

JAIME B. CURBERA

GRAECOLATINA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 118 (1997) 235–236

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

GRAECOLATINA

1. In *Archaeologia* 49 (1885) 126 Arthur J. Evans published a bilingual epitaph which he copied in Thessalonike in 1883. Evans' text was reproduced by Th. Mommsen, CIL III suppl. 7331, and Ch. Edson, IG X 2.1, 666. Edson could not find the inscription and classified it among the "nunc deperditae". The inscription, in fact, was not in Thessalonike, but in Athens, where it was copied by U. Köhler, *AM* 9 (1884) 302 (= IG II² 13226), who did not know of the non-Attic origin of the stone: cf. L. Robert, *CRAI* 1978, 241 n. 4 (= *Op. Min.* V 697 n. 4). Recently, D. Papaconstantinou-Diamandourou, *Αρχαιολογία* 7 (1991–2) 26–7, has found the inscription in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens (n. 11540). Both the use of Latin and the Latin flavour of the Greek text (Θ. Κ. for *D. M.* and *πονοῦντες* for *dolentes*) show that the family had strong ties with Rome (L. Robert, *RPhil*, 1974, 226 = *Op. Min.* V 313).

	D. M.		Θεοῖς καταχθονίοις.
	Spenis vixit ann.		Σπῆνις ἔζησεν ἔτη
	VI, m. VIII, d. XXIX. domi-		ς', μῆ. θ', ἡμ. κη'. οἱ κύρι-
	ni et parentes Primiti-	10	οι καὶ γονεῖς Πρεμιτεῖ-
5	vus et Sotira dolentes		βος καὶ Σώτειρα πονοῦν-
	fecerunt.		τες ἐποίησαν.

For lack of a commentary, we know from the index of CIL III (suppl. 2 p. 2413) that Mommsen considered *Spenis* the genitive of the proper name *Spes*. This flexion is, in fact, well documented in late Latin inscriptions¹. The rest of the editors have not attempted to explain this odd name. The relationship with Latin *Spes* is, I think, clear, but the Greek text leaves no doubt that *Spenis* / Σπῆνις is not a genitive, but a nominative. In vulgar Latin we occasionally find analogical nominatives in *-is* for the consonant stems: *carnis* (= *caro*), *faucis* (= *faux*), *lentis* (= *lens*), *pectinis* (= *pecten*), *splenis* (= *splen*), etc.² *Spenis*, therefore, is best explained as a similar nominative, in this case derived from the consonant stem *Spes*, *-enis*. One could be tempted to interpret a form *Spenini* found in a Christian inscription from Sardinia (CIL X 7988) as the dative of our *Spenis*: *Valeriaeni Spenini coiugi benemerenti*. However, nominatives like *Spenis* are due to a tendency towards parasyllabic declensions (the dative, therefore, would be *Speni*) and, on the other hand, the form *Valeriae-ni* indicates that *Spenini* is a hypercharacterized dative formed by the addition of *-ni* to the expected form *Speni*.

2. The *-ni* dative ending found in *Valeriaeni Spenini* (CIL X 7988, see above) probably originated in an *n*-inflection for the first declination that is well documented in late Latin: *Augeni* dat. of *Auge* (CIL VI 1900), *Chariteni*, dat. of *Charite* (CIL VI 27986), *Νυμφηνι* dat. of *Nymphe* (ICUR 4648, Latin text in Greek letters), etc.³ This flexion has troubled some editors. An inscription from the catacomb of Priscilla (ICUR IX 25018) presents the following text: Βακχυλλίς Βαρβαράνη φιλῖαι βενεμερεντι φηκίτ. The name of the deceased is not **Barbarane*, as Ferrua assumes⁴, but *Barbara*. The form Βαρβαράνη may be an itacistic spelling (= *Barbarani*), but it could also be a dative in *-e*, well documen-

¹ A. Bindel, *De declinatione Latina titulorum quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Jena 1912) 55–6. For other names, see H. Solin, *ZPE* 91 (1992) 183–4.

² F. Neue – C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache I* (Leipzig 1902 = Hildesheim 1985) 232; W. A. Baehrens, *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi* (Halle 1922) 102–3; V. Väänänen, *Introduction au latin vulgaire* (Paris 1967) § 233.

³ Neue–Wagener *op. cit.* 102–3; Väänänen *op. cit.* § 239; M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (München 1977²) 459–60. This inflection is also documented in Greek, especially in inscriptions from Thrace and Macedonia: P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 11 (1921) 229–30 and O. Masson, *Bull. ép.* 1992 n. 184.

⁴ A. Ferrua, *Note al Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. Addenda et Corrigenda* (Bari 1986) 75.

ted in imperial times: *Petiliae Chrestene* (CIL VI 23985), *Iunia Tychene* (CIL VI 20005), etc⁵. A similar case is found on a bilingual epitaph from Kios copied by Pococke and by Le Bas–Waddington. The name of the deceased appears in Greek as Φλαβία Σόφη (nom.) and, in Latin, as *Flaviae Sophene* (dat.). In his valuable corpus, Th. Corsten thinks of a nominative *Sophene*⁶, while Th. Mommsen (CIL III 333) reads *Sopheni* in order to have the expected late dative of *Sophe*. As we have seen, *Sophene* is a valid dative of a name *Sophe*. The dative in *-e* may be an archaizing feature, just like the form *servos* for *servus* in l. 4 of the same inscription (see Corsten’s commentary).

Madrid

Jaime B. Curbera

⁵ See Leumann *op. cit.* 435 and the examples collected by A. Hehl, *Die Formen der lateinischen Ersten Deklination in den Inschriften* (Diss. Tübingen 1912) 53.

⁶ Th. Corsten, *Die Inschriften von Kios* (I. K. 29, Bonn 1985) n. 46: “Warum die Frau im lateinischen Text Sophene, im griechischen aber Σόφη (Z. 9) heißt, ist unklar.” In the index (p. 190) we read *Flavia Sophene*.