicas; and (9) anceps treatment of the two monosyllables hic and hoc. The first five of these possible alterations in syllabic quantity figure in the versification of the African carmina epigraphica.

(1) The lengthening of a syllable containing a short vowel followed by the consonant sequence mute + liquid. Students were instructed that the quantity of such a syllable could either remain short or be considered as long, (sc. communis syllaba fit) cum correptam vocalem duae consonantes secuntur, quarum prior debet esse muta, quam
A few grammatici perceived juncture as a factor in the treatment of these consonant sequences. Pompeius, for example, taught that a word-initial sequence of mute + liquid does not lengthen a preceding short syllable,

nullus sermo latinus potest fieri positione longus sequente muta et liquida una in alia parte orationis (K5.118.14-15),

and Charisius notes that if the sequence straddles a syllable boundary the preceding syllable is always long. His observation is accurate; his illustrations, however, are inapposite,

si duae consonantes in duas syllabas fuerint divisae, non fiet communis sed longa, ut ... "alma" ... (et) "arma" (K1.13.23-27).

Neither of these considerations of juncture is complete. In classical poetry, as a general rule, where a word boundary or a grammatical boundary separates the short vowel from the sequence, the syllable containing the short vowel remains short, for example, sinē crimine, rētrahit; where a word boundary or a grammatical boundary divides the sequence such that the mute closes the syllable containing the short vowel and the liquid opens the next syllable, the syllable containing the short vowel is long, for example, āb leone, ābripi.

(2) The lengthening power of consonantal i or u. Students were taught that syllables containing a short vowel followed by a single consonant + i or u could be either short, if the i or u preserved its vocalic status, for example, tenuis > tē- nū- īs, or long, if the i or u was treated as a consonant, for example, tenuis > tēn- uīs.

"arietat in portas": "arietat", stringe illud "arietat", "ar" longa fit positione, quia i transit in consonantis potestatem. et "genua labant": "genua", stringe illud "genva la", e vocalis desinit in n, illa n stringitur,
et u transit in locum consonantis, et fit positione longa (Pompeius K5.120.13-16).

The examples provided by the grammatici are from Vergil, in whose works are found several instances of lengthening by position through consonantalization of i or u.

Some grammarians may have led their pupils astray in teaching that the digraph qu could be considered an example of the sequence "consonant + consonantal u", and thus could make position. According to Audax,

(sc. positione longa syllaba fit) cum correpta vocalis excipitur a littera q, quam necesse est ut consequatur littera u, quae cum altera vocali iuncta loco consonantis accipitur, ut apud Lucretium, "quae calidum faciunt aquae tactum atque vaporem" (K7.328.18-329.3)

Audax probably cites this line (de Rerum Natura 6.868), incorrectly, from memory; the extant manuscripts of the de Rerum Natura all read laticis for aquae. The phenomenon for which he attempts an explanation, however, is genuine, for Lucretius does use aqua in two other places in Book 6, and liquidus in four passages elsewhere in the work, in which the first syllable of these words appears to scan long.92 Bede also interprets the Lucretian aqua as a case of a syllable made long by position.93 Other grammatici, however, taught that qu did not constitute a sequence of two consonants and therefore did not make position in quantitative versification.94 Modern scholars agree that in classical poetry qu was not treated as a double consonant, and they offer other explanations for the Lucretian scansions of aqua and liquidus.95 The teachings of Audax and Bede may simply be erroneous; or they may reflect a contemporary pronunciation of qu that differed from the classical.96

(3) The correction of final o. The grammarians' discussions of the length of final o in classical poetry are, in general, accurate. Students were informed that Vergil preserved the natural length of final o, except in the verb scio, in the adverb modo, the noun duo,97 and the pronoun ego,
In their reading of the classical elegists students will have encountered the correction of final o in more words than those allowed by Vergil. Verbal forms in which final o is sometimes scanned short in elegy include the first person of the present tense indicative, the first person of the future or future perfect tense, and the imperative. Ovid also occasionally abbreviates final o in proper names and in three common nouns (nemo, leo, homo). 98

The grammatici did observe that later poets extended their practice of the abbreviation of final o in the first person form of present tense verbs,
neoterici autem omnes, Statius et alii, maiores sunt in illa parte quae brevis est, quam in illa quae longa est, contra Vergilium. omnis ergo o in prima persona semper corripitur exceptis monosyllabis (Pompeius K5.232.35-38).

Pompeius' general observation that later poets shortened final o more often than did Vergil, is correct, but his specific statement that final o is "always" short in the first person singular form of verbs is exaggerated.

(4) The lengthening of a short precaesural syllable in arsis. This is a licence familiar to all readers of classical poetry; it was used by Vergil and by the elegists, and is exploited frequently by the authors of verse inscriptions who aspired to imitate them. It is surprising, therefore, to find in the grammatici accounts of it that are at best incomplete and often quite misleading. All the grammarians who discuss syllabic quantity observe the phenomenon of the lengthening of final syllables; only one, however, specifies the criterion of the
position of the lengthened syllable in the verse, namely, in
arsis before a caesura. Sergius, for example, instructs his
pupils that a final short syllable is "common",
cum correpta vocalis in unam desinit consonantem, quae
partem terminat orationis; est enim longa in hoc, "omnia
vincit amor et nos cedamus amori"; brevis in hoc "hic
amor hoc studium"; sciendum est quod, etsi haec vocalis
non desinat in unam consonantem, sed nuda sit, saepe
communem syllabam facit; est enim longa in hoc, "dona
dehinc auro gravia sectoque elephanto"; brevis in hoc,
"talia dicta volant" (K4.479.6-14).
Marius Victorinus adds as example a lengthened -que,
"liminaque laurusque dei"; haec syllaba et inter
communes haberi potest (K6.30.7-8).
Similar descriptions are found in other grammarians. The fact
that Sergius and others can omit mention of the verse position
at which lengthening occurs, and can adduce as examples two
instances of amor, one of which occurs in arsis before a
caesura, the other in thesis at foot-end, is strong evidence of
their misunderstanding of the phenomenon. Only Bede provides an
accurate account,
"omnia vincit amor et nos cedamus amori", ubi "mor" ideo
potuit produci, quia post emensos pedes integros partem
terminat orationis, tametsi vocalis sequatur. (K7.231.6-
8)
The grammarians' descriptions of this licence are
incomplete and misleading in four respects. First and most
important, there is, apart from Bede's teaching, no mention of
the caesura. Students may have been left with the impression
that any final syllable ending in a short vowel + consonant and
followed by a word-initial vowel (amor et), or ending in a short
vowel followed by word-initial consonant + vowel (gravia
sectoque), regardless of its position in the verse, could be
either long or short. Actual classroom instruction possibly
provided clarification. Second, no indication is given of the
frequency with which the classical poets applied this licence. It was, in fact, relatively rare. Vergil, for example, lengthened a final closed syllable like *amor* only fifty-four times in all his works; the enclitic *-que* only sixteen times. Bede, again the exception, refers briefly to the frequency of Vergil's use of the licence, although in this case he proves inaccurate, *apud Virgilium non rarissimum* (K7.232.5). The elegists used the licence some thirty-eight times. Students will have felt free to apply the licence regularly, and in fact, as we shall see, it is the frequent use of this licence that constitutes one of the characteristic features of the versification of popular epigraphic *carmina*. Third, none of the grammarians evince any notion of the syntactic or rhetorical contexts in which classical lengthening in arsis occurs. R.Kent, however, has shown that of Vergil's fifty-four lengthenings of a final closed syllable, forty-two occur at a grammatical or a rhetorical pause. And R.Williams attributes Vergil's lengthening of the enclitic *-que* to imitation of Homer's treatment of the equivalent Greek enclitic.

The fourth respect in which the grammarians' discussions of the licence are inadequate is their failure to distinguish between the lengthening of final closed syllables and of final open syllables. Vergil's lengthening of final open syllables, however, was restricted, with one possible exception, to the enclitic *-que*. The only instance of his lengthening of a final open syllable other than the enclitic is the one given by Sergius and the other grammarians, *gravia sectoque* (Aen 3.464), cited above. There are five possible instances of the same phenomenon in the elegists. Some scholars have questioned the authenticity of these prosodical anomalies in Vergil and the elegists, and have offered emendations. The reading *gravia sectoque* in the Vergilian line, however, has the authority not only of the grammarians' citation, but also of Servius and of manuscript consensus. There is more doubt concerning the authenticity of the examples from the elegists, for the extant
manuscripts vary in their readings of some of the lines in question, and what the grammarians' manuscripts read is not known, for the lines are not cited by them. There is some uncertainty, therefore, regarding the practice of Vergil and the elegists in using this licence, and it is not impossible that these classical poets did, rarely, lengthen in arsis final open syllables other than -que. In view of the discussions of the grammarians and of their citation of a Vergilian example of lengthening in arsis of a final open syllable other than -que, it will not be surprising to find in the versification of their students free use of lengthening in arsis, not only of final closed syllables, but also of final open syllables. In this they were following the teaching of their grammatici, and they may have been following the example of the classical poets.

(5) The lengthening of a short syllable followed by a sequence of single consonant + h. Students were instructed that h could have consonantal value and therefore make position after another consonant,

... de h: aliquando littera est et facit longam syllabam, aliquando nihil est. littera est et longam facit superiorem in illo exemplo, "terga fatigamus hasta": "mus has", "mus" brevis est naturaliter; sed "mus", id est u vocalis, desinit in s et excipitur ab h, quae modo pro consonante est, ut duae consonantes sint; et fit longa. potest esse in illo altero exemplo pro nihil, "quisquis honos tumuli". "quis" longa positione posset esse, si h pro consonante haberetur. sed dicimus h perire in sequenti syllaba, et erit dactylus, non palimbacchius. ergo in hoc perit, "quisquis honos tumuli"; in illo permanet, "terga fatigamus hasta" (Pompeius K5.117.14-22).

All the grammarians who discuss syllabic quantity describe this licence; most use the same two examples. Only two, Diomedes and Bede, observe that the example illustrating consonantal h, "terga fatigamus hasta" is dubium because -mus is better
explained as an instance of the lengthening of a short syllable in arsis before the caesura (térga fatígamus || hastá ...). The grammatici seem simply to have erred, for there are no cases of h making position in Vergil or in the elegists. It has been noted, however, that the lengthening of a short closed syllable in arsis before the caesura occurs in Vergil more commonly before h than before a vowel, in proportion to the frequency of initial h in Latin. It is possible, therefore, that there existed in the pronunciation of cultivated speakers of Latin some basis for according h consonantal value.¹⁰⁴

From the grammarians' lectures on "common" syllables, therefore, students will have become acquainted with several licences that allowed the alteration of normal syllabic quantities. They may, however, also have been misled by the apparently incomplete and in some cases inaccurate interpretations of some grammatici regarding the prosodical practice of the classical poets. It will not be surprising, therefore, to find in the versification of their own compositions both the use and the abuse of these licences.

Instruction in the composition of dactylic hexameters and of the elegiac couplet, the two most common verse forms in the carmina epigraphica, was fairly straightforward. The dactylic hexameter, termed the versus heroicus by the grammarians, was described as consisting of six feet, either dactyls or spondees, although the fifth was almost always dactylic, and the sixth was spondaic or trochaic.¹⁰⁵ No extant grammarian discusses the distinctive cadence of the classical hexameter, in which quantitative and accentual rhythms coincide. One or two, however, register disapproval of monosyllabic line-ends, objecting, doubtless, to the rough rhythm produced.¹⁰⁶

A pleasing rhythm is produced only if the words of the hexameter are so arranged that word-end and foot-end do not coincide, that is, if caesurae (tomae or incisiones) are present.¹⁰⁷ The grammatici describe four possible caesurae, penthemimeral, hephemimeral, third trochaic, and fourth
trochaic,\textsuperscript{108} the first two of which were commonest.\textsuperscript{109} No grammarian seems to have noted any artistry in the great poets' use of caesurae. There is no mention, for example, of the relationship between caesurae and grammatical or rhetorical pauses, or of the conscious striving for variety. Students were simply instructed that a hexameter must have one or more caesurae and that the penthemimeral and hephthemimeral were the \textit{principales}. The conception of the caesura as a mechanical metric device, and the knowledge, gained from the lecture of the \textit{grammaticus} and observed in the reading of Vergil and Ovid,\textsuperscript{110} that the penthemimeral and then the hephthemimeral were by far the most common caesurae, explains the characteristic practice of the amateur poets of epigraphic verse, whose monotonous and mechanical use of the penthemimeral caesura, with or without a hephthemimeral caesura, constitutes one of the chief features of their versification.

The pentameter was variously described, but most simply as the repetition of the first two and one-half feet of a hexameter.\textsuperscript{111}

After the \textit{grammaticus} had described the basic structural features of the various verse types, he proceeded to point out several "barbarisms" that might occur in versification. A \textit{barbarismus}, classified as a \textit{vitium} and defined as a \textit{vitiosa dictio unius verbi},\textsuperscript{112} was produced by the alteration (by addition, subtraction, change or displacement) of letters, syllables, quantity, accent and aspiration. Donatus' offers the following examples: \textit{relliquias} for \textit{reliquias}; \textit{abisse} for \textit{abisse}; \textit{Italiam} for \textit{Italian}; \textit{salsamentum} for \textit{salsamentum}; \textit{unius} for \textit{unius}; \textit{ollii} for \textit{illi}; \textit{Evandre} for \textit{Evander}; \textit{deos} for \textit{deos}.\textsuperscript{113}

We might expect the grammarians' descriptions of barbarisms to be cautionary examples of potential errors in their pupils' work, but, as is clear from Donatus' illustrations, many are anomalies found in the great poets, especially Vergil. \textit{Relliquias}, for example, comes from Aen 1.30; \textit{abisse} from Aen 2.25; \textit{Italian} from Aen 1.2; \textit{unius} from Aen 1.41; and \textit{Evandre}
from Aen 11.55. It is understandable that the grammaticus, endeavouring to train his students in correct versification, would not want them to indulge in such exceptions, yet he could not appear to ascribe vitiositas to such masters of poetry as Vergil. Hence, a distinction was made: irregularities in versification that occurred in pupils' exercises were reproved as barbarismi; the same irregularities, if found in the canonical poets, were treated as metaplasmi, that is, transformations effected metri ornatusve causa (Donatus K4.395.28). Sacerdos puts it forthrightly,

haec vitia... cum dicuntur ... a nobis vitia sunt, cum a poetis metaplasmi (K6.451.14-16).

Metaplasms were classified and accorded technical names, and, in every case, illustrations were adduced from Vergil. Relevant in terms of the present study are five: systole, ectasis, synalipha, ecthlipsis and episynalipha.

Systole is the irrational shortening of a natural vocalic length,

systole est cum producta syllaba contra rationem corripitur, ut "urbemque Fidenam". (Charisius K1.279.1-2)

Ectasis is the irrational lengthening of a natural vocalic length,

ectasis est extensio syllabae contra naturam verbi, ut "Italiam fato profugus", cum Italia correpte dici debeat (Donatus 4.396.14-15).

It is noteworthy that most of the grammarians' examples of literary systole and ectasis occur in proper names, the adaptation of which to the fixed rhythms of quantitative verse was not infrequently difficult, even for the great poets. It will not be surprising, therefore, to find in popular epigraphic verse many instances of the alteration of vocalic lengths in proper names to suit the needs of the meter.

Synalipha is the elision of a word-final vowel before a word-initial vowel or h,
si vocalis vocalem excludat, synaliphe est, ut "ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus avena". "ille ego", e et e duae istae vocales sunt, altera tamen alteram exclusit, et non fecit "ille ego", sed fecit "illego". (Pompeius K5.298.12-16).

Ecthlipsis is the elision of a syllable ending in "vowel + m", ecthlipsis est cum inter se aspere concurrentium syllabarum intercedente sola m littera consonante et vocalem et consonantem, quam diximus, elidi necesse est, ut "multum ille et terris" (Probus K4.264.10-12).

The possibility of hiatus was noted, interdum sane vocales inter se concurrentes synalipham fieri vetant, et, si versus inpleri nequiverit, nulla eliditur, ut "et sucus pecori et lac subducitur agnis" (Probus K4.264.6-9).

However, that the grammarians perceived and taught that elision was the norm in classical poetry is implied by their discussions of it. One or two are explicit. Bede, for instance, refers to Vergil's frequent use of elision, and Probus notes Vergil's "vigilance" in eliding intervocalic word-final m. That synalipha and ecthlipsis are included in the grammarians' lists of metaplasms is somewhat puzzling. Most of the phenomena designated metaplasmi are infrequent or anomalous alterations effected by the poet metri ornatusve causa. Elision, however, as the grammarians themselves noted, is neither infrequent nor anomalous; it is normal literary practice in the case of contiguous vowels or of intervocalic word-final m.

A licence found in preclassical versification, the muting of final s after a short vowel and before a consonant, was treated by some grammarians as a kind of elision. Sacerdos, for example, observes that s ... littera eliditur ... si a consonanti incipiat altera pars orationis, ut Lucretius ... "infantibus parvis" .... "infantibu parvis" ... scandimus (K6.448.8-31).
Marius Victorinus is among the few who note that practice of this licence was limited to poetae antiqui. The muting of final s after a short vowel and before a consonant appears a few times in the African verse inscriptions.

Episynalipha (synizesis or synaeresis), is the cohesion of two contiguous vowels that belong to different syllables in the same word, with the result that the number of syllables in the word is reduced,

cum duae vocales in unam syllabam coguntur, quae possunt duarum syllabarum locum divisae completae, nulla dumtaxat interposita consonante, ut ... "villis onerosum atque unguibus aureis" .... in scandendo autem "reis" syllaba non dividitur, sed e littera in unitatem cum i deducta (Marius Victorinus K6.66.18-25).

Episynalipha is found once in the African verse inscriptions.

The ancient grammarians have been seen in a few cases to present an inaccurate account of certain phenomena of versification, and in many cases to impart incomplete and misleading information. The observation that h could make position after another consonant, for example, is erroneous; discussions of the lengthening of a syllable in arsis before the caesura are inadequate. Even where descriptions are correct, they are very often misleading, for poetic licences that were exercised in classical verse as exceptions to the usual rules of syllabic quantity are presented as alternative prosodical treatments of syllables, without qualification or restriction as to metric,lexical, syntactic or rhetorical context, or to frequency. However, these grammatical treatises by no means provide a full record of actual classroom instruction. Grammatici doubtless elaborated upon each point, clarifying and refining in the course of their teaching their perceptions and exposition of classical versification.

After four or five years under the grammaticus, a student will have become acquainted with the principles of the
composition of classical quantitative verse, and with the great poetry of the past that embodied those principles. In his grammar lessons he will have learned the sounds of the vowels and consonants, the concept of vocalic length by nature, and the criteria for determining syllabic quantity. He will have been instructed in the basic structural principles of the hexameter and of the pentameter, and would be aware of the phenomena of word juncture, that is, of elision and hiatus. From the grammarian's description of "common" syllables and of barbarismi and metaplasmi, however, the student will also have learned the many possible exceptions to the rules: letters and syllables could be added, subtracted, changed and displaced; quantities could be altered; contiguous vowels could elide, coalesce or remain in hiatus. Only the brightest and most talented students, perhaps, will have been able to discern the the relative frequency or the artistic effects of such phenomena. It is true that the grammaticus instructed his pupils that the many phenomena described as barbarismi were a nobis vitia, a poetis metaplasmi; however, given the apparent abundance of time devoted to their description in the grammar lesson, given the auctoritas lent them by the use of the classics for illustration, and given the study and memorization of the poetry that exemplified them, it will be not at all surprising to find such anomalies both used and abused in the versification of men and women of average talent and proficiency.
Chapter 4. Linguistic Milieu

Certain phonological differences that existed between the Latin spoken by the authors of the African verse inscriptions and the literary Latin of their classical models appear frequently to have hampered their efforts in the composition of classical quantitative verse.

The term "literary Latin" denotes the classical idiom, that is, the fixed set of lexical, morphological, syntactical and phonological forms and practices that had, by the end of the first century BC, become established as "correct" for the composition of good literature and for the speech of educated Romans. This linguistic standard was achieved and preserved through the imposition of certain restrictions, most of which concerned the identification and elimination of solecisms, rusticisms and barbarisms of form and sound. Authority for usage and instruction in the literary language was, as we have just seen, based on a collection of works that employed and exemplified it, and, since this corpus remained unchanged from the end of the first century AD, correctness, even centuries later, depended on the auctoritas of these canonical authors. Regarded thus as "hallowed for eternity" in the works of the old masters, literary Latin admitted no change, and imposed a "tyrannical classical ideal" upon those who would use it.\textsuperscript{117}

The expression "spoken Latin", on the other hand, refers to the everyday idiom of the living language as used in ordinary, spontaneous speech.\textsuperscript{118} It differed from literary Latin in many lexical, morphological, syntactical and phonological features, and itself encompassed manifold varieties both synchronic, that is, marked by regional, social and occasional differences, and diachronic, that is, manifesting progressive changes in its natural chronological evolution. Of the differences between the spoken and the literary idioms, only the phonological are relevant for the present study. Since there are today no native speakers of Latin and no direct record of its phonology,
knowledge of its unclassical features, and of the evolution of those features, must be gleaned from a variety of sources. The most fruitful are the orthographical errors found in prose inscriptions, the explicit statements made by certain ancient authors, including some comments of the grammarians, and comparative studies of the Romance languages.

Prose inscriptions, which exist in abundance in the form of epitaphs, dedications, *defixionum tabellae* and graffiti, reveal several phonological features of spoken Latin and document their evolution. Since authors of inscriptions used the only vehicle known to them for written expression, namely, the classical idiom in which they had been educated, their efforts really represent literary Latin. Where, however, their spoken idiom differed from the literary, and where memory of the "correct" form failed them, their natural phonology manifests itself in orthographical errors. *Etati* (CIL 4.1684) for *aetati*, for instance, reflects a monophthongal pronunciation of the classical diphthong ae. So-called hypercorrections such as *saenatus* for *senatus* (CIL 6. 2066) attest the confusion that often resulted from awareness of a difference in idiom, but uncertainty regarding correctness. Errors occur both in private and in official public inscriptions, although the latter are more likely to adhere to literary norms.

Not all deviations from standard orthography, however, necessarily reflect a phonological phenomenon. Alterations of letters and syllables may be attributable simply to graphic error. *Eco* for *ego* (CIL 8. 9081), for example, need not represent a hypercorrection attesting the voicing of the intervocalic velar plosive (c > g), but perhaps only the mason's failure to add a horizontal bar to his c. Nor does the omission of certain final consonants necessarily reflect the muting of that consonant in speech; *anni*, for example, is thought by A.Acquati to illustrate the muting of final s, *anni* < *annis*, but may be a deliberate abbreviation, an epigraphic feature especially common in formulaic expressions,
as others have seen. Although the possibility of such alternative explanations necessitates caution in interpreting each orthographical deviation, the majority of examples cited as evidence for popular speech are very likely authentic, and most scholars of spoken Latin regard prose inscriptions as one of their most valuable sources.

Firsthand testimony regarding certain features of the popular speech of their contemporaries is provided in the comments of ancient authors such as Cicero and Augustine, and in the teachings of some grammarians. The latter must be read particularly carefully since, as we saw above, most of their examples of barbarismi in pronunciation are drawn, without notice of citation, from the literary Latin of the classical poets. A few, however, come from the spoken Latin of their students. One grammaticus who distinguishes carefully between literary Latin sources and spoken Latin sources of barbarismi is the fifth century Consentius,

nunc iam quibus modis barbarismus fiat, tempestivius proferemus. in quo equidem non imitabor eos scriptores, qui exempla huius modi vitiorum de auctoritate lectionum dare voluerunt ... nos exempla huius modi dabimus, quae in usu cotidie loquentium animadvertere possumus, si paulo ea curiosius audiamus (K5.391.25-33).

Since the Romance languages developed from the spoken and not the literary idiom, it is possible, through comparative linguistic studies of them, to postulate the existence of certain phonological phenomena in spoken Latin. For example, from the various Romance forms that derive from the Latin word for "weight", such as French poids (old pois), Italian, Spanish and Portuguese peso, Rumanian păs, a spoken Latin form *pesu is hypothesized. Given the literary Latin pensum, the inference is drawn that two features of colloquial Latin in antiquity were the muting of the nasal in the consonant group ns (ns > s) and the muting of word-final m (-m > -∅). Although no Romance language developed from African spoken Latin, the colloquial
idiom in the African provinces, as attested by various sources, shares with the other regions of the empire those phonological features that are relevant for the present study. The testimony of the Romance languages, therefore, can safely be used to confirm the evidence presented by other sources.

Of the many features of spoken Latin that appear in the African verse inscriptions, four are important for the purposes of this study: the muting of word-final m; the muting of word-final s; the monophthongization of the diphthong ae; and, by the third or fourth century, if not earlier, the loss of quantitative vocalic distinctions. These habits of popular speech produced syllabic structures that differed from the literary, and, therefore, where they intrude into attempts to versify according to classical models, they frequently mar the expected rhythmic pattern of heavy and light syllables.

Muting of word-final m. In classical literary Latin final m was observed both orthographically and prosodically before a word-initial consonant, and observed orthographically but not prosodically before a word-initial vowel. That final m was dropped in spoken Latin not only before a vowel but also before a consonant, is suggested by its frequent omission in inscriptions from all eras and regions in the Roman empire, and confirmed by the Romance languages, which show no trace of it except in a few monosyllables. An early inscription that illustrates this feature of spoken Latin is the third century BC epitaph of L. Cornelius Scipio, ... duonoro optumo fuisse viro ... (= bonorum optimum fuisse virum, BL 6.2). In the African provinces we find such examples as septe mensi(bus) (CIL 8.1040, second or third century), me(n)sa fecerunt (CIL 8.21646, fourth century), septe plus (CIL 8.8639, fifth century).

Muting of word-final s. In literary Latin word-final s was observed both orthographically and prosodically, its former muting before a consonant being regarded by Cicero's day as subrusticum. In spoken Latin inscriptive evidence suggests, and Romance developments confirm, that treatment of final s
varied geographically. Beginning in the second century BC, official inscriptions usually record -s; private inscriptions, however, differ. In Italy and Dacia final s is frequently omitted, while in other areas, for instance, Gaul, Iberia and Sardinia, it is usually retained. Italian and Rumanian show no trace of final s, while French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Sardinian preserve it. In the African provinces, the epigraphic omission of final s occurs in inscriptions dating from the second century to Byzantine times; examples include si meo rito castitati vivas (CIL 8.13134, second century), Valentin[ian]u Valens et Gratianu (CIL 8.22519, fourth century), and laboribo fecerunt (CIL 8.4354, sixth century). No linguistic descendant of African spoken Latin exists to support the epigraphic evidence that final s was muted in everyday speech. One recent study, however, suggests that final s was treated in Africa as in Rome and in Dacia (muted), and not as in Gaul (unmuted). According to the analyses of S.Kiss, African inscriptions exhibit the same relatively high frequency of omission of final s as do inscriptions from Rome and from Dacia (Africa 1.3%, Rome 1.6%, Dacia 1.1%), compared with the much lower frequencies in the Gallic provinces (Narbonensis 0%, other Gallic regions .5%). Since modern Italian and Rumanian confirm the evidence of the inscriptions that final s was muted in Rome and Dacia, and since the African inscriptions reveal about the same percentage of examples of muting, it seems reasonable to conclude, even in the absence of a corroborating Romance language, that muting of s at word-end was a feature of the spoken Latin of some inhabitants of the Roman provinces of North Africa.

Monophthongization of ae. In literary Latin the diphthongal value of ae was observed both orthographically, ae, and prosodically, æ (treated as a long vowel). In popular speech throughout the empire, however, reduction of the diphthong to a simple vowel, ae > e, occurred at an early date. Passages in Varro attest a monophthongal pronunciation of ae in Italy in the
second and first centuries BC,
in pluribus verbis a ante e alii ponunt alii non, ut ...
rustici (sc. dicunt) pappum Mesium non Maesium. a quo
Lucilius scribit "Cecilius pretor ne rusticus fiat" (LL
7.96)
and
... quod illic (apud Sabinos) fedus, in Latio rure
hedus, qui in urbe ut in mults a addito haedus (ibid
5.97).

Inscriptions dating from the empire amply illustrate the
phenomenon, both by the orthographic representation of e for ae
and by the hypercorrection ae for e. Examples are found in the
African provinces from the age of Iuba to Byzantine times, for
example, ae sua impe(n)sa (CIL 8.21086, age of Iuba), tribunicie
potestatis III (CIL 8.10124, AD 220), havae Clodi Felix
rarissimae fili (CIL 8.9069, AD 320), matri sue (CIL 8.21555,
fifth century), domum eternalem an(no) provincie dxcv (CIL
8.9923, AD 634). That ae occurs as a hypercorrection both for
classical ē and for classical ē attests confusion regarding the
length of the new monophthong, "... the new vowel would have
been adapted to the existing quantitative system, either as ē ...
or as ē ...."128

Certain passages in the fourth and fifth century grammarians
attest a popular monophthongal pronunciation of ae among their
contemporaries. Servius, for instance, anticipates possible
confusion of the noun miserae with the adverb misere in Vergil's
Aen 1.344, Phoenicum et magno miserae dilectus amore, commenting
miserae dativus non est adverbium. And a century later Pompeius
alludes to the difference between the literary and the spoken
treatment of the diphthong in instructing his students that
si (quis) velit dicere aequus pro eo quod est equus in
pronuntiatio hoc (sc. barbarismus) fit (K5.285.8-9).

Loss of quantitative vocalic distinctions. In literary Latin
vocalic length was phonemic, or functional. Although vocalic
quality, or aperture, was observed phonetically, length was the
differentiating element, that is, the feature that distinguished members of minimal pairs such as *solum* (floor) and *solum* (only). In modern Romance languages, however, length does not exist as a distinctive element, and since Romance languages developed from spoken rather than literary Latin, it is inferred that at some stage in the evolution of the colloquial idiom length disappeared as a differentiating vocalic feature.\textsuperscript{129}

The principal factor effecting the elimination of phonemic quantitative distinctions was the stress accent, which tended to shorten the vocalic nucleus of contiguous unaccented syllables, and to lengthen the vowel of the syllable on which it fell, so that in the spoken idiom all unaccented vowels came to be realized as short and all accented vowels as long. This reconstruction of the process by which quantitative vocalic distinctions were effaced in everyday speech is based on evidence from several sources.

From a passage in Quintilian, for example, we learn that unaccented syllables tended to be treated more weakly than accented syllables,

\begin{quote}
dilucida vero erit pronuntiatio primum si verba tota exierint, quorum pars devorari, pars destitui solet, plerisque extremas syllabas non perferentibus, dum priorum sono indulgent (11.3.33).
\end{quote}

One effect of the weakened pronunciation of unaccented syllables was the alteration of the quantity of that syllable, for the stress accent in Latin, in concentrating the speaker's articulatory energy on one syllable, caused the length of the vocalic nucleus of contiguous syllables, both pre- and post-accentual, to be abbreviated. It is this natural linguistic phenomenon that is reflected in the metric process of iambic shortening, for example, *hābē* > *hābē*, and it is significant that this literary licence was commonly used in the representation of everyday speech by Plautus and Terence, but in the more formal literary idiom of the classical age, it was restricted to a few words such as *ego* and *sibi*. "... the process (of iambic
shortening) ... must have some basis in the language; ... (and) it is not surprising if early scenic verse, with its closer adherence to colloquial speech, should be more tolerant of accentual patterns taking precedence over quantitative.¹³⁰

The stress accent affected vocalic length not only in neighbouring unaccented syllables but also in the accented syllable itself, where it reinforced an already long vowel or lengthened a short vowel. In spoken Latin this tendency to lengthen short accented vowels and to abbreviate long unaccented vowels produced such barbarisms as that adduced by Donatus to illustrate popular errors in quantity,

... ut siquis deos producta priore syllaba et correpta posteriore pronuntiet (K4.392.21).

Literary Latin déós, that is, was realized in colloquial speech as déōs. And that African spoken Latin was especially noted for this barbarism, at least in the fifth century, is attested by a passage in Consentius,

(sc. barbarismus temporis sic fit), ut quidam dicunt piper producta priore syllaba, cum sit brevis, quod vitium Afrorum familiare est; ... (et) ut siquis dicat orator correpta priore syllaba quod ipsum vitium Afrorum speciale est (K.5.392.3-12).

Literary Latin pīper and ōrātor, that is, were popularly pronounced pīper and ōrātor. In some cases, the colloquial Latin pronunciation of stressed and unstressed vowels would have coincided with the literary, as in rū-ī-nā; in others, such as dé-ōs, the influence of the accent would have altered the quantitative value accorded the vowels in literary Latin. It is not difficult to see that this linguistic phenomenon should have acted to obscure and then to obliterate quantitative vocalic distinctions.

The question just when in the long history of spoken Latin quantitative vocalic distinctions ceased to be observed in everyday speech is much debated. Opinions vary widely from the third century BC to the third or fourth centuries AD, and
arguments are complicated by differing views regarding the intermediate stages of the transformation, and regarding interpretation of some of the evidence. The matter, however, is of some importance since one of the purposes of this study is to test the common assumption of scholars of epigraphic verse that popular adherence to the principles of classical quantitative versification declined with time, and that one reason was the interference of popular speech patterns in which the stress accent acted to lengthen accented syllables and to shorten unaccented syllables.

That quantitative vocalic distinctions were not observed in ordinary speech in late fourth century Roman Africa is stated explicitly by Augustine,

Afrae aures de correptione vocalium vel productione non iudicant (de Doctrina Christiana 4.10.24).

The same observation is found in other works of the bishop. In the de Musica, for example, one of his pupils is made to say,

nam iudicium aurium ad temporum momenta moderanda me posse habere non nego, quae vero syllaba producenda vel corripienda sit ... omnino nescio (3.3.5).

The recognition that men did not perceive quantitative vocalic differences, in fact, led Augustine on one occasion to abandon quantity altogether and to rely on accent alone as the rhythmic principle of a didactic poem he composed for his flock. Written in AD 393, his Psalmus Contra Partem Donati is considered by some to be the earliest extant literary example of accentual, nonquantitative Latin poetry.¹³¹

Evidence that this feature of popular speech, that is, the absence of quantitative vocalic distinctions, obtained some two centuries earlier in Africa, and that authors of prose works had, in response, already begun to employ accent as their rhythmic principle, comes from a recent series of statistical studies of imperial prose clausulae. R.Hall and S.Oberhelman have shown that in the first two centuries AD clausulae were composed on the Ciceronian models, which were based on quantity;
that in the third to fifth centuries a *cursus mixtus* was adopted, which superposed accentual onto quantitative patterns; and that in the late fourth century a true *cursus*, based on accent alone, came into use.\textsuperscript{132} Furthermore, their data suggest that it was in Roman Africa that the *cursus mixtus* first appeared. From the chronological and geographical distribution of their examples, Hall and Oberhelman conclude that "at some time in the late second to early third centuries African schools ... began teaching a new clausular system which incorporated both accentual and metrical patterns". The motivation for the new system, they reason, was the recognition that men no longer appreciated a rhythmic pattern that was based on quantity alone. "... the schools originated a rhythmical system which reflected the speech patterns of their constituents at large".\textsuperscript{133}

On the evidence of the prose clausulae and the statements of Augustine, it is agreed by most scholars of spoken Latin that by the third or fourth century AD the vernacular idiom no longer observed quantitative vocalic distinctions. How much earlier this feature of popular speech can be documented, however, is disputed.

One view sees evidence of a lack of quantitative vocalic distinctions in the inscriptions from Pompeii, which would push back its earliest appearance to the first century AD. For V.Väänänen, "la preuve capitale" lies not only in the quantitative errors of some verse inscriptions, but especially in the epigraphic confusion of ae and e. Since ae for ē (vicinae for *vicine* CIL 4.7517, for example) occurs much more frequently than ae for ē (aegisse for *egisse* CIL 4.2413, for instance), the phenomenon, according to Väänänen, not only reflects the monophthongization of the diphthong, but also attests the indifference of the inscriber to quantitative vocalic distinctions. "Ces graphies (sc. *advaentu* for *adventu*, *vicinae* for *vicine*) nous permettent de déduire non seulement que l'ancien ae était dès lors une monophtongue ..., mais encore que l'opposition de timbre commençait déjà à l'emporter sur
l'opposition de quantité des voyelles, puisque cette
monophtongue issue de ae, et qui par origine était une voyelle
longue, se confond ... plutôt avec ē ... qu'avec ē ....".\textsuperscript{134}

Väänänen's interpretation of the significance of epigraphic
ae < e is shared by Acquati, who infers from her study of this
error in the African inscriptions a precocious and noteworthy
indifference to quantitative vocalic distinctions among African
speakers of Latin. "Notevole è ... il numero delle scritture
inverse (sc. ae < e) che testimoniano ... l'indifferenza degli
Africani alla quantità vocalica ...."\textsuperscript{135} Of this absence of
quantitative distinctions she finds "attestazioni precoci".\textsuperscript{136}
None of Acquati's examples of ae for e is dated, but since she
includes CIL 8.21086 (cited above, page 49), an inscription that
belongs to the age of Iuba, by "precoci" she must mean late
first century BC or early first AD.

This interpretation of the significance of epigraphic
ae < e, however, is rejected by others. Spence, for example, as
we have seen, argues that ae for ē as well as for ē need not
imply the absence of quantitative vocalic distinctions; rather,
it merely reflects popular confusion regarding the quantity of
the new monophthong. Furthermore, Väänänen's adduction of
Pompeian examples of faulty versification as confirmation of
the lack of quantitative distinctions in popular speech is also
rejected by Spence, for, as Väänänen himself admits, these
errors may simply represent the negligence or incompetence of
the versifier.\textsuperscript{137}

Yet another view dates the loss of quantitative vocalic
distinctions in popular speech as early as the third century BC.
According to E. Pulgram,\textsuperscript{138} evidence for the absence of phonemic
vowel quantity in the third century BC exists in an
orthographical phenomenon found in early inscriptions, namely,
the confusion of ĩ and ē and of ũ and ō. These alternative
spellings are thought to reveal the merger of the sounds ĩ and
ē, and of the sounds ũ and ō, which in turn presumes a vocalic
system in which quantitative distinctions are not phonemic.
Pulgram's reconstruction of the nature and evolution of the preclassical Latin vowel system is as follows.

Prior to the third century BC phonemic distinctions of length had coexisted with nonphonemic distinctions of quality; quantities and qualities were exactly paired, such that the long vowels were more closed and more "wide" in their articulation, that is, either more front or more back, than the short vowels, as was the case in literary Latin. Thus, \( \tilde{\i} = \check{i}; \check{i} = \check{i}; \check{e} = \check{e}; \check{e} = \check{e}; \check{\circ} = \check{\circ} ;\check{\circ} = \check{\circ} ; \check{\check{u}} = \check{\check{u}} = \check{\check{u}}. \) The pairing of quantity and quality constituted a redundancy since either length or quality alone can be distinctive; one will serve phonetically to reinforce the other, but both are not necessary. As the vocalic system of spoken Latin evolved, this redundancy was naturally and gradually eliminated, and, since distinctions of quality are more easily discernible and potentially greater in number, forming, that is, a more efficient "parameter of distinctiveness", they came to prevail over distinctions of length.

In the third century, however, in the midst of these changes in the vocalic system, certain conditions conspired to create a new and separate Latin dialect in which the old quantitative distinctions were preserved. The birth of Latin literature with its adoption of Greek rhythms based on quantitative distinctions, the establishment of "correct" standards of pronunciation, and the cultivation of those standards by the educated elite of Rome, had the effect of producing a prestigious "literary" dialect, the phonology of which was quite different from that of the spoken dialect. Literary Latin is seen, therefore, as a somewhat artificially created offshoot of ordinary spoken Latin; its importation of Greek rhythms based on quantitative vocalic distinctions in effect "resuscitated" the old vocalic system of spoken Latin, preserving phonemic quantity which was otherwise moribund.

Pulgram's view that the early epigraphic confusion between \( \check{i} \) and \( \check{e} \), and between \( \check{\check{u}} \) and \( \check{\check{\circ}} \), attests the merger of the two pairs
of sounds in pronunciation, and that this presumes the absence of quantitative distinctions in the contemporary spoken idiom, is shared by others.\textsuperscript{141} Acquati, for instance, finds the presence of this phenomenon in the African inscriptions to be one more proof of the precocious and noteworthy loss of quantitative distinctions there.\textsuperscript{142}

A different interpretation of the \textit{i/e} and \textit{u/o} confusion, and a different chronological reconstruction of the loss of quantitative vocalic distinctions, is offered by Spence.\textsuperscript{143} He argues that confusion of \textit{i} and \textit{e} and of \textit{u} and \textit{o} need not reflect actual mergers of the pairs of phonemes, but merely a change in quality of the short vowels \textit{i} and \textit{u} (an increase in aperture, that is, a new position of articulation farther away from long (closed) \textit{i} and long (closed) \textit{u}), so that they were perceived by some as more like \textit{e}'s and \textit{o}'s than \textit{i}'s and \textit{u}'s. This increase in the qualitative differences between the long and short high vowels was a development that took place within the existing quantitative system, and marked a transitional first stage in the disappearance of quantity as a distinctive vocalic feature. The appearance of new qualities made quantity superfluous and facilitated its disappearance. Epigraphic confusions of \textit{i} and \textit{e} and of \textit{u} and \textit{o}, therefore, reflect not the end but the beginning of what would be a gradual transformation of the vocalic system of spoken Latin. That the process was well underway by the third century AD, at least in Roman Africa, when accentual rhythms appear in prose works, is certain; how much, if at all, earlier is not known.

It is not possible within the limits of the dissertation to discuss the many different views regarding the loss of quantitative vocalic distinctions in spoken Latin; nor is it necessary for the purposes of this study to adopt any one position. Two relevant points, however, may be extracted from the various arguments. First, it is virtually certain, based on the evidence of prose rhythms and on the explicit statements of Augustine, that by the third or fourth century African speakers
of Latin no longer observed quantitative vocalic distinctions. Second, it is possible, based on the evidence in prose inscriptions of the loss of quantitative vocalic distinctions, that right from the time Africans began to compose carmina epigraphica, that is, in the first century AD, the vocalic system of their spoken idiom differed markedly from that of their classical model; if the disappearance of phonemic vowel quantity was not already complete it was at least underway.

These characteristics of everyday speech, that is, the muting of final m and s, the monophthongization of ae, and the loss of quantitative vocalic distinctions, would have encumbered the student of verse, first, in his acquisition of the literary language, and, later in life, in his attempt to recall the classical quantities and to use them in the composition of an epitaph or dedication.

Three other features of popular speech, the muting of n before s, the muting of n before a stop, and the merger of the sounds of b and v, appear a few times in the African verse inscriptions. All are attested as phonological phenomena of the spoken idiom throughout the empire by their frequent appearance in prose inscriptions;¹⁴⁴ all except the muting of n before a stop are attested in the grammatici¹⁴⁵ and in the Romance languages.¹⁴⁶ Epigraphic examples of the muting of n before s include mesibus (< mensibus, CIL 8.387, first century), and cesori (< censori, CIL 8.20590, AD 419); examples of the muting of n before a stop include Arrutius (< Arruntius, CIL 8.27112, second century), and huc (< hunc, Tab.Alb. 14.22, fifth century); and examples of the merger of b and v include fabente (< favente, CIL 8.20303, AD 352), and bixit (< vixit, Duval-Prévot 1975 n.132, Byzantine age).

In quantitative verse, the muting of n before s and the muting of n before a stop should have the effect of abbreviating the preceding syllable, if that syllable contains a short vowel. According to the rules of syllabification and the criteria for syllabic quantity, consonant sequences composed of ns, or of n +
stop render a preceding syllable closed and long by position, that is, *men-si-bus*, *Ar-rūn-ti-us*, whereas the muting of n before s or a stop should render the syllable open and short, that is, *mē-si-bus*, *Ar-rū-ti-us*. Of the five instances in the African verse inscriptions of the omission of n before s or before a stop, however, none seems to have resulted in the alteration of syllabic quantity. These omissions may be attributed either to graphic error or to compensatory nasalization and lengthening of the preceding vowel.\textsuperscript{147}

Evidence of the merger of the sounds of b and v also appears a few times in the African verse inscriptions. A recent study of the phenomenon shows that in the spoken Latin of the first century AD, both b, the voiced bilabial stop, and v, the voiced labiovelar semi-vowel (ᵽ), began to be pronounced as a voiced bilabial fricative, that is, with the lips only very slightly open.\textsuperscript{148} Epigraphical confusion of the letters b and v, which attests the merger of the two sounds in spoken Latin, is of course orthographical only, and does not affect syllabic structure.\textsuperscript{149}

The sum of the features of popular speech that have been described above, namely, the muting of final m and final s, the muting of n before s and before a stop, the monophthongization of the diphthong ae, and especially the loss of quantitative vocalic distinctions, suggests a rather wide gulf between the phonology of the spoken idiom and that of the literary language studied in schools. The authors of the African verse inscriptions, therefore, who aspired to express themselves in quantitative verse, were composing in linguistic patterns that, at least from the third or fourth century and perhaps earlier, did not exist in their everyday speech, but only in the literature that they had absorbed under the grammaticus.
PART III. CORPUS OF DATED CARMINA LATINA EPIGRAPHICA AFRICANA

The inscriptions, which have been designated "CLEA", are arranged in chronological order and numbered consecutively. Each epigraphic text is presented and studied as follows:

CARMEN EPIGRAPHICUM
ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
COMMENTARY

CARMEN EPIGRAPHICUM

Symbols used in editing are the following: round brackets (abc) for supplementations of standard abbreviations; hooked brackets {abc} for letters or words accidentally repeated; square brackets [abc] for conjectural restorations of letters lost or illegible; dots within square brackets [...] for letters lost and not restorable; angled brackets <abc> for corrections of accidental omissions or errors made by the lapicida; dots within angled brackets for errors of the lapicida, for which no corrections have been attempted. A diagonal slash / indicates a line end on the stone.

Appended to each poem is the following information: the main sources of the text (epigraphic collections or other works); a brief apparatus criticus, where variant readings or restorations affect analysis of versification; prose prescripts or subscripts; a brief description of the monument that bears the inscription, and its provenience; the date of the carmen, with the source of the dating given in brackets; the type of composition it represents, that is, its purpose, either funerary or nonfunerary, and its religious character, either pagan or Christian. Matters of controversy are described in the endnotes.

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - the classical quantitative form is identified, either dactylic hexameter or elegiac couplet. Unclassical forms,
such as hypermetric and hypometric lines, or combinations of forms, such as a series of hexameters followed by a series of elegiac couplets, are noted.

**prosody** - deviations from normal classical syllabic quantities are noted. Full scansion of each *carmen* is provided in Appendix I.

**COMMENTARY**

Observations regarding the classical and unclassical metric and prosodic features of each poem are offered.

First, an attempt is made to discern the causes of any unclassical metric phenomena. Is irregularity of line length related to the content of the line, that is, can hypermetricity be attributed to the necessity of specifying such idiosyncratic biographical data as name and age, or to the author's unwillingness to resist the addition of a rhetorical flourish, as Galletier suggests? What of hypometricity? Can lines of prose, which occasionally intrude into a sequence of lines of verse, be accounted for in terms of content? Are any stylistic objectives apparent in an author's decision to use an unclassical combination of meters in one poem?

Second, an attempt is made to discern the causes of any unusual prosodic features. Some altered syllabic quantities are attributable to the author's application of a classical licence: the lengthening in arsis of precaesural syllables; the coreption of final o in a few words; the use of ectsasis or systole in proper names; the lengthening of a vowel preceding the consonant sequence mute + liquid; the consonantalization of i and u, excluding the consonantalization of u after q. These can be considered classical. Other altered syllabic quantities are prosodical errors, many of which can be attributed to the intrusion of certain features of the author's everyday spoken Latin: the muting of final m and s; the monophthongization of the diphthong ae; the tendency under influence of the stress accent to lengthen tonic syllables and to abbreviate atomic
syllables. Deviations attributable to licence are presumably deliberate and attest the author's recall of the prosody he learned under the grammaticus; frequent recourse to licences merely betrays the author's inexpertise. The presence of colloquial linguistic features, however, is presumably inadvertent, and indicates that the author's everyday patterns of speech have interfered with his recall and practice of the principles of quantitative verse that he acquired in school. A few errors can be traced to the faulty interpretation and teaching of some grammatici.

Third, the effect of the prosodical errors on a quantitative reading of the poem is estimated. First, the extent to which the author has deviated from classical prosody is quantified and expressed as a percentage of error per metrical foot. Thus, for example, the occurrence of three errors in a poem of seventy-two feet represents an error rate of about 4%. Syllabic quantities that have been altered by the application of licences used by the classical poets are not counted as prosodical errors. Such quantification will facilitate the observation of any chronological patterns in quality of versification that may exist in the corpus, remarks concerning which will be made in the chapter of conclusions that follows the texts and commentaries. Next, note is taken whether prosodical errors are those of vocalic length by nature or length by position; the former seem less disruptive to the expected rhythm of a verse than the latter. The sum of the effect of the number and the nature of the prosodical errors is then considered; are they limited to occasional slips in vocalic length by nature, so that the quantitative pattern remains easily discernible, or are they so numerous or so serious, involving errors in length by position, that they obscure the quantitative rhythm?

Fourth, a brief assessment of each author's knowledge of and competence in the composition of classical verse is made. Note is taken first of the presence of certain structural features that are found in some carmina latina epigraphica - the acrostic
or telestic arrangement of lines, the use of epitaphic or dedicatory formulae, and the incorporation of portions of classical verse. The use of an acrostic or telestic structure made versification more challenging because it limited the lexical possibilities at line-start and line-end. Formulae and portions of classical poetry, on the other hand, could facilitate versification; epigraphic commonplaces, which were familiar to composers of carmina from other inscriptions in their communities, and the corpus of classical poetry, which was studied and memorized by them in school, provided two sources of ready-made lines and half-lines of prosodically sound verse. An author's success or failure in integrating these devices into his own composition can provide good evidence of his metric and prosodic knowledge and proficiency.

If the content of a carmen is not wholly or to a great extent formulaic or borrowed from one of the great poets, and if the author adheres perfectly to the metric and prosodic norms of his classical model, it can be inferred that he knew well the principles of classical quantitative versification, and was competent to compose an original work of his own.

Where deviations occur, several factors are considered. Are they limited to metrics, that is, does the author let stand an unclassical combination of meters, or lines that are hypermetric or hypometric, but prosodically correct? If stylistic or other motives for unclassical metric phenomena can be discerned in a poem exhibiting good classical prosody, it is likely that the author deliberately abandoned the norms of his model, and expected toleration of his innovation from his contemporary audience. If a poem contains prosodic errors, but few and limited to those of vocalic length by nature, it can be inferred that the author had a good grasp of the principles of quantitative versification, but that the difference between the phonology of his everyday Latin and that of his classical model interfered with his attempted recall of classical vocalic lengths. Where prosodic errors are numerous and include those of
length by position, or where some lines or portions of lines are simply irreducible to any quantitative measure, we can infer that the author's understanding and recall of classical verse was weak, and that the unclassical features of his everyday speech exacerbated his difficulty in composing quantitative verse.

Any information concerning the rank or education of the author that can be gleaned either directly from the text of the inscription or indirectly from its monumental context is presented. Such data will facilitate conclusions, to be drawn in the final chapter, regarding the identification of the social strata to which the dedicators of the African verse inscriptions belonged.

Finally, the disposition of the inscription on the stone is considered. A verse by verse arrangement of a *carmen epigraphicum* facilitates, first, the recognition of the text as poetic and, second, a quantitative reading of the work. A haphazard arrangement, however, obscures discernment of the poetic nature of a text and renders difficult a quantitative recitation of its lines. In verse inscriptions in which metric and prosodic irregularities occur, an arrangement in which lines of text do not conform to lines of verse exacerbates the difficulty of making a quantitative reading. And in poems that have been composed acrostically a haphazard graphic arrangement can completely obscure the acrostic device. For those inscriptions that are not engraved verse by verse, remarks are offered regarding the possible effect of the arrangement of the text: could the poetic nature of the work have been easily discerned by a contemporary passerby; would a quantitative reading of the poem have been hindered; could an acrostic device have been recognized?

Following the corpus of texts and commentaries conclusions will be drawn, based on the evidence provided by the individual analyses, regarding the nature, extent and chronology of popular deviations from classical standards of versification.
CLEA 1. EPITAPH OF DAPHNIS, A SLAVE

Daphnis ego Hermetis coniunx sum libera facta / cum dominus vellet primu Hermes liber ut esset / fato ego facta prior fato ego rapta prior / quae tuli quod gemui gemitus viro saepe reliqui / quae domino invito vitam dedi proxime nato / nunc quis alet natum quis vitae longa ministrat / me Styga quod rapuit tam cito a superos / 5

CIL 8.24734; BL 2115, Lommatzsch; ILT 987, Merlin

prescript - none
subscript - pia vixit annis XXV h(ic) s(ita) e(st)
monument and provenience - stele, in cemetery of officials of the Augustan household, Carthage
date - age of Nero or Flavians (Lassère 141)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1, 2, 4, 5, 6; pentameters, lines 3, 7
prosody - 3 irregularities: tulī, virō line 4; dedī, line 5

COMMENTARY

For the unclassical sequence of hexameters and pentameters used by Daphnis' eulogist, there seems no obvious explanation.

Of the author's three prosodical irregularities, none can be considered classical. All are due to the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the weakening of posttonic vowels under influence of the stress accent. A second feature of popular speech, the muting of final m, has produced the orthographically unclassical primu and eni, lines 2 and 7; since, however, both final syllables are elided, the former preceding initial h, the latter an initial vowel, neither causes a breach of classical
prosody.

The incidence of prosodical error is three in forty feet, or about 8%. All are minor slips in vocalic length by nature, and do not hinder a quantitative reading of the epigraph.

The deceased and, probably, her eulogist belonged to the imperial household; they may have been fairly well educated. That Daphnis' eulogist knew well the principles of classical quantitative versification is evident; in metrics, his only shortcoming is his unclassical sequence of hexameters and pentameters, in prosody, three slips in vocalic length. Why he did not adhere more strictly to classical metric norms and produce a poem composed either of continuous hexameters or of elegiac couplets is not clear.

CLEA 2. EPITAPH OF MARCUS FURIUS HERENNUS, SON OF A VETERAN

Baetica me genuit te lu<1>us cupidus / Lib<y>ae cognoscere / {cognoscere} fines Caesar<e>ae / veni cupidus fata me rapuere mea / et me iacio <fidus> ignotis vixsi an/nis L vivere dum li<c>uit carus me/is et pius vixsi et in omnia sollers / ite mei sine me ad meos ite

dic / rogo praeteriens hosp<e>s sit t(ibi) t(erra) / levis et mol<1>iter ossa quiesc<a>nt /

BEG 1893 89-93, Schmitter; BL 479, Buecheler; CIL 8.21031

1.telus, lapis; Libu<ae>, lapis; 2.Caesarae, lapis; 3.eidais, lapis; fidus, Schmitter; an graecum est εἰςως?, Buecheler; 4.liquit, lapis; 6.hospehs, lapis; hosphs primum dedit lapicida (an η graecam?) tum e ad p adiunxit, Buecheler; 7.moliter, lapis; quiescnt, lapis
prescript - M(arcus) Furius Herennus Papiri(a) Astigitan(us) veterani f(ilius) hic situs est /
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stele, Caesarea
date - first century (Lassère 1977 391)\textsuperscript{151}
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Lines 1, 2, and 4 are hypermetric, having respectively eight feet, six and one-half feet, and nine feet; lines 5 and 6 are hypometric, each amounting to little more than a first hemistich; line 3 is irreducible to quantitative measure; only line 7 is a true hexameter.

Buecheler interprets M(arcus) Furius ....situs est as the first two lines of the carmen, rather than as a prose prescript, doubtless because Astigitan(us) forms a good hexameter cadence, and f(ilius) hic situs est the second hemistich of a good pentameter. The content, however, of the lines in question, that is, the name of the deceased, his tribal affiliation and his military status, seems more likely to have constituted a prescript, as elsewhere.

prosody - 5 irregularities in the portion of the epitaph that can be scanned: fāta, line 2; meis, pius, line 4; rogō, line 6; levis et, line 7. Scansion of line 2 as a hexameter requires the elimination of mea.

COMMENTARY

Herennus' eulogist displays an almost complete disregard for classical metrics, and a curious range of competence in classical prosody. Lines 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 begin well with a hemistich delimited by a penthemimeral caesura, yet all except 7 are severely hypometric or hypermetric. Lines 1, 2, 4, and 7, and the first hemistiches of lines 5 and 6, are, with three exceptions, quantitatively correct; line 3 reads only as prose.
The explanation for the quality of this interesting specimen of popular versification lies in the formulaic nature of its composition. Apart from the prosaic line 3, which presents personal information about the deceased, the inscription represents a patchwork of formulae familiar from many other epitaphs found throughout the empire. The same theme of death in a foreign land (lines 1 and 2) and the formula used to express it is found, for example, in the same verse position and with the same metric configuration, in the following inscriptions,

Itala me genuit tellus ... AE 1933.34 (Spain),
Troia me genuit tellus ... Z 59.1 (Rome).\textsuperscript{152}

The theme and formula are imitative of the introduction to Vergil's supposed grave inscription,

Mantua me genuit ... (\textit{Vita Donati} 136f).\textsuperscript{153}

The theme of the voyage to a distant place, \textit{Libyae cognoscere fines / Caesareae veni cupidus} ..., in words that are similar, though not formulaic, is found elsewhere,

\begin{quote}
venimus hoc cupidi multo magis ire cupimus
ut liceat nostros visere Roma lares
(BL 2060, Italy),
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
dum cupidus iuvenis urbem voluisse videre
(BL 629.1, Iulium Carnicum).
\end{quote}

For the theme of grasping Fate, \textit{fata me rapuere mea}, compare,

\begin{quote}
anima mea rapuerunt fata
(BL 496.3, Rome),
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
quem ... fata rapuere (CIL 9.3209, Italy).\textsuperscript{154}
\end{quote}
For the lifespan allowed a mortal, *vivere dum licuit*, compare, in the same verse position and with the same metric configuration,

\[ \text{vix}^1 \text{ ego dum licuit (BL 1082.2, Pannonia)}, \]

\[ \text{vix}^1 \text{ ego dum licuit (BL 971.3, Rome)}.^155 \]

The request to the passerby and the utterance of the formulaic sepulchral prayer, *dic rogo praeteriens hospes / sit tibi terra levis*, is found many times in epigraphic poetry, for instance,

\[ \text{te rogo praeteriens dicas s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis)} \]
\[ (BL 1123.5, Baetica), \]

\[ \text{et tu praeteriens dicas Procule sit tibi terra levis} \]
\[ (BL 1482.3, Italy).^156 \]

The formula *sit tibi terra levis* is incorporated into more than fifty verse inscriptions in the Buecheler-Lommatzsch volumes alone, and was so familiar that it was often abbreviated *sttl*. For the prayer *molliter ossa quiescant*, which is found in Vergil's *Ecl* 10.33 (*... o mihi tum quam molliter ossa quiescant*), compare the variation *leviter ... ossa quiescas*,

\[ \text{lapis obtestor leviter super ossa quiescas} \]
\[ (BL 1192.9, Gaul),^157 \]

and the similar formula *molliter ossa cubent* (found in Ovid *Her* 7.162),

\[ \text{molliter ossa cubent dicat, rogo, quisque viator} \]
\[ (BL 1458.1, Rome), \]
Antoni et Proculi molliter ossa cubent
(BL 428.15, Italy). 158

Three of the prosodical irregularities in this composite
work can be considered classical: pius can be attributed to the
author's use of the licence that consonantalized i; rogō to the
correction of final o in the first person present tense form of
verbs; levis et to the lengthening in arsis of a precaesural
syllable. Of the two unclassical quantities, one, meis, can be
attributed to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the
lengthening of tonic vowels under influence of the stress
accent.

The incidence of prosodical error in the portion of this
work that can be scanned is two in thirty-five and one-half
feet, or about 6%. Both errors are minor slips in vocalic length
by nature. Two elements of the inscription, however, are most
intrusive; the word mea, which is extraneous to the meter of
line 2, and the long and prosaic fourth line. If these segments
with their two and eighteen syllables respectively are taken
into account, and considered for the sake of tabulation to
contain one-half foot and six feet, and if each foot is assumed
to present one error, the rate of error will be much higher,
eight in forty-two feet, or about 19%. The highly irregular line
lengths and the presence of a line irreducible to quantitative
measure combine to make virtually impossible a reading of this
epitaph as a composition in hexameter verse.

Herennus was the son of a veteran. There is no indication in
the inscription regarding his education, or, if he himself did
not compose the work, regarding the rank or education of his
eulogist. It is clear, however, that the author has merely
strung together several very common formulae. The quantitatively
correct portions are formulaic and the credit for their
adherence to the principles and practices of classical
quantitative verse belongs to their long-forgotten originators.
The line that is irreducible to quantitative verse, line 3,
which provides idiosyncratic biographic details, is the author's own, and demonstrates his complete lack of comprehension of quantitative rhythms. The prosodical errors and the highly irregular line lengths are to be ascribed to this author's inept melding of several readymade formulae.

Buecheler's brief notations regarding *eidais*, line 3, and *hospehs*, line 6, the readings on the stone, suggest the possibility that the *lapicida* hired to inscribe this eulogy was Greek. Given the proliferation of the Greek arts in Mauretania under the patronage of Juba II, it would not be surprising to find evidence of a Greek-speaking craftsman in Caesarea in the first century AD. If this inference is correct, it is unfortunate that Herennus, dying in a foreign land, chanced to employ a workman whose knowledge of Greek intruded into his transcription of a Latin text, thereby depreciating an already inferior poetic effort.

The difficulty encountered by a contemporary passerby, first, in discerning the poetic nature of this poorly versified work and, second, in making a quantitative reading of it, would have been exacerbated by its graphic arrangement; the verses have been disposed haphazardly on the stone, and no attempt has been made to demark them through the inscription of epigraphic punctuation symbols.

**CLEA 3. EPITAPH OF A FREEDMAN OF THE EMPEROR CLAUDIUS**

```plaintext
tu qui praeteriens spectas / monimentum meum
aspice / indignans hic data morte /
```

BL 125, Buecheler; CIL 8.21008

**prescript** - none

**subscript** - Ti(beri) Claudi Aug(usti) l(iberti) [ad]i(utoris)
tabulari a ratio[nibus] Cannutia T [... co]niugi bene [merenti
fecit h(ic) s(itus) e]st) s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) [l(evis)]
monument and provenience - stone, Caesarea
date - reign of Claudius to late first century (identity of
deceased named in subscript)\textsuperscript{159}
type - funerary, pagan

**NOTE:** It is clear that this *carmen* is a faulty specimen of
quantitative versification. The brevity of this author's work,
however, and uncertainty regarding the syntax of his second
line, make it difficult to determine his metric intentions and
to assess his success. Buecheler classifies the lines as senarii
with the comment,

\begin{quote}
  adsumptus est senarius quasi formula, cetera detorta ex
  versibus quales ... aspice quam indigne sit data vita
  mihi et pedestria, deest velut ossa Claudi.
\end{quote}

The rhythmic pattern of the formulaic hemistiches of which it is
composed, however, as will be seen below, is probably that of
the elegiac couplet. Sense can be made of the second line if it
is assumed that the final m of the accusative case has been
omitted both from *data* and from *morte*. Analysis of versification
will be based on this view.

**ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION**

- **meter** - elegiac couplet
- **prosody** - 2 irregularities: *meum*, line 1; *data*, line 2

**COMMENTARY**

Line 1, which falters after the fourth foot, will scan if a
spondaic fifth foot is allowed and the first syllable of *meum*
lengthened, under influence of the stress accent. The first
hemistich of the pentameter is sound, if hiatus is allowed; the
second hemistich will scan if both syllables of *data* are
considered long, the first under influence of the stress accent,
the second assuming the orthographical but not prosodical
omission of final m.

The incidence of error is two in eleven feet, or about 18%. Both are minor slips in vocalic length by nature. Both, however, occur in close proximity with other irregularities, the first after a spondaic fifth foot, the second preceding a syllable from which final m has been orthographically dropped but which requires the preservation of the consonant in order to be scanned long. The errors, therefore, present a hindrance to a quantitative reading of both second hemistiches.

Tiberius Claudius' eulogist, like Herennus' (CLEA 2), has attempted to compose a verse inscription using readymade sepulchral formulae familiar from other grave epigrams. The address to the passerby expressed in the first hemistich of line 1 is found in hexameters from many provinces of the empire. Examples include,

\[
\text{ut qui praeteriens } \ldots \text{ (BL 1184.16, Rome),}
\]
\[
\text{te rogo praeteriens } \ldots \text{ (BL 1123.5, Spain),}
\]
\[
\text{tu qui praeteriens } \ldots \text{ (BL 1943.7, Carthage).}
\]

The plea, expressed in the second half of the hexameter, that he stop and regard the sepulchral monument, has several times in the epigraphic carmina caused metric difficulties, for instance,

\[
\text{tu qui praeteriens spectas monimentum meum}
\]
\[
\text{(BL 1539.1, Italy),}
\]
\[
\text{tu qui stas et spectas mortem monimenti mei}
\]
\[
\text{(BL 1540.1, Rome),}
\]
\[
\text{tu qui praeteriens spectas mortis monumentum meum}
\]
\[
\text{(BL 1541.1, Italy).}
\]

A metrically correct version of the couplet comes from Italy,
tu qui praeteriens legis hoc mortis monumentum
aspice quam indigne sit data vita mihi
(BL 1084.1-2).

That Tiberius' eulogist, perhaps his wife Cannutia, let stand an imperfect copy suggests that she had little grasp of the principles of quantitative versification. Tiberius himself, who served as imperial adiutor tabulari a rationibus, must have had some education; perhaps Cannutia, wishing to honour him in a way he would have appreciated, but finding herself unequal to the task of composition simply, and ineptly, borrowed from elsewhere.

The difficulty encountered by a contemporary passerby in discerning the poetic nature of this poorly versified work and in making a quantitative reading of it would have been exacerbated by its arrangement on the stone, for the carmen has not been engraved verse by verse, nor have the verses been demarked through the inscription of graphic punctuation symbols.

CLEA 4. EPITAPH OF MANIA SECUNDA, A CHILD

Mania pupa iacet paucos dilecta per annos /
quam pater ad<sid>ue {dum} dum deflet ipse querella est /
nam hanc tulerat genitor divinae lucis ad oras /
dulcius ut posset cum spe spem prindere magna /
anticipata fuga tenebris se condidit altis /
non nasci miserae quanto erat utilius /

adve, lapis; adgue, Marec; adsidue, Degrassi

prescript - Mania L(ucii) f(ilia) Secunda h(ic) s(ita) e(st) /
subscript - vixit annis II dies XIII
monument and provenience - stele with niche containing crude portrait of the deceased, El Kouif
date - first, or, at the latest, early second century (Picard 1970 129n.1)\textsuperscript{160}
type - funerary, pagan

NOTE. Degrassi's conjectural restoration of the poet's text, adsidue, line 2, is better supported by the sense of the passage than Marec's. He offers, furthermore, a plausible reconstruction of the origin of the mason's error, "Il lapicida avrebbe omesso il si di adsidue, mentre avendo sotto gli occhi il dum seguente avrebbe scritto dum quello che avrebbe dovuto scrivere due."
(Degrassi 51-52) Analysis of versification and commentary will be based on this reading.

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1-5; pentameter, line 6
prosody - 1 irregularity: \textit{deflet}, line 2

COMMENTARY

The conclusion of a series of hexameters by a single pentameter is unclassical. Attempted artistry, rather than ignorance or incompetence, however, can be discerned, for the change in meter calls attention to the final line and enhances the pathos of its content.

The single unclassical quantity, which produces an incidence of error of one in thirty-five feet, or about 3\%, can be attributed neither to the author's application of a licence nor to the intrusion of a specific feature of his everyday speech. It is, however, a minor slip in vocalic length by nature and does not spoil a quantitative reading of the poem.

Nothing in this inscription indicates the rank or education of the author. That he was educated in classical quantitative versification is evident; that he adhered nearly perfectly to
classical prosody but let stand an unclassical sequence of meters suggests that he deliberately abandoned the metric norms of the classical model for his own artistic purposes.

CLEA 5. EPITAPH OF ZOPYRUS, UNDECIMPRIMUS

ossa quieta precor / Zopyri requiesqui<t>e / in urna
   et sit hum/us ciner<i> non [on]ero<sa levi > /

CIL 8.12302; BL 1242, Buecheler; ILT 661, Merlin

1. requiesquiue, lapis; requiescant>, Schmidt CIL;
   requiesqui<t>e, Buecheler; 2. cinere, lapis; desinit titulus in
   [on]ero quasi integer non mutilus; levi, Buecheler; precor,
   Schmidt CIL

prescript - Zopyrus Tironis f(ilius) Bisicensis ex XI primis
vixit annis LXXXVIII h(ic) s(itus) e(st) /
subscript - none
adscript - o(ssa) t(ibi) b(ene) [q(uiescant)], to the left of
the poem, vertically; s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis), to the
right, vertically
monument and provenience - stone, Bisica Lucana
date - late first or early second century before Hadrian
(historical context)\textsuperscript{161}
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
  meter - elegiac couplet
  prosody - classical

COMMENTARY
  The eulogist of this Punic magistrate has adhered perfectly
to classical standards of metrics and prosody; the composition, however, is not his own, for he has simply quoted the final couplet of an elegy of Ovid, *Amores* 3.9, and adapted it slightly to suit his own purpose. Ovid's farewell to Tibullus ends thus:

ossa quieta precor tuta requiescite in urna
et sit humus cineri non onerosa tuo.

This epigraphical evidence of the knowledge of Ovid from a native town of Proconsularis still governed by *undecimprimi* attests the process of Romanization and Latinization of the upper classes of Roman Africa. Those Bisicans, however, who were familiar with classical poetry, and who might have been expected to stop and recite quantitatively Zopyrus' epitaph, would have been challenged at first, perhaps, to discern the poetic nature of the text, for it is arranged haphazardly on the stone.

**CLEA 6. EPITAPH OF MARCUS FLAVONIUS AVITUS, A SCHOOLMASTER**

hic situs est Marcus Flavonius ille / magister
annos / qui centum vivit bene semper Avitus /

BCTH 1901 403-404 n.27, Merlin; CIL 8.26670; BL 1962, Lommatzsch; ILT 1445, Merlin

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) /
subscript - h(ic) s(itus) e(st)
monument and provenience - stone, reused in Byzantine wall at Thugga
date - first half of the second century (Lassère 142)
type - funerary, pagan
ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters

prosody - classical

COMMENTARY

The author of this brief epitaph has adhered perfectly to the requirements of classical quantitative verse. A noteworthy feature of his composition is his (or the mason's) care in the arrangement of the words on the stone so that the letters aligned at the right spell, from bottom to top, miser:

hic situs est Mar
cus Flavonius ille
magister annos
qui centum vi
xit bene sem
per Avitus

The telestic is unusual in three respects: in the word that it spells, that is, a sepulchral epithet rather than the name of the deceased; in the method that produced it, that is, by the manipulation of the position of syllables as well as of complete words; and in the reverse arrangement of its letters. It is interesting that in the inscription of this text it was considered more important to contrive a telestic device through the graphic manipulation of the words than to call attention to the poetic nature of the work through a verse by verse disposition.

It is fitting that the epitaph of a schoolmaster should serve as one of the earliest examples in the corpus of good popular versification; perhaps Flavonius himself composed the couplet.
CLEA 7. EPITAPH OF TITUS FLAVIUS SECUNDUS

sint licet exiguae fugientia tempora vitae /
parva\(u\)e raptorum cito transeat hora dierum /
mergat et Elysiis mortalia corpora terris /
adsidue rupto Lachesis male conscia penso /
iam tamen inventa est blandae rationis imago /
per quam prolatos homines in tempora plura /
longior excipiat memoratio multaq(ue) servet /
secum per titulos mansuris fortius annis\(^{162}\) /

ezcze recens pietas omni placitura favore /
ingentem famae numerum cum laude meretur /
exemplo iam plena novo quam Flavius alto /
more Secundus agens patrio signavit honore /

quis non iam pronis animi virtutibus adsit /
quis non hoc miretur opus fusasq(ue) videndo /
divitias stupeat tantos se cernere census /
per quos aetherias surgunt monimenta per auras /

haec est fortunae melius laudanda facultas /
sic sibi perpetuas faciunt impendia sedes /
sic immortales scit habere pecunia mores /
aeterno quotiens stabilis bene figitur usu /
viderit ille furor nimio qui ducitut auro /
quem trahit argenti venalis sanguine candor /

viderit et fusae vanis in amoribus errans /
gloria luxuriae peregrinas quae rere magno /
quae didicit vestes gemmasq(ue) nitore placentes /
aut ab \(<E>ruthr<ae>\)o venientia munera fluctu /
quam laedunt gentes vario certamine rerum /
Graecia cum pueris Hispania Pallados usu /
venatu Libyae tellus orientis amorom /
Aegyptos Phariis levitatibus artibus actis / 30
Gallia semper ovans dives Campania vino /

haec cito deficiunt et habent breve munus amoris /
momentis damnata suis set si quis ad omnes /
respiciat vitae casus hominemque laboret /
metiri brevitate sua tunc credere discet /
nil aliut melius fieri nisi viribus aevi /
quot possit durare diu sub honore deorum /
nunc ego non dubitem tacitis Acherontos in umbris /

si post fata manent sensus gaudere parentem /
saepe Secunde tuum reliquas et spernere turmas /
quod sciat hic tantam faciem superesse sepulchri /
perpetua novitate sui sic stare nitentes /
consensus lapidum sic de radice levatos /
in melius crevisse gradus ut et angulus omnis /
sic quasi mollitae ductus sit stamine cerae /

mobilibus signis hilaris sculptura novatur /
et licet a<tidue probet hos vaga turba [lab]ores / 40
luentes stupeat pariter pendere columnas /
quid cum militiae titulos ipsumq(ue) parentem /
numinibus dederis haec gaudia saepe nitentem /

quae quondam dedit ipse loco dum munera Bacchi /
multa creat primasq(ue) cupit componere vites /
et nemus exornat revocatis saepius undis /
permittant mihi fata loqui noctisq(ue) timendae /
regnator Stygius sic immortalis haberi /

iam debet pater ecce tuus Ditisq(ue) relict[i] /
tristem deseruisse domum dum tempore toto /
mavolt haec monumenta sequi scriptisq(ue) per aevom /
v]ivere nominibus solitis insistere lucis /
ads</s>idue patrias hinc cernere dulciter arces /

quosq(ue) dedit natis prope semper haberemc penates /
forsitan haec multi vano sermone ferentes /
venturae citius dicant praesagia mortis /
si quis dum vivit ponat monimenta futuris /
temporibus mihi non tales sunt pectore sensus /
set puto securos fieri quicumque parare /
aeternam volvere domum certoq(ue) rigore /
numquam lapsuros vitae defigere muros /
fatis certa via est neque se per stamina mutat /
Atropos ut primo coepit decurrere filo /
crede Secunde mihi pensatos ibis in annos /
set securus eris set toto pectore dives /
dum nulli gravis esse potes nec plena labore /
testamenta facis tuus hoc dum non timet heres /
ut sic aedificet iam nunc quodcumq(ue) relinques /
totum perveniet tua quo volet ire voluntas /
set revocat me cura operis celsiq(ue) decores /

stat sublimis honor vicinaque nubila pulsat /
et solis metitur iter si iungere montes /
forte velint oculi vincuntur in ordine colles /
si videas campos infra iacet abdita tellus /

non sic Romuleas exire colossos in arces /
dicitur aut circi medias obeliscus in auras /
 nec sic sistrigeri demonstrat pervia Nili /
dum sua perspicuis aperit Pharos aequora flam<is>is /

quid non docta facit pietas lapis ecce foratus /
luminibus multis hortatur currere blandas /
intus apes et cerineos componere nidos /
uts semper domus haec Thymbraeo nectare dulcis /
sudet florisapos dum dant nova mella liquores /

huc iterum Pietas venerandas erige mentes /
et mea quo nosti carmina more fove /
ecce Secundus adest iterum qui pectore sancto /
non monimenta patri sed nova templa dedit /  
quo nunc Calliope gemino me limite cogis /  
quas iam transegi rusus adire vias /  
nempe fuit nobis operis descriptio magni /  
diximus et iunctis saxa polita locis /  
circuitus nemorum currentes dulciter undas /  
    atque reportantes mella frequenter apes /  

hoc tamen hoc solum nostrae puto defuit arti /  
dum cadis ad multos ebria Musa iocos /  
in summo tremulas galli non diximus alas /  
    altior extrema qui puto nube volat /  
cuius si membris vocem natura dedisset /  
    cogeret hic omnes surgere mane deos /  
et iam nominibus signantur limina certis /  
    cernitur et titulis credula vita suis /  
    opto Secunde geras multos feliciter annos /  
    et quae fecisti tu monimenta legas /  

CIL 8.211-216; BL 1552, Buecheler; ILT 331

26. Aeruthreo, lapis; 47. aesidue, lapis; 85. flamis, lapis

prescript - T(itus) Flavius Secundus filius fecit T(ito) Flavio
Secundo patri pio mil(itavit) an(nis) XXXIII vix(it) an(nis) CX
h(ic) s(itus) e(st) Flaviae Urbanae matri piae vix(it) an(nis)
CV h(ic) s(ita) e(st) Fl(aviae) Secundae sorori p(iae) v(ixit)
a(nnis) XX h(ic) s(ita) e(st) T(ito) Fl(avio) Marcello fratri
p(io) v(ixit) a(nnis) XX h(ic) s(itus) e(st) T(ito) Fl(avio)
Martiali fratri mil(itavit) a(nnis) XII v(ixit) a(nnis) XXXV
h(ic) s(itus) e(st) Fl(aviae) Speratae sorori p(iae) v(ixit)
a(nnis) XXXVI h(ic) s(ita) e(st) Aemiliae Sex(ti) fil(iae)
Pacatae uxori piae flaminicae perp(etuae) vix(it) an(nis) LIII
h(ic) s(ita) e(st) T(itus) Flavius T(iti) filius Pap(ricia)
Secundus ipse flamen perp(etuus) vix(it) ann(is) LX h(ic)
s(itus) e(st) Flaviae T(iti) filiae Pacatae flaminicae
perp(etuae) col(oniae) Thelept(ae) fil(iae) piae Fl(avia) Libera
mater statuam posuit v(ixit) a(nnis) XV mensibus X h(ic) s(ita)
e(st) F(lavia) Libera T(iti) Fl(avi) Secundi uxor pia vix(it)
an(nis) LXXXVIII h(ic) s(ita) e(st) /

subscript - 3 brief prose epitaphs

monument and provenience - mausoleum Flaviorum, Cillium
date - first half of the second century (archeological context,
military career of the deceased)\textsuperscript{163}
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1-90; elegiac couplets,
lines 91-110

prosody - 7 irregularities: memoratio or memoratio\textcircled{\textdagger}, line 7;
dederīs haec, line 50; putō, line 66; descriptio or descriptio\textcircled{\textdagger},
line 97; putō, lines 101, 104; optō, line 109

COMMENTARY

This sepulchral poem, which adorns the family mausoleum of
the Flavii, appears to be composed of an unclassical combination
of meters; a long passage in continuous hexameters, followed by
a much shorter passage in elegiac couplets. The content of the
inscription, however, suggests that it comprises two separate
poems, the first of which is the eulogy proper, composed to
commemorate Flavius and his achievements, while the second is a
later addition (iterum ... ecce Secundus adest iterum 91-93),
composed to draw attention to the other family members whose
names were inscribed after that of Flavius (nominibus signantur
limina 107). The author's decision to use a different meter for
his second poem can be attributed to his desire to display his
metric versatility, a talent to which he seems to call attention
in his invocation to Calliope, muse both of hexameter verse and
of elegy (nunc Calliope gemino me limite coquis 95). An attempt
at clever display may also have determined the length of his
second poem, for the addition of the elegy raises the number of lines in the inscription to one hundred ten, and, as Wilmanns has pointed out (CIL ad loc), the fact that the number of lines of the epitaph corresponds to the number of years Flavius is said to have lived may not be accidental.

All seven prosodical irregularities can be considered classical. The scansion *dederīs haec* is attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened in arsis a precaesural syllable; alternatively, the scansion may reveal this author's knowledge of the classical elegists' indifferent treatment of the final syllable of the future perfect indicative and perfect subjunctive termination *-eris* (Platnauer 1951 56). The "licence" taught by some grammatici that *h* could make position may also have contributed to the lengthening of this syllable. The abbreviation of final *o* in the first person present tense forms of the verbs *putō* and *optō* is not inconsistent with the practice of the classical elegists. For the accommodation to dactylic verse of the words *memoratio* and *descriptio*, there are two possibilities: either the author used the classical licence that reduced the number of syllables by consonantalization of *i*, thus preserving the length of final *o*, or he extended a licence used by Ovid, the abbreviation of final *o* in the nominative of some proper nouns, to include the nominative of common nouns. In the case of the former remedy, *descriptio* would produce a spondaic fifth foot, which is unusual but not unexampled in classical verse. Regarding *Æruthreo*, line 26, the unclassical orthography (*Æruthreo* (< *Erythraeo*) might indicate the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the monophthongization of *ae* and consequent confusion regarding the length and spelling both of the old diphthong and of the new monophthong; however, since classical treatment of *ae* is consistently observed elsewhere in this long *carmen*, this apparent hypercorrection is better taken as a graphic error, the mason having transposed the diphthong and the *e*. All prosodical irregularities are, therefore, attributable to the use of a
classical licence or to the error of a mason; Flavius' son has adhered well in his composition to the requirements of classical quantitative verse.

The poem is remarkable not only for the quality of its versification, but also for its length, which is unparalleled in the epigraphic carmina from the Roman provinces of North Africa. Interesting evidence of the author's concern for clarity in the reading of this long work is seen in the use of the H-like symbol that precedes lines 9, 13, 17, 23, 32, 62, 78, 82, 86, 91, and 101 as a paragraph marker; he must have instructed his lapicida to include this aid for the reader.

The prose prescripts and subscripts that accompany the verse epitaph of Flavius attest the municipal importance of his family, not only in Cillium but also in neighbouring Thelepte. One of the Flavii may have been well educated and competent himself to compose this poem. The carmen itself illustrates, as Pikhaus remarks, the role that settlements of discharged veterans played in the Romanization and Latinization of provincial natives, for both the content and the versification of the epitaph affirm and exemplify for the local population the Romanitas and Latinitas of the Flavii. That such a display was deliberate is suggested by Flavius' self-conscious references to the family's Roman heritage, for example, alto more Secundus agens patrio signavit honore, lines 11-12, by the invocation to his muse, Calliope gemino ... limite, line 95, and by his boastful expectation that the community will marvel at his work perpetua novitate ... probet ... vaga turba ... stupeat, lines 42-48.

CLEA 8. EPITAPH OF MINICIA PRIMA, WIFE OF A SLAVE

Prima aetate tua rapta es karissima coniunx /
annis bis denis et sex tibi vita probata est /
Roma tibi genus est fatum fuit ut Libys esses /
duceris ad Stygiam nunc miseranda ratem /
Inque tuo tristis versatur pectore Lethe / 5
ut non cognoscas me miseranda pium /
Munus erat Fortuna tuum servare pudicam /
et poteras ambos Italae dare tu /
A multis fletu renovaveris o bona simplex /
cum te in conspectu non habeam comitem /

CIL 8.12792; BL 1187, Buecheler; ILT 906, Merlin

prescript - dis man(ibus) sac(rum) Miniciae Primae quae vixit
annis XXVI Nicodromus Aug(usti servus) piae et bene merenti
uxori fecit /
subscript - h(ic) s(ita) e(st)
in antica - prescript repeated (Miniciae > Minuciae)
monument and provenience - marble tablet from the cemetery of
the household of Caesar, Carthage
date - age of Trajan, Hadrian, Pius (Lassère 138)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
meter - elegiac couplets, with substitution of a hexameter
for a pentameter, line 2
prosody - classical

COMMENTARY

The substitution of a hexameter for a pentameter, line 2, is
attributable to the difficulty of adapting to verse such
necessary prosaic details as the age of the deceased.

Particular attention has been paid to the name, the "essence
of immortality" of the deceased, the author having availed
himself of several name-enhancing devices. Not only does he
spell Prima's name acrostically through the initial letters of
alternate lines, he uses it as the first word in the epitaph,
and at the same time makes a play on it, prima aetate .... The acrostic design has been successfully worked into the composition without breach of classical metrics or prosody, and has been highlighted for the reader through enlargement of the letters P R I M A and indentation of the lines that do not belong to it.

The dedicator of this verse inscription was an imperial slave, many of whom were well educated. It is not surprising that he demonstrates perfect adherence to classical prosody; that he let stand an unclassical sequence of hexameters and pentameters suggests that the form of his expression of his wife's age, line 2, was more important to him than was his strict adherence to classical metrics.

CLEA 9. EPITAPH OF NORBANIA SATURNINA

orta ut fama probat memoranda divite Roma /
duodecies binos superavi luminis annos /
bis senam ex numero partem quam diximus anni /
et dece coniunctis bis ter cum fine diebus /
casta pudicitiae servavi tempora vitae /
condita nunc Libyca felix tellure quiesco /
tu quoque praeteriens tumulum qui perlegis istum /
parce meos cineres pedibus calcare protervis /
sic tibi ab aetherias lux multa superfluat auras /

CIL 8.24787; BL 1943, Lommatzsch; ILT, Merlin

prescript - dis manib(us) sacr(um) Norbania Saturnina pia /
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stone, Carthage
date - second century (Lassère 142)
type - funerary, pagan
ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 3 irregularities: duodecies, line 2, decē(m)
coniunctis, line 4

COMMENTARY

Of the three prosodical irregularities, one can be considered classical: duodecies is attributable to the author's application of the classical licence that consonantalized u. Of the two unclassical quantities, one, decē(m) coniunctis, is due to the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the muting of final m. Both prosodical errors, duodecies and decē(m) coniunctis, occur in the recording of a biographical datum, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse.

The incidence of prosodical error committed by this author is two in fifty-four feet, or about 4%. One, decē(m) coniunctis, is a serious error in length by position. Its adverse effect on the scansion, however, is mitigated in this poem by the orthographical omission of the letter. Neither of the two errors, therefore, causes a serious hindrance to a quantitative reading of the work.

Nothing in the prose prescript or verse text indicates the social stratum from which this inscription comes. Norbania's eulogist, however, appears to have had a good grasp of the metric and prosodic principles of classical quantitative verse.

CLEA 10. DEDICATION TO THE DALMATIAN GOD MEDAURUS

moenia qui Risinni Aeacia qui colis arcem /
Delmatiae nostri publice Lar populi /
sancte Medaure domi e<t> sancte hic nam templa quoq(ue) ista /
   vise precor parva magnus in effigia /
successus laeva sonipes qui surgit in auras /
altera dum letum librat ab aure manus /
talem te consul iam designatus in ista /
sede locat venerans ille tuus [ ... ] /
notus Gradivo belli vetus ac tibi Caesar /
Marce in primor<e cl>arus ubique acie /

adepto consulatu [ ... ] /
tibi respirantem faciem patrii numinis /
hastam eminus quae iaculat refreno ex equo /
tuus Medaure dedicat Medaurius /

CIL 8.2581; BL 1527, Buecheler

3.e sancte, lapis; et, Buecheler; 10.primo<e paru>rus, lapis;
primori clarus, Buecheler

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - base of equestrian statue, temple of Aesculapius, Lambaesis
date - 169-177 (identity of emperor, Caesar Marce, lines 9-10)
type - nonfunerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - elegiac couplets, lines 1-10; iambic senarii, lines 11-14. Lines 8 and 11 are not hypometric; rather, the name of the dedicator has suffered damnatio memoriae. If B.Thomasson's identification of the disgraced Augusti legatus as M.Lucceius Torquatus Bassianus is correct, his name would not easily have been adapted to the verse.

prosody - classical

COMMENTARY

The combination of elegiac couplets and iambic senarii is unclassical. It is possible that the couplets were composed by
the author as consul designate (line 7) for the erection of the statue, the senarii by the author as consul (line 11) for the dedication of the statue (... statuam equestrem consul designatus posuit, consul dedicavit, Buecheler). The change of meter will perhaps have been intended to highlight the dedicator's change in status.

The author has enhanced his poem with an image from the ninth book of Vergil's Aeneid. Compare his reference to the pose of the equestrian statue that he dedicates with Vergil's description of Nisus in battle,

altera dum letum librat ab aure manus (CLEA 10.6),
ecce aliud summa telum librabanb ab aure (Aen 9.417).

He has successfully worked the reminiscence into his own composition without breach of classical metrics or prosody.

The dedicator of this carmen was a legionis legatus; he may have received a classical education, and been competent to compose the work himself. The author's knowledge of the principles and practices of classical dactylic and iambic verse is attested by his adherence to the metric and prosodic norms prescribed for those forms; his familiarity with at least one classical work that embodied those principles is attested by his use of an image from Vergil. Why he did not produce a work composed entirely of elegiac couplets or of iambics is not clear.

CLEA 11. EPITAPH OF VARIUS FRONTONIANUS

hic situs est Varius cognomine Frontonianus /
quem coniunx lepida posuit Cornelia Galla /
dulcia restituens veteris solacia vitae /
marmoreos voltus statuit oculos animumque /
longius ut kara{ra} posset saturare figura /  5
hoc solamen erit visus nam pignus amoris /
ppectore contegitur memor<i> dulcedine mentis /
nec poterit facili labium oblivione perire /
set dum v<i>ta manet toto est in corde maritus /
nec mir(um) quoniam tales quae femina mores /  10
vel ...
ille piu ...
in dulc ...
et quo ...
felix i ...  15
set fo ...
eripuit ...
nam bi ...
nec li ...
anno ...

CIL 8.434, 11518; BL 480, Buecheler; ILT 426, Merlin

7. memor, lapis; 9. vsta, lapis; hiatus post dum admissus v.9 nisi
busta vel inusta vel simile aliquid fuit, CIL; vita, Buecheler

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stone, Ammaedara
date - second or third century (Lassère 133)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
   meter - dactylic hexameters
   prosody - 3 irregularities: Frontŏnianus, line 1; lepida, line 2; statuĭt oculos, line 4

COMMENTARY
   All the prosodical irregularities can be considered
classical: lepida and statuēt oculos are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis; Frontonianus to his use of systole in a proper name.

Frontonianus' eulogist has enhanced his work with a reminiscence of Catullus. Compare,

... ut kara posset saturare figura (CLEA 11.5),
... cara saturata figura (64.220).

He has successfully integrated the borrowed image into his own composition without breach of classical metrics or prosody.

There is no indication in the inscription regarding the rank or education of the deceased or his eulogist. That the author understood well the principles of classical quantitative verse and was competent to put them into practice is clear; that he was familiar with at least one of the great works that exemplified those principles is attested by his use of an image from Catullus.

CLEA 12. EPITAPH OF PASSIENA

manib(us) hic [pl]acidis Pass[ie]/na casta quiescit /
quinq(ue) et XL vixit pia / larga benigna /
hoc sibi costituunt / patres fratresque / sepulcrum /

CIL 8.412, 11514; BL 559, Buecheler; ILT 422, Merlin

1. Passiena, Wilmanns; nomen si recte expletum est, hoc ruinam dedit metri, Buecheler; 2. XL pronuntiandum quarranta ut in titulo Rhenano scriptum est?, Buecheler

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stone, Ammaedara
date - second or third century (Lassère 133)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 5 irregularities: Passiēnā, line 1; quadragintā, vīxit, line 2; pātres, line 3

COMMENTARY

The first prosodical irregularity, Passiēnā, can be disregarded, for it belongs to a conjectural restoration. Of the other four, one can be considered classical: pātres is attributable to the author's application of the licence that treated as long by position a vowel followed by the consonant sequence mute + liquid. If Buecheler's suggestion regarding the author's popular syncopated pronunciation of the numeral is correct, his second line would have scanned without error. If, however, the numeral was pronounced as in literary Latin, the line presents two errors, one of which, quadragintā, is attributable to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the abbreviation of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. All three errors, Passiēnā, quadragintā and vīxit, occur in the recording of biographical data, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse.

The incidence of prosodical error in this carmen, if it is scanned according to classical norms, is three in eighteen feet, or about 17%. One, vīxit, is a serious error in length by position. Only in the middle of the second line, however, where two errors occur consecutively, is a quantitative reading of the poem hindered.

The inscription provides no information regarding the rank or education of the deceased or her eulogist. The author does seem to have understood the principles of quantitative verse;
only where the traditional exigencies of funerary epigraphy
demanded the recording of biographical details does he appear
unequal to the task of expression in verse.

A contemporary passerby might not at first have discerned
the poetic nature of this text, for its hexameters have been
disposed over two or three lines each. His scansion of the work,
however, will have been facilitated by the graphic indication of
the hexameter ends, for these have been made to coincide with
the line ends.

CLEA 13. EPITAPH OF LUCIUS CASSIUS FAUSTUS

homo bonus rebus ho/minibusq(ue) pernecessa/rius
   quem quaerit pa/triae maximus hic / populus
terra tegit fe/lix lux attem ingrata / reliq(uit)

CIL 8.352, 11572; BL 1239, Buecheler; ILT 436, Merlin

3.attem < autem, Buecheler

prescript - dis m(anibus) s(acrum) L(ucius) Cassius L(uci)
   fil(ius) Quir(ina) Faustus vix(it) annis XLIII /
subscript - L(ucius) C(assius) E(utychus?) frat(er) p(ius)
p(osuit)
monument and provenience - small altar, Ammaedara
date - second or third century (Lassère 137)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
   meter - elegiac couplet, lines 1-2; single dactylic
   hexameter, line 3
   prosody - line 1 is only with numerous and forced
   adjustments reducible to quantitative verse; even if the first
syllables of homo and hominibusque were considered long, and the third syllable of pernecessarius short, perhaps under influence of the stress accent, the verse would still require abbreviation of the first syllable of rebus, lengthening of the enclitic, and contraction of the last three syllables of pernecessarius through consonantization of i.

COMMENTARY

For the unclassical combination of meters used by Cassius' eulogist, there seems no obvious explanation.

The author exhibits a puzzling range of competence in quantitative versification. In lines 2 and 3 he has adhered perfectly to the requirements of classical verse; line 1, however, presents so many errors in syllabic quantity that one wonders whether it was intended to be read as prose rather than poetry. The explanation that the correct portions consist of precomposed formulae while the incorrect portions represent the original efforts of the author is not available in the case of this verse inscription, since none of the thoughts expressed are formulaic.

The incidence of error in this work is five in seventeen feet, or about 29%. One, pernecessarius, is a serious error in length by position. The distribution of errors is such that line 1 is impossible to read quantitatively; lines 2 and 3 scan well.

Nothing in this inscription indicates the social stratum in which it was composed. The brevity of the work and the unevenness in quality of versification that it exhibits make it impossible to assess fairly the knowledge or competence of the author.

The difficulty encountered by a contemporary passerby in discerning the poetic nature of this poorly versified epitaph and in making a quantitative reading of it would have been exacerbated by its graphic arrangement; the verses have been disposed haphazardly on the stone, and no attempt has been made to indicate the verse ends or even to separate the end of the
carmen from the beginning of the prose subscript.

CLEA 14. EPITAPH OF NERIA PRIMIGENIA

aequas optavi sedes iucunda / marito . perveni .
filius hoc voluit qui mihi carus erat

CIL 8.11613; BL 1284, Buecheler; ILT 444, Merlin

prescript - dis manibus Neria Primigenia vix(it) ann(is) LXX
h(ic) s(ita) e(st) /
subscript - Ligari piae matri posuerunt
monument and provenience - altar, Ammaedara
date - second or third century (Lassère 137)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
   meter - elegiac couplet. Line 1 is hypermetric.
   prosody - classical

COMMENTARY
   Apart from the intrusive perveni, which renders line 1 hypermetric, Neria's eulogist has adhered perfectly to the requirements of classical quantitative verse.
   One feature of the inscription of this poem provides interesting and valuable evidence for the interpretation of hypermetric lines in some specimens of popular epigraphic poetry. The word perveni, which belongs neither metrically nor syntactically to the first line or to the second, is set apart from the rest of the inscription by periods. It is clear that the author well knew the limits of the classical hexameter and pentameter, but deliberately deviated from standard metrics in order to insert between his first and second lines an emphatic
and affective single-word sentence, and that he had his mason add the punctuation marks as graphic indicators for the reader of his metric intentions. Buecheler's arrangement and punctuation of the poem implies this interpretation of the author's intentions,

\[ \text{aequas optavi sedes iucunda marito.} \]
\[ \text{perveni.} \]
\[ \text{filius hoc voluit qui mihi carus erat.} \]

No line break or graphic symbol, however, separates the end of the \textit{carmen} from its prose subscript.

Neria's eulogist, therefore, who understood and was competent in the composition of classical quantitative verse, adhered strictly to prosodic norms but felt free to deviate from metric norms in the interests of a rhetorical flourish. There is no indication in this inscription of the social stratum in which it was composed.

CLEA 15. EPITAPH OF GAIUS IULIUS FELIX

\begin{verbatim}
non digne Felix / cit{t}o vitam caruisti / miselle
vivere debu/eras annis fere c(entum) li/cebat
si sunt manes / sit tibi terra levis /
\end{verbatim}

CIL 8.11594; BL 1328, Buecheler; ILT 440, Merlin

\textit{prescript} - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) C(aius) Iulius Felix vixit
\textit{annis LXXXII mensibus VII}
\textit{subscript} - h(ic) s(itus) e(st) uxsor carissima [fecit]
\textit{monument and provenience} - stone, Ammaedara
\textit{date} - second or third century (Lassère 137)
\textit{type} - funerary, pagan
ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

**Meter** - dactylic hexameters, lines 1-2; pentameter, line 3. The first hemistich of line 3 is hypometric.

**Prosody** - 6 irregularities: *vitām caruisti*, *cāruistī*, line 1; *ferē*, *centūm licebat*, line 2

**Commentary**

The unclassical use of a pentameter to conclude a series of hexameters is attributable to the formulaic nature of the pentameter; the hypometricity of the first hemistich of the pentameter is due to the inept use of this common formula. Compare,

\[
\text{simodo sunt manes ... (BL 1323.1, Moesia)},
\]
\[
\text{si sunt di Manes ... (BL 1057.15, Rome)},
\]
\[
\text{si quae sunt Manes ... (BL 2170.8, Rome)}.\]

Of the six prosodical irregularities, one can be considered classical: *cāruistī* is attributable to the author's application of the licence that reduced a hypersyllabic word through consonantalization of u. The other five are errors due to the intrusion of two features of popular speech, the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent, and the muting of final m. One error, *centūm licebat*, occurs in the recording of a biographical datum, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse.

The rate of prosodic error is five in sixteen and one-half feet, or about 30%. Three, *vitām cāruistī* and *centūm licebat*, are serious errors in length by position. The number and nature of the errors present a serious hindrance to a quantitative reading of these lines.

The prosodic deviations in this poem are confined to the hexameters; the correct prosody of the pentameter, however, cannot be credited to this author, for it is formulaic; words similar to those of the first hemistich are found in several
verse inscriptions, examples of which are quoted above, and the sepulchral prayer of the second hemistich is found in over fifty carmina epigraphica throughout the empire, examples of which were quoted in the commentary to CLEA 2. Twice again in Ammaedara are the two formulae coupled, as here in Felix's epitaph,

```
set quia sunt manes sit tibi terra lev[is
(BL 1497.3, Ammaedara),
set quia sunt manes sit tibi terra levis
(BL 1329.5 = CLEA 16, below).
```

There is nothing in this inscription to identify the social stratum in which it was composed. The author's metric and prosodic shortcomings are many; it seems that he had an unsure grasp of the principles of classical verse, and that the difference between the phonology of his everyday Latin and that of his classical model exacerbated his difficulty in producing a quantitative poem.

The difficulty encountered by a contemporary passerby in discerning the poetic nature of this poorly versified carmen and in making a quantitative reading of it would have been exacerbated by its graphic arrangement; the verses have been inscribed haphazardly on the stone, and no attempt has been made to indicate the verse ends or even to separate the end of the prose prescript from the beginning of the poem.

**CLEA 16. EPITAPH OF MEVIA FELICITAS**

```
non digna coniux cito vita [.......]/crevisti misella vivere debue/ras annis fere centu licebat /
fuit enim forma certior mo/resque facundi
fuit et pu/dicitia quam in al[i]is nec / fuisse dicam nec esse /
```
set quia / sunt manes sit tibi ter/ra levis / 5

CIL 8.403, Wilman; BL 1329, Buecheler; ILT 421, Merlin

1.\textit{digna}: mihi visum est, sed A non satis certa, probabilior tamen quam E, Wilman; \textit{vita exire decrevisti}: lacuna in fine versus septem circiter litterarum capax est, Wilman

\textit{prescript} - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) Mevia Felicitas vixit annis XL Q(untus) Calpurnius Fortunatus maritus coniugi karissime posuit /

\textit{subscript} - h(ic) s(ita) e(st)

\textbf{monument and provenience} - stone, Ammaedara

\textbf{date} - second or third century (Lassère 133)

\textbf{type} - funerary, pagan

\textbf{ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION}

\textbf{meter} - dactylic hexameters, lines 1, 2, 3; line 4 is irreducible to quantitative measure, but does terminate in an accentually dactylic cadence; pentameter, line 5. Line 1 must have been hypermetric. If line 4 was intended to be a hexameter, it too will have been hypermetric.

\textbf{prosody} - 8 irregularities in the portion of this work that can be scanned: \textit{digna, [...]}\textit{crevistī}, line 1; \textit{fere, centū(m)} licebat, line 2; \textit{fuit, forma, certior}, line 3; \textit{contendam}, line 4

\textbf{COMMENTARY}

Mevia's eulogist exhibits an almost complete disregard of classical metrics, and a curious range of competence in classical prosody. Comparison of the versification of his composition with that of another Ammaedaran epitaph suggests an explanation, for it appears that this author has copied and enlarged the verse eulogy of Felix, CLEA 15, above, including some of his model's errors, and adding more of his own.
The hypermetricity of verse 1 is to be attributed to the author's alteration of the fourth foot of the borrowed line. Whatever the lacuna contained, Mevia's eulogist has substituted his own manner of expressing "you died" for that of his model, to the detriment of the meter. The hypermetricity of line 4 and the author's failure to produce an even partially dactylic rhythm preceding the cadence is also to be ascribed to his inept elaboration; having composed (or borrowed?) a line praising his wife's incomparable beauty and character, line 3, he seems to have been inspired to expand upon it,

fuit enim forma ...
fuit et ...

The author of CLEA 16, however, has produced a metrically correct pentameter, whereas the equivalent line in CLEA 15 is hypometric. It is possible that both authors used a common source no longer extant.

Of the eight prosodical irregularities in the portion of this inscription that can be scanned, three can be considered classical: digna and forma are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis; certior to the reduction in number of syllables through consonantalization of i. Five are errors due to the intrusion of two features of popular speech: crevisti, fere, fuit, contendam to the weakening of atonic syllables and the lengthening of tonic syllables under influence of the stress accent; centũ(m) licebat to the muting of final m. The latter error occurs in the recording of a biographical datum, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse.

The incidence of prosodical error in this epitaph is high. If the prosaic fourth line with its twenty-five syllables is taken into account, and considered for the sake of tabulation to have eight feet with one error per foot, the rate of error is twelve in thirty-one feet, or about 39%. Two, centũ(m) licebat
and contendam, are serious errors in length by position. The adverse effect of the former is mitigated in this poem by the orthographical omission of the consonant. The numerous irregularities both metric and prosodic committed by this author, however, make virtually impossible a quantitative reading of his work.

Nothing in this inscription indicates the social stratum in which it was composed. It is clear that, whatever the source of "inspiration" of Mevia's eulogist, he, like Felix's eulogist, had an unsure grasp of the principles of classical quantitative verse, and that the difference between the phonology of his everyday speech and that of his classical model exacerbated his difficulty in producing a quantitative carmen.

The difficulty encountered by a contemporary passerby in discerning the poetic nature of this poorly versified epitaph would have been exacerbated by its graphic arrangement, for the verses have been disposed haphazardly on the stone. The inscription of periods at the ends of lines 1, 2, 3 and 4 may have been intended to mark these verse ends, thereby assisting the reader in his quantitative recitation; periods have also been inscribed, however, after the words dicam, line 4, and set, line 5, which makes uncertain the interpretation of their purpose in this inscription.

CLEA 17. EPITAPH OF IULIA PAULA

omnes vicisti spe/cie doctrina puel/la
Iulia cara mihi fa/tis abducta paternis /
auro nil aliut pretio/sius atque cylindro /
nil Tyrio suco formo/sius adque Lacone
mar/more nil Pario splen/dentius adq(ue) Caris<te>o /
nil forma melius s[eu] / pulchrius esse lic[ebat] /
lanifica nulla pot[uit] / con<te>dere Arachne /
cantu Sirenas Pa[nd]i[o]/nidasque sorores
et / specie superasti / quae sunt super omni/a dicta
tu quae Graiu/geno sata es heroe / parente 
10
nata bis / octonos letali fu/nere rapta
  hoc si/t a nunc iaceo Iulia / Paula rogo /

BCTH 1907 ccliv-cclvii n.2a, Merlin; BL 1996, Lommatzsch; ILT
458, Merlin

5. Carisio, lapis, emendavit Lommatzsch; 7. condere lapis,
emendavit Merlin; 9. numeri flagitabant superas, Lommatzsch

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) /
subscript - none
monument and provenience - hexagonal cippus, vicinity of
Ammaedara
date - second or third century (Lassère 151)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

  meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1-10; elegiac couplet,
  lines 11-12
  prosody - 6 irregularities: doctrinā, line 1; lanificā,
nulla, line 7; superasti, quae, line 9; es heroe, line 10

COMMENTARY

The combination of continuous hexameters and an elegiac
couplet is unclassical. Attempted artistry rather than ignorance
or incompetence, however, is to be discerned, for the change in
meter coincides with a change in imagined speaker, the hexameter
portion expressing the father's eulogy of his daughter (or the
husband's of his wife), the elegiac portion expressing the
lament of the deceased herself. The combination of meters seems
to have been deliberately designed to enhance the separation of
the personal lament from the eulogy.
Of the six prosodical irregularities, three can be considered classical: lanificā, NULLA and ūES HEROE are attributable to this author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. The "licence" taught by some grammatici that h could make position may also have contributed to the lengthening of ūES HEROE. The other three are errors due to the intrusion of features of his everyday speech: doctrinaē and superastiē to the weakening of posttonic syllables under influence of the stress accent; guaē to the monophthongization of ae, here reduced to a short vowel.

The incidence of prosodical error in this poem, three in seventy-one feet, is about 4%. The errors are limited to those of vocalic length by nature, and a quantitative reading of the work is hindered only in verse 9, in which two successive errors occur midline.

Although neither the monumental context nor the prose prescript or subscript offers information regarding the social status of the deceased or her eulogist, the reference in the body of the poem to the girl's learning, line 1, suggests a well placed and well educated family.

The haphazard graphic arrangement of the text facilitates neither discernment of its poetic nature nor a quantitative reading of its verses.

CLEA 18. EPITAPH OF VIBIA

certavi tecum con/iunx pietate vir/tute
frugalitate / et amore sed perii / cunctis
ha[ec sors con]/cedatur

MEFR 1912 199, Piganiol and Laurent-Vibert; BL 2299, Lommatzsch; ILT 489, Merlin
prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) Vibia Caeli v(ixit) a(nnis) XL h(ic) s(ita) e(st) /
subscript - I[anaria]nus uxori
monument and provenience - caisson, Henchir Hadj-Abid
date - second or third century (Lassère 150)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1 and 2; a dactylic hemistich, line 3

prosody - 6 irregularities: virtute, line 1; frugālitate, amore, periī, line 2

COMMENTARY

The third line appears to be deliberately hypometric, for neither the content of the epitaph nor its arrangement on the stone indicates a textual lacuna.

Of the six prosodical irregularities, one, amore, is attributable to the application of the licence that lengthened in arsis a precaesural syllable. Of the five errors, four, virtute, frugālitate and periī, can be ascribed to the intrusion a feature of the author's everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of prosodical error in the extant portion of this poem is five in twelve feet, or about 42%. One unclassical quantity, virtute, is a serious error in length by position. The distribution of the errors, four of the five occurring in one line, has an uneven effect on a quantitative reading of the work; line 1 scans normally, apart from the single error in the thesis of the fifth foot, but line 2 is virtually impossible to scan. That it was intended to be read as a hexameter is indicated only by its length and by its accentually dactylic cadence.

Nothing in this inscription indicates the rank or education
of the deceased or her eulogist. The author's metric and prosodic shortcomings, however, reveal the weakness of his understanding or recall of the principles of classical versification. The striking difference in quality of composition between lines 1 and 2 may indicate that this author borrowed his first verse from elsewhere, and attempted to add to it material of his own composition. The brevity of the epitaph makes difficult a fair assessment of his knowledge and competence.

The difficulty encountered by a contemporary passerby in making a quantitative reading of this poorly versified carmen would have been exacerbated by its graphic arrangement; the hexameters have been disposed haphazardly on the stone, and no attempt has been made to indicate the verse ends or even to separate the poem from its prose subscript.

CLEA 19. EPITAPH OF VITALIS

dum sum Vitalis et vivo ego feci sepulcrhum / adque meos versus dum transseo perlego et ipse / diploma circavi totam regione pedestrem / et canibus prendi lepores et denique vulpes / postea potiones calicis perduxi libenter / multa iuventutis feci quia sum moriturus / quisque sapis iuvenis vivo tibi pone sepulcrhum /

CIL 8.1027, 12468; BL 484, Buecheler

prescript - et Antigona vivit et convivatur d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) Vitalis Aug(usti) n(ostr(i) tabellarius vivet et convivat
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stone, Carthage
date - second or third century (Lassère 133)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 8 irregularities: Vitalīs et, fecī, line 1; transseō, line 2; diplōma, regionē(m) pedestrem, line 3; posteā, potiōnes, perduxi, line 5

COMMENTARY

Of the eight prosodical irregularities, three can be considered classical: Vitalīs et is attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis; transseō to the abbreviation of final o in the first person present tense form of verbs; potiōnes to the consonantalization of i. Of the five errors, four are due to the intrusion of features of popular speech: fecī, posteā, perduxi to the weakening of posttonic syllables under influence of the stress accent; regionē(m) to the muting of final m.

The incidence of prosodical error is five in forty-two feet, or about 12%. One, regionē(m) pedestrem, is a serious error in length by position. Its adverse effect, however, is mitigated in this poem by the orthographical omission of the consonant. Only in lines 3 and 5, in which occur two errors each, is a quantitative reading of the poem hindered.

The author of this inscription appears to have understood well the principles of classical metrics and prosody. The difference between the phonology of his everyday Latin and that of his literary model, however, has intruded in a few places to spoil his adherence to classical vocalic lengths. Vitalis was a tabellarius of the imperial household; he may have been well educated. We may, therefore, accept at face value his claim, lines 1 and 2, that he composed se vivo his own epitaph.
CLEA 20. EPITAPH OF PRISCILLA

eximia specie iacet hic Priscilla / puella
sex et viginti secum / quae pertulit annos
hanc fra/tres pietate pari maestique so/rorem
sedibus Elysiis condide/runt tumulo

CIL 8.13110; BL 1188, Buecheler

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) /
subscript - Victor vix(it) an(nis) V
monument and provenience - stone from cemetery of the household of Caesar, Carthage
date - second or third century (Lassere 139)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1-3; pentameter, line 4
prosody - 1 irregularity: condiderunt, line 4

COMMENTARY

The combination of three hexameters and one concluding pentameter is unclassical. It seems the poet wanted to compose two elegiac couplets but was not able to express the biographical datum of line 2 within the structure of a pentameter.

His competence in classical prosody, however, is evident, for the single unusual quantity in the carmen is the abbreviation of the first syllable of the perfect termination -erunt, one of the metaplasms expounded by the grammatici, and found, although rarely, in classical verse.

The monumental context of the epitaph suggests that the inscription was composed by a member of the familia Caesars, many of whom were well educated. It is not surprising that the author demonstrates perfect adherence to classical prosody; that
he let stand an unclassical sequence of hexameters and pentameters suggests that the form of his expression of Priscilla's age, line 2, was more important to him than was his strict adherence to classical metrics.

The graphic arrangement of the text facilitates neither discernment of its poetic nature nor a quantitative reading of its verses; the verses have been inscribed haphazardly on the stone, and no attempt has been made to indicate the verse ends or even to separate the *carmen* from its prose subscript.

CLEA 21. EPITAPH OF THE CHILD OF A SLAVE

nomen non dico nec / quod vixerit annis /
   ne dolor im mentem / cum legimus maneat /
infans dulcis er<a>s sed / tempore parvo /
mors vitam vicit ne li/bertatem teneres /
   he<u t>u non dolor es<t> ut / quem amas pereat /
nunc mors perpetua liber/tatem dedit /

CIL 8.25006; BL 1331, Buecheler; ILT 1001, Merlin

1. deest velut *dico tibi*, Buecheler; 3.*eres*, lapis; 3.deest velut *eras nobis*, Buecheler; 5.*heh.u*, lapis; *heheu? heus tu?*, Buecheler; 5.*esl*, lapis; 6.intellege *perpetuam*, Buecheler

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) /
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stone, Carthage
date - second or third century (Lassère 142)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
   meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1, 3, 4; pentameters,
lines 2, 5, 6. Lines 1 and 3 are hypometric.

**prosody** - 3 irregularities: *libertatēm teneres*, line 4; *perpetuā*, *libertatēm dedit*, line 6

**COMMENTARY**

The unclassical sequence of hexameters and pentameters, and the hypometricity of lines 1 and 3, seem unrelatable to content or style.

Regarding the prosodical irregularities, if Buecheler is correct in his understanding that *perpetua* was construed with *libertatēm* rather than with *mors*, this will not constitute an unclassical quantity, but merely a graphic error on the part of the mason. If, however, the nominative case of the adjective was intended by the author, the altered quantity can be attributed to his application of the classical licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. The two errors *libertatēm teneris* and *libertatēm dedit* are due to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the muting of final *m*.

The incidence of prosodical error in this poem, two in thirty-one feet, is about 6%. Although the number of errors is low, both are those of length by position, and their seriousness combines with the metric irregularities presented by this author to stumble the reader in his scansion of this work.

The content of lines 4 and 6 suggests that the infant and his eulogist, perhaps a parent, were slaves. The author appears to have had a basic understanding of the principles and practices of classical hexameter and pentameter versification. Lack of competence in original composition has produced his metric errors; and the difference in phonology between the Latin of his everyday speech and that of his classical model has interfered in two places in his attempt to adhere to the classical quantitative rhythm.

A contemporary reader might not at first have discerned the poetic nature of this text, for its verses have been disposed over two lines each. His scansion of the work, however, will
have been assisted by the graphic indication of the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.

CLEA 22. EPITAPH OF IULI[A FORT]UNATA

casta bona inviolans rarum hoc / <a> coniuge munus
Fortunata tibi sic placet / Hardalio
nomine digna meo quod tu mihi ka[r]e / superstes
natorum natis te incolumi vigui /

CIL 8.1954, 16513; BL 1289, Buecheler; ILA I 3148, Gsell

1.pₐ, lapis

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) Iuli[a Fort]unata pie vixit
annis LX /
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stone, Theveste
date - second or third century (Lassère 140)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
meter - elegiac couplets
prosody - classical

COMMENTARY
Iulia Fortunata's eulogist has adhered perfectly to the requirements of classical quantitative versification.

There is no indication in the inscription regarding the social stratum in which the poem was composed. That the author was well educated in the principles of classical elegiac verse, however, is obvious.

Firm knowledge of and competence in the recitation of
classical quantitative verse would also have been required of his contemporary audience, for the haphazard disposition of the *carmen* on the stone facilitates neither discernment of its poetic nature nor a quantitative reading of its verses.

**CLEA 23. EPITAPH OF TITUS FLAVIUS PUDENS MAXIMIANUS**

Fl(avius) hic situs est pro/avus qui tempora / vitae plura senex / numerans meruit / hoc saepe vocari / vixit ad exemplum vi/tae poteratque nepo/tum dici simul / virtute pater nam / saepe solebat / e[...] aequo caeleri / rivos transcendere magnos 5 n[am cani]bus / sen<i>or leporem monstrabat et ipse / sic fortis centum num{m}erat tempo/ra vitae hos ego iam proavo ver/sus pater ipse neposque / testantes vitam multa per sae/cula misi /

BCTH 1896 230-231 n.27, Cagnat; CIL 8.28082; Engström 186; ILA I 2831, Gsell; BL 1967, Lommatzsch

5.debuit altus, vector equo simil. ex equo si fuit, vitium acrostichidis gratia admissum est: lacuna maior quam unius litterae, Lommatzsch; (a)equus equo celeri, Engström; 6.senor, lapis

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) F(lavius) F(lavi) fil(ius) Quir(ina) Pudens Maximianus p(ius) v(ixit) a(nnos) LXXXIII m(enses) XI h(ic) s(itus) e(st) o(ssa) t(ibi) b(ene) q(uiescant) / subscript - none

adscript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) Titina Fortunata pia vixit annis XLVIII h(ic) s(itae) e(st) o(ssa) t(ibi) b(ene) q(uiescant) monument and provenience - cippus or altar, Henchir El Amana
date - second or third century (Pikhaus 1983 vol. III 104)

**type** - funerary, pagan

**ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION**

**meter** - dactylic hexameters

**prosody** - 5 irregularities: *meruit hoc*, line 2; *dici*, line 4; *aēquo*, *caēleri*, line 5, and *multā*, line 9

**COMMENTARY**

Of the five prosodical irregularities, two can be considered classical: *meruit hoc* and *multā* are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. The "licence" taught by the *grammatici* that *h* could make position may also have contributed to the lengthening of *meruit hoc*. The other three are errors due to the intrusion of two features of colloquial speech: *dici* to the weakening of final syllables under influence of the stress accent; *aēquo* and *caēleri* to the monophthongization of *ae*. Given the correct spelling and length of the diphthong elsewhere in the poem, these two hypercorrections (< *equo* and *celeri*) attest this author's confusion regarding the spelling and length both of the old diphthong and of the new monophthong. It is unclear whether the first syllable of *aēquo* ended a dactylic or a spondaic foot. If the former, both hypercorrections suggest that *ae* had monophthongized, at least in the speech of this author, to a short *e*; if the latter, the different lengths given the hypercorrections attest his confusion regarding the length of the new monophthong.

The incidence of prosodical error is three in fifty-three and one-half feet, or about 6%. The errors are minor slips in vocalic length by nature; only in the first two feet of line 5, where two errors occur in close proximity, is a quantitative reading of the poem hindered.

Care has been taken in the composition of the first seven lines of this epitaph that the name of the deceased be recorded
acrostically, F.PUDENS. It is possible that the author's integration of this acrostic device into his poem has disturbed his prosody at the beginning of line 4, where he seems to have been unable to find a word both of trochaic shape and beginning with the letter d.

There is no indication in this inscription regarding the rank or education of the deceased or his eulogist. The author appears to have understood well the principles of classical quantitative verse. Only in a few places has the difference between the phonology of his everyday Latin and that of his literary model interfered to spoil his attempt at quantitative versification.

The graphic arrangement of this poem is interesting. Although the text is not inscribed verse by verse, some care has been taken to indicate the hexameter ends, for seven of the nine verses are have been demarked either by coincidence with a line end (lines 2, 4, 6, 8, 9) or by a graphic symbol (line 3 by a period, lines 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 by hederae distinguentes). The haphazard disposition of the lines, however, does obscure the poetic nature of the work, and renders virtually indiscernible the acrostic.

CLEA 24. EPITAPH OF GAIUS VIBIUS COSMUS, AN ACTOR

Tu qui praeteriens stas spectas exitum mortem / monumenti mei / aspice quam digna sit data vita mihi / quinque et triginta / annis vixi et <f>ui

BCTH 1943-1945 397-398 n.3, Massiera; AE 1946.48; Z 112

3. *lui*, lapis

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum)
subscript - her(es) C(aii) Vibi Cosmi act[oris]
monument and provenience - stone, Satafis
date - second half of the second or first half of the third century (Pikhaus 1983 vol.III 158-159)¹⁶⁸
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - elegiac couplet, lines 1-2; hexameter, line 3. Line 1 is hypermetric; line 3 may be hypometric.

prosody - in order for line 1 to scan, the m of exitum must be muted in order to abbreviate the final syllable, and the last two words of the line must be dropped altogether. In line 2 the final vowel of digna must be lengthened. The first two and one-half feet of line 3 are sound; how its second hemistich was meant to be scanned is unclear. Hypometricity can be avoided only by drastic accommodations: hiatus between vixi and et, a spondaic fifth foot, and lengthening of the first syllable of fui.

COMMENTARY

The explanation for the metric and prosodic irregularities of this specimen of popular versification lies in the nature of its composition. For Vibius' eulogist has attempted to construct a verse epitaph by using phrases and formulae borrowed from other inscriptions, and adding a line of his own to express the age at death of the deceased. The couplet in which the deceased addresses the passerby and requests that he pause to contemplate the monument and the life commemorated is the same one used by Tiberius Claudius' eulogist, CLEA 3, above.

Whether the author of Vibius' epitaph was an actor, like the deceased, and perhaps had received a classical education, is not known. That he let stand so inferior a rendering of the formulae, as well as adding an imperfect line of his own, suggests his complete lack of understanding of the principles of quantitative versification.
As the work stands, one of the prosodical irregularities can be considered classical: *dignā* is attributable to the licence that lengthened in arsis a precaesural syllable. The other two are errors due to the intrusion of features of the author's everyday speech: *exitūm mortem* to the muting of final *m*; *fūi* to the lengthening of tonic vowels under influence of the stress accent. The words *monumenti mei*, which are extraneous to the meter of line 1, add at least three more errors in their six syllables, for they cannot be reduced to dactylic measure. The incidence of error committed by this author is, therefore, five in twenty-two feet, or about 23\%. One, *exitūm mortem*, is a serious error in length by position. The distribution of errors is such that they disturb a quantitative reading of the work in the second hemistiches of the first and third lines.

The difficulty posed for the reader by this author's metric and prosodic errors is exacerbated by the arrangement of the text on the stone, for the verses have been disposed over two or three lines each and, although the ends of verses 1 and 2 have been made to coincide with the line ends, the *carmen* has not been separated by any graphic means either from the prose prescript or from the prose subscript.

**CLEA 25. EPITAPH OF SITTIA**

*quisquis a/mat coniunx / hoc exsemplo con/iungat amore . /
   est autem vitae dulce / solaciolum .
haec / abit ad superos cum / filio Episuco karissi/mo nostro .*

*CIL 8.7427; BL 1288, Buecheler; ILA II 1244, Gsell*

*prescript* - d(is) m(anibus) Sittiae Spen[i] /
*subscript* - vixit a(nnis) LVII h(ic) s(ita)
*adscript* - d(is) m(anibus) L(ucius) Iulius Kandidus v(ixit)
a(nnis) LXXX qui vere vicsit o(ssa) t(ibi) b(ene) q(uiescant), inscribed to the left of the poem; L(ucius) Iulius Episucus v(ixit) a(nnis) XI, inscribed in a wreath at the top of the stone

monument and provenience - altar, Cirta
date - late second or early third century (Lassère 147)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - elegiac couplet, lines 1-2; dactylic hexameter, line 3. Both hexameters are hypermetric.

prosody - 3 irregularities: solaciolum, line 2; filio, karissimo, line 3

COMMENTARY

There seems no obvious explanation for this author's use of an unclassical combination of meters. The hypermetricity of line 3 can be related to its content, the specification of the relationship between the eulogist and one of those whom he commemorates, and the recording of the name of the deceased boy. The son's name alone adds an extra four syllables to the already hypermetric line 3.

One of the prosodical irregularities can be considered classical: filio is attributable to the author's use of the licence that consonantalized i. The other two are errors due to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the weakening of atonic syllables under the influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of prosodic error in this poem is two in twenty feet, or 10%. Both errors are minor slips in vocalic length by nature and do not hinder seriously a quantitative reading of the inscription.

Although the hypermetricity of his hexameters gives the poem an awkward appearance and reading, the author appears to have understood the principles of classical verse; the difference in
phonology between his everyday Latin and that of his literary model, however, has intruded in two places into his effort to reproduce the classical quantitative rhythm. There is no indication of the rank or education of the deceased or her eulogist.

The haphazard arrangement of the text on the stone does not facilitate the reader's discernment of its poetic nature. Some care has been taken, however, to indicate the verse ends through the inscription of punctuating periods.

CLEA 26. DEDICATION OF THE FRIGIDARIUM OF BATHS AT SULLECTHUM

en perfecta cito Baiaru grata voluptas /
undantesque fluunt aq(uae) saxi de rupe sub ima /
nisibus hic nostris prostratus libor anhelat /
quisquis amat fratrum veniat mecumq(ue) laetetur /

RAL 23 1968 59-68, Beschaouch; AE 1968.610

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - mosaic, at entrance to the frigidarium of small baths at Sullecthum
date - third century (archeological context, Beschaouch 1968 64-65)
type - nonfunerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Line 2 is hypermetric.
prosody - 2 irregularities: āquae, line 2; laētetur, line 4

NOTE: Beschaouch's analysis of the versification of this carmen differs from that proposed above. For lines 2 and 4, which
contain the only metric and prosodic errors in this composition, she offers the following scansion,

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{u}nd\tilde{a}n- &| t\tilde{e}sq\tilde{u}e~ fl\tilde{u}-| \tilde{u}nt~ \ddot{a}q^{(uae)}~ s\tilde{a}-|~ x\tilde{i}~ d\tilde{e}- |~ r\ddot{u}p\ddot{e}~ s\ddot{u}b- | \ddot{i}m\ddot{a} \\
q\ddot{i}squ\ddot{i}s~ \ddot{a}- | m\ddot{a}t~ fr\ddot{a}- |~ t\ddot{r}um~ v\ddot{e}n\ddot{i}- |~ \ddot{a}t~ m\ddot{e}- |~ c\ddot{u}m\ddot{q}^{(ue)}~ l\ddot{a}\ddot{e}- | \ddot{t}\ddot{e}\ddot{t}\ddot{u}r.
\end{align*}
\]

Although the hypermetricity of line 2 is thus removed, and the natural vocalic length of \( \ddot{a}q^{(uae)} \) is preserved, this reading produces a serious error in length by position for the first syllable of \( s\ddot{a}x\ddot{i} \), and requires the unnatural and unparalleled suppression of abbreviated syllables in the recitation of the verse. It seems more likely that a contemporary passerby reading line 2 would have pronounced both syllables of \( aq\ddot{u}ae \), and tolerated a prosodical deviation in length by nature and a hypermetric line, phenomena not uncommon in popular epigraphic versification, rather than suppress the termination of the noun, especially since "waters" is the subject of the dedication. In scanning line 4, a reader would have been more likely to pronounce the enclitic \( \ldots que \) and abbreviate the diphthong in the first syllable of \( l\ddot{a}e\ddot{t}e\ddot{u}r \), again a phenomenon not uncommon in verse epigraphy, than to suppress the enclitic and render the fifth foot spondaic.

**COMMENTARY**

There seems no obvious explanation for the hypermetricity of line 2.

Both prosodical irregularities are errors due to the intrusion of features of his everyday speech: \( l\ddot{a}e\ddot{t}e\ddot{u}r \) to the monophthongization of \( ae \), which has reduced the diphthong to a short vowel; \( aq\ddot{u}ae \) to the lengthening of tonic vowels under influence of the stress accent. It is possible that in lengthening the first syllable in \( aq\ddot{u}ae \) the author has followed the misleading information imparted by some grammatici regarding the treatment of \( gu \) as a position-making double consonant. A
second feature of colloquial speech, the muting of final m, has produced the unclassical orthography Baiaru grata, line 1, but has not affected the scansion.

The incidence of error, two in twenty-five feet, is 8%. Both errors are minor slips in vocalic length by nature and do not disrupt seriously a quantitative reading of the poem.

The brotherhood (fratrum, line 4) who built and dedicated the baths may have been worshipers of pater Liber, for a marble head of Dionysus was found near the inscription. The cult was widespread in Roman Africa.\textsuperscript{171} It is not unlikely that one of their members was sufficiently educated to compose a dedicatory verse inscription.

CLEA 27. DEDICATION TO TITUS LICINIUS CLAUDIUS HIEROCLES, SON OF A PROCURATOR OF MAURETANIA CAESARIENSIS

incipe parve puer stu/diis superare parent(em) /
egregiumque genus / propriis virtutibus orna /

BCTH 1930-1931 232-234 n.9, Albertini; AE 1931.39; Z 37

prescript - T(ito) Licinio Cl(audio) Hie[rocleti] L(uicius) Vinnius Fronto ex ta(bulario) /
subscript - none
monument and provenience - base, Caesarea
date - first half of the third century (historical figure, Albertini 1930-1931 233; PIR\textsuperscript{2} V 1.182)\textsuperscript{172}
type - dedicatory, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - classical
COMMENTARY

The author of this dedication, the tabularius L. Vinnius Fronto, has adhered perfectly to the metrics and prosody of classical quantitative verse.

As Albertini (1930-1931 232) has noted, however, the carmen is not entirely an original work but rather a pastiche of three lines from Vergil's fourth eclogue,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{incipe parve puer risu cognoscere matrem}, \\
\text{incipe parve puer qui non risere parenti}, \\
\text{pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem}
\end{align*}
\]

(Ecl 4.60, 62, 17).

That Vinnius, ex tabulario of the procurator, had received a good education is unsurprising. Although he has borrowed much of his text from Vergil, he does seem to have understood the principles of classical versification, for, as we shall see, not all authors of epigraphic carmina were successful in stitching together the poetic phrases and hemistiches that they had appropriated from elsewhere.

A contemporary passerby might not at first have discerned the poetic nature of this text, for its hexameters have been disposed over two lines each. His scansion of the work, however, will have been assisted by the graphic indication of the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.

CLEA 28. EPITAPH OF MARCUS PETRONIUS FORTUNATUS

tu ni sc<i>s quantis vita[m d]eduxerit annis / 
a me non disces titulu[s ti]bi ta<l>ia dicat / 
voci praepositus no[st]ae <q>ui de super instat / 
inde tibi si forte libe[t pe]rcurrere cuncta / 
aspice dicemus <q>u[anto se vert]ice moles / 5
intulit in nubem [stellanti proxima] caelo /
ut soli data d[...]us in u[...]

(there follow 6 very fragmentary lines)

CIL 8.217-218; BL 450, Buecheler; ILT 333

1. scas, lapis; 2. taeia, lapis; 3. oui, lapis; 5. ou..., lapis;
quam celso vertex, CIL; quanto se vertice, Buecheler; 6. caput
et quam proxima, CIL; stellanti proxima, Buecheler

prescript - a long prose inscription beginning militavit L annis
IV in leg(ione) III A[u(ca)]t) librar(ius) tesser(arius) optio
signifer ... / records the military career of this veteran
subscript - none
monument and provenience - mausoleum of Petronius Fortunatus,
Cillium
date - first half of the third century (details of the military
cursus of the deceased as known from the prose inscription found
in the mausoleum, Pikhaus 1983 vol.III 11-12)173
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
    meter - dactylic hexameters
    prosody - classical

COMMENTARY

Petronius' eulogist has adhered perfectly in the extant
portion of his work to the metrics and prosody of classical
quantitative verse. It is not impossible that Petronius himself
composed the work, for his career as librarius, tesserarius,
optio and signifer suggests that he was an educated man.174
CLEA 29. DEDICATION BY LAETUS TO THE NYMPHS

hanc aram nymphis extruxi / nomine Laetus /
cum gererem fasces patriae / rumore secundo /
plus tamen est mihi gratus / honos quod fascibus annus /
is nostri datus est quo sancto nomine dives /
Lambaesem largo perfu/dit flumine nympha /

CIL 8.2662; BL 252, Buecheler

prescript - numini aquae Alexandrianae / (from which the name of
(Severus) Alexander was erased)
subscript - none
monument and provenience - in nymphaeum at Lambaesis (CIL
8.2662, 18106)
date - 222-235 (reign of Severus Alexander, named in prescript)
type - nonfunerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

    meter - dactylic hexameters
    prosody - classical

COMMENTARY

We can infer from his position as municipal duumvir (cum
gererem fasces patriae, line 2) that Laetus belonged to the
educated elite of Lambaesis. His adherence to classical
standards of metrics and prosody demonstrates his firm
understanding of and competence in the composition of classical
quantitative verse.

A contemporary passerby might not at first have discerned
the poetic nature of this text, for its hexameters have been
disposed over two lines each. His scansion of the work, however,
will have been assisted by the graphic indication of the verse
ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.
CLEA 30. EPITAPH OF PINARIUS MUSTULUS

et vixi satis et genui feliciter et rem /
non modicam e minimo quaestu[i] fraude sine ulla /
atque meis propriis et natorum honoribus auctus /
aeternam moriens famam claramque reliqui /

BCTH 1943-1945 461, Picard; AE 1946.62; Z 77

2. quaestus, lapis; quaestui, from a stele found nearby (AE 1960.116) which preserves a copy of some of the text in question

prescript - none extant
subscript - none extant
monument and provenience - the poem is found on two stone blocks that belonged originally to a family mausoleum, but which were reused in Byzantine times in the repair of a wall of a Christian basilica, Mactar
date - mid-third century (Picard 1970 148-149, 149n.1)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 2 irregularities: quaestui, line 2; natorum, line 3

NOTE: The discrepancy between the reading of the original text, quaestu, line 2, and that of the copy, quaestui, presents a difficulty in discerning the scansion intended by the author and in assessing his competence in the composition of classical metrics and prosody. The reading quaestu renders the line hypometric; the reading quaestui provides the correct number of syllables for the line, but presents a prosodical error. That quaestui was the reading of the original text is suggested by
the text of the copy; moreover, the loss of the final i is easily explained, for the stone on which the original text was inscribed is fractured at precisely that point, between guaestu and fraude.

**COMMENTARY**

The fourth foot of line 3 also presents a problem in scansion; did the author intend the line to be read

\[
\text{atque me-| is propri-| is || et | nātōr̃um hō-| nōribūs | aǔtūs}
\]

or,

\[
\text{atque me-| is propri-| is || et | nātō- | ūm hō- | nōribūs | aǔtūs?}
\]

Both possibilities involve a prosodical error; the second also involves a metric error.

If the poem did read quaestūi and natōr̃um, the incidence of error in it is two in twenty-four feet, or about 8%. Both are minor slips in vocalic length by nature; the first does not seem seriously to disrupt the scansion of line 2, but the second, because it occurs contiguously with a syllable the elision or hiatus of which is in question, would have stumbled a reader in the fourth foot of line 3.

That Pinarius Mustulus and his family belonged to the local elite of Mactar can be inferred from the monumental context of his epitaph, and from the references in the poem to their property (rem non modicam, lines 1-2) and municipal offices (meis propriis et natorum honoribus auctus, line 3). It is possible that one of the Pinarii put to epigraphic funerary use the education he had received in the principles of classical versification.
CLEA 31. EPITAPH OF IULIA SIDONIA A PRIESTESS OF ISIS

Iulia Sidonia Felix / de nomine tantum /
cui nefas ante diem / ruperunt stemina Par/cae
quam procus heu / nuptiis Hymeneos con/tigit ignes
ingemuere / omnes Dryades doluere puellae /
et Lucina facis demerso lumi/ne flevit

virgo quod et so/lum pignus fueratque paren/tum
Memphidos haec fu/erat divae sistratae sacer/dos
hic tumulata silet / aeterno munere somni /

MEFR 1905 63-79, Grenier; BL 1997, Lommatzsch; ILA II 809, Gsell

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) memoriae /
subscript - v(ixit) a(nnis) XVIII m(enses) IIII d(ies) XIII
h(ic) s(ita) e(st)
monument and provenience - altar, Cirta
date - mid third century (Lassère 145)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 6 irregularities: Sidonia, line 1; nefâs, line 2;
nuptiiis, line 3; virgô, line 6; sistratae, line 7; silet
  aeterno, line 8

COMMENTARY

Of the six prosodical irregularities, three can be
considered classical: Sidonia and silet aeterno are attributable
to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a
precaesural syllable in arsis; nuptiiis to the reduction of
syllables through consonantalization of i (or through
synizesis). The other three are errors due to the intrusion of
features of the author's everyday speech: nefâs and virgô to the
weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress
accent; *sistratae* to the monophthongization of ae.

The rate of prosodical error in this *carmen*, three in forty-eight feet, is about 6%. All are minor errors in vocalic length by nature and do not hinder a quantitative reading of the poem.

That Iulia Sidonia belonged to the educated elite of Cirta is suggested by her status as priestess. Her importance is attested by the fact that her epitaph is one of only three African *carmina* for which duplicate copies are known to have been made.178 The author of her eulogy, perhaps another priestess, knew well the principles of classical quantitative versification; the difference between the phonology of her everyday Latin and that of her literary models has intruded only in two places into her attempt to adhere to classical vocalic lengths.

The haphazard arrangement of this text on the stone does not facilitate discernment of its poetic nature. Some care, however, has been taken to indicate for the reader the hexameter ends, for these are marked either by coincidence with the line ends (lines 1, 4, 8) or by *hederae distinguentes* (lines 2, 3, 5, 6, 7).

CLEA 32. VOTIVE DEDICATION BY AN EQUESTRIAN OFFICER TO THE GODDESS PANTHEA

CIL 8.9018; BL 253, Buecheler

1-6. supplements, CIL; 7. Gargilianus, nomen incertum, Buecheler; 8. signa deum, Buecheler

prescript - none
adscription - ded(icitum anno) pr(ovinciae) CCVII
monument and provenience - stone fragments, Auzia
date - 246 (provincial year in adscript)
type - nonfunerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 2 irregularities: teḡit hanc, line 5; ā, line 7

COMMENTARY

Of the two prosodical irregularities in the extant portion of this inscription, one can be considered classical: teḡit hanc is attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. The "licence" taught by the grammatici that h could make position may also have contributed to the lengthening of this syllable. The only prosodical error occurs in the recording of a biographical datum, in this case the military rank of the dedicator; such details often proved difficult to adapt to verse.

The incidence of prosodical error committed by the author, one in forty-two feet, is about 2%. The only error is a minor slip in vocalic length by nature and does not hinder a quantitative reading of the poem.

[Gargil]ianus was of high military rank; he may have been well educated. It is possible that he himself composed this sound specimen of popular epigraphic versification.
CLEA 33. EPITAPH OF BECCUT

Beccut iam pri/mum Iloni coniuncta ma/rto /
virgo rudis tenera quo me / Fortuna reduxit /
vitae set leti sedes sic fata tulere /
hic hymno tedaq(ue) simul praeaeun/te canebar /
nunc vustis urnaq(ue) simul contecta / resedi /  
vixi dum licuit morum sine labe pudica /
maternum nomen feci Lucinae fa/vore /
natum progenui nostro qui no/mine vivat /
ne fleat hoc nimium cui sum carissima / cordi /
commune est hominum f[...])br[...] / [qu]erela[m ]179 /  10


prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) /
subscript - ... l ... eia ... rissima pia vixit annis XV ...
Euthesia
monument and provenience - altar, Mactar
date - 250-260 (Picard 1970 148)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
  meter - dactylic hexameters
  prosody - 4 irregularities: virgō, tenerā, line 2;
            praēeunte, line 4; Lucinaē, line 7

COMMENTARY
  Of the four prosodical irregularities, one can be considered
classical: tenerā is attributable to the author's application of
the classical licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in
arsis. Another, praēeunte, is possibly the result of the
author's use of a second classical licence, that which
abbreviated a diphthong in hiatus; however, given the evidence
elsewhere in the poem of his confusion regarding the length of
the diphthong, this prosodical irregularity is better taken as an error. Three of the four irregularities, therefore, are errors, all due to the intrusion of features of the author's everyday speech: *virgo* to the abbreviation of atonic vowels under influence of the stress accent; *praeeunte* and *Lucinae* to the monophthongization of *ae* and consequent confusion regarding the length of the new vowel. The latter linguistic colloquialism has also produced the orthographically but not prosodically unclassical *tedaque*, line 4.

The incidence of error committed by this author is three in fifty-six and one-half feet, or about 5%. All errors are minor slips in vocalic length by nature, and do not disrupt a quantitative reading of the poem.

Nothing in the inscription indicates the rank or education of the deceased or her eulogist. The author, however, demonstrates his firm grasp of the principles of classical metrics and prosody; only in three places does the difference between the phonology of his everyday speech and that of his literary model interfere with his attempt to produce classical quantitative hexameters.

A contemporary passerby might not at first discerned the poetic nature of this text, for its hexameters have been disposed over one, two or three lines each on the stone. His scansion of the work, however, will have been assisted by the graphic indication of the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.

**CLEA 34. EPITAPH OF IULIA**

*reddere* / *quot solum licuit post m/orte m<a>rite*
*hunc tumulum / vobis m<a>nes m<o>n<i>m(enta)que <s>acra /*
*obsequiumque mei Victorinus / vovi dolor(is) iacet in hoc loco / Iulia kara quae vix(it) ann(is) / XL*
et linquit / dulces natos et coniuge [dig]/nu 5

CIL 8.9127; BL 517

1. mrite, lapis; 2. mnesmnemouetacra, lapis: m<a>nes mnem<a>que <s>acra(tum), Renier, CIL; monimentaque sacra, Buecheler

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) /
subscript - fec(it) d(e)d(icavit anno) pr(ovinciae) CCXX
monument and provenience - stone, Auzia
date - AD 259 (provincial year in subscript)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1, 2, 3, 5. Line 4 is irreducible to quantitative measure; if this line was intended to read as a hexameter, it will have been severely hypermetric.

prosody - 6 irregularities in the portion of the epitaph that can be scanned: mortē(m) marite, line 1; sācra, line 2; Victorīnus (or Vīctorīnus), vovī, line 3; coniuqē(m) dignu(m), line 5

COMMENTARY

Line 4 reads only as prose; it seems the biographical details that it records proved too difficult for Victorinus even to attempt to accommodate to verse.

Of the six prosodical irregularities two can be considered classical: sācra is attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a syllable preceding the consonant sequence mute + liquid; the alteration of a vocalic length by nature in Victorinus' name, whether Victorīnus or Vīctorīnus, to his use of systole in adapting this name to verse. The other four are errors due to the intrusion of features of his everyday speech: mortē(m) marite and coniuqē(m) dignu(m) to the muting of
The incidence of prosodical error in the portion of this carmen that can be scanned is four in twenty-three feet, or about 17%. The long and prosaic line 4 is most intrusive; if this line with its thirty syllables is taken into account and considered for the sake of tabulation to contain ten feet, each presenting one error, the rate of error will be much higher, fourteen in thirty-three feet, or about 42%. Three of the errors, mortē(m) marite, coniugē(m) dignu and Victorinūs vovi (or Vīctorinus), are those of length by position. The adverse effect of the first two is mitigated in this poem by the orthographical omission of the consonant. The number and nature of the errors, however, present a serious hindrance to a quantitative reading of the poem.

Two features of the composition suggest that the author had little understanding of quantitative versification. The first is the prosaic fourth line. The second is its derivative nature, for a comparison of Victorinus' dedication with others from Auzia suggests that he has merely strung together several epitaphic formulae and phrases borrowed from other inscriptions. For the formula reddere quot solum licuit post..., compare the first line of the funerary monument of Caefalius, also from Auzia, reddere quod [solum] licuit post ..., (CLEA 39, below). For the expression of a husband's grief followed by a prose formula recording the name and age of his deceased wife, compare, as Buecheler suggests, the epitaph of Iulia Syra,
erected in Auzia a generation before that of Victorinus' wife, ... Donatus novi doloris ... hoc loco Iulia Syra ... quae vixit an(nis) XXII men(sibus) VI d(iebus) VII..., (CIL 8.9133). And for the phrase coniuge(m) dignu(m), compare the many epigraphic hexameter cadences in which coniuge fills the fifth foot and a disyllable the sixth. No examples from Auzia are extant, but ... coniuge Cara is found at Sitifis (BL 317.2), ... coniuge sanctam at Cirta (BL 516.8) and ... coniuge tali on a stone found between Capsa and Thelepte (BL 516.5). Lines 1, 3 and 4 of Victorinus' inscription are therefore formulaic, and it seems not unlikely that his second and fifth lines, both of which express general funerary sentiments, have also been taken from neighbouring epigraphs.

Neither the monumental context nor the epigraphic text of Victorinus' dedication offers any indication of his rank. Perhaps he was uneducated. If he did belong to the educated of Auzia and had received instruction in quantitative versification, it seems that he had forgotten or become unsure of the principles of classical metrics and prosody, and, lacking the competence or confidence to compose an original epitaph, borrowed from the works of others.

The graphic arrangement of this inscription does not facilitate the reader's discernment of its poetic nature, for not only have the verses not been inscribed on the stone line by line, no attempt has been made to indicate the verse ends or even to separate the carmen from its prose subscript.

CLEA 35. EPITAPH OF CAESILIA NAMINA[...] AND [...]LIANUS

... uc ... aliis ... ma tue
paupere progenitus lare sum parvoq(ue) parente /
   cuius nec census neque domus fuerat /
ex quo sum genitus ruri mea vixi colendo / 
nec ruri pausa nec mihi semper erat / 
et cum maturas segetes produxerat annus / 
demessor calami tunc ego primus eram / 
falcifera cum turma virum processerat arvis / 
seu Cirtae Nomados seu Iovis arva petens / 
demessor cunctos ante ibam primus in arvis / 
post tergus linquens densa meum gremia / 
bis senas messes rabido sub sole totondi / 
ductor et ex opere postea factus eram / 
undecim et turmas messorum duximus annis / 
et Numidae campos nostra manus secuit / 
hic labor et vita parvo contena valere / 
et dominum fecere domus et villa paratast / 
et nullis opibus indiget ipsa domus / 
et nostra vita fructus percepit honorum / 
inter conscriptos scriptus et ipse fui / 
ordinis in templo delectus ab ordine sedi / 
et de rusticulo censor et ipse fui / 
et genui et vidi iuvenes carosq(ue) nepotes / 
vitae pro meritis claros transegimus annos / 
quos nullo lingua crimine laedit atrox / 
discite mortales sine crimine degere vitam / 
sic meruit vixit qui sine fraude mori / 

CIL 8.11824; BL 1238, Buecheler; ILT 528, Merlin; Ant.Afr.1970 147-149, Picard, LeBonniec, Mallon

12. pos, lapis; 17. conta, lapis; 18 and 20.indented as though pentameters; 19.unindented as though hexameter

prescript - Caeselia Namina[...] pia vixit annis [...] lianus pius [vix]it annis [...] 
subscript - none 
adscript - [d(is)] m(anibus) s(acrum) [C(aius) M]ulceius
Maximus [vixi(t) a]n(nis) XXX, inscribed to the left; [d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum)] S Au[reli]us F[...]nus [vixit] an(nis) XL, inscribed to the right

monument and provenience - altar, Mactar
date - 260-270 (Picard 1970 148)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - elegiac couplets, lines 3-16; single hexameter, line 17; elegiac couplets, lines 18-23; single hexameter, line 24; elegiac couplets, lines 25-28

prosody - 11 irregularities: nēque, line 4; vixē, line 5; pausa, line 6; falciferā, line 9; operē and postēā, line 14; vitā, line 17; opībūs indiget, line 19; nostrā, vitā, line 20; linguā, line 26

COMMENTARY

The author's unclassical insertion of two extra hexameters into a series of elegiac couplets cannot be accounted for in terms of content or stylistic objectives. That he intended his work to stand as an elegy, however, is clear, both by the number of regular couplets, and by the arrangement of the lines on the stone, for the mason, probably under instruction of the author, has indented the pentameters, a graphic feature not always used in the inscription of couplets. It is interesting to note that when the mason came to the first intrusive hexameter, line 18, he indented it, expecting it to be a pentameter, and did not realize his error until lines 20 and 21, which are inscribed as two successive pentameters.

Of the eleven prosodical irregularities eight can be considered classical: pausa, falciferā, operē, vitā, opībūs indiget, vitā, nostrā and linguā are attributable to this author's application of the classical licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. The other three are errors due to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the lengthening of
tonic syllables and the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. It is possible that in his lengthening of the first syllable of neque this author has followed the misleading information imparted by some grammatici regarding the treatment of qu as a position-making double consonant.

The incidence of error committed by this author is three in one hundred fifty-four feet, or about 2%. All are minor errors in vocalic length by nature and do not hinder seriously a quantitative reading of the poem.

The author of this long carmen has enhanced his encomium with a phrase borrowed from classical epic. Compare,

\[ \text{discite mortales sine crimine degere vitam (CLEA 35.27),} \]
\[ \ldots \text{sine crimine vitam / degere ... (Aen 4.550-551).} \]

The attestation that the deceased lived a pure life is commonplace in funerary verse inscriptions, for example,

\[ \ldots \text{sine crimine vixit / (BL 382.4, Dalmatia),} \]
\[ \ldots \text{sine crimine vitae / (BL 485.4, Lusitania),} \]
\[ \ldots \text{sine crimine vitae / (BL 1004.1, Italy).} \]

No other extant inscription, however, echoes so closely Vergil's words, and it is possible that this literary echo reflects the author's familiarity with the work, and can be considered a conscious and deliberate borrowing. The Mactaritan eulogist has successfully integrated the borrowed material into his own composition without breach of classical metrics or prosody.

That the author of this verse eulogy knew well the principles of classical metrics and prosody, and was competent himself in quantitative versification, is evident. In metrics, his only failing is the unclassical insertion of two extra hexameters into a series of elegiac couplets; in prosody, his only shortcomings are his excessive use of the licence that
lengthened in arsis, and his three slips in vocalic length by nature. The literary reminiscence suggests his familiarity with Vergil.

This inscription presents an interesting and challenging piece of evidence for the question regarding the authorship of the *carmina epigraphica*. Although at least four men and women are named in the prose prescript and adscripts, the verse eulogy commemorates only one, the son of an itinerant harvester (lines 3-9), who expresses pride in having risen from poverty through hard work and thrift (lines 10-19) to reach the highest municipal office, *de rusticulo censor* (line 23). If the harvester composed the poem, when did he receive his education? His parents were landless peasants, and he himself harvested for twelve years. He did, however, acquire property and a home, and eventually qualified to sit on the municipal senate. It is possible that he hired a tutor for himself, and discovered a late appreciation and talent for poetry; it is also possible that he commissioned the poem from a professional poet, or that one of his sons or heirs composed the work.

CLEA 36. VOTIVE DEDICATION TO SATURNUS BY GAIUS MANIUS FELIX FORTUNATIANUS, A PRIEST

in somnis monitus Saturni/ni numine iussus /
Manius hie votum solui / sacrumque dicavi /
pro comperta fide et pro ser/vata salute /

CRAI 1975 111-118, Beschaouch; AE 1975.874

*prescript* - pos uit, or itum) Car[o et Carino co(n)s(ulibus)]
III idus I[unias, or ul]ias Saturno Aug(usto) sac(rum) C(aius)
Manius Felix Fortunatianus sacerdos /
*subscript* - v(otum) s(oluit) l(ibens) a(nimo)
monument and provenience - stele from the sanctuary of Saturnus, Chul (Beschaouch 1975 112-118)
date - 283 (consular year, as reconstructed by Beschaouch 1975 115)
type - nonfunerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
   meter - dactylic hexameters
   prosody - 3 irregularities: sācrumque, line 2; compertā, servatā, line 3

COMMENTARY
   Of the three prosodical irregularities, one can be considered classical: sācrumque is attributable to the author's use of the licence that lengthened a vowel preceding the consonant sequence mute + liquid. The other two are errors due to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

   The incidence of prosodical error is two in eighteen feet, or about 11%. Although both are minor slips in vocalic length by nature, the presence of two errors in one line does interrupt the rhythm of a quantitative reading of the poem.

   The author of this inscription demonstrates his knowledge of and competence in classical versification. Manius may have composed the carmen himself, for his office as priest of Saturnus (sacerdos, prescript) suggests that he was reasonably well educated.

   A contemporary passerby might not at first have discerned the poetic nature of this text, for its hexameters have been disposed over two lines each. His scansion of the work, however, will have been assisted by the graphic indication of the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.
CLEA 37. COMMEMORATION OF THE RESTORATION OF A WALL OF THE FORUM AT LAMBAESIS

moenia quisq(ue) dolet nova condere successori /
    inculto maneat lividus hospitio /

CIL 8.2729; BL 890, Buecheler

prescript - none
subscript - Acilius Clarus u(ir) co(n)s(ularis) p(raeses)
p(rovinciae) N(umidiae) sibi et successorib(us) fecit
monument and provenience - stone in wall of forum, perhaps
    adjoining praesidium, Lambaesis
date - c. 286 (historical figure, Acilius Clarus corrector Italiae AD 286, PLRE I 206)
type - nonfunerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
    meter - elegiac couplet
    prosody - classical

COMMENTARY
    Acilius has adhered very well to the principles of classical elegiac verse. The only unusual feature, a spondaic fifth foot in the hexameter, is not unparalleled in classical poetry.

    It is not impossible that Acilius, who as praeses Numidiae belonged to the educated elite of Roman society, composed this brief dedicatory inscription himself.

CLEA 38. EPITAPH OF AELIA SECUNDULA

funeri mule quidem condigna iam misimus omnes /
insuper arequ(e) deposite Secundulae matri /
lapideam placuit nobis atponere mensam /
in qua magna eius memorantes plurima facta /
dum cibi ponuntur calicesq(ue) ei copertae / 5
vulnus ut sanetur nos rod<ens> pectore saevum /
libenter fabul<as> dum sera red<d>imus hora /
castae matri bonae laudesq(ue) vetula dormit /
ipsa <q>(uae) nutrit iaces et sobriae semper /

MEFR 1895 49-50, Gsell; CIL 8.20277; ILCV 1570, Diehl; BL 1977, Lommatzsch

1. muita guid<md>, lapis; 6. nos rod pectore, lapis; videndum ne
lapis nos[t]ro d[e] pectore exhibeat, Lommatzsch; 7. fabul,
lapis; 9. ipsa <q>, lapis

prescript - memoriae Aeliae Secundulae /
subscript - v(ixit) a(nnis) LXXV a(nno) p(rovinciae) CCLX
Statulenia Iulia fecit
monument and provenience - stone, Satafis
date - 299 (provincial year, subscript)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 16 irregularities: funerī, iām misimus, line 1;
areque, Secundulae, line 2; lapideam, line 3; cibī, line 5; īt
sanetur, line 6; libenter, fābulas, line 7; mātrī, laudesquē,
vētula, line 8; ipsā, iāces, sobriae, line 9

COMMENTARY

Of the sixteen deviations from classical prosody, only one
can be considered classical: Secundulae is attributable to the
author's use of ectasis in adapting to verse a proper name. Of
the fifteen errors, nine can be ascribed to the intrusion of
specific features of popular speech: *funerī*, *cibī*, *matri*, *vētula*, *iāces* to the lengthening of tonic syllables and the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent; *iām misimus* to the muting of final m; *ārēque*, *Secundulaē*, *sobriaē* to the monophthongization of ae and the consequent confusion regarding the length of the new vowel. The confusion that attended the reduction of the diphthong in colloquial speech is well illustrated in this poem, for ae is orthographically and prosodically correct in *copertae*, line 5, *saevum*, line 6, *castae*, *bonae*, line 8, *quae*, line 9; orthographically correct but prosodically incorrect, *Secundulae*, line 2; and orthographically incorrect twice, first scanned short, *ārēque*, then long, *deposite*, line 2. In addition, ae may be put for short a in *sobriae*, line 9 (alternatively, *sobriae* < *sobrie*, the adverb), a phenomenon found in a few other African inscriptions.\(^{181}\)

The incidence of prosodical error in this *carmen* is fifteen in fifty-four feet, or about 28%. One, *iām misimus*, is a serious error in length by position. Such is the distribution of errors that only two lines can be read quantitatively without hindrance: line 3, in which the only error occurs at the beginning, where a vowel short by nature is easily lengthened under the first ictus of the verse; and line 4, which is free of error.

Noteworthy is the attention paid to acrostic composition in this poem. The form is unusual not only in incorporating both an acrostic and a telestic device,\(^ {182}\) but also in spelling out not a name but the familial relationship between dedicator and recipient, FILI DULCISIMAE MATR.\(^ {183}\) It is possible that the author's incorporation of this acrostic device has disturbed his prosody at the beginning of lines 1, 3, 7 and 9; he was unable to provide at line 1 a word both of dactylic shape and starting with f, at lines 3 and 7 words the first syllables of which were long and began with l, and at line 9 a word of spondaic shape and beginning with i. The number of prosodical errors elsewhere
in the *carmen*, however, suggests that these errors are more likely due simply to ignorance than to the integration of the acrostic. The acrostic and telestic designs are easily discerned, for the hexameters are engraved on the stone verse by verse.

The rank of the family who raised this epitaph is not known. That Secundula's eulogist, perhaps the Statulenia Iulia named in the subscript, had received some education in classical verse and that she endeavoured to model her lines on the classical hexameter is indicated by her adherence to the basic structural features of that form, that is, line length of six feet, several prosodically sound dactylic segments, and rhythmically distinct cadences (the fifth foot spondee and irregular rhythm in the cadence of line 5 produce a doubly unusual but not unprecedented classical cadence). The nature of the prosodical errors suggests that she understood the principle of quantitative rhythm. The high number of her errors, however, indicates that she spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened or obliterated. The obvious confusion throughout the epigraph regarding the orthography and prosody of the diphthongae is striking evidence of the interference of contemporary popular speech in the attempt to compose classical verse. The difference between the phonology of her everyday speech and that of her classical model has interfered with her attempted recall of classical vocalic lengths, and produced so many errors that a quantitative reading of her work is virtually impossible.

**CLEA 39. EPITAPH OF IULIUS KAPITO CAEFALIUS**

reddere quod [solum] / licuit post fat[a sepul]/chorum qui pat[riae] / casus miserans [ci]/viumque suoru[m / clausis itineribu[s pe]/netravit devia cu[rsu / quem non respe[cta] / defessa par<entibu>s aeta[s /
nec subolum pietas [po]tuit detinere per[iclo] / 5
quid superest [haec om]/nium est con[scien]ia nostrum /
cur fuerit tale[m p]er/pessus morte do[lo]re /
dum civibus requiem / tributorum ferre v[o]/lebat
incidit infe/lix contrario mu/nere missu

BL 518, Buecheler; CIL 8.20758

1.-8.restorations, CIL; 4. pars, lapis; patris or parentium, CIL; parentibus, Buecheler

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) Caefalio ex[imi]ae laudis i[uve]ni /
subscript - Iul(ius) Kapito Iul(io) Kapitoni fil(io) fec(it)
vix(it) an(nis) XLIII me(nsibus) VIII
monument and provenience - stone, Auzia
date - third or fourth century (onomastics, specifically, the
use in the prescript of the detached signum "Caefalius")¹⁸⁴
type - funerary, pagan

NOTE: analysis and commentary are made on the assumption that
the restorations offered by the editor of CIL and by Buecheler
are likely reflective of the original text.

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters

prosody - 9 irregularities: civiumque, line 2; clausīs, itīneribus, line 3; respectā, line 4, dētinere; line 5,
conscientia, line 6; civibus, tribūtorum, line 8, contrario, line 9

COMMENTARY

Of the nine prosodical irregularities, four can be
considered classical: civiumque, conscientia and contrario are
attributable to the author's application of the licences that
consonantalized i; respectā to the lengthening of a precaesural
syllable in arsis. Of the five errors, three are due to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech: clausis, detinere and tributorum to the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. A second popular linguistic feature, the muting of the final consonant m, has produced the unclassical orthography dolore, line 7, but since the word occurs at line end, scansion has not been adversely affected.

The incidence of prosodical error in this poem is five in fifty-four feet, or about 9%. All errors are limited to those of vocalic length by nature, and only lines 3 and 8, which present two errors each, seem difficult to read quantitatively.

Neither the monumental context nor the text of this inscription provides information regarding the rank or education of Caefalius or his eulogist. That the author was familiar with the principles of composition of classical hexameter verse is attested by his adherence to literary metrics and by his adherence, for the most part, to classical prosody. The difference between the phonology of his everyday Latin and that of his classical model resulted in a few slips in prosody.

The arrangement of this text on the stone is interesting. Although the verses seem at first glance haphazardly inscribed and their poetic nature obscured, some care has been taken to assist the reader in making a quantitative recitation. First, the mason attempted to dispose the verses over two lines each, so that the verse ends would be clear; he succeeded with all the verses except 1 and 8, which spill over into the next lines, and 9, which runs on into the prose subscript. He marked these verse ends clearly, however, through the inscription of hederae distinguentes after the words sepulchrum, volebat and missu.

CLEA 40. EPITAPH OF TITUS CLODIUS LOUELLA

colum(en) moru ac pie(tatis) /
laud(ibus) ac titulis or/natus v(ixit) hon(este)
omnibu/s hic carus fuerat / felic(ite)r a(nnos)
L minus uno / gessit studio set /
usus on(orbitus) ordinis est / adque viru v(ir)
egr(egius) fl(amen) / patriae p(ius) admod(erator) /
largus munidator / ed [...] sator ing[...]
uo[...]
Lenaei pat(ris) cultor / fel(ixque) sac(erdos)
addidit hic / decus ac nomen suae / Claudiae genti
inspic/ies lec(tor) primordia / versiculorum / 10

CIL 8.4681, Wilmanns; BL 511, Buecheler; ILA I 2207

1.taken with the prose prescript, Wilmanns

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) T(itus) Clodius Louella
aed(ilis) IIvir q(uaestor) fl(amen) p(er)p(etuus) sac(erdos)
Liberi patris v(ixit) a(nnis) XLVIII / hic situs est /
subscript - none

monument and provenience - stone, Madauras
date - third or fourth century (historical figure, PIR II 276 n.1168)185
type - funerary, pagan

NOTE: The poetic portion of the inscription is acrostically composed, the first letters of each line spelling out the name of the deceased. Where the carmen begins, however, is disputed. The editor of CIL sees the start at laud(ibus) ..., which produces the acrostic LOLUELLA or, with resolution of the numeral, LOQUELLA, necessitating emendation of the name Louella in the prose prescript. Buecheler sees the beginning at colum(en) ..., noting that the acrostic so generated does spell out the name(s) of the deceased, CLO(DIUS) L(O)UELLA. This interpretation is supported by the graphic arrangement of the epitaph, for the formula hic situs est, which immediately precedes Buecheler's poem beginning, has been indented, thus
separating the portion column... from the rest of the inscription.

It is possible also that the author intended his poem to start with hic situs est, for the combination of this sepulchral formula, which scans well as the first one and one-half feet of a hexameter, with the first four words of the eulogy, column moru(m) ac pietatis (Buecheler's first line), would produce a prosodically sound, although slightly hypometric, hexameter. Telling against this view, however, is, first, the indentation of the formula, which separates the text column... , and, second, the fact that the first letter of the first hexameter would not, like the other primordia versiculorum to which the author directs our attention (line 10), belong to the acrostic.

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Lines 1 and 5 are hypometric.
prosody - 6 irregularities: quinquaginta, minūs, line 4; munidator, line 7; pātris, line 8; suāe, Claudiae, line 9

COMMENTARY

Line 1 lacks a full hemistich; line 5 a half-foot. The difficulty caused by the integration of the acrostic design may have contributed to the hypometricity lines 1 and 5, where the author was unable to fill out the verses without disturbing the acrostic.

Of the six prosodical deviations, three can be considered classical: minūs and munidator are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis; pātris to the lengthening of a vowel before the consonant sequence mute + liquid. The other three, quinquaginta, suae and Claudiae, are errors caused by the intrusion of two features of popular speech, the weakening of posttonic vowels under influence of the stress accent, and the monophthongization of ae. Another feature of colloquial speech, the muting of final m, is reflected in the orthography moru,
line 1, and *vira*, line 5, but has not affected the scansion. Two of the errors, *quadragintã* and *Claudiaë*, occur in the recording of biographical data, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse.

The incidence of prosodical error, three in fifty-seven feet, is about 5%. All are minor slips in vocalic length by nature, and do not seem to hinder a quantitative reading of the inscription.

Both the *carmen* and its prose subscript reveal that Clodius belonged to the elite of Madauros. He may have received a classical education and been competent himself to compose his own epitaph. The author appears, on the whole, to have understood the principles of classical quantitative poetry; his few unclassical prosodic features can be attributed to his inadvertent lapse into patterns of his everyday speech.

Noteworthy are two graphic features of this inscription. The first, which is unparalleled in African verse epigraphy, is the extensive use made of abbreviation in the metric portion of the inscription. Some are the standard abridgments commonly seen in prose inscriptions, for example, *v(ixit), a(nnos), f1(amen), p(ius), sac(erdos)*, but several such as *laud(ibus), egr(eqius) and felic(iter)* require the reader to supply not only nominal, adjectival and adverbial terminations, but also some of the stems of the words represented. The second noteworthy feature is the haphazard arrangement of the *carmen* on the stone, for, although the author has taken pains to versify his eulogy and to compose it acrostically, a fact to which he refers explicitly in his final line, no effort has been made graphically to indicate the poetic nature of the work or to show off the acrostic device. A reader of this *carmen* would have had to be sufficiently accustomed to recite epigraphic verses that he could supply missing syllables, discern dactylic hexameters in a text that is not obviously poetic, and carry in his memory as he read the *primordia versiculorum*, in order that he might appreciate the acrostic recording of Clodius' name. Few, surely, would have had the talent or taken the time.
CLEA 41. EPITAPH OF CALESTINA

casta fides mentis semper servata marito /
ad caelum pervexit obans tua gaudia vitae /
exemplare manent terris imitanda pudicis /
laus habet hoc meritum servat tua fama pudorem /
exsuperans mortis legem cum durat in aebum /
sic vivunt mores sic numquam deficit aetas /
te doluit genus omne tuum te cUNCTae pudicae /
innocuam quisquis miratus tempore vitam /
non moritur fatum solvuntur corpora laeto /
angustos vitae vicisti temporis annos /

5

10

LA 9-10 1972-1973 19-20, Nestori

7. tum, murus; tuum, see below under commentary

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - catacomb, Sabratha
date - late third to late fifth (archeological context, Nestori 1972-1973 24)\[186]
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Line 7 as inscribed is hypometric.

prosody - 1 error: cunctaē, line 7

COMMENTARY

Line 7 as inscribed is hypometric, but probably contains a simple mason's error in tum (< tuum). That the source of the problem is not a metric or prosodic error of the author but a graphic error of the lapicida seems likely, given the author's obvious competence in the composition of classical quantitative
verse elsewhere in the poem, and given the fact that the
degemination of letters is not an uncommon epigraphic
phenomenon.

The single prosodical error cunctaē is attributable to the
intrusion of a feature of this author's everyday speech, the
monophthongization of ae.

The incidence of prosodical error, one in sixty feet, is
about 2%. The single error is a minor slip in vocalic length by
nature and does not disrupt a quantitative reading of the poem.

Caelestinia's eulogist has arranged the words of each line so
that the name of the deceased might be recorded acrostically,
CAELESTINA. The acrostic device has been successfully worked
into the carmen without breach of classical metric and
prosodical norms, and it is easily discerned, for the hexameters
are engraved on the stone verse by verse.

There is no indication in the text regarding the rank or
education of the deceased or her eulogist. This first
inscription from a Christian milieu in the corpus of dated
carmina latina epigraphica africana, however, attests the firm
grasp of its author of the principles and practices of classical
quantitative versification.

CLEA 42. EPITAPH OF FLORENTINUS

inter odoratos nemorum ubi laeta recessus /
mater pingit humus et lectis dedala tellus /
floribus exultat gratisque et frondibus almmum /
vix patitur cum sole diem hic provide felix /
Florentine decus cum coniuge sancta pudica /
Hostiliana tua et Splendonillae natoque /
cons....
hic pulcr....
aedes pen....
incertu....
constru....
felices ut....

CIL 8.2035; BL 469, Buecheler; MEFR 1954 168-171, Boucher; ILA I 3550, Gsell

prescript - none
subscript - unknown
monument and provenience - stone from a wall that enclosed a garden, perhaps a funerary garden, Theveste
date - fourth century (archeological context, Boucher 171)
type - funerary^{187}, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 7 irregularities: nemorūm ubi, line 1; humūs et, line 2; diem hic, line 4; sanctā, line 5; Hostilianā, Splendonillaē, nātoque, line 6

COMMENTARY

Of the seven prosodical irregularities, three can be considered classical: nemorūm ubi, humūs et and diem hic are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. In the case of diem hic, it is also possible that h was considered by this author a position-making consonant, as was taught by some grammatici. The other four, sanctā, Hostilianā, Splendonillaē and nātoque, are errors due to the intrusion of two features of popular speech, the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent and the monophthongization of ae. The latter phenomenon is also manifested in the form dedala, line 2, but since the diphthong has here reduced to a long e, classical prosody has been preserved. Three of the prosodical errors, Hostilianā, Splendonilla and nātoque, occur in the recording of biographical
data, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse.

The incidence of prosodical error committed by this author, four in thirty-six feet, is about 11%. All four errors are limited to those of vocalic length by nature, and only in line 6, which presents three incorrect vocalic lengths, does a quantitative reading of the poem seem hindered.

For the image with which this author wanted to open his poem he found in Vergil's Aeneid a suitable half-line, and in Lucretius a striking cadence. Compare:

inter odoratos nemorum ... (CLEA 42.1),
inter odoratum lauri nemus ... (Aen 6.658),

... dedala tellus (CLEA 42.2),
... daedala tellus (de Rerum Natura 1.7, 228).

The reminiscences have been successfully integrated metrically and prosodically with the rest of the carmen, which is the author's own original composition.

There is no indication in this inscription regarding the rank or education of the deceased or his eulogist. However, that he knew well the principles of classical quantitative versification is attested by his adherence to classical metrical norms, and, with only a few slips, to the rhythmic pattern of the dactylic hexameter; his familiarity with some of the great poetry that embodied those principles is suggested by his use of phrases borrowed from Vergil and Lucretius. The difference between the phonology of his everyday Latin, in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened or obliterated under influence of the stress accent, and that of his classical model caused his four prosodical errors, and his inexpertise in original composition led him to resort three times in his six extant hexameters to the use of classical licences.
CLEA 43. EPITAPH OF VITALIS

vel vos quos pietas duxit munerearente parentes / 
iarm requiem sumimus ubi nos fortuna remisit / 
talia quis faciat nisi vos quos amore adigit / 
accipiant cuncti vestros ornasse parentes / 
laetitia sumimus eodem matrisque senectus / 
iter agens salve versus cum legeris istos / 
si a capita explores ingenium nomenque / probabis / 

CIL 8.20808; BL 1830, Buecheler

5. laetitiam, lapis

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) on left handle
subscript - Mummiclea Kamerina marito et Aelii Vitalis Kamerinus
  Sergianus et Saturninus Vitali patri et Saturninae aviae
  dignissimis (anno) pr(ovinciae) CCLXVI
monument and provenience - in tabella quasi ansata, Auzia
date - 305 (provincial year, subscript)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Line 7 is hypermetric.
prosody - 10 irregularities: munereare, line 1; sumimus ubi,
  line 2; amor, line 3; sumimus eodem, eodem, matrisquaē, line 5;
iter, line 6; capita, line 7

COMMENTARY

How line 7 was scanned is uncertain. Hypermetricity could
have been avoided through elisions in the first and second feet
and consonantization of i in ingenium, and prosody corrected
by abbreviation of the final syllable of ingenium and the first
syllable of nomenque,
s' a cāpī-| tē explō-| rēs īn-| gēniīm nō-| mēnque prō-| bābīs.

Since, however, this scansion would introduce a prosodical error in length by position, which does not occur elsewhere in the poem, it is more likely that hypermetricity, a not uncommon feature of popular epigraphic versification, was tolerated,

s' a cāpī-| tā ex-| plōres | īngēnī-| ēm nō-| mēnque prō-| bābīs.

The hypermetricity of the line may be related to its content; the author's interest in drawing his reader's attention to his clever acrostic, VITALIS, which records the name of the deceased, overrode his desire to produce a metrically correct line.

Of the ten prosodical deviations, three can be considered classical: sumīmus (bis) and capitā, are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. Of the seven errors, four, mūnerare, āmor, īter, matrisquaē, are due to the intrusion of two specific features of popular speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent, and the monophthongization of ae with consequent hypercorrection. It is possible that the author's incorporation of an acrostic device into his poem has disturbed his prosody at the start of line 6, for he seems to have been unable to find a word both of trochaic shape and beginning with i. The high number of prosodical errors elsewhere in the work, however, suggests that īter, too, is more likely due simply to ignorance than to the integration of the acrostic.

The incidence of prosodical error, seven in forty-three feet, is about 16%. All errors are limited to those of vocalic length by nature, and only in line 5, in which occur three errors, does a quantitative reading of the work seem seriously
interrupted.

Neither the monumental context nor the text of this inscription provides information regarding the rank or education of the deceased or his eulogist. However, that this author knew well the principles of classical quantitative versification is attested by his adherence, for the most part, to classical metric norms and to the rhythmic pattern of the classical hexameter. The nature of his prosodical errors, however, indicates that he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened or effaced under influence of the stress accent; this difference between the phonology of his everyday Latin and that of his literary model has interfered in several places with his attempt to reproduce a classical dactylic hexameter.

The disposition of this carmen on the stone might have caused a contemporary reader some confusion at first, both in making a quantitative recitation of it and in discerning its acrostic. Its hexameters are engraved in two vertical columns, such that the verse ends of the left column, lines 1-4, are separated from the verse beginnings of the right column, lines 5-7, only by hederae distinguentes, while the prose subscript runs continuously in two horizontal rows below both columns. How was a reader to know that he must read the hexameters down and not across? How did he know where the hexameters of the left column ended and the prose subscript began? Moreover, while the hexameters of the left column are inscribed verse by verse, and their terminations clearly marked by hederae, two hexameters of the right column, lines 5 and 7, have been forced through lack of space over their line ends; the cadence of line 5 occupies a line of its own, so that verse-end and line-end coincide, but when the mason ran out of room for the final word of line 7, he simply appended it to the end of the first line of the subscript. This graphic arrangement also hampers discernment of the acrostic, for the disposition of the final three hexameters obscures the last two letters of the name of the deceased.
CLEA 44. EPITAPH OF VALERIUS DALMATIUS, EXARCUS EQUITUM

hic ego infelix receptus Tartara Ditis /  
horrea dira mihi viae vitamque remisi /  
non licuit fatoque meo filiosque vider[e] /  
cernerem infernas sedes superosq(ue) remisi /  
Parcarum arbitrio genesis vel lege tributa /  
infestis querellis superis ac tristibus aris /  
tura dedi manibus supplex crepitantia flammis /  
quod non exauditas pre<c>es de<a>busque supernis /  
te precor his precibus Bato carissime frater /  
si qua mea commendata tibi filiosque repertos /  
tradas <...> dea pauperies obnoxia non sit /  
memoriam facitote mihi ne derisus in imo /  
infernas <i>nt<r>a sedes de crimine passus /  
nomine Dalmatio semper <a>matus ad omnes /  

BCTH 1915 ccxxxvii-ccxxxviii, Gsell; AE 1916.7-8

8. preoes, lapis; debusq, lapis; 11. tradasvefes, lapis;  
13. pntiae, lapis; 14. dmatus, lapis; all emendations, Gsell

prescript - d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum)  
subscript - Val(ero) Dalmatio exarco equitum Stablesianorum
Bato suo parenti
monument and provenience - stone found in the region of Sitifis
date - early fourth century (military career of deceased, Hoffmann 1969 252n.494)
type - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 12 irregularities: receptus, line 1; viae, line 2; filiosque, line 3; querellis, line 6; exauditās, line 8; meā,
COMMENTARY

Of the twelve prosodical deviations, four can be considered classical: the reduction of *mea* to a monosyllable is attributable to the author's use of synizesis; *semper amatus* is attributable to his application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis; *filiosque* (bis) to consonantalization of *i*. Of the eight errors, three, *viae*, *exauditās* and *dērisus*, can be ascribed to the intrusion of a specific feature of popular speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of prosodical error, eight in eighty-four feet, is about 10%. Two errors, *quērellis* and *exauditās preces*, are those of length by position. The distribution of errors is such that they hinder a quantitative reading of the work in lines 6 and 8, both of which present an error in length by position, and in line 12, which presents three prosodical errors; the other eleven hexameters scan well or with little hindrance.

Valerius Dalmatius was an army officer; he may have received a classical education and composed this *carmen* himself. It is evident by his adherence to classical metric norms and by his adherence, for the most part, to classical prosody that the author understood the basic principles of quantitative versification. The number of his prosodical errors reveals that he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened or effaced, and that this difference between the phonology of his everyday Latin and that of his classical models exacerbated his difficulty in recalling and practising classical prosody.
CLEA 45. COMMEMORATION OF THE VICTORY OF CONSTANTINE OVER MAXENTIUS

Constantine / tuos sic semper / malis iratos /
Cernimus Aug(ustis) / malis et pace / potimur /
Cum et in hoc g[e]/nio sese provin/cia monst[re]t /
Nam <t[o][l]<t> ille / cruces et proe/lia saeva tyranni /

CIL 8.18261; BL 278, Buecheler

2. Augg, lapis; 4. nampo..iille, lapis; tolit < tulit, Buecheler

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - base of statue commemorating the victory of Constantine over Maxentius, Lambaesis
date - early fourth century, after 312 (historical context)
type - nonfunerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 5 irregularities: mālis, īratos, line 1; mālis, line 2; cūm, line 3

COMMENTARY

All the prosodical errors committed by this author are attributable to the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of error in this carmen is five in twenty-four feet, or about 21%. All are errors in vocalic length by nature. Their distribution, however, is such that they seriously hinder a quantitative reading of the work in the following places: in the cadence of line 1, where three successive errors occur; midline, line 2, where an error is immediately preceded by an
abbreviation the supplementation for which involves two syllables, and in the first foot of line 3, in which the disturbance of the rhythm caused by the error in the first syllable is exacerbated by the hiatus that follows.

The monumental context of this metric inscription suggests that the magistrates of Lambaesis commissioned the work. That the author knew the principles of classical quantitative verse is evident in his adherence to classical metric norms and in his general success in adhering to classical prosody; it is also evident, however, that he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened or effaced, and that this difference between the phonology of his everyday Latin and that of his literary models intruded to spoil his effort at original composition.

A contemporary passerby might not at first have discerned the poetic nature of this text, for its hexameters have been disposed over three lines each. His scansion of the work, however, will have been assisted by the graphic indication of the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.

CLEA 46. EPITAPH OF IULIA MO[...] BENENATA

si quis honos vitae / est testis post mune/ra fati
mortis sorte / cluet cum iam sub fine / supremo
aspicit infe/rnorum Acherusia te/mpla deorum
secure/q(ue) videt strepitu / Acheruntis avari
na/mq(ue) egomet quod pio se/mpet in corpore vixi 5
Ely/sios teneo mites Proserpin/ae campos
lege deum solemq(ue) / super ac sidera novi

CRAI 1946 460-466, Picard; Eranos 46 1948 159-161, Nilsson; AE 1948.107; Z 78; Prévot II.18
7. *solem q(uem)*, Picard; *solem q(ue)*, Nilsson

**prescript** - none

**subscript** - Iulia Mo[...] Benenata h(onesta) f(emina) vix(it) annis in pace LXXXIII menses X h(ic) s(ita) e(st) **monument and provenience** - cippus/altar, Mactar 

**date** - c. 320 (Picard 1970 147-148) 

**type** - funerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION 

**meter** - dactylic hexameters 

**prosody** - 5 irregularities: strepitūm Acheruntis, line 4; pio, semper in, line 5; Proserpinaē, line 6; supēr ac, line 7

**NOTE**: Evaluation of the prosody of line 7 is complicated by alternative views, first, of the intended supplementation of the abbreviation g, whether *quem* (Picard 1946 462) or *-que* (Nilsson 160), and second, of the meaning of *lege*, whether from *legere* (Picard) or from *lex* (Nilsson). According to the former view, the poem concludes, "je goûte dans la douceur des Champs Elysées de Proserpine, c'est-à-dire du dieu Soleil que je vois d'en haut avec les constellations" (Picard *ibid*); scansion of line 7 will involve three prosodical errors, 

\[
\text{lege} \text{ de-} | \text{ūm} \text{ so-} | \text{ēm} \text{ quēm} | \text{sūpēr} \text{ ac} | \text{sīdērā} | \text{nōvī}.
\]

According to Nilsson, the final lines mean "je demeure dans les doux Champs Elysées de Proserpine selon la loi des dieux" (Nilsson *ibid*); scansion of line 7 will involve one irregularity,

\[
\text{lege} \text{ de-} | \text{ūm} \text{ so-} | \text{ēmquē} \text{ su-} | \text{pēr} \text{ ac} | \text{sīdērā} | \text{nōvī}.
\]

This reading has been accepted not only because it produces better sense, as Zarker observes (1958 191), but also because
the abbreviation g elsewhere in the inscription clearly represents the enclitic (lines 4, 5).

COMMENTARY

Four of the five prosodical deviations can be considered classical: strepitum Acheruntis, semper in and super ac are attributable to this author's application of the licence that lengthened a precausal syllable in arsis; pio to the consonantalization of i. The fifth irregularity, Proserpinae, is an error due to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the monophthongization of ae.

The incidence of prosodical error, therefore, is one in forty-two feet, or about 2%. The single error is a minor slip in vocalic length by nature, and does not interrupt a quantitative reading of the poem.

Iulia's eulogist has enhanced his depiction of the world beyond the grave with images and phrases borrowed from Vergil's Georgics and Aenid. Compare the following,

```
... strepitum Acheruntis avari / (CLEA 46.4),
... strepitemque Acheruntis avari / (Geo 2.492),
... solemque super ac sidera novi / (CLEA 46.7),
... solemque suum sua sidera norunt / (Aen 6.641).
```

The integration of these citations into his own composition necessitated slight alterations in both original passages, the elimination of the enclitic from the first quotation, and a lexical substitution in the second. Both accommodations produce a prosody less perfect than that of the source passages, requiring the application of licences in scansion.

Neither the monumental context nor the text of this inscription provides information regarding the rank or education of the deceased or her eulogist. However, that the author knew well the principles and practices of classical hexameter verse,
and was competent in its composition, is attested by his adherence to classical metrics, and, with one minor exception, to classical prosody. That he resorted to the use of licences four times in his seven hexameters betrays his inexpertise. His familiarity with at least one, and perhaps more, of the great works that exemplified those principles is revealed by his incorporation of some literary expressions.

The text of this *carmen* is arranged haphazardly on the stone, without regard for line breaks, word boundaries or even for syllable boundaries within words; discernment of the poetic nature of the eulogy and a quantitative reading of it, however, is facilitated somewhat by the mason's inscription of a short horizontal line at each hexameter end.¹⁸⁹

CLEA 47. COMMEMORATION OF SIDONIUS' CONSTRUCTION OF PRIVATE BATHS

splendent tecta Bassiani fundi cognomine Baiae /
invente lucisqu(e) magis candore relucen[t /
disposuit facere ... dicati n...
oppositos me ...
nomine Sidon[ius ...
iure sub Aug ...

NAMS 1907 399-403, Gauckler; CIL 8.25425; RA 1906 465-466 n.183, Monceaux; ILCV 788, Diehl; BL 1910, Lommatzsch; ILT 1184, Merlin

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - mosaic floor panel from the bath structure of a villa, Sidi Abdallah
date - mid-fourth century (archeological context, Gauckler 400)¹⁹₀
type - nonfunerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Line 1 is hypermetric.

prosody - there is a problem in the first hemistich of line 1, splendent tecta Bassiani, for which the simplest means of correction would be the lengthening of the final syllable of tecta and the reduction of Bassiani to three long syllables by consonantalization of i, although this produces two spondaic feet with diaereses, a very awkward beginning to the line.

COMMENTARY

The hypermetricity of the first line may reflect the author's greater concern with the expression of his own name than with adherence to classical metric norms.

If line 1 was scanned as suggested above, one of the two prosodical irregularities, Bassiani, can be attributed to the author's application of the classical licence that consonantalized i. No prosodical errors occur in the rest of the inscription, although the remaining extant portion is too scanty to support an assessment of the prosodical competence of this author. The form inventē ( < inventae), line 2, is due to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the monophthongization of ae, which in this case, has produced an orthographically but not prosodically unclassical form.

The incidence of prosodical error in the extant portion of this carmen is one in nineteen and one-half feet, or about 5%. The error is a minor one in vocalic length by nature; however, the occurrence of this prosodical error in a metrically awkward hemistich does present a hindrance to the reader's quantitative recitation of the beginning of the poem.

The author of this poem has arranged the words of each line so that the name of the owner of the baths might be recorded acrostically, SIDONI. The difficulty caused by the integration of this device may have contributed to the hypermetricity of
line 1, where the author was unable to reduce his content without disturbing the acrostic. The acrostic would have been easily discerned by a contemporary passerby, for the hexameters are laid out in the mosaic line by line.

The monumental context of this inscription suggests that Sidonius belonged to the elite of his town; he may have received a classical education, and been competent to compose his own commemorative carmen.

CLEA 48. EPITAPH OF FLAVIA CAMERINA

**ad<d>itus amor erat nobi<s> si fata dedi<s>sent /**
**fuit nobis iunctio dulcis bis <V>I per annos /**

BCTH 1887 153 n.666, Cagnat; CIL 8.20776; BL 1993, Lommatzsch

1.adlitus, lapis; nobisi, lapis; dedisent, lapis; 2.TI, lapis; XX, CIL; VI, Lommatzsch; II, see note, below

**prescript** - none

**subscript** - M(arcus) V(i)b(ius) Locinus Fl(aviae) Camerinae coniugi carissimae fecit, d(e)d(icatum anno) p(rovinciae) CCCXV v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXV bibit pro ....

**monument and provenience** - stone, Auzia

**date** - 354 (provincial year, subscript)

**type** - funerary, pagan

**ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION**

**meter** - dactylic hexameters

**prosody** - 4 irregularities: *amor*, line 1; *fuit*, *iunctio*, and either *per* or *duo* (see note, below), line 2

**NOTE**: Uncertainty regarding the numeral in the cadence of line 2 makes difficult an interpretation of the author's scansion of
this line. If Lommatzsch's restoration VI is correct, and if per
is lengthened, the fifth and sixth feet will form a spondaic
cadence, which is unusual but not unprecedented in classical
verse. Lommatzsch rightly rejects the conjecture XX on the
grounds that it does not take into account the information given
about the deceased in the prose subscript. Flavia cannot have
been married for twice twenty years, for she died aged thirty-
five. Another possible restoration, not considered by
Lommatzsch, is II. Easily explicable as a simple mason's error,
TI < II, the numeral would suit the biographical context and its
resolution would provide a dactylic cadence, at least in terms
of accent, duo per | annos.

COMMENTARY

Of the four prosodical deviations, two can be considered
classical: fuit and iunctio are attributable to the author's
application of the licence that reduced the number of syllables
in a word through consonantalization of i and u. The other two,
āmor and either per or duō, are errors that can be ascribed to
the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the
lengthening of tonic syllables under influence of the stress
accent. The latter error occurs in the recording of a
biographical datum, which often proved difficult to adapt to
verse.

The incidence of prosodical error in this brief inscription
is two in twelve feet, or about 17%. The errors are those of
vocalic length by nature. Their distribution in the poem is such
that line 1 can be scanned without great difficulty, but line 2,
which presents two consonantalizations and a prosodical error,
is almost impossible to read quantitatively.

There is no indication in this inscription regarding the
rank or education of the deceased or her eulogist. That the
author had some knowledge of the principles of classical
quantitative verse is suggested by his adherence to the basic
structure of the hexameter and by his partial success in
adhering to classical prosody. However, the only quantitatively correct portion of the poem, the second hemistich of line 1, proves to be a formulaic expression. Compare the following hexameter ends,

... si fata dedissent (BL 1219.1, Rome),
... mea fata dedissent (BL 1058.3, Rome),
... sic fata dederunt (BL 490.6, Rome).

Although the brevity of the epitaph makes it difficult to judge the author's competence in classical composition, it seems that he had a rudimentary knowledge of classical metrics and prosody, but was unequal to the task of quantitative versification.

CLEA 49. DEDICATION OF A FORTRESS IN MAURETANIA

praesidium aeternae firmat prudentia paci  s /
rem quoque Romanam fida tutat undique dextra  a /
amni praepositum firmans munimine monte  m /
e cuius nomen vocitavit nomine Petra  m /
d enique finitimae gentes deponere bell  a /  5
in tua concurrunt cupientes foedera Samma  c /
ut virtus comitata fidem concordet in omn  i /
umere Romuleis semper sociata triumfi  s /

CRAI 1901 170-172, Gsell; RA 1906 138-139 n.211, Monceaux; BL 1916, Lommatzsch

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stone, M'laku
date - mid fourth century (historical context, Gsell 1901 170)\(^{192}\)
type - nonfunerary, pagan
ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

- meter - dactylic hexameters
- prosody - 1 irregularity: tutat, line 2

COMMENTARY

The author of this inscription has adhered well to classical metrics and prosody. The only defect of the poem, tutat, is a minor prosodical error in vocalic length by nature, and does not at all hinder a quantitative reading of that line. Furthermore, a suggestion of Lommatzsch, tutat fida undique, raises the possibility that the error is the fault not of the author, but of the lapicida, who inadvertently transposed two words. The line would then scan correctly, with elision of the final vowel of fida.

If the reading of the stone is accepted as that intended by the author, the incidence of prosodical error in this dedicatory carmen is one in twenty-four feet, or about 4%. The error is a minor slip in vocalic length by nature and does not hinder a quantitative reading of the work.

Care has been taken to record the name of the builder of this fortress not only in the body of the poem, Sammac, line 6, but also in the acrostic and telestic arrangement of the hexameters. This name-enhancing device has been successfully worked into the poem without breach of classical metrics or prosody, and was highlighted for the reader by the separation of the first and last letters of each line by the insertion of hederae distinguentes, and by the vertical alignment of the name Sammacis at the right.

The Sammac named in the text of the dedication and in the telestic arrangement of the hexameters was a Romanized indigenous chieftain in the area of Tubusuctu. The verse inscription that commemorates his fortress and his loyalty attests his Romanitas and Latinitas.
CLEA 50. DEDICATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

hortaris in vitam / miscens adversa secun/dis /
Clodius Hermogena / proconsulatu salu/bri /
Theodoti cura lega/ti dedicat arcem /
hos ego Ianuarius / versus formare cu/ravi /

ILA I 1285, Gsell; BL 1907, Lommatzsch

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - base of statue of Fortuna, Thubursicu
date - 361/362 (historical figures: Clodius Hermogenianus
proconsul Africae AD 361, PLRE I 640; Flavius Atilius Theodotus
legatus Numidiae AD 361/362, PLRE I 905–906)
type - nonfunerary, pagan

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
   meter - dactylic hexameters
   prosody - 8 irregularities: hortāris, line 1; Hermogenā,
   proconsulatū, line 2; Theodoti, line 3; Ianuarius, cūravi, line
   4

COMMENTARY

Of the eight prosodical irregularities, four can be
considered classical: Hermogenā is attributable to the author's
use of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in
arsis; Theodoti to his use of ectasis in the adaptation to verse
of proper names; Ianuarius to the reduction in number of
syllables through consonantalization of i and u. Of the four
unclassical quantities, two, proconsulatū and cūravi, are due to
the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the weakening
of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of prosodical error is four in twenty-four
feet, or about 17%. The errors are limited to those of vocalic
length by nature. Their distribution is such that a quantitative reading of the *carmen* is hindered in two places, at the start of line 1, where the first foot appears to be a spondee but proves to contain an error in its second syllable and must be scanned as a dactyl, and in line 2, in which occur two errors in two successive feet.

The Ianuarius who composed this *carmen* was, as he informs us in the body of his work (line 4), commissioned by the magistrates of Thubursicu for the dedication of the *arx*. He may have been a local poet, or perhaps a schoolmaster. That he understood and was competent in putting into practice the principle of quantitative rhythm is suggested by his lack of errors of length by position. The number of errors of vocalic length by nature, however, is high; Ianuarius seems to have spoken a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened or effaced. The difference between the phonology of his everyday speech and that of his classical model has interfered in a few places with his attempt at quantitative versification.

A contemporary reader might not at first have discerned the poetic nature of this text, for its hexameters have been disposed over two or three lines each. His scansion of the work, however, will have been assisted by the graphic indication of the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.

**CLEA 51. EPITAPH OF AN INFANT**

hic corpus iacet / pueri nominandi /
o benedicte puer / paucis te terra / diebus
infantem / tenuit celiquae / in regna remisit /
propterea et / natus ut ca/peres tanta / renatus /
prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stone, Hippo Regius
date - fourth or early fifth century (historical context, Gagé ibid 378-379; Pikhaus 1983 vol. III 111)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Line 1 is hypometric.
prosody - 5 irregularities: iācet, nōminandi, line 1; nātūs ut, cāperēs, line 4

COMMENTARY

For the hypometricity of line 1, there seems no obvious explanation.

Of the five prosodical deviations, one can be considered classical: nātūs ut is attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. The other four, iācet, nōminandi and cāperēs, are errors due to the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. A second feature of colloquial speech, the monophthongization of ae and consequent confusion regarding the orthography and length both of the old diphthong and of the new monophthong, will explain the form celiquae (< caelique), line 3. Since, however, the diphthong has here reduced to a long e, and since the hypercorrection in the enclitic has been elided, classical prosody has been preserved.

The incidence of prosodical error in this carmen is four in twenty-three feet, or about 17%. One, cāperēs tanta, is an error not only in vocalic length by nature but also in length by position. The distribution of errors is such that lines 2 and 3
scan correctly, but line 1, which contains two errors in addition to its hypometricity, and line 4, which contains two errors in the one word, both present hindrances to a quantitative reading of the eulogy.

There is no hint in this inscription regarding the rank or education of the family who buried this infant. It seems that the author knew the basic principles of classical hexameter verse, but was unequal to the task of adhering completely either to metric or to prosodic norms. With respect to his prosody, it is clear that the difference in phonology between his everyday Latin and that of his literary models intruded deleteriously into his effort to reproduce the quantitative dactylic rhythm.

The difficulty encountered by a contemporary passerby in discerning the poetic nature of this *carmen* and in making a quantitative reading of it would have been exacerbated by its disposition on the stone, for the hexameters have been inscribed haphazardly, and no attempt has been made to demark them.

**CLEA 52. EPITAPH OF CELA**

Cela ancilla in pace vicxit an/nis quos
illi fata hominum deusq(ue) s(anctus) / decrebit /
d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) /
nuc eterna tenet sedem late/riq(ue) iugali
altum patitur sine fine soporem / 5

BCTH 1953 53, Picard; Prévot XI.23

2. *s(anctus)* or *s(ummus)*, Picard

*prescript* - none
*subscript* - none
*monument and provenience* - moulded slab discovered in a
necropolis of Mactar

**date** - fourth or early fifth century (Prévot 1984 118)

**type** - funerary, Christian

**ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION**

- **meter** - dactylic hexameters. The first line is irreducible to quantitative measure, and would but for its close syntactic connection with the next line be taken as a prose prescript. The third line contains only the common prose sepulchral invocation D M S. The final line is hypometric.

- **prosody** - 5 irregularities in the portion of the epitaph that can be scanned: déusque, sanctūs decrebit, dēcrebit, line 2; eternā(m) tenet, line 4

**COMMENTARY**

Cela's eulogist seems to have attempted to compose in quantitative hexameter verse: with respect to metrics, lines 2 and 4 have the correct number of feet, and lines 4 and 5 have the distinctive cadence of the hexameter; with respect to prosody, line 4 presents only one error, and line 5 contains no errors, although it lacks an initial one and one-half feet.

The author's failure to produce an even partially sound hexameter for his first line is attributable partly to the difficulty of adapting to verse such funerary biographical details as the name and age of the deceased. The prosaic nature of line 3 is also attributable to its content, for the author has used a very common epitaphic prose formula; why he inserted it intrusively into his lines of verse is not clear. The hypometricity of line 5 seems unrelated to content.

Of the five prosodical irregularities in the portion of the **carmen** that can be scanned, none can be attributed to the application of a classical licence. Three are errors due to the intrusion of features of the author's everyday speech: sanctūs decrebit and dēcrebit to the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent; eternā tenet (< eterna(m))
tenet) to the muting of final m. A third feature of colloquial speech, the muting of final s, may have contributed to the abbreviation of the final syllable of sanctus. A fourth feature of popular speech, the monophthongization of ae, has produced the unclassical form eterna(m) (< aeterna(m)), but since the diphthong has here reduced to a long e, classical prosody has not been affected.

The rate of prosodical error committed by this author in the poetic portion of his composition is five in sixteen and one-half feet, or about 30%. Two, sanctüs decrebit and eternā(m) tenet, are serious errors in length by position. The distribution of errors is such that line 2, which presents four mistakes in its second hemistich, can be scanned without difficulty only to the caesura, while line 4, in which the only error is mitigated by the orthographical omission of final m, can be read without serious hindrance, and the hypometric line 5 scans without error as the final four and one-half feet of a hexameter. The prosaic lines 1 and 3 are intrusive; if these lines, with their thirteen and six syllables respectively, are taken into account and considered for the sake of tabulation to contain six feet and two feet, each foot presenting one error, the incidence of error will be much higher, thirteen in twenty-four and one-half feet, or about 53%. The presence of one hypometric line and two lines irreducible to verse combines with the high rate of prosodical error in the poetic portion of this work to make virtually impossible a quantitative reading of it.

Neither the monumental context nor the text of this inscription provides information regarding the rank or education of the deceased or her eulogist. The epitaph contains numerous and serious deviations from classical norms. The metric irregularities reveal the author's weak understanding of, or incompetence in adhering to, the basic structure of the classical hexameter; the prosodic errors attest the difference in phonology between his everyday Latin and that of his literary models, which interfered to spoil his effort in producing the
quantitative dactylic rhythm.

The difficulty encountered by a contemporary passerby in discerning the poetic nature of this poorly versified work and in making a quantitative reading of it would have been exacerbated by its graphic arrangement; the *carmen* has not been engraved verse by verse, no attempt has been made to indicate the verse ends, and the reading of the text from left to right is interrupted in lines 1 through 4 by the inscription of a large Constantinian monogram.

CLEA 53. EPITAPH OF POMPONIANUS

felix pater habes / digna tuae premia / vite
optima cum resonat / perpetuo nomine fama
pre/coniumq(ue) tu<u>m merito commu/[n]i ore p[robatu]r
per benigna tibi q/[uaesitum tem]p[ore in om]ni
pectora dum / [vivis praest]ando cuntis amo/[rem

BCTH 1896 178 n.59, Gsell; RA 1906 468-470 n.187, Monceaux; CIL 8.4763; ILA I 2774; ILCV 334, Diehl; BL 1975, Lommatzsch


prescript - i p(er) Chr(istum) a(d) m(eliora or -artyres) / subscript - Pomponianus q(ui) felix vix(it) an(nis) LXVIII
monument and provenience - tabula or mensa, Madauros
date - fourth or fifth century (Constantinian monogram)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Line 3 is hypermetric.
prosody - 7 irregularities: pāter, dignā, tuaē, line 1;
**COMMENTARY**

The hypermetricity of line 3 does not seem related to its content.

Of the seven prosodical deviations in the extant portion of the text, three can be considered classical: *dignā* is attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis; *perpetuo* and *preconiumque* to the licence that consonantalized u and i. Of the four errors three can be ascribed to the intrusion of features of his everyday speech: *pater* and *cuntis* (*< cunctis*) to lengthening of tonic syllables and weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent; *tuae* to the monophthongization of ae. Monophthongization has also produced the orthographically unclassical but prosodically sound forms *premia*, *vite*, line 1, and *preconiumque*, line 3.

The incidence of error, four in thirty-one feet, is about 13%. All are simple errors in vocalic length by nature; none seems seriously to hinder a quantitative reading of the poem.

Neither the monumental context nor the text of the inscription offers information regarding the rank or education of the deceased or his eulogist. The author, however, appears to have known the principles of quantitative hexameter verse, for he has adhered with some success to classical metrics and prosody. Why he let stand a hypermetric line is unclear. His prosodical errors suggest that the difference in phonology between the Latin of his everyday speech and that of his literary models intruded into his attempt to compose according to classical standards.

The graphic arrangement of this inscription does not facilitate the reader's discernment of its poetic nature or a quantitative recitation of its hexameters; the verses have not been disposed line by line, and no attempt has been made either
to indicate the hexameter ends or even to separate the *carmen* from its prose subscript.

**CLEA 54. DICTUM FROM THE BAPTISTRY OF A CHRISTIAN BASILICA**

*si quis ut vivat / quaerit addis/cere semper /
hic lavetur / aqua et videat / caelest[ia regna /*

RA 1883 402-403, Gavault; MEFR 1894 368-369, Gsell; BL 319, Buecheler; CIL 8.20911; RA 1906 303-304 n.221, Monceaux; IM 1921 90-91 n.374, DePachtere; ILCV 1522, Diehl

2. *caelestia regna*, Gavault

**prescript** - none  
**subscript** - none  
**monument and provenience** - mosaic on the lintel of the baptistry of the great basilica, Tipasa  
**date** - fourth or fifth century (archeological context)  
**type** - nonfunerary, Christian

**ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION**

**meter** - dactylic hexameters  
**prosody** - 3 irregularities: *quīs*, *quaerīt addiscere*, line 1; *lāvetur*, line 2

**COMMENTARY**

Of the three prosodical deviations, one can be considered classical: *quaerīt addiscere* is attributable to the author's application of the classical licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. Of the two errors, one, *quīs*, can be ascribed to the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic vowels under influence of the
stress accent.

The incidence of error in the extant portion of the *carmen*, two in ten and one-half feet, is about 19%. Both are minor slips in vocalic length by nature; neither seems seriously to interrupt a quantitative reading of the work.

The monumental context of the dictum suggests that it may have been composed by a member of the Tipasan clergy. The author appears to have known and to have been reasonably able in the composition of quantitative verse, for he has adhered to classical metric norms, and, with two minor exceptions, to classical prosody. The brevity of his work makes it difficult to assess his knowledge and competence.

A contemporary passerby might not at first have discerned the poetic nature of this text, for its hexameters have been disposed over three lines each. His scansion of the work will have been assisted, however, by the graphic indication of the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.

**CLEA 55. COMMEMORATION OF THE REPAIR OF BATHS**

tu modo Frumenti domito virtute rebelli /
respicis ac reparas dumis contecta lavacra /

*CIL 8.10946, 21497; MA II 216-217, Gsell; RA 1906 310 n.226, Monceaux; BL 281, Buecheler*

*prescript* - none  
*subscript* - none  
*monument and provenience* - floor mosaic from a building identified either as a bath structure (Gsell) or baptistry (Monceaux), Tigava  
*date* - fourth or fifth century (Constantinian monogram)
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - classical

COMMENTARY

The author of this brief carmen has adhered perfectly to the requirements of classical quantitative verse. The monumental context of this work suggests that the Tigavan benefactor Frumentius belonged to the local elite; he may have received a classical education and been competent to compose the inscription himself.

CLEA 56. COMMEMORATION OF THE RESTORATION OF A FOUNTAIN

[f]elix Urania mecum par/tire laborem /
et nymfis aude recidivos pan/dere fontis /
laxet ubi sentibus horrens / merserat ante /
inca<s>sum funditus supe/rante ruina /
currit iter liquidum de / more prisco fluore /
ecce gradatim nosces / quo curante si queras /

ILA II 4724, Gsell; REL 1966 373-376, Marrou; AE 1969-1970 691

4. incasum, lapis

prescript - none
subscript - d(ie) IIII k(alendas) Iunias
monument and provenience - stone slab, Thibilis
date - fourth or fifth century (Constantinian monogram)
type - nonfunerary, Christian
ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Line 4 is hypometric.

prosody - 7 irregularities: Urania, line 1; lātext, ēbi, line 3; ēnditus, line 4; more, prisco, line 5; sī, line 6

COMMENTARY

The hypometricity of line 4 seems unrelated to content.

Of the seven prosodical irregularities, only one can be considered classical: Urania is attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. Of the six errors, three, lātext, ēbi and prisco, can be attributed to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and abbreviation of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. A second feature of popular speech, the monophthongization of ae, has produced the orthographically but not prosodically incorrect form gueras (< quaeras), line 6.

The incidence of prosodical error, six in twenty-four feet, is 25%. One, ēnditus, is a serious error in length by position. Lines 1, 2, 5 and 6 scan without great difficulty. A quantitative reading of lines 3 and 4, however, is seriously hindered by irregularities both prosodic and metric: line 3 lurches with two prosodic errors in the first two feet and with diaeresis rather than caesura observed throughout; the first hemistich of line 4 is marred by an error in length by position and by its hypometricity.

Particular attention has been paid to the name of the one responsible for the restoration work. The author has availed himself of several name-enhancing devices; not only does he spell his name acrostically, he uses it as the first word in his dedication, and at the same time makes a play on it, Felix Urania.... As explanation for the ablative case Marrou suggests that a contemporary reader would have understood curante, from line 6.

Felix has further enhanced his carmen with two phrases
borrowed from Vergil. With his invocation to Urania compare Turnus' invitation to Camilla,

... mecum partire laborem (CLEA 56.1),
... mecum partire laborem (Aen 11.510),

and with his reference to the flowing water, compare Vergil's description of the flight of a pigeon,

currit iter liquidum ... (CLEA 56.5),
radit iter liquidum ... (Aen 5.271).

The borrowed literary phrases have been integrated successfully into the composition without breach of classical metrics or prosody. The difficulty posed by the incorporation of the acrostic device, however, may have contributed to the hypometricity of line 4, where the author was unable to fill out the line without spoiling the acrostic; it may also have disturbed his prosody at the start of line 3, where he was unable to find a word the first syllable of which was long and began with the letter l. The high number of prosodical errors elsewhere in the work, however, suggests that these are more likely due simply to ignorance than to the integration of the acrostic.

The monumental context of this inscription suggests that the Thibilan benefactor Felix belonged to the elite of his community. That he had a basic understanding of classical quantitative versification is attested by his partly successful adherence to classical metric and prosodic conventions; his prosodical errors, however, suggest that he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened or effaced; the difference in phonology between his everyday Latin and that of his classical model has intruded in a few places into his attempt to produce the classical hexameter rhythm.

Although the verses of this text have been disposed over two
lines each, care has been taken to facilitate the reader in discerning its poetic nature, and in making a quantitative reading of it, for the portions of each hexameter that spill over onto a second line have all been well indented, and the hexameter ends have been made to coincide with the line ends. This graphic arrangement also facilitates discernment of the acrostic device that the author has worked into his composition, and to which he refers in his final verse.

CLEA 57-63. FUNERARY AND NONFUNERARY MOSAIC INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE BASILICA OF ALEXANDER AT TIPASA

In this Christian church there are seven contemporary mosaic texts that are considered carmina epigraphica. Three are clearly composed in classical quantitative verse (CLEA 57, 62, 63); four others appear to be attempts at the composition of quantitative verse, but present errors so numerous and serious that they can be read quantitatively only with difficulty (CLEA 58, 59, 60, 61). Although not all meet the criteria established for this study, that is, presenting two complete or nearly complete lines that are clearly metric and recognizable as dactylic verse, they have been included for the sake of completeness and comparison with the other verse inscriptions in the basilica.

We may infer from the monumental context of the inscriptions that their authors belonged to the educated elite of Tipasa and were, therefore, familiar with classical quantitative verse. The seven texts form an interesting and revealing sample of the varying levels of competence that existed among men of similar rank and similar educational backgrounds.

The mosaics, which came to light gradually as the basilica was excavated, are described by Gsell (1901 II 333-337), Monceaux (1906 297-302 nn.215, 218, 219), DePachtère (1921 95-97 nn.397, 399, 400, 401), Leschi (1938-1940 422-431 and 1957 371-
388) and Duval (1971 vol.II 11-20). The four texts known to Gsell, CLEA 57, 58, 62, 63, were dated by him on stylistic grounds to the late fourth or early fifth century; the texts later discovered by Leschi, CLEA 59, 60, 61, were recognized as contemporary. All subsequent commentators have accepted this dating as valid for the seven verse inscriptions.

**CLEA 57. DEDICATION OF THE BASILICA**

hic ubi tam claris laudantur moenia tectis /
culmina quod nitent sanctaque altaria cernis /
non opus est procerum set tanti gloria facti /
Alexandri rectoris ovat per saecula nomen /
cuius honorificos fama ostendente labores /
iustos in pulchrham sedem gaudent locasse priores /
quos diuturna quies fallebat posse videri /
nunc luce praefulgent subnixi altare decoro /
collectamque suam gaudent florere coronam /
animo quod sollers implevit custos honestus /
undiq(ue) visendi studio Christiana aetas circumfusa venit /
liminaque sancta pedibus contingere laeta /
omnis sacra canens sacramento manus porrigere gaudens /

ILCV 1825, Diehl; BL 1808, Buecheler; CIL 8.20903; RA 1906 297 n.215, Monceaux; IM 96 n.397, DePachtère

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - floor mosaic from the central nave of the Basilica of Alexander, Tipasa
date - late fourth or early fifth century
type - nonfunerary, Christian
ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters; lines 6, 11, 13 are hypermetric
prosody - 17 irregularities: sanctāque, line 2; Aēxāndri, line 4; lōcasse, line 6; lūce, line 8; ānimō, custōs, line 10; Chrhistiāna, circumfūsa, line 11; liminaque, sanctā, line 12; sācra, sacramentō, porrīgere, line 13.

COMMENTARY

The hypermetricity of line 6 seems unrelated to content; that of lines 11 and 13 may have been caused by the author's inept attempt to integrate some images and phrases borrowed from Vergil (see below).

Of the seventeen prosodical irregularities, five can be considered classical: Aēxandri is attributable to the author's use of ectasis in the adaptation to verse of a proper name; Chrhistiāna to his consonantalization of i; liminaque and sanctā to the lengthening in arsis of a precaesural syllable; sācra to the lengthening of a syllable preceding the sequence mute + liquid. Of the twelve unclassical quantities, seven, Aēxandri, ānimō, custōs, sacramentō and porrīgere, can be ascribed to the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. It is possible that in lengthening the middle syllable of sanctaque he has followed the misleading information imparted by some grammatici regarding the treatment of qu as a position-making sequence of two consonants. However, in view of the evidence elsewhere in the poem of his faulty recall of classical vocalic lengths it is more likely that this error, too, is due simply to ignorance. Two errors, both in length by position, Aēxāndri, occur in the recording of a biographical datum, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse.

The incidence of prosodical error in this poem is twelve in eighty-two feet, or about 15%. Two, Aēxāndri, are errors in length by position. The distribution of errors is such that six
lines, 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, can be scanned without difficulty, while the rest present errors so numerous and serious as to hinder a quantitative reading.

The author of this dedicatory carmen has enhanced his work in one place with images and phrases borrowed from Vergil. With his description of Christians eagerly flocking to the Tipasan basilica, compare Vergil's depiction of the Trojans' reception of the Greek horse,

undique visendi studio Crhistiana aetas circumfusa venit
liminaque sancta pedibus contingere laeta
omnis sacra canens sacramento manus porrigrere gaudens
(CLEA 57.11-13),

undique visendi studio Troiana iuventus
circumfusa ruit ...
(Aen 2.63-64),

sacra canunt funemque manu contingere gaudent
(ibid 239).

The integration of the borrowed phrases into his own composition, however, has resulted in two breaches of classical metrics and three of classical prosody.

This author demonstrates his basic understanding of the principles of composition of classical hexameter verse: that ten of his thirteen lines conform to the shape of the literary hexameter attests his knowledge of classical metrics; that all but two of his prosodical errors are those of vocalic length by nature, and that the two errors in length by position occur in a proper name, attests his grasp of and competence in putting into practice the principle of quantitative rhythm. And that he was familiar with at least one great work that exemplified those principles is revealed by his use of some expressions of Vergil. In composing an original work in quantitative dactylic verse, however, he has failed to adhere well either to classical
metrics or to classical prosody. The high number of his prosodical errors, and the fact that five of them can be attributed directly to the influence of the stress accent, suggest that he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened or effaced. The differences between the phonology of his everyday speech and that of his classical model have marred his effort in the composition of quantitative versification.

CLEA 58. DIDACTIC MOSAIC

clausula iustitiae est / martyrium votis optare /
habes et aliam similem ae/lemosinam viribus facere /

CIL 8.20906; IM 96 n.399, DePachtère; ILCV 2035, Diehl; BL 1922, Lommatzsch

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - floor mosaic from the north aisle of the basilica, Tipasa
date - late fourth or early fifth century
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameter, line 1. Line 2 is irreducible to quantitative measure; if it was intended as a hexameter it will have been hypermetric.

prosody - 3 irregularities in the portion of the inscription that can be scanned: martyrium, votis, optare, line 1

COMMENTARY

That line 1 was intended to be read as a hexameter is
indicated by its correct number of feet, a dactylic pattern that is clear in the first four feet, and the distinctive cadence of the hexameter, at least in terms of accent. Line 2, however, reads only as prose. This author's failure to produce an even partially sound second hexameter can be related to the difficulty of adapting to verse the common Christian tenet *ælemosinam facere* (*ælemosina* transliterated from the Greek ἐλεημοσύνη).

Of the three prosodical irregularities, one can be considered classical: *martyrium* is attributable to the application of the licence that consonantalized i. The other two are errors due to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of prosodical error in the first line is two in six feet, or about 33%. Both are serious errors in length by position. It appears that this author spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been obliterated. If he intended his second line to be read as a hexameter, he failed completely. If this prosaic line with its twenty syllables is taken into account and considered for the sake of tabulation to contain seven feet, each foot presenting one error, the rate of error will be much higher, nine in thirteen feet, or about 69%. The presence of a line irreducible to verse combines with the high rate of prosodical error in the hexameter to make virtually impossible a quantitative reading of this inscription.

The brevity of his work and the difference in metric quality between the two verses make it difficult to assess either his metric intentions or his success in achieving them.

The difficulty caused the reader by the author's metric and prosodic errors is exacerbated by the graphic arrangement of the text in the mosaic, for the verses have been disposed over two lines each; care, however, has been taken to indicate the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.
CLEA 59. DIDACTIC MOSAIC

vivite felices quibu[s] / haec sunt condita tect[a] / servate praeccepta ut reg/netis in vita aeterna / aelemosinam enim facere / hoc est Crhistianum monstrare /

BCTH 1938-1940 427-428 Mosaic J, Leschi; AE 1940.22; Z 72

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - floor mosaic from the north aisle of the basilica, Tipasa
date - late fourth or early fifth century
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1 and 2. Line 3 is irreducible to quantitative measure, but terminates in an accentually dactylic cadence; if it was intended as a hexameter it will have been hypermetric.

prosody - 6 errors in the portion of the inscription that can be scanned: servāte, ōn vita, vitā, aēterna, line 2; Christianūm monstrare, mōnstrare, line 3

COMMENTARY

The author of this dictum has attempted to compose classical quantitative hexameters, at least in his first two verses. The lines have the correct number of feet, a dactylic pattern that is clear in line 1, midline caesurae, and the distinctive cadence of the hexameter, with coincidence of quantitatively and accentually dactylic rhythms in line 1, accentual rhythm only, line 2. The hypermetricity of line 3 and the author's failure to produce an even partially sound hexameter preceding the cadence can be related to the difficulty of adapting to verse the Christian tenet aelemosinam facere.
Of the six prosodical irregularities in the rhythmic portion of this work, none can be considered classical. Four can be attributed to the intrusion of features of the author's everyday speech: \textit{vita} and \textit{monstrare} to the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent; \textit{aeterna} to the monophthongization of \textit{ae}; \textit{Christianum monstrare} to the muting of final \textit{m}.

The incidence of prosodical error in the poetic portion of this inscription is six in fourteen feet, or 43%. Three, \textit{in vita} and \textit{Christianum monstrare}, are serious errors in length by position. The distribution of errors is such that line 1 scans well, while line 2, which contains four incorrect quantities, including an error in length by position, is impossible to read quantitatively. If the prosaic third line, with its nineteen syllables, is taken into account and considered for the sake of tabulation to contain seven feet, each presenting one error, the rate of error will be even higher, eleven in nineteen feet, or about 58%.

The only evidence that this author had any knowledge of or competence in the composition of classical quantitative verse is the well constructed first verse. It is not, however, entirely his own work, for the first hemistich was composed by Vergil. Compare,

\textit{vivite felices quibus est fortuna peracta (Aen 3.493).}

The half-line proves, by its frequent and widespread occurrence in the \textit{carmina latina epigraphica}, to have become formulaic. The second hemistich, the nonspecific content of which completes a line that would have been useful for many dedicatory inscriptions, may also have been borrowed from elsewhere. The fact that this author's prosodically sound line 1 is not entirely his own composition confirms the evidence of his inept second and third lines that he had little knowledge of or competence in the composition of classical quantitative verse.
The difficulty that this author's errors pose for the reader in discerning the poetic nature of the text is exacerbated by its arrangement in the mosaic, for the verses have been disposed over two lines each. Care has been taken, however, to indicate the verse ends, for they have been made to coincide with the line ends.

CLEA 60. DIDACTIC MOSAIC

resurrectionem carnis / futuram esse qui credit /
angelis in caelis re/surgens similis erit /

BCTH 1938-1940 428-429 Mosaic K, Leschi; AE 1940.23; Z 73

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - floor mosaic from the north-west corner of the basilica, Tipasa
date - late fourth or early fifth century
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 8 irregularities: resurrectionem futuram, qui, line 1; angelis, resurgens, similis, erit, line 2.

COMMENTARY

That the author of this didactic inscription modeled his composition on the classical hexameter is indicated by his adherence to the basic structural features of that form, that is, the correct number of feet per line (with consonantalization of i in resurrectionem, line 1), the use of midline caesurae, and a rhythmically distinctive cadence, at least as regards
accent.

His prosodical errors, however, are numerous. Of the eight irregularities, only one can be considered classical: resurrectionem is attributable to the author's consonantalization of i. Of the seven errors, three, angelīs, sīmilis and ērit, can be attributed to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of prosodical error in this work, seven in twelve feet, is about 58%. Although the errors are limited to those of vocalic length by nature, it is clear from the sheer number of them that the author spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions were no longer observed. The difference between the phonology of his everyday speech and that of his classical model, therefore, has spoiled his effort at classical versification to the extent that a quantitative reading of his poem is virtually impossible.

The graphic arrangement of the text does not facilitate the reader's discernment of its poetic nature, for the verses have been disposed over two lines each; care has been taken, however, to indicate the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.

CLEA 61. DIDACTIC MOSAIC

quisquis es Christianus / ad sublimia vere qui tendis /
iustorumque viam / ex fide gradi qui cupis /
aelemosinam facito et / vivis in regno caelestii /
hoc est opus enim / quod facit vivere semper /

BCTH 1938-1940 430-431 Mosaic L, Leschi; AE 1940.24; Z 74
prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - floor mosaic from the entrance to the basilica, Tipasa
date - late fourth or early fifth century
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. The first foot of line 3 has too many syllables; how it was read is indeterminable.

prosody - 17 irregularities in the portion of the work that can be scanned: ēs Christianus, Christianus, Christianus ad, ād sūlimia, verē, quī, line 1; viām, fīde, grādī, quī, cūpis, line 2; regnō, cālestis, line 3; ōpus, fācit, line 4.

COMMENTARY

That the author of this didactic inscription tried to model his lines on the classical hexameter is indicated by his adherence to the basic structural features of that form: the correct number of feet per verse, lines 1, 2, 4; the use of midline caesurae; the distinctive hexameter cadence, with coincidence of quantitatively and accentually dactylic rhythms, line 4, accentual rhythm only, lines 1, 2, 3. The hypermetricity of line 3 and the author's failure to produce a dactylic rhythm in the first foot can be related to the difficulty of adapting to verse the Christian tenet aelemosinam facere.

The prosodical errors in this inscription are numerous, they include errors in length by position, and forced adjustments must be effected in order that the lines may scan as hexameters. Only two irregularities can be considered classical: Christianus ad is attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis; Christianus to his reduction of the same word to three syllables by consonantalization of i. Of the fifteen unclassical quantities, nine can be ascribed to the intrusion of features of popular
speech: verē, fīde, grādi, cūpis, regnō, ōpus and fācit to the
lengthening of tonic syllables and weakening of atonic syllables
under influence of the stress accent; caelestis to the
monophthongization of ae.

The incidence of prosodical error in the portion of this
work that can be scanned is fifteen in twenty-three feet, or
about 65%. If the first portion of line 3 is taken into account
and considered for the sake of tabulation to contain one and
one-half feet and one error, the rate of error will be slightly
higher, sixteen in twenty-four and one-half feet, but still
approximately 65%. The frequency and seriousness of the errors
indicate that the author spoke a Latin in which quantitative
vocalic distinctions had been effaced. The difference between
the phonology of his everyday speech and that of his classical
model has spoiled his attempt at quantitative versification to
the extent that a quantitative reading of his work is
impossible, except in the first hemistich of verse 2.

The graphic arrangement of the text does not facilitate the
reader's discernment of its poetic nature, for the verses have
been disposed over two lines each; care has been taken, however,
to indicate the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide
with the line ends.

CLEA 62. EPITAPH OF ASTANIA

hic iacet egregia meritis et gratia morum /
heu memoranda bonis Astania dignissima caelo /
nobilis et atavis clarissima femina magnis /
concors blanda decens regumen fidele suorum /
haec bona familii mater pia sedula coniux /

BL 1836, Buecheler; CIL 8.20908; RA 1906 302 n.219, Monceaux; IM
97 n.400, DePachtere; ILCV 190, Diehl
prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - floor mosaic from the north aisle of the basilica, Tipasa
date - late fourth or early fifth century
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 6 irregularities: egregia, line 1; Astania, dignissima, line 2; et atavis, line 3; fidele, line 4; familiis, line 5

COMMENTARY

Three of the six prosodical irregularities can be considered classical: egregia and et atavis are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened precaesural syllables in arsis; Astania to the consonantalization of i. Of the three errors, one, dignissima, can be ascribed to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The rate of prosodical error is three in thirty-six feet, or about 8%. No line contains more than one error, and only in line 2, in which occurs an error in length by position, dignissima, is a quantitative reading of the poem is hindered.

Astania's eulogist demonstrates a basic understanding of the metric and prosodic principles of the composition of classical hexameter verse. However, he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened or effaced, and the difference between the phonology of his everyday speech and that of his classical model intruded in a few places into his attempt to adhere to classical prosody.
CLEA 63. EPITAPH OF BASILIUS

suscipit eximum sublimis regia caeli /
Basilium meritis etiam post vita viventem /
qui digna deo sic duxit tempora vitae
iustitia probitate fide praeclarus et actu
sexaginta / duos felix bene clau serit annos /

BL 1835, Buecheler; CIL 8.20907; RA 1906 301 n.218, Monceaux; IM 97 n.401, DePachtere; ILCV 3436, Diehl

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - floor mosaic from the south aisle of the basilica, Tipasa
date - late fourth or early fifth century
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 5 irregularities: vitā(m) viventem, viventem, line 2; dignā, dēo, line 3; sexagintā, line 5

COMMENTARY

Of the five prosodical irregularities, one can be considered classical: dignā is attributable to the author's application of the classical licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. The other four are errors due to the intrusion of features of his everyday speech: viventem, dēo, and sexagintā to the lengthening of tonic syllables and weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent; vitā(m) viventem to the muting of final m. One error, sexagintā, occurs in the recording of a biographical datum, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse.

The rate of error committed by Basilius' eulogist is four in
thirty feet, or about 13%. Three of the errors are minor slips in vocalic length by nature; the one error in length by position, vitā(m) viventem, is mitigated by the orthographical omission of final m. None is overly obtrusive.

The author knew well the metric and prosodic principles of classical hexameter verse; he has adhered to classical metrics, and, with four exceptions, to classical prosody. Only in a few places has the difference in phonology between the Latin of his everyday speech and that of his classical model interfered with his attempted recall of classical vocalic lengths.

The arrangement of the lines of this text is interesting. Although some of the verses are haphazardly disposed, care has been taken to assist the reader in recognizing the poetic nature of the work and in making a quantitative reading of it. Only the first two of the five hexameters have been laid out in the mosaic verse by verse; the ends of hexameters 3 and 4, which do not coincide with the line ends, have, however, been indicated by a small punctuation mark that resembles the letter v.

CLEAR 64. EPITAPH OF MAXIMUS

salve eter/nu>m> mihi Max/ime frater
ete/rnumq(ue) vale /

BCTH 1907 ccxlii-ccxliii, Gérard; ILCV 855, Diehl; BL 2033, Lommatzsch; ILA II 1997, Gsell

1.eternu, lapis

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - mosaic pavement from basilica, vicinity of Cirta
**date** - late fourth to early fifth century (style of mosaic, Cintas and Duval 1958 239)

**type** - funerary, Christian

**ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION**

- **meter** - dactylic hexameter, line 1, dactylic hemistich, line 2; line 1 is hypometric
- **prosody** - classical

**NOTE:**

This author has borrowed the text of his eulogy from Vergil. Compare,

```plaintext
nos ...  
fata vocant: salve aeternum mihi maxime Palla
aeternumque vale ...  
(Aen 11.96-98).
```

The author's epigram consists of the final four and one-half feet of one hexameter and the first two and one-half feet of the next; apart from the slight adaptation in the sixth foot of his first line, he has quoted Vergil exactly.

The fact, however, that he has not integrated the citation into an original composition of his own, but has let it stand as his complete text, raises a question concerning his metric intentions; did he conceive of his eulogy as a *carmen* proper, that is, as a composition that exhibits a certain metric and prosodic structure, or did he think of it simply as a prose statement, which, thanks to the nature of its source, contains a dactylic rhythm? Since the inscription does contain a rhythmic element, since it can be read as a *carmen* of two hypometric hexameters, and since hypometricity is a common fault of popular versification, analysis and commentary of this text will be made on the basis of the view that it was intended to be read as an independent *carmen*. 
COMMENTARY

The hypometricity of both lines 1 and 2 is due to the author's failure to fill out with original material the hexameters he has borrowed.

Line 2 scans perfectly as the first hemistich of a hexameter, as in the Vergilian passage. Line 1, however, in which the final four and one-half feet of a Vergilian hexameter stand as a complete line, contains two points of prosodical uncertainty that make its scansion difficult to determine: the treatment of the contiguous vowels between *salve* and *eternu*, and the significance of the orthographical omission of final m in *eternu*. If, on the one hand, the author observed hiatus of vowels between the first and second feet, and if he pronounced final m in *eternu* and allowed it to make position, in which case the orthographical omission was an error of the *lapicida*, the line will scan well enough as a five foot "hexameter". If, on the other hand, the author observed elision of the vowels, as in the Vergilian passage, and if he suppressed final m, as perhaps he did in his everyday speech, the line will scan well up to its penthemimeral caesura, but will falter through lack of a half-foot between the caesura and the cadence. That the suppression of final m in *eternu* is more likely a graphic error of the mason than a prosodical error of the author is suggested by its position preceding another m, for the graphic degemination of consonants is a common epigraphical phenomenon.

The incidence of prosodical error in this inscription is, therefore, 0%. The hypometricity of both verses, however, and their haphazard disposition in the mosaic, do hinder a quantitative reading of Maximus' epitaph.

The monumental context of this inscription suggests that the deceased and his family belonged to the elite of their community. They may have received a classical education and been competent to compose their own inscriptions. This author's use of a citation of Vergil attests his familiarity with at least one classical quantitative work. The fact, however, that he did
not attempt to complete the hexameter portions that he borrowed, but let stand a text that does not adhere to classical metrical norms, suggests that he was inadequate to the task of original composition.

CLEA 65. EPITAPH OF PACATUS

<i>c  Pacate  sedem locas baptis/mate purus quartum du/m icurris deflendum funere lustrum /

Février 1965 103-104 B46; AE 1966.587

1. <i>l</i>c, lapis; <i>i</i>c <i><i>hic</i></i>, Février

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - mosaic pavement from "Basilica B", Sitifis
date - between 389 and 410 (archeological context, Février ibid 40)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 2 irregularities: <i>s</i>êdem, <i>l</i>ocas, line 1

COMMENTARY

Neither of the two prosodical irregularities can be considered classical. One, <i>locas</i>, can be attributed to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of errors, two in twelve feet, is about 17%.
Both are minor slips in vocalic length by nature. Because both occur in close proximity midline in verse 1, they do interrupt a quantitative reading of that line; line 2 scans well.

It can be inferred from the monumental context of this inscription that the family of the deceased belonged to the elite of Sitifis, and, therefore, had received a good education in classical literature; perhaps one of them composed the epitaph. The author has adhered perfectly to classical metric norms, and, with two minor exceptions, to classical prosody. It is clear that he understood the principles of quantitative hexameter verse, but that he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened, and that the difference between the phonology of his colloquial Latin and that of his literary models intruded to some extent into his attempt to compose classical dactylic verse.

The position and nature of the prosodical errors in this *carmen*, and the difference in quality of versification between lines 1 and 2, raises the question of the source of error in verse inscriptions, that is, can some errors be imputed to the *lapicida* rather than to the author? For in this epigraph it is obvious that the simple reversal of the two words in which the errors occur would produce perfect adherence to classical prosody. The brevity of the poem, however, makes difficult a fair assessment of the author's prosodical competence.

The reader's discernment of the poetic nature of this text is not facilitated by a line by line disposition of its hexameters; care has been taken, however, to indicate the end of line 1, for a palm was added to the inscription after the word *purus*.

*CLEA 66. EPITAPH OF HONORATA*

*in[m]atura quidem mortis honore dotata /*
ist[a su]is defleta iacet cui nomen inheret /
Honorata decens mores vocabulo iungens /
iustitia vitae caeli promissa secuta /
breve quod est vitae caeli conmut<at> honore /
vitia condemnans gaudet commercio tali /
et secur[a vi]tae gaudet finisse laborem /

Février 1965 84-85 B6; AE 1966.563

5. commut honore, lapis

prescript - none
subscript - vixit annis XVIII decessit in pace pridie idus Iunias an(no) p(rovinciae) CCCLXXI (or CCCLXXVI: see under "date" for the discrepancy)
monument and provenience - mosaic pavement from "Basilica B", Sitifis
date - either 410 or 415 (provincial year, subscript)196
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 10 irregularities: mortīs honore, hōnore, dōtata, line 1; Hōnorata, vōcabulō, line 3; breve, line 5; vītia, commercio, line 6; and, if the conjecture is right, vītae, line 7

COMMENTARY

Of the ten prosodical deviations, three can be considered classical: Hōnorata is attributable to the author's use of ectasis in the adaptation to verse of a proper name; mortīs honore to his lengthening of a precaesural syllable in arsis; commercio to consonantalization of u. The "licence" taught by the grammatici that h could make position after a consonant may also have contributed to the lengthening of the final syllable
of mortis. Of the seven unclassical quantities, four, dōtata, breve, vitia and vocabulo, can be ascribed to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. A second feature of the author's colloquial speech, the monophthongization of ae, will account for the orthographically unclassical form inheret (< inhaeret), line 2; prosody has not been affected in this case, the diphthong having reduced to a long e.

The incidence of prosodical error is seven in forty-two feet, or about 17%. All are simple errors in vocalic length by nature; the high number of them, however, does disrupt a quantitative reading of the work.

It can be inferred from the monumental context of the epitaph that the family of the deceased belonged to the educated elite of Sitifis. The author does seem to have understood the principles of classical quantitative verse, for he has adhered to classical metric norms, and has attempted to adhere to classical prosody. It is clear, however, that he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been weakened or effaced, and that the difference between his everyday phonology and that of his literary models has spoiled his effort to compose dactylic hexameter verse.

CLEA 67. EPITAPH OF URBICA

hic iac]es extinc/[ta mat]ri gratissi/[ma] virgo /
    Urbica, quod / nomen semper / [i]n astra viget /
l]audes in excel/sis talibus erep/ta tenebris /
    cum tibi perpe/tua redditur / alma dies /

BCTH 1896 164 n.24, Gsell; CIL 8.27916; RA 1906 468 n.186, Monceaux; ILA I 3429, Gsell; BL 2131, Lommatzsch; ILCV 3432A,
Diehl

1. patri, Gsell; matri, Lommatzsch; 1-3. restorations, Gsell

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - floor tile from the atrium of the great basilica, Theveste
date - fifth century (archaeological context, Christern 1970 110)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - elegiac couplets
prosody - 6 irregularities: iaces, extincta, line 1; laudes, talibus erepta, line 3; perpetua, line 4

COMMENTARY

Of the six prosodical irregularities, three can be considered classical: extincta, talibus erepta and perpetua are attributable to the author's application of the classical licence that lengthened precaesural syllables in arsis. Of the three errors, two, iaces and laudes, are due to the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of prosodical error is three in twenty-two feet, or about 14%. All are minor slips in vocalic length by nature and do not seriously disrupt a quantitative reading of the work.

It can be inferred from the monumental context of this mosaic epitaph that the family of the deceased belonged to the educated elite of Theveste; perhaps one of them composed the carmen. Urbica's eulogist knew well the principles of the composition of classical elegiac verse. He has adhered well to classical metric norms; the difference, however, between the Latin of his everyday speech and that of his literary models has
intruded to some extent into his effort to adhere to classical prosody.

A contemporary passerby might not at first have discerned the poetic nature of this text, for its verses have been disposed over three lines each. His scansion of the work, however, will have been assisted by the graphic indication of the verse ends, for all four have been marked both by coincidence with the line ends and by the inscription of hederae distinguentes (lines 1, 2, 3) or a palm (line 4).

CLEA 68. EPITAPH OF NOVATUS, A CHRISTIAN PRIEST

hic iacet antis/tes s(an)c(tu)sque Nova/tus
ter denos et VII / sedis qui meruit annos /

CIL 8.8634; BL 687, Buecheler; RA 1906 133-134 n.201, Monceaux; ILCV 1101, Diehl

prescript - none
subscript - precessit die X kal(endas) Sept(em)b(res) (anno)
pr(ovinciae) CCCCI
monument and provenience - stone, Sitifis
date - 440 (provincial year, subscript)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Line 1 is hypometric.
prosody - 3 irregularities: septēm sedis, sēdis, mēruit,
line 2

COMMENTARY

For the hypometricity of line 1 there seems no obvious explanation.
None of the prosodical irregularities can be considered classical. Of the three errors, two are attributable to the intrusion of specific features of the author's everyday speech, *septēm* to the muting of final m, and *meruit* to the lengthening of a tonic vowel under influence of the stress accent. One of the errors, *septēm sedis*, occurs in the recording of a biographical datum, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse.

The incidence of prosodical error is three in eleven feet, or about 27%. One, *septēm sedis*, is a serious error in length by position. The distribution and nature of the errors is such that a quantitative reading of line 2 is seriously disrupted.

It can be inferred from the text of the poem that the deceased belonged to the educated elite of Sitifis. Novatus' eulogist, perhaps one of his colleagues, has obviously attempted to compose in classical hexameter verse. It seems that he had a rudimentary understanding of the principles of quantitative versification, but was unequal to the task of adhering completely either to classical metric norms, line 1, or to classical prosody, line 2.

The difficulty caused a reader by the author's metric and prosodic errors would have been exacerbated by the graphic arrangement of this epitaph, for the hexameters have not been inscribed verse by verse, nor has care been taken to indicate the hexameter ends.

**CLEA 69. COMMEMORATION OF THE EMBELLISHMENT OF THE BASILICA OF SAINT SALSA BY POTENTIUS**

```
munera quae cernis quo / sancta altaria fulgent /
[his sumptusque l]aborq(ue) in est cura/[que Pot]enti .
icreditum / [sibi qui gau]det perficere munus /
m[artyr] hic est Salsa dulcior / nectare semper .
```

MEFR 1894 387-388, Gsell; BL 318, Buecheler; CIL 8.20914; RA 1906 304-306 n.223, Monceaux; ILCV 1824, Diehl

2.[hic opus l]aborque, Gsell; [his sumptus l]aborque, Buecheler; initio praestat fortasse ornatus, Buecheler; 3.[sibi qui gau]det, Gsell, Buecheler; 4.m[artyr], Gsell, Buecheler; 6.[gau]dens, Gsell; cogitasse videtur scriptor quae meruit et Potentium remunerans probabit. praetuli studens, ceteri redds. nec pro dativo Potenti positum credo sed subaudimus sancto muneris Potenti, Buecheler; 7.[m]eritum(ue), Gsell; [i]nteritum(ue), Buecheler

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - mosaic pavement from the nave of the basilica of Saint Salsa, necropolis east of Tipasa
date - mid-fifth century (archeological context, Gsell 1894 317, 387-388, and historical figure, PAC 898-899 s.v. Potentius 2) 197
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Line 6 is hypermetric.
prosody - 7 irregularities, excluding the larger restorations: perficere, line 3; Salsa, dulcior, line 4; semper habitare, line 5; reciprocum, Potentio, line 6; regnō, line 7

COMMENTARY

The causes of two unclassical metric phenomena in this inscription may lie partly in the author's specification of proper names, first, the martyr honoured by the basilica, Salsa, named in the acaesural line 4, and, second, the restorer of the
basilica, Potentius, named in the hypermetric line 6.

Of the seven prosodical irregularities in the extant portion of the mosaic, three can be considered classical: dulcior and Potentio are attributable to the author's elimination of a syllable through consonantalization of i; semper habitare to his use of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. The "licence" taught by some grammatici that h could make position may also have contributed to this altered quantity. Of the four errors, two, perficere and regnō, can be ascribed to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and abbreviation of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. One of the errors, Salsā, occurs in the recording of a biographical datum, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse. A second feature of popular speech, the monophthongization of ae, has produced the orthographically but not prosodically unclassical form celorum (< caelorum), line 7.

The incidence of prosodical error in the extant text of this poem is four in thirty-six feet, or about 11%. All are simple errors in vocalic length by nature, and none seriously disrupts a quantitative reading of the line in which it occurs.

It can be inferred from the monumental context of this inscription and from the information provided in the poem itself that its dedicators belonged to the educated elite of Tipasa. It is clear that the author, perhaps one of the priests of Tipasa, understood the basic principles of classical quantitative verse. His effort in the composition of dactylic hexameters, however, has been spoiled by his failure to adhere completely either to classical metric norms or to classical prosody, for he let stand one hypermetric line and one acaesural line, and he lapsed, in at least three places, into the unclassical linguistic patterns of his everyday speech.

The graphic arrangement of this text does not facilitate the reader's discernment of its poetic nature, for the verses have been haphazardly laid out in the mosaic. Care has been taken,
however, to indicate the hexameter ends, either through their coincidence with the line ends (lines 1, 3, 5, 7), or through the inscription of a period (lines 2, 4, and possibly 6, although the lacuna after Potentio obscures the original reading).

CLEA 70. EPITAPH OF TURASIUS, PRESBYTER

accipe merentes lacrima[s] / pia munera fratris / 
aeternu[mq]ue vale n[ox est] / brev[i]s il[l]a se[pulch]ri / 
off[ulge]t facies [m]ecum est / tua semper imago /

BSAF 1923 105-109, Gsell and Zeiller; AE 1924.58

prescript - Turasius presb(yter)\textsuperscript{198} in pace vix(it) an(nos) XLIII men(ses) III dies XVII dep(ositus) id(us) Oct(obres) Aetio et St[udi]o co[nsulibus] /

subscript - none

monument and provenience - stone slab from the substratum of a church, Cuicul

date - 454 (consular year, prescript)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters

prosody - classical

COMMENTARY

The unclassical form merentes ($< \text{maerentes}$), line 1, is due to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the monophthongization of ae; since in this case the diphthong has reduced to a long e, the scansion has not been affected.

The monumental context of the inscription suggests that the
deceased belonged to the educated elite of Cuicul. The author, perhaps a colleague of Turasius, knew well the principles of the composition of classical hexameter verse, for he has adhered perfectly to classical metrics and prosody. That he was familiar with some of the poetry that embodied those principles is attested by his use of a hemistich of Ovid,

... est tua semper imago (CLEA 69.3),
... est tua semper imago (Pont 2.4.7).

The integration of the Ovidian half-line has been effected successfully without breach of classical metrics or prosody.

A contemporary passerby might not at first have discerned the poetic nature of this epitaph, for its hexameters have been disposed over two lines each. His scansion of the work, however, will have been assisted by the graphic indication of the verse ends, for these have been made to coincide with the line ends.

CLEA 71. DEDICATION OF THE BASILICA OF CRESCONIUS

hic ubi tam claris laudantur moenia tectis /
culmina quod nitent sanctaque altaria cernis /
non opus est procerum sed tanti gloria facti /
Cresconi rectoris ovat cum saecula nomen /
quibus honorificos eum ostendente labores / 5
iustos in pulcra sede gaudent locasse piores /
quos diuturna quies fallebat posse videri /
nunc luce profulgent subnixi altare decoro /
collectamque suam gaudent florere coronam /
animo quod sollers inplevit custos honestus /
undicque se visendi studio Cristiana decurrit / 10
aetas in unam congeriæm deo dicere laudes /
liminaque sancta pedibus contingere laeta /
omnis sacra canens manus porrigere gaudet /
sacramento dei medicinam sumere <s>c[h]ismae /
Cresconius legibus ipsis et altaribus natus /
honoribusque in eclesia catolica unctus /
castitatis custos caritatis pacique dicatus /
cuius doctrina floret innumera pleps Cuiculitana /
pauperum amator elemosin deditus omni /
cui numquam defuere unde opus celeste fecisset /
huius anima refrigerat corpus in pace quiescit /
resurrectione expectans futuram in Crîsto corona /
consors ut fiat sanctis in sede regni celestis /

BCTH 1922 xxvi-xxxii, Albertini; AE 1922.25

15.c[.]ismae, lapis; schismae, Albertini

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - floor mosaic from the choir of the basilica, Cuicul
date - fifth or sixth centuries (historical figure, PAC 240 s.v. Cresconius 10)
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1-15; prose with accentual cadences, lines 16-24. Line 6 is hypermetric.

prosody - 22 irregularities in the first 15 lines: sanctāque, line 2; guibus, line 5; sede, lōcasse, line 6; lūce, line 8; animō, custōs, line 10; visendī, stūdio, christiana, dēcurrit, line 11; aetās, deō, line 12; liminaque, sancta, line 13; sācra, mānus, porrīgere, line 14; sacramentō, line 15

COMMENTARY

The hypermetricity of line 6 cannot be related to content.
Of the twenty-two prosodical deviations found in the first fifteen lines, seven can be considered classical: sedē, liminaque and sanctā are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened in arsis pre-caesural syllables; studio and Christiana to his consonantalization of i; sācra and sacramento to his lengthening of a syllable preceding the consonant sequence mute + liquid. Of the fifteen errors, eleven, quībus, ānimō, custōs, visendi, dēcurrit, aetās, deō, manus, porrīgere and sacramento, can be ascribed to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. One error, studio, may be due to the author's failure to perceive that his use of the consonantalization of i makes long by position the preceding syllable.

The incidence of prosodical error in the quantitative portion of the inscription is fifteen in ninety-one feet, or about 16%. All the errors except studio are simple mistakes in vocalic length by nature. Their distribution is such that ten lines (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15), which are prosodically sound or present only one minor error, scan easily as dactylic hexameters, while five lines (6, 10, 11, 12, 14) present errors so numerous that a quantitative reading is virtually impossible.

It is clear from the monumental context of this mosaic inscription that its dedicators belonged to the educated elite of Cuicul. The metrics and prosody of the first fifteen lines of the work suggest that the author knew the basic principles of classical hexameter verse, but that he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been effaced. The difference between the phonology of his everyday speech and that of his literary models intruded in many places into his effort to produce classical hexameters.

The final nine lines of the text are irreducible to any quantitative measure; only the accentually dactylic rhythm that is employed in the cadence of every line sets them apart from
simple prose. The author of these verses seems to have had only a rudimentary knowledge of the hexameter, that is, its approximate line length and its distinctive cadence, at least in accentual terms.

The curious contrast in compositional competence between the first fifteen lines and the final nine lines is easily explained, for the author has merely combined the texts of two inscriptions he had seen in Tipasa, taking them in their entirety and effecting only slight adjustments to suit his own situation. The borrowed inscriptions are both from the basilica of Alexander; lines 1-15 from the dedicatory inscription of that church (CLEA 57, above), and lines 16-24 from the epitaph of Alexander (BL 1837). The measure of adherence to classical standards of quantitative versification that marks the first portion, and the complete lack of comprehension, or deliberate disregard, of the quantitative principle of rhythm that marks the second portion, are due to the respective authors of the source inscriptions.

Comparison of the original Tipasan texts with the slightly altered text from Cuicul gives no clue regarding the Cuiculitan author's comprehension of or competence in classical quantitative versification, for he has both improved upon and debased the composition of his source. The substitution of Cresconius' name in line 4, for example, removes the quantitative errors from the original, and the deletion of the words aetas circumfusa venit, line 11, and of sacramento from line 14, corrects the hypermetricity of the original. On the other hand, the hypermetricity of the original line 6 is not corrected, and the addition of the reflexive pronoun se, line 11, introduces two quantitative errors. What does suggest a lack of comprehension of quantitative verse in the Cuiculitan author is, first, the fact that he copied rather than composed, and second, that he joined together two inscriptions of widely different types of versification.
CLEA 72. DEDICATION OF A NYMPHAEUM

intus aque dulces biboque sedilia sax<o>
nimfarum que Florenti fundata labore
s(unt) de donis Dei /

BCTH 1899 clxviii-clxx, Gauckler; CIL 8.23673; RA 1906 461-462
n.180, Monceaux; ILCV 785, Diehl; BL 1912, Lommatzsch; ILT 565, Merlin

1. saxa, lapis

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - found in ruins of a nymphaeum, Mactar
date - fifth to seventh centuries (Greek cross)
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

   meter - dactylic hexameters, lines 1 and 2. Line 3 is
   irreducible to dactylic measure.
   prosody - classical, lines 1 and 2

COMMENTARY

This inscription presents an unclassical combination of
poetry and prose. The prose portion consists of two parts, the
completion of the thought expressed in the two hexameters
(sedilia ... fundata ... sunt) and the addition of a Christian
formula that is commonly found in Roman Africa (de donis Dei). The
above arrangement of the text is that of Lommatzsch; the
inscription, however, is engraved on the stone in a single line,
so that it is difficult to know just where the poet intended his
poem to end and his prose to begin. If the poem ends with
labore, as above, both hexameters will be seen to adhere
perfectly to classical metric and prosodical norms, but the fact
that the text of the poem continues into the line of prose will hinder a quantitative reading of the work, as the hexameters trail off uncertainly into prose. If, on the other hand, the poem ends with the auxiliary verb sunt, the cadence of the second hexameter will have been obscured, and the line made hypermetric by one half-foot.

An alternative interpretation is to construe s(unt) with the words of the prose formula, so that the end of the poem coincides with the end of the second hexameter; the rest of the inscription will then consist of an appended prose formula, expressed in the form of a simple sentence. The former interpretation better suits the sense and the syntax. In either case the poet has not adhered to classical metrics. His combination of verse and prose, however, is easily explained by the formulaic nature of his last three or four words; he simply added to his brief poem a formula that came precomposed in prose.

The prosody of the verse portion of the inscription is sound. The orthographical forms aque, line 1, and que, line 2, are due to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the monophthongization of ae, but since the diphthong has reduced here to a long e, the scansion has not been affected.

Credit for the classical prosody up to the trihemimeral caesura of the second line, however, belongs to Vergil, whom this author here quotes,

\[
\text{intus aquae dulces vivoque sedilia saxo} \\
\text{nympharum (domus) ... (Aen 1.167-168).}
\]

The deviations from Vergil's text, aque for aquae, biboque for vivoque, and nimfarum for nympharum, which reflect this author's everyday habits of speech, are orthographical only and do not affect the scansion. Saxa for saxo is probably an error of the lapicida. The final two and one-half feet of the second
hexameter, *fundata labore*, may also be the work of another poet, for the words occur in two other African inscriptions, one found near Sicca Veneria, the other at Henchir Bou-Said.\(^{202}\)

The monumental context of this inscription suggests that the Mactaritan benefactor Florentius belonged to the elite of his community. He may have received a classical education and been competent to compose the dedication himself. That he was familiar with at least one classical work is attested by his adaptation of a Vergilian passage. The fact that he has crafted a work constructed for the most part of a literary citation and a phrase from other epigraphs need not call into question his competence in versification, for, as has been seen several times in the African *carmina*, composers of verse inscriptions were not always successful in adapting to their own compositions the portions of verse they had borrowed from elsewhere.

**CLEA 73. EPITAPH OF MERA DAMULA INBIDIOSA**

```latex
moribus inbentum fuerat mihi nomen /
matris Mera Damula qui et Inbidiosa /
et nunc magna meis sub terras ibit / imago membra fidelis .
hec tegit / eterno tel<l>us amplexa sopore /
```

BCTH 1951-1952 209-210 n.33, Picard; AE 1955.52; Z 62

4.*telus*, lapis

prescript - none
subscript - *posita tumulo requiescit vixit in pace annis VIII mens(ibus) IIII dies XVIII, dep(osita) V kal(endas) Maias, sepolti semper parentibus dolores innobantur
monument and provenience - tablet, Aradi
date - fifth to seventh centuries (Greek crosses)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Lines 1 and 2 are hypometric; line 3 is hypermetric.

prosody - 1 irregularity: Mera, line 2

COMMENTARY

The nature of this author's deviation from classical metrics is most interesting. Lines 1 and 2 are hypometric by one full foot each, for which there seems no obvious explanation; the hypermetricity of line 3, which has eight feet, is due to the fact that it ends with two consecutive hexameter cadences, ibit imago and membra fidelis; line 4 is metrically sound. The superfluous cadence of his third line, however, belongs in close syntactic relation with the content of the fourth line, membra fidelis ha(e)c tegit ... tel(l)us; such explanations of hypermetricity as the poet's presentation of necessary sepulchral information or his indulgence in a rhetorical flourish are, therefore, not available. The rhythm of the hexameter cadence of his first line, which is quantitatively but not accentually dactylic, is unusual but not unexampled in classical verse.

The single prosodical irregularity can be considered classical, attributable to the author's use of ectasis in his adaptation to verse of a proper name. The orthographical forms hec ( < haec) and eterno ( < aeterno), line 4, are due to the intrusion of a feature of popular speech, the monophthongization of ae; since the diphthong has reduced here to a long e, the scansion has not been affected.

There is no indication in the inscription regarding the rank or education of the deceased or her eulogist. The author, however, demonstrates his knowledge of and competence in classical prosody; why he did not adhere also to classical metric norms is not clear.
The graphic arrangement of this epitaph exacerbates the difficulty caused the reader by the author's metric irregularities. The first two hexameters are inscribed verse by verse, but the third and fourth are disposed haphazardly over three lines on the stone. A period engraved after the word fidelis appears to mark the end of the third verse of the carmen; if this punctuation mark was added on instruction of the author, it may have been intended as an aid to the reader in interpreting the unusual rhythm of the verse.

CLEA 74. COMMEMORATION OF THE RESTORATION OF A SANCTUARY

cede prius nomen [no]vitati cede vetustas /
    regia letan[t]er vota dicare [l]i[b]et /
haec Petri Paulique sedes Cristo [i]ubente resurgit /
unu[m q]ues[o pa]res unum duo [sumit]e munus /
    unus [hon]or celebre[t quos h]abet una fides /

CIL 8.10707-10708, 17615; RA 1906 126-128 n.195, Monceaux; ILCV 974, Diehl

prescript - none
subscript - none
adscript - aeclesia (with a Greek cross, following line 4); dom[...] (with a Greek cross, following line 5); tist[...] (with a Greek cross, following line 6), all on the right
monument and provenience - architrave, probably from the apse of the sanctuary of Saints Peter and Paul, Ain Ghorab
date - mid-fifth to sixth centuries (Greek crosses to the right of the inscription, and historical figure, PAC 922 s.v. Probantius 2)\textsuperscript{203}
type - nonfunerary, Christian
ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - elegiac couplets. Pentameters following lines 3 and 6 are lacking. Line 3 is hypermetric.
prosody - 3 irregularities: sēdes, iūbente, line 3; quesō, line 4

COMMENTARY

Both the metric and the prosodic irregularities are attributable to this author's inept borrowing and adaptation of a Roman inscription. Compare the dedication from the basilica of St. Peter-in-Chains in Rome, composed in the pontificate of Sixtus III (AD 432-440),

ceed prior nomen novitati cede vetustas
regia laetanter vota dicare libet
haec Petri Paulique simul nunc nomine signo
Xystus apostolicae sedis honore fruens
unum queso pares unum duo sumite munus
unus honor celebrat quos habet una fides
presbyteri tamen hic labor est et cura Philippi
postquam Efisi Chr(ist)us vicit utrique polo
praemia discipulis meruit vincente magistro
hanc palmam fidei rettulit inde senex

(Bl 912)

Of the prosodical irregularities found in the African inscription, one can be considered classical: quesō, which is copied from the original inscription, is attributable to the Roman author's application of the licence that abbreviated final o in the first person present tense form of verbs. The forms letanter, line 2, and queso, line 4, which occur in the African inscription but not the Roman model, are produced by the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the monophthongization of ae; the diphthong having here reduced in both cases to a long e, classical prosody has not been breached.
The incidence of prosodical error in the African poem, two in thirty-five feet, is about 6%. Both are minor slips in vocalic length by nature, and do not disrupt a quantitative reading of the work.

The monumental context of this dedicatory *carmen* suggests that Probantius belonged to the upper classes of his town. However, that this African author had neither a good knowledge of nor competence in the composition of classical elegiac verse is suggested, first, by the fact that he copied rather than composed the *carmen*, and second, by the fact that the prosodically correct portions of his inscription - lines 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and the first two and one-half feet of line 3 - are those copied from the Roman inscription, and the unclassical metric and prosodical features of his work - the hypermetricity of line 3, the prosodical errors in line 3, and the lack of a pentameter following lines 3 and 6 - occur where he has deviated from his model.

**CLEA 75. EPITAPH OF MAURICIA GALLA**

hic genetrix posita est dudum famula Chr(ist)i i / 
hae meritis dantur sedes quas optima mater / 
tenes cuius sicu<b>i amplissima facta i / 
dicere iam <f>ama totum diffudit in aevum i /

BCTH 1915 107-108, Joly; ILA I 2772, Gsell; ILCV 1453, Diehl; BL 2194, Lommatzsch


*prescript* - none

*subscript* - Mauricia Galla in pace vixit annis LII

*monument and provenience* - stone found in the ruins of a
basilica, Madauros

date - mid-fifth to seventh centuries (monogrammatic cross with apocalyptic letters)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - 6 irregularities: positā, fāmula, line 1; tēnes, sicūbī, line 3; famā, line 4

COMMENTARY

Of the six prosodical deviations, three can be considered classical: positā, sicūbī and famā are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. Of the three errors, two, fāmula and tēnes, are caused by the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of prosodical error, three in twenty-four feet, is about 13%. All are minor slips in vocalic length by nature, and only in the first hemistich of line 3, in which there are two errors, and an awkward rhythm produced by two consecutive diaereses, is a quantitative reading of the work seriously hindered. Lommatzsch's classification of this verse inscription as commatic, that is, as composed of lines of prose enhanced by brief portions of verse or by quantitatively or accentually rhythmic cadences, therefore, seems incorrect.

The monumental context of this epitaph suggests that the deceased and her family belonged to the elite of Madauros. Perhaps one of them was sufficiently educated in classical quantitative versification and competent to compose the work himself. The author appears to have understood the principles of classical hexameter verse; the difference in phonology, however, between his everyday Latin and that of his classical models has intruded in a few places to mar his effort.
CLEA 76. EPITAPH OF ALURIUS GEMINIUS

hic situs est fandi quonda/m vitaeq(ue) magister
semper fide / adq(ue) salutiferas curas humanis d/ebebat
corporibus LXXX enim mag/nos bolvendis mensibus / orbes
fidelis vitam peregit / consequentibus metis
hac / sede digna in pace / quiebit /

BCTH 1950 160-161, Picard; AE 1953.49; Z 53; Prévot XII.1

prescript - Alurius Geminius /
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stone slab of unknown origin, Mactar
date - mid-fifth to seventh centuries (monogrammatic cross with
apocalyptic letters)
type - funerary, Christian

NOTE: Picard, who first published this Mactaritan epitaph,
transcribes the text as follows,

Alurius Geminius
his situs est fandi quonda
m vitaeq. magister semper fide
adq. salutiferas curas humanis d
ebebat corporibus LXXX enim mag
nos bolvendis mensibus
orbes fidelis vitam peregit
consequentibus metis hac
sede digna in pace
quiebit

He considered the composition "semi-métrique". "Nous n'arrivons
pas à trouver une scansion satisfaisante." (1950 160)

Although the poetic nature of the text is obscured by its
arrangement on the stone, that its author intended it to be read
as classical dactylic hexameter verse is indicated by the presence of prosodically sound segments: line 1; the second, third and fourth feet of line 2; the final five feet of line 3; and the cadence of line 5. Just where Geminius' eulogist intended each hexameter to begin, however, is disputed. Zarker's arrangement of the lines is this,

Alurius Geminius hic situs est fandi quondam vitaeque magister semper fide adque salutiferas curas humanis debebat corporibus octoginta enim magnos bolvendis mensibus orbes fidelis vitam peregit consequentibus metis hac sede digna in pace quiebit

He observes that the author "appears to have intended to write dactylic meter but included too many feet." (1958 176) Prévot construes the verses in this way,

fandi quondam vitaeque magister semper fide adque salutiferas curas humanis debebat corporibus octoginta enim magnos bolvendis mensibus orbes fidelis vitam peregit consequentibus metis hac sede digna in pace quiebit

She finds in these lines only "bribes d'hexamètres" (1984 127). The arrangement of the lines proposed above, CLEA 76, differs both from that of Zarker and from that of Prévot. Since the phrase *hic situs est* forms a good dactylic verse portion, and in fact is used as the first one and one-half feet of many hexameters in the *carmina epigraphica*²⁰⁵, it is more likely that this was the intended beginning of the poem. Analysis of versification and commentary on the metrics and prosody of the poem will be based on this view.
ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Lines 2 and 3 are hypermetric; line 5 is hypometric.

prosody - 10 irregularities: semper fide, humanis, debebat, line 2; corporibus octoginta, enim, line 3; fidelis, peregit, consequentibus metis, line 4; sede, line 5.

COMMENTARY

For the hypermetricity of line 2 and the hypometricity of line 5, there seems no obvious explanation. The extreme hypermetricity of line 3 can be ascribed both to the necessity of specifying the age of the deceased at death and to the author's inept integration of a reminiscence of Vergil (see below).

Of the ten prosodical irregularities in the portion of the epigraph that can be scanned, two can be considered classical: corporibus octoginta and sede are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. Of the eight errors, six, semper fide, humanis, debebat, enim and consequentibus metis, are attributable to the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic and the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. The abbreviation of the last syllable in consequentibus before a word-initial consonant may also reflect a feature of his colloquial idiom, the muting of final s.

The incidence of prosodical error in this poem is eight in thirty-three feet, or about 24%. Four of the unclassical quantities, semper fide, humanis debebat and consequentibus metis, are serious errors in length by position. Only line 1 scans without error. Such is the number and nature of the errors in lines 2 and 4 that a quantitative reading of these verses is virtually impossible, while the rhythm of line 3 is impeded midline by the presence of an error immediately following a hiatus.
One of this author's prosodically sound segments is not his own, for the final five feet of his third line are taken from Vergil's *Aeneid*. Compare

\[ \text{triginta magnos volvendis mensibus orbis (Aen 1.269).} \]

Moreover, he has failed to integrate well the borrowed phrase into his own composition, for it has produced a severely hypermetric line.

There is no indication in the inscription regarding the rank or education of the deceased or his eulogist. That the author knew some classical poetry is indicated by his citation of the hemistich from Vergil. The number and nature of his errors, both metric and prosodic, on the other hand, tell against this author's comprehension of and competence in the composition of classical quantitative verse. It is always possible that the sound portions of a popular composition are borrowed from elsewhere and that the defective portions are the author's own; whatever the source of the problems in this inscription, however, it is clear that the poetic aspirations of Alurius' eulogist exceeded his competence.

The difficulty encountered by a contemporary passerby in discerning the poetic nature of this text and in making a quantitative reading of it would have been exacerbated by its graphic arrangement; the *carmen* has been disposed haphazardly on the stone without regard for verse breaks, word boundaries, or even syllable boundaries.

**CLEA 77. CHRISTIAN DICTUM**

inbide / quid laceras / illos quos cresce/re sentis
tu tibi tortor / tu tecum tua bulnera / portas /
ILAI 1971, Gsell; ILCV 2388C, Diehl; BL 1929, Lommatzsch

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - tabula, Thubursicu
date - late fifth to seventh centuries (Latin cross)
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - classical

COMMENTARY
There is no indication in this brief epigraphic maxim regarding the rank or education of its author. He has adhered perfectly to the requirements of classical quantitative verse.

The haphazard arrangement of the text on the stone, however, obscures its poetic nature.

CLEA 78. CHRISTIAN DICTUM

qui ce<l>at secreta regis quem mundus adorat /
hic requies abitet hic pax eterna moretur /

BCTH 1946-1949 631-633, Picard; AE 1951.45

1.ceat, lapis; 2.abitet, lapis; (h)ab<e>t et, Picard

prescript - none
subscript - domus d(e)o miserant<i>e villatici biri togati
prefectorii Eidor<i>
monument and provenience - stone, Sufetula
date - late fifth to seventh centuries (Latin cross)
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
   meter - dactylic hexameters
   prosody - 2 irregularities: rēqis, line 1; abītēt hīc, line 2

COMMENTARY
   Of the two prosodical deviations, one can be considered classical: abītēt hīc is attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. The "licence" taught by the grammatici that he could make position after a consonant may also have contributed to the lengthening of this syllable. The intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the monophthongization of ae, has produced the orthographically unclassical form eterna (\textless{} aeterna), line 2; the diphthong having reduced to a long e, however, classical prosody has not been breached.

   The incidence of error in this carmen is one in twelve feet, or about 8%. The error is a minor slip in vocalic length by nature, and does not disrupt a quantitative reading of the work.

   The prose subscript identifies the owner of the house that this inscription adorned as a functionary of the prefect, either the prefect of the town, or the prefect of Africa (Picard 632). He may have been well educated and competent himself to compose a brief carmen. It is clear that the author of this Christian dictum understood well the principles of composition of quantitative hexameter verse.

CLEA 79. EPITAPH OF CONSTANTINA

ic cernite funere nostra nuc bulnera nata
inm/ortalem sempe<r> manens sub / pectore nostro
eu meruit ne/q(ue) dulcis magnu liqu/i<st> d/o lore
maius hopus mo<v>eo / maior mi<h>i nascitur hord/o
quis te e tuis subtraxit hae/c s<u>e / matris
quem sibi futura/m gaudebit nupta marito
q/uis tantis non defleat cas/ibus admissa prole
dec/or ac tibi <bis> senos anno(s) nec / dum per ordine plenos
s/ic fatale munus acerba morte sortita est
iam matur/a biro iam plenis nubilis ann/is

Libyca I 1953 215-230, Marrou; AE 1954.142

2. sempe, lapis; 3. liquisti, dlore, lapis; 4. moreo, lapis; mihci, lapis; 5. sre, lapis; 8. x, lapis; emendations, Marrou

prescript - none
subscript - Constantina fidelis v(i)xit in pace ann(os) XII
monument and provenience - stone slab from the cemetery at Hippo
date - late fifth to seventh centuries (Latin cross)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters. Line 8 is hypermetric.
prosody - apart from two portions, ic cernite funere, line 1, and decor ac tibi bis senos annos nec dum per, line 8, which are irreducible to quantitative measure, there are 15 prosodical irregularities: semper manens, line 2; dulcis magnu, m<ag)n, liquisti, line 3; tuis, subtraxit haec, su<, line 5; futuram, line 6; defleat casibus, admissa, admissa(m) prole(m), line 7; munus, munus acerba, acerba, sortita, line 9

COMMENTARY

Both the metric and the prosodic irregularities of line 8 can be attributed to its content, the expression of the age of the deceased at death.
Of the fifteen prosodical deviations contained in the
portion of the inscription that can be scanned, only one can be considered classical: munūs acerba is attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis. Of the fourteen unclassical quantities, eight can be ascribed to the intrusion of features of the author's everyday speech: semper manens, dulcis magnu, liquisti, tūis, defleāt casibus, sōrtita to the lengthening of tonic and abbreviation of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent; suē (< suae) to the monophthongization of ae; admissā(m) to the muting of final m, a colloquial linguistic phenomenon which appears in the orthography at several other points - nostra(m), nata(m), line 1, magnu(m), dolore(m), line 3, prole(m), line 7. It is possible that one error, subtraxīt haec, is the result of his use of the "licence" taught by some grammatici that h could make position.

The rate of prosodical error in the portion of this carmen that can be scanned is fourteen in fifty-three and one-half feet, or about 26%. Seven of the unclassical quantities, semper manens, dulcis māgnu, defleāt casibus, admissā(m) prole(m) and sōrtita, are serious errors in length by position. The adverse effect of one of them, admissā(m) prolem, is mitigated by the orthographical omission of the consonant. The distribution of errors is such that only lines 4 and 10, which are without error, and perhaps line 6, which presents only one minor error in vocalic length by nature, can be read quantitatively. If the portions of lines 1 and 8 that cannot be reduced to quantitative measure are taken into account the incidence of error will be much higher; if the segment hic ... funere with its seven syllables is considered to contain two and one-half feet, and the segment decor ... per with its thirteen to contain four and one-half feet, each with one error, there will have been an incidence of twenty in sixty and one-half feet, or about 33%.

The number and nature of his errors tell against this author's comprehension of and competence in quantitative versification. Moreover, the credit for his only prosodically
correct lines belongs to Vergil, for one is a direct quotation from *Aeneid 7*, the other a composite of two lines from the same book of the epic. Compare,

iam matura biro iam plenis nubilis annis (CLEA 79.10),
iam matura viro iam plenis nubilis annis (Aen 7.53),

maius hopus moveo maior mihi nascitur hordo (CLEA 79.4),
Hesperiam. maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo
maius opus moveo ... (Aen 7.44,45).

Both the citation and the composite have been integrated into his own work successfully without breach of classical metrics or prosody.

Neither the monumental context nor the text of this inscription provides information regarding the rank or education of the deceased or her eulogist. The author, it seems, recalled the basic principles of hexameter composition that he had learned in school, and retained some of the lines and phrases of Vergil that he had studied and committed to memory; where, however, he attempted original work, the unclassical habits of his everyday speech interfered and badly marred his effort in adhering to the classical quantitative rhythm.

The difficulty caused the reader by the author's metric and prosodic irregularities would have been greatly exacerbated by the graphic arrangement of this inscription; the *carmen* has been inscribed haphazardly without regard for hexameter breaks, for word boundaries or even for syllable boundaries. Moreover, no attempt has been made to separate the *carmen* from its prose subscript.
CLEA 80. DEDICATION OF BATHS IN TUNIS

cerne salutiferas sp[lendent]i marmore Baias /
qui calidos aest[us tan]gere quae ris aquis /
hic ubi Vulcano Ne[ptunus] certat amore /
   nec necat unda f[ocum, n]ec nocet ignis aquas /
gaude operi Gebam[unde tu]o regalis origo / 5
deliciis sospes ute[re cum] populo /

CRAI 1907 790-795, Gauckler; CIL 8.25362; BL 2039, Lommatzsch;
ILCV 787, Diehl; ILT 1154, Merlin

prescript - none
subscript - none
monument and provenience - stone, Tunis
date - early sixth century (historical figure, Gauckler 1907 795)\textsuperscript{207}
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
   meter - elegiac couplets
   prosody - 1 irregularity: sospes utere, line 6

COMMENTARY
The single prosodical irregularity presented in the extant portion of the text is classical, attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis.

The author of this dedicatory elegy has enhanced his composition with an adynaton borrowed from Ovid. Compare,

   nec necat unda f[ocum n]ec nocet ignis aquas (CLEA 71.4),
   unda dabit flamma et dabit ignis aquas (Tristia 1.8.4).

The integration of this borrowing into his own composition has
been successfully effected without breach of classical metrics or prosody.

That this author knew well the principles and practices of classical elegiac poetry is attested by his perfect adherence to the metrics and prosody of that verse form. That he was familiar with at least one classical elegiac poet is attested by his incorporation of images and phrases of Ovid. Indirect information regarding this author's identity is provided by his reference to the person responsible for the building of the baths, Gebamundus, line 5, who was the nephew of the Vandal king Gelimer; the poet will have belonged to the Vandal court, and his *carmen* attests the interest of the Vandal elite in Latin literature.

CLEA 81. EPITAPH OF PROBATUS

carmina qui *n nostro* percurritis / forte sepulcro / obsecro meorum / a vovis dimovi quae/rellas / mortis damna fugit vita qui secu/li transit / bis decem et senos / vixit Probatus an/nos reddidit qui/escens devitum in pace / naturae / 5

MEFR 1971 425-428 n.VI.10, Duval

1.*quin nostro*, lapis

*prescript* - none
*subscript* - none
*monument and provenience* - pavement, nave of basilica VI, Sufetula
*date* - 527-565 (archeological context, Duval 1971 425)
*type* - funerary, Christian
ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

- meter - dactylic hexameters
- prosody - apart from the first three words of line 5, which are not reducible to quantitative measure, there are 8 irregularities: percurritis forte, line 1; obsecrō, mēorum, dimovī, guaerellas, line 2; seculī, line 3; Prōbatius, line 4; nāturae, line 5

COMMENTARY

Of the eight prosodical deviations, two can be considered classical: obsecrō is attributable to the author's application of the licence that abbreviated final o in the first person present tense form of verbs; Prōbatius to his use of ectasis in the adaptation to verse of a proper name. Of the six errors, five are attributable to the intrusion of features of his everyday speech: percurritis forte, dimovī, seculī and nāturae to the weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent; the hypercorrection and abbreviation of the first syllable of guaerellas to the monophthongization of ae, with consequent confusion regarding the orthography and length both of the old diphthong and of the new monophthong. A third feature of popular speech, the muting of final s, may have contributed to the abbreviation of the final syllable of percurritis, and a fourth, the muting of final m, explains the unclassical orthography vita, line 3. The monophthongization of ae also appears in the orthography in seculī, line 3.

The incidence of prosodical error in the portion of this inscription that be scanned is six in twenty-seven feet, or about 22%. One, percurritis forte, is a serious error in length by position. The distribution of errors is such that only lines 3 and 4, which present one minor irregularity each, can be read quantitatively without great difficulty. If the segment of line 5 that cannot be scanned is taken into account, the rate of error will be much higher; if the words reddidit ... devi- are considered to contain three feet with one error each, the
incidence will have been nine in thirty feet, or 30%.

The monumental context of this mosaic epitaph suggests that the author belonged to the educated elite of Sufetula. It seems, however, that he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions were no longer observed, and that the discrepancy between the phonology of his everyday speech and that of his classical models has spoiled his effort to produce a "classical" poem.

The difficulty caused the reader by the author's errors in versification would have been greatly exacerbated by the arrangement of the text on the stone, for its hexameters have not been inscribed verse by verse, and no attempt has been made to indicate the hexameter ends.

CLEA 82. COMMEMORATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF FORTIFICATIONS

hoc opus imperium felix has prestitit arces /
magnanimique etiam Solomonis iussa dedere /
cui paruit Nonnus qui condidit ista tribunus /
urbs domino laetare pio iamque aspice quantis /
es subducta malis quantoque or[n]ata decore /
Maurorem tandem recipis subducta timore /
censuram statum cives ius moenia fastus /
atque suum nomen posuit <t>ibi regia coniuxn /
Iu<s>tiniani manu Maurorem gente fugata /
omnia tempus abent elebant et ea[s i]ngentes /

Pringle n.4; Durliat n.15

8.\textit{ibi}, lapis; 9.\textit{Iutiniani}, lapis

\textit{prescript} - none
\textit{subscript} - none
monument and provenience - inscribed over the west gate, Cululis Theodoriana

date - 539-544 (historical figure, Durliat 1981 39)\textsuperscript{208}

type - nonfunerary, Christian

**ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION**

- **meter** - dactylic hexameters
- **prosody** - 3 irregularities: \textit{statum}, line 7; \textit{Iustinianũ}, line 9; \textit{ėlebant}, line 10

**COMMENTARY**

None of the prosodical deviations can be considered classical. Two, \textit{statum} and \textit{Iustinianũ}, are attributable to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and abbreviation of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. The form \textit{prestitit} (< \textit{praestitit}), line 1, is due to the intrusion of a second feature of his colloquial speech, the monophthongization of \textit{ae}; since the diphthong has here reduced to a long vowel, the scansion has not been affected. One of the prosodical errors, \textit{Iustinianũ}, occurs in the recording of a biographical datum, which often proved difficult to adapt to verse. The cadence of line 10 is doubly unusual in having a rhythm that is dactylic only in quantity, and a spondaic fifth foot; neither feature, however, is unprecedented in classical verse.

The incidence of prosodical error in this \textit{carmen} is three in sixty feet, or 5%. All the errors are minor slips in vocalic length by nature, and do not hinder a quantitative reading of the poem.

This author's adherence to classical metric norms and, with a few minor exceptions, to prosodic norms demonstrates his knowledge of and competence in the composition of quantitative hexameter verse. The \textit{carmen} belongs to the series of inscriptions that commemorate the construction of defense works in Byzantine Africa; its monumental context, therefore,
indicates that it was commissioned by the imperial staff. This
dedicatory poem was composed by a poet who modeled his lines on
the classical dactylic hexameter; the author adhered well to
classical prosody, and his composition provides good evidence
for the knowledge and practice of classical versification in
Africa in the late empire.

CLEA 83. EPITAPH OF BELLATOR, MAGISTRATUS (OR MAGISTER MILITUM)

ornatus patr(iae) tegeris/ Mustelus sepulcro
urbs / defensor ...
qui gratius / populis extrabasmente / benigna /
post ances eterna meruisti / sumere bita /

BCTH 1941-1942 610-612 nn.14-15, Poinssot and Feuille; AE
1946.30; BCTH 1946-1949 130-131, Poinssot; Z 54 and 98; Duval-
Prévot 155-158 nn.121-122

prescript - none
subscript - Bellator qui et Mustelus m(a)g(istratus)\textsuperscript{209} in pace
vixit
monument and provenience - poem inscribed on two slabs found in
the porch of the "Basilica of Melleus or Saint Cyprian",
Ammaedara
date - 568-600 (Duval/Prévot 1975 511-512)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION

meter - dactylic hexameters
prosody - classical

COMMENTARY

The four instances of unclassical orthography, patri(a)e,
line 1, (a)eterna(m), bita(m), line 4, are due to the intrusion of two features of the author's everyday speech, the monophthongization of ae, and muting of final m. Since, however, ae has reduced here to long e, and since final a(m) has been scanned long, in eterna, perhaps, by its position in arsis before the caesura, and in bita by its anceps position at line-end, the prosody has not been affected.

The monumental context of the inscription, and the reference to the deceased as MG, that is, either magistratus or magister militum, suggests that he, and perhaps his eulogist, belonged to the educated elite of Ammaedara. The author has adhered perfectly in the extant portion of his work to classical metrics and prosody.

The haphazard arrangement of this text on the stone, however, obscures its poetic nature and makes difficult a quantitative reading of the hexameters.

CLEA 84. COMMENORATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A FORTIFICATION WALL

haec quoque[e pr]aefectus cons/truxit moen[i]a Thomas sed decus his / aliud melioris roboris addens /
Tiberiam dixit de nomine / Caesaris urbem

CIL 8.2245, 17671; BL 1807, Buecheler; RA 1906 129-130 n.197, Monceaux; ILCV 795, Diehl; Pringle n.33; Durliat n.28

prescript - none
subscript - domino Chr(ist)o a[d]iubante s(uos) pos(uit) cofirmante i(m)p(e)r(atare) d(ominio) i(nvictissimo) Tiberio a(u)g(u)s(to) Gennad[i]o m(a)g(istro) m(i)l(itum) a<c> pa<tri>ci(o) Bi<ct>or tr(i)b(u)n(u)s
monument and provenience - two fragments of unknown original
location, Mascula
date - 578-582 (historical figure: emperor named in poem and in subscript)
type - nonfunerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
   meter - dactylic hexameters
   prosody - 1 irregularity: Tiberiam, line 3

COMMENTARY
   The single prosodical irregularity can be considered classical, attributable to the author's use of ectasis in the adaptation to verse of a proper name.

   This text belongs to the series of official inscriptions that commemorate the construction of defense works in Byzantine Africa. In quality of versification it is to be compared with CLEA 82, for both poets commissioned by the imperial staff demonstrate well their knowledge and competence in the composition of classical quantitative verse.

   The graphic arrangement of this *carmen*, however, facilitates neither discernment of its poetic nature nor a quantitative reading of its hexameters, for, although the poem has been separated from its prose subscript by the inscription of a cross, it has not been inscribed verse by verse, and no attempt has been made to indicate the hexameter ends.

CLEA 85. EPITAPH OF HONORATA

terra premes te/neros iniusto ponde/re Manes
quamta te/cum bona de summi/s duces ad ima
hic / Honorata tibi mem/bra ponit animamque / Tonanti
hos tibi ap/ices filia baledictu/ra
discedam bis qua/ternos functa anno/s
NOTE: That the author attempted to compose classical dactylic hexameters is indicated by the presence of a prosodically sound opening line, *terra premes teneros in iusto pondere Manes*, and by the presence of three dactylic cadences, *mamque To-nanti*, in which quantitative and accentual rhythms coincide, and *duces ad ima* and *baledictura*, in which the rhythm is accentual only. After *baledictura*, however, the text contains no quantitatively or accentually dactylic segments, and it is unclear where the author intended his poem to end and his prose subscript to begin.

Zarker arranges the lines as follows,

```
terra premes teneros in iusto pondere Manes
quamta tecum bona de summis duces ad ima
hic Honorata tibi membra ponit animamque Tonanti
hos tibi apices filia baledictura
discedam his quaternos functa annos
debitum vite finem reddidit. sub die deposita
octabu id aprilis ind XIII
```

He does not comment on the absence of poetic portions after *baledictura*; his transcription, however, suggests that he considers the entire text an attempt at verse.

According to Prévot, the inscription comprises a *carmen*, which concludes either with the words *... finem reddidit*, or
with the words *fucta annos*, and a prose subscript, which begins either at *sub die deposita* or at *debitum vite*.

The portion of the text identified as *carmen*, CLEA 86, above, consists of the four lines in which dactylic segments have been discerned, that is, from *terra* to *baledictura*, and a fifth line of prose, which belongs both in sense and in syntax with the preceding line. Analysis of versification and commentary on the metrics and prosody of the poem will be based on this view.

**ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION**

**meter** - dactylic hexameters. Line 3 is hypermetric; line 5 is irreducible to quantitative measure.

**prosody** - line 1 is sound. Lines 2 through 4, which exhibit many errors each, can be made to scan if the following 13 deviations from classical quantities are allowed: *tēcum, bōna, ducēs*, line 2; *Honōrata, membrā, ponīt animamque*, line 3; *āpīces, filīa, bāledīctura*, line 4

**COMMENTARY**

The hypermetricity of line 3 and the prosaic nature of line 5 are attributable to the difficulty caused by the necessity of specifying the name and age of the deceased.

Of the thirteen prosodical errors, four can be considered classical: *bonā, membrā* and *ponīt animamque* are attributable to the author's application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in arsis; *Honōrata* to his use of systole in the adaptation to verse of a proper name. Of the nine errors, five, *bōna, ducēs, āpīces, bāledīctura*, can be ascribed to the intrusion of a feature of his everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables and weakening of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent.

The incidence of prosodical error in the poetic portion of this epitaph is nine in twenty-five feet, or 36%. One error, *bāledīctura*, is a serious mistake in length by position. Such is
the distribution of the errors that line 1, which is prosodically correct, and line 3, which scans well, although hypermetrically, with the application of licences, can be read quantitatively without serious hindrance; lines 2 and 4, which present three and six errors respectively, are virtually impossible to scan as quantitative hexameters. If the prosaic fifth line with its eleven syllables is taken into account and considered for the sake of tabulation to contain six feet, each presenting one error, the rate of error will be much higher, fifteen in thirty-one feet, or about 48%.

The monumental context of this epitaph suggests that Honorata and her family belonged to the elite of Mactar. It is possible that they had received a classical education, and that one of them composed the carmen. The author attempted to construct hexameters on the classical quantitative model. However, that he let stand hexameters so flawed suggests that his recall of the principles of classical metrics and prosody, or his competence in adhering to them, was weak. Analysis of his prosodical errors suggests that he spoke a Latin in which quantitative vocalic distinctions were no longer perceived. His insufficient recall of classical metrics and prosody was exacerbated by the interference of the unclassical features of his everyday speech, which spoiled his effort in the composition of dactylic hexameters.

The difficulty encountered by a contemporary passerby in making a quantitative reading of this poorly versified work would have been greatly exacerbated by its graphic arrangement. The hexameters have been disposed haphazardly on the stone, without regard either for word boundaries or for syllable boundaries, and no attempt has been made to indicate line ends or even to separate the carmen from its prose subscript.
CLEA 86. EPITAPH OF A YOUNG GIRL

quisquis ades lector causam qui noscere benis /
    funde precor lacrimas non minor hic dolor est /
hic iacet examinis magnus decor illa parentum /
    quam mors im(meritam) inp[ia] sorte tulit /
incassum nil saeva iubans quam perdere duxit / 5
    insontem animam dum sine sorde trait /
sed hanc dira dolum rapiens commune parentum /
    tradidit et miseris tristia corda dedit /
nam vivit haec moriens aeterna in luce manebit /
    redemta et magno permanet Aelisio / 10
vis quinos linquens sup<ple>letis mensibus annos /

CRAI 1916 163-164, Delattre; ILT 1144; Z 101; Ennabli 112

prescript - in hoc tumulo iacens
subscript - in pace deposita pridie kalendas apriles
ind(ictione) XII
monument and provenience - marble slab found in the ruins of the
basilica of St.Monica, Carthage
date - Byzantine era (use of indiction dating)
type - funerary, Christian

ANALYSIS OF VERSIFICATION
    meter - elegiac couplets, lines 1-10; single hexameter, line 11
    prosody - 6 irregularities: bēnis line 1; im(meritam) inpia,
        line 4; insontem animam, line 6; sed, line 7; vivit, line 9;
        redemta, line 10

COMMENTARY
    The content of the final line, the age of the deceased at
death, may explain the author's addition of a single hexameter
to his series of elegiac couplets; why he did not add a
concluding pentameter to complete his final couplet is not clear.

Of his six prosodical irregularities, two can be considered classical: *immeritām inpia* and *insontēm animam* are attributable to his application of the licence that lengthened a precaesural syllable in *arsis*. Of the four unclassical quantities, two, *bēnis* (*< venis*) and *sed*, can be attributed to the intrusion of a feature of the author's everyday speech, the lengthening of tonic syllables under influence of the stress accent. It is possible that in treating *sed* as long the author has followed the misleading information imparted by some *grammatici* regarding the power of *h* to make position after another consonant. A second feature of colloquial speech, the monophthongization of *ae* and consequent confusion regarding the orthography and length both of the old diphthong and of the new monophthong, has produced the unclassical form *Aelisio*, line 10, which is a hypercorrection for *Elysio*; classical prosody, however, has not been breached.

The incidence of error is four in sixty-one feet, or about 7%. The errors are minor slips in vocalic length by nature, and do not disrupt a quantitative reading of the poem.

The monumental context of the inscription suggests that the deceased and perhaps her eulogist belonged to the educated elite of Carthage. That the author was familiar with and competent in the composition of classical elegiac verse is indicated by his general adherence to classical metrics and prosody; his one metrical error, the addition of a single concluding hexameter, can be attributed, here as elsewhere in epigraphic verse, to the exigencies of sepulchral texts, and his few prosodical errors to the differences in phonology between his everyday Latin, in which quantitative vocalic distinctions had been effaced, and that of his classical model.
PART IV. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this thesis has been to study the versification of the carmina latina epigraphica africana, in particular, the nature, extent and chronology of their authors' deviations from classical norms of metrics and prosody. The conclusions drawn in this chapter are based on the data compiled in the analyses of the texts, which formed Part III of the study.

The corpus comprises eighty-six dated verse inscriptions from the Roman provinces of North Africa: they range in date continuously from the first century AD through the Byzantine age; all are composed in dactylic verse, either continuous hexameters or elegiac couplets; forty-nine come from pagan, thirty-seven from Christian milieux.

The inscriptions were raised principally by those who belonged to the upper ranks of Roman society. In fifty-seven of the inscriptions a social stratum can be identified. Three poems were composed by members of the senatorial or equestrian orders (CLEA 10, 32, 37). Two commemorate works of the imperial government (CLEA 82, 84); one a work of the Vandal regime (CLEA 80). Nine were raised by municipal officials (CLEA 7, 26, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 40, 78), and thirty by those whose municipal prominence is implied by the monumental contexts of their inscriptions or by their professions; of these thirty, twenty-one epitaphs and dedications are found in Christian churches (CLEA 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 81, 83, 85, 86), two commemorate municipal benefactions (CLEA 45, 50), four commemorate private benefactions (CLEA 47, 55, 56, 72), one is the epitaph of a schoolmaster (CLEA 6), one the epitaph of a Christian priest (CLEA 68). Two inscriptions come from members of the native aristocracy (CLEA 5, 49). Four come from the military, one the son of a veteran (CLEA 2) and two officers (CLEA 28, 44). Eight come from the lowest ranks; six concern imperial slaves and
freedmen (CLEA 1, 3, 8, 19, 20, 27), one a private slave (CLEA 21), one an actor, (CLEA 24). There is no indication in the remaining twenty-eight inscriptions regarding the rank of those who raised them. Those dedicators who as senators, equestrians and members of the municipal elite belonged to the upper ranks are likely to have received a classical education, and, therefore, to have been able themselves to compose their own carmina. The careers of most of the dedicators from the lower strata, that is, the military officials and the imperial slaves and freedmen, imply that they too were reasonably well educated and able to compose verse. The texts of the two inscriptions from members of the native aristocracy, one a Numidian chieftain, the other an undecimprimus, attest the Romanization and Latinization of their dedicators, and it is not impossible that these men had acquired some education in classical literature. Only three carmina belong to persons whom we would not normally expect to have been sufficiently educated to compose their own works, one a private slave, one an actor, the other the son of a veteran. These data support the argument of Pikhaus that the dedicators of African epigraphic poetry are not the "illetrés" assumed by Cagnat and others, but rather those members of Roman society who possessed the learning and the leisure to compose occasional verse, and the interest in commemorating themselves and their families by an epigraphic poem of their own creation.

Conclusions will be drawn first regarding the nature and extent of the unclassical metric and prosodical features of their versification.

Of the eighty-six authors whose carmina have been studied, only fourteen or about 16% have adhered perfectly to classical standards of versification both in metrics and in prosody (CLEA 5, 6, 11, 22, 27, 28, 29, 37, 55, 70, 77, 80, 83, 84). Their epitaphs and dedications are composed in continuous hexameters or in elegiac couplets, their hexameters and pentameters have the correct number of metric feet, caesurae midline, and, in the
case of hexameters, the distinctive cadence in which quantitatively and accentually dactylic rhythms coincide; the syllables in each line are accorded their classical quantities and are arranged to carry a clearly dactylic rhythm.

The remaining seventy-two epigraphic works contain unclassical metric or prosodic features. The majority of these carmina exhibit both metric and prosodic irregularities. Several, however, are metrically sound but prosodically deviant (CLEA 9, 12, 19, 23, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 54, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 75, 78, 81, 82), while others deviate from classical metrics but adhere well to classical prosody (CLEA 7, 8, 10, 14, 20, 64, 72, 73). These two types of deviation will be considered separately.

With respect to metrics, forty-five or slightly more than one-half of the eighty-six authors adhere strictly to the standards of their classical models. In the forty-one poems that exhibit unclassical metrical features, three types of deviation are found; seventeen carmina are composed of an unclassical combination of meters, twenty-eight contain one or more hypermetric or hypometric lines, and six include a line that cannot be reduced to quantitative measure, and appears, therefore, as an intrusive line of prose. Examination of the content of lines in which a change of meter occurs, of lines of irregular length, and of prosaic lines reveals some commonalities and suggests certain specific explanations of deviation.

Of the seventeen poems that exhibit an unclassical combination of meters, four are composed of two metrically distinct parts, nine contain one nonconforming line only, and four present random sequences of hexameters and pentameters. For the change of meter in the four carmina composed of two metrically distinct parts, various reasons have been seen. CLEA 7, which comprises ninety continuous hexameters and ten elegiac couplets, is composed of two separate poems, the first of which is the eulogy proper, commemorating Flavius and his
achievements, the second a later addition drawing attention to
the names of the family members who had died after Flavius. The
author uses different meters in order to display his metric
versatility, a talent to which he calls attention in his
invocation to Calliope, muse both of hexameter verse and of
elegy. CLEA 10 may also be composed of two separate poems, the
first, a series of five elegiac couplets, composed by the author
as consul designate to commemorate the erection of an equestrian
statue, the second, four iambic senarii, composed by the author
as consul to commemorate the dedication of the work. The change
of meter was perhaps intended to emphasize the author's change
in status. The change in rhythms is striking and attributable to
this author's desire to show off his metric skills. In CLEA 17
the change of meter concides with a change in imagined speaker,
the initial ten hexameters expressing the father's eulogy of his
daughter, the concluding elegiac couplet expressing the lament
of the deceased herself; thus the author highlights and enhances
the pathos of his concluding sentiment. The use of two different
types of versification in CLEA 71, fifteen hexameters followed
by nine lines of prose each of which terminates in an
accentually dactylic cadence, is easily explained, for the
author has merely copied and combined with little adaptation the
texts of two inscriptions he had seen elsewhere.

Of the nine poems that contain only one metrically
nonconforming line, seven exhibit a change of meter in their
concluding lines; continuous hexameters are followed by a single
pentameter in CLEA 4, 15 and 16; elegiac couplets are followed
by a single hexameter in CLEA 13, 24, 25 and 86. In two poems of
elegiac couplets, CLEA 8 and 20, a hexameter appears in the
place of the pentameter at line 2. The addition of a single
pentameter to a series of hexameters can in all three cases be
related to the content of the appended lines. The change of
meter in CLEA 4 can be attributed to the author's desire to call
attention to the final verse and to enhance its pathos, for the
pentameter expresses a bereaved father's exclamation of grief,
"how much better it would have been if the poor girl had not been born". The change in meters in CLEA 15 and 16 can be attributed to the formulaic nature of the added lines, for the sepulchral prayers that they express came precomposed as pentameters. The single hexameters appended to elegiac couplets in CLEA 24, 25 and 86, and the hexameters that replace pentameters in CLEA 8 and 20 all contain the biographical details traditionally offered in sepulchral inscriptions, the name (CLEA 25) or age (CLEA 8, 20, 24, 86) of the deceased. Why the authors of CLEA 24, 25 and 86 did not add a pentameter to make a complete couplet is not apparent. The substitution of hexameters for pentameters in CLEA 8 and 20 is perhaps attributable to the difficulty of expressing the age of the deceased within the limits of the shorter line.

For the random sequencing of hexameters and pentameters that is used by four authors, in CLEA 1, 21, 35, 74, no explanation can be offered.

In twelve of the seventeen African poems that exhibit an unclassical combination of meters, therefore, we can suggest a reason for the deviation: in two, their authors' display of metric versatility (CLEA 7 and 10); in two, their authors' attempted artistry (CLEA 4 and 17); in one, an author's ignorance in copying and combining two disparate texts (CLEA 71); in two, their authors' use of precomposed formulae (CLEA 15 and 16); and five authors deviate in their expression of biographical details (CLEA 8, 20, 24, 25, 86).

In the twenty-eight poems that present one or more hypermetric or hypometric lines are found forty lines of irregular length; twenty-five are hypermetric, fifteen are hypometric. Twenty-five of these instances of hypermetricism or hypometricism can be attributed to the inept integration of certain elements of epigraphic verse: nine nonconforming lines contain common epigraphic formulae (CLEA 2.1, 2, 4, 6; CLEA 15.3; CLEA 16.5; CLEA 24.1; CLEA 59.3; CLEA 61.3); six contain biographical information (CLEA 25.3; CLEA 47.1; CLEA 69.6; CLEA
76.3; CLEA 79.8; CLEA 85.3); five incorporate portions of classical verse (CLEA 57.11, 13; CLEA 64.1, 2; CLEA 76.3); four occur in acrostic poems (CLEA 40.1, 5; CLEA 43.7; 47.1); one is copied from another inscription (CLEA 71.6). For the remaining sixteen lines of irregular length, no explanation can be offered.

Of the six inscriptions that include an intrusive line of prose, five present just one irregular line, and one presents two (CLEA 2, 34, 52, 58, 72, 85). All these lines but one can be attributed to the inept integration of elements of epigraphic verse: four contain biographical details (CLEA 2.3, CLEA 34.4, CLEA 52.1, CLEA 85.5); two contain epigraphic formulae (CLEA 52.3, CLEA 72.3).

Examination of the content of metrical popularisms, therefore, suggests how they have occurred. Over two-thirds of the metrical deviations in the African carmina can thus be accounted for: a few authors appear to have used an unclassical combination of meters in order to suit their own artistic purposes or to show off their metric versatility; many others failed to adhere to classical line lengths or resorted to prose in their integration into their own compositions of such elements of epigraphic verse as biographical information, traditional formulae, images and phrases from classical literature and the acrostic arrangement of verses; one erred in copying faulty verses from other inscriptions.

Moreover, consideration of the individual contexts of these lines, Specifically, of the overall quality of versification of the poems in which they occur, suggests that while most are to be attributed simply to an author's incompetence in adhering to classical metrics, some can be ascribed to the deliberate disregard by popular epigraphic poets of literary metric norms.

Five authors can be said with certainty intentionally to have deviated from classical metrics. Four use unclassical combinations of meters either to display their metrical versatility (CLEA 7 and 10) or to highlight and enhance certain
sentiments (CLEA 4 and 17), and one allows the hypermetric addition to his elegiac couplet of an affective single word sentence (CLEA 14). Supporting evidence that the authors of these poems deliberately disregarded the canons of classical metrics in order to suit their own individual purposes is provided by the quality of their versification, for, apart from their unusual combinations of meters, the authors have adhered perfectly to classical metrics, and perfectly or nearly perfectly to classical prosody, that is, with an incidence of error of less than 5%, and with errors limited to minor slips in vocalic length by nature. They clearly possessed the knowledge and competence to adhere to classical metrics, had they so wished.

Eight other epigraphic poets seem deliberately to have let stand unclassical metric phenomena. Three use an unclassical combination of meters in order to express biographical data, two in substituting a hexameter for a pentameter (CLEA 8.2 and CLEA 20.2) and one in appending a single hexameter to an elegiac couplet (CLEA 86.11). All three hexameters record the age at death of the deceased; it is clear that the line length of the hexameter facilitated the expression of these data. It is also apparent that these authors knew well and were skilled in the composition of hexameters and pentameters, for apart from their nonconforming single hexameters they have adhered perfectly to classical metrics and perfectly or nearly perfectly to classical prosody. The authors of CLEA 8 and 20 might easily have preserved the normal classical sequence of hexameter and pentameter by reducing one of their other hexameters to a pentameter; the author of CLEA 86 might easily have completed his final couplet by composing another pentameter. That they did not suggests that they accepted for themselves metrical standards less exacting than those of their literary models in the interests of the clear expression of the biographical details demanded by the sepulchral tradition.

Two authors may deliberately have compromised their
adherence to classical metrics in order to produce a clever
crostic design. The incorporation of an acrostic device made
versification more challenging because it limited the lexical
possibilities at line-start not only to words beginning with a
long syllable but also to words beginning with a certain letter.
The epitaph of Clodius Louella (CLEA 40) and the carmen
commemorating Sidonius' construction of private baths (CLEA 47)
both contain hexameters of irregular length; analysis of the
other hexameters in these poems, however, reveals that their
authors were capable of composing a metrically and prosodically
sound dactylic hexameter. Apart from their hypermetric and
hypometric lines, they have adhered perfectly to classical
metrics, and nearly perfectly to classical prosody. That they
did not take the time or trouble to reduce or expand these lines
to conform to the normal length, but let stand one or two
hypermetric or hypometric hexameters, suggests that their
interest in producing a name-enhancing acrostic was greater than
their concern in adhering to the rigid canons of classical
metrics.

Three other authors may deliberately have let stand
unclassical metric features. Although no specific reasons can be
discerned for the random sequence of hexameters and pentameters
in CLEA 1, for the addition of a single concluding hexameter to
an elegiac couplet in CLEA 26, or for the intrusion of two
single hexameters into a long series of elegiac couplets in CLEA
35, an examination of the individual hexameters and pentameters
of these epitaphs attests clearly the metric and prosodic
knowledge and competence of these authors. Apart from their
unclassical combinations of meters they have adhered perfectly
to classical metrics and nearly perfectly to classical prosody.
The author of CLEA 1 might easily have made his work conform to
a standard metrical sequence by composing either continuous
hexameters or a series of elegiac couplets; the author of CLEA
26 could have added a pentameter to complete his final couplet;
and the author of CLEA 35 could have added complementary
pentameters to his two intrusive hexameters. That they did not suggest that they, like the authors discussed above, felt free to deviate from the metrical forms of their classical literary exemplars.

Of the forty-one authors whose works exhibit unclassical metrical features, therefore, thirteen can be said deliberately to have deviated from literary norms in order to suit their own particular purposes. The unclassical combination of meters and the presence of hypermetric and hypometric lines were phenomena sufficiently common in popular epigraphic versification in Roman Africa that these authors could expect from their contemporary audience toleration of their slight irregularities.

With respect to prosody, seventeen of the eighty-six authors adhere perfectly to the standards and practices of their classical models; their hexameters and pentameters present no unclassical syllabic quantities (CLEA 5, 6, 8, 10, 14, 20, 22, 27, 28, 29, 37, 55, 64, 70, 72, 77, 83). Five more authors can be said to adhere perfectly to classical prosody, for the alterations in syllabic quantity that are necessary for their verses to scan are limited strictly to those allowed by the classical poets (CLEA 7, 11, 73, 80, 84). Thus twenty-two or slightly more than one-quarter of these African authors of epigraphic verse adhere well to classical prosody.

The prosodical irregularities exhibited in the carmina fall into two main types, those that can be considered classical and those that are unclassical. The former are attributable to an author's application of one of the licences used by the classical poets. The latter are simply errors that attest an author's failure to recall the classical prosody he learned in school; many errors can be ascribed to the intrusion of certain features of his everyday speech. Alterations in syllabic quantity that are attributable to licence are presumably deliberate; those that are errors inadvertent.

Of the many prosodical licences that the authors learned from their grammatici, seven are found employed by them in the
versification of their epitaphs and dedications. Five are used as by the classical poets: the lengthening in arsis of precaesural syllables; the use of ectasis or systole especially in the adaptation to verse of proper names; the correction of final o in a few words; lengthening before the consonant sequence mute + liquid; and the reduction in number of syllables through synizesis. One, the consonantalization of i and u, is used as in classical verse, but extended sometimes to include instances not allowed by the classical poets. One, the treatment of the sequence consonant + h as a position-making sequence, is used incorrectly.

By far the most common licence resorted to for the alteration of syllabic quantities is the lengthening in arsis of precaesural syllables. Forty or almost one-half the authors use it one, two or three times, and one author uses it eight times in the space of his twenty-eight verses; seventy-two examples are found. Seventeen authors lengthen only closed syllables or the enclitic -que (thirty-six instances) (CLEA 2, 7, 19, 32, 40, 42, 44, 46, 51, 54, 61, 66, 69, 78, 79, 80, 86); the rest lengthen not only closed syllables but also open syllables other than -que (thirty-six instances) (CLEA 11, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 31, 33, 35, 39, 43, 50, 53, 56, 57, 62, 63, 67, 71, 75, 76, 85). In the indiscriminate use of lengthening in arsis epigraphic poets are following the teaching of their grammatici, who understood Vergil to have lengthened both types of syllable, and thus expounded the licence for their pupils. It is possible that they may also be following a genuinely classical example, for, as we have seen, there is some uncertainty regarding the practice of Vergil and of the elegists in the use of this licence. Of the forty authors who lengthen in arsis, eighteen employ the licence more than once in their brief works, thus exceeding the practice of their literary models, for Vergil and the elegists were sparing in its use.

The next most common licence found, the consonantalization of i and u, is used by twenty-three authors at least once each
The treatment of i and u as consonant-al served two purposes in their versification, the elimination of a syllable in a hypersyllabic line (filiosque > filiosque, CLEA 44.3), and the lengthening by position of a preceding syllable, where this was necessary (perpetuo > perpetuo, CLEA 53.2). The former remedy is often applied to words the syllables of which form a cretic pattern and do not otherwise lend themselves to dactylic verse. The amateur poets who use this licence are following the teaching of their grammatici and the example of their classical models. Three authors, however, appear to have extended the application of this licence beyond that practised by the classical poets, in lengthening by position a vowel followed by the digraph qu (CLEA 26, 35, 57). Two of the authors who lengthen before qu demonstrate elsewhere in their works a reasonably good grasp of classical prosody, and it is possible that these unclassical quantities reflect not their ignorance but their misunderstanding, which can be traced, as we have seen, to the faulty interpretation and instruction of some grammatici.

Eleven epigraphic poets resort once each to the metaplasms systole or ectasis, ten in adapting to verse a proper name (CLEA 11, 34, 38, 50, 57, 66, 73, 81, 84, 85), one in suiting to the thesis position of a dactylic foot the -e of the third person plural termination of the perfect tense (CLEA 20.4). The alteration of natural vocalic length in these two linguistic environments conforms to the practice of the classical poets.

Five authors abbreviate final o in the first person present tense form of verbs, in order to suit the thesis position of a dactylic foot (CLEA 2, 7, 19, 74, 81). Eight instances are found in the corpus. In this correction of o, they follow the example of the classical elegists.

Five authors take advantage of the licence that treated as long a syllable containing a vowel followed by the consonant
sequence mute + liquid (CLEA 12, 34, 36, 57, 71). Six instances are found in the corpus. All five authors adhere to the practice of their classical models and restrict their use of the licence to nonjunctural sequences.

Two authors lengthen before the sequence consonant + h (CLEA 79 and 86). One demonstrates elsewhere in his poem his grasp of classical prosody, and it is possible that this unclassical quantity reflects not his ignorance but a misunderstanding regarding the classical treatment of h, which, as we have seen, can be traced to the faulty teaching of some grammatici.

One author reduces the number of syllables in a word through synizesis (CLEA 44).

In fifty-six or well over one-half the carmina of the corpus occur prosodical irregularities that can be considered classical on the grounds that they are attributable to the author's application of a classical licence; one hundred thirty such irregularities are found. The use of licences, which were useful to the epigraphic poets in effecting the lengthening and abbreviation of syllables that did not naturally suit the arsis or thesis position of the foot in which they fell, attests their recall of the prosody they learned under their grammatici. The frequency with which they resorted to licence reflects their inexpertise, and constitutes one of the chief features of their versification.

The remaining prosodical irregularities, which cannot be attributed to the application of a classical licence, are simply errors. The majority of the carmina in the corpus, sixty-four of eighty-six, exhibit at least one unclassical syllabic quantity. A total of two hundred eighty-one errors are seen. Most of these errors can be attributed to the intrusion of certain features of popular speech, the phonology of which differed from that of the literary idiom. Four specific habits of colloquial Latin are found in the corpus, the lengthening of tonic syllables and the abbreviation of atonic syllables under influence of the stress accent, the monophthongization of the diphthong ae, the muting
of final m, and the muting of final s. These interfere with
popular authors' efforts to recall and to practise the prosody
they learned in school, for they produced syllabic structures
that differed from the literary, which intrude into attempts to
versify according to classical models and disrupt the expected
rhythm.

In fifty-three of the sixty-four poems that present
prosodical errors, the influence of the stress accent can be
identified as an error-causing factor (CLEA 1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 15,
16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40,
42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61,
62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 75, 76, 79, 81, 82, 85, 86). One
hundred fifty-four examples of incorrect lengthening of tonic
syllables and incorrect correction of atonic syllables are
found. Most are errors in vocalic length by nature, for example,
dédī (CLEA 1.5) or pēriī (CLEA 18.2); forty-eight are errors in
length by position, for instance, vīrtūte (CLEA 18.1).

In thirty-one poems is evident the intrusion of the
monophthongization of ae. The reduction of the diphthong to a
simple vowel produced confusion regarding the orthography and
the length not only of the old diphthong but also of the new
monophthong. Four types of error occur. In twelve poems occur
cases in which the diphthong preserves the literary spelling,
but must be realized in scansion as a short vowel, for example,
cūntaē pūdīcae, (CLEA 17, 26, 31, 33, 38, 40, 41, 42, 46, 53,
59, 61). In three poems the diphthong is put hypercorrectly for
a literary monophthong, for instance, mātrisquaē senēctus, (CLEA
23, 43, 81). Nineteen examples of short ae are found. In twenty-
two poems the literary diphthong appears as a simple e. In two
of these the e must be scanned short, for instance, haēc suē
mātris, (CLEA 38, 79); two such examples of ae > ē are found. In
the other twenty the e must be scanned long, for example, dēdala
tēllus, (CLEA 33, 34, 38, 42, 47, 51, 52, 53, 56, 66, 69, 70,
73, 74, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 86). Twenty-five such examples of ae
> ē are seen; these cases of the popular monophthongization of
ae are orthographically but not prosodically unclassical. A few authors use the diphthong and the new monophthong indiscriminately metri gratia in one composition. The various ways in which the reduction of the diphthong could interfere with an amateur poet's recall and practice of classical prosody is well illustrated in the epitaph of Aelia Secundula, CLEA 38, for of the nine occurrences of the diphthong, five are orthographically and prosodically correct, two are orthographically correct but prosodically incorrect, and two others are orthographically incorrect, the one prosodically incorrect, the other prosodically correct.

In twenty-one poems the colloquial muting of final m is apparent. It produces three types of error. In six poems, m is retained orthographically but must be suppressed to preserve classical prosody, for example, in the pentameter hemistich libertatem dedit, (CLEA 15, 21, 24, 38, 59, 68). In seven poems, m is omitted both orthographically and prosodically, for instance, in the hexameter cadence regione pedestrem, (CLEA 9, 16, 19, 34, 52, 63, 79). Sixteen such examples of the prosodical suppression of final m are found in the corpus; they constitute serious errors in length by position. In eight poems the consonant has been omitted but its omission seems not to have affected the scansion, for example, in the hexameter cadence ádque virú vir (CLEA 1, 3, 26, 39, 40, 64, 81, 83). Twelve such instances are found; these reflections of the muting of final m in popular speech are orthographically but not prosodically unclassical.

The feature of popular speech that least commonly intrudes into the versification of popular poets is the muting of finals. The consonant is almost always recorded orthographically. In four inscriptions (CLEA 34, 52, 76, 81), however, it must be suppressed prosodically, for it occurs before a word-initial consonant in the thesis position of a dactylic foot, where it constitutes a serious error in length by position, for example, in the hexameter cadence consequéntibús métis. Since this
unclassical phenomenon occurs in carmina that are otherwise prosodically inferior, it more likely reflects the author's pattern of speech than his conscious application of the (subrusticum) licence, learned under the grammaticus, that allowed muting of final s before a consonant, when -s was preceded by a short vowel.

One hundred ninety-one prosodical errors, or about 68% of the total number seen in the corpus, can be attributed to one of these four specific features of popular speech. This intrusion of the unclassical features of their colloquial speech into their efforts to versify on the classical model constitutes one of the chief features of the prosody of the African authors of epigraphic verse.

Examination of the contexts in which prosodical errors occur, and comparison with the contexts in which metrical errors occur, reveals a common source of difficulty - the integration of certain elements of epigraphic composition. Fifteen authors deviate from classical prosody in their attempted adaptation to verse of prosodically unwieldy biographical data, most often the specification of names and ages (CLEA 9, 12, 15, 16, 32, 34, 40, 42, 48, 57, 63, 68, 69, 79, 82); eight authors err in their use of formulae (CLEA 2, 3, 15, 16, 24, 34, 48, 59); two in copying other inscriptions, one in his verbatim borrowing of faulty verses (CLEA 71), the other in his inept adaptation of sound verses (CLEA 74); four err in their incorporation of an acrostic device (CLEA 23, 38, 43, 56); and one in his attempted integration of images and phrases borrowed from classical poetry (CLEA 57). A total of forty-three prosodical errors occur in these five contexts.

Consideration of the overall competence of the authors who commit prosodical errors in these five contexts suggests that while most err out of ignorance, a few may deliberately have disregarded classical prosody. All the authors whose errors occur in their use of formulae, in lines borrowed from other inscriptions, in their incorporation of an acrostic device, in
their integration of portions of classical verse, and twelve of the fifteen authors whose errors occur in the recording of biographical data reveal elsewhere in their works their unsure grasp of classical quantities; there is no significance, therefore, in the context in which their errors occur. Three authors, however, who deviate from classical prosody in the recording of biographical data demonstrate elsewhere in their carmina their firm grasp of literary syllabic quantities; their errors occur only in their adaptation to verse of certain details demanded by the sepulchral tradition (CLEA 9, 12 and 32). That they did not reword in order to perfect their prosody suggests that they intentionally allowed to stand a few errors in the greater interest of the accurate recording of funerary data, and that they expected toleration of their few deviations in their contemporary audience.

Of the sixty-four authors whose works exhibit unclassical prosodical features, therefore, only three can be said deliberately to have deviated from literary norms. Thirteen of the forty-one whose works present unclassical metric phenomena, however, can be said deliberately to have let them stand. It is not surprising that in the composition of popular epigraphic verse the presence of unclassical metric phenomena should have been considered more acceptable than unclassical prosodic phenomena, for an unclassical combination of meters, or an occasional hypermetric or hypometric line, is much less disruptive of a quantitative reading of an epitaph or dedication, provided prosody is preserved, than are deviations from classical syllabic quantities.

The general impression of popular epigraphic versification that is conveyed by the data collected thus far is one of widespread deviation from classical literary norms of metrics and prosody. The specific distribution of these deviations in the corpus, and the questions whether an author's adherence to literary norms is related to the period in which he lived, or to the religious milieu from which he comes, or to any other aspect
of his composition of a poem for inscription, must now be considered.

Four main observations can be made. The first concerns the extent to which individual authors deviate from their classical models. In the commentaries was noted the number and nature of each author's metric and prosodical errors. The data reveal a wide range in the metrical competence of African versifiers, for of the forty-one authors who err metrically, twenty-five exhibit one minor deviation only, for example an unclassical combination of meters or a single hypermetric line, (CLEA 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 26, 35, 43, 47, 51, 53, 56, 59, 61, 68, 69, 71, 74, 79, 86), sixteen exhibit two or more, six of these including a line that reads only as prose (CLEA 2, 15, 16, 21, 24, 25, 34, 40, 52, 57, 58, 64, 72, 73, 76, 85). The data also reveal a very wide range in prosodical competence. Deviation from classical prosody, which was quantified in each case and expressed as a percentage of error per metric foot, varies from 0% to 69%. The distribution of these percentages, however, reveals that the extent of prosodical error in most poems of the corpus is fairly small: twenty-two authors commit no error; twenty-five exhibit an error rate between 1 and 10%; twenty err from 11 to 20%; nine from 21 to 30%; two from 31 to 40%; three from 41 to 50%; three from 51 to 60%; and two from 61-69%. Of the eighty-six authors, therefore, forty-seven or over one-half exhibit low rates of error, between 0 and 10%, and can be said to adhere perfectly or nearly perfectly to classical prosody.

When the sum of each author's metric and prosodical deviations is considered, and their effect on a quantitative reading of his *carmen* evaluated, the following degrees of competence are seen. Thirty-nine authors demonstrate a sound understanding of and competence in the composition of classical quantitative versification; if they err metrically it is only in their unclassical combination of meters or in the composition of a single hypermetric line, their prosodical errors are few and limited to those of vocalic length by nature, and their poems
can be read quantitatively without serious hindrance (CLEA 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 20, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 41, 46, 49, 53, 54, 55, 67, 69, 70, 72, 73, 77, 78, 80, 82, 83, 84, 86). Eighteen more authors demonstrate a reasonably good grasp of the principles and practices of classical versification; they adhere for the most part to classical metrics and prosody and, although they may commit more than one metric error and their prosodical deviations occasionally include the more disruptive type of error in length by position, difficulty in scanning their poems is limited to one or two places, where, for example, two errors occur in close proximity (CLEA 12, 17, 19, 23, 25, 30, 36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 47, 50, 62, 63, 65, 75). Twelve authors demonstrate their weak understanding and recall of classical metrics and prosody; most err both metrically and prosodically, their prosodical deviations are numerous and most include one or more errors in length by position. Their errors present a serious hindrance to a quantitative reading of their poems (CLEA 13, 15, 18, 21, 38, 45, 48, 51, 56, 57, 66, 68). Seven authors reveal by their metrically or prosodically inept appropriation of verses composed by others their weak understanding of classical metrics and prosody (CLEA 2, 3, 24, 34, 64, 71, 74). Ten authors have left carmina so metrically and prosodically faulty, many including lines that cannot be reduced to quantitative measure, that scansion of them is virtually impossible (CLEA 16, 52, 58, 59, 60, 61, 76, 79, 81, 85). Of the eighty-six authors, therefore, fifty-seven or about 66% have left carmina that can be read quantitatively with little or no hindrance.

Further examination of the distribution of errors in the corpus reveals a correlation between an author's metric and prosodical competence and his use of certain of the compositional elements that belonged to the tradition of epigraphic verse, and that served as aids or enhancements in versification. The elements in question are the copying of verses from other inscriptions, the use of epigraphic formulae,
the integration of portions of classical poetry, and the acrostic or telestic arrangement of verses.

Two authors copied inscriptions composed by others. One supplied a long dedicatory mosaic for a Christian basilica in Cuicul simply by combining the texts of two inscriptions that he had seen in Tipasa (CLEA 71); the other supplied a poem for the commemoration of the restoration of a sanctuary in Ain Ghorab by taking some verses from an inscription that he had seen in Rome (CLEA 74). Both authors altered a few details where necessary to suit their own contexts. Analysis of their compositions suggests that neither of these authors had a sure grasp of the principles and practices of classical versification; not only did they copy the works of others rather than compose original poems, they created or let stand in the new contexts errors both metric and prosodic. The two authors of the corpus who used verses from other inscriptions, therefore, did so of necessity, for they were themselves unequal to the task of original composition.

Eight authors employ one or more sepulchral formulae (CLEA 2, 3, 15, 16, 24, 34, 48, 59). That the epigraphic tradition was a valuable source of precomposed lines and half-lines is most strikingly illustrated by CLEA 2, which is composed almost entirely of sepulchral commonplaces. Analysis of the carmina of these authors reveals their poor comprehension of classical versification; all have high rates of prosodical error, three of which are among the highest in the corpus, and six are also metrically unsound. The eight authors of the corpus who resort to the use of formulae, therefore, like the authors who took their verses from other inscriptions, did so of necessity, for they lacked the competence to versify an original eulogy.

Fifteen authors incorporate into their own compositions portions of classical verse. Eleven quote or adapt lines or hemistiches of Vergil (CLEA 10, 27, 35, 42, 46, 56, 57, 64, 72, 76, 79); three use expressions of Ovid (CLEA 5, 70, 80); one borrows from Catullus (CLEA 11); one from Lucretius (CLEA 42). That Vergil should be the classical poet most often quoted is
not surprising, for it was his works that were most often studied in schools, adduced by the grammatici to illustrate features of quantitative versification, and memorized by students. Examination of the metric and prosodical competence of these authors suggests that most had a good grasp of classical versification, for ten of the fifteen adhere perfectly or nearly perfectly to classical metrics and prosody (CLEA 5, 10, 11, 27, 35, 42, 46, 70, 72, 80). Their competent quotation or adaptation of portions of classical verse served to enhance the literary quality of their epitaphs and dedications. The other five authors demonstrate by their metric and prosodical errors their incompetence in versification (CLEA 56, 57, 64, 76, 79). That authors incapable of adhering to classical metrics and prosody in their own original compositions should be able to quote or adapt portions of classical poetry is not surprising; their extensive reading and memorization of classical poetry during the years under the grammaticus provided them with a store of readymade lines and half-lines upon which they could draw, later in life, for an image or phrase.

Ten authors have taken the trouble to arrange their verses acrostically or telestically. Analysis of the versification of their carmina suggests that most were competent, for eight of the ten adhere reasonably well to classical metrics and prosody (CLEA 6, 8, 23, 40, 41, 43, 47, 49). Their successful integration of an acrostic or telestic device both showed off their cleverness and served to highlight a detail of the circumstances of the dedication. The other two authors demonstrate by their metric and prosodical errors their unsure grasp of classical versification (CLEA 38, 56). In the corpus of African carmina, therefore, the incorporation of an acrostic or telestic device, or of portions of classical verse, is more likely to have been undertaken by competent than by incompetent versifiers; these authors sought thereby to enhance the display of their learning and skill that their verse inscriptions presented to their communities.
In summary it may be said that authors who resorted to copying other inscriptions or to the use of precomposed formulae were those who were unsure of classical metrics and prosody and were themselves unequal to the task of original composition; those who sought to enhance their compositions through the quotation and adaptation of portions of classical verse or through the acrostic or telestic arrangement of their verses were, in general, those who were competent in versification and confident of their abilities. It is not surprising to find such a correlation between an author's competence in versification and his use of these compositional elements of epigraphic verse.

The second observation to be made concerns the chronological distribution of errors in the corpus. The fourteen poems that exhibit sound classical metrics and prosody are fairly evenly distributed throughout the corpus, with a very slight preponderance of them dated to the earlier centuries of the period: two were composed in the first or second century (CLEA 5, 6); two in the second to third centuries (CLEA 11, 22); four in the third century (CLEA 27, 28, 29, 37); one in the fourth to fifth centuries (CLEA 55); one in the fifth century (CLEA 70); one is dated late fifth to seventh centuries (CLEA 77); three are dated to the sixth century (CLEA 80, 83, 84). From the first three centuries of the Roman period in North Africa, therefore, come eight or about 57% of the verse inscriptions that adhere perfectly to classical metrics and prosody; from the fourth to seventh centuries come the other six or about 43%.

Metric deviations are fairly evenly distributed in the corpus, with a very slight preponderance found in poems composed in the later centuries. Of the forty-one poems that exhibit unclassical metric features: six are dated first or second century (CLEA 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10); thirteen are dated second to third or third century (CLEA 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 34, 35); one dates third to fourth centuries (CLEA 40); thirteen are dated to the fourth or fifth centuries (CLEA 43, 47, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 64, 68, 69); six date fifth
to sixth or fifth to seventh (CLEA 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 79); and two are dated sixth to seventh centuries (CLEA 85, 86). From the first three centuries, therefore, come nineteen or about 46% of the metrically deviant poems; from the later period come the other twenty-two or about 54%.

Consideration of the distribution of one type of popular metricism, the composition of hypermetric or hypometric lines, reveals as incorrect the observations of an early scholar of epigraphic verse. H. Bianchi, who discerned in the corpus four distinct stages of decline in adherence to classical metrics and prosody, identified as a characteristic of his third stage, which he dated late fourth to mid-sixth centuries, the appearance of lines of irregular length. Of the thirty-eight inscriptions in the present corpus dated to the first three centuries, however, eight or about 21% contain one or more such lines (CLEA 2, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 26). The presence in an African verse inscription of hypermetric or hypometric lines, or of any other popular metricism, therefore, does not necessarily indicate a late date of composition.

Prosodical errors are less evenly distributed, and the question is raised whether a correlation exists between an author's adherence to classical prosody and the date at which he lived. Prosodical incompetence, as we have seen, is used by some scholars to date otherwise undatable inscriptions to a late period; prosodical competence to date them to an early period. A survey of the prosodically faulty poems in the corpus does reveal that in very general terms a poem that exhibits errors is slightly more likely to belong to the later than to the earlier centuries of the Roman period in North Africa: twenty-five or about 66% of the poems that date to the first three centuries contain errors, while thirty-nine or about 81% of the poems that to the later period contain errors. However, a survey of the extent to which the authors err reveals a distinct chronological pattern. First to be considered are those authors who adhere perfectly or nearly perfectly to classical prosody, that is,
those who exhibit low rates of error, between 0 and 10%. The numbers of poems that are free or nearly free of error are as follows: eight or 80% of the ten poems dated first or second century; eighteen or about 64% of the twenty-eight dated second to third or third; six or about 55% of the eleven poems dated third to fourth or fourth century; five or about 24% of the twenty-one dated fourth to fifth or fifth century; ten or 63% of the sixteen dated fifth to sixth centuries or later. A steady decrease in adherence to classical prosody is observed from the first century to the fifth; the decline is reversed in poems the estimated date of which spans the last two or three centuries of the Roman period in North Africa. When note is taken of those authors who do not adhere well to classical prosody, that is, those whose rates of error are 11% or greater, a parallel pattern appears. The numbers of poems that exhibit these high percentages of error are as follows: two or 20% of the ten poems dated first or second century; ten or about 36% of the twenty-eight dated second to third or third; five or about 45% of the eleven dated third to fourth or fourth; sixteen or about 76% of the twenty-one dated fourth to fifth or fifth; six or about 38% of the sixteen dated fifth to sixth or later. A steady increase in deviation from classical prosody is observed from the first century to the fifth; the increase is reversed in poems the estimated date of which spans the last two or three centuries of the period.

The fact that popular adherence to classical prosody is seen to decline with distance from the classical age is to be related to the phonological evolution of the vocalic system of the spoken idiom, which as Augustine attests had by his day progressed to the extent that quantitative vocalic distinctions were no longer recognized or observed in ordinary speech. Although classical prosody was taught in schools, recall and practice of the quantitative principles of versification later in life, in the composition of an epitaph or dedication, was hampered by the wide gulf that existed between the literary and
the spoken idioms. Authors were increasingly unable to overcome the obstacle presented by the difference in phonology between classical and spoken Latin. Why there should appear an apparent revival of competence in adherence to classical prosody in poems dated to the last three centuries of the period is not clear.

Two aspects of the chronological distribution of prosodical errors that has been observed in this corpus make unsafe the practice of dating according to an author's level of prosodical competence. First, there are extant verse inscriptions both of sound and of unsound prosody dated to all periods of the Roman occupation of North Africa. Second, in the last three centuries of the period the number of poems of sound prosody is sufficiently high that there appears a reverse in the chronological decline of adherence to classical prosody. Undated carmina that exhibit sound prosody, therefore, are not necessarily early; carmina that exhibit unsound prosody not necessarily late.

Consideration of the distribution of prosodical errors in the corpus also suggests that the specific assertions of two early scholars regarding the chronology of prosodical competence in the corpus should be modified. H. Bianchi discerned four distinct stages in a progressive chronological decline: from the first to early third century authors adhere well to classical prosody; from the early third to late fourth, they are unsure of vocalic lengths by nature; from the late fourth to mid-sixth, their errors include lengths by position and accent is seen to have prevailed over quantity as principle of rhythm; and from the mid-sixth century on the only rhythm they produce in a verse is in its accentual cadence.

The data provided by the analyses of the present corpus, however, reveal important exceptions to each of Bianchi's periods: among the ten poems dated first to early third (CLEA 1-10) are three or 30% whose authors can be said to be unsure of some vocalic lengths by nature (CLEA 1, 4, 9) and two or 20% that exhibit high rates of error (CLEA 2 with an incidence of
error of 19% and 3 with a rate of 18%), so that it is not entirely true that these early authors adhere well to classical prosody or that errors in length by nature do not appear until the third or fourth century; of the twenty-five poems dated third to fourth century (CLEA 26-50), four or 16% exhibit perfect prosody (CLEA 27, 28, 29, 37) and of the rest three contain errors in length by position (CLEA 34, 38, 44), so that it is not completely true either that these authors are unsure of vocalic lengths by nature or that errors in length by position do not appear until a later period; of the eighteen poems dated to Bianchi's third stage (CLEA 57-71, 80-82) five or about 28% exhibit perfect or nearly perfect prosody (CLEA 62, 64, 70, 80, 82) so that while it is true that errors tend to increase in this period, over one-quarter of the poems stand apart from this trend; and of the four poems dated to his last stage (CLEA 83-86) two adhere perfectly (CLEA 83, 84) and one adheres nearly perfectly (CLEA 86) to classical prosody, so that three or 75% do not conform to his postulated pattern of deviation. A fair assessment of his description of this last stage, however, cannot be made, for Bianchi included poems of the commatic type ("verba prosa fere oratione composita", Bianchi 43-44) and these have been excluded from the present study. It is possible that extension of the study to include compositions of this type would in general terms validate Bianchi's description of the prosody of this last period. The testing of Bianchi's chronology against the poems of the present corpus, therefore, suggests that the very broad lines of the decline that he sees are accurate enough; the precise terms in which he describes the stages of the decline, however, must be rejected.

The second scholar to describe a chronological decline in adherence to classical prosody in the African carmina was Galletier, who specified the third century as the point at which a marked decline appears, and identified the influence of the stress accent as the chief factor in Africans' loss of knowledge
of classical quantitative vocalic distinctions. However, analyses of the prosody of the poems in this corpus that date to the third century, or to a span that includes the third century (CLEA 11-41), suggest that Galletier is incorrect. Of thirty-one third century compositions, eight or about 26% adhere perfectly and thirteen more or about 42% adhere nearly perfectly, with an error rate of 10% or less, to classical prosody. About 68% or slightly more than two-thirds of the third century authors can, therefore, be said to adhere well to classical prosody.

The chronological point at which a marked decline does appear is the fourth century. Of twenty-seven fourth century compositions (CLEA 39-65), only two or about 7% adhere perfectly and eight more or about 30% adhere nearly perfectly, with an error rate of 10% or less, to classical prosody. About 37% or slightly more than one-third of the fourth century poems can be said to adhere well to classical prosody. The number of authors whose compositions attest their prosodical competence is, therefore, reduced by almost 50% from the third century to the fourth. These figures bear out the testimony of Augustine that by his day African ears no longer perceived quantitative vocalic distinctions.

A third observation can be made of the distribution of errors in the corpus: there appears to exist some correlation between an author's proficiency in versification and the religious milieu from which he comes. Comparison of the pagan with the Christian poems of the corpus reveals that pagan authors tend to adhere more closely than Christians both to classical metrics and to classical prosody. If the numbers of authors who adhere strictly to literary metric and prosodical norms is considered, very little difference between the competence of pagans and the competence of Christians is seen. Of the forty-nine pagan authors (CLEA 1-40, 42-50), twenty-seven or about 57% adhere strictly to literary metric norms, thirteen or about 27% to literary prosodical norms; of the thirty-seven Christian authors (CLEA 41, 51-86), eighteen or about 49% adhere
to classical metrics, nine or about 24% to classical prosody. If the numbers of authors who deviate from literary norms is considered, the same very small difference between the two groups appears. Twenty-two or about 45% of pagan authors and nineteen or about 51% of Christians exhibit unclassical metric features; thirty-six or about 73% of pagans and twenty-eight or about 76% of Christians exhibit unclassical prosody.

However, when the extent to which authors deviate from classical prosody is taken into account, pagan authors are seen to be the more prosodically competent: thirty-two or about 65% of pagan authors and fifteen or about 41% of Christians exhibit a low rate of prosodical error, between 0 and 10%, and can be said to adhere well to classical prosody. A verse inscription that is reasonably prosodically sound, therefore, is about one and one-half times more likely to derive from a pagan than a Christian milieu. Conversely, poems that exhibit very high error rates, 21% or greater, tend to come from Christian contexts: eleven or about 30% of Christian compositions are so prosodically inferior that they can scarcely be read quantitatively, compared with the eight or about 16% of the pagan poems that deviate to the same extent. A verse inscription that is prosodically unsound, therefore, is about two times more likely to come from a Christian than a pagan milieu. These data disprove the assertions both of Monceaux, who found pagan and Christian authors equally incompetent, and of Galletier, who asserted his expectation that Christian composers, many of whom were educated priests, would adhere more closely than their pagan counterparts to classical metrics and prosody. That pagan authors demonstrate greater prosodical proficiency is probably to be related to the period in which they lived, for, as we have seen, poems from the first three centuries of the Roman period tend to be more prosodically sound than those composed in the later period.

A final observation that can be made concerns the disposition of each *carmen* on the stone or in the mosaic. A wide
range in quality of the graphic arrangement of a text is seen. In thirty-two epitaphs and dedications, care has been taken by the lapicida, probably under instruction of the poet, to make a verse by verse disposition of the hexameters or pentameters, thereby facilitating the reader's discernment of the poetic nature of the text and his quantitative recitation of it (CLEA 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19, 26, 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 47, 48, 49, 55, 57, 62, 66, 71, 74, 75, 78, 80, 82, 86). In several of these poems, one or more of the graphic punctuating symbols available to the mason have also been inscribed to assist the reader; the H-like mark that appears eleven times in CLEA 7, for example, serves as a paragraph indicator in this long eulogy. In the other inscriptions, however, the verses have not been so clearly arranged. In twenty-seven, the verses have been haphazardly engraved, without regard for line breaks, and sometimes without regard for word breaks or even for syllable boundaries; a reader would not easily have discerned the poetic nature of these texts, and he would have been hampered in making a quantitative reading of their verses (CLEA 2, 3, 5, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 34, 40, 51, 52, 53, 64, 68, 72, 76, 77, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85). The inscription of CLEA 6 is unusual in that its haphazard graphic arrangement was designed to form a telestic device. In the remaining twenty-seven inscriptions, although the hexameters and pentameters have not been inscribed verse by verse, some care has been taken to indicate the verse ends, thereby assisting the reader in his quantitative recitation of the work. In seventeen, the verses have been disposed over two or three lines each, so that the verse ends are marked by their coincidence with the line ends (CLEA 12, 21, 27, 29, 33, 36, 43, 45, 50, 54, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 67, 70). In ten others, the verse ends are indicated by such symbols as hederae distinguentes, periods, dashes, marks resembling a v, and palm branches (CLEA 14, 23, 25, 31, 39, 46, 63, 65, 69, 73).

Such graphic devices as the coincidence of verse ends and line ends or the inscription of punctuating symbols would have
been helpful; however, where a poem is poorly versified, the reader's difficulty in coping with metric or prosodical errors would have been greatly exacerbated by any random or partly random disposition of the text.

In the case of those poems composed to read acrostically or telestically, a random arrangement of the verses would have obscured completely the device.

There appears to exist some degree of correlation between the care and competence with which a carmen was composed and the care with which it was inscribed on the stone or in the mosaic. Of the fifty-seven authors who have adhered sufficiently well to classical metrics and prosody that their works can be read quantitatively without serious hindrance, twenty-six have had their hexameters and pentameters arranged verse by verse (CLEA 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19, 26, 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 41, 42, 44, 47, 49, 55, 62, 75, 78, 80, 82, 86), and in nineteen other inscriptions care has been taken to indicate for the reader the verse ends, either through coincidence with the line ends or through the inscription of graphic symbols (CLEA 12, 14, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 36, 39, 43, 46, 50, 63, 65, 67, 69, 70, 73). Forty-five or about 79% of the fifty-seven carmina of reasonably sound metrics and prosody, therefore, have been inscribed in such a way as to facilitate the reader's discernment of their poetic nature and his quantitative recitation of their verses. Conversely, of the twenty-nine poems that present metric and prosodical errors numerous and serious enough to hinder a reader in his recitation of them, only six have been inscribed verse by verse (CLEA 38, 48, 57, 66, 71, 74), and seven others include graphic devices to demark the verses (CLEA 21, 45, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61). Only thirteen or 45% of carmina of poor quality of versification, therefore, have been inscribed so as to facilitate the reader's recognition and recitation of their poetic content.

Of the ten acrostic or telestic poems in the corpus, seven are inscribed so that the acrostic or telestic device is easily
discernible (CLEA 6, 8, 38, 41, 47, 49, 56), one exhibits an irregular arrangement of some of the verses, which hampers distinction of the device (CLEA 43), and the other two are randomly disposed, so that their acrostics are completely obscured (CLEA 23, 40).

The range in quality of the graphic disposition of the poems of this corpus raises the question of the relationship between an author and his lapicida. It is surprising that an author who had expended some effort in versifying a worthy commemoration did not ensure that its poetic nature was highlighted for contemporary passersby through an appropriate graphic disposition. It is more surprising that an author who had taken the time and trouble to compose an acrostic or telestic poem did not see to it that the graphic arrangement of his verses did not obscure his cleverly incorporated device. It is possible that the authors whose works have been haphazardly inscribed forgot to instruct their masons regarding the graphic arrangement of their verses, or that they chanced to employ a careless workman who forgot his instructions and, not perceiving himself the poetic nature of the text or the presence of an acrostic or telestic, inscribed the verses as he would have a prose text.

The classical and unclassical features of the versification of the carmina latina epigraphica africana, as they are exhibited in the present corpus of dated dactylic texts, may be summarized as follows. Only 16% of the poems adhere perfectly both to classical metrics and to classical prosody, while the rest exhibit metric deviations and prosodical errors. Metrical errors characteristic of the corpus include the unclassical combination of different meters in one poem, the composition of hypermetric and hypometric lines, and the intermixture of prose with lines of verse. Prosodical irregularities comprise those that can be considered classical, for they can be ascribed to an author's application of one or more of the licences used by his classical masters, and those that are errors, most of which are attributable to the intrusion of certain unclassical features of
an author's everyday speech. A not infrequent source of error is an author's use of certain elements of epigraphic verse, the integration of which sometimes spoiled his efforts at adherence to metrics and prosody; these include the specification of idiosyncratic biographical information, the incorporation of epitaphic formulae, the borrowing of verses from other inscriptions, the acrostic or telestic arrangement of verses, and the quotation or adaptation of portions of classical verse.

The extent to which individual authors deviate from classical metrics and prosody varies widely; the majority of versifiers, however, can be seen to have adhered to literary norms sufficiently well that their works can be read quantitatively without serious hindrance.

The presence of metric deviations in a poem carries no chronological significance, for these are evenly distributed in the corpus. A general chronological decline in adherence to classical prosody, however, is discernible from the first century to the fifth, with a marked decline in the fourth century. The lines of this decline, however, are not sufficiently consistent that quality of versification can safely be used as a dating criterion, for not only does adherence to classical prosody appear to revive in the last three centuries of the period, but also there exist in the corpus poems of unsound versification of very early date and poems of sound versification of very late date.

Pagan authors tend to adhere slightly more closely than their Christian counterparts to classical metrics and prosody.

The validity of the prevailing view that the versification of the African carmina latina epigraphica is inferior to that of carmina composed in other areas of the Roman empire can be determined only by comparison of the data compiled in this corpus with those compiled in other regional corpora.
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13 ibid 68

14 ibid 70

15 ibid 66

16 ibid 77

17 ibid 43

18 Vernier 371
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20 Bianchi 43-44. Another early scholar who shared this view of a chronological decline in quality of versification was E. Albertini. Albertini does not mention Bianchi's study, but his assumption of such a chronology forms the basis of his estimation of a date for a text from Tipasa, "Une versification aussi régulière ne peut être, à mon avis, postérieure au IVe
siècle, et doit même se placer plus près de 350 que de 400." (Albertini 1920 391)

21 Chevallier 23

22 Picard, LeBonniec, Mallon 155. LeBonniec's remark concerns the epitaph of Beccut, CLEA 33, studied below.

23 Galletier 3

24 The corpus of inscriptions studied both by Bianchi and by Galletier was limited to the carmina of Buecheler's two volumes and a few post-Buecheleriana; no criteria or sources are given for their dates, and some are questionable. According to Bianchi (1910 46), for instance, BL 522 dates to the late fourth to mid-sixth centuries, but according to Pikhaus (1981 645n.21), belongs to the third century. And according to Galletier (303n.3, 304nn.4, 5), BL 1058 dates to the first century AD, BL 485 to the 2nd, and BL 524 to the 3rd, but these inscriptions are deemed undatable by any modern study.

25 Galletier 304

26 Monceaux Histoire III 1906 445

27 For African verse inscriptions published after 1983, such journals as L'Année épigraphique and CRAI have been searched. No new texts that meet all the criteria fixed for this study have been found.

28 Examples of such "literary inscriptions" are the twenty-one texts in Monceaux RA 1906 (nn.154-163, 165-168, 170-173, 176-178) from the Latin Anthology, some of which are prefaced versus (fontis, basilicae, crucis); two texts in ILA I (88.II, 88.III) said to have been composed by Augustine, one taken from the Vita Augustini of Possidius, the other found in the margin of a manuscript containing the bishop's Confessiones; and one "text" from the Passio Montani, a letter sent by the martyr Montanus to the church at Carthage, one sentence of which DeRossi thought represented a quotation from a basilica inscription. By altering the word order in one place, and adding words in two other places, DeRossi produced a reconstruction of the "inscription" (ICUR II xxxii).

29 N.Duval 1957 258-260; id 1981 515-517

30 For AE 1928.38, for example, a dedicatory inscription from Saldae that commemorates an unspecified victory, ob pulsum moenibus hostem, Leschi (1957 357-359) sees two possible contexts in insurrections of the third century. And for BL 521, an epitaph from Thicilla, the phrase occidit [in] bello Num[ id]um could, in Pikhaus' view (1983 Appendix II 65), refer to the uprising of the Bavares in the third century. Both
references, however, are vague, both inferences conjectural.

31 "Remarques sur les inscriptions funéraires datées de Maurétanie césarienne orientale (II-V siècle)", MEFR 1964 105-172

32 "Le Cippe de Beccut", Ant Afr 4 1970 125-164

33 "Recherche sur la chronologie des épitaphes païennes de l'Afrique", Ant Afr 7 1973 7-151

34 Les inscriptions funéraires chrétiennes de la basilique dite de Sainte-Monique à Carthage Rome 1975

35 Recherches archéologiques à Haïdra. I. Les inscriptions chrétiennes d'Haidra Rome 1975

36 Recherches archéologiques franco-tunisiennes à Mactar V. Les inscriptions chrétiennes Rome 1984

37 "L'Afrique est faite de régions compartimentées qui ont souvent ignoré leurs voisines et qui toutes n'ont pas subi - surtout au même moment - les mêmes influences extérieures ... et il serait dangereux d'appliquer à tels autres ensembles de textes les résultats d'une étude locale" (Lassère 1973 8, regarding pagan inscriptions). The same observation is made of Christian inscriptions, "le formulaire des tombes chrétiennes différait très souvent d'une ville à l'autre à l'intérieur de la même province" (Monceaux 1905 203).

38 For two of these I have altered slightly the proposed date, for which an explanation will be offered in an endnote to the analyses. Twelve other verse inscriptions, dated by Pikhaus on the basis of criteria from these regional studies, and otherwise acceptable for the present study, have been rejected. Two problems render the proposed datings insufficiently secure. The first is the attempt, on the strength of one or two criteria, to fit an undated inscription from one of the communities studied into the chronology established for that community. Three inscriptions, one from Thugga, one from Lambaesis, and the other from Mactar, all deemed undatable by the scholars who studied the inscriptions of those regions, are assigned to the second or third century on the basis of a single onomastic feature, or of phrasing similar to that of a dated inscription. Many elements, however, figured in the assignment of a date to each inscription, and, since these inscriptions were thought undatable by the scholars who studied them, Lassère for Thugga and Lambaesis, and Picard for Mactar, they have been excluded from the present study.

The second problem is Pikhaus' use of certain of Lassère's criteria, namely the abbreviated gentilicium, the absence of praenomen, the double cognomen, the signum, and the invocation memoriae. According to Pikhaus, Lassère's data reveal
abbreviated *gentilicia* in the second or more probably third century, "over de afgekorte gentiliciëm frequent in de IIIe E., doch reeds sporadisch in de IIe: Lassère...129" (Pikhaus 1983 Appendix II 120, with similar statements pp.23, 92, 94, 104, 124, 131, 173). Lassère, however, observes abbreviated *gentilicia* in the first century (at Théveste and Cirta), as well as in the second and third centuries (in all communities). Abbreviation of *nomina*, moreover, is "frequent" in no period in Africa and in fact his tables reveal a decrease in use from the second to the third century in Thugga, Théveste, and Cirta. The summary statement to which Pikhaus refers (Lassère 129), "bien qu'on en puisse citer deux exemples à Théveste à l'époque légionnaire (sc. last quarter of the first century), on peut considérer que cette habitude ne se manifeste que très timidement en Afrique à partir du IIe siècle", means, as comparison of his statistical tables indicates, that the abbreviation of *gentilicia* in the areas studied by Lassère occurs precociously two times in the first century, and ubiquitously from the beginning of the second, but never more than "très timidement". This onomastic custom, therefore, is not a reliable dating criterion.

Another onomastic feature, the omission of the *praenomen*, is considered by Pikhaus to indicate a third century date, "vanaf de vroeg IIIe E., verdwijnt het *praenomen*. Zie Pflaum *Onomastique Latine* 319" (Pikhaus 1983 Appendix II 24, with similar statements pp.92, 135, 149). Pflaum says only that "le prénom a comme ailleurs tendance à disparaître vers le début du IIIe siècle". Lassère's tables, however, reveal the absence of a *praenomen* in the onomastics of several African inscriptions from the first century on, and prove the unreliability of this phenomenon as a dating criterion.

The presence of two *cognomina* is said to point to a second or third century date, "*dubbele cognomina verwijzen naar de IIe of IIIe... Lassère... 129" (Pikhaus *ibid* 94, with similar statement p.96). Since, however, the phenomenon occurs in the first century (although rarely), as Lassère's tables reveal, and continues into the fourth, as Kajanto's studies demonstrate (Lassère *ibid* 75; Kajanto 1963 24-30), it cannot serve as a secure dating criterion.

39 Lassère 1973 120-121
40 Février 1964 123, 136
41 Kajanto 1963 5
42 Février 1964 115
43 This chronology, observed by Gsell early in this century (1901 vol.II 115 and n.1), is affirmed by the recent regional studies of Duval-Prévot (1975 331-348), Ennabli (1975 54-57), Prévot (1984 168-177) and others.
The one extant sixth century example of a Constantinian monogram, that inscribed on a Byzantine martyrium at Ammaedara (Duval-Prévet 1975 189-208), need not render invalid the traditional view that in general this symbol ceased to be used after the fifth century. Moreover, the text on which it is inscribed may be considered "archaizing" in that it commemorates martyrs of the persecution of Diocletian.

Gordon, among others, cautions against dating by paleography alone, "(although) there are clearly several more or less distinct periods in the paleography of Latin inscriptions ... it is not always easy to distinguish between inscriptions of the late republic and Augustan or between those of the third and fourth phases (sc. Augustan to end of second century, and third century to end of empire) especially when we deal in texts of different areas." (1983 38f) The existence of local differences in paleography is attested, for example, by Lassère's study of seven communities in Proconsularis, Numidia and Tripolitania, "Aucune évolution d'ensemble ne se manifeste dans le domaine de la graphie." (1973 32)
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Cagnat 1889, reiterated 1914 286

id 1889 53-54

Focillon 1905 xxix
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Picard, LeBonniec, Mallon 1970 155

Lier 1903 447-448

Munno 1911; Galletier 1922 228
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Inter-provincial travel, in fact, figures in two motifs of epigraphic verse, the "voyage away from home" and "death in a foreign land", which Cugusi treats (1985 chapter 4 "Due 'temi' epigrafici" 199-222).

Cugusi 1985 gathers epigraphic expressions of interest in literature in his first two chapters, "Carmina Latina Epigraphica 'firmati'" 21-90, and "Uomini lettere nei Carmina Latina Epigraphica" 91-164.

For Roman education and its emphasis on classical poetry, see chapter 3, below; for the popular composition of occasional verse, see, for example, Pliny the Younger 4.27, 5.3, 7.4, 7.9.
The social milieux in which verse inscriptions were produced is also the subject of a previous article by Pikhaus (1981).

This figure combines the 63% of verse inscriptions belonging to *honestiores* and the 22% whose financial capacity ensures *honestior* rank for the next generation (Pikhaus 1987 185, 187).

Some phrases of BL 486 (Caesarea, Mauretania),

\[
vixit \ldots \text{sine crimine ullo},
vivite mortales moneo mors omnibus instat,
discite qui legitis,
\]

are repeated wholly or in part in BL 485 (Conimbriga), BL 802 (Rome), and BL 1004 (Verona); the sentiment *spes et fortuna valete* is expressed in BL 2139 (Theveste) and ILA II 4831 (Thibilis); and *aeterna domus hec est/ pausum laboris* (BL 225, Lambesis) recurs, although not verbatim, at Cillium (BL 1896) and in Rome (ILCV 3661).

BL 1997 (Cirta) = ILA II 809 (Cirta); BL 1640 (Thibilis) = BL 2025 (THibilis); AE 1946.62 (Mactar) = AE 1960.116 (Mactar); CIL 8.726 (Henchir El Khima)= CIL 8.12190 (Henchir El Khima); BL 1328.1-3 (Ammaedara) = BL 1329.1-2 and 5 (Ammaedara); ILA I 2775.1 (Madauros) = ILA I 2776.1 (Madauros); AE 1974.695 (Belalis Maior) = AE 1974.697 (Belalis Maior); ILA II 6581 (Sigus) = ILA II 6610 (Sigus); BL 517.1 (Auzia) = BL 518.1 (Auzia); BL 592.4-6 (Auzia) = BL 593.4-6 (Auzia) = BL 594.3 (Auzia); CIL 8.9158 (Auzia) = CIL 8.9164 (Auzia); CIL 8.682 (Mactar) = CIL 8.645, 647 (Mactar); BL 635.2 (Sigus) = BL 636.2 (Aqua Thibilitanae); IRT 295.11 (Lepcis Magna) = IRT 231.6 (Oea) (Pikhaus 1987 189-190).

The Roman inscription duplicated in Henchir Adjedj is BL 315; that duplicated in Ain Ghorab (CLEA 74, studied below) is BL 912.

CLEA 71, studied below

CLEA 84, studied below

Pikhaus 1987 190-191

collected in the eight volumes of H.Keil

Lambert 1908 3-4; Sturtevant 1940 23; Marrou 1958 9-26
Quintilian Inst 1.4.2. Quintilian’s description is echoed in the fourth century by Diomedes,

tota autem grammatica consistit praecipue intellectu poetarum ... prompta expositione et in recte loquendi scribendique ratione (K1.426.18-20),

and in the sixth by Marius Victorinus,

grammatica quid est? scientia interpretandi poetas et recte scribendi loquendique ratio (K6.188.1-2).

In the exposition of literary works, the province of the grammaticus was chiefly poetry, that of the rhetor chiefly prose (Marrou 1956 277-278; Bonner 1977 218).

Marrou 1956 277-278; Marrou 1958 13

Suetonius Gramm 16.2

... optime institutum est ut ab ... Vergilio lectio inciperet .... (Quintilian 1.8.5)

Priscian provides an example of the latter,


According to Donatus,

tres sunt omnino positurae vel distinctiones ..., distinctio, subdistinctio, media distinctio. distinctio est ubi finitur plena sententia; huius punctum ad summam litteram ponimus. subdistinctio est, ubi non multum superest de sententia, quod tamen necessario separatum mox inferendum sit; huius punctum ad imam litteram ponimus. media distinctio est, ubi fere tantum de sententia superest, quantum iam diximus, cum tamen respirandum sit; huius punctum ad medium litteram ponimus. (K4.372.15-22)

According to Donatus,

hyphen (est) virgula subjicta versui; hac nota subter posita duo verba, cum ita res exigit, copulamus,
"ante tulit gressum" et "Turnus ut ante volans tardum praecesserat agmen". huic contraria est diastole, dextera pars circuli ad imam litteram adposita: hac nota male cohaerentia discernuntur, ut est "ereptae, virginis ira" et "viridique in litore conspicitur, sus". apostrophos item circuli pars dextera, sed ad summam litteram adposita: hac nota deesse ostendimus parti orationis ultima vocalem, cuius consonans remanet, ut est "tanton' me crimine dignum duxisti?" (K4.372.2-11)

According to Pompeius,

quod si vis codicem distinguere, ita distinguere. quando vis acutum accentum facere, lineam a sinistra parte in dexteram partem sursum ducito; ... quotiens vis longam (sc.syllabam),— hoc adiacens fac; quotiens vis brevem, hoc faciens fac. (K5.132.1-5)

Cicero De Or 1.187

Bonner 1977 228

Augustine Conf 1.13

Augustine De Anima 4.7.9

According to Servius,

vocales dicuntur quia per se sonant et per se syllabam faciunt ... vocales sunt quinque a e i o u ... omnes vocales Latinae et produci et corripi possunt, a producitur, ut "acer"; corripitur, ut "amor"; e producitur, ut "meta"; corripitur, ut "ego"; i producitur, ut "itum"; corripitur, ut "ib"; o producitur, ut "Roma"; corripitur, ut "rosa"; u producitur, ut "unus"; corripitur, ut "ubi". (K4.421.6-422.6ff).

And according to Probus,

y vocalis est, quae et produci et corripi possit: producitur in hoc, "quos neque Tydides"; corripitur in hoc, "sic demum lucos Stygiae" ... (hanc) Latinitas de Graeco fonte derivavit non suorum necessitate verborum quam Graecorum nominum ratione. (K4.222.8-12)

Diphthongs were treated as double vowels, duplicatae vocales, and regarded as long.

Although the grammarians' references to these differences are sometimes brief, and their descriptions, where they do occur, difficult to understand, pronunciation was no doubt made clear
in the classroom through demonstration, exemplification and practice. An account of the littera e is found in Pompeius,

   e aliter longa aliter brevis sonat ... dicit ita
Terentianus, quotiennscumque e longam volumus proferri,
   vicina sit ad i litteram ... quando dicis evitat
   vicina debet esse - sic pressa, sic angusta ut vicina
   sit ad i litteram. quando vis dicere brevem e,
simulciter sonat (K5.102.4-13)

of i in Victorinus,

   igitur qui correptum (sc. sonum o) enuntiat, nec magno
hiatu labra reserabit et retrorsum actam linguam
tenebit. Longum autem productis labris, rictu tereti,
lingua antro oris pendula (K6.3.3.4)

and of o and u in Terentianus Maurus,

   igitur sonitum reddere cum voles minori
retrorsus adactam modice teneto linguam
   rictu neque magno sat erit patere labra
at longior alto tragicum sub oris antro
   molita rotundis acuit sonum labellis.

   hanc edere vocem quotiens paramus ore
   nitamur ut U dicere, sic citetur ortus;
   productius autem coentibus labellis
   natura soni pressior altius meabit. (K6.329.130-145)

None of the grammatici mention a qualitative difference between long and short a. A passage from Lucilius seems to suggest that there was in fact no difference,

   aa primum longa <a> brevis syllaba. nos tamen unum
hoc faciemus, et uno eodemque ut dicimus pacto
scribemus "pacem", "placide", "Ianum", "aridum",
Marx)

86 The ancient use of the term semivowel differs from the
modern. The grammatici designated as semivowels those sounds
that modern phonologists term continuants, that is, the
consonants that are not stops; modern phonologists apply the
term semivowel to consonantal i and u, which are referred to
simply as i and u loco consonantis in ancient grammar (Allen
1978 37n.1).

87 According to Marius Victorinus,

   consonantium vero est species duplex: sunt enim aliae
semivocales, aliae mutae. semivocales sunt quae per se
quidem proderuntur, sed per se syllabam non faciunt.
sunt autem numero septem, f l m n r s x .... mutae sunt autem quae neque per se proferri possunt nec per se syllabam faciunt. sunt autem numero novem, b c d g h k p q t. (K6.5.19-26)

The letter z was appended to the list of Latin consonants, for use in Greek words.

88 On this point, as on so many others, the Latin grammatici simply took over the teaching and analysis of their Greek counterparts, and named as liquids the letters l, r, m and n,

quattuor, l m n r, liquidae sunt, si consonantibus aliis, in una tamen sed posteriores dumtaxat syllaba, postponantur. idcirco dictae liquidae, quoniam postpositae propriae vim potestatemque deperdunt, dum earum sonus liquescit et tenuatur. (Probus, K4.221.15-18)

Some grammatici noted that really only two of these, l and r, behaved as liquids in Latin,

sunt autem liquidae quattuor, sed non omnes liquidae sunt. apud Graecos quidem omnes liquescunt, apud Latinos duae frequenter, l et r; m vero numquam apud Latinos liquescit, nisi in graecis nominibus; n vero raro, l et r frequentissime. (Pompeius, K5.109.22-25)

89 According to Marius Victorinus,

vocantur spiritales tres, c, p, t, quia his h littera subiecta inserit spiritum ut "Chiron", "Philon", "Thoas". (K6.7.9-10)

90 Discussion of length and quantity raises a problem. Modern studies of Latin versification, such as those of Zirin (1970) and Allen (1973, 1978), explain the syllable, and present the criteria that determined its quantity, phonologically in terms of syllabic structure. The ancient grammarians, however, explained the syllable, and presented the criteria that determined its quantity, descriptively in terms of orthography. Thus modern students of Latin quantitative verse are instructed by scholars such as Allen (1978 89) that length is a property of vowels (short vowel, long vowel), quantity a property of syllables (light syllable, heavy syllable); a syllable is light if it is open, that is, if it ends in a vowel, and if that vowel is short, while a syllable is heavy if it is open and ends in a long vowel or diphthong (heavy "by nature"), or if it is closed, that is, if it ends in a consonant, regardless of the length of its vowel (heavy "by position"). Ancient students, on the other hand, were instructed by their grammatici that length was a property both of vowels and of syllables; a syllable was short if it contained a short vowel not followed by two consonants;
long by nature if it contained a long vowel or diphthong, and long by position if it contained a short vowel followed by two consonants.

91 According to Donatus,

breves sunt quae et correptam vocalem habent et non desinunt in duas consonantes aut in unam duplicem aut in aliquid quod sit pro duabus consonantibus. longae aut natura sunt aut positione fiunt; natura, cum aut vocalis producitur, ut a, o, aut duae vocales iunguntur et diphthongan faciunt, ut ae, or, au, eu, ei; positione, cum correpta vocalis in duas desinit consonantes. (K4.368.20-25)

92 aqua at 6.552 and 1072; liquidus at 1.349, 2.452, 3.427, 4.1259

93 K7.253.17-19

94 Several grammatici, such as Pompeius (K5.104.15-105.2), interpreted qu as a single phoneme. Their descriptions suggest a velar plosive uttered with lip rounding [kʷ] (Allen 1978 16).

95 According to Bailey, aquae at 6.552 is "probably to be scanned as a trisyllable" and aquai at 6.1072 as a quadrisyllable. As for liquidus, "the quantity of (the) root was probably uncertain in Lucretius' time, though later the short vowel was established, but it may be noticed that the vowel is long when it occurs in arsis and when the final syllable is short, short when it is in thesis and when the final syllable is long." (131)

96 Allen (1978 18) suggests the alternative pronunciations [kw] and [kkʷ].

97 The grammarians classified adjectives as nouns. (Lambert 1908 50-53)

98 Platnauer 1951 51-52

99 Kent 1948 303

100 Williams 1972 276

101 Platnauer 59-62

102 Tibullus 1.7.61; Propertius 2.13.15, 2.29.39 and 4.5.64; Ovid Am 3.7.55. A few more examples of the lengthening of a precaesural open syllable are found in some texts of Vergil and the elegists, but these do not have the same manuscript authority as the six examples cited here.
103 R. Williams, for example, in his 1972 edition of the *Aeneid* accepts "with some uncertainty" Schaper's emendation *dona dehinc auro gravia ac secto elephanto* of the manuscripts' *dona dehinc auro gravia sectoque elephanto*. The question of these prosodical anomalies and of their emendation is discussed by Housman 1927 1-12.

104 Of the 54 instances in Vergil of lengthening in arsis of a short final closed syllable, 14 occur before word-initial h, and 40 before a word-initial vowel; but h is 10 times less frequent than a vowel in word-initial position (Allen 1973 148).

105 for example, Diomedes, K1.495.27-496.1

106 According to Marius Victorinus,

\[
\text{in signes autem in metris sunt ... in monosyllabum desinentes, ut "procumbit humi bos". (K6.72.1-7)}
\]

107 According to Priscian,

\[
\text{caesurae vero cursum et rythmum leviorem solent facere, et necesse est vel una vel duae caesurae in versu inveniri. (K3.460.16-17)}
\]

108 Some grammarians considered the bucolic diaeresis a fifth caesura, for instance, Marius Victorinus, K6.65.31-66.3.

109 for example, Marius Victorinus, K6.65.2-26

110 A penthemimeral caesura occurs in 84.5% of Vergil's hexameters (Shipley 1924 146), and in almost 100% of Ovid's hexameters (Platnauer 1951 6n.1).

111 According to Marius Victorinus,

\[
\text{geminata autem penthemimeres tome versum pentametrum complet, ut "quam Iuno fertur, quam Iuno fertur". (K6.65.6-7)}
\]

112 Sacerdos, K6.451.4

113 K4.392.11-21

114 qui eadem libertate synalipha utebatur (K7.253.290)

115 According to Probus,

\[
\text{(sc. littera m) apud Vergilium in synalipham semper cadit a vocali excepta, ut "Ilium et omnis humo fumat" ... in hoc ergo vigilantia Vergiliana laudanda est, quod ubique haec littera finalis a vocali excipiatur aut ab aspiratione, ut sit synaliphae locus et per se}
\]
stare non possit. (K4.224.8-15)

116 The licence was thought *subrusticum* by Cicero's day (*Orator* 48.161)

117 Both phrases are Marrou's (1956 277).

118 Spoken Latin may also be called "vulgar Latin", if by the latter term is meant (properly) the constantly changing non-literary language as spoken by ordinary men and women throughout all periods of Roman history, and not (as sometimes used) the Latin of the very late empire ("proto-Romance"). Väänänen (1966 3-5) summarizes the various ways in which the term has been used.

119 As interpreted by Acquati 1974 33

120 Acquati *ibid* 52

121 Compare nona < nonas, idu < idue (Duval-Prévot 1975 502), and mense < menses (Prévot 1984 185), although in the latter case the same word is listed elsewhere (*ibid* 238) as an example of muted final s in popular speech.

122 The evidence of prose inscriptions is variously valued. Elcock (1966 35) and Kiss (1972 23), for example, express no reservations. J. Marcillet-Jaubert (1960), on the other hand, scorning the "philologie monstreuse" that is sometimes inferred from epigraphic deviations in orthography, rejects completely the use of them as a direct source of spoken Latin. Inscriptions, in his opinion, serve only to corroborate knowledge gained from other sources. Others, like Gaeng (1968 34-40) and Omeltchenko (1977 28-32), adopt a properly cautious but positive approach to the inscriptions as evidence for popular speech.

123 M is preserved, for example, (as n) in French *rien* < *rem*. Other examples are found in Bonioli 1962 102.

124 Cicero *Orator* 48.161. That Cicero refers in his description of the muting of final s not only to the old-fashioned licence in versification but also to a feature of popular speech is pointed out by W. Belardi 1965.

125 Final s is in fact omitted several times in the Iberian inscriptions. The significance of its omission, however, is variously interpreted. Carnoy, for example, rejects the possibility that the loss of final s reflects a phonological phenomenon (Carnoy 1906 193), attributing its omission at line-end to deliberate disregard by the mason *marginie urgente*, and its omission elsewhere in the line to conventional abbreviation (*ibid* 191). Gaeng, however, argues that some instances of omitted -s suggest a morphological change in the spoken
language, namely, the substitution of a vowel-final accusative form for the second declension nominative singular, -o for -us (Gaeng 1984 58 and n.71). Gaeng also notes that Carnoy introduces an inconsistency into his discussion when he acknowledges the probability that certain omissions of -s, for example, maritu < maritus, do reflect such a morphological change (Carnoy ibid 197).

126 Kiss 1972 85

"Two factors limit the applicability of Kiss' statistics. First, he treats together in the one table both final s and final t, "% des inscriptions présentant -s > 0 ou -t > 0", and, second, he breaks down his Italian data by region, finding a much higher percentage of the muted consonants in Rome than in North or South Italy (1.6%, .5%, .4% respectively). It seems reasonably safe, however, to adduce his data as evidence that, in general terms, the African inscriptions resemble the Dacian and the Roman in treatment of final s."

127 Two factors limit the applicability of Kiss' statistics. First, he treats together in the one table both final s and final t, "% des inscriptions présentant -s > 0 ou -t > 0", and, second, he breaks down his Italian data by region, finding a much higher percentage of the muted consonants in Rome than in North or South Italy (1.6%, .5%, .4% respectively). It seems reasonably safe, however, to adduce his data as evidence that, in general terms, the African inscriptions resemble the Dacian and the Roman in treatment of final s.

128 Spence 1965 3. The question of the length and quality (aperture) of the new monophthong, e from ae, and its effect on the vocalic system, is variously argued. Spence's view, however, that it was assimilated into the existing system, pronounced long by some and short by others, seems reasonable.

129 In most modern Romance languages it is vocalic quality that is phonemic; although vocalic length may be observed phonetically, quality is the differentiating element. Thus, whereas the literary Latin solum (floor) is distinguished from solum (only) by the contrastive lengths of the vowel o, short in the former, long in the latter, the Italian solo (or suolo) (floor) and solo (only) are distinguished by the contrastive qualities of o, open in the former, closed in the latter (solo, solo) (Väänänen 1981 29). It is inferred, therefore, that in the colloquial idiom from which such languages developed, vocalic quantity had been replaced by vocalic quality as differentiating element. Literary Latin ï was realized in popular speech as ï, ï as ï, e as e, è as e, a and ã as a, õ as õ, õ as õ, ù as ù, ù as u. A simplification of the new qualitative system occurred with the merger of e and ë and of õ and ù. Three stages of this evolution from quantity to quality as distinctive vocalic feature are thus postulated,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl.L.</th>
<th>â</th>
<th>ē</th>
<th>ē</th>
<th>ï</th>
<th>ï</th>
<th>ŏ</th>
<th>ŏ</th>
<th>ù</th>
<th>ū</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early V.L.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ï</td>
<td>ï</td>
<td>ŏ</td>
<td>ŏ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Palmer 1954 156).

In a few modern Romance languages, however, for example, Sardinian, neither length nor quality are phonemic. It is inferred, therefore, that in the colloquial idiom from which
these languages developed the loss of vocalic quantity entailed a concomitant loss of vocalic quality. A simpler evolution of the vowel system is thus postulated,

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
Cl.L. & \ddot{\iota} & \ddot{i} & \ddot{e} & \ddot{e} & \ddot{a} & \ddot{a} & \ddot{o} & \ddot{o} & \ddot{u} & \ddot{u} \\
Sardinian & i & e & a & a & o & o & u & u & u & u
\end{array}
\]


Spoken Latin, therefore, knew more than one vocalic system. Four regional varieties, in fact, have been identified by H. Lausberg. That represented in Palmer's table belongs to the "Italic qualititative system"; that represented in Vincent's table to the "Sardinian archaic system" (Lausberg 1956:vol. I:96, 98).

A recent comparative study of the vocalism exhibited in Latin inscriptions, that of S. Omelchenko (1977), has demonstrated that the Latin spoken in the Roman provinces of Africa belonged to the Sardinian system, that is, that in colloquial "African Latin" the loss of vocalic quantity was accompanied by a loss of vocalic quality.

130 Allen 1975:179, 184

131 The text of the poem is published in Lambot 1935; its accentual system is analyzed by Norberg (1958:137-138). Augustine himself refers to the work as a new type of composition,

\[
\text{volens etiam causam Donatistarum ad ipsius humillimi vulgi et omnino imperitorum atque idiotarum notitiam pervenire et eorum quantum fieri posset per nos inhaerere memoriae, psalmum qui eis cantaretur ... feci ... ideo autem non aliquo carminis genere id fieri volui, ne me necessitas metrica ad aliqua verba quae vulgo minus sunt usitata compelleret. (Retractationes 1.19)}
\]


133 Hall and Oberhelman CP 1985:226

134 Väänänen 1966:18-19

135 Acquati 1971:167

136 id 184

137 Spence ibid 12n.29

138 Pulgram 1975

139 Long and short "a" apparently shared the same quality, namely, closed and central; thus they coincide to form the point of the vowel triangle that represents the range of Latin vocalic
sounds. (Allen 1978 47)

140 Pulgram *ibid* chapters 1 and 9 and *passim*

141 Sturtevant, for instance, 1940 108-111, and Klausenburger 1975

142 Acquati 1971 157

143 Spence' 1965 12-13

144 For epigraphic evidence of the omission of n before s and before a stop, see Väänänen 1966 63, 68; Kiss 1972 29-30, 31n.14; Acquati 1974 45-47. For the confusion of b and v, see Acquati 1974 21-24; Barbarino 1978 59-74 and 151-158.

145 Quintilian, for example, (*Inst* 1.7.29) and Charisius (K1.58.17-19) mention the muting of n before s. Adamantinus (or Martyrius) devotes a treatise to the subject of the merger of b and v, *De B Muta et V Vocali* (K7.165.99ff).

146 Of the sequence ns in words derived from Latin there is no trace in the Romance languages (Sturtevant 1940 154, Bonioli 1962 132). An illustration of the b/v merger, which commonly occurs in Romance languages in an intervocalic position, is *debere* > Ital. *dovere*, Sard. *devere*, Fr. *devoir* (Sturtevant 174). The b/v merger in an initial position is found in fewer Romance areas (Väänänen 1981 50).

147 Sturtevant 1940 154, Allen 1978 28

148 Väänänen 1981 50-51, Barbarino 1978 159

149 Another unclassical orthographical feature that appears a few times in the African inscriptions is the degemination of consonants, for example, *redimus* (< *reddimus*) and *telus* (< *tellus*). Degemination, like the muting of n before s and the b/v merger, is attested by inscriptive evidence, by passages in the *grammatici* and by comparative Romance studies as a phonological phenomenon of popular speech; unlike the muting of n and the b/v merger, however, it is dated relatively late, about the sixth century AD (Väänänen 1981 58). The few instances of degeminated consonants that appear in the dated African carmina epigraphica, therefore, are considered to be graphic errors only. That the *lapicida* might easily and inadvertently have omitted one of a pair of consonants is pointed out by Kiss (1972 75).

150 Hundreds of "echoes" or "reminiscences" of classical authors have been detected in the *carmina latina epigraphica*, and presented as evidence of popular knowledge of the classics throughout antiquity. General collections include those of Buecheler (vol.II, index III, pages 913-920) and Lommatzsch
(index III, pages 174-178), and Cugusi (1982 and 1985, index II pages 283-290); compilations of echoes of specific poets have been made by R.P.Hoogma (Vergil, Aeneid only); D.Joly (Vergil Aeneid XII only); S.Mariner Bigorra (Vergil); Lissberger (Catullus, elegists, Ovid's Metamorphoses); Popova (Catullus, Horace, Propertius, Tibullus); Shackleton Bailey (Propertius); Kleberg (Juvenal).

Some epigraphic reminiscences of literary works can be accepted as deliberate citations, and can be taken as evidence that a popular versifier was familiar with at least some classical poetry. Compare, for example, these images from a Mactaritan eulogy,

secureque videt strepitum Acheruntis avari (CLEA 46.4)
lege deum solemque super ac sidera novi (CLEA 46.7),

with these from Vergil,

subiecit pedibus strepitumque Acheruntis avari
(Geo 2.492)
purpureo, solemque suum sua sidera norunt (Aen 6.641).

The distinctive images, the close verbal similarity and the extent of the quotations suggest that this author knew well Vergil's poetry and deliberately and consciously borrowed from it in order to enhance his own composition.

However, other epigraphic phrases that have been identified as borrowings from classical verse, prove by their widespread and frequent occurrence, to have become formulaic, and to have passed into what may be called the tradition of epigraphic verse. For instance, the hemistich vivite felices quibus ..., which is found in eight verse inscriptions, is not certainly a quotation by each author of Vergil's Aeneid 3.493.

Other verbal similarities between epigraphic and literary verse may be instances of "reverse borrowing", in which a classical poet has taken a popular epigraphic expression and elaborated upon it. The nine verse inscriptions that assert or doubt the existence of the Manes in a hemistich such as si sunt Manes or sed quia sunt Manes are listed by Popova as borrowings from Propertius 4.7.1, sunt aliguid Manes ...; it is more likely, however, that Propertius has drawn on the epigraphic tradition, adapting a commonplace sepulchral expression to his own literary purpose. P.Colafrancesco discusses the question of priority in epigraphic and literary loci similes (1985-1986 293ff).

Many other so-called echoes are unconvincing. Hoogma, for instance, discerns the following "anlehnungen" in carmina from Roman Africa:

et linquit dulces natos et coiuge dignu (CLEA 34.5)
nec dulcis natos Veneris nec praemia moris (Aen 4.33),

and,
aditum amor erat nobis si fata dedissent
(CLEA 48.1)
nec veni nisi fata locum sedemque dedissent
(Aen 11.112).

The brevity and banality of phrases such as these tell against
the view that they have been culled by the author from a
specific classical source. The hexameter ending si fata
dedissent, for instance, is found not only in Vergil but also in
Propertius (2.1.17), Ovid, (Met 10.163) and Lucan (1.114), as
well as in several other epigraphic carmina. Such expressions
are, at most, chance echoes of poetry studied and memorized in
school; the presence of several brief echoes in one poem may be
considered to reflect the author's thorough grounding in the
classics and to illustrate the manner in which a store of
images, built up in the years under the grammaticus, could be
drawn upon, probably unconsciously, later in life in the
composition of an original epitaph or dedication. In many cases,
however, brief and indistinctive reminiscences are merely
accidental verbal similarities, attributable to the fact that
classical literary poets and popular epigraphic poets, composing
in the same language and portraying similar situations, happened
to choose similar vocabulary.

In the commentaries are noted those reminiscences that carry
distinctive images, that follow their model closely and that
extend to a hemistich or more, that is, those that can be
considered reasonably to attest an author's familiarity with a
particular classical work, and that can be examined for evidence
of his competence in versification, for, as we shall see,
epigraphic authors vary widely in their ability to integrate
portions of readymade verse into their own compositions.

189) notes that the absence of the invocation d(is) m(anibus)
s(acrum) supports Lassère's proposed date.

152 Compare the following:

barbara quem genuit tellus ... (BL 1276.1, Gaul)
Dadan[a] me genuit ... (BL 407.17, Moesia)
Tigimma te genuit ... (BL 523.1, Mactar)
Gallia me genuit ... (BL 1175.1, Rome)
Sassina quem genuit ... (BL 1320.1, Italy).

153 Vita Donati 136f, Vita Probiana 20f. The formulaic
imitation of Vergil's supposed epitaph by authors of the carmina
epigraphica is noted by several commentators (Galletier 245,
Tolman 45, Hoogma 221, Zarker 1958 216, 1968 392ff). As Zarker
points out, the actual authorship of the epitaph and the
question whether it was in fact inscribed on Vergil's tomb, or
composed and circulated after his death, is irrelevant in the
matter of popular imitation, since it was believed in antiquity
that Vergil had composed it himself, and the "element of
probable Vergilian authorship gives authority for borrowing and adaptation" (1968 393). Zarker also compares the "epitaph" of Lucan, Corduba me genuit ..., found in Riese's Anthologia Latina II.485c=668.1.

154 Compare also:

florentem rapuerunt fata ... (BL 1149.1, Italy)
quos ... rapuerunt fata ... (BL 595.3, Italy)
puellam ... fata rapuerunt ... (BL 1565.2, Moesia)
me rapuit fatum ... (BL 409.6, Italy).

155 Compare also:

vivere non potui ... (BL 1007.3, Germania)
vivere non potui ... (BL 1604.7, Africa).

156 Compare also:

oro ut praeteriens dicas s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis)
(BL 1451.3, Lusitania)
dic rogo qui transis, sit tibi terra levis
(BL 1452.1, Lusitania)
te precor ut dicas, s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis)
(BL 1457.2, Hispania).

For abbreviation of the whole, see BL 1453 and 1454, both from Lusitania:

d(ic) r(ogo) p(raeteriens) s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis)
(BL 1453)
p(raeteriens) d(icas) s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis)
(BL 1454)

157 Identical or nearly identical lines are found in BL 1152.3, 1539.7, 2138.1, all from Italy.

158 The same phrase is found in BL 1377.14 and BL 2221.3, both from Africa.

159 Pikhaus (1983 vol.III 188) argues for a late first century date on the basis of the designation Augusti libertus, which replaced Caesaris libertus about the end of the Flavian dynasty. Tiberius Claudius, she suggests, will have been freed at 30-35 years, the average age of manumission according to Weaver (1972 104), will have lived another 40 years, and died about AD 90.

160 Marec (1966 655f) dates this inscription to the fourth or early fifth century on the basis of the "Christian" content in lines 3 through 6. He views as the context of this father's expression of despair the fourth and fifth century Christian doctrine regarding the damnation of unbaptised infants, as taught, for example, by Gregory and Augustine. Degrassi (1967-
1968 52f), however, argues that the filiation suggests an earlier date ("ben difficilmente concepibile in un' iscrizione cristiana del IV o V secolo" 52), and that the content is more likely pagan than Christian, citing similar phrases from Vergil, Lucretius and Ennius. He proposes a second century date or slightly earlier or later. Picard (1970 129n.1), noting the similarity in the style of the monument and portrait of the deceased to the cippi of his dated series from Mactar, dates the poem to the first or early second century.

Local government by undecimprimi indicates a date earlier than Bisica's elevation to municipal status, which, according to Pflaum (1970 90) and Gascou (1972 126f), occurred under Hadrian. Pikhaus (1983 vol.III 38) notes that the absence of d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum) confirms this proposed date.

The H-like symbol on the stone preceding lines 9, 13, 17, 23, 32, 62, 78, 82, 86, 91, and 101 seems to indicate paragraphing.

The mausoleum is dated on stylistic grounds to the Antonine age (Saladin 1887 159). De Buck (1982 55-60) and Pikhaus (1983 vol.III 12) argue for a date in the first half of the second century on the basis of the name and military career of the deceased. According to the long prose prescript, Flavius served 33 years, which means he was at least 50 years old at retirement. If, as his name suggests, he had gained Roman citizenship from a Flavian emperor, and if he really lived 110 years, he will have died about AD 129-156.

Pikhaus 1983 202
Zarker 1960 138
Thomasson 1960 181-184

Pikhaus' proposed date is based on the presence of the invocation d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum), the use of an abbreviated gentilicum, and the notice of tribal affiliation. Although the abbreviated gentilicum is not a useful criterion, as shown above (n.38), the presence of the invocation and the notice of tribal designation do provide good termini post and ante quos (see p.13, above).

Pikhaus dates this inscription between c.120 and c.250 on the basis of the form of the monument, a stele, and the presence of the invocation dms, citing Février's observation that no funerary steles are found in Mauretania after the mid-third century (BSAF 1962 153 and MEFR 1964 115), and stating that the invocation is not found before Hadrian's reign. Février, however, shows that the appearance of dms is later in the Mauretanias than in the other African provinces, and that the earliest known belongs to an inscription dated 169. The lower
The date for Flavius' epitaph is, therefore, to be dated slightly later than Pikhaus suggests; perhaps mid-second century.

169 The reason for Pikhaus' addition of a question mark to Lassère's proposed date is unclear.

170 Beschaouch suggests a third century date based on linguistic and archeological evidence. Her first point, that the muting of final m and the merger of b and v indicate a "relatively late date", is invalidated by evidence of the muting of final m in African inscriptions, both prose and verse, from the first century AD, and by evidence of the merger of b and v from the second century AD (Acquati 1974 22). The archeological evidence, however, does support a third century date (a coin of Constantine found above; and a head of Dionysus found nearby and the design of the mosaic both dated third century).

171 Massiera _Latomus_ 4 345

The child addressed in the poem, the _puer_ of an equestrian family (_egregium genus_, line 2), is identified by Albertini as the son of T.Licinius Hierocles, procurator of Mauretania Caesariensis in AD 227, on the basis of two prose inscriptions from Caesarea, CIL 8.20996 and 9354. The former names the elder Licinius' wife, Claudia Nerviana, and his son Hierocles; the boy, it appears, was given his father's _praenomen_ and, as his _cognomen_, his mother's _gentilicium_. The second inscription, which is dated in the sixth tribunician year of Severus Alexander, puts Licinius' procuratorship in AD 227.

172 A _terminus post quem_ of 193-211 for the death of Petronius Fortunatus is provided by the notice of his centuriate in the second Parthian legion, for this was levied under Septimius Severus. Since Petronius' posts are probably listed in chronological order, and since his centuriate is listed as his penultimate post, Pikhaus proposes a date in the first half of the third century. She notes that the dating of Petronius Fortunatus' military career by Breeze (1974 264), "first half of the second century", is probably a misprint for "first half of the third century".

173 Birley 208-209

174 The name of the deceased is known from the fragments of a duplicate inscription found nearby,

... feliciter et rem  
non ... mo quaestui fraude ...  
... eis propriis natorum ...  
... riens famam claram ...  
Pinarius Mustulus  
LXXV h(ic) s(itus) e(st)  
(AE 1960.116)
The inscription continues with a second epitaph, perhaps that of Pinarius' wife. According to Picard (1955-1956 179 and 1970 149n.1), the portion of the epitaph preserved in the Byzantine wall (AE 1946.62 = CLEA 30) belonged originally to the mausoleum of the deceased; the portion of the epitaph preserved on the fragments found nearby (AE 1960.116, above) belonged to a stele on which had been inscribed a copy of the text from the mausoleum. The inscriptions, that is, preserve in duplicate the epitaph of Pinarius Mustulus. The inscription may, therefore, be compared to the two other African carmina epigraphica for which duplicate copies were made (ILA II 810 and 809 (CLEA 31), Cirta; and ILA II 4726 and 4725, Thibilis).

According to Picard, the epitaph of Pinarius Mustulus belongs to a series of nine carmina from Mactar, which, on the basis of the style of their monuments and the similarity of their content, are to be dated between 230 and 270. Picard does not specify a date for Pinarius' poem, but he does order it chronologically slightly later than that of Iulius, which he dates 230-240 (composed in senarii and therefore not included in this study), and slightly earlier than that of Beccut (CLEA 33), which he dates 250-260.

For the duplicate of Iulia Sidonia's epitaph, see ILA II 810. For the other two inscriptions for which duplicates are known, see n.175, above.

Picard's transcription of the poem (1970 126) indicates uncertainty regarding most of the letters of line 10; he reads commune est hominum funebrem [qu]erela[m...]. Mallon, however, (ibid 153, 155) claims certainty for the reading commune est hominum, but not after that point. The photograph, page 160 figure 21, suggests that Mallon's view is correct.

Diehl (ILCV 1570) takes the poem as Christian, perhaps on evidence of the term mensa, line 3. Février, however, sees no Christian sentiment in the inscription (1962 158) and notes that the word mensa is also found in pagan inscriptions (1964 129). Saxer (1980 306) interprets the work as pagan.

Acquati 1971 169-170

For another African verse inscription arranged both acrostically and telestically, see BL 1916 (= CLEA 49).

For another unusual acrostic, see AE 1937.31, from Auzia, BENE LAVA TE.

Pikhaus dates this inscription to the second half of the second or more probably third century (1983 vol.III 173) on the basis of the presence of dms, an abbreviated gentilicium in the
subscript, and the use of a detached signum in the prescript. Neither the invocation nor the abbreviated gentilicium provides a reliable dating criterion; the former is useful only as a terminus post quem (see p. 13, above), the latter not at all (see n. 38, above). The detached signum, however, does offer a very useful dating criterion. Pikhaus adduces the traditional view that its earliest use was c. 150, but notes Kajanto's observation that the earliest firmly dated example belongs to the year 202 (Kajanto 1963 34-35). Not taken into consideration in her proposed dating of Caefalius' epitaph, however, is another observation of Kajanto, namely, that most detached signa belong to the fourth century and that none are found after the very early fifth (ibid 46). The presence of a detached signum, therefore, suggests a third or fourth century date. (The latest dated example of a detached signum found by Kajanto belongs to the year AD 400 or 405. His observation in a summary sentence that detached signa disappear "at the beginning of the fourth century" seems to be a slip, which should read "at the beginning of the fifth century".)

185 Also Bassignano (1974 282-283) dates Louella's flaminate to the third century.

186 The proposed date is based on evidence from several inscriptions in the catacomb: the use of the formulae bon(a)e memori(a)e and memori(a)e; of Constantinian monograms; of the term subdiaconus; of the style of decoration; and of ceramic fragments.

187 It is difficult to determine whether the purpose of this fragmentary inscription was funerary, perhaps composed for an individual or a group of individuals, or dedicatory, perhaps commemorating the construction of an enclosing wall.

188 The apparently conflicting evidence for the religious character of this inscription, namely, the pagan content of the poem, and the Christian formulaic expression vixit in pace of the subscript, is variously interpreted. Prévot (1984 37) takes the inscription as Christian, accounting for the pagan eschatology and mythology by noting that many Christian authors of inscriptions adopt or adapt the traditional pagan view of the beyond. Picard, on the other hand, suggests that Iulia herself was not a Christian, but that when her family erected the memorial stele, they could not resist adding a brief Christian formula (1970 147-148).

189 These hyphen-like marks are visible in the photograph in Picard 1946 460, figure 3.

190 The date proposed by Gauckler (1907 400) is based on the technique and style of the mosaics. Pikhaus (1983 vol.III 60-61) explains that Lommatzsch's error in dating the text sixth century stems probably from his confusion of the seascape mosaic.
that contains the inscription with a similar seascape mosaic that overlaid it in Byzantine times. Dunbabin (268) dates the work fourth century.

191 The designation of this inscription as Christian appears to have been made (by Diehl and Monceaux) solely on the basis of its relatively late date. There are, however, no Christian symbols, formulae or content.

192 Sammac, named in line 6 and in the telestic arrangement of the poem, was an indigenous pro-Roman chieftain in the area around Tubusuctu in the second half of the fourth century. The brother of Firmus, he built a castellum, Petra, line 4, and, according to Ammianus Marcellinus (29.5.11-12), figured in the war between the Roman general Theodosius and the rebel Firmus. Ammianus calls him Salmaces; his notice of him belongs to the year AD 372.

193 The expression of Pelagian thought in the poem is, according to Gagé, typical of the fourth and fifth centuries. Pikhaus restricts the date to the fourth or early fifth century based on the observation of Courtois (1964 136n.2) that no reference to Pelagianism is found in Roman Africa after AD 427.

194 Gsell inclines to the fourth century partly on the basis of the style of the bas-reliefs on the tablet.

195 The basilica is variously dated: Romanelli (1970 381-383), to the late fourth or early fifth century on the grounds of the similarity between the mosaic pavement of this basilica and that of Alexander (CLEA 57, also in Tipasa); Christofle (1933-1936 80, to the fourth century; and Khatchatrian (1962 136), to the fifth century. Since a span of two centuries in estimated dating is acceptable for the purposes of this study, it will be sufficient to propose a date of fourth or fifth century, which allows for all these opinions.

196 There is an inconsistency in Février's transcriptions of the date: "CCCLXXI = 410" on page 84; but "CCCLXXVI" on page 85, which would be 415. The discrepancy is not resolved either by the photograph in Février, which is unclear at the point in question, or by the copy of the text given in AE (1966.563), which contains an obvious slip, "CCCLXXVI - 410".

197 The inscription is dated on the basis of the style of the mosaic (Gsell 1894 317), and on the identification of the Potentius commemorated in the poem with the Potentius known from a letter of Leo the Great as envoy to Mauretania in AD 446 (Gsell ibid, PAC 898-899 s.v. Potentius 2, Y.Duval 170). This identification is unquestioned by all commentators except Christern (1968 257), who accepts it with caution.

198 The reading was first published as PRESL (Gsell and Zeiller
1923), and completed as pr(a)es(u)l, a title among Christian clergy; Bruston (1923 23) took the L for an incomplete E and proposed pr(a)es(e)s, and argued that the poem stems from a pagan and not Christian milieu. Reexamination of the stone by Gsell and Zeiller (1925) showed the true reading, PRESB, that is, presb(yter), which attests Turasius' Christianity. The expressions in pace and depositus also indicate a Christian context.

Since this inscription recording the euergetism of Cresconius is an amalgam of two inscriptions from the "basilica of Alexander" in Tipasa (see Commentary), a terminus post quem of the late fourth or early fifth century can be posited. Furthermore, since a bishop Cresconius is known to have attended the conference of 411 in Carthage (Maier 282), it is tempting to identify him with the Cresconius who built the basilica in Cuicul, and to propose a date in the early fifth century for the building of the Cuiculitan church and the composition of its dedicatory inscription (Monceaux 1922 406-407). Cresconius of Cuicul, therefore, will have learned of the new Tipasan basilica with its dedicatory inscription either during his stay in Carthage, or perhaps on his journey home, and will have returned inspired to build a new basilica in Cuicul and to adorn it with a verse inscription. This view, however, has been challenged. Février suggests, on the basis of the style of its mosaics, that the basilica and its verse inscription belong to the sixth century. He notes that a bishop Cresconius is known in the sixth century, for he attended a council in Constantinople (BSAF 1965 89). Mandouze also denies, without explanation, that the fifth century Cresconius was dedicator of the Cuiculitan inscription (PAC 240 s.v. Cresconius 10). Both views may be accommodated if a date of "fifth or sixth century" is proposed.

The epitaph of Alexander, inscribed in a mosaic in the basilica at Tipasa, has been excluded from this study because it belongs to the commatic group of verse inscriptions; it is composed of lines of prose each of which ends in an accentually dactylic cadence. The inscription, BL 1837, reads as follows:

Alexander episcopu[s l]egibus ipsis et altaribus natus aetatibus honoribusque in aeclesia catholica functus castitatis custos karitati paceque dicatus cuius doctrina floret innumera plebs Tipasensis pauperum amator aelemosinae deditus omnis cui numquam defuere unde opus caeleste fecisset huius anima refrigerat corpus hic in pace quiescit resurrectionem expectans futuram de mortuis primam consors ut fiat sanctis in possessione regni caelestis

For example, CIL 8.21551, 21554

CIL 8.27693 and BL 1913
As DeRossi showed (1878 14), the author of this inscription copied and adapted the dedication from the basilica of St. Peter-aux-Liens in Rome (BL 912), which had been composed under the pontificate of Sixtus III (AD 432-440). Probantius is identified in PAC as a bishop of the fifth or sixth century.

The phrases semper fide and in pace quiebit suggest that the poem is Christian.

Hexameters beginning with the formula hic situs est (or hic sita est) include: BL 317.3, 445.1, 575.2, 800.4, 1142.5, 2273.1.

Picard proposes this date without explanation. The presence of a Latin cross, however, to the left of the lines, as well as a monogrammatic cross, does suggest a date not earlier than the late fifth century.

The figure named in line 5 is identified by Gauckler as the Gebamundus mentioned by Procopius (Bell Vand 1.18.1), who was charged by his uncle, the Vandal king Gelimer, with commanding a division of the Vandal army against the Byzantines at the gates of Tunis.

The dates represent the dates of the prefectures of Solomon. Durliat identifies as the victory referred to in the poem the defeat of the Mauri by Solomon in his second prefecture.

According to Duval-Prévot, the abbreviation MG may be understood either as m(a)g(ister) or as m(a)g(istratus). Magister is ambiguous for it could designate Mustelus as teacher or as commander of a division of the army (magister militum).
This bibliography consists primarily of works cited; also included are a few works not cited, but which were found useful in the preparation of the thesis.

Acquati, A. "Il vocalismo latino-volgare nelle iscrizioni africane", Acme 24 1971 155-184

Albertini, E. "Mosaïque à inscription, découverte à Tipasa", CRAI 1920 387-391


Audollent, A. Defixionum Tabellae, Paris 1904

Barbarino, J.L. The Evolution of the Latin /b/ - /u/ Merger, Chapel Hill 1978

Bonner, S.F. Education in Ancient Rome from the Elder Cato to
the Younger Pliny, London 1977


Boyance, P. "L'épitaphe de Julia Modesta et l'exégèse symbolique de Virgile", CRAI 1951 375-376


Bruston, Ch. "Lettre relative à l'interprétation d'une inscription de Djémila", BSAF 1923 260-261

Buecheler, F. Carmina Latina Epigraphica, 2 vols., Leipzig 1895, 1897

Cagnat, R. "Inscriptions inédites d'Afrique extraites des papiers de L.Renier", BCTH 1887 50-180

_________ "Sur les manuels professionnels des graveurs d'inscriptions romaines", Rev Phil 13 1889 51-65

_________ "Découvertes des brigades topographiques d'Algérie et de Tunisie, in 1896", BCTH 1896 223-286

_________ Cours d'épigraphie latine Paris 1914


Campanile, E. "Due studi sul latino volgare", L'Italia Dialettale 34 1971 1-64

Carnoy, A. Le latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions Bruxelles 1906

Castiglioni, L. "Note Lucreziane", Acme 2 1949 3-8

Chevallier, R. Epigraphie et littérature à Rome, Faenza 1972

Cholodniak, I. Carmina Sepulcralia Latina², Petropoli 1904

Christern, J. "Basilika und Memorie der heiligen Salsa in Tipasa", BAA 3 1968 193-258

_________ "Il complesso cristiano di Tebessa, architettura e decorazione", Corsi di Cultura sul Arte Ravennate e Bizantina 17 1970 103-117

Christofle, M. Rapport sur les Travaux de Fouilles et Consolidations effectuées en 1933-1934-1935-1936 par le
Service des Monuments historiques de l'Algérie, Alger 1938

Colafrancesco, P. "Un problema di convivenza: epigrafia e poesia", *Invigilata lucernis* 7-8 1985-1986 281-299


_________ *Aspetti Letterari dei Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, Bologna 1985

DeBuck, E. *Carmen epigraphicum 1552: een historisch, literair en godsdiensthistorisch commentaar* (diss.) University of Ghent 1982


Delattre, R.P.A.L. "Une grande basilique près de Sainte Monique à Carthage", *CRAI* 1916 150-164

DePacthère, F.G. *Inventaire des mosaiques de la Gaule et de l'Afrique*, (T.III Algérie), Paris 1921


Diehl, E. *De M finali epigraphica*, Leipzig 1899

_________ *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres I-III*, Berlin 1925, 1927, 1931; and Moreau, J., Marrou, H.I. *ILCV* IV, Dublin-Turici 1967


Durliat, J. *Les dédicaces d'ouvrage de défense dans l'Afrique byzantine*, Rome 1981

Duval, Noël. "Recherches sur la datation des inscriptions
chrétiennes d'Afrique en dehors de la Maurétanie", Atti del
III° Congresso internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina
1957, Rome 1959 245-262

"Les mosaiques funeraires d'Algérie compares à
celles de Tunisie", Corsi di Cultura sull'arte Ravennate e
Bizantina 17 1970 149-159

"Inscriptions byzantines de Sbeitla (Tunisie) III",
MEFR 83 1971 423-443

"Etudes d'architecture chrétienne nord-africaine",
MEFR 84 1972 1071-1172

Les églises africaines à deux absides. Vols I-II.
Paris 1971, 1973

"Comment distinguer les inscriptions byzantines
d'Afrique?", Byzantion 1981 511-532

Duval, N., and Prévot, F. Recherches archéologiques à Haïdra. I
Les inscriptions chrétiennes, Rome 1975

Duval, Y. Loca sanctorum Africae. Le culte des martyrs en
Afrique du IVe au VIIe siècle vols.I-II, Rome 1982

Elcock, W.D. The Romance Languages2 (revised with new
introduction by John N.Green), London 1975

Engstrom, E. Carmina Latina epigraphica post editam collectionem
Buechelerianam in lucem prolata (diss.), Gotoburgi 1911

Ennabli, Liliane. Les inscriptions funéraires chrétiennes de la
basilique dite de Sainte Monique à Carthage, Rome 1975

Fele, M.L., Cocco, C., Rossi, E., Flore, A. edd. Concordantiae
in Carmina Latina Epigraphica, Hildesheim 1988

Février, P.A. "Le formulaire des inscriptions funéraires datées
de la Maurétanie Césarienne orientale", BSAF 1962 452-460

"Remarques sur les inscriptions funéraires datées
de Maurétanie Césarienne orientale (IIe-Ve siècle)", MEFR
1964 105-172

"Remarques sur les mosaiques de basse époque à
Djemila (Algérie)", BSAF 1965 85-92

Fouilles de Sétif. Les basiliques chrétiennes du
quartier nord-ouest, Paris 1965

Focillon, H. "Etude sur la poésie funéraire à Rome d'après les
inscriptions", (preface to F.Plessis' Poésie latine.
Epitaphes. Textes choisis et commentaires Paris 1905 xvii-xxi)

Gaeng, Paul A. An Inquiry into Local Variations in Vulgar Latin as Reflected in the Vocalism of Christian Inscriptions, Chapel Hill 1968

__________________________
Collaps and Reorganization of the Latin Nominal Flection as Reflected in Epigraphic Sources, Potomac 1983

Gagé, J. "Une épitaphe chrétienne d'afrique", RHPhR 9 1929 377-381

Galletier, E. Etude sur la poésie funéraire romaine d'après les inscriptions, Paris 1922

Gascou, J. La politique municipale de l'empire romain en Afrique Proconsulaire de Trajan à Septim-Sévere, Rome 1972

Gauckler, P. "Une note sur les travaux d'aménagement de la source romaine de Medoudja", BCTH 1899 clxviii-clxx

__________________________
"Rapport sur des inscriptions latines découvertes en Tunisie de 1900-1905", Nouvelles archives et missions scientifiques 15 1907 283-589

__________________________
"Les thermes de Gebamund à Tunis", CRAI 1907 790-795


Gerard, M. "Découverte d'une mosaïque", BCTH 1907 ccxlii-ccxlvi

Gordon, A.E. Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy, Berkeley 1983

Grandgent, C.H. An Introduction to Vulgar Latin, Boston 1907

Grenier, A. "Deux inscriptions métriques d'Afrique", MEFR 1905 63-79

Groag, E., Stein, A., Petersen, L. Prosopographia imperii Romani saecularum I.II.III² Berlin 1933-1970

Gsell, St. "Tipasa. Ville de la Maurétanie césarienne" MEFR 1894 291-450

__________________________
"Satafis et Thamalla", MEFR 1895 33-70

__________________________
"Inscriptions inédites de l'Algérie", BCTH 1896 156-220
"Note sur une inscription d'Ighzer-Amokrane (Kabylie)", CRAI 1901 170-172

Les monuments antiques de l'Algérie I-II, Paris 1901

"La basilique chrétienne de Mdaourouch" BCTH 1915-1916 222-234

"Inscription trouvée dans la région de Sétif", BCTH 1915-1916 ccxxxvii-ccxxxviii


"Virgile et les Africains", Cinquantenaire de la Faculté des lettres d'Alger: 1881-1931 1932 5-42

Gsell, St., and Pflaum, H.G. Inscriptions latines de l'Algérie I-II.1, Paris 1922, 1957; ILA II.2, Algiers 1976

Gsell, St., and Zeiller, J. "Inscription recemment découverte à Djemila, l'ancienne Cuicul", BSAF 1923 105-109

"Inscription chrétienne de Djemila", BSAF 1925 228-229

Hall, R.G., and Oberhelman, S.M. "A New Statistical Analysis of Accentual Prose Rhythms in Imperial Latin Authors", CP 79 1984 114-130

"Meter in Accentual Clausulae of Late Imperial Latin Prose", CP 80 1985 214-227

"Rhythmic Clausulae in the Codex Theodosianus and the Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum Pertinentes", CQ 35 1985 201-214

"Internal Clausulae in Late Latin Prose as Evidence for the Displacement of Metre by Word-Stress", CQ 36 1986 508-526

Harris, J.M. A Study of the Hexameters in the Carmina Epigraphica of Bücheler (diss), Washington University, St.Louis, Missouri 1936

Hoffmann, D. Das spätromische Bewegungsheer und die Notitia Dignitatum, Dusseldorf 1969

Hoffmann, E. De Titulis Africae Latinis Quaestiones Phoneticae (diss.), Breslau 1907

Hoogma, R.P. Der Einfluss Vergils auf die Carmina Latina Epigraphica, Amsterdam 1959

Housman, A.E. "Prosody and Method", CQ 21 1927 1-12


Joly, D. "Quelques souvenirs du dernier chant de l'Enéide", Hommages M. Renard vol. I (Collection Latomus CI), Brussels 1969 470-492


Keil, H. Grammatici Latini, 8 vols., Leipzig 1857-1870

Kent, R.G. "Likes and Dislikes in Elision and the Vergilian Appendix", TAPA 54 1923 137-158


Kleberg, T. "Juvenalis in the Carmina latina epigraphica", Eranos 44 1946 421-425

Klubert, C. La grammaire latine selon les grammairiens latins du IVe et du Ve siècle, Paris 1908


Lassère, J.-M. Ubique Populus, Paris 1977
Lattimore, R. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana 1942


Lebel, P. "Latin vulgaire et fautes de graveurs dans des inscriptions gallo-romaines", *Revue archéologique de l'est et du centre-est* 1965 115-120


Manuel d'épigraphie chrétienne d'après les marbres de la Gaule Paris 1869

L'épigraphie chrétienne en Gaule et dans l'Afrique romaine Paris 1890

Leschi, L. "Rapport sur des fouilles exécutées récemment à Tipasa (Maurétanie Césarienne)", *BCTH* 1938-1940 422-431

Etudes d'épigraphie, d'archéologie et d'histoire africaines, Paris 1957

Lier, B. "Topica carminum sepulcrailum latinorum", *Philologus* 62 1903 445-477

Lissberger, E. *Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in den Carmina epigraphica* Tubingen 1934

Löfstedt, E. "Reminiscence and Imitation", *Eranos* 47 1949 148-164

Lommatzsch, E. *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* III, Leipzig 1926

Maier, J.L. *L'Episcopat de l'Afrique romaine, vandale et byzantine*, Rome 1973

Mandouze, A. *Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne* (303-533), Paris 1982

Marcillet-Jaubert, J. "Philologie et inscriptions", *REA* 1960 362-382

Marec, E. "Epitaphe d'une enfant, morte en bas âge", in *Mélanges d'archéologie, d'épigraphie et d'histoire offerts à J.Carcopino*, Paris 1966, 651-656

Mariner Bigorra, S. "'Loci Similes' virgilianos en epígrafes hispánicos de reciente aparicion" *Emerita* 28 1960 317-326

Marrou, H.I. "Epitaphe chrétienne d'Hippone à réminiscences virgilienes", *Libyca* 1 1953 215-230
A History of Education in Antiquity
(trans. from the French by G. Lamb), New York 1956

Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique,
Paris 1958

"Deux inscriptions métriques d'Afrique", REL 44 1966 372-376

"Deux inscriptions chrétiennes", BAA 2 1968 343-351

Massiera, P. "Inscriptions de Perigotville", BCTH 1943-1945 396-398

Merlin, A. "Fouilles à Dougga", BCTH 1901 374-412

"Deux inscriptions funéraires", BCTH 1907 ccliv-cclvii

Inscriptions latines de la Tunisie, Paris 1944


Monceaux, P. "Enquête sur l'épigraphie chrétienne d'Afrique", RA 4.2, 1903 59-90. 240-256; ibid 4.3 1904 354-373; ibid 4.7 1906 177-192, 260-279, 461-475; ibid 4.8 1906 126-142, 297-310

"Les inscriptions chrétiennes de Carthage.
Recherches sur la chronologie de quelques formules et symboles", Recueil des mémoires du centenaire de la société nationale des antiquaires de France 1804-1904 1904 307-313

Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne,
vol. III, Paris 1905

Mémoires présentées par divers savants à l'académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres XII.1, Paris 1908 161-339

"Rapport sur une inscription métrique de Musée de Sétif", BCTH 1915 ccxxxvii-ccxxxviii

"Découverte d'un groupe d'édifices chrétiens à Djemila", CRAI 1922 380-407

Munno, G. "Le pretese fonti delle iscrizioni funerarie latine", AR 1911 359-366

Norberg, D. *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale* Stockholm 1958

Nilsson, M.P. "A propos d'une inscription de Mactar", *Eranos* 46 1948 159-161


Palmer, L.R. *The Latin Language*, London 1954

Pflaum, H.G. "La romanisation de l'ancien territoire de la Carthage punique à la lumière des découvertes épigraphe récentes", *Ant Afr* IV 1970 75-117

---


---

"La basilique funéraire de Julius Piso à Mactar", *CRAI* 1945 185-212

---

"Le mysticisme africain", *CRAI* 1946 443-466

---

"Rapport sur l'archéologie romaine en Tunisie pendant le second semestre 1948", *BCTH* 1946-1949 619-643

---

"Rapport sur l'archéologie romaine en Tunisie pendant le second semestre 1949", *BCTH* 1950 74-89

---

"Rapport sur l'archéologie romaine en Tunisie dans le premier semestre 1950", *BCTH* 1950 154-162

---

"Rapport sur l'archéologie romaine en Tunisie pendant l'année 1951", *BCTH* 1951-1952 189-217

---

"L'archéologie romaine en Tunisie en 1952" *BCTH* 1953 39-59

---


---

"La chronologie et l'évolution stylistique des monuments funéraires de Mactar (Tunisie)", *BCTH* 1965-1966 159-160

Picard, G-Ch., Le Bonniec, H., Mallon, J. "Le Cippe de Beccut",
Ant Afr 4 1970 125-164

Piganiol, A., and Laurent-Vibert, R. "Recherches archéologiques à Ammaedara (Haidra)", MEFR 1912 69-232

Pikhaus, D. Levensbeschouwing en Milieu in de Latijnse Metrische Inscriptions, Brussels 1978


Latijnse Metrische Inscriptions uit Romeins Africa (1e - VIe eeuw) (diss.), Ghent 1983

"La poésie épigraphique latine. Quelques points de vue nouveaux", Mélanges J. Veremans 1986

"Literary Activity in the Provinces: The Carmina Latina Epigraphica from Roman Africa (1st - VIth Century)", Euphrosyne 15 1987 171-194

Platnauer, M. Latin Elegiac Verse, Cambridge 1951

Plessis, F. Epitaphes. Textes choisis et commentaires, Paris 1905

Poinssot, L. and Feuille, G.-L. "Inscriptions chrétiennes d'Ammaedara (Haidra)", BCTH 1941-1942 601-639

Popova, Z. "Influence de Tibulle sur Carmina Sepulchralia Latina Epigraphica" 61 1967 103-172 (the Popova articles are all in Bulgarian with a French résumé)


Prévot, F. Recherches archéologiques franco-tunisiennes à Mactar. V Les inscriptions chrétiennes, Rome 1984

Pringle, D. The Defence of Byzantine Africa from Justinian to the Arab Conquest, Oxford 1981

Pulgram, E. Latin-Romance Phonology: Prosodics and Metrics, Munich 1975

Romanelli, P. Topografia e archeologia dell'Africa romana,
Torino 1970

Saladin, M. "Kasrine (Cillium)", Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires XIII series 3, 1887 155-165

Sanders, G. "Le dossier quantitatif de l'épigraphie latine versifiée", AC L 1981 707-720

Saxer, V. Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles, Paris 1980

Schmitter, A. "Inscriptions inédites de Cherchell", Bulletin épigraphique de la Gaule III 1893 89-93

Shipley, F.W. "Hiatus, Elision, Caesura, in Virgil's Hexameter", TAPA 54 1923 137-158


Spence, N.C.W. "Quantity and Quality in the Vowel-System of Vulgar Latin", Word 21 1965 1ff

"A Further Note on the Monophthongization of Latin AE", TPS 1974 81-85

Sturtevant, E.H. The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin², Philadelphia 1940


Susini, G. The Roman Stonecutter (translated from the Italian by E.Badian), Oxford 1973

Thomasson, B.E. Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus, Lund 1960

Tolman, J.A. A Study of the Sepulchral Inscriptions in Buecheler's Carmina Latina Epigraphica, Chicago 1910


Väänänen, V. Etude sur le texte et la langue des "Tablettes Albertini", Helsinki 1965

Le Latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes³, Berlin 1966

Introduction au latin vulgaire³, Paris 1981

Vernier, L. "Les inscriptions métriques de l'Afrique romaine"
Vincent, N. "Latin", in The Romance Languages, London 1988 (26-78)

Vroom, H. Le Psaume abécédaire de St. Augustin et la poésie latine rhythmique Nijmegen 1933

Weaver, P.R.C. Familia Caesaris, Cambridge 1972

Webster, G. The Roman Imperial Army of the First and Second Centuries A.D., London 1969


——— "Acrostic CLE", Orpheus III 1966 125-151

——— "A Possible Vergilian Parody of the CLE", Helikon 1968 517-522

APPENDIX I

ANALYSES OF VERSIFICATION

Each carmen is scanned according to the metric and prosodic norms of classical quantitative verse. Alterations in syllabic quantity required by the meter are limited to those that were available to authors through the application of classical licences. Such alterations in syllabic quantity are indicated.

CLEA 1. EPITAPH OF DAPHNIS

Dāphnīs ē- gō Hērmē- tīs || cōn- iūnīx sum | lībērā | fācta
Cum dōmī- nūs vel- lēt || prī- m(m) Hērmēs | lībēr ut | ēssēt
fātō ēgo | fāctā prī- ēr || fātō ēgo | rāptā prī- ēr
quaē tūūlī | quōd gēmū- ī || gēmī- tūs vīrō | saēpē rē- līqui
quaē dōmī- nō Īnvī- tō || vī- tām dēdī | prōxīmē | nātō
nūnc quīs ā- lēt nā- tūm || quīs | vītāe | lōngā mī- nīstrāt
mē Stŷgā | quōd rāpū- īt || tām cītō ē- nī(m) ā sūpē- rōs

CLEA 2. EPITAPH OF MARCUS FURIUS HERENNUS

Bāetīcā | mē gēnū | īt || tēl- lūs cūpī- dūs Liby- āe cōg-
| nōscērē | fīnēs
Caesārē- āe vē- nī || cūpī- dūs fātā | mē rāpū- ērē (mēā)
et mē iācēō fidūs Ignōtīs vīxsī ānnīs quīnquā qintā
vīvērē | dūm līcū- īt || cā- rūs mē- īs ēt | piūs vīx- sī ēt
| īn | omnīā | sōllērs
ītē mē- ī sīnē | mē || ād mēōs ītē
CLEA 3. EPITAPH OF A FREEDMAN OF THE EMPEROR CLAUDIUS

tū qui | praetēri- | ēns || spec- | tās mōnī- | mēntūm | mēūm
   āspīcē | Īndīg- | nāns || hīc dā- | tā(m) mōr- | tē(m)

CLEA 4. EPITAPH OF MANIA SECUNDA

Mānīā | pūpā iā- | cēt || pāu- | cōs dī- | lēctā per | ānnōs
   quām pātēr | ādīdū- | ē || dūm | dēflēt | ūpsē quē- | rēllā est
   nām hānc tūlē- | rāt gēnī- | tōr | dī- | vīnāe | lūcīs ǎd | őrās
dūlciūs | ūt pōs- | sēt | cūm | spē spēm | prīndērē | māgnā
   āntīcī- | pātē fū- | gā || tēnē- | brīs sē | cōndīdīt | āltīs
   nōn nās- | cī mīsē- | rāe || quantō ērāt | ūtilī- | ūs

CLEA 5. EPITAPH OF ZOPYRUS

ōssā qui- | ētā prē- | cōr || Zōpy- | rī rēquī- | ēsquītō īn | ūrnā
   et sīt hū- | mūs cīnē- | rī || nōn ōnē- | rōsā lē- | vī

CLEA 6. EPITAPH OF MARCUS FLAVONIUS AVITUS

hīc sītūs | ēst Mār- | cūs || Flā- | vōnīūs | Īllē mā- | gīstēr
   ānnōs | quī cēn- | tūm || vī- | xīt bēnē | sēmpēr Ā- | vītūs
CLEA 7. EPITAPH OF TITUS FLAVIUS SECUNDUS

sint licet | exigu- | ae | fugi- | entia | tempora | vitae
parvauque | raptot- | rum | cito | transeat | hora di- | erum
mergat et | Elysi- | Is | mor- | tali- | corpore | terris
adsidue- | rup- | to | Lache- | sis male | consci- | penso
iam tamen | Inv- | est | blan- | dae radi- | onis i- | mago
per quam | prol- | tos | honi- | nes in | tempora | plur-
longior | excipi- | at | memo- | radi- | multaque | servet
secum | per titu- | los | man- | suris | fortius | annis
ecce re- | cens plie | tas | om- | nil placi- | turam fai- | vere
ingen- | tem fa- | mae | nume- | rum cum | laude me- | retur
exem- | plio iam | plena no- | vo | quam | Flavius | alto
movere Set | cundus a- | gens | patri- | sig- | navit hoi- | nore
quis non | iam pro- | nis | ani- | mi vir- | tultius | adsit
qui non | hoc mi- | retur o- | pus | fui- | sasque vi- | dend
diviti- | as stup- | at | tan- | tos se | cernere | census
per quos | aetheri- | as | sur- | gust moini- | menta per | aur-
haec est | fortius | nae | melli- | us lau- | danda fai- | cultas
sic sibi | perpetu- | as | faci- | unt im | pendia | sedes
sic im- | morta- | les | sic hae- | bere pe- | cuni- | more
aeter- | no quoti- | ens | stabi- | lis bene | figitur | usu
videmuit | Illae fu- | ro- | nimi- | o qui | ducitur | aur-
quem tranhit | argen- | ti | ve- | nalis | sanguin- | candor
videmuit | et fu | sae | va- | nis in a- | moribus | errans
gloria | luxuri- | ae | per- | grinae | quaerere | magno
quaedid- | cit ves- | tes | gem- | masque nis | tore pla- | centes
aūt āb ē- | rūthrae- | ō | vēnī- | ēntīā | mūnērā | flūctū 26
quam laē- | dūnt gēn- | tēs | vārī- | ō cēr- | tāmīne | rērūm
Graēciā | cūm pūē- | rīs | Hīs- | pānīa | Pāllādōs | ūsū
vēnā- | tū Līby- | āe | tēl- | lūs orī- | ēntīs ā- | mōmō
Aēgyp- | tōs Phārī- | īs | lēvī- | tātībūs | ārtībūs | āctīs 30
Gāllīā | sēmpēr ō- | vāns | dī- | vēs Cām- | pānīa | vīnō
haec cītō | dēfīci- | ūnt | ēt hā- | bēnt brēvē | mūnūs ā- | mōrīs
mōmēn- | tīs dām- | nātā sū- | īs | sēt | sī quīs ād | ōmēs
rēspīcī- | āt vī- | tāe | cā- | sūs hōmī- | nēmquē lā- | bōrēt
mētī- | rī brēvī- | tātē sū- | ā | tūnc | crēdērē | dīscēt 35
nīl ālī- | ĳt mēlī- | ūs | fē- | rī nīsī | vīrībūs | āevī
quōt pōs- | sīt dū- | rārē dī- | ĵu | sūb hō- | nōrē dē- | ōrūm
nūnc ēgō | nōn dūbī- | tēm | tācī- | tīs āchē- | rōntōs īn |
ūmbrīs
sī pōst | fātā mā- | nēnt | sēn- | sūs gāu- | dērē pā- | rēntēm 39
saēpē Sē- | cūndē tū- | ūm | rēlī- | quās ēt | spērnerē | tūrmās
quōd sciāt | hīc tān- | tām | fācī- | ēm sūpē- | rēssē sē- |
pūlchrī
pērpētū- | a nōvī- | tātē sū- | ĵi | sīc | stārē nī- | tēntēs
cōnsēn- | sūs lāpī- | dūm | sīc | dē rā- | dīcē lē- | vātōs
īn mēlī- | ūs crē- | vīssē grā- | dūs | ūt ēt | āngūlūs | ōmnīs
sīc quāsī | mōllī- | taē- | dūc- | tūs sīt | stāmīnē | cērā 45
mōbīlī- | būs sīg- | nīs | hīlā- | rīs scālp- | tūrā nō- | vātūr
ēt līcēt | ātsūdū- | ē | prōbēt | hōs vāgā | tūrbā lā- | bōrēs
lūcēn- | tēs stūpē- | āt | pārī- | tēr pēn- | dērē cō- | ēmnās
quīt cūm | mīlītī- | aē | tītū- | lōs īp- | sūmquē pā- | rēntēm
nūmīnī- | būs dēdē- | rīs | haec | gāudiā | saēpē nī- | tēntēm 50
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quaē quōn- | dām dēdīt | Īpsē lō- | cō | | dūm | mūnerā | Bācchī
mūltā crē- | āt prī- | māsquē cū- | pīt | | cōm- | pōnerē | vītēs
ēt nēmūs | ēxor- | nāt | | rēvō- | cātīs | saēpiūs | ūndīs
pēmil- | tānt mīhī | fātā lō- | quī | | nōc- | tīsquē tī- | mēndaē
rēgnā- | tōr Stỹgī- | ūs | | sīc | īmmore- | tālis hā- | bērī
iām dē- | bēt pātēr | ēccē tū- | ūs | | Dī- | tīsquē rē- | līctī
trīstēm | dēserū- | īssē dō- | mūm | | dūm | tēmpōrē | tōtō
māvōlt | haec mōnī- | mentā sē- | quī | | scrīp- | tīsquē pēr |
| | | | | | | | | | | | aēvōm
vīvērē | nōminī- | būs | | sólī- | tīs īn- | sīstērē | lūcis
adsidū- | ē pātri- | ās | | hīnc | cēnrērē | dūlicērē | ārēces
quōsquē dē- | dīt nā- | tīs || pōpē | sēmpēr hā- | bērē pē- | nātēs
fōrsitān | haec mūl- | tī | | vā- | nō sēr- | mōnē fē- | rēntēs
ventūr- | āē cītī- | ūs | | dī- | cānt praē- | sāgā | mōrtīs
sī quīs | dūm vī- | vīt | | pō- | nāt mōnī- | mentā fū- | tūrīs
tēmpōrī- | būs mīhī | nōn | | tā- | lēs sūnt | pēctōrē | sēnsūs
sēt pūtō | sēcūr- | ās | | fīē- | rī quī- | cūmquē pā- | rārē
aētēr- | nām vōl- | vērē dō- | mūm | | cēr- | tōsquē rī- | gōrē
nūmquām | lāpsū- | rōs | | vī- | tae dē- | fīgērē | mūrōs
fātēs | cērē vī- | ā est | | nēquē | sē pēr | stāmīnā | mūtāt
Ātropōs | ūt prī- | mō | | coē- | pīt dē- | cūrrērē | filō
credē Sē- | θundē mī- | hī | | pēn- | sātōs | ìbis īn | ānnōs
sēt sē- | cūrūs e- | rīs | | sēt | tōtō | pēctōrē | dīvēs
dūm nūl- | lī grāvis | ēssē pō- | tēs | | nēc | plēnā lā- | bōrē
tēstā- | mentā fā- | cīs | | tūūs | hōc dūm | nōn tīmēt | hērēs
ūt sīc | aēdīfī- | cēt | | iām | nūnc quōd- | cūmquē rē- | līnquēs
tōtūm | pērvēnī- | ēt | | tūā | quō vōlēt | īrē vō- | lūntās
sed revō- | cāt mē | cūr- | ōpē- | rīs cēl- | sīque dē- | cōrēs
stat sūb- | līmīs hō- | nōr- | vī- | cīnaqē- | nūbīlā | pūlsāt
ēt so- | līs mē- | tītūr i- | tēr- | sī- | iūngēre | mōntēs
fōrtē vē- | līnt ōcū- | lī- | vīn- | cūntūr īn- | ōrdīnē | cōllēs 80
sī vide- | ās cām- | pōs- | īn- | frā iācēt | ābdītā | tēllūs
nōn sīc | Rōmūlē- | ās- | ēx- | ērē cō- | lōssōs īn- | ārcēs
dīcitūr | aūt cīr- | cī- | ābē- | līscūs īn- | āūrās
nec sīc | sīstrīgē- | rī- | dē- | mōnstrāt | pērvīā | Nīlī
dūm sūā | pērspicū- | īs- | āpē- | Īt Phārōs | aēquōrā |
flāmmīs 85
quīd nōn- | dīctā fā- | cīt- | pīē- | tās lāpīs | ēccē fō- |
rātūs
lūmīnī- | būs mūl- | tīs | hōr- | tātūr | cūrrērē | blāndās
Īntūs ā- | pēs ēt | cērīnē- | ōs- | cōm- | pōnerē | nīdōs
ūt sēm- | pēr dōmūs | haēc | Thīm- | braēō | nēctārē | dūlcīs
sūdēt | flōrīsā- | pōs- | dūm | dānt nōvā | mēllā lī- | quōrēs
hūc ītē- | rūm Pīē- | tās- | vēnē- | rāndās | ērīgē | mēntēs 91
ēt mēa | quō nōs- | tī- | cārminā | mōrē fō- | vē
ēccē Sē- | cūndūs ā- | dēst- | ītē- | rūm quī | pēctōrē | sāntō
nōn mōnī- | mēntā pā- | trī- | sēd nōvā | tēmplā dē- | dīt
quō nunc | Cāllīō- | pē- | gēmī- | nō mē | lūmīte | cōgīs 95
quās iām | trānse- | ĭ- | rūsūs ā- | dīrē vī- | ās
nēmpē fū- | Īt nō- | bīs- | ōpē- | rīs dēs- | cripitiō | māgni
dīxīmūs- | ēt iūnc- | tīs- | sāxā pō- | lītā lō- | cīs
circūī- | tūs nēmō- | rūm | cūr- | rēntēs | dūlcītēr | ūndēs
ātquē rē- | pōrtān- | tēs- | mēllā frē- | quēntēr ā- | pēr
hoc tāmēn | hoc sō- | lūm | nōs- | traē pūtō | défuit | ārtī
CLEA 8. EPITAPH OF MINICIA PRIMA

prīm° æ-| tātē tū-| ā | | rāp-| tā ḍs kā-| rīssīmā | cóniūnx
ānnīs | bīs dē-| nīs | | et | sex tībī | vītā prō-| bātā ēst
Rōmā tī-| bī gēnūs | ēst | | fā-| tūm fuīt | ĵt Libys | ēssēs
dūcēris | ād Stygī-| ām | | nūnc mīsē-| rānda rā-| tēm
Īnquē tū-| ō trīs-| tīs | | vēr-| sātūr | pēctōre | Lēthē
ūt nōn | cógnōs-| cās | | mē mīsē-| rānda pī-| ūm
mūnūs ē-| rāt Fōr-| tūnā tū-| ūm | | sēr-| vārē pū-| dīcām
ēt pōtē-| rās am-| bōs | | Įtālī-| āe dārē | tū
ā mūl-| tīs flē-| tū | | rēnō-| vāverīs | ĭ bōnā | sīmplēx
cūm tē īn | cōnspēc-| tū | | nōn hābē-| ām cōmī- | tēm

CLEA 9. EPITAPH OF NORBANIA SATURNINA

ōrt° ūt | fāmā prō-| bāt | | mēnō-| rānda | dīvītē | Rōmā
duōdēci | ēs bī-| nōs | | sūpē-| rāvī | lūmīnīs | ānnōs
bīs sē-| nēm ex nūmē-| rō | | pār-| tēm quām | dīxīmūs | ānnī
CLEA 10. DEDICATION TO THE Dalmatian God Medaurus

moenia quī Rī- sīnnī | Ae- acia | quī colis | arcem
Delmāti- ae nos- tri | publice Lar pōpu- lī
sancē Mē- daure dō- mi et | sanct- te hīc nām | templā quo-
que Īstā

visē prē- cor par- vā | magnus in | effigi- ā
succēs- sus laē- vā | sōnī- pes quī | surgit in | āuras
alterā dum le- tum | librāt āb | aurē mā- nūs
tālem te cōn- sul | iām desīg- nātūs in | īstā
sedē lō- cat vēnē- rāns | īllē tū- ĩs ...
nōtūs Grādi- vō | bel- ī vētūs | āc tībī Caesār
Marcē in prīmō- rī | clārūs ū- bīquē acī- ē

CLEA 11. EPITAPH OF VARIUS FRONTONIANUS

hīc sitūs est Vārī- ūs | cog- nōmine Frōntōni- ānūs
quēm cōn- iūnx lēpī- dā | pōsū- īt cor- nēlia | Gālla
dulciā restitū- ens | vētē- rīs sō- lāciā | vītae
marmōrē- os vōl- tūs | stātū- īt | occū- lōs anī- mūmque
lōngiūs ut ka- rā | pōs- sēt sātū- rāre fī- gūra
CLEA 12. EPITAPH OF PASSIENA

mānībūs | hīc plācī- | dīs | | Pāss- | īēnā | căstā quī- | ēscīt
quīncue | ēt | quādra- | qīntā vī- | xīt | | pīa | lārgā bē- | nīgnā
hōc sībī | cōstītū- | ūnt | | pāt- | rēs frāt- | rēsque sē- | pūlcrūm

CLEA 13. EPITAPH OF LUCIUS CASSIUS FAUSTUS

hōmō bō- | nūs rēbus | hōminī- | būsque | pērncēs- | săriūs
quam quaē- | rīt pātrī- | aē | | māxīmūs | hīc pōpū- | lūs
tērrā tē- | gīt fē- | līx | | lūx | attēm īn- | grātā rē- | līquīt

CLEA 14. EPITAPH OF NERIA PRIMIGENIA

aēquās | optā- | vī | | sē- | dēs iū- | cūnda mā- | rītō (pērvēnī)
fīliūs | hōc vōlū- | īt | | quī mīhi | cārus ē- | rāt

CLEA 15. EPITAPH OF GAIUS IULIUS FELIX

nōn dīg- | nē Fē- | līx | | cītō | vītām cār- | uīstī mī- | sēlē
vīvērē | dēbuē- | rās | | ān- | nīs fērē | cēntūm lī- | cēbāt
sī | sūnt mā- | nēs | | sīt tībī | tērrā lē- | vīs
CLEA 16. EPITAPH OF MEVIA FELICITAS

non dig- | nă  | con- | iūx  | cītō | vīta [...] cre- | vīstī mī- | sēllā
vīvērē | dēbūē- | rās  | ān- | nīs fērē | centū(m) lī- | cēbāt
fuīt e- | nīm fōr- | mā  | cer- | tīr mō- | rēsqué fā- | cūndī
fuīt et pūdīcitā quām īn ālīis nec fuīsse dicām nec ēsse
cōntēndām
set quīā | sūnt mā- | nēs  | sīt tībī | terrā lē- | vis 5

---

CLEA 17. EPITAPH OF IULIA PAULA

ōmnēs | vīcīs- | tī  | specī- | ē doc- | trīnā pū- |  ēlla
Iūlīā | cārā mī- | hī  | fā- | tīs ab- | dūctā pā- | terrīs
aūro | nīl ālī- | ūt  | pretī- | ōsīus | ātque cū- | līndō
nīl Tūrī- | o su- | cō  | fōr- | mōsīus | ādque Lā- | cūnē
mārmōrē | nīl Pārī- | o  | splēn- | dēntīus | ādque Ĉā- | rīsto 5
nīl fōr- | mā mēlī- | ūs  | seū | pūlchriūs | ēssē lī- | cēbāt
lānīfī- | cā  | nūl- | lā  | pōtū- | ît con- | tende<t> ā- | rāchnē
cāntū | Sīrē- | nās  | Pān- | dīōnī- | dāsque sō- | rōrēs
ēt specī- | ē sūpēr- | āstī quaē | sūnt  | sūpēr | ōmnīā | dīctā
tū quaē | Graūgē- | nō  | sātā | ēs  | hē- | rōē pā- | rēnte 10
nātā bīs | octō- | nōs  | le- | tālī | funerē | rāptā
hoc sītā | nūnc iācē- | o  | Iūlīā | Paulā rō- | go

---

CLEA 18. EPITAPH OF VIBIA

cērtā- | vī te- | cūm  | con- | iūnx pīē- | tātē vīr- | tūtē
frūgāliī- tātē ēt | āmō- rē | sēd | pērīlī | cūncīs
haēc sōrs | cōncē- datūr

CLEA 19. EPITAPH OF VITALIS

dūm sūm | Vītā- līs | ēt | vīvō ēgō | fēcī sē- | pūlcrhūm
ādquē mē- | ōs vēr- | sūs | dūm | trāssēō | pērlēgō ēt | īpsē
dīplōmā | cīrca- vī | tō- | tām rēgī- | ōnē(m) pē- | dēstrēm
ēt cānī- | būs prēn- | dī | lēpō- | rēs ēt | dēnīque | vūlpēs
pōstēā | pōtiō- | nēs | cālī- | cīs pēr- | dūxī lī- | bēntēr
mūltā iū- | vēntū- | tīs | fē- | cī quīā | sūm mōrī- | tūrūs
quīsquē sa- | pīs iūvē- | nīs | vī- | vō tībī | pōnē sē- | pūlcrhūm

CLEA 20. EPITAPH OF PRISCILLA

ēxīmī- | ā specī- ē | iācēt | hīc Prīs- | cīlā pū- | ēlā
sēx ēt | vīgīn- | tī | sē- | cūm quaē | pērtūlīt | ānnōs
hānc frā- | trēs pīē- | tātē pā- | rī | maē- | stīquē sō- | rōrēm
sedībūs | Elīsī- | īs | condīdē- | rūnt tūmū- | lō

CLEA 21. EPITAPH OF THE CHILD OF A SLAVE

nōmen | nōn dī- cō | nēc | quōd | vīxērīt | ānnīs
nē dōlōr | Im mēn- | tēm | cūm lēgī- | mūs mānē- | āt
Infāns | dulcīs ē- | rās | sēd | tempōrē | pārvō
mōrs vī- | tām vī- | cīt | nē | lībēr- | tātēm tē- | nērēs
he[.]iu | nōn dōlōr | ēst | āt quēm ā- | mās pērē- | āt
nūnc mōrs | pērpētū- | ā | lībēr- | tātēm dē- | dīt
CLEA 22. EPITAPH OF IULIA FORTUNATA

castā bona | īnviō- | lāns | | rārum | hōc ā | coniūge | mūnūs
Fōrtū- | nātā tī- | bī | | sīc placēt | Hārdāli- | ā
nōminē | dīgnā mē- | ā | | quōd | tū mīhi | kārē sū- | pērstēs
nātō- | rūm nā- | tīs | | tē īncōlū- | mī vīgū- | ā

CLEA 23. EPITAPH OF TITUS FLAVIUS PUDENS MAXIMIANUS

Flāviūs | hīc sitūs | est | | prōa- | vūs quī | tempōrā | vitae
plūrā sē- | nēx nūmē- | rāns | | mērū- | ĕt | | hōc | saēpē vō- | cārī
vīxīt ēd | ēxēm- | plūm | | vī- | tae pōtē- | rātquē nē- | pōtūm
dīcī sī- | mūl vīr- | tūtē pā- | tēr | | nām | saēpē sō- | lēbāt
ē[.] āē- | quō caēlē- | rī | | rī- | vōs trāns- | cēndērē | māgnōs 5
nām cānī- | būs sēnī- | ōr | | lēpō- | rēm mōn- | strābāt ēt | īpsē
sīc fōr- | tīs cēn- | tūm | | nūmē- | rābāt | tempōrā | vitae
hōs ēgō | iām prōa- | vō | | vēr- | sūs pātēr | īpsē nē- | pōsquē
tēstān- | tēs vī- | tām | | mūl- | tā | | pēr | saēcūlā | mīsī

CLEA 24. EPITAPH OF GAIUS VIBIUS COSMUS

tū quī | praētērī- | ēns | | stās | spectās | exitūm | mortēm
(mōnīmentī mēī)
aspīcē | quam dīg- | nā | | sīt dātā | vitā mī- | hī
quīnque ēt | trīgīn- | tā | | ān- | nīs vī- | xī ēt | fūī

CLEA 25. EPITAPH OF SITTIA

quisquis ā- | mat cōn- | iūnx | | hōc | ēxēm- | plō cōn- |
CLEA 26. DEDICATION OF THE FRIGIDARIUM OF BATHS AT SULLECTHUM

ēn per- | fectā ci- | tō | Bai̯- | ārū(m) | grātā vō- | lūptās
ūndān- | tēsquē flū- | unt | ā- | quae sa- | xī de | rūpē sūb | ōmā
nīsibūs | hīc nōs- | trīs | prō- | strātūs | lībor ān- | hēlāt
quīsquīs ā- | māt frā- | trūm | vēnī- | at mē- | cūmquē laē- | tētūr

CLEA 27. DEDICATION TO TITUS LICINIUS CLAUDIUS HIEROCLES

İncīpē | parvē pu- | ēr | studī- | Is supē- | rārē pā- | rēntēm
ēgreği- | umquē gē- | nūs | prōpri- | Is vīr- | tūtībus | ōrṇā

CLEA 28. EPITAPH OF PETRONIUS FORTUNATUS

tū nī | scīs quān- | tīs | vi- | tām dē- | dūxērit | ānnīs
ā mē | nōn dīsc- | cēs | tītū- | lūs tībī | tāliā | dīcāt
vōcī | praepōsī- | tūs | nōs- | ētē quī | dē sūpēr | īnstāt
İndē tī- | bī sī | fortē lī- | bēt | pēr- | cūrrērē | cūntā
āspīcē | dīcē- | mūs | quān- | tō sē | vērtīcē | mōles
İntūlīt | Įn nū- | bēm | stēl- | lāntī | prōxīmā | cālō
ūt so- | lī dātā ...
CLEA 29. DEDICATION BY LAETUS TO THE NYMPHS

hānc ā- | rām Nym- | phīs | | ēx- | trūxī | nōmine | Laētūs
cūm gērē- | rēm fās- | cēs | | pātrī- | aē rū- | mōrē sē- | cūndō
plūs tāmēn | ēst mihi | grātūs hō- | nōs | | quōd | fāscībōs |

īs nōs- | trī dātūs | ēst | | quō | sāntō | nōmine | dīves
Lāmbae- | sem lār- | gō | | per- | fūdīt | flūminē | Nymphā

CLEA 30. EPITAPH OF PINARIUS MUSTULUS

ēt vi- | xī sātīs | ēt | | genu- |ī fē- | līcītēr | ēt rēm
nōn mōdì- | cām e mīnī- | mō | | quaē- | stūī | frawūdē sī- | nē ūllā
ātquē mē- | īs prōprī- | īs | | ēt | nātōrum hō- | nōrībūs | aǔctūs
aēter- | nām mōrī- | ēns | | fā- | mām clā- | rāmquē rē- | līquī

CLEA 31. EPITAPH OF IULIA SIDONIA

Iūlīā | Sīdōní- | ā | | Fē- | līx de | nōmine | tantūm
cuī nefās | ānte dī- | ēm | | rū- | pērunt | stēminā | Pārcaē
quām prōcūs | heū nūpt- | iīs | | Hymēn- | ēōs | contigit | Ignēs
Ingēmū- | ēre ōm- | nēs | | Dryā- | dēs dōlū- | ēre pū- | ēllaē
ēt Lū- | cīnā fā- | cīs | | dē- | mērsō | lūminē | flēvīt

vīrgō quōd | ēt sō- | lūm | | pīg- | nūs fūē- | rātquē pā- | rēntūm
Memphidōs | haec fūē- | rāt | | dī- | vae sīs- | trātae sā- | cērdōs
hic tūmū- | lātā sī- | lēt | | ae- | tērnō | mūnerē | sōmnī
CLEA 32. VOTIVE DEDICATION BY AN EQUESTRIAN OFFICER TO THE GODDESS PANTHEA

Panthēa | cōrnīgē- | rī | sāc- | rīs ād- | iūnctā Tō- | nāntīs
quaē Līby- | cīs Māū- | rīsque sī- | mūl | vēnē- | rābīlīs | ārīs
hīs ētī- | ām cōlī- | tūr | tēr- | rīs quām | Iūppīter | Hāmmōn
īntēr ū- | trūmquē lā- | tūs | mēdī- | ām cūm | Dītē sē- | vērō
dēxtēr | sēdē tē- | gīt | ĕānc | pūlvī- | nārībūs | ēltīs
sūblī- | mīquē dī- | cāt | sōlī- | ō dī- | vōsquē frē- | quēntīs
Gārgīlī- | ānūs ā | mīlītī- | īs | dē | sūppīcē | vōtō
sīgnā dē- | ūm fācī- | ē | rēnō- | vāns dōmī- | nāmquē bī- | fōrmēm

CLEA 33. EPITAPH OF BECCUT

Bēccūt | īān prīmūm | Īlō- | nī | cōn- | iūnctā mā- | rītō
vīrgō rū- | dīs tēnē- | rā | quō | mē Fōr- | ūnā re- | dūxīt
vītaē | sēt le- | tī | sē- | dēs | sīc | fātā tū- | lērē
hīc hūm- | nō tē- | dāquē sī- | mūl | prāē- | ūnte cā- | nēbār
nūnc vūs- | tīs ūr- | nāquē sī- | mūl | cōn- | tēctā re- | sēdī
vīxī | dūm līcū- | īt | mō- | rūm sīnē | lābē pū- | dīcā
mātēr- | nūm nō- | mēn | fē- | cī Lū- | cīnae fā- | vōrē
nātūm | prōgenū- | ī | nōs- | trō quī | nōmīnē | vīvāt
nē fleāt | hōc nīmī- | ūm | cuī | sūm cā- | rīssīmā | cōrdī
cōmmūnē | ēst hōmī- | num ...

CLEA 34. EPITAPH OF IULIA

reddērē | quōt sō- | lūm | līcū- | īt pōst | mōrē(m) mā- | rītē
hunc tūmū- | lūm vō- | bīs | mā- | nēs mōnī- | mēntāquē | sācrā
CLEA 35. EPITAPH OF CAESILIA NAMINA[...] AND [...] LIANUS

... paupertē | progenī| tūs | lārē | sum pār- | vôquē pā- | rēntē
   cuīūs | nec cēn- | sūs | nec quē dō- | mūs fūē- | rāt
ex quō | sum gēnī| tūs | rū- | rī mēa | vīxi cō- | lēndō
   nec rū- | rī pau- | sā | nec mīhī | semper ē- | rāt
et cum | matū- | rās | sēgē- | tēs prō- | dūxērāt | ānnūs
dēmes- | sōr cālā- | mī | tūnc ēgō | prīmūs ē- | rām
fālcifē- | rā | cum | tūrnā vī- | rūm | pro- | cessērāt | ārvīs
   seu Cīr- | taē Nōmā- | dōs | seu lōvis | ārvā pē- | tēns
   dēmes- | sōr cūnc- | tōs | ān- | tē Ībām | prīmūs īn | ārvīs
post tēr- | gūs līn- | quēns | dēnsā mē- | ĭm grēmī- | ā
bīs se- | nās mēs- | sēs | rābī- | dō sūb | sōlē tō- | tōndī
dūctor ēt | ēx opē- | rē | postēa | fāctūs ē- | rām
undēcīm | ēt tur- | mās | mēs- | sōrum | dūxīmus | ānnīs
   ēt Nūmī- | daē cām- | pōs | nostrā mā- | nūs sēcū- | īt
hic lābōr | ēt vī- | tā | pār- | vō cōn- | tēntā vā- | lērē
ēt dōmī- | nūm fē- | cēre dō- | mūs | ēt | vīllā pā- | rātāst
ēt nūl- | līs òpī- | būs | indīgēt | ïpsā dō- | mūs
ēt nōs- | trà | vī- | tā | fruc- | tūs pēr- | cēpīt hō- | nōrūm
Inter cōnscrip­tis tōs | scrib­tūs ēt | Īpsē fū- | 1
ōrdīnīs | ĭn tēm- pō | | dē- lēctūs āb | ōrdīnē | sēdī
ēt dē | rūstīcū- lō | | cēnsōr ēt | Īpsē fū- | ĭ
ēt gēnu- ī | ĭt vī- dī | | iūvē- nēs cā- | rōsqua nē- | pōtēs
vītaē | prō mērī- tīs | | clā- | rōs trān- | ēgīmus | ānnōs
quōs nūl- lō ĭn- guā | | crīmīnē | laēdit ā- | trōx
dīscītē | mōrtā- lēs | | sēnē | crīmīnē | dēgērē | vītām
sīc mērū- ĭt vī- xīt | | quī sēnē | fraūdē mō- rī

CLEA 36. VOTIVE DEDICATION TO SATURNUS BY GAIUS MANIUS FELIX FORTUNATIANUS

īn sōm- nīs mōnī- tūs | sā- tūrnī | nūmīnē | iūssūs
Māniūs | hīc vō- tum | | sōl- uī sāc- | rūmquē dī- cāvī
prō cōm- pērta fī- dē | | ēt | prō sēr- vātā sā- lūtē

CLEA 37. COMMEMORATION OF THE RESTORATION OF A WALL OF THE FORUM AT LAMBÆSIS

mōnīnā | quīsque dō- lēt | | nōvā | cōndērē | sūcēs- sōrī
İncūl- tō mānē- ĭt | | līvīdūs | hōspītī- ĭ

CLEA 38. EPITAPH OF AELIA SECUNDULA

fūnērī | mūltā quī- dēm | | cōn- dīgnā iām | mīsīmus | ōmnēs
İnsūpēr | āreque | dēpōsī- tē | | sē- cūndūlae | mātrī
lāpīdē- ām placū- ĭt | | nō- bīs āt | pōnērē | ōmensm,
İn quā | māgnō e- iūs | | mēmōr- āntēs | plūrīmā | fāctā
dūm cībī | pōnūn- tūr | | cālī- cēsquē ē- ĭ cō- pērtaē
CLEA 39. EPITAPH OF IULIUS KAPITO CAEFALIUS

reddērē | quōd sō-| lūm | līcū-| īt post | fātā sē-| pūlchrūm
qui pātri-| āe cā-| sūs | mīse-| rāns cī-| viūmquē sū-| ōrūm
clāusīs ī-| tīnērī-| būs | pēnē-| travīt | dēviā | cūrus
quem nōn | rēspēc-| tā | dē-| fēssā pā-| rēntībūs | aētas
nec sūbō-| lūm pīe-| tās | pōtū-| īt dēti-| nērē pē-| rīclo
quid sūpē-| rēst haec | ōmnīum | ēst | cōn-| sciēntiā | nōstrūm
cūr fūē-| rīt tā-| lēm | pēr-| pēssūs | mōrtē dō-| lōrē(m)
dūm cīvi-| būs rēquī-| ēm | trībū-| tōrum | fērrē vō-| lēbāt
īncīdīt | īnfē-| līx | cōn-| trāriō | mūnērē | mīssū

CLEA 40. EPITAPH OF TITUS CLODIUS LOUELLA

cōlū-| mēn mō-| rū(m) āc pīe-| tātīs
lauūbūs | āc tītū-| līs | ār-| nātūs | vīxīt hō-| nēstē
ōmnībūs | hīc cā-| rūs | fūē-| rāt fē-| līcītēr | ānnōs
quīnquā-| gīntā mī-| nūs | ē-| nō gēs-| sīt stūdī-| o sēt
ūsūs o-| nōrībūs | ōrdīnis | ēst | ādquē vī-| rū(m) vīr
ēgrēgī-| ūs flā-| mēn | pātri-| āe pīus | ādmōdē-| rātōr
lārgūs | mūnīdā-| tōr | ed | sator ing[... | suo[...]
Lēnae-| ī pāt-| rīs | cūl-| tōr fē-| līxquē sā-| cērōs
āddīdit | hīc dēcūs | āc | nō-| mēn sūaē | Clāudiāē | ĝentī
CLEA 41. EPITAPH OF CAELESTINA

Cæstæ fī-| des mēn-| tīs || sēm-| per sēr-| vātā mā-| rūtō  
ād cae-| lūm pēr-| vēxīt ō-| bāns || tūā | gau̇dīā | vītaē  
ēm-| plārē mā-| nēnt || tēr-| rīs īmī-| tāndā pū-| dīcīs  
laūs ḫābēt | hōc mērī-| tūm || sēr-| vāt tūā | fāmā pū-| dōrūm  
exsūpē-| rāns mōr-| tīs || le-| gēm cūm | dūrāt in | aēbūm 5  
śīc vī-| vūnt mō-| rēs || śīc | nūmquām | dēfīcīt | aētās  
tē dōlū-| īt gēnūs | ēmnē tū-| ūm || tē | cūnctaē pū-| dīcāe  
Īnnōcū-| ām quīs-| quīs || mī-| rātūs | témpōrē | vītām  
nōn mōrī-| tūr fā-| tūm || sōl-| vūntūr | cōrpūrā | laētō  
āngūs-| tōs vī-| taē || vī-| cīstī | témpōrīs | ānūs 10

CLEA 42. EPITAPH OF FLORENTINUS

Īntēr ō-| dōrā-| tōs || nēmō-| rūm || ūbī | laētā rē-| cēssūs  
mātēr | pīngīt hū-| mūs || ēt | lēctīs | dēdālā | tēllūs  
flōrībūs | ēxūl-| tāt || grā-| tīsquē ēt | frōndībūs | ālmūm  
vīx pātī-| tūr cūm | sōlē dī-| ēm || hīc | prōvīdē | fēlīx  
Flōren-| tīnē dē-| cūs || cūm | cōniūgē | sānctā pū-| dīcā 5  
Hōstīlī-| ānā tū-| ā || ēt | Splēndō-| nīllaē nā-| tōquē  
cōns ...  
hīc pūlcr ...  
aedēs pen ...  
Īncērtu ...  
constru ...
CLEA 43. EPITAPH OF VITALIS

vel vos | quos pie-| tas || dui-| xit mun-| rare pa-| rentes
iam requi-| em sum-| mus || ubi | nos for-| tua re-| misit
talia | quis faci-| at || nisi | vos quos | amor ad-| dedit
accipi-| ant cunc-| tii || ves-| tris or-| nasse pa-| rentes
laetiti-| am sum-| mus || eoo-| dem mat-| risqua se-| nectus 5
iter a-| gens sal-| ve || ver-| suis cum | legerus | istos
si a capi-| ta || ex-| plores | ingenii-| um || no-| menque pro-|
babis

CLEA 44. EPITAPH OF VALERIUS DALMATIUS

hic ego | inf-| lix || re-| ceptus | Tartara | Ditis
horrea | dira mi-| hi || vi-| ae vi-| tamque re-| misi
non licu-| It fa-| toque m-| o || fil-| Josque vi-| dere
cernerem | infer-| nas || se-| des sup-| rosque re-| misi
Parca- | rum arbitri-| o || gene-| sis vel | legre tri-| buta 5
infes-| tis querel-| lis || sup-| ris ac | tristibus | aris
tura de-| dini man-| bus || sup-| plex crepi-| tantia |flammis
quod non | exau-| distas pre-| ces || dea-| busque su-| pernis
teprecor | his preci-| bus || Ba-| to ca-| rissime | frater
si qua mea | commen-| data ti-| bi || fil-| Josque re-|
pertos

tradas [ ... ] dea | pauperi-| es || ob-| noxia | non sit
memori- | am faci-| tota mi-| hi || ne de-| risus in | imo
CLEA 45. COMMEMORATION OF THE VICTORY OF CONSTANTINE OVER MAXENTIUS

Constan-| tīnē tū-| tōs || sīc | semper | mālis ī-| rātōs
cernīmūs | Augūs-| tīs || mās-| līs ēt | pācē pō-| tīmūr
cūm ēt ēn | hoc gēni-| ō || sē-| sē prō-| vincīā | mōstrēt
nam tōlīt | illē crū-| cēs || ēt | proēliā | saēvā tū-| rānnī

CLEA 46. EPITAPH OF IULIA BENENATA

si quis hō-| nōs vī-| tē est || tēs-| tīs pōst | mūnērā | fātī
mortīs | sortē clū-| ēt || cūm | iām sub | fīnē sū-| prēmō
apspīcit | īnfer-| nōrōm || Āche-| rūsīā | templā dē-| ōrūm
secū-| requē vī-| ēt || strēpi-| tūm || Āche-| rūntīs ā-| vāri
namquē ēgō-| mēt quōd | pīō sem-| pēr || īn | corpŏrē | vīxī 5
Ēlŷsi-| ōs tēnē-| ō || mī-| tēs prō-| sēpīnaē | cēmpōs
lēgē dē-| um sō-| lēmquē sū-| pēr || āc | sīderā | nōvī

CLEA 47. COMMEMORATION OF SIDONIUS' CONSTRUCTION OF PRIVATE BATHS

splēndēnt | tēctā | Bassiān-| ē || fūn-| dī cōg-| nōmīnē |
Baiae
Inven-| tē lū-| cīsquē mā-| gīs || cān-| dōrē rē-| lūcent
disposū-| īt fācē-| re ...
opposū-| tōs me ...
CLEA 48. EPITAPH OF FLAVIA CAMERINA

additūs | āmor ē- | rāt | nō- | bī(s) sī | fātā dē- | dissēnt
fūt nō- | bīs iūnc- | tiō | dūl- | cīs bīs | sēx pēr | ānnōs

CLEA 49. DEDICATION OF A FORTRESS IN MAURETANIA

praesīdiūm | ācter- | naē | fīr- | māt prū- | dēntīā | pācīs
rēm quōque | Rōmā- | nām | fī- | dā tūtāt | ūndīque | dēxtrā
āmnī | praēpośi- | tūm | fīr- | māns mū- | nōmīnē | mōntēm
ē cū- | iūs nō- | mēn | vocī- | tāvīt | nōmīnē | Petrām
dēnīque | fīnītī- | maē | gēn- | tēs dē- | pōnērē | bēllā
5
In tūā | concūr- | rūnt | cūpī- | ēntēs | foēdērā | Sammāc
ūt vīr- | tūs cōmī- | tātā fī- | dēm | cōn- | cōrdēt īn | ōmnī
mūnērē | Rōmūlē- | īs | sēm- | pēr sōcī- | ātā trī- | ūmīs

CLEA 50. DEDICATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

hortāris | īn vī- | tām | mīs- | cēns ād- | versā sē- | cūndīs
Clōdiūs | Hērmōgē- | nā | prō- | cōnsū- | lātū sā- | lūbrī
Theōdō- | tī cū- | rā | le- | gātī | dēdicāt | ārcēm
hōs ēgō | Iānūr- | iūs | vēr- | sūs fōr- | mārē cū- | rāvī

CLEA 51. EPITAPH OF A YOUNG BOY

hīc cor- | pūs iā- | cēt | pūe- | rī nōmī- | nāndī
ō bēnē- | dīcētē pū- | ēr | paū- | cīs tē | terrā dī- | ēbūs
Infān- | tēm tēnū- | It | cē- | līquae īn | rēgnā rē- | mīsit
prōptērēa | ēt nā- | tūs | ūt | cāpēres | tāntā rē- | nātūs

CLEA 52. EPITAPH OF CELA

Cēlā ancīllā īn pace vīcxīt ānnīs quīs
īlī | fātē homī- | nūm | dē- | usquē | sāncia dē- | cĪbit
dīs mānībus sācrūm
nūc e- | tērnā(m) tē- | nēt | sē- | dēm lātē- | rīquē iū- | gālī
āl- | tūm | pātī- | tūr sīnē | fīnē sō- | pōrēm

CLEA 53. EPITAPH OF [POM]PONIANUS

fēlīx | pātēr hā- | bēs | dīg- | nā | tūae | prēmiā | vītē
ōptīmā | cūm rēso- | nāt | pēr- | pētuō | nōmine | fāmā
prēcōn- | īumquē tū- | ūm | mērī- | tō cōm- | mūnī | ōrē prō- | bātūr
pēr bē- | nīgnā tī- | bī | quae- | sītūm | tēmpōre īn | ōmnī
pēctorā | dūm vī- | vīs | praē- | stāndo | cūntīs ā- | mōrēm

CLEA 54. DICTUM FROM THE BAPTISTRY OF A CHRISTIAN BASILICA

sī quis | ūt vī- | vāt | quae- | rīt | ād- | dīscēre | sēmpēr
hīc lā- | vētur ā- | quē ēt | vīdē- | āt caē- | lēstīa | rēgni

CLEA 55. COMMEMORATION OF REPAIR OF BATHS

tū mōdō | Frūmen- | tī | dōmi- | tō vīr- | tūtē rē- | bēlli
CLEA 56. COMMEMORATION OF THE RESTORATION OF A FOUNTAIN

felīx | Ūrānī- | ā | mē- | cum pār- | tīrē lā- | börem
ēt nym- | fīs au- | dē | rēcī- | dīvōs | pāndērē | fontīs
lātēx | ūbī | sentībūs | hōrrēs | mēsērāt | āntē
Incās- | sūm fūndī- | tūs | sūpēr- | āntē rū- | īnā
currīt ī- | tēr līquī- | dūm | dē | mōrē | prīscō flū- | ōrē
ēcē grā- | dātīm | nōscēs | quō | cū- | rāntē sī | quērās

CLEA 57. DEDICATION OF THE BASILICA OF ALEXANDER

hic ūbī | tām clā- | rīs | laū- | dāntūr | moēnīā | tēctīs
culmīnā | quōd nī- | tēnt | sānc- | tāquē āl- | tārīā | cērnīs
non ōpūs | est prōcē- | rūm | sēt | tāntī | glōrīā | fāctī
Ālexān- | drī recī- | tōris ō- | vāt | pēr | saēcūlā | nōmēn
cuiūs hō- | nōrīfī- | cōs | fā- | māōstēn- | dēnte lā- | böres
iūstōs | īn pūl- | chrām | sē- | dēm gau- | dēnt lō- | cāsse prī- | ōres
quōs dū- | tūrnā quī- | ēs | fāl- | lebāt | pōssē vī- | dērī
nunc lūcē | praēfūl- | gēnt | sub- | nīxī āl- | tārē dē- | cōro
collēc- | tāmqūē sū- | ām | gau- | dēnt flō- | rērē cō- | rōnām
ānīmō | quōd sōl- | lērs | Īm- | plēvīt | ĕustōs hō- | nēstūs
undīquē | vīsēn- | dī | stūdī- | o Chrīs- | tīaēnā æ- | tās cīr-
cumfūsā | vēnīt
līmīnā- | quē | sānc- | tā | pēdī- | būs cōn- | tīngērē | laētā
CLEA 58. DIDACTIC MOSAIC FROM THE BASILICA OF ALEXANDER

clausula | iustitiae | est | marse | tyrrium | votis opere | tarere
haebes et aliam similem aelemosinam viribus facere

CLEA 59. DIDACTIC MOSAIC FROM THE BASILICA OF ALEXANDER

vivite | felici | ces | quibus(s) | haec sunt | condita | tecta
servate | praecepit | tae ut | regit | netis in | vita aeterna
aelemosinam enim facere hoc est Christum monstre

CLEA 60. DIDACTIC MOSAIC FROM THE BASILICA OF ALEXANDER

resurere | rectio | nem | car | nisi futurum | esse qui | credit
angelis | in caelo | lis | re | surgens | similis | erit

CLEA 61. DIDACTIC MOSAIC FROM THE BASILICA OF ALEXANDER

quisquis est | Christianus | nus | ad sub | blimia | vere qui

iustus | rumque vae | am | ex | fide | gradui qui | cupid
aelemosinam nam factum est | et | vita | vis in | regno caelo | lestis
hoc est | opus esse | nim | quod factit | vivere | semper
CLEA 62. EPITAPH OF ASTANIA FROM THE BASILICA OF ALEXANDER

hic iacet | egregi- | a || merti- | tis et | gratia | morum
heu memo- | randa bo- | nis || As- | tania dig- | nissima | caelo
nobilis | et || ata- | vis || cla- | rissima | femina | magnis
consors | blandis de- | cens || regu- | men fi- | dele su- | orum
haec bona | famili- | is || ma- | ter pia | sedula | coniux
hic cor- | pus posu- | it || se- | dem di- | cavit in | astris

CLEA 63. EPITAPH OF BASILIUS FROM THE BASILICA OF ALEXANDER

suscipit | eximi- | um || sub- | limis | regia | caeli
Basili- | um merti- | tis || eti- | am post | vita(m) vi- | ventem
qui dig- | na || de- | o || sic | duxit | tempora | vita
iustiti- | a probi- | tate fi- | de || prae- | clarus et | actu
sexa- | ginta dui- | os || fe- | lix bene | clauserit | annos

CLEA 64. EPITAPH OF MAXIMUS

salve | eter- | num mihi | Maxime | frater
eter- | numque vae | le

CLEA 65. EPITAPH OF PACATUS

ic Papa- | cate se- | dem || lo- | cas bap- | tismate | purus
quartum | dum icur- | ris || de- | flendum | funere | lustrum
CLEA 66. EPITAPH OF HONORATA

인마- | 터라 규- | dem | | 모르- | 틨스 | | 호로 | 노르 드- | 타타

이상 수행 | 이드- | 플라 임- | 쟝 | | cui | nominate 인- | heret

홀로 | 라타 드- | 체스 | | 모- | 려스 뜻- | 쟔불로 | iungens

이우스티- | 아 비- | 태 | | 캐- | 림 프로- | 미사 세- | 쿠타

브레브 퀀드 | 운 비- | 태 | | 캐- | 림 콘- | 무타트 호로 | 노르 이 5

비타 | 콘드림- | 나스 | | 가우- | det 콤- | 메르시오 | 탈리

에 세- | 쿠라 비- | 태 | | 가우- | det 필- | 농세 라 | 보렘

CLEA 67. EPITAPH OF URBICA

hic iacês | extinc- | 타 | | 마- | 트리 그라- | 지스마 | 빈고

울리카 | 퀀드 노- | 메앙 | | 센프르 인 | 아스트라 비- | 겔

라우드스 인 | excel- | sıs | | 탈리- | 부스 | | e- | répta 테- | 네브리스

cum 티비 | perpetu- | 야 | | ređditur | alma 디- | es

CLEA 68. EPITAPH OF NOVATUS

hic iacet | antis- | 티스 | | 산스- | 투스 쎈 노- | 빈투스

ter 드- | 노스 이 | 세템 새- | 디스 | | qui | 머우트 | ἀν노스

CLEA 69. COMMEMORATION OF THE EMBELLISHMENT OF THE BASILICA OF SAINT SALSA BY POTENTIUS

 mũi르라 | 쿠에 셔- | 나스 | | 쿠오 | 산츠 알- | 티우 | fulgent

[his sump-| tusque 1]a-| 보르케 인- | est | | 쿠- | 라쿠 푸- | 텐티

crēditum | [sibi | qui gau] | det per- | ficere | mũi우스
CLEA 70. EPITAPH OF TURASIUS

accipe | meren- | tes | lacri- | mas piä | munera | fratriis
aeter- | numquae va- | le | nox | est brevis | illa se- | pulchri
offul- | get faci- | es | me- | cum est tua | semper i- | mago

CLEA 71. DEDICATION OF THE BASILICA OF CRECONIUS

hic ubi | tam clae- | ris | lau- | dantur | moenia | tectis
culmina | quod ni- | tent | sanct- | taquë al- | taria | cernis
non opus | est proce- | rum | sed | tantï | glorïa | facti
Crëscosis- | ni rec- | toros- | vae- | cum | saecula | nomem
quiæs hoi- | norifis- | cos | eum | ostenos- | denti la- | bores
iustos | in pul- | cra- | se- | de | gaui- | dent lo- | cassæ pri- | ores
quos diu- | turna qui- | es | fal- | lebat | possi vi- | deri
nunc luci- | proful- | gent | sub- | nixi al- | tare de- | core
collec- | tamquæ suæ- | am | gaui- | dent flo- | re re co- | ronam
animi | quod solæ- | lers | in | plœvit | custos hoi- | nestus
undique | se vi- | sendi stud- | lo | crist- | iana de- | currit
aetas in | unam | congerti- | em | deo | dicere | laudes
limina- | quæ | sanct- | tæ | pedi- | bus con- | tingeræ | laeta
ōmnīs | sācrā ca- | nēns | ma- | nūs pōr- | rīgērē | gaūdēt
sācrā- | mentō dē- | ī | medī- | cīnām | sūmērē | schismae

Cresconius legibus ipsis et al-| tāribus | nātus
honoribusque in eclesia ca-| tōlica | úncus
castitatis custos caritatis pa-| cīque di-| cātus
cuius doctrina floret innumera pleps | Cuiculi-| tāna
pauperum amator elemosin(ae) | dēditus | ómni
cui numquam defuere unde opus ce-| lēste fe-| cīset
huius anima refrigerat corpus in | pāce qui-| ēscit
resurrectione expectans futuram in | Crīsto co-| rōna
consors ut fiat sanctis in sede | régni ce-| lēstis

CLEA 72. DEDICATION OF A NYMPHAEUM

İntūs ă-| quē dūl-| cēs | bi-| bōquē sē-| dīliā | sāxā
nīmfā-| rūm quē | Flōren-| tī | fūn-| dātā lá-| bōrē
sūnt dē dōnīs dēl

CLEA 73. EPITAPH OF MERA DAMULA INBIDIOSA

mōrībūs | İnben-| tūm | fuē-| rāt mīhī | nōmēn
matrīs | Mērā Dā-| mūlā qu'i ēt | İnbīdī-| ōsā
ēt nūnc | māgnā mē-| īs | sūb | tērās | ībit ī-| māgō
mēbrā fī-| dēlīs
hēc tēgīt | ētēr-| nō | tēl-| lūs ām-| plēxā sō-| pōrē
CLEA 74. COMMEMORATION OF THE RESTORATION OF A SANCTUARY

cede pri-| us no-| men || novi-| tātī | cēde vē-| tūstās
regīa | lētan-| ter || vōta dī-| cāre lī-| bēt
haec Pet-| rī Pau-| līquē sē-| dēs || Crīs-| tō iū-| bēnte rē-
surgīt
ūnum | quēsō pā-| rēs || ū-| nūm dūō | sūmītē | mūnūs
ūnus hō-| nōr cēlē-| bret || quōs hābēt | ūnā fī-| dēs 5
presbītē-| rī tāmēn | hīc || ōpus | ēst ēt | cūrā Prō-| bāntī

CLEA 75. EPITAPH OF MAURICIA GALLA

hīc gēnē-| trīx posī-| tā || ēst | dūdūm | fāmulā | Chrīsti
hae mērī-| tīs dān-| tūr || sē-| dēs quās | ōptīmā | mātēr
tenēs | cūiūs | sīcū-| bī || ām-| plīssīmā | fāctā
dīcerē | iām fā-| mā || tō-| tūm dīf-| fūdīt īn | aēvūm

CLEA 76. EPITAPH OF ALURIUS GEMINIUS

hīc sitūs | ēst fān-| dī || quōn-| dām vī-| taequē mā-| gīster
semper fī-| dē ādquē sā-| lūtīfē-| rās || cū-| rās hū-| mānīs
dē-| bēbāt
corpōrī-| būs || òc-| togīn-| tā ē-| nīm || māg-| nōs bōl-
vēndīs | mēnsībus | òrbēs
fīdē-| līs vī-| tām || pērē-| gīt consē-| quēntībūs | mētīs
hāc sē-| dē || dīg-| nā || īn | pācē quī-| ēvīt
CLEA 77. CHRISTIAN DICTUM

Înbîdê | quîd lâcê- | râs | | îl- | lôs quôs | crêscêrê | sêntîs
tu tîbî | tôrtôr | tu | | tê- | cúm tuâ | bûlnêrâ | pórtâs

CLEA 78. CHRISTIAN DICTUM

quî cê- | lât sê- | crêtâ rê- | gîs | | quêm | mûndûs â- | dôrât
hîc réquî- | âs âbît- | têt | | hîc | pax e- | têrnâ mô- | rêtûr

CLEA 79. EPITAPH OF CONSTANTINA

Îc cêrînîtê fûnêrê nô- | strâ(m) | | núc | bûlnêrâ | nátâ(m)
înmôr- | tâlêm | sêmpêr mâ- | nêns | | sûb | pêctôrê | nôstrô
eu mêrû- | ît nêquê | dûlcîs mág- | nû(m) | | lî- | quîstî dô- | lôrê(m)
maiûs hô- | pûs mûvê- | ô | | mai- | or mîhî | nàscîtûr | hûrdô
quiês tê | ê tû- | îs | | sûb- | traxît | hàéc suê | mâtîs
quiêm sîbî | fûtû- | râm | | gau- | dêbît | nûptà mâ- | rîtô
quiês tân- | tîs | | nôn | dêfleât | càsîbûs | àdîssà(m) | | prôlê(m)
dêcôr âc tûbî bîs sênôs ãnnôs nêc dûm pêr | ôrdînê | plênôs
sic fâ- | tâlê mû- | nûs | | a- | cêrîbà | mûrtê sôr- | tîtê ëst
iâm mâ- | tûrê bû- | rô | | iâm | plênîs | nûbilîs | ânnîs

CLEA 80. DEDICATION OF BATHS IN TUNIS

cêrê sa- | lûtîfê- | râs | | splên- | denti | mûrmôrê | Balas
qui câlî- | dôs aês- | tús | | tângërê | quaérîs â- | quiês
CLEA 81. EPITAPH OF PROBATIUS

cärminā | quī în nōs-| trō | pér- | currītīs | fortē sē- | pūlcrō

obsecrō | mēō- | rūm ā | vō- | vīs dī- | móvī quaē- | réllās

mortīs | dāmnā fū- | gīt | vī- | tā(m) quī | sēcūlī | trānsīt

bīs dēcēm | et sē- | nōs | vī- | xīt Prō- | bātiūs | ānnōs

reddīdit quīscēns dēvitūm īn | pācē nā- | tūrāē

CLEA 82. COMMEMORATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF FORTIFICATIONS AT CULULIS THEODORIANA

hoc ōpūs | impērī- | ūm | fē- | līx hās | prēstītīt | ārcēs

māgnānī- | mīqūe ētī- | ām | Sōlō- | mōnīs | iūssā dē- | dērē
cuī pārū- | īt Nōn- | nūs | quī | cōndīdīt | īstā trī- | būnūs

ūrbs dōmī- | nō laē- | tārē pī- | ē | iām- | qūe āspīcē | quāntīs

ēs sūb- | dūcta mā- | līs | quān- | tōqūe ōr- | nātā dē- | cōrē

Maūro- | rūm tān- | dēm | rēcī- | pīs sūb- | dūcta tī- | mōrē

cēnsū- | rām stā- | tūm | cī- | vēs iūs | moēniā | fāstūs

ātque sū- | ūm nō- | mēn | pōsū- | īt tībī | rēgīa | cōniūnx

Īūstīnī- | ānī mā- | nū | Maū- | rōrūm | gēntē fū- | gātā

ōmnīā | tēmpūs ā- | bēnt | ēlē- | bānt ēt ē- | ās īn- | gēntēs
CLEA 83. EPITAPH OF MUSTELUS

ōrnā-| tūs pātī-| ē || tēgē-| rīs Mūs-| tēlē sē-| pūlcrō 
ūrbīs | dēfēn-| sōr || ...
qui ĝrā-| tūs pōpū-| līs || ēx-| tābās | mēntē bē-| nīgnā
pōst ānc | ētēr-| nā(m) || mērū-| īstī | sūmērē | bītā(m)

CLEA 84. COMMEMORATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A FORTIFICATION WALL AT MASCUŁA

haēc quōque | praēfec-| tūs || cōn-| strūxīt | moēnīa | Thōmās
sed dēcūs | hīs ālī-| ūd || mēlī-| ēris | rōborīs | āddēns
Tībērī-| ām dī-| xīt || dē | nōminē | Cāsāris | ĭrbēm

CLEA 85. EPITAPH OF HONORATA

tērrā prē-| mēs tēnē-| rōs || īn-| iūstō | pōndērē | Mānēs
quāmtā te-| cūm bō-| nā || dē | sūmmīs | dūces ād | ĭmā
hīc Hōnō-| rātā tī-| bī || mēm-| brā || pō-| nīt || ānī-| māmquē
Tō-| nāntī
hōs tībī | āpī-| cēs || fī-| lī ā | bālēdīc-| tūrā
dīscēdām bīs quāternōs ēunctā ānnōs

CLEA 86. EPITAPH OF A YOUNG GIRL

quīsquīs ā-| dēs lēc-| tōr || cau-| sām quī | nōscērē | bēnīs
fūndē prē-| cōr lācī-| māns || nōn mīnōr | hīc dōlōr | ēst
hīc iācēt | ēxānī-| mīs || māg-| nūs dēcōr | ĭllā pā-| rēntūm
quām mōrs | Īmmērī-| tām || īnplā | sōrtē tū-| līt
Incās- | sūm nīl | saēvā iū- | bāns | quām | pérdere | dūxīt

İNsōn- | tēm | ānī | mām | dūm sīne | sōrdē trā- | īt
sēd hānc | dīrā dō- | lūm | rāpi- | ēns cōm- | mūnē pā- | rēntūm
tradīdit | ēt mīse- | rīs | trīstiā | cōrdā dē- | dīt
nām vivīt | haec mōri- | ēns | ae- | tērnā In | lūcē mā- | nēbīt
redem- | tā et māg- | nō | permānēt | Aēlīsi- | ō
vīs quī- | nōs līn- | quēns | sūp- | pletīs | mēnsībus | ānnōs
APPENDIX II

INITIA CARMINUM

accipe merentes lacrima[s] pia munera fratris CLEA 70
ad<d>itus amor erat nobi<s> si fata dedis<s>ent CLEA 48
aequas optavi sedes iucunda marito CLEA 14

Baetica me genuit tel<l>us cupidus Lib<y>ae cognoscere CLEA 2
Beccut iam primum Iloni coniuncta marito CLEA 33

carmina qui <i>n nostro percurritis forte sepulcro CLEA 81
casta bona inviolans rarum hoc <a> coniuge munus CLEA 22
casta fides mentis semper servata marito CLEA 41
cede prius nomen [no]vitiati cede vetustas CLEA 74
Cela ancilla in pace vicxit annis quos CLEA 52
cerne salutiferas sp[lendent]i marmore Baias CLEA 80
certavi tecum coniunx pietate virtute CLEA 18
clausula iustitiae est martyrium votis optare CLEA 58
colum(en) moru ac pie(tate) CLEA 40
Constant<i>ne tuos sic semper malis iratos CLEA 45

Daphnis ego Hermetis coniunx sum libera facta CLEA 1

dum sum Vitalis et vivo ego feci sepulcrhum CLEA 19

en perfecta cito Baiaru grata voluptas CLEA 26
et vixi satis et genui feliciter et rem CLEA 30
eximia specie iacet hic Priscilla puella CLEA 20

felix pater habes digna tuae premia vite CLEA 53
f]elix Urania mecum partire laborem CLEA 56
Fl(avius) hic situs est proavus qui tempora vitae CLEA 23
funeri mu<l>ta quid<e> condigna iam misimus omnes CLEA 38

haec quoqu[e pr]aeffectus construxit moen[i]a Thomas CLEA 84
hanc aram nymphis extruxi nomine Laetus CLEA 29
hic corpus iacet pueri nominandi CLEA 51
hic ego infelix receptus Tartara Ditis CLEA 44
hic genetrix posita est dudum famula Chr(ist)i CLEA 75
hic iac[es extinc[ta mat]ri gratissi[ma] virgo CLEA 67
hic iacet antistes s(an)c(tu)sque Novatus CLEA 68
hic iacet egregia meritis et gratia morum CLEA 62
hic situs est fundis quondam vitaeq(ue) magister CLEA 76
hic situs est Marcus Flavonius ille magister CLEA 6
hic situs est Varius cognomine Frontonianus CLEA 11
hic ubi tam claris laudantur moenia tectis (Tipasa) CLEA 57
hic ubi tam claris laudantur moenia tectis (Cuicul) CLEA 71
hoc opus imperium felix has prestitit arces CLEA 82
homo bonus rebus hominibusq(ue) pernecessarius
hortaris in vitam miscens adversa secundis
ic cernite funere nostra nuc bulnera nata
<i>c Pacate sedem locas baptismate purus
in somnis monitus Saturni nomine iussus
inbide quid laceras illos quos crescere sentis
incipve parve puer studis superare parent(em)
in[m]atura quidem mortis honore dotata
inter odoratos nemorum ubi laeta recessus
intus aque dulces biboque sedilia sax<o>
Iulia Sidonia Felix de nomine tantum

Mania pupa iacet paucos dilecta per annos
manib(us) his [pl]acidis Pass[ie]na casta quiescit
moenia qui Risinni Aeacia qui colis arcem
moenia quisg(ue) dolet nova condere successori
moribus inbentum fuerat mihi nomen
munera quae cernis quo sancta altaria fulgent
nomen non dico nec quod vixerit annnis
non digna coniux cito vita [...]crevisti misella
non digne Felix cit(t)o vitam caruisti miselle

omnes vicisti specie doctrina puella
orta ut fama probat memoranda divite Roma
ossa quieta precor Zopyri requiesqui<t>e in urna

Pan]thea cornigeri sacris adiuncta Tonantis
...
paupere progenitus lare sum parvoq(ue) parente
praesidium aeternae firmat prudentia pacis
prima aetate tua rapta es karissima coniunx

qui ce<l>at secreta regis quem mundus adorat
quisquis ades lector causam qui noscere benis
quisquis amat coniunx hoc exsemplo coniungat amore
quisquis es Christianus ad sublimia vere qui tendis

reddere quod [solum] licuit post fat[a sepul]chrum
reddere quot solum licuit post morte m<a>rite
resurrectionem carnis futuram esse qui credit

salve eternu<m> mihi Maxime frater
si quis honos vitae est testis post munera fati
si quis ut vivat quaerit addiscere semper
sint licet exigua fugientia temporae vitae
splendent tecta Bassiani fundi cognomine Baiae
suscepteximium sublimis regia caeli

terra premes teneros iniuoi pondere Manes
tu modo Frumenti domito virtute rebelli
tu ni sc<is> quantis vita[m d]eduxerit annis
tu qui praeteriens spectas monimentum meum
TU qui praeteriens stas spectas exitum mortem
vel vos quos pietas duxit munerae parentes
vivite felicis quibus haec sunt condita tect[a]

CLEA 28
CLEA 3
CLEA 24
CLEA 43
CLEA 59