J. N. ADAMS

TWO NOTES ON RIB

Two Notes on RIB

I. RIB 306

The text is printed as follows:

deuo Nodenti. Siluianus anilum perdedit. demediam partem donauit Nodenti. inter quibus nomen
*Seniciani **nollis petmittas** (sic) sanitatem donec perfera(t) usque templum [No]dentis*

Nollis[1] (*permittas*) cannot be right. *Nolim* (*nolo* etc.) could of course be construed with the plain subjunctive,[2] but this type of curse formula requires *non* (or *nec*) + the jussive subjunctive *permittas* accompanied by a dative pronoun referring to the intended victim.

Nollis conceals *non illis*. The decisive parallel is Tab. Sulis 45.6: *non illi permittas nec oculos nec sanitatem nisi caecitatem orbitatemque*, but other cases requiring various restorations obviously belong to the same type: Tab. Sulis 47.4: *non il]li permittas*, 54.5: *no[n il]l[i p]ermittas nec sedere nec iacere* (cf. 32.4, 35.5, and with the verb in the third person, 10.13). The spelling could be explained either phonetically,[3] or as a simple copying error.

At the start of the sentence *inter* is not to be construed with *quibus*. The latter is dative (*quibus nomen Seneciani (est)*), and the antecedent which would have been dependent on *inter* (*inter (eos) quibus*) has been omitted. Such ellipse is well attested,[4] though often emended away.

Perfera could be a misspelling either of *perferat*[5] or of *perferant*.

II. RIB 1065

D(is) M(anibus) Regina liberta et coniuge Barates Palmyrenus natione Catuallauna an(norum) XXX

This is the Latin part of a Latin-Palmyrene bilingual set up by a Palmyrene Barates in honour of his wife. There is a problem about the interpretation of the syntax. According to the editors, *Regina*, *liberta*, *coniuge* and *Catuallauna* are in the ablative, but that is in fact the one case that is out of the question. In Latin funerary inscriptions the name of the deceased (after *dis manibus*) may be in the nominative (e.g. RIB 11), the genitive (e.g. RIB 12) or the dative (e.g. RIB 15), but the ablative would not be meaningful in this position. If these words were to be defended as ablatives, it would be necessary to resort to some such claim as that Barates did not understand the Latin case system and simply wrote down whatever forms he knew. There is no need for such a desperate solution.

There is in fact another case into which the name of the deceased may be put. In Greek inscriptions a standard construction is the accusative of the honorand juxtaposed with the nominative of the dedicator, with a verb of honouring or setting up usually understood.[6] The construction is so commonplace all over the Greek world that it scarcely needs illustration, but for examples from (e.g.) Delos, see ID 1657, 1659, 2009. The distinction between the Latin practice and that of Greek can be

---

[1] Interpreted by the editors as = nolis.

[2] Cic. Att. 2.1.6: *nolim ita existimes*, Mur. 59: *nolo accusator in iudicium potentiam adferat.*

[3] Cf. *no* = *non* at CIL IV 4133; *ille* lost its initial vowel in the transition to the Romance languages, and is already often scanned as a monosyllable in Plautus. See on *no* V. Väänänen, Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes[3] (Berlin, 1966), 77.

[4] See J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik (Munich, 1965), 556 with examples and bibliography.

[5] See Väänänen, op. cit. 70–1.

[6] The construction occurs chiefly in honorific inscriptions, but it also found its way into funerary dedications as well: see I. Kajanto, A Study of the Greek Epitaphs of Rome (Helsinki, 1963), 19.

seen, for example, in the bilingual inscription CIL III 8 (*Iuliae Augustae Cyrenenses*: Ἰουλίαν Σεβαστὰν Κυραναῖοι), where the accusative of the Greek corresponds to the dative of the Latin. The accusative construction did find its way into Latin texts, but only those which were subject to influence from the Greek pattern. Often, for example, in bilingual inscriptions the Greek construction is adopted in the Latin version as well, as for example in the Delian inscriptions ID 1698 and 2009, and at CIL III 7265. Note also the following inscription relating to members of the imperial horse guard, the equites singulares Augusti, recently re-edited by M. P. Speidel, Die Denkmäler der Kaiserreiter. Equites singulares Augusti, no. 688c:

> m(emoriae) c(ausa). C. Iul. Proculum, eq. sing. impp. nn., natione Pannonium . . . Q. Iul. Finitus . . .
> Μ(νήμης) χ(άριν). Γ. Ἰούλιον Πρόκλον ἱππ[έ]α σινγουλάριν τῶν κυρίων αὐτοκρατόρων, γένει
> Παννόνιον . . . Γάιος Ἰούλιος Φινῖτος.

The point about this inscription is that it was set up at the unit's winter quarters in the Greek-speaking area of Anazarbos in Cilicia. In their numerous inscriptions at Rome the horse guards never used the accusative of the honorand. But it is not only in the Latin versions of bilingual inscriptions that the accusative is found; Latin speakers sometimes adopted the Greek construction in Latin texts set up in Greek areas, as for example Delos (e.g. ILLRP 370) or Sicily (ILLRP 320). The underlying Greek background to a Latin text containing the accusative construction may be revealed by various tell-tale signs. For example, in the Bulgarian inscription ILBulg. 155[7] (*D. M. Mucianum mil. leg. [. . . de]ceptum a barba[ris] Durazis fra(ter) eius memoriam [ca]usam posuit. ualete uiatores*) there is not only an accusative of the honorand (this time with a verb expressed rather than understood), but also the expression *memoriae causa*, a formula which found its way into Latin funerary inscriptions in some (Greek-speaking) areas under the influence of μνήμης χάριν;[8] it was seen above, for example, in the bilingual inscription from Anazarbos. The Greek origin of the expression is particularly clear here, in that the accusative *causam* must have been determined by the form of χάριν, with the ending of *memoriam* an anticipation of that of the next word.

Thus *Regina*, *liberta*, *coniuge* and *Catuallauna* are all in the accusative, with a banal omission of final *-m*. The reason why Barates adopted the Greek-influenced accusative pattern is that as a Palmyrene he would have been bilingual in Greek and Palmyrene Aramaic, and hence familiar with the Greek construction, which is commonplace in the Greek inscriptions of Palmyra itself. Note, for example, C 3937 (dated to A.D. 258) in the recent collection of the Palmyrene inscriptions by D. R. Hillers and E. Cussini, Palmyrene Aramaic Texts (Baltimore and London, 1996):

> Αὐρήλιον Οὐορώδην / ἱππικὸν καὶ βουλευτὴν / Παλμυρηνὸν Βηλά/καβος Ἀρσᾶ τὸν φί/[λον
> τ]ειμῆς χάριν / ἔτους οφ′.

The restoration of φίλον is certain (see e.g. C 3943). In this inscription, exactly as in that from Britain, the name of the honorand comes first, followed by two words expressing his titles (cf. *liberta et coniuge*). Then there is the name of the dedicator in the nominative (cf. *Barates Palmyrenus*), after which there is another accusative (τὸν φίλον) agreeing with the initial name (cf. *Catuallauna*; *natione* could go either with *Palmyrenus* or *Catuallauna*). The interlaced structure and case usage of the two texts are thus all but identical. Barates used a syntactic pattern with which he was familiar from another of his languages.

These various inscriptions illustrate some of the ways in which the bilingualism of a writer might influence the structure and phraseology of a funerary text.

All Souls College, Oxford   J. N. Adams

---

[7] B. Gerov, Inscriptiones Latinae in Bulgaria repertae (Sofia, 1989).

[8] See Kajanto, op. cit. 23.