HIC TACITUS LAPIS: VOICE, AUDIENCE, AND SPACE IN EARLY ROMAN

VERSE-EPITAPHS

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Cornell University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Allison Catherine Boex

August 2014

HIC TACITUS LAPIS: VOICE, AUDIENCE AND, SPACE IN EARLY ROMAN

VERSE-EPITAPHS

Allison Catherine Boex, Ph. D.

Cornell University 2014

This dissertation sets out to investigate the content, role, and effects of ancient Roman grave-inscriptions; I argue that Roman gravestones and their inscriptions were intended to serve as metonymic markers, stand-ins for their deceased subjects in the land of the living, allowing the dead to engage with the living and the living with the dead.

As many previous studies of Roman grave-inscriptions have been undermined by the fact that their authors attempt to address the entire body of Roman epitaphs (a corpus too large and diverse to allow productive study of its entirety), this dissertation focuses on a smaller corpus, the forty-nine extant verse-inscriptions generally assigned to the Roman Republic. In investigating these epitaphs, I focus on the effects of the reading-act and the related issues of voice, audience, and space; my approach is informed by the works of Svenbro (1993) and Vallette-Cagnac (1997) on the reading-act in ancient Greece and Rome respectively, Sourvinou-Inwood's (1995) study of voice in ancient Greek epitaphs, and Lowrie's (2006) work on deixis and its effects on the reader's perception of presence and absence.

I argue that the reading-act of the passer-by activates a depiction of the deceased's life, tied to the stone as the metonymic marker of the deceased; it is through this depiction that the figure of the deceased can engage, implicitly and explicitly, with the living upon each reading of the inscription. Even among the most basic poems, devoid of any acknowledgement of a living audience, we find epitaphs

that seek to connect through various devices to the real time and space of the living reader; other examples engage in what Conso (1994) terms "oralité fictive," allowing the epitaph to speak directly to that reader. And finally, we find examples in which the deceased's attempt to engage with the living is explicit: the deceased speaks, co-opting the voice of the reader to present his own portrait, in some cases without addressing a specific audience, but in other cases addressing the passer-by, or loved ones left behind.

This study not only offers a detailed look at the content and artistry of these fascinating (and in many cases neglected) poems, but also illuminates the ways in which ancient Romans dealt with life and death.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Allison Catherine Boex holds a B.A. in Classics from Kenyon College; as an undergraduate she also spent a semester studying Latin and ancient Greek at Eberhard Karls University in Tübingen. At Kenyon, she received high honors for a thesis on the sepulchral epigrams of the new Posidippus papyrus and was inducted into Phi Beta Kappa before graduating *summa cum laude* in 2003. Other research interests include Latin poetry of the Republican period and Indo-European linguistics.

During her time at Cornell she has taught Latin at the EAC Montessori School of Ithaca, worked for the American Philological Association's online 'Classical Works Knowledge Base' (http://cwkb.org/), and done freelance editing of classical scholarship for Cornell University Press and Brill; she also enjoys getting her hands dirty in the fields and orchards of Indian Creek Farm in Ithaca.

Multis sodalibus

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In our quest to understand the institutions of Rome and her inhabitants, we study texts of all sorts, from the sparest of occasional inscriptions to ornate poetic epics; the former can tell us much about the workaday life of the Romans, and the latter about their rich cultural life. Firmly in the middle of this spectrum lies the genre of poetic epitaph. In its most basic form, an epitaph might contain the name of the deceased and his or her filiation and age, allowing us to extract information as to what sort of subject merited what Armando Petrucci calls a 'written death.'[1] But when the commissioner of the epitaph saw fit to order the inclusion of more than these basic facts, we are given the opportunity to observe even more tantalizing information: imbued as they often are with emotion, these more elaborate epitaphs contain glimpses of how the Romans – a people who indisputably revered their ancestors – saw (and chose to depict) the relations between the living and the dead. In these inscriptions we see enacted a complex nexus of interaction, perceived by the Romans at the scene of the gravesite, involving the deceased, the tombstone, and such overlapping groups as the commissioner(s) of the monument, the family, and mourners.[2] This graveyard scene was intended to be activated, as it were, by a reading audience, most often the passer-by to whom many of the epitaphs are addressed. The Romans sought through this medium not only to memorialize their deceased but also in many cases to provide via the inscription a continued interaction between the dead and the living.

Although non-metrical epitaphs are also worthy of study, the verse-epitaphs, by their nature more intricate, merit a deeper investigation. The poetic nature of

---

[1] Petrucci 1998, xvi.
[2] Cf. Shaw 1991, 67: "The act of placing a tombstone, of having it inscribed, was integrally connected with the web of duties and feelings concerning the dead and, by extension, a mirroring of their status while still among the living."

these inscriptions is itself a clue to the motivation of the commissioner of the epitaph: the desire was not only for an occasional marker, but for something aspiring to art. The use of meter further indicates that the composer,[3] rather than simply recording information, is self-consciously tapping into a poetic tradition. As such, the craft of the poetic epitaph begs investigation, both in and of itself, and as a component in that poetic tradition. The relationship between poetry and commemoration was firmly established in the Greek literary world, beginning with Homer's emphasis on the importance of *kleos aphthiton* and its conferral via poetry, with or without the presence of a physical monument.[4] The Latin poets, too, would explore the *topos* of poetry-as-monument, most famously Horace at *Odes* 3.30.[5] In the early Latin verse-epitaphs, we can examine the implementation of poetry as a commemorative tool *on* a physical monument.

And so: poetic epitaphs, combining as they do socio-historical information, expressions of emotion and of religious thought, as well as evidence of poetic artistry, offer unique insights into the lives and minds of their subjects, commissioners, and authors. In the absence of a unified Roman view of the afterlife, one way in which we can gain some understanding of how the Romans conceptualized their deceased *maiores* is to investigate how gravestones and their accompanying inscriptions served as metonymic markers for their deceased subjects among the living: such a monument would be both a memory-marker and at the same time a stand-in for the deceased, activated by the reading-act of the passer-by.

We will ask several questions as we examine these epitaphs: What sort of portraits, or more broadly tableaux, do the epitaphs create of their subjects? What

---

[3] We pass over the complex question of who made up the community of second-class poets likely to be commissioned to compose inscriptions such as these. For the question of authorship of the poems of the *CLE*, see Cugusi 1985, 21-90; for discussions of the *collegium poetarum*, see Sihler 1905, Horsfall 1976, and Gruen 1990, 89-91.

[4] See Segal 1989, 330-359 and Ford 1992.

[5] See Fowler, 2000, 193-217; cf. also the passage of Ennius quoted by Cicero at *Tusc.* 1.34 (supposedly part of the poet's epitaph, *var.* 17-18 Vahlen[2] = fr. 46 *FLP*): *uolito uiuos per ora uirum.*

qualities are emphasized and what aspects of the subjects' lives are chosen for inclusion? What diction is used?

How does each epitaph cast and situate its portrait? With what narrative structure does the epitaph present the portrait? Does the epitaph situate the portrait within a tableau depicting social or familial connections, or does the subject stand isolated at the gravesite, the site of their metonymic marker? What sort of awareness does the inscription show of its nature and of its space as it creates the portrait? Whose voice is envisioned as speaking the epitaph?

What are the effects, intended or otherwise, of the reading of the epitaph by a passer-by? These include, of course, effects for the deceased subject, but also effects for others implicated in the epitaph, and for the passer-by who lends his voice to the inscription. And finally, to what extent and how are the deceased subjects ever envisioned as engaging directly with the living?

Before we begin this task it is necessary to consider which epitaphs best repay investigation: a comprehensive and detailed study of, for example, the 1,370 poems in Cholodniak's *Carmina Sepulcralia Latina*, would be unmanageable (and indeed, as we will see shortly, the primary flaw of the majority of scholarly work on this subject is a tendency to gather examples from a spectrum too wide in number and time; the Romans wrote metrical epitaphs for over six hundred years). As such, I have found it both necessary and desirable to limit the corpus of inscriptions under consideration. It is my hope that the most rewarding understanding of the genre will emerge from consideration of the earliest poetic epitaphs, beginning with those of the Scipios and proceeding through those epitaphs believed to have been written during the first century BCE, with the end-date of the corpus corresponding roughly with the end of the Roman Republic.

The time period I have chosen is attractive for study for several reasons: the epitaphs written in the third and second centuries BCE[6] have the potential to improve our understanding of a period that, because of the scarcity of preserved texts, remains mysterious in many ways. Furthermore, composed during a period when Roman literature was just beginning to establish itself, these earlier inscriptions offer us a unique opportunity to investigate what motivations and conventions were followed in poetic epitaphs before there was a clear national poetic tradition.[7] As for the epitaphs written in the first century BCE, they come from a time when manifold changes, both cultural and political, were rapidly transforming Rome. In them we can observe the development of the genre before the works of Vergil and Propertius became widely known and distributed, altering the poetic landscape (including the conventions of funerary poetry) in their wake. In addition to the continued development of her literary tradition, Rome saw in the first century BCE drastic social and political changes: the influx of created citizens from the newly enfranchised Italian allies and increased social mobility between classes, resulting from the decline and disappearance of the older aristocracy,[8] continued to challenge the traditional political and societal roles once taken for granted. Rome would be forever changed by the political developments of the first century BCE; it is my hope that the study of the epitaphs written during this time will help us to understand better the way of life that, with the change of regime from Republic to Empire, ceased to exist except in memory.

---

[6] See below pp.11-13 for a discussion of dating the epitaphs.

[7] On the question of Greek influence: it is tempting, examining as we are the earliest examples of Roman metrical epitaphs, to hope that we might establish an understanding of a "native" Italo-Roman tradition, free from Greek influence. Such a hope is not likely to be realized, however: the influence of the Greek language and literature, traced to the second half of the fourth century BCE (Cornell 1995, 398), predates our earliest epitaphs. As such, we must keep in mind the possibility (indeed the probability) of Greek influence on all the poems of the corpus. In this study we will not concern ourselves with the wider question of Greek influence, but rather address such questions individually as they arise from the content of the epitaphs.

[8] Syme 1939, 10-27 and 490-508.

The publication in the last decade of the nineteenth century of Franz Bücheler's *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* (hereafter *CLE*), a collection of 1,858 inscriptions arranged by their putative meters, made more accessible to scholars texts that had previously been published, intermixed with non-metrical examples, in the rather more imposing volumes of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (hereafter *CIL*). Cholodniak's *Carmina Sepulcralia Latina* (hereafter *CSL*), published in 1897, further increased access to metrical epitaphs. And indeed, very soon after the appearance of these verse-collections, scholars began to produce philological studies of these sepulchral inscriptions.

James Church, in his 1901 doctoral dissertation *Beiträge zur Sprache der Lateinischen Grabinscriften*, offers a short discussion of the basic formulae and syntax of sepulchral inscriptions, both metrical and non-metrical. It is a valuable starting point, but Church was primarily interested in collecting examples, rather than in analyzing them. Furthermore, although he nominally treats the historical development and geographic distribution of each formula, his study must inevitably be undermined by the fact that he is attempting to assimilate to his categories a body of several thousand inscriptions, written over a period of several centuries. One must doubt whether he actually read carefully every example in the huge body of evidence about which he is drawing conclusions; and if not, can his conclusions be trusted? And what important examples might he have missed? As we will see ourselves, dating these inscriptions can be a formidable challenge: it is difficult to classify many of them without careful consideration. How much faith can we have, then, in Church's cursory attempts to discuss chronological considerations? While Church's observations are valuable, conclusions reached in this manner (that is, by attempting to address such a vast body of evidence, and lacking consistent chronological perspective) cannot be considered much more than sweeping generalities.

So too the studies of Lier (*Topica carminum sepulcralium latinorum*, 1903),
Van Bleek (*Quae de hominum post mortem condicione doceant carmina sepulcralia Latina*, 1907), Tolman (*A Study of the Sepulchral Inscriptions in Bücheler's "Carmina Epigraphica Latina*," 1910) and Schwarzlöse (*De titulis sepulcralibus Latinis quaestionum capita quattuor*, 1913) are all discussions of sepulchral themes, or *topoi*, arranged with varying emphases. With the exception of Schwarzlöse, who, like Church, includes non-metrical inscriptions, these studies limit their scope to metrical inscriptions; but even so, little effort is made to distinguish early epitaphs from late. What conclusions are reached are illustrated by examples chosen from any time period, and a reader is left with the impression that these works, though impressive, have as a result of their swollen body of evidence failed to offer an accurate picture of the genre: it seems doubtful that every inscription has been considered and incorporated, and the lack of chronological distinction must skew any conclusions. Furthermore, while valuable as research tools thanks to their detailed systems of organization, these studies offer little in the way of analysis; the authors seem satisfied simply to create and describe categories of classification.

Outstanding among the studies from the early twentieth century is Plessis' *Poésie Latine: Epitaphes* (1905). Whereas the works above seem to choose examples somewhat indiscriminately to fit the advancement of a thesis or simply for the sake of organization, Plessis offers historical and philological commentary on epitaphs arranged chronologically within thematic groups. Although he too attempts to cover epitaphs written over too vast a time period, by attempting a chronological arrangement he offers the reader a more contextualized and accurate depiction of the genre than the studies described above.

In Galletier's *Étude sur la Poésie Funéraire Romaine d'après les Inscriptions* (1922), one sees the first attempt at a more rigorous treatment of the epitaphs, with three sections devoted respectively to the epitaphs' religious or

philosophical, historical, and literary value. Although Galletier suffers from the same handicap as previous scholars (he, too, culls examples in each section from the entire chronological range of sepulchral *carmina*), he offers an excellent discussion (pp. 191-212) of the development of the genre over time, including consideration of influence from the Roman traditions of the *neniae* (funeral dirges sung by kinswomen of the deceased) and *laudationes funebres* (public funeral orations) as well as from the Greek literary tradition.

The works of Purdie (*Some Observations on Latin Verse Epitaphs*, 1935), Lattimore (*Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, 1944) and Sanders (*Bijdrage tot de studie der Latijnse metrische grafschriften van het heidense Rome*, 1960) share their methodology with the studies done in the early twentieth century: examples from a wide time-span are arranged thematically. Lattimore's opus is by far the most comprehensive of such studies, but treating as he does metrical and non-metrical epitaphs in both Greek and Latin, the depth of his analysis is necessarily limited.

Recent decades have offered further philological studies of the Latin metrical inscriptions, with varying degrees of focus. While Cugusi (*Aspetti Letterari dei Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, 1985) offers a wide-ranging literary analysis of subject-grouped epitaphs over a range of centuries, similar to the works mentioned above, several scholars have offered studies that limit the chronological range of inscriptions under consideration (although in each of the following works, all varieties of metrical inscriptions are included, not only the sepulchral). Massaro (*Epigrafia Metrica Latina di Età Repubblicana,* 1992) includes in his metrical, epigraphical, and literary discussion only inscriptions believed to have been written during the Roman Republic; so too Keuleers (*Latijnse Epigraphische Poëzie uit de Republiek*, 2003). Even narrower is the focus of Kruschwitz' *Carmina Saturnia epigraphica* (2002): as the title indicates, he offers commentary on only those inscriptions written in the early Latin Saturnian meter. Also to be mentioned is

Courtney's *Musa Lapidaria*, of which the first forty-four pages are devoted to metrical inscriptions from the Republic, and Kruschwitz' 2007 *Metrische Inschriften der römischen Republik*, which offers several papers on diverse aspects of Roman Republican inscriptions.

While the recent works mentioned above offer commentary and discussion of selected verse-inscriptions, two other books attempt to construct a more comprehensive understanding of the genre. Häusle, in his *Das Denkmal als Garant des Nachruhms* (1980), sets forth his task as tracing the motives behind the creation of a written monument, a task similar to the one proposed for this current study. Yet despite careful organization and detailed analyses of the inscriptions and the accompanying monuments, Häusle's study leaves room for improvement in two areas. First, he too has tackled a corpus far too large for successful comprehension – not only does he fail to limit the time-period of inscriptions, but he also uses non-metrical epitaphs to reach his conclusions; such a practice, while admirable in its inclusiveness, brings the size of the genre he is addressing to massive proportions, diluting the validity of his conclusions. The second disadvantage to Häusle's study is that he limits his investigation of motive to the perspective of the deceased subject of the epitaph, leaving aside the various other parties, mentioned above, who also must be considered when attempting to understand the intended effects of a Roman epitaph.

A second recent book that sets out to develop an understanding of the genre of Roman epitaphs (in this case limited to verse-epitaphs), Wolff's *La Poésie funéraire épigraphique à Rome* (2000), is subject to the same criticisms as the work by Häusle: although Wolff devotes a chapter to the evolution of the genre of verse-epitaph, in the remainder of the book she too addresses the body of inscriptions with no chronological limits, leading the reader to wonder how truly representative her examples might be of so large a corpus. And like Häusle, Wolff is preoccupied with

the subjects themselves of the epitaphs, to the exclusion of the other individuals implicated in the inscriptions.

On the other hand, other studies not directly concerned with Roman verse-epitaphs seem to offer methods of inquiry useful for this topic. Concerned as we are with an epitaph's activation by a passer-by, and the roles implicated individuals play in the inscriptions, various studies concerning the reading act as integral to the functionality of an epitaph have proved helpful: the second and third chapters (pp. 26-63) of Svenbro's *Phrasikleia: An Anthology of Reading in Ancient Greece* (1993) offer a compelling discussion of archaic Greek epitaphs, specifically of the relationship between the written text and the reader via the inherent speech act. Related and equally insightful is Sourvinou-Inwood's discussion (pp. 279-284) of 'voices' in archaic Greek epitaphs in *'Reading' Greek Death* (1995); she illustrates successfully the importance of understanding gravestones and their inscriptions as 'metonymic markers' for the deceased. Valette-Cagnac investigates similar issues of reading, speech, and disparate voices in her discussion of epitaphs in the second chapter (pp.73-110) of *La lecture à Rome* (1997). Such a perspective as is found in these works (i.e., consideration of the reading act as an integral part of any inscription) can and should be further applied to the study of Latin verse-epitaphs, especially those that seem to depict interactions between the deceased and the living.

Our methodology, then, will be based on the following points. We seek to investigate the genre of Roman epitaphs; as discussed above, these texts offer a compelling window into Roman thought about life and death. The corpus of Latin grave inscriptions is large and diverse: they number in the tens of thousands, written over the course of six centuries, all over the Mediterranean and its environs. Large as this body of evidence is, for meaningful study it is necessary to limit ourselves to a certain part or sample of it; it is my hope that strong interpretative pressure on a

carefully delineated corpus can both produce valuable findings about the smaller corpus itself and also, with these findings as a starting point, suggest future avenues of study for the larger body of evidence. We have discussed above the selection criteria we have chosen to apply, but to summarize: the genre of Roman epitaph was a living and growing literary and cultural tradition; the earliest surviving evidence is a natural starting point to any study of that genre and tradition. Beginning, then, with the earliest Roman epitaphs, the end of the Republic is a conventional boundary, and an appropriate one, based on the cultural and historical factors discussed above. Interested as we are in the way in which epitaphs in verse sought to tap into the Classical tradition of *kleos aphthiton*, and with the additional premise that verse-inscriptions are, as a rule, more carefully composed than non-verse, we hope that verse-epitaphs will respond most productively to the kind of interpretative pressure we intend to apply. And so we have arrived at our corpus: there are forty-nine extant Republican verse-epitaphs, discussed in more detail below.

A study such as the one I propose, which undertakes to explore, based on a corpus of only the earliest Latin verse-epitaphs, the content, narrative structure, and effects of those epitaphs, with a particular awareness of the voice, audience, and space acknowledged in the poems, has never been completed. In considering the effects of the epitaphs, we will look especially closely at the idea that these inscriptions and their monuments were intended to serve as metonymic markers for the deceased, allowing them, through the portraits created by a reading of the inscription, to engage with those still living. We will explore the portraits these early epitaphs create and how they create them; furthermore, we will consider what the implications would be for the memorialized subject, as well as for others appearing in the tableaux created by the inscriptions, and for the reader who lends his voice to the inscription. I hope this study will improve our understanding not

only of Roman poetic epitaphs themselves, but also of the society that produced those epitaphs.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will offer an introduction to various aspects of our corpus of forty-nine inscriptions, including discussions of the methods by which these inscriptions are dated, the metricality of the inscriptions and the effects of that metricality, and a description of the deceased subjects represented in the epitaphs; I hope this introduction will better acquaint the reader with the corpus on which the investigation in the following chapters will be based. Immediately thereafter will follow a chapter summary, and then a first look at our earliest poems, the *elogia* of the Scipios.

Dating[9]

Any attempt to establish dates for inscriptions like the forty-nine in our corpus must be based on evidence from several disciplines (the rare exception being when internal evidence, such as a mention of the consul at the time of composition, provides a clear date), including historical linguistics, paleography, and archaeology. Historical linguists have attempted, Lindsay's *Handbook of Latin Inscriptions* (1897) being a notable early example, to establish a chronological framework based on the phonological and orthographic development of Latin, to which the linguistic features of a given inscription can be compared. Paleography in turn draws conclusions from the features of the lettering of inscriptions: Arthur and Joyce Gordon, building on the work done by Jean Mallon in *Paléographie Romaine* (1952), in their *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions* (1959) offer a summary of the development of letter-forms (as well as punctuation) over time as a means for tentative dating – an overview that has yet to be improved upon.[10] Archaeological

---

[9] I present here an overview of the dating process and of the accepted dates of the poems in our corpus. Consideration of the dating of individual poems will be discussed in later chapters on a case-by-case basis.

[10] It is Gordon-Gordon to which both Bodel (2001, 50) and Keuleers (2003) refer the reader on the subject of paleographic dating.

evidence related to the environment of an inscription can also contribute to an estimated date of composition;[11] unfortunately for us, however, many of our inscriptions were removed from their original location without any notation of their environment. Modern epigraphic studies that address the dating of Latin inscriptions tend to combine all of the above-mentioned sources of evidence to offer comprehensive (albeit still tentative) conclusions.[12]

The specificity with which the verse-inscriptions in our corpus can be dated varies widely: a very few can be dated to a specific year, whereas many others can be classified only in terms of centuries. These dates, once established by scholars, continue to be debated; the classification, for example, of the first two epitaphs of the Scipios, those for Lucius Cornelius Scipio Barbatus and his son Lucius Cornelius Scipio, have been an especial source of controversy. Attempts to date these two inscriptions based upon the historical study of the language described above led Allen, Wölfflin, and Fay to conclude that the epitaph of the father was in fact later than the epitaph of the son,[13] but recent work by Wachter,[14] supplemented by the archaeological conclusions of Coarelli,[15] has shown that this is not necessarily the case: in fact, the timeline of the composition of the two verse-inscriptions is now believed to correspond to the respective (estimated) dates of death of the father and son.[16]

Due to these inherent difficulties of the dating process, I have for the purposes of this study relied upon the collected conclusions of certain epigraphers, notably Colafrancesco and Massaro, whose *Concordanze dei Carmina Latina*

---

[11] See, for example, Coarelli's discussion (1972, 36-106) of the archaeological evidence from the tombs of the Scipios.
[12] For discussion of the dating of early Latin inscriptions incorporating all these disciplines, see Wachter 1987, Courtney 1995, Hartmann 2005, and Cooley 2012.
[13] Allen 1879, 22-24; Woelfflin 1892, 188-219; Fay 1920, 163-171.
[14] Wachter 1987, 301-359.
[15] Coarelli 1972, 36-106.
[16] For a clear account of the conclusions of Wachter and Coarelli on this subject see Flower 1996, 171-180; see also discussion of these two epitaphs later in this chapter (pp.24-33).

Epigraphica (1986) remains the most comprehensive attempt to date the inscriptions found in Bücheler's corpus.[17] Wherever possible I have also considered the conclusions of other scholars, including Bücheler, Courtney, Keuleers, Kholodniak, Kruschwitz, Plessis, Wachter,[18] Alfonsi, Degrassi, Koch, Popova, Warmington, and Wölfflin.[19]

After consulting the works of these scholars, for thirty-seven of the forty-nine inscriptions I have established (tentative, but sufficient for the purposes of this study) dates based upon concurrent conclusions reached by two or more of the studies listed above with no dissenting opinion present. Of these, eight are agreed to have been written in the second century BCE or earlier: five date at least as early as the first half of that century and three to the second half.[20] Twenty-nine verse-epitaphs are dated to the first century BCE: nine to the first half of the century, three to the second half, and seventeen are of uncertain date within the century.[21]

For the remaining twelve inscriptions in the corpus, the dates are less securely established: three inscriptions each have dates suggested by only one modern authority,[22] and nine are of disputed date.[23] The details of putative dating will be discussed with the presentation of each epitaph.

---

[17] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986.

[18] For discussion of the works of these scholars, see above pp. 4-8.

[19] Alfonsi 1965, 60-65; Degrassi 1957-63; Koch 1993, 191-242; Popova 1968, 57-66; Warmington 1940; Wölfflin 1908.

[20] First half of the second century BCE or earlier (the "or earlier" caveat referring to the first two Scipio epitaphs, which may date to the third century BCE): CIL I² 6-7, 8-9, 10, 11, 1861; second half of the second century BCE: CIL I² 14, 1202, 1211.

[21] First half of the first century BCE: CIL I² 708, 1213, 1221, 1223, 1547, 1570, 1603, 1702, 1837; second half of the first century BCE: CIL I² 1212, 1216, CIL VI 14211; of indeterminate date within the first century BCE: CIL I² 1214, 1215, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1270, 1283, 1347, 1761, 1798, 1822, 1924, 1930, 2138, 2161, 2274, CIL X 2971.

[22] CIL I² 1259 (period of Sulla or later, according to Keuleers), 1319 (first century BCE, Colafrancesco/Massaro), and 1406 (first century BCE, Kholodniak).

[23] CIL I² 1209 (second half of the second century BCE, C/M; 100-75 BCE, Keuleers; first century BCE, Warmington), 1210 (second half of the second century BCE, C/M; late Republic/early Empire, Keuleers), 1222 (first century CE, C/M; period of Cicero and Caesar, Keuleers); 1325 (late Republic/early Empire, Wölfflin); second century CE (C/M); no secure dating (Keuleers), 1732 (first half of the first century BCE, C/M, Bücheler, and Alfonsi; Republic, Keuleers; Empire, Plessis and Popova; c. 45 BCE, Warmington), 1836 (first century BCE, C/M; late second/early first century

13

Geographic distribution

The majority (twenty-nine) of the inscriptions come from the city of Rome and its environs.[24] Of the remaining twenty, seventeen were discovered in other parts of Italy. Fourteen of these are from central Italy, conquered by the Romans and subject to colonization and alliance in the fourth and third centuries BCE, although uprisings continued to occur throughout the region until after the Social War at the beginning of the first century BCE: two from Latium, two from Campania, one from Apulia, one from Samnium, one from Marsica, one from the territory of the Paeligni, one from the territory of the Aequi, three from the territory of the Sabini, and two from Picenum.[25] Three were found in northern Italy in Cisalpine Gaul (conquered, but then lost to Hannibal, in the late third century BCE, and reclaimed in the early second century BCE).[26] Finally, three were discovered in Carthago Nova, on the south-east coast of Spain, which had been founded by the Carthaginian general Hasdrubal but was taken by Scipio Africanus in 209 BCE.[27]

Meters[28]

As discussed above, the use of meter in a funerary inscription indicates an aspiration on the part of the commemorator for the memorial-text to be considered a part of a poetic tradition, as well as a desire to tap into the Classical tradition of poetry-as-commemoration. What meters, then, were chosen by the commissioners of the texts in our corpus?

BCE, Keuleers), 2139 (first century BCE, C/M; no secure dating, Keuleers), 2273 (late second/early first century BCE, Keuleers; first century BCE, Warmington; time of Claudius, Kholodniak), and 3449d (second half of the second century BCE, Koch; first half of the first century BCE, Keuleers; first century BCE, Bücheler; of uncertain age, C/M).

[24] CIL I² 6-7 through 1406, and CIL VI 14211.

[25] Latium: CIL I² 1547 (Casinum), 1570 (Minturnae); Campania: 1603 (Capua), CIL X 2971 (Naples); Apulia: CIL I² 1702 (Venusia); Samnium: CIL I² 1732; Marsica: CIL I² 1761 (Atessa); Paeligni: CIL I² 1798 (Interpromium); Aequi: CIL I² 1822 (Alba Fucens); Sabini: CIL I² 1836 (Masacci), 1837 (Reate), 1861 (Amiternum); Picenum: 1924 (Fiastra), 1930 (Ancona).

[26] Cisalpine Gaul: CIL I² 2138, 2139 (Cremona), 2161 (Eporedia).

[27] CIL I² 2273, 2274, and 3449d.

[28] I present here an overview of the meters attested in our corpus. Consideration of the metricity of each poem will be discussed in later chapters on a case-by-case basis.

14

The most common meter in our corpus of early Latin verse-inscriptions is the iambic senarius, used in twenty-four inscriptions.[29] This meter in its basic form may be illustrated thus:[30]

$$X - X - X \, (|^{31}) - X - X - U - |$$

The iambic senarius was used in Latin primarily by the dramatic poets for both tragedy and comedy, including Livius Andronicus (in whose work the meter is first attested in Latin), Naevius, Lucilius, and Plautus and Terence, having been adapted from the Greek dramatic meter referred to as iambic trimeter. Both the Greek original and its Latin counterpart, flexible as they were, apparently produced verses that, to the ears of listeners, lacked metrical artifice: Aristotle writes that iambic trimeter was the meter that resembled plain speech most closely;[32] and of the iambic senarius (which permits even more freedom in resolution than the trimeter[33]) Cicero says that lines written in this meter were so similar to ordinary speech that they could be difficult to recognize as verse.[34] The freedom the senarius grants to the composer, as well as its accessibility in our period via the popular comedies of Plautus and Terence, may explain why the composers of our corpus favored it. The frequency with which iambic senarii are attested in our corpus is one aspect that differentiates our corpus from later funerary verse-inscriptions:[35] in the Empire, epitaphs were most commonly composed in dactylic hexameter or elegiac couplets.

---

[29] CIL I² 1209, 1210, 1211, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1218, 1283, 1570, 1702, 1761, 1822, 1836, 1837, 1924, 1930, 2138, 2139, 2161, ('*compositio vitiosa*,' per Colafrancesco and Massaro: CIL I² 1212, 1217, 1219, 1798). The total number increases to twenty-five if we reject reconstruction of *felixs* to *felices* in CIL I² 1347; the verse remains then an iambic senarius rather than a Saturnian.

[30] See Gratwick 1993, 40-63.

[31] The caesura usually comes after the first syllable of the third foot, but also sometimes comes after the first syllable of the fourth foot.

[32] *Poetics* 1449a 24-26.

[33] For a list of ways in which Plautus' senarius differed from Menander's trimeter see Lindsay 1922, 11-112 and 269-270.

[34] *Orat*. 184. See Goldberg 2005, 103 and Abbott 1944, 130.

[35] Thus Massaro (2007a, 139): "In questo metro si esprime nell'ultima età repubblicana la grande innovazione e la produzione più diffusa e più significativa di epigrafia metrica in lingua latina, di genere sepolcrale e nei ceti popolari e libertine, sia a Roma che nelle regioni italiche."

A second common meter in the corpus is the so-called 'Saturnian' meter, which is used in six poems (although one of these is fragmentary and has been restored).[36] Despite much ink having been spilled on the topic of the Saturnian (in inverse proportion to the size of the corpus: the number of surviving lines written in this meter – though itself a subject of controversy – is fewer than 200, and by most estimates, 150), a true understanding of its nature and origin has yet to be reached.

Our evidence for the meter is comprised mainly of fragments from L. Livius Andronicus' translation of the *Odyssey* and Cn. Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum* (both composed in the third century BCE), supplemented by inscriptional verses, many of which (between thirty-five and forty lines, depending as described above on our acceptance of restorations) are contained in our corpus. From this scanty evidence, some conclusions can be drawn: it is agreed that the Saturnian can be divided into two cola, separated by a caesura; the second cola of the verse, generally shorter than the first, can be divided by another (known as Korsch's) caesura. Little else can be agreed: scholars continue to debate whether the meter is based on quantity or on word-accent;[37] and although the meter is generally accepted as arising from an Italic rather than Greek tradition, the possibilities of an Indo-European origin and of Greek influence are still being considered.[38] For our purposes it will be sufficient to note that the use of Saturnians carries two main implications: that of antiquity (the meter fell out of use before the Classical period[39]) and of a preference for an Italic

---

[36] CIL I² 6-7, 8-9, 10, 11, 1202 (restored: 708; also, the total number increases to seven if we accept I² 1347 as a Saturnian (rather than an iambic senarius) with the restoration of *felixs to felices*).

[37] For the quantitative approach, see Cole 1969, 3-73 and Parsons 1999, 117-137; for the accentual approach, see Lindsay 1893, 305-334.

[38] For a clear presentation of the ongoing debate in the secondary literature, see Goldberg 1993, 19-36. For a recent approach informed by both the quantitative and accentual solutions as well as consideration of non-Roman Italic examples, see Mercado 2012.

[39] Cf. Ennius' famous verses (*Ann.* 206-7), referring, according to Cicero (*Brut.* 75-6), to the Saturnians of Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum*: *scripsere alii rem / uorsibus quos olim Faunei uatesque canebant.* For discussion, see Wiseman 2006.

poetic tradition rather than the Greek traditions drawn on by all the other meters in the corpus.

The two other meters that are well-represented in our corpus of early Latin verse-epitaphs are the elegiac couplet, which appears in eight poems, and dactylic hexameter, appearing in four poems.[40] These meters, as mentioned above, would become the norm for funerary verse-inscriptions after the period of our corpus; and indeed, it is in funerary inscriptions of our corpus (specifically CIL I² 15 and 1861) that each of these meters is first attested in Latin. No explanation of these familiar meters is necessary here; let us note, however, the poetic traditions to which each belong. Elegiac couplets were the meter of choice for Greek funerary verse, including both the inscribed examples and the literary funerary epigrams composed by the Hellenistic poets; the adoption of this meter after our period by Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius for their love poetry reminds us that elegiac couplets were also used by the Greeks (Mimnermus being a notable early example) for erotic poetry.[41] Dactylic hexameter, in addition to its use in early Greek inscriptions,[42] is of course the meter of oral Greek epic, and was imported and adapted to Latin by Ennius for his *Annales*, thereby establishing the meter as standard for the Latin epic tradition as well.

The above discussion has accounted for the meters of forty-two of our forty-nine poems. Of the remaining seven inscriptions, four fall into clear metrical categories: three[43] are written in various trochaic meters, used by (among others) the tragic poets, Lucilius, and Plautus and Terence, and one[44] is a (rather singular)

---

[40] Elegiac couplets: CIL I² 15, 1221, 3449d, CIL VI 14211, CIL X 2971 (*compositio vitiosa*: CIL I² 1222, 1223, 1732); dactylic hexameter: CIL I² 1603 (*compositio vitiosa*: CIL I² 1270, 1861, 2274).
[41] See West 1974.
[42] See Sicking 1993, 69-82.
[43] CIL I² 1319 (trochaic septenarii, albeit '*vitiosi*'), 1325 (trochaic octonarius), 1406 (trochaic senarius).
[44] CIL I² 1259.

dactylic tetrameter. Of the remaining three, one[45] may be either a Saturnius or iambic senarii, depending on its restoration, and two[46] are '*commatica*,' i.e., they cannot be classified in terms of a single metrical scheme, but show metrical aspirations in that they contain distinct verse-units.

Demographics[47]

Forty-nine early Latin verse-epitaphs have as their subjects a total of fifty-seven people: forty-three of the epitaphs are written for individuals, five are written for couples, and one generic epitaph has four people as its subject.

Forty-two of the epitaphs include (sometimes via a non-metrical super- or sub-script) information about the subjects' sex, class, and stage of life at the time of death. The remaining seven epitaphs indicate the sex of the deceased, but lack indications of either stage of life, class, or both. The following information can be gleaned from the inscriptions.

Sex

Of the forty-three individual-epitaphs, twenty-seven have men as their subjects, and sixteen are for women.[48] Five pair-epitaphs have as their subjects married couples,[49] and the one generic epitaph has as its subject three freedman and one freedwoman, bringing the gender totals to thirty-five men and twenty-two women.

Class[50]

---

[45] CIL I² 1347; see n.29 and n.36 above.
[46] CIL I² 1547, 2273.
[47] For a wider look at the demographics of sepulchral commemoration, see Shaw 1991.
[48] Men: CIL I² 6-7, 8-9, 10, 11, 15, 708, 1202, 1209, 1210, 1212, 1216, 1223, 1283, 1325, 1547, 1603, 1702, 1761, 1798, 1861, 1924, 2138, 2139, 2274, 3449d, CIL VI 14211, CIL X 2971; women: CIL I² 1211, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1222, 1270, 1406, 1570, 1732, 1836, 1837, 2161, 2273.
[49] CIL I² 1221, 1259, 1319, 1347, 1930.
[50] I have taken traditional filiation as an indicator of free-born status. Also, I follow Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) and Kruschwitz (2002, 166) in believing the subject of 1202 to be free-born, although no filiation appears in the inscription.

Nineteen of the individual-epitaphs are written for free-born individuals;[51] one of the pair-epitaphs (CIL I²1259) describes a free-born husband. Of the fifty-seven subjects, then, twenty are indicated as free-born.

Fourteen of the individual-epitaphs are written for freedmen or freedwomen;[52] pairs of married freedmen and freedwomen are the subjects of CIL I² 1319, 1347, and 1221, and CIL I² 1259 describes a couple in which the wife is a freedwoman; finally, the generic 1822 has as its subject four freedpeople. Therefore the number of freedmen and freedwomen represented as such in these epitaphs is twenty-five.

Far fewer are the epitaphs that indicate that their subjects were slaves: only four epitaphs have slave subjects.[53]

Six of the individual epitaphs do not indicate the class of their subjects;[54] CIL I² 1930, an epitaph for a married couple, also fails to do so, leaving a total of eight people whose class is unspecified.

Stage of life[55]

Of the individual-epitaph subjects, twenty-seven can be considered mature and fourteen immature, while two of the individual-epitaphs give no indication of the deceased's stage of life.[56] All of the individuals concerned in the five pair-epitaphs can be considered mature at the time of their deaths, as were the four

---

[51] CIL I² 6-7, 8-9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 708, 1202, 1215, 1216, 1603, 1702, 1761, 1798, 1836, 1837, 1924, 2274, 3449d, CIL X 2971.
[52] CIL I² 1209, 1210, 1212, 1214, 1218, 1223, 1270, 1283, 1406, 1547, 1570, 2138, 2161, 2273.
[53] CIL I² 1213, 1219, 1861, CIL VI 14211.
[54] CIL I² 1211, 1217, 1222, 1325, 1572, 1732, 2139.
[55] Whenever possible I have classified the subject of the epitaph as either 'mature' or 'immature.' This distinction is necessarily subjective, but there is evidence of such a distinction pertaining to death in Roman thought (Lattimore 1942, 186-187). I have taken marriage as a sign of adulthood/maturity except where the epitaph indicates a contrary sentiment (see, however, Treggiari 1991, 39-42 on the subject of at what age girls were considered suitable for marriage).
[56] Mature: CIL I² 6-7, 8-9, 15, 708, 1202, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1270, 1283, 1406, 1547, 1570, 1702, 1732, 1761, 1836, 1861, 2138, 2273, 2274, CIL VI 14211, CIL X 2971; immature: 10, 11, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1222, 1223, 1603, 1798, 1837, 1924, 2161, 3449d; no indication: 1219, 1325.

freedpeople who are the subjects of the generic 1822. Therefore forty-one of the epitaph subjects are considered mature, fourteen immature, and two unclassifiable in terms of maturity.

Demographic trends

Slightly more men than woman are represented in the epitaphs; but perhaps more notable is the fact that men drastically outnumber women in the free-born category, while similar numbers of men and women are represented in all the other categories. It seems, then, that free-born men were more likely to receive metrical epitaphs during this period than their female counterparts, whereas no such imbalance applied for freed-people and slaves. One explanation for this discrepancy could be that free-born men were more likely to have that status indicated on their tombstones than women of the class, and therefore fewer of the free-born women can be easily identified as such.

The small proportion of slave-epitaphs is not surprising given the limited resources of that class. Also not surprising is the fact that far more of the deceased were mature at the time of their deaths than immature; for an individual to die young (particularly before his or her parents) was anomalous,[57] as indicated by the mournful tone of epitaphs for such subjects.

Such, then, is our corpus of early Latin verse-epitaphs; with this knowledge we shall proceed to a consideration of the inscriptions themselves, with the objectives described above. Shortly, in the latter part of this chapter, we will take a first look at the earliest poems in our corpus, the five *elogia* of the Scipios; as we will see, these poems stand apart from the rest of our corpus in context and content. We will return to consider them once again in the conclusion, once we have explored the evidence of the remainder of the corpus.

---

[57] Contra Hopkins 1983, 70-72.

The arrangement of the discussions of epitaphs in the following chapters is based first of all on whether the deceased subject is envisioned as playing an active role in the tableau created by the inscription: we will look first (in chapters two, three, and four) at those twenty-six poems in which the deceased is not depicted as speaking, and then (in chapters five and six) at those eighteen examples in which the deceased does play an active role, speaking some or all of the poem. The organization of the chapters is intended to highlight an increasing engagement with space and audience, accompanied by increasingly complex manifestations of fictive orality. We will end with those poems in which the deceased, through the inscription carved on his or her gravestone, is envisioned as speaking for him- or herself to a living audience.

In chapter two, then, we will examine ten poems in the corpus that I have designated 'endocentric,' poems that show no awareness or acknowledgement of their space or audience. An examination of these poems, in which the portrait of the deceased created by the text does not engage with an addressee, the reader, or the space around them, will help us to understand the basic content of such portraits and their tableaux before we move on to more elaborate 'exocentric' versions that do engage with their space and audience.

In the third chapter we will consider five poems that, while they do not acknowledge an audience, do have a particular 'exocentric' element: a reference to their space via deixis. We will see whether the addition of this element otherwise affects the content of an epitaph, and consider the relationship that such an element creates between the inscription, the tableau it creates, the space, and the reader.

In chapter four we will look at eleven poems that do acknowledge their audience in some way, and investigate how the inclusion of such an acknowledgment affects the content of the epitaph and the tableau it creates. We will see that with the addition of a recognized audience comes, in some cases, a

21

particular 'voice' speaking the inscription: as opposed to those in chapters two and three, some of these poems acknowledge their status as texts and are envisioned as delivered by particular speakers.

Chapter five covers nine poems in which the deceased speaks for him- or herself, but without acknowledging an audience; here we explore whether and how the fact that the deceased is endowed with speech, rather than silent as in all of the preceding examples, may change the content and its effects. We will also see that this trope of deceased-as-speaker seems tied to a stronger awareness of the space around the monument, for in these examples the stone serves more explicitly as the deceased's metonymic marker, and references of various kinds to the stone and the space around it, the assumed environment of the activated portrait, appear in every example.

In the sixth chapter we consider those nine poems in which the deceased is envisioned as speaking to a particular (living) audience: the passer-by in the first seven examples, and, in the last two, still-living mourners. These poems show the most fully developed 'fictive orality,' and here we explore what it is that the dead have to say to the living, how they say it, and what the intended effects might have been for the parties involved, including the subject, the commissioner, the mourners, and the passers-by who serve as readers and listeners. As we will see, several elements of content appear in these epitaphs that appear nowhere else; the choice to commission this sort of epitaph reflects particular motivations and intended effects that differ from other examples.

These are remarkable poems, showing a broad spectrum of quality and artistry as they illustrate the many motives and, poignantly, the hopes behind the creation of such monuments. They offer a window into the ways in which the Romans wished to commemorate and be commemorated, and how they envisioned

themselves as continuing to engage with their friends and family members even after they had died.

Epitaphs of the Scipios

To end this introductory chapter, we will take a first look at the metrical epitaphs of the Scipios: these five inscriptions[58] include what are likely some of the oldest inscriptions in our corpus. As we have not yet, however, explored the framework of content, effects, and 'fictive orality' that will develop through our investigation into the rest of the corpus, we will delay our consideration of the effects of these epitaphs to our final, concluding chapter.

The epitaphs of the Scipios merit their own separate consideration, as they form a distinct unit in themselves, being the only set of epitaphs in our corpus written for members of the same notable family; furthermore, they stand apart among the other poems of the corpus in both their environment and their content. I will first present a brief overview of what the archaeological evidence has shown about the environment of the inscriptions – which will of course affect our understanding of their intended audience and reception – and then a consideration of the content of each the epitaphs.

The metrical epitaphs of the Scipios adorned sarcophagi in a subterranean vault on the Via Appia outside of the Porta Capena,[59] built shortly after the construction of that roadway in 312 BCE, and expanded by the addition of an annex c. 130 BCE.[60] Zevi has suggested, and Van Sickle concurs, that the very location of the tomb has political implications, symbolizing the developing political emphasis of the period on expansion into southern Italy.[61] Upon excavation the tomb was

---

[58] CIL I² 7, 9, 10, 11, and 15; 14 is reconstructed as Saturnians by Ritschl (see n.170 below) but is too fragmentary to be included here.
[59] Cf. Cic. *Tusc*. 2.13: *an tu egressus porta Capena cum Calatini Scipionum Seruiliorum Metellorum sepulchra uides, miseros putas illos?*
[60] Coarelli 1972, 48-51. For detailed discussions of the tomb as a whole, see Coarelli, Courtney 1995, Flower 1996, and Fassbender 2007.
[61] Zevi 1973, 65; Van Sickle 1987, 41.

found to contain nineteen sarcophagi;[62] nine have extant inscriptions, including three non-metrical inscriptions in addition to the metrical epitaphs included in our corpus.[63] The fact that all these inscriptions were carved on sarcophagi results from a funerary practice that further distinguishes the tombs of the Scipios from the others in our corpus: rather than cremating their dead, as was the norm by the time-period in question, the Cornelii followed the older practice of inhumation.[64] Unlike the situation assumed for all the other epitaphs on the Appian Way in our corpus, these Scipio epitaphs were not visible from the road; scholars agree that only family members entered the tomb.[65]

But just as the environment in which the *elogia* of the Scipios are situated differs from that of the other epitaphs in the corpus, so too their content marks them as distinct, in two ways. More so than in any of the other epitaphs, the *elogia* show an emphasis on the accomplishments of their subjects: what political and religious offices they held, and what they accomplished in those offices. Furthermore there is, not surprisingly, a heavy emphasis on family: three of the Scipio epitaphs include metrical filiation, a feature rare elsewhere in the corpus, and there are more general mentions of the family as a whole than in the other epitaphs, where most often it is individual and specific family members that are implicated.

The first of the Scipio *elogia*, CIL I² 6-7 (or, to be more precise, 7, since 6 refers to the non-metrical superscript) for L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus (*RE* no. 343), cos. 298 BCE, is carved into the front of his sarcophagus:

L. Corneli]o(s) Cn. f. Scipio

---

[62] The century of the first discovery of the tomb is reported as the sixteenth (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.) or the seventeenth (Courtney 1995, 216), but it is agreed that the site was then neglected and had to be 'rediscovered' in 1780. The tomb and its contents underwent restoration from 1926 to 1929.
[63] A potentially interesting future avenue of study would be to compare the content and effects of these metrical *carmina* with those of the three non-metrical inscriptions found in the tomb.
[64] Courtney 1995, 216; cf. Cic. *Leg*. 2.56 and Plin. *Nat.* 7.187.
[65] Flower 1996, 160; see also Eck 1984, 133 n.34.

```
<<************************************ | *****************>>
```
Cornelius Lucius   Scipio Barbatus,
Gnaiuod patre | prognatus,   fortis uir sapiensque,
quoius forma uirtutei   parisuma | fuit,
consol, censor, aidilis   quei fuit apud uos,
 Taurasia(m) Cisauna(m) | Samnio cepit,
subigit omne(m) Loucanam   opsidesque abdoucit.[66]

Lucius Cornelius Scipio, son of Gnaeus.
Lucius Cornelius Scipio Barbatus, begotten of his father Gnaeus, a brave and sapient man,
whose handsome form was fully a match for his courage, who was consul, censor, aedile
among you, captured Taurasia, Cisauna, Samnium, reduced all of Lucania and took hostages
from there (trans. Courtney).

The four inscription-lines do not correspond with the six Saturnian verses:[67] line-breaks are indicated in the text above, which is metrically arranged (as will be the remaining texts).

Attempts to date inscriptions like those in our corpus are often fraught with difficulties,[68] and the question of how to date this epitaph in particular has engendered much discussion, with the *communis opinio* undergoing several major shifts over the last two hundred years.[69] As noted above, Barbatus was consul in 298 BCE; he is the earliest of the Scipios to receive a metrical *carmen*, and the father of L. Cornelius Scipio, the subject of CIL I² 8-9. We do not know when he died, but we might reasonably suppose that his death, and therefore his burial and its accompanying inscriptions, would be the earliest in the tomb (and therefore also in our corpus).[70] And indeed, certain aspects of the orthography are markedly old-fashioned;[71] elsewhere in the inscription, however, other forms show a more

---

[66] CLE 7: On the lid of the peperino sarcophagus, separate from the poetic inscription, is a painted non-metrical notation (CIL I² 6) of the deceased's name and filiation (shown in italics in the text above). Above and along the first line of the carved metrical inscription are traces of an erasure, the nature of which has been much debated; see Flower 1996, 171-5; Courtney 1995, 217-20; Wachter 1987, 318-21; Saladino 1970, 15. The inscription is now in the Vatican museum.

[67] On the meter of this poem, see Kruschwitz 2002, 47-48 and Mercado 2012.

[68] See above pp.11-14.

[69] For a summary, see Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[70] Flower 1996, 171; she cites Coarelli's (1972) proposal that the construction of the sarcophagi of Barbatus and his son suggests respective dates of 270 and 230 BCE.

[71] In *Gnaiuod*, for example, we see the earlier spelling of the diphthong /ai/; <ai> and <ae> are both in use at the time of the *SCdB* (186 BCE; see Weiss 2009, 103). We also see in that word the retention of intervocalic /u̯/ before /o/ (Weiss ibid., 154) and also the final /d/ of the ablative singular

advanced stage of orthography.[72] As a result of these inconsistencies, several

scholars in the late 19th century began to argue that while the painted name and

filiation may have been contemporary with Barbatus' burial, the extant metrical

carmen could be far younger, perhaps even later than CIL I² 8-9 for Barbatus' son;

Allen and Wölfflin agree on a date of approximately 200 BCE.[73]

In the 20th century, attention shifted from the linguistic evidence to

archaeological investigation. La Regina, Zevi, and Coarelli contributed to an

archaeologically-based chronology summarized by Van Sickle in 1987 that places

CIL I² 8-9 for the son c. 240-230 BCE, and the inscribed longer verses for Barbatus

c. 200 BCE.[74]

Also in 1987 came a careful and well-considered study of the epitaphs by

Rudolf Wachter in his *Altlateinische Inschriften*. Wachter asserts that the *carmen* of

the father, contrary to previous scholarly conclusions, need not be later than that of

the son and furthermore that its composition could, in fact, be contemporary with

the death of Barbatus. He points out that to declare the language of the Barbatus

epitaph 'too modern' for the middle of the third century BCE is problematic given

that we have no dated inscriptions before 217 BCE. The majority of his arguments,

based on the valid principle that in dating an inscription one must be more

concerned with the innovations rather than archaisms, attempt to convince the

reader that rather than moving the date of the Barbatus inscription forward based on

---

ending of the thematic declension (Weiss ibid., 222). Egbert (1983) suggests that the final <d>
ceased to be written shortly after 200 BCE and notes that while is it written in the *SCdB*, it is not
used in the decree of Aemilius Paulus written three years earlier; Lindsay (1897) points out that it
appears in Naevius but not in Plautus. Also among the seemingly archaic features are the diphthongs
in *Loucanam* and *abdoucit* (with the latter being a mid-stage from *deuk-) for later <ū> (see Weiss
2009, 103-104).
[72] The question of whether to take *Samnio* as accusative or ablative (i.e. *in Samnio*, with the
preposition understood) remains open, but if we accept the latter, then this form fails to show the
final <d> of *Gnaivod*; we also have monophthongized *Lucius*, contrary to <ou> in *Loucanam* and
abdoucit mentioned above.
[73] Allen 1879 and 1898, and Wölfflin 1890 and 1892.
[74] Van Sickle 1987.

forms like *Lucius*, we should conclude that the language had developed to the represented point by the time of Barbatus' death. Courtney, however, in his 1995 treatment, is not convinced.[75]

Having sorted through that rather long history of others' opinions, I am hesitant to add my own, except to note that although the orthography of CIL I² 9 for the son L. Cornelius does indeed appear to me to be more old-fashioned that that of CIL I² 7 for his father Barbatus, the possibility of deliberate archaizing in one or both of the inscriptions must confuse the issue; on the other hand, Wachter's arguments seem to me to have some validity. We will settle, then, for believing Barbatus' inscription to belong to the latter half of the third century BCE, possibly as late as 200 BCE. Let us turn, then, to the content of the poem; this too has received a great deal of scholarly attention, so we will on some points defer to the work of others.

The name of the deceased occupies the entire first line, but with a reversal of the *praenomen* and *nomen*. Kruschwitz reports that such reversals are an observed feature of Saturnian poetry;[76] he suggests that the motivation is ultimately metrical, but other reasons have also been suggested.[77] At the beginning of the second line is a feature that is rare among the poems of our corpus:[78] a metrical filiation, *Gnaiuod patre prognatus*. The substantive *prognatus* appears in the nominative case, modifying the deceased Barbatus who is the subject of each of the following five verbs. Till and Courtney note that *prognatus* (for the more common *filius*) was

---

[75] Courtney (1995, 219-220) acknowledges the validity of Wachter's former point (that is, the lack of absolutely dated evidence) but rejects the latter argument. Courtney proposes the following chronology (based on historical arguments about the status of the family at that time):

      L. Cornelius' painted inscription: c. 240 BCE
      Barbatus' painted inscription, L. Cornelius' carved inscription: c. 200 BCE
      Barbatus' carved inscription: c. 186-5.

[76] Kruschwitz 2002, 83; he also notes cases in Ennius, Lucilius, and Catullus.

[77] As we note in reference to CIL I² 1209 (ch.4 n.82), the one other example of such a reversal in our corpus, it can be used to single out an individual by putting the emphasis on his *praenomen* (see Ogilvie on Liv. 4.23.1).

[78] The only non-Scipionic example appears in CIL I² 1215, discussed in ch.6.

probably already archaic at the time of composition;[79] Plessis suggests further that the juxtaposition of *patre* and *prognatus* is anomalous, with the term *prognatus* more commonly paired with the name of a grandfather or more remote ancestor, but admits that other examples of such a juxtaposition do exist in the works of early Latin poets, including Naevius and Plautus.[80] The choice to use *prognatus* together with *patre* here may also have been motivated by a desire for alliteration, which, as we will see, we also find in the metrical filiation of CIL I² 10.

The remainder of the second verse and the whole of the third praise the deceased: Barbatus is characterized as a *uir fortis* and *sapiens*, whose form was more than equal to his virtue, *forma uirtutei parisuma*. Praise is, not surprisingly, a common element in Roman epitaphs, but in fact the diction here and the ideas expressed by it are not well paralleled elsewhere in our corpus. The epithet *fortis* appears nowhere else in our corpus, nor does *sapiens*.[81] The implications of this line have been discussed in detail elsewhere,[82] so we will limit ourselves here to noting that the line is distinctive within our corpus: praise of the deceased's *forma* occurs in only one other example, too fragmentary for full treatment;[83] mentions of *uirtus*, perhaps surprisingly, are limited to the Scipio epitaphs and two other examples.[84]

---

[79] Till 1970, 279; Courtney 1995, 224.

[80] Plessis 1905, 10: Naev. (*trag.* 49 Ribbeck), *Dryante regem prognatum patre*; Pl. *Men.* 1078, *me esse dico, Moscho prognatum patre*.

[81] Harrod (1904, 44) cites no other examples of *fortis* applied to the deceased in his treatment of the epithets in CIL VI, and *fortissimus* appears only twice; *sapiens*, he reports (ibid., 46) appears only once. Courtney notes that Cicero chooses these two adjectives (*Tusc.* 5.36) to translate Plato's ἀνδρεῖος and φρόνιμος (*Menex.* 248a). For more on the choice and implications of these adjectives, see Courtney 1995, 224-5 and Kruschwitz 2002, 39-40 and 48-53.

[82] On the possible Greek model καλοκαγαθία, see Courtney 1995, 225 and Kruschwitz 2002, 41-42; see the latter for discussion of the various shades of meaning for *uirtus* here, and the possibility that the mention of appearance was due originally to the presence of an accompanying statue. For a detailed discussion of precedents, parallels, and further implications of this statement, see Kruschwitz 2002, 53-57.

[83] CIL I² 1208 (see ch.2 n.105), where it is also mentioned relative to character, although there the deceased's good character surpassed his or her appearance: *Quoius forma(m) t[enaces] | uicerunt mores fi[dei]*.

[84] Neither of the two other uses is applied to a full-grown man: CIL I² 1217, attributed to a woman, and 1924 for a young boy. As we will see, *uirtus* is something of a Scipionic catchword, appearing in several of these *elogia*; cf. the 'epic periphrasis' *uirtus Scipiadae* applied to Scipio Aemilianus at

The last three lines relay a report of Barbatus' activities, as Kruschwitz puts it,[85] *domi militiaeque*. The whole of the fourth line is given over to a sort of *cursus honorum*, listing the offices held by the deceased Barbatus: *consol, censor, aidilis quei fuit apud uos*.[86] Although Kruschwitz, citing Meyer, declares this element "conventional" in Roman honorary, dedicatory, and sepulchral inscriptions,[87] we see this feature nowhere else in the corpus outside of the Scipionic epitaphs; as we will see, there are occasional mentions of the deceased's profession, but nothing as formal or specific as here. This lack may be explained, however, by the simple fact that none of the other epitaph-subjects had such a career to boast about – the vagaries of historic preservation have not left extant any other examples of epitaphs for high-status individuals. The *apud uos* is intriguing, suggesting as it seems to that the unidentified speaker is addressing a plural audience beyond the family members likely to see the tomb. We will postpone our discussion of this address until the section on the effects of these epitaphs later in our study; here it will suffice to note that this and CIL I² 9 are the only *carmina* to include this phrase, and that an address to an unidentified plural audience is rare in our corpus.

The content of the fifth and sixth lines, which summarize the martial activities of Barbatus' consulship, is also unparalleled in the corpus outside of the Scipionic sub-set, likely for the same reason that the *cursus* finds no parallels. We learn that Barbatus captured (although the tense here changes to the historical present) Taurasia and Cisauna in Samnium,[88] *Taurasia(m) Cisauna(m) Samnio*

Hor. *Sat*. 2.1.72 (Aemilianus built a temple to *Virtus*: Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 5). For more on the implications of *uirtus*, see Hellegouarc'h 1972, 476-483, Eisenhut 1973, and, more recently, McDonnell 2006.
[85] Kruschwitz 2002, 42.
[86] For a discussion of this list of offices, including reasons for this particular word order, see ibid., 42-43.
[87] Ibid., 43, citing Meyer 1991, 94-97; in fact, so-called *cursus* inscriptions are generally used in an honorific rather than sepulchral context (see Cooley 2012, 145-6).
[88] Various ways to take *Samnio* have been suggested (see n.72 above): as an accusative parallel to the others in these lines (as in Courtney's translation; perhaps less likely due to the clearly reduced thematic vowel elsewhere in the inscription, e.g. in the nom. sg. *Cornelius*); an ablative, locatival or

cepit, as well as the whole of Lucania, and took hostages, *subigit omne*(*m*) *Loucanam opsidesque abdoucit*. In fact Barbatus is generally seen as a rather minor historical character, at least according to extant sources,[89] but these verses report his accomplishments with pride.

We see a parallel account in CIL I² 8-9 for Barbatus' son, L. Cornelius Scipio, (*RE* no. 323), cos. 259:

> *L.*] *Cornelio*(*s*) *L. f. Scipio* | *aidiles, cosol, cesor.*
> honc oino(m) ploirume(i)   cosentiont R[omai][90]
> duonoro(m) optumo(m)   fuise uiro(m),
> Luciom Scipione(m)   filio(m) Barbati.
> consol, censor, aidilis   hic fuet a[pud uos],
> hec cepit Corsica(m)   Aleria(m)que urbe(m),
> dedet Tempestatebus   aide(m) mereto[d].[91]
>
> 3 filio(m) *L. Havet, De Saturnio Latinorum Versu* (*1880*), *221*: filios *lapis*[92]
>
> *Lucius Cornelius Scipio, son of Lucius, aedile, consul, censor.*
> Most people agree that this man, Lucius Scipio, son of Barbatus, was uniquely best among the good men at Rome. He was consul, censor, aedile among you, he captured Corsica and the city of Aleria, he gave to the Storm-deities a temple, as they deserved (trans. Courtney).

This *elogium* of the son differs from that of the father in that the six inscription-lines do correspond with the six Saturnian verses, with no line-breaks disturbing the metrical arrangement.[93] For the dating of this inscription, see discussion above of 6-7 for Barbatus; a date-range from 240-230 (as a likely death-date for Lucius[94]) to

---

of separation (but as noted above it lacks the final <d> seen in *Gnaiuod*); a dative of disadvantage; or finally and least likely (as it seems to me), a genitive plural (= *Samnitium*). See Courtney 1995, 224 and Kruschwitz 2002, 45.

[89] See Courtney 1995, 224 and Flower 1996, 170; the latter sends the reader (n.50) to Silvestri 1978, Innocenti Prosdocimi 1980/1981, and Marcotte 1985 for discussion of the place-names here. See Liv. 10.11.10ff. for that author's account of Barbatus' consulship.

[90] Kruschwitz prefers the restoration *R*[*omane*], based on the conventions of syntax in Saturnians and on the parallel of the Atilius Calatinus epitaph (see n.101 below), although he considers *R*[*omae*] reasonable as well (2002, 64-65).

[91] CLE 6: CIL I² 8, the non-metrical superscript, is painted on the top of Lucius' peperino sarcophagus, and 9, the metrical inscription, is carved onto the front (with damage to the right side). The inscription is now in the Vatican museum.

[92] For *filios* vs. *filio*(*m*), see below.

[93] For the meter here, see Courtney 1995, 222, Kruschwitz 2002, 69-70, and Mercado 2012.

[94] Although it is possible, of course, that he died sooner; he is not mentioned after his censorship (Flower 1996, 177).

170 BCE (a *terminus ante quem* based on the paleography and orthography[95]) seems safe enough.

The first three lines of this *carmen* for the son contain the same three elements as the preceding one for the father – name, filiation, and praise – but in a different order: whereas CIL I² 7 begins with Barbatus' full name, immediately followed by a metrical filiation, here the poem begins with praise for the deceased, a clause that occupies the full first two verses, asserting that very many people[96] agree (*ploirume*[97] *cosentiunt*, a vivid present tense) that this man (*honc oino*(*m*); note the deixis) was the best of good men[98] (*duonoro*(*m*) *optumo*(*m*) *fuise uiro*(*m*)). As we will see as we investigate the remainder of the corpus, praise in these early Roman epitaphs is often given not absolutely, but in relation to others, and such is very much the case here: not only is Lucius said to be the best of good men (an explicit comparison of the deceased to his contemporaries), he is said to be so in the judgment of others.[99] The resulting praise, is, however, rather generic; and in fact lines very similar to these also, according to Cicero, began the epitaph for a contemporary of Lucius, Atilius Calatinus (*RE* Atilius 36, cos. 258 and 254), whose tomb was located near that of the Scipios.[100] Scholars have not reached a consensus

---

[95] As mentioned above, this inscription shows even more "old-fashioned" orthographic features than 7 for Barbatus, e.g. in the first verse unraised <o> in *honc* and the last syllable of *cosentiont* (see Weiss 2009, 139-140), <oi> for later /ū/ in *oino*(*m*) (Weiss ibid., 102) and *ploirume* (on which see Weiss ibid., 360; also see n.97 below), and <e> for the diphthong /ei/, later monophthongized to /ī/ (Weiss ibid., 101). For further discussion, see Courtney 1995, 221-222 and Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[96] Or, if we take Kruschwitz' preferred *R*[*omane*], many Romans.

[97] On the question of whether the etymologically correct spelling of the first syllable of the superlative should be *ploir-* or *plour-,* see ch.3 n.72.

[98] According to Kruschwitz (2002, 65), *boni*, especially when paired with *uiri*, carries the meaning of "capable, competent" ('tüchtige'), associated with the "konservative Aristokratenschicht," which leads him to suggest as a translation here "best of the nobility" ('der Beste des Adels'). Flower considers this claim and the one in Calatinus' epitaph "reflections of the spirit of rivalry and competition which accompanied the rise of the Scipios during the Second Punic War" (1996, 179).

[99] As Habinek (2002, 51) puts it, "the list of high offices, military achievements, and pious activities is not left to stand on its own, but is validated by the prior assertion of widespread recognition and evaluation of those achievements."

[100] *De Fin.* 2.116, *Cato* 61: *hunc unum plurimae consentiunt gentes / populi primarium fuisse uirum.*

as to which of these epitaphs influenced the other, and there is, as always, the possibility of a lost mutual source.[101]

In the third verse here we find another example of a metrical filiation, simpler than the one for Barbatus, including only the Latin word for son (*filius*, rather than *prognatus*) plus the genitive of the father's name: *filio*(*m*) *Barbati*. In this simplicity it resembles more closely the standard non-metrical form of filiation, i.e. an abbreviation of the father's name (understood to be in the genitive) followed by the abbreviation *f.* for *filius* (although it is the *praenomen* that is standard: cf. the non-metrical *L. f.* in the superscript of this poem).[102] As was the case in 7, the filiation follows immediately the name of the deceased; here, however, there may be a change in case, depending on whether we understand the stone's *filios* or *filio*(*m*), a widely accepted emendation based on the idea that *filios* was wrongly expanded from *filio* by an over-eager stonecutter.[103] Accepting *filios* would require that word and the next to go with what follows, destroying the symmetry of three lines containing name, filiation, and praise followed by three containing the *cursus* and career highlights (a feature paralleled in Barbatus' epitaph); taking *filio*(*m*) allows that symmetry.[104]

And so here too we have a *cursus* line, similar to the fourth verse of Barbatus' epitaph (with *apud uos* restored based on that line), listing the offices he held: *consol*, *censor, aidilis hic fuet a*[*pud uos*]; the only other difference between

---

[101] Courtney believes that Calatinus' was likely earlier, but he notes that others do not agree (1995, 221). Courtney also mentions as a possible predecessor the commendation of the grandson of Lucius, Scipio Nasica, in 205 BCE reported at Liv. 29.14.8: *P. Scipionem Cn. f.…iudicauerunt in tota ciuitate uirum bon<or>um optimum esse*.

[102] According to Van Sickle (1988, 146), the use of Barbatus' cognomen in the metrical filiation here is "an emphatic and individualized sign of continuity with the heroized founder of the tomb." See also Kruschwitz 2002, 66.

[103] Courtney 1995, 221.

[104] Kruschwitz does not agree (2002, 66, esp. n.261), pointing out that the stonecutter felt no inclination to expand many other forms (*oino, duonoro, optumo, uiro*, etc.); he does not address the lost symmetry, but points out that sentence-beginning at this verse-break appears in Livius Andronicus.

the two is *hic* here for *quei* in 7.[105] And as was also the case in Barbatus' *elogium*, the concluding two lines summarize the accomplishments of the deceased at war and at home: here Lucius is said to have captured Corsica and the city of Aleria (he led an expeditionary force as part of the first Punic War[106]), *hec*[107] *cepit Corsica*(*m*) *Aleria*(*m*)*que urbe*(*m*), and dedicated a temple to the storm-gods (presumably in response to his fleet surviving a storm at sea[108]), *dedet Tempestatebus aide*(*m*) *mereto*[*d*].[109]

No such deeds are mentioned in the next Scipio epitaph, CIL I² 10 for a Publius Scipio, probably P. Cornelius Scipio (*RE* no. 331), aug. 180 BCE, the son of Africanus, and therefore the great-grandson of Lucius:[110]

> quei apice(m) insigne Dial[is   fl]aminis gesistei, |
> mors perfec[it] tua ut essent   omnia | breuia,
> honos fama uirtusque, | gloria atque ingenium,
> quibus sei | in longa licu[i]set   tibe utier uita, |
> facile facteis superases   gloriam | maiorum.
> qua re lubens te in gremiu(m), | Scipio, recip[i]t
> terra, Publi, | prognatum   Publio, Corneli.[111]

---

[105] Kruschwitz (2002, 67-68) mentions the possibility that this <hic> could be *hīc* rather than the deictic adj. *hic* serving as subject here; this suggestion seems unlikely to me, given the parallel *quei* in the Barbatus epitaph. But the fact that *hec* in the next line is generally agreed to represent *hic* (cf. the use of <e> for /ĭ/ in *Tempestatebus*; see Courtney 1995, 222) is a point in favor of taking this *hic* as *hīc* (i.e. the two different spellings of *hĭc* in subsequent lines would seem rather odd). Courtney does not seem to balk at this variation, however, seeing "an attempt at anaphora" here. Kruschwitz does not ultimately take a position on this *hic*, noting only that *hec* in the following line seems to be the deictic adjective, gesturing at the son as opposed to the father and therein comparing their deeds.

[106] Walbank et al. 1990, 553.

[107] See n.105 above for the orthography.

[108] Ovid mentions the temple, near the Porta Capena (its exact location is unknown) at *Fasti* 6.193-4: *Tu quoque, Tempestas, meritam delubra fatemur / cum paene est Corsis obruta classis acquis.* Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) asserts that the dedication was in thanks for the fleet's survival of a particular storm that caused the failure of a later expedition from Olbia to Sardinia, but I have found no corroboration for this.

[109] Kruschwitz considers the expansion/restoration of the final *d* superfluous; see 2002, 69.

[110] The identification is far from certain, however: the son of Africanus does not seem to have died at an especially young age (Cicero mentions him as an eloquent speaker, so he likely reached adulthood; *Brut.* 77; *Sen.* 35; *Off.* 1.121) but it was rather the fact that he was sickly that prevented him from following the normal *cursus honorum* (Liv. 40.42.13) (Flower 1996, 168); furthermore, P. Cornelius Scipio was an augur in 180 BCE, and dual priesthoods would be unusual (Tatum and Moir 1988, 257; Gellius 10.15.1-25 also suggests that being *flamen Dialis* basically precludes any other activity), nor is the augurship of this P. Cornelius Scipio mentioned in the epitaph. See Courtney 1995, 226 and Moir 1986, 264-5 for a summary of other possibilities.

> You who wore the cap, the mark of the flamen Dialis, death caused everything that belonged to you, your honour, reputation, courage, glory and talents, to be short-lived. If you had been allowed to enjoy these in a long life, you would easily have outshone the glory of your ancestors. Therefore, Publius Cornelius Scipio, scion of Publius, the earth gladly receives you into her bosom (trans. Courtney).

This inscription, also in Saturnians,[112] is generally dated to 170-160 BCE based on the sarcophagus type and material,[113] as well as the paleography and orthography.[114] As was the case for the previous two *elogia*, this poem has already been the subject of much study; here we will look briefly at the content, referring often to the work of others, and return to the effects of the poem later in the dissertation.

Bücheler suggests that the first line, a relative clause loosely dependent upon the finite clause in line 2,[115] was added later than the following six verses: the line begins farther to the left than the others, and is written with smaller letters; furthermore, each of the preceding Saturnian *elogia* contain only six lines, whereas this one shows seven, and the first inscription-line corresponds to its Saturnian verse, while the following verses are written continuously, not corresponding to lines on the stone.[116] Not all scholars find these arguments convincing, however.[117] The line, beginning an *elogium* addressed directly to the deceased (a marked

---

[111] CLE 8: This inscription is also carved into the peperino sarcophagus (in two panels, with damage to the right side of the left panel), but is not supplemented, as are the prior examples, by a non-metrical superscript. The inscription is now in the Vatican museum.

[112] For notes on the meter, see Kruschwitz 2002, 87 and Mercado 2012.

[113] Coarelli 1973, 48-49.

[114] Kruschwitz 2002, 71; Keuleers 2003 ad loc: two notable orthographic features are the inconsistent gemination of consonants (indicating a transition period around the time of Ennius) and the omission of final <m> in *apice* (indicating a date before c. 130 BCE).

[115] The antecedent is inferred from *tua*; see Kühner-Stegmann I.130 and cf. Mankin on *De. Or.* 3.13.

[116] *CLE* ad loc.; cf. Flower 1996, 167, Courtney 1995, 226, and Coarelli 1972, 44. The assertion is that a descendant (possibly Scipio Aemilianus) added the line describing the flaminate, perhaps at the time of the expansion of the tomb c. 130 BCE, in order to grant the deceased the status of an office-holder (that priesthood brought with it senatorial status and the right to an *imago*, among other privileges; Flower 1996, 168). There is no confirming evidence that Africanus' son was *flamen Dialis*. For an interesting, but largely speculative, discussion of possible reasons for an omission of the flaminate from the original version of the inscription, see Tatum and Moir 1988, 256.

[117] Courtney reports Bücheler's assertion without taking a position; Kruschwitz (1999, 262) notes that the first line and the following six appear to have been cut by the same stone-cutter, and that beginning the first line of an inscription to the left of the rest can be considered standard epigraphic practice (and indeed, we see this feature, though not to the same extent as in 10, in the preceding inscription for Lucius, CIL I² 9, and in the following inscription for Hispanus' brother, CIL I² 11).

departure from the previous two, each addressed to an unidentified plural audience), identifies him as one who wore the cap, *apice*(*m*), of the *flamen Dialis*, a high priest of Jupiter.[118] This is the only office mentioned; the epitaph reports in the following lines that the Scipio honored here died young.[119]

The next line describes that early loss and its effects: death saw to it (*mors perfecit*) that everything of his (*tua ut…omnia*[120]) was short-lived (*essent breuia*); the next verse (3) lists those qualities and attributes cut short: *honos fama uirtusque, gloria atque ingenium*. Kruschwitz suggests that for personified *mors* to be the agent of a premature death is fairly standard, although he notes that the simple verb *fecit* is more common.[121] In the four other uses of a personified *mors* in our corpus, two are for immature subjects: one characterizes *mors* as "snatching," with *eripuit*,[122] and in the other, with a formulation similar to the one used here, *fecit* is the verb;[123] in the two other cases, however, *mors* acts on a mature subject.[124]

The list of qualities made too brief by death here falls into two parts, with each element of the latter part summarizing/paralleling elements of the previous one: *gloria* recalls *honos and fama*, and *ingenium* recalls *uirtus*. The implications of these qualities in particular have been treated extensively elsewhere,[125] so we will

---

[118] For notes on the diction here, including the question of whether to take *insigne* as a substantive or an adjective *insigne*(*m*) (both Kruschwitz and Courtney prefer the former) see Courtney 1995, 226 and Kruschwitz 2002, 74-75.

[119] But cf. n.116 above, and Flower's assertion (1996, 168) that the epitaph may exaggerate the youth of its subject to explain his lack of accomplishments.

[120] For *ut* in this position as common in early Latin, see Kruschwitz 2002, 78.

[121] 2002, 77-78, citing *TLL* s.v. *mors*, 1503.64-1507.82.

[122] CIL I² 1215.

[123] CIL I² 1798.

[124] CIL I² 1325, *quem numquam nisi mors feiniuit labore*, and 1570, *mors animam eripuit, non ueitae ornatum apstulit*.

[125] See Flower 1996, 167-168, and Kruschwitz 2002, 79-82; among other things, the latter suggests that *honos* can be taken both abstractly and as referring more concretely to the deceased's office of *flamen*; that *fama* has none of the negative connotations it can have elsewhere but, with an understood *bona*, could be an adaptation of Greek εὐδοξία; and that *ingenium* can be taken as referring to an intellectual quality, i.e. *sapienta*, but can also be understood more generally. Tatum (1988, 254-255) offers a further illumination of *ingenium*: he notes that of the sixteen uses of the word in CIL VI, ten are for immature subjects, suggesting that its use here is part of a larger pattern

not explore them in detail; it is interesting to note, though, that the first set, *honos,*

fama, and *gloria*, all refer to aspects of one's character in the eyes of others

('Aspekte des Ansehens einer Person,' as Kruschwitz puts it),[126] interesting

especially, that is, in light of our claim, to be illustrated by the remainder of the

corpus, that most praise in these epitaphs is not absolute but given in relation to

others. The list calls to mind one other in the corpus, for a subject of far lower

social status: in CIL I² 1214, for the freedwoman Licinia (also not yet grown at the

time of her death: she was fourteen), death is also responsible for the end of certain

elements of *gloria*: *studium patronae, cura, amor, laudes, decus / silent ambusto*

corpore et leto tacent. Despite the aforementioned difference in social stature, the

concern in both cases of premature death is the same: that death has deprived the

subject of the due share of *gloria* among his or her contemporaries; the respective

epitaphs set out to remedy or at least allay that situation.

The next two verses reiterate this message, reassuring P. Scipio, and anyone

reading, that had he been allowed to enjoy these things in a long life, *quibus sei in*

longa licu[*i*]*set tibe utier*[127] *uita*, he would have easily surpassed by his deeds the

glory of his ancestors, *facile facteis superases gloriam maiorum*.[128] This claim is

certainly an attempt to legitimize and justify a family member whose life was not

otherwise sufficiently impressive to be incorporated into the family hierarchy. It

also reveals what was, for the Scipios, at least, the ultimate goal of life and lifetime

accomplishments (*facta*): to attempt to equal if not surpass the *gloria* – here,

according to Flower, "the concept which elucidates office (*honos*), public position

---

whereby *ingenium*, with its broad semantic range, could be applied to a subject who died too young
to have earned more specific praises.

[126] Cf. also Hellegouarc'h 1972, 324.

[127] For this form of the passive infinitive, see Kruschwitz 2002, 82-83; cf. *partier* in CIL I² 1215.

[128] Again see Kruschwitz 2002, 82-83 for a detailed discussion of the diction: in particular he notes
the relative positions of *mors* and *uita* in their respective verses, and disagrees with Ernout that *facile*
should be understood as "perhaps," preferring to take it literally as "easily" or as indicating
likelihood.

or reputation (*fama*), moral qualities (*uirtus*), and talent (*ingenium*),"[129] – of one's *maiores*, the celebrated antecedents of the family who were already dead, and to bring renown, via those accomplishments to the family, past, present and future.[130]

On the basis of such assurances (*qua re*), the unidentified speaker then goes on to give a different sort of reassurance to P. Scipio: that the earth receives him willingly into her lap, *lubens te in gremiu*(*m*)...*recipit terra*.[131] As Courtney and Kruschwitz note, the reception of the deceased into the "lap of the earth" is a formulation well-precedented in Greek epitaphs;[132] the expression does not, however, occur anywhere else in our corpus.[133] Both the change to the present tense and the hint of sentiment here – an attempt to comfort (explicitly) the deceased and (implicitly) the mourners (a precursor, perhaps of the formula *sit tibi terra leuis*) – make this sentence quite vivid. Courtney suggests that the fact that the poem as a whole is addressed to the deceased "emphasizes, though in a restrained fashion, the pathos of his early death," but I would suggest that here specifically we have a glimpse of real emotion rare in the Scipio epitaphs, and also rare in Saturnian epitaphs more generally.[134]

As mentioned above, this *elogium* is not preceded, as the two others have been, by a non-metrical superscript including the name and filiation of the deceased.

---

[129] Flower 1996, 168.

[130] For a discussion of these expectations and the competition inherent therein, see Kruschwitz 2002, 86-89.

[131] For the enjambment of *terra*, see Kruschwitz ibid., 84; such enjambment is rare but not unheard of in Saturnians.

[132] γαῖα κόλποις ἐδέξατο: Courtney 2995, 226-227 and Kruschwitz 2002, 83-85 both cite Lier 1903, 586; cf. also Cicero *De Leg.* 2.63: *ut sinus et gremium quasi matris mortuo tribueretur.* It is also widely noted in connection with this phrase that the Scipios followed the old-fashioned practice of inhumation; in fact, however, references to returning the body to the earth also occur in cases of cremation (cf. discussion of CIL I² 1218 in ch.5).

[133] The expression *in gremium recepit*, though, does occur in one other epitaph, in a context that is both very different but also in a certain way parallel, seemingly signifying adoption in CIL I² 1221: s*eptem me naatam annorum gremio ipse recepit;* the examples share the idea of a parent-child relationship (i.e. *terra mater* here, and the adoptive father in 1221). This is also true for the one other usage of the word *gremium* in the corpus: in CIL I² 1223, a child is said to be snatched from the *gremium* of his mother.

[134] See also discussion of CIL I² 1202 in ch.6.

It is only here at the very end of the poem that we learn that information, as the unidentified speaker calls the deceased by name,[135] with the *cognomen, praenomen*, and *nomen* spread out: the first two are separated by *recipit terra*, and the second and third by a metrical filiation, *prognatum Publio* (a position contrary to the custom of the non-metrical filiation, between the *nomen* and the *cognomen*). Again we see the archaic *prognatus* paired with the name of the father in the ablative, but without the *patre* of CIL I² 7; here, though, the word *patre* is not necessary to create alliteration, as the praenomen of the deceased, Publius, provides the initial voiceless labial stop necessary for alliteration. Artificial as the separation of the names is generally agreed to be,[136] it strikes me, when read aloud, as rather poignant.

Although similar circumstances – an early death, and an accompanying lack of accomplishments – are addressed in our next example, CIL I² 11 written for a L. Cornelius Scipio who died at the age of twenty,[137] it does not show the same softening of tone:

> *L. Cornelius Cn. f. Cn. n. Scipio*
> magna(m) sapientia(m) | multasque uirtutes
> aetate quom parua | posidet hoc saxsum.
> quoiei uita defecit, non | honos, honore(m),[138]
> is hic situs, quei nunquam | uictus est uirtutei,[139]
> annos gnatus (uiginti) <h>is | l[oc]eis m[a]ndatus,   5
> ne quairatis honore(m) | quei minus sit mandatus.[140]

---

[135] A delay that may have had an interesting effect for the reader and listeners; see the concluding chapter for discussion.

[136] Courtney (1995, 227) declares this interruption (together with the delay and arrangement of the name of the deceased) "artificial;" Van Sickle (1988, 151) writes, "Strained separation and mannered placement of language reach here a complexity that again invites comparison with the Hellenistic Greek style, or, closer to home, certain hexameters of Ennius." On this topic cf. also Till 1970, 283. Also reminiscent of the Hellenistic poets, it seems to me, is the combination of real pathos as discussed above with marked artificiality.

[137] Possibly the son of Hispallus and Paulla Cornelia, a brother of the Scipio Hispanus of CIL I² 15 discussed below (Courtney 1995, 227); Kruschwitz declares the question of identity "ungeklärt" referring the reader to Munzer (*RE* 4 s.v. Cornelius (326), 1433-1434) and Coarelli (1972a, 23).

[138] Courtney's text, with *honore* understood as accusative; see n.150 below.

[139] It seems to me that a full stop is desirable here, and indeed, Courtney's translation reflects such a punctuation, although he keeps the comma in his text for some reason.

[140] CLE 8: the non-metrical nomenclature and filiation preceding the metrical inscription are, together with the *elogium*, carved into the sarcophagus (differing from 6-7 and 8-9, where the

> *Lucius Cornelius Scipio, son of Gnaeus, grandson of Gnaeus.*
> This stone holds great prudence and many fine qualities coupled to a brief span of life. Here lies that man whose life, not (lack of) respect, denied him office, who was never outdone in merit. So that you may not enquire why office was not entrusted to him, he was entrusted to this place at the age of twenty (trans. Courtney).

The six verses are widely accepted as Saturnians.[141] The inscription is dated to roughly the same time as the preceding example (c. 170 BCE) based on similar observations about the paleography and orthography.[142]

The first verse seems to describe qualities of the deceased: *magna*(*m*) *sapientia*(*m*) and *multas uirtutes*, and in the first colon of the second verse, we read that these qualities were accompanied by a brief life-span, *aetate quom*[143] *parua*; it is only in the latter colon of that second verse that we learn that the subject of the sentence is not the deceased himself, but the 'this stone,' *posidet hoc saxsum*. The quality of *sapientia* appears as an element of praise in Barbatus' epitaph, but as we noted there, nowhere else in the corpus; *uirtus*, also attributed to Barbatus as well as to P. Scipio in the example just discussed, seems to be a Scipionic catchword, but also makes two other appearances in the corpus.[144] In commenting on this first verse, Kruschwitz, although he does refer the reader back to his earlier discussion of these qualities, ultimately suggests that their use here has more to do with the comparative youth of the subject and the consequent lack of more specific praiseworthy attributes; i.e. their generality makes them useful for praising a young

---

superscripts were painted along the upper part of the sarcophagi). The sarcophagus, found in 1781 and now in the Vatican museum, is from peperino and is crumbing or damaged in several places. As illustrated by the line-breaks in the text above, the seven inscription-lines do not correspond to the six Saturnian verses (Kruschwitz 2002, 90; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

[141] For several observations leading to that conclusion, see Kruschwitz 2002, 93, and for more on the meter ibid. 107, Courtney 1995, 228, and Mercado 2012.

[142] Kruschwitz 2002, 91; in addition to the transitional state of the geminate consonants and the omission of final <m>, we also see both <ae> and <ai> spellings of the diphthong. For epigraphical/archaeological dating Kruschwitz sends the reader to Coarelli 1972b, 89-90 and De Rosalia 1978, 115-116.

[143] The initial <qu> in the preposition is not etymological, but this spelling also appears in other old Latin inscriptions, due presumably to confusion with the conjunction *cum* < *quom* (Courtney 1995, 227, Kruschwitz 2002, 96; cf. Leumann 1977, 137).

[144] See n.84 above.

man who had not distinguished himself in ways that could be described more specifically.[145]

Kruschwitz seems rather taken aback, or at least suggests that a reader might be taken aback, to discover at the end of this sentence that it is not the deceased who is said to be in possession of these virtues, but rather, in an example of prosopopoeia (and, he says, catachresis of *posidet*), the stone itself;[146] he goes on to suggest, correctly in my opinion, that this device is indicative of a close association or identification between the monument and the deceased himself. Indeed, although nowhere else among these Scipionic *elogia* is the stone or monument even mentioned much less given such a prominent role, elsewhere in the corpus we see other examples of the stone (forms of *saxum* or *lapis*) or monument engaging in certain ways with the reader.[147] Furthermore, although nowhere else is there such a strong, seemingly explicit identification between the stone and the deceased, we find various kinds of evidence that the stone was intended to serve as a metonymic marker for the deceased, i.e. as his representative among the living.[148]

The next verse is a relative clause, dependent not on the preceding lines (of which *hoc saxsum* is the subject), but on the following line, where the deceased is introduced as subject (*is hic situs*); that relative clause asserts, with play on two different meanings of *honos*, that it was the lifespan of the deceased, not his (lack of) honor,[149] that was to blame for his lack of office: *quoiei uita defecit, non honos, honore(m)*.[150] Kruschwitz notes that whereas in the previous poem it was *mors* that

---

[145] Cf. n.125 above for a similar suggestion by Tatum for *ingenium*.

[146] Referring, in this case, not to a *cippus* or similar gravestone, but to the sarcophagus itself, according to Kruschwitz (2002, 97 n.441) a well-attested usage.

[147] Cf. CIL I² 1209, 1210, 1216, and 2273.

[148] Cf. Häusle 1980, 123-124.

[149] An example of *res pro rei defectu* (Courtney 1995, 227-228 and Kruschwitz 2002, 100).

[150] Courtney argues for taking *honore* (interpretable as a dative, ablative, or accusative) as an accusative, citing what he calls a parallel in Grattius 291 *ille tuos olim non defecturus honores* (1995, 227); Kruschwitz points out, however, and I agree, that the meaning of *deficio* in the cited passage is different from the one here. Kruschwitz prefers to take *deficio* in the sense of *deesse/non sufficere*

was the agent of curtailment, here *uita* fills that role. There are no other examples of this meaning of *uita* (viz. 'the course of his life,'[151] i.e., his brief life-span) in our corpus of inscriptions, nor does Kruschwitz cite any precise parallels, referring only to Lier's more general section on the trope of the deceased's lifespan/fate curtailing his career.[152] Kruschwitz also notes the lack of parallels for the polyptoton of *honos*; this line, then, stands out as rather unique in the well-represented category of epitaphs for the prematurely dead, indicating, as we have seen in the several examples preceding, the priority of *honos* for the Scipios of this period.

Thereafter comes in the fourth verse the three-word locatival statement *is hic situs* (with *est* elided), the only such locatival statement among the epitaphs of the Scipios; an ancestor, perhaps, of the phrase *hic situs est*, which would become so common in later examples.[153] The use of the pronoun *is* in addition to the deictic adverb *hīc* recalls further the Ennian phrase *hic est ille situs*, reported by Cicero as referring to the inhumation of Scipio Africanus.[154]

Filling out the remainder of the next verse is another relative clause, *quei nunquam uictus est uirtutei*;[155] whether this clause depends upon the preceding locative statement or on a statement of burial in the next line (*is loceis mandatus*) remains an open question.[156] The subject of the clause is clearly the deceased

---

(*TLL* 335.25-65) and *honore* as 'für die Ehre eines Amtes;' of the three possible cases, he considers an ablative most likely (2002, 99).

[151] *OLD* s.v. *uita* 6a.

[152] 2002, 99.

[153] For several such examples elsewhere in our corpus, and a discussion of the effects of such locatival statements, see ch.3.

[154] Enn. *var.* 19 Vahlen (Kruschwitz 2002, 101); see also discussion of CIL I² 2274 in ch.3, esp. n.44.

[155] Here the *i*-stem ablative *-ī*(*d*) (cf. LOUCARID 'grove,' ILLRP 504; Weiss 2009, 245) is spelled (non-etymologically) with the <ei> diphthong; see, per Courtney 1995, 228, Leumann 1977, 436.

[156] Courtney (1995, 227-228), as shown in the text of the inscription above, takes *is* in 5 as <h>*is*, "entrusted to this place (at the age of twenty)," ascribing the omission of <h> not to the phonetic error that becomes common later, but to the influence of *is* in line 4. Thus he takes the whole of that verse as an adjectival phrase modifying the subject of the final line and answering the imagined question therein (*ne quairatis honore*(*m*) *quei minus sit mandatus*); this relative clause in 4 is understood to depend upon the previous *is hic situs*. Kruschwitz (2002, 100-101), however, while noting the arguments against starting a new sentence at *quei* in 4 (based on our understanding of Saturnian conventions, the sharp syntactic break in the middle of a Saturnian colon, and the

himself: "he who never was conquered in virtue." Kruschwitz suggests that here too (as he had argued for *posidet hoc saxsum* above) there is something unexpected about the construction: it is common, he says, for *uinco* to be paired with *uirtute* as an instrumental, but such is clearly not the case here, where *uirtutei* seems to be an ablative of respect/limitation.[157] And so yet again here we have the attribution of *uirtus* to a member of the Scipio family, and it is offered in terms of relations with others, specifically in competition with (unspecified) challengers to the deceased's *uirtus*. The expression need not indicate, of course, any real challenge – it is likely a rhetorical flourish indicating the superlativity and/or continuity of the deceased's *uirtus* – but we should note here yet again both the fact that the praise is given not absolutely (e.g. "*uirtus* was his" *vel sim.)* but in relation to others, and also the element of competition inherent even in this simple expression of praise.[158]

The next verse gives us the deceased's age, *annos gnatus* (*uiginti*), although the round number combined with its metrical convenience makes Kruschwitz wonder about the accuracy of the figure.[159] A notation of the deceased's age does not appear in any of the other Scipio epitaphs, not even the one just discussed for another prematurely deceased Scipio (although there the omission may have been deliberate); elsewhere in the corpus notation of age is often confined to a non-metrical super- or subscript, but does appear in the metrical *carmen* in four other

---

following enjambment, would both be unusual) but points out that 1. the lack of evidence should make us wary of trusting too much in these suggested conventions; 2. such an understanding (viz. *quei* as looking forward rather than backward) allows the text to stand as is, with no modification (cf. Courtney's <*h*>*is*); and 3. that such a sophisticated construction would go well with the high level of diction, stylistics, and poetics elsewhere in the poem. While K.'s first argument is certain true generally, his last is rather vague, and 2. would also be satisfied by leaving *is loceis mandatus* alone (i.e., understanding it, as he does, as "he (is) entrusted to (these) places", but also taking *quei* as dependent upon the previous statement rather than the following one). This last suggestion removes the oddity of a mid-colon period and following enjambment, but keeps the text intact.

[157] 2002: 102; he goes on to offer three parallels: Plaut *Amph.* 75, Cic. *Sull.* 22ff., and Tac. *Germ.* 14.1.

[158] Kruschwitz (ibid., 104 n.476) suggests a Homeric comparison, *Il.* 6.208-209: αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων, / μηδὲ γένος πατέρων αἰσχυνέμεν, but stops short of suggesting an allusion here.

[159] Ibid. 104.

cases.[160] As discussed briefly above,[161] the question of whether to restore <h>is in the latter part of the line, *is l[oc]eis m[a]ndatus*, remains open; Kruschwitz prefers to understand *is*, but acknowledges that *loceis* without a deictic seems odd, and Courtney insists on <h>is.[162] While a definitive answer would be welcome, the meaning of the statement is clear regardless: at twenty years old, the deceased was entrusted (*mandatus*) to the gravesite (*loceis*, with or without <h>is). Each of these terms is common enough in this context,[163] but Kruschwitz points out that the combination of the two in a sepulchral context occurs only here.[164]

The verb *mandare* appears again in the next, final verse, but used in a different sense, that of the entrusting of an office: *ne quairatis honore(m) quei minus sit mandatus*.[165] Here *honore* is generally agreed to be accusative, having wandered into the governing clause, with the sense being *ne quairatis cur honos non sit mandatus*.[166] Courtney suggests that this verse forms a purpose clause with the preceding one, i.e. "…at the age of twenty, (*quod dictum est*) so that you do not ask why…",[167] but Kruschwitz, following others, prefers to take it as a prohibition, "Do not ask why…"[168] Courtney's interpretation seems better to me; but however we

---

[160] 1215 (for one "scarcely twenty"); 1221 (forty), 1223 (damaged, so the age cannot be read, but likely for a young boy), and 1214 (fourteen). The third and fourth of these also show extrametrical notations; other extrametrical notations of age include 1214, 1270, 1603, 1761, and 1924.

[161] See above n.156.

[162] Kruschwitz 2002, 100-101 and 104-5; Courtney 1995, 228.

[163] For *locus* in this sense, cf. CIL I² 1218; forms of *mando* occur in 1210 and 1218, but with the sense of "command" rather than "entrust" as here.

[164] For *locus* (and the plural *loca*, as here) as 'grave' or gravesite,' Kruschwitz sends the reader to *TLL* s.v. *locus*, 1579.84ff. and for *mandare* in a funerary context to *TLL* s.v. *mando*, 261. 66-73. The expression *locis mandare* does make two appearances in literature (*Rhet.Her.* 3.30-31 and Colum. 3.1.5), but in contexts markedly different than here (2002, 104-5).

[165] Earlier scholars have suggested emendations to avoid the repetition, but both Courtney and Kruschwitz reject any such change: Kruschwitz points out that such *uariatio* is used elsewhere in the inscription and that the latter use of *mandare* is a *uerbum proprium* appropriate to the content (2002, 106); Courtney rather condescendingly points out that "we must not impose our sense of elegance on archaic inscriptions, and the composer may have thought that he was actually being elegant" (1995, 228).

[166] With *quei* being, per Courtney (1995, 228) the instrumental *qui*, with non-etymological <ei> for /ī/, and *minus = non*; so also Kruschwitz (2002, 106).

[167] 1995, 228.

[168] 2002, 105-106; cf. Lindsay 1897, 77-78 and Plessis 1905, 26.

43

understand the *ne*, the sense is clear: this is yet another *apologia*, here addressed to an unidentified plural audience (cf. *apud uos* in our first two examples), for the deceased's lack of office.

No impressive deeds are described, then, in this epitaph, for the simple reason that the deceased accomplished none. The *elogium* attributes what general praise it can to the deceased (with Scipionic catchwords *sapientia* and *uirtus*) but is, overall, rather defensive in tone, focusing on the premature death of its subject and the fact that his lack of public office was a direct result of that early death, even anticipating (and repudiating) an accusatory question from its audience on that subject. The expectation of a public life for the members of this family is thus very clear; so strong was this expectation that an epitaph for a young man who failed to meet it must be almost entirely taken up by an apologia as to why that was the case. We should note also that this is the first of the Scipionic *elogia* not to show a metrical filiation.

Also lacking a metrical filiation is the final Scipionic *elogium* we will consider,[169] CIL I² 15 for Cn. Cornelius Scipio Hispanus (*RE* no. 347), pr. 139, but in this example the deceased speaker makes explicit reference to the expectations of his ancestors:

> *Cn. Cornelius Cn. F. Scipio Hispanus pr*(aitor) *aid*(ilis) *cur*(ulis) *q*(uaistor)
> *tr*(ibunus) *mil*(itum) II *Xuir sl*(itibus) *iudik*(andis) *Xuir sacr*(is) *fac*(iundis)
> uirtutes generis mieis moribus accumulaui,
>   progeniem genui, facta patris petiei,
> maiorum optenui laudem ut sibei me esse creatum

---

[169] Cf. also CIL I² 14, carved on a sarcophagus-fragment of tufa found in the later annex to the vault; the text is too fragmentary to reveal the identity of its deceased subject:
              …]is
              …Sci]pionem
              …qu]oad ueixei
Ritschl (1862 ad loc.) suggests that it was written in Saturnians, and Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) dates it, based on paleography, to the last decade of the 2nd century BCE. Like the following CIL I² 15, it seems to have been envisioned as spoken by the deceased ([*qu*]*oad ueixei*).

<div style="text-align: center">laetentur; stirpem nobilitauit honor.[170]</div>

> *Gnaeus Cornelius Scipio Hispanus, son of Gnaeus, praetor, curule aedile, quaestor, twice tribunus militum, member of the Board of Ten for settling lawsuits, Member of the Board of Ten for supervising ritual.*
> By my noble character I built still higher the glorious deeds of my family; I begat offspring and emulated the deeds of my father. I upheld the praise of my ancestors, so that they rejoice that I was born to them. My public career ennobled my family (trans. Courtney).

This inscription differs from the preceding four epitaphs in two ways: the (carved, rather than painted) non-metrical superscript is far more elaborate than any of the previous examples, containing not only nomenclature and filiation but also a *cursus honorum*, and the metrical portion is written not in Saturnians but in two elegiac couplets, the earliest example of this meter extant in Latin.[171]

We learn from the superscript that Hispanus, son of Gnaeus (Hispallus), held various offices up to the praetorship, as well as a positions on two different decemvirates;[172] it is assumed (by Münzer and subsequent scholars[173]) that he died before he could stand for the consulship, so likely around the age of forty. With all this information given in the non-metrical superscript, the metrical portion is entirely given over to describing Hispanus' place within his family.

In the first hexameter of the metrical epitaph, Hispanus declares that by his deeds he has added to his *gens*' store of moral accomplishments: *uirtutes generis mieis moribus accumulaui*.[174] The pentameter is divided into two halves as he describes his relationship with two specific generations of the family, the one after him and the one before him: he produced offspring, *progeniem genui*, and he pursued the deeds of his father, *facta patris petiei*. With regard to the first assertion,

---

[170] CLE 958: the inscription is carved on two plates of peperino attached to the face of a sarcophagus of tufa, found in a later annex to the family tomb in 1782; the plates are now in the Vatican museum (Egbert 1893, 296; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.). For metrical and linguistic notes see Lindsay 1897, 78-79.
[171] See Massaro 1992, 38-40.
[172] For more on these committees, see Keuleers 2003 ad loc.
[173] *RE* Cornelius 347; see also Coarelli 1972, 45 and Flower 1996, 169.
[174] Flower and Till concur with this interpretation of *uirtutes*, *contra* Courtney, who translates "glorious deeds;" the two interpretations are not, however, mutually exclusive.

Till and Courtney note that the act of producing children was particularly to be praised at this time due to a perceived dying out of the aristocratic families.[175] As for the second assertion, the precise meaning of the verb is debated: Flower notes that Van Sickle and Bettini take it as meaning that Hispanus "aspired to" the deeds of his father Hispallus, but she herself suggests that the verb here can be deliberately ambiguous, hinting at the fact that Hispanus, who died before he attained the consulship, fell short of his father Hispallus, who had achieved that office in 176 BCE.[176] The symmetry of this line, with its specific references to the preceding and following generations, highlights the continuity of the family, a manifestation of the reflection of prominence and renown among the three generations.

In the second hexameter, enjambing into the pentameter, Hispanus asserts that he obtained the praise of his ancestors, *maiorum optenui laudem*, so that they rejoice (*laetentur*, in the present tense) that he was a part of their family.[177] He fills out the final pentameter by concluding that his holding of public office (*honor*[178]) has affirmed the noble status (*nobilitauit*) of his *stirps*. According to Flower, the explicit expression of cause and effect (i.e. that a family's *nobilitas* was the result of the public engagement of its members) is unusual;[179] but it certainly seems to fit within the context of these epitaphs, where the content is almost entirely focused on the deeds of each deceased member of the family and his place in that family.

---

[175] Till 1970, 286; Courtney 1996, 229.

[176] Flower 1996, 169 n.37; cf. Van Sickle 1987, 53 and Bettini 1992, 182. Bettini notes (n.26) another reference to such father-son comparison among the Scipios in Cicero: of the son of Africanus (possibly the subject of CIL I² 10, as discussed above), he writes *propter infirmitatem ualetudinis, non tam potuit patris similis esse quam ille fuerat sui* (*Off.* 1.121).

[177] This phrase must influence our understanding of the word *maiores*, here and in CIL I² 10: does the present tense of the verb imply that the *maiores* here referred to are still alive, or do we see here a depiction of the idea that the deceased *maiores* would stand in judgment of their descendants? The latter seems more likely to me. Flower (1996, 169-70) remains non-committal, but points out that Traina (1969, 169) believes that this rejoicing of the ancestors was represented by the *imagines*, implying a belief that the *maiores* referred to here were, in fact, dead.

[178] Note the rhotacism of the final *r* here, as opposed to *honos* in earlier inscriptions.

[179] 1996, 170.

Of the overall arrangement of content, we should note that, not surprisingly given the change in meter and the exclusion of the nomenclature and filiation to the non-metrical superscript, the structure of this epitaph differs from any of the preceding examples. In the poems for Barbatus and his son, nomenclature, filiation, and praise of the deceased addressed to the public (*apud uos*) occupy the first half of each poem, with an outline of military and domestic accomplishments in the latter half. In each of the next two, both for prematurely deceased members of the family, the sections are less clearly delineated as generalized praise for the deceased is intertwined with descriptions of the effects of the early loss: in the case of CIL I² 10 there is a rather touching address to the deceased, including his full name and filiation, and an assurance that the earth will welcome him into her bosom; in CIL I² 11 the tone is rather defensive, insisting to a plural audience (*ne quairatis*; perhaps the public addressed by *apud uos* in the first two poems?) that the deceased's lack of *honos* was through no fault of his own. Here, however, the point of reference has shifted: no public audience is acknowledged, but the deceased speaks only of his family as the potential judges of his life. Framing the poem in the first and last verses are assertions about his relationship with the family as a whole, *gens* and *stirps* respectively; in the central section he addresses his relation to specific parts of that family: the following generation (*progenies*), the preceding one (*pater*) and finally the *maiores*.

Nowhere else in these epitaphs is the emphasis on family more strongly felt;[180] but the giving-over of the whole metrical epitaph to familial claims has a (perhaps) unintended effect, and indicates a change in motivation from earlier examples: no longer, as in CIL I² 7, 9, and 10, is an effort made to memorialize via the poetry the name and filiation of the deceased; in fact, when separated from the

---

[180] Bettini 1991, 182 writes that the *elogium* "illustrates in exemplary fashion…the relationship that joins the identity of the individual with that of the family in aristocratic culture."

non-metrical superscript, this *elogium* becomes almost generic, containing little that could tell us about the nature of the deceased himself – not even his name. Rather the *elogium* has become a vehicle for showing what a Scipio – any Scipio – should do for his family.

And so we have seen that in the epitaphs of the Scipios, the emphasis is overwhelmingly on the public deeds of the deceased, and on each member's place within the family. As we will see, nowhere else in the corpus are these elements so strongly emphasized. There are, however, some characteristics shared by these poems with the many other examples we will see, first and foremost the fact that the portrait of the deceased created by the inscription is one cast in relation to others. Over the next several chapters we will, in examining the remaining poems in our corpus, build a framework of the expected content and effect of these epitaphs, including investigation of the portraits created in each case and of the fictive orality in which many of these portraits engage. Once we have established that framework, we will return to these earliest poems to examine their effects for the deceased and for the reader, to establish their place in the wider tradition of the genre.

CHAPTER TWO: 'ENDOCENTRIC' POEMS

As we set out to investigate the content and effects of the other forty-four epitaphs in our corpus, looking especially at the issues of voice, audience, and space, it will be useful to examine first of all those examples that do not engage in any sort of fictive orality, or make any reference to their space. Such a consideration will allow us to establish a baseline: an understanding of what elements and effects are the fundamental stuff of such a poem without the addition of more elaborate interactive elements, and furthermore what the result of such a lack may be for the effect and reception of the poems.[1] As such, this chapter will consider those ten poems[2] that acknowledge no space or addressee, real or imagined, but function simply as endocentric texts.[3] Furthermore, none of these epitaphs includes a distinct 'voice,' i.e. an indication, via a first-person referent or some other means, of who may be envisioned as speaking the words of the text; instead, each assumes an unidentified third-person narrator.[4] The texts' exclusion of

---

[1] By 'poem' I refer to the metrical portion of an inscription (as opposed to the extra-metrical super- and/or sub-script that often accompanies the metrical portion); part of our investigation will be to consider the presence of information within or outside the metrical portion, and the effect of that distribution.

[2] CIL I² 708, 1213, 1259, 1270, 1283, 1547, 1761, 1798, 1924, and 2139. The poems are all dated, with varying degrees of specificity, to the first century BCE; five come from Rome, four from elsewhere in central Italy, and one from northern Italy. A more detailed provenance of each epitaph will be presented when that epitaph is introduced for discussion; see also ch.1 pp.11-14 for chronological and geographical information about all the inscriptions in the corpus.

[3] I use the term 'endocentric' *faut de mieux* to describe these poems, as their focus can be said to be contained within the poem rather than directed outwards to an acknowledged audience. Although these texts do not acknowledge an audience, one might suggest that they have as their default or assumed audience the passer-by; and indeed, the question of whether and how the epitaphs in this chapter differ substantially from those in ch.4 that acknowledge the passer-by as audience, is central to the overall investigation of the effects of such interactive elements.

[4] Sourvinou-Inwood suggests, in her study of voice in archaic Greek epitaphs (1995, 281-282), that when no voice is identified the default speaker is imagined to be the community of the deceased. Cf. also Tanner (1999, 158-164, quoted in Day 2007, 33), discussing epigrammatic dedications on Greek statues of athletic victors: "In reading and speaking the poem […] the viewer is the mouthpiece of collective memory, ritually enacting and renewing shared understanding […]. Preservation of collective memory is at the cost of the autonomy of the viewer-reader, whose own individuality is submerged in the poem he enacts […]." See ch. 4 below for more explicit examples of the inscription co-opting the voice of the reader.

interactive elements encourages the reader to focus on the content of the poem; as we examine the content, and thereby the effects, of the poems, we can see consistencies and trends that may give us an idea of the basic characteristics and expectations of the genre.

Accordingly, as we investigate the nexus of involvement surrounding the epitaphs, in the absence of exocentric elements such as addressee or audience, it is to the content that we must look to determine who the individuals are for whom the poem was intended to have an effect. We will look first at five poems in which the deceased is the only individual implicated; for the most part in these poems praise for the deceased is the central element,[5] although that praise is often cast in relation to others with whom the deceased interacted. We will then consider four poems in which, in addition to the deceased him- or herself, individuals from the deceased's household are implicated: two in which the mother of the deceased appears, and two in which a *patronus* or *patrona* appears. With this expansion of the nexus of involvement comes an accompanying expansion of content: in addition to praise for the deceased, these poems include references to mourning for the deceased and to the construction of the tomb. In the last two cases, the use of present-tense verbs to describe the actions of the other individuals creates a re-enactment, via the voice of a passer-by, of those individuals' described actions; even in these endocentric poems, then, there can be performative elements included in the text. The final endocentric poem that we will consider, in many ways singular, seems to belong to another tradition entirely and sits outside of the patterns we have found (though it, too, contains an example of praise, implicit rather than explicit); its singularity in this group highlights the coherence and shared characteristics of the other ten.

---

[5] We might expect one central function of any funerary inscription to be the naming of the deceased (cf. Galletier 1922, 98-99, Wolff 2000, 49-50), but in fact, in this group of five epitaphs, and indeed in all but one of those discussed in this chapter, the name of the deceased is excluded from the metrical portion of the inscription.

As mentioned above, the central characteristic of the first five poems, in which the deceased is the only individual implicated, is praise for the subject.[6] But as we will see, that praise, which manifests itself in various degrees of complexity, is never expressed absolutely, but is rather presented in relation to other people with whom the deceased interacted in life; and so even in this most basic sub-group of poems that acknowledge no audience and in which the deceased is the only individual mentioned, the portrait created by each poem is situated within a tableau, and depicts a nexus of involvement of varying size and shape.[7]

The first such poem we will consider, CIL I² 1259, is the simplest of the five, lacking even a verb:

> *Q. Brutius | P. f. Quir(ina tribu) u(iuus), | mercator boua(rius) | de Campo, heic cubat,*
> frugi castu(s) amabili(s) | ominibus.
> *Brutia Q. l. Rufa | pia patrono, | dum uixsit, placuit.*[8]
>
> *Quintus Brutius, son of Publius of the tribe Quirina, a cattle-merchant from the campus as a living man,*[9]*here lies,*

---

[6] In fact, only limited work has been done on the specifics of praise and the implications thereof in Latin epitaphs. General studies of Latin epitaphs (e.g. Schwarzlöse 1893, Lier 1902, Tolman 1910, Galletier 1922, Purdie 1935, Lattimore 1962) tend to address the subject not at all or only anecdotally. Harrod's *Latin Terms of Endearment* (1909) is the exception: a lexicographical study based on CIL VI, it presents classified lists of terms of endearment, as well as of family relationship, used in that corpus. The recent work of Sigismund Nielsen (1997) looks more closely into the choice of epithets applied and the implications thereof, based on a statistical sample of epitaphs from CIL VI; but both of these last-mentioned studies suffer from the fact that their evidence is collected from a corpus spanning several centuries rather than from a designated time-period. Some scholars have suggested a relationship between praise in epitaphs and the funerary *elogia*, and the abbreviated versions of these attached to the family *imagines*; see, e.g., Wolff 2000, 57: "la coutume de faire suivre le nom de défunt d'un elogium en vers, abrégé sans doute de son éloge funèbre." Cf. Sandys 1927, 93-104; Flower 1996, 159-184; Carroll 2006, 136.

[7] Cf. Galletier 1922, 116: "La poésie funéraire ne nous renseigne pas seulement sur les individus, elle nous permet de les replacer dans le milieu où ils ont vécu, et tout d'abord dans leur milieu familial."

[8] CLE 1867 (suppl.): the inscription is written on a travertine cippus, which the CIL reports had been used in antiquity to repair damaged stairs; it was found on the Via Salaria in Rome (CIL I² ad loc., Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

[9] I have translated *u(iuus)* as it stands, without supplemental meaning, as there is some ambiguity here: we would normally take *V* as standing in for *u(iuus fecit)*, i.e. the deceased was responsible for financing/constructing the tomb before his death; but Keuleers (ibid.) suggests that the praise for him makes it more likely that it was rather the freedwoman who was responsible for the inscription, and in that case it would be incorrect to read *u(iuus fecit)* here. It is still possible, as Keuleers acknowledges, that *V* does stand in for *u(iuus fecit)*, if Q. Brutius was responsible for the inscription,

51

wise, modest, friendly to everyone.
Brutia Rufa, freedwoman of Quintus, loyal to her patron, while she lived,[10]
was pleasing to him.

Keuleers dates the inscription, the metrical portion of which is a dactylic

tetrameter,[11] to the period after Sulla but before the Principate; he bases this

conclusion on his analysis of the orthography and of the proper names in the

inscription.[12]

The bulk of the information about the deceased is contained in an

extrametrical superscript: the name of the deceased (Quintus Brutius); his filiation

(son of Publius, which notation also establishes his status as a citizen[13]); his tribe

affiliation (Quirina); his profession (cattle-merchant); his neighborhood (the

Campus Martius[14]); and finally, a locative statement asserting the presence of his

remains in that spot.[15] The poem is also accompanied by an extrametrical subscript,

which is an epitaph in itself for a freedwoman of Quintus Brutius, praising her in

relation to her former master.[16]

and its (self-)praise. The ambiguity is reflected in the various supplements (cf. Keuleers, ibid.):
Dessau and Massaro give *u*(*iuus*) but Degrassi and Warmington give *u*(*iuit*).

[10] Keuleers (ibid.) suggests that the deceased himself could also be the subject of *uixsit*, in which
case, "while *he* lived," supporting the idea that the freedwoman outlived him and perhaps was
responsible for the construction of the monument.

[11] The metrical character of the line is probable, but not certain: in order for it to scan as a dactylic
tetrameter, the final word *ominibus* must be read as three syllables (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.); such a
reading is reasonable, however, given that the extra <i> is likely a mistake rather than a real
anaptyctic vowel. Massaro 1992, 33: "A partire da *frugi* si può scandire una tetrapodia dattilica […]
È vero che qui mancherebbe il consueto rilievo epigrafico di inizio della parte 'metrica'; ma lo si
potrebbe giustificare con la ristrettezza di spazio, e almeno da un punto di vista compositivo la serie
di attributi appare ben distinta dal *titulus* […] Comunque anche in questo caso si può ritenere meglio
casuale la successione ritmica."

[12] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[13] For names in Roman funerary inscriptions and their value as class-markers, see Carroll 2006, 129.

[14] Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) suggests rather that we read *mercator Boua*(*rio*) / *de Campo*, with Campus
Boarius being another name for the Forum Boarium.

[15] For a discussion of the use and effects of deixis, see ch. 3; as the deixis is in this case outside of the
metrical portion of the inscription, it will not be considered in detail here.

[16] The inclusion of Brutia Rufa in the same burial, and her mention in the inscription, might cause us
to wonder whether she was to Quintus Brutius more than a freedwoman; for spouses to be buried
together was the norm (Treggiari 1991, 493), and Keuleers assumes (2003 ad loc.) that she was his
wife. But also possible is that the duty and expense of burying her former owner/patron (and the
honor of sharing his tomb) fell to her, if he lacked closer surviving relations; see Treggiari 1991, 492:
"Failing children, freed slaves who bore the same name might be granted the privilege of sharing the
tomb and carrying on the cult of the dead while they lived." Each theory has its difficulties,
however: if she were his wife, it seems odd that no mention is made of that fact; and while the

But it is praise for the deceased that occupies the entire metrical portion of the inscription: three adjectives, *frugi castu*(*s*) *amabili*(*s*), applied to the deceased, followed by the indirect object of those adjectives, *ominibus*. Why then these adjectives in particular? We can assume, here and in general within the corpus, that the adjectives were chosen specifically to suit the individual subject, as no uniformity or patterns emerge to indicate formulaic choices at this early stage of the genre.[17]

The indeclinable adjective *frugi* (which also appears as a cognomen[18]), in origin a predicative dative of the noun *frux*,[19] seems to be a catch-all complimentary epithet: "having merit or worth," and when paired with *esse* (as may be understood here) "to do one's duty."[20] According to the *OLD*, it is used 'esp. of slaves,'[21] but here, and once elsewhere in the corpus, it is applied to a citizen; in the three other appearances in our corpus it is applied to a person with freedman status.[22] Its rate of appearance in the corpus (in five of the sixty-two poems) is quite high, in

---

scenario of a freedperson commemorating his or her patron is known, it is also relatively rare (see Saller and Shaw 1984, 139 n.62).

[17] Cf. Sigismund Nielsen 1997, 169-170, in reference to her examination of a statistical sample from the entire corpus of Latin sepulchral inscriptions: "In my examination, I assume that no information in any epitaph is given without reason. No term of relationship, age indication, and epithet was chosen haphazardly, and it was not a coincidence whether some information – such as status or occupation – figured in the epitaph. This assumption is, of course, not properly valid. As in our own Western culture, Roman dedicators sometimes chose rather mechanically what was included for the passer-by to read, but usually there seems to have been good reason why an epitaph had a particular form."

[18] First given to L. Calpurnius Piso, cos. 133 BCE (*OCD*, s.v. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, Lucius). Cf. Cic. *Fin.* 2.90: *sed qui ad uoluptatem omnia referens uiuit Gallonius, loquitur ut Frugi ille Piso…*

[19] Originally something like "fit for food," *L&S* s.v. *frux* 2.b.1; cf. Ernout-Meillet, s.v. *frux*: "ancien datif de *frūx*, employé d'abord dans les locutions telles que *esse frūgi bonae* «être capable de donner une bonne récolte, ou un bon revenu»; de la terre, s'est ensuite étendu à l'homme." For the formation, see Kuhner-Stegmann I 342-3.

[20] *OLD*, s.v. *frux* I.B.

[21] Cicero (*Deiot.* 26) considers the quality of *frugalitas* 'the greatest virtue,' but characterizes it as appropriate for a man of private, rather than public, virtue: *frugi hominem dici non multum habet laudis in rege: fortem, iustum, seuerum, grauem, magnanimum, largum, beneficum, liberalem: hae sunt regiae laudes, illa priuata est. Vt uolet quisque, accipiat: ego tamen frugalitatem, id est modestiam et temperantiam, uirtutem maximam iudico.*

[22] CIL I² 1210, applied to a freedman; 1349 and 1406 (extrametric) to a freedwoman; 1408 to a male citizen.

comparison to its rate of appearance in book VI of the CIL, where, according to

Harrod,[23] it is applied to the deceased in only seventeen of 35,000 (prose and poetic)

inscriptions.[24] From this disparity we may suggest that the epithet was more

common in the period of our corpus than later.[25]

The next adjective, *castus*, seems to be more semantically specific than

frugi, meaning in its basic sense "free from vice, upright, moral," but more

specifically either "unstained (in a religious sense), holy, pure" or "sexually pure,

chaste, not promiscuous."[26] Tolman, in his section on praise, notes (with only

anecdotal support) that "the virtue of chastity seems to have been the most

admired."[27] In our corpus, this laudatory epithet appears four times, in three

poems;[28] Harrod reports that it is applied to the deceased thirty-four times in CIL

VI.[29] While here the numerical disparity is less than in the previous case, there is

another kind of disparity: in CIL VI, the adjective is applied in every case to a

deceased woman;[30] here, such is the case in two of the three poems, but in the

current example, the deceased is male. Perhaps, then, the adjective was not yet,

---

[23] Throughout this chapter and occasionally in the following chapters I will refer to statistics and conclusions from Harrod's (1909) *Latin terms of endearment*, a study of epithets applied to the deceased in the epitaphs of CIL VI. Although occasional spot-checks reveal that Harrod is not infallible (see n.75 below on *splendidus*), and his study obviously omits information from more recent finds, I generally accept his statistics for the sake of convenience; time would not permit detailed searches of CIL VI for every epithet, and his study can offer valuable information about general trends in usage in the wider sepulchral context.

[24] Harrod 1909, 44.

[25] Cf. *TLL* s.v. *frux,* 1458.7ff.

[26] *OLD* s.v. *castus.* The pairing of these first two epithets occurs elsewhere in contemporary literature: Horace uses them to describe the early Roman theater-going community at *A.P.* 205-6: *populus numerabilis, utpote paruos, et frugi castusque uerecundusque coibat.* He also uses *castus* twice in the *Carmen Saeculare*: *pueros castos* (6) and *castus Aeneas* (42).

[27] Tolman 1910, 44.

[28] Here, in CIL I² 1221 (twice), and in 1836, both for female freedwomen. Only here and once in 1221, however, is it applied to the deceased him- or herself; in the other usage in 1221 it is applied to the deceased's *corpus*, and in 1836 the *rat*[*io*] of her life.

[29] Harrod 1909, 40; cf. *TLL* s.v. *castus* 567.5ff.

[30] Of the superlative form *castissimus*, which is applied to a woman in thirty-one of forty examples, Harrod (1909, 38) declares "it is plain that this term refers to the purity of woman and is much more closely restricted to its particular field than *sanctissimus*, which is somewhat similar in meaning." Cf. Forbis 1996, 85-88.

during the period of our corpus, as stereotypical as an epithet for women as in that larger corpus including epitaphs from later centuries.[31]

The third adjective, *amabilis* (*OLD* 'amiable or worthy to be loved, lovable') seems semantically straightforward, although rarer than the previous two: it appears nowhere else in the corpus, and is applied to the deceased only six times in CIL VI;[32] nor does it appear frequently enough in Dickey's corpus for her to include it in her list of adjectives.[33] As such this last, rather touching, laudatory epithet is least subject of the three to suggestions of formularity.

We are presented, then, with a picture of Quintus Curtius as a worthy, chaste, lovable man. But as we have observed, this praise (indeed, our entire metrical depiction) of the deceased is cast not absolutely, but in relation to 'everyone.' As such, the nexus of involvement invoked by this poem is not limited to other individuals or designated groups, but includes everyone with whom the deceased ever interacted, living (at the time of the inscription) or dead. As the statement *heic cubat* in the non-metrical portion establishes the location of the remains of the deceased in the physical world of the passer-by,[34] the praise in relation to *ominibus* asserts upon each reading the social position of the deceased among his fellow men. The overall portrait of the deceased, then, created by the inscription and reified by each reading,[35] is an expansive and inclusive one; the laudatory depiction of the deceased is not limited to one sphere of society, e.g. the

---

[31] Dickey includes *castus* in her list of 'adjectives expressing affection and/or respect' noting its occurrence 4+ times in her corpus of forms of address (2002, 131); in the entry for the adjective in her glossary, she makes no note of a marked gender affiliation (2002, 315).

[32] Harrod 1909, 42; the superlative form *amabilissimus* also appears twice. There is also no sub-section in the *TLL* for sepulchral uses.

[33] The epithet appears elsewhere in a complimentary list of sorts, at Horace *Ep*. 2.2.132: *cetera qui uitae seruaret munia recto more, bonus sane uicinus, amabilis hospes, comis in uxorem…*

[34] For the effects of deixis when present in the metrical portion of the epitaph, see ch.3.

[35] Cf. Joseph Day (2010, 16) on the representation and reenactment of the dedication process via archaic Greek inscriptions: "From the perspective of effects and reception, then, a dedication inscribed with an epigram could memorialize the act of dedicating by generating its perpetual reperformance. As in poetic performance or religious ritual, that which was (re)presented was (re)enacted."

household or state. For as long as the inscription survives, Quintus Curtius is positioned by it among all of those with whom he ever interacted.

In our next example in which the deceased is the only individual implicated, CIL I² 1283, the laudatory depiction of the subject is cast in relation not to society-at-large, but rather specifically to his own family:

> *P. Clodi Pulchri | l*(*iberti*) *Felicis|*
> semper qui fuit | dulcis sueis. |
> *u*(*iua*) *Clodia Pulc. l. Athenais.*[36]
>
> (*Tomb*) of Publius Clodius Felix, freedman of Clodius Pulcher,
> who was always kind to his family.
> *Clodia Athenais freedwoman of Pulcher as a living woman.*

Bücheler proposed that the metrical portion of the inscription (beginning with *Felicis*) be read as an iambic senarius,[37] but Massaro suggests rather that we begin from *semper* (taking *felix* as a cognomen rather than an adjective) and read an iambic quaternarius; we will follow the latter suggestion here.[38]

Colafrancesco and Massaro date the inscription to the first century BCE, and Keuleers even more specifically to the late Republic.[39] In fact, the name of the *patronus* in the superscript may serve as evidence for the date: Bücheler suggests that he is the infamous P. Clodius Pulcher who, having served as tribune of the plebs in 58 BCE, was murdered by Milo in 53 BCE;[40] Mommsen, however, believes that the *patronus* named here was that man's son, who served (in an unknown year) as praetor and augur.[41]

---

[36] CLE 210: this inscription, on a marble tablet, was originally found at Rome, but viewed by Mommsen in a private house in Sena Gallica (modern Senigallia), a resort town on the Adriatic Coast; its current location is unknown (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.). Whether we take *felix* as an epithet or a cognomen (see below) obviously affects the ultimate translation.

[37] Bücheler CLE ad loc.

[38] The iambic quaternarius must be acatalectic with a regular iambic shortening in *fuit* (Massaro 1992, 28-9).

[39] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[40] *MRR* 2.208.

[41] CIL ad loc., Wiseman 1970, 210; cf. CIL VI 1282: *P. Claudius P. f. Ap. n. Ap. pron. Pulcher, q. quaesitor pr. augur.*

This inscription shares certain characteristics with the previous example: the name and libertination of the subject of the metrical portion, Publius Clodius Felix, are contained in a non-metrical superscript, and an epitaph for a freedwoman (of the same master) comprises a non-metrical subscript.[42] And again, the content of the metrical portion is praise for the deceased. But whereas the metrical portion of CIL I² 1259 was simply a list of adjectives applied to the deceased (as the subject of the non-metrical *heic cubat*), here the metrical portion is a clause in itself – specifically a relative clause of which the deceased is the subject – in which we see, in addition to an adjective *dulcis* and an indirect object *sueis*, the verb *fuit* and the adverb *semper*.

Like its frequent English translation "sweet," *dulcis* is sensual in its origin, where it refers to taste or fragrance, and the diminutive aspect of the English adjective seems to apply in Latin as well: Harrod notes that "*dulcis*, like *dulcissimus*, is used particularly of children."[43] As was the case with *frugi* and *castus* above, however, our example does not mesh with Harrod's findings in CIL VI: there is no indication in the inscription that P. Clodius Felix died prematurely.

The adjective is far more common in this context than any of the three adjectives that appeared in our previous example: it is applied to the deceased forty-six times in CIL VI, and its superlative *dulcissimus* 1,634 times, with the latter being the third most common epithet in the book.[44] In our sixty-two poems, however,

---

[42] As was the case above in CIL I² 1259 (see n.16 above), we are left in the dark as to the relationship between the male subject of the metrical portion and the female subject of the non-metrical subscript. The notation *u(iua)* preceding the name of the freedwoman indicates that she, while still living, was responsible for the construction of the monument or at least, having outlived P. Clodius Felix, the addition of her name to the tomb.

[43] Harrod 1909, 36-7; Sigismund Nielsen (1997, 185-193) does not disagree, but shows in her detailed study of *carissimus* and *dulcissimus* that the situation is more nuanced than Harrod suggests. The *TLL* (s.v. *dulcis*, 2194.35) finds a different tendency, but equally at odds with our example: *saepissime in titulis sepulcralibus, plerumque superlatiuo, qui usus de genere feminine praeualere uidetur.*

[44] Harrod 1909, 6; he suggests no distinction in meaning between the positive and superlative degrees. Dickey, in her discussion of the implications of various degrees of adjectives in forms of address (1997, 133-141) takes issue with this (133 n.1): she reports that in her (admittedly different)

dulcis is applied as an epithet to the deceased only here,[45] and *dulcissimus* appears not at all, which suggests that the adjective and its superlative had not yet become as common in this sepulchral context as would later be the case.[46]

The presence of the verb *fuit* and the adjective *semper* strengthens the attribution of the quality described above to the deceased, but also limits it: whereas in 1259 the laudatory description of Q. Brutius floated, as it were, with nothing to bind it to a temporal location, here the adverb *semper* asserts the continuousness of this quality, while the verb *fuit* places the characterization firmly in the past.

Again, the deceased is praised not absolutely, but in relation to another group of people: just as Q. Brutius was praised in relation to "everyone," P. Clodius Felix was *dulcis* to *sueis*, his family. Given the more intimate nature of the adjective *dulcis*,[47] it is perhaps not surprising that the referents here should be his close relations rather than society at large; the choices of both the adjective and of its referents indicate a desire on the part of the composer for a more intimate picture of the deceased.

What, then is the effect of these various elements? As was the case in 1259, the poem asserts upon each reading the social presence of the deceased among his fellow men; but in this case, the image cast by the poem is limited in time by the perfect verb *fuit*. Furthermore, the nexus of involvement invoked by the epitaph is limited to the family of the deceased, and it is among his close relations that the deceased has a presence reified by the reading of a passer-by.

---

corpus, the positive degree is used 60% of the time, the superlative 18%, and that "the positive appears to have more force than the superlative," based on statistical analysis of the relationships between givers and receivers of the epithet (136). Dickey also notes that while in forms of address *dulcissimus* is used exclusively by men, *dulcis* can be used by both men and women (144).

[45] The adjective also appears in CIL I² 1222, but modifies *amor* (the sweet love of the deceased girl).
[46] It was precisely in the 50's BCE that this adjective enjoyed a vogue among literary poets; see Clausen 1994, 80.
[47] Sigismund Nielsen 1997, 188.

In the next inscription we will consider, CIL I² 1270, the deceased is described in relation to his family, friends, and society at large:

> *Carfinia M. l. M*[*...*] *uíxit an. XX*[…] /
> iucunda sueis | gratissima amíceis |
> omnibus officiosa | fuit.[48]

> *Carfinia M*[…]*, freedwoman of Marcus, lived twenty-*[…] *years.*
> Delightful to her family, most pleasing to her friends, she was obliging to everyone.

Colafrancesco and Massaro date the inscription to the first century BCE or earlier; Keuleers suggests, without going into any detail, that the characterization of the deceased woman places the inscription in the late Republic or early Principate.[49] The metrical portion has been identified by Bücheler as dactylic hexameter but by Massaro as an anapestic octonarius.[50]

The inscription begins with a non-metrical superscript in which the *nomen* of the deceased (Carfinia;[51] damage to the tablet makes the cognomen illegible), accompanied by her libertination, is the subject of a sentence (also damaged) establishing the length of her life.[52] The metrical portion is an independent clause in itself, and as such, differs from our previous two examples in that it does not rely syntactically on the non-metrical portion. But again, the whole of the metrical portion is given over to praise for the deceased: three adjectives, paired respectively with three indirect objects, form a tricolon, followed by the perfect verb *fuit*. The

---

[48] CLE 364: this inscription, on a marble tablet, was found at Rome and is now in the Capitoline Museum (CIL ad loc.).

[49] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.: "Het pakket attributen dat aan de vrouw wordt toegeschreven, pleit eerder voor een datering op het einde van de Republiek of zelfs aan het begin van de Keizertijd."

[50] Bücheler's suggestion (CLE ad loc.) of a hexameter (certainly more common in this context) requires one to supply an understood *haec mulier* uel sim. to begin the first verse; but (as noted by Massaro, 1992, 28) the metrical section scans as a non-catalectic anapestic tetrameter (octonarius) without any such modification.

[51] The name, likely Sabellic based on the internal *f* (Weiss 2009, 474), is attested at Juvenal 2.69: *est moecha Fabulla; damnetur, si uis, etiam Carfinia: talem non sumet damnata togam.*

[52] For a list of other mentions of age in non-metrical super- or subscripts see Galletier 1922, 101 n.8; for a discussion of age as an element in Latin epitaphs, see Wolff 2000, 64-5.

arrangement of the tricolon is *ab ab ba*: the first and second phrases are synchysistic, and the second and third chiastic.

We have seen, in the two examples discussed above, various laudatory adjectives chosen to described the deceased (CIL I² 1259: *frugi, castus, amabilis*; CIL I² 1283: *dulcis*) in relation to designated groups (1259: *sueis*; 1283: *ominibus*); here, however, Carfinia is praised with three different adjectives in relation, respectively, to three different social groups. The tricolon expands in terms of the designated referents of the adjectives, with each referent group larger than the one before: the first adjective *iucunda* is in reference to Carfinia's family (*sueis*); the second adjective *gratissima* is in reference to her friends (*amiceis*); and the third adjective *officiosa* stands in relation to everyone (*omnibus*). What we have here, then, is a remarkable delineation of the various spheres in which a woman was imagined as interacting – a hierarchy, as it were, of her expected social interactions – and furthermore, an indication of valued characteristics within each of those spheres.

Carfinia was *iucunda* (*OLD* 2. "delightful to be with"; *L&S* "pleasant, agreeable, delightful, pleasing") among her family. The adjective is not frequent in CIL VI: Harrod notes its application to the deceased in only three poems,[53] two of which (the current example and I² 1215) appear in our corpus. Of *iucundus* and its superlative (which is applied to a deceased individual eight times in CIL VI but not at all in our corpus) he writes, '*Iucundus* and *iucundissimus* refer most frequently to the charm of childhood.'[54] Our evidence does not verify that conclusion: here and in 1215 the adjective is applied to young women who died in their twenties. Our evidence also conflicts with that of Dickey, who notes a different preference of usage in her corpus: she asserts that the adjective and its superlative are used, in

---

[53] Nor is there a sub-section in the *TLL* for sepulchral uses.
[54] Harrod 1909, 45.

60

forms of address, "by men to valued male friends,"[55] and while her assertion – that

the word is associated (by predominantly male writers) with the joy of friendship –

is borne out by the literary evidence,[56] such is obviously not the case in our corpus.

Rather than accepting either Harrod's or Dickey's suggestions as to the semantic

tendencies of the adjective, we can only conclude that for the commissioner of the

inscription this particular adjective was, in the case of the deceased girl, an apt one

to describe her behavior in a familial context.[57]

Among her friends, Carfinia was *gratissima* (*OLD* s.v. *gratus*: 'pleasant,

attractive, charming'). This superlative appears nowhere else in the corpus; it is

applied to a deceased subject seven times in CIL VI, and appears seven times in

Dickey's corpus of forms of address.[58] Neither Harrod nor Dickey note especially

marked semantics or usage;[59] we may conclude from its context here that it

described a desirable quality for a young woman particularly among her friends.

The third of the three adjectives, *officiosa*, applied to Carfinia in relation to

omnibus, is extremely rare in this sepulchral context: it appears nowhere else in our

corpus, and the current example is the only one Harrod finds in CIL VI;[60] nor is it

---

[55] Dickey 2002, 242, 335; Catullus uses the adjective in just such a way at 14.2 and 50.16 (both addressing C. Licinius Calvus), but cf. 64.215, where it is used father to son (Aegeus to Theseus) and thus more in line with the familial context here.

[56] Per Mankin (1995, 52) see Cic. *Am*. 55 *tamen uita inculta et deserta ab amicis non possit esse iucunda*, and *Fin*. 1.67 *Nullo modo sine amicitia firmam et perpetuam iucunditatem uitae tenere possumus*. For a comprehensive listing of usages of the word in various periods of Latin, see Gaertner 2005, 444.

[57] The appropriateness of this word to a familial context is strengthened by the above-mentioned use in CIL I² 1215, where the deceased young woman applies the adjective to herself in relation to her parents; see ch.6 p.268ff.

[58] Harrod 1909, 44; the positive *gratus* appears three times; Dickey 2002, 133; the positive *gratus* appears six times (131). Again, the *TLL* includes no section on sepulchral uses for this adjective or for the next adjective in the poem, *officiosus, -a, -um*.

[59] In fact, as Mamoojee notes (1981, 220), *iucundus* and *gratus* (along with *dulcis* and *suauis*; see, respectively, discussions of CIL I² 1283 above, p.57 and CIL I² 1861 below, ch.3 p.106) appear together in one of Charisius' lists of synonyms (418, 4-5 Barwick). Cf. also Axelson's discussion of the same four words in his classic (if subsequently questioned) book on "unpoetic words" (1945, 35-7), and Clausen on Verg. *Ecl.* 2.49.

[60] Harrod 1909, 45.

frequent enough in address to be included in Dickey's list of adjectives.[61] The sense

of the adjective (from the noun *officium* "duty,"[62] plus the abundance-indicating

suffix *–ōsus*) is clear: *OLD* "always ready to fulfill the obligations due to a friend,

superior, etc., dutiful, attentive, solicitous or sim." Such, then, was Carfinia's

behavior to society in general; and indeed such was the behavior expected from

women in this wider social context.

As was the case in 1283, the characterization of the deceased is temporally

established and limited by the verb *fuit*, and thus firmly situated, from the

perspective of the reader, in the past; but whereas each of the previous two

examples offer one single depiction of deceased in relation to one specific group,

Carfinia's epitaph offers three different portraits, as it were: with each reading of a

passer-by, the poem establishes and reifies positive views of Carfinia in three

different societal roles.

In each of the three examples above, praise for the deceased takes the form

of one or more laudatory adjectives, accompanied by one or more indirect objects

and, in the second and third cases, the verb *fuit*. We turn now to a poem that departs

from this basic style, CIL I² 1761:

> *C. Vtius C. f. leto | occidit*
> Honestam uitam uixsit / pius et splendidus,
> ut sibi quisque exoptet / se honeste uiuere.
> *Arn(ensis)*[63] *a(nnos) n(atus) LXX*[64]
>
> *Gaius Utius, son of Gaius, has perished in death.*

---

[61] Clausen (1994, 38, quoting Syme 1964, 264 n.149): "Adjectives in *–osus* are, as R. Syme observes, 'a large and instructive theme.'" On the various patterns of usage in Latin poetry, see Knox 1986, 90-101; he reports that outside of comedy, such adjectives were rare in Latin poetry before Vergil (92). See also Leumann 1977, 341-342.

[62] For *officium*, see Dyck 1996, 5-8 and Hellegouarc'h 1963, 152-163; for *officiosus* specifically see ibid. 156.

[63] Restored alternately as *Arnensis* or *Arniensis*; the former seems generally agreed to be the primary form, the latter a variant. See Egbert 1893, 419 and Olcott 1904 s.v. *Arnensis*.

[64] CLE 70: the inscription was found in the region of Atessa, and recorded by Caraba in 1854 (CIL ad loc.); no note was made of the material on which the inscription was carved.

He, steadfast and splendid, has lived an honorable life; would that each man wish that he might live honorably.
Seventy years, of the tribe Arnensis.

Keuleers suggests that that lack of cognomen dates the inscription to the Republic, and furthermore that the tribe affiliation of Arnensis suggests a date after 90 BCE: the Frentani, the local population of Atessa where the inscription was found, were incorporated into that tribe after their rebellion in the Social War.[65] Colafrancesco and Massaro consider it no later than the first century BCE, and Kruschwitz considers it a Republican inscription.[66]

The iambic senarii that comprise the undisputed metrical portion of the inscription are accompanied by a super- and subscript written in smaller letters and set apart from the metrical portion.[67] In the superscript, the name of the deceased (Gaius Utius), accompanied by his filiation (son of Gaius), serves as the subject of the pleonastic phrase *leto occidit*;[68] the subscript gives the above-mentioned tribe affiliation (Arnensis) and the age of the deceased (seventy years).

As was the case in the previous three examples, the content of the metrical portion is praise for the deceased, and a connection of that praise to others; but here, those elements take a form expanded both grammatically and figuratively. The first clause praises Gaius Utius via the laudatory epithets *pius* and *splendidus*, but also includes *uixsit*, a verb semantically stronger than the *fuit* of the previous example, and its direct object modified by an adjective, *honestam uitam*. Thereupon follows

---

[65] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[66] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Kruschwitz 2001, 57.

[67] Kruschwitz (ibid.) asserts, however, that the superscript, previously considered non-metrical, can also be read as an iambic senarius, and as such should be considered part of the *carmen*; but the graphic arrangement, with its clear divide between the superscript and the undisputed senarii (preserved for us by the 19th century observers) argues against his assertion. Massaro (1992, 19 n.22) discusses the inscription in his section on iambic senarii, but does not mention the possibility that the superscript is metrical.

[68] Kruschwitz (2001, 58) suggests, perhaps in support of considering the first line as part of the *carmen*, that the pleonastic/repetitive nature of *leto occidit* reflects a similar tendency toward pleonasm and repetition in the metrical portion (*uitam uixsit*; *honestam uitam…honeste uiuere*). He notes further that the phrase *leto occidit* is often associated with violent death, but that the reported age of the deceased seems to argue against such a usage here.

a clause that relates the praise to others: the line expresses the wish (*ut* for *utinam*)[69]

that each man desire for himself (*sibi quisque exoptet*) that he live honorably (*se*

honeste uiuere).

     Pius, its superlative *piisimus*, and the semantically equivalent variant

pientissimus[70] are far more common in this sepulchral context than any of the

adjectives we have encountered thus far: *pius* appears applied to an individual 116

times, *pientissimus* 907 times, and *piissimus* 737 times in CIL VI.[71] Of the epithets

found in Sigismund Nielsen's statistical sample, the two superlatives make up a full

ten percent. Defined in the *OLD* as "faithful to one's moral obligations, dutiful,

conscientious, upright etc." the adjective and its noun *pietas* have been the subject

of much study.[72] The *OLD* notes further (1b) that the epithet is often applied to the

"virtuous dead," and the frequency with which the adjectives appear in CIL VI bears

out this assertion;[73] in our corpus, however, *pius* appears only this once, and the

superlatives not at all, leading to the conclusion that the sepulchral use of the word

was not yet as firmly established as it would become later.

     Splendidus, "bright, shining"[74] is not nearly so common in the sepulchral

context: the adjective is applied to an individual only once in CIL VI,[75] and this is

its only appearance in the corpus. *OLD*'s definition 4 seems to fit best here: "(w.

---

[69] Other readings of the clause are possible (e.g. as a result clause or as a potential subjunctive) but do not drastically affect our understanding of the line, i.e. that it sets up Gaius Utius as an example for his fellow men; see n.76 below for Kruschwitz' suggestion regarding the *ut*-clause.

[70] From **piens, pientis*; forms of this positive degree are very few and are often considered spurious (see *TLL* s.v. *piens* 10.1.2086.34).

[71] Harrod 1909, 25-6; for the sepulchral uses noted in the *TLL*, see *TLL* s.v. *pius* 2244.38ff.

[72] Cf. Sigismund Nielsen's discussion (193-198); for *pietas* she directs the reader (194 n.28) to Liegle, '*PIETAS*' 1932 and Saller 1988, 410 and 1991, 150.

[73] And indeed the adjective and its superlatives are far rarer in Dickey's corpus of forms of address (2002, 132-133), supporting the idea that the adjective was especially suited to the sepulchral context.

[74] *OLD* s.v. *splendidus* 1.

[75] CIL VI 31850 *ispeldido equiti Romano*; Harrod misses it, and no wonder, given the orthography. It is also restored for CIL VI 41309: *sp(lendido) eq(uiti) R(omano)*, a restoration supported by Egbert (1893)'s list of abbreviations. Most of the other uses in CIL VI are in the phrase *splendidissimus ordo,* a title given to the senates of *municipia* and colonies.

reference to rank, esteem, etc.) splendid, illustrious" and indeed, Kruschwitz takes it as such, suggesting that this adjective should be taken most closely with the following *ut*-clause.[76] The one CIL VI example, however, provides a link with a usage outside of the sepulchral corpus: there it is part of the phrase *splendidus eques Romanus.* According to Stock (on Cic. *Sex. Rosc.* 20), *splendidus* is a "standing epithet of the equestrian order."[77] On the other hand, L'Hoir cites the same passage of Cicero as an example of that author using *splendidus* somewhat condescendingly of a non-Roman, suggesting that this adjective, together with *honestus* and *nobilis*, was a slightly patronizing epithet especially for non-Romans.[78] To what extent each of these nuances applies here is impossible to know, but they could well fit: the subject Gaius Utius was a citizen of Rome and so could have been an *eques*, but – if his monument's *Fundort* indicates where he lived – from the region of Marsica.

The first line of the poetic epitaph tells us, then, that Gaius Utius was a pious and illustrious man (whatever the connotations of *splendidus*), and further that he lived an honorable life (*honestam uitam uixsit*). Although more semantically marked and complex than the *fuit* we have seen in previous examples, the verbal phrase, containing a *figura etymologica* with *uitam* as an internal accusative,[79] expresses little more than the idea that the deceased lived honorably (cf. *honeste uiuere* in 2), i.e. that he was an honorable man. The epithet *honestus*, "regarded with honour or respect, of good repute,"[80] applied here to the deceased's life but effectively also to the deceased himself, appears nowhere else in the corpus, nor is it

---

[76] 2001, 58: "Auf dieser Umstände [its rarity in the sepulchral context] scheint *splendidus* wohl am ehesten zur Motivation des folgendes *ut*-Satzes gesetzt zu sein, also eher 'ansehnlich' denn 'angesehen' zu verstehen zu sein."

[77] Of the elder Sex. Roscius from Ameria: *homo tam splendidus et gratiosus*; he cites several other examples from Cicero of the association of *splendidus* with forms of *eques*.

[78] See n.75 above for the superlative's use in the phrase *splendissimus ordo* to refer to municipal and colonial senates.

[79] For a discussion of *figurae etymologicae* in Indo-European, and especially in ancient Greek, see Clary 2009. The expression ('live a life') appears in Cato (*orat.* 246.1), Ennius (*trag.* 202) and several times in Plautus (e.g. *Mil. glor.* 628, 726, and 1051).

[80] *OLD* s.v. *honestus* 1.

frequent as an epithet applied to individuals in CIL VI.[81] The choice to emphasize this quality, then, was presumably a decision of the composer or commissioner, rather than a choice based on formula.

The second line of the metrical portion serves, as did the indirect objects in previous examples, to relate the praise of the deceased to others. Those examples, however, name the groups affected by the described qualities of the deceased; here the 'other' is the indefinite pronoun *quisque*, and the effect is hoped for (provided we take *ut* for *utinam* and *exoptet* as an optative subjunctive[82]) rather than asserted: that each man might wish to live honorably (*honeste uiuere*) as the deceased has done.[83] The expression of this wish also sets apart Utius' epitaph from the three described above: in each of those, the unidentified third-person narrator simply enumerates the virtues of the deceased without editorializing; here the narrator (or the inscription itself) has sufficient narrative presence to voice his or its own wish as to the effect of the deceased's behavior.

The overall effect of the metrical section of this epitaph, then, is more complex than those of the others we have seen: the first line, given over to praise of the deceased, offers laudatory epithets and, via the phrase *honestam uitam uixsit,* establishes the portrayal of the deceased in the past, and limits it thereby; but the line of praise lacks the indirect objects found in previous examples, and is followed instead by a line in which the wish is expressed that others live honorably as the deceased has done. When the inscription was read aloud by a passer-by, his voice would repeat that wish, along with the praise of the deceased.

---

[81] Nor is there a section of sepulchral uses in the entry in *TLL*. Harrod does not report any uses in CIL VI, but there are in fact a few; the closest parallel, however, is with the adverb *honeste*: VI 4870 *quandius uixit honeste uixit.*

[82] As at, for example, Hor. *S.* 2.1.43 *ut pereat positum robigine telum*; see Gildersleeve §261.

[83] Among the earlier commentators on Latin epitaphs, few have discussed this idea of deceased-as-example; it seems to occur less frequently than other consolatory *topoi*. Galletier (1922) and Lattimore (1962) mention such a *topos* not at all; Tolman (1909, 90), Purdie (193, 43-44), and Wolff (2000, 75) mention it briefly, giving anecdotal examples.

We turn now to the last poem of those in this chapter in which the deceased is the only individual implicated, CIL I² 1924, reserved to the end of this section because it is in several ways more complex than the other examples we have seen:

> *C. Turpidi P. f. Hor. |*
> *C. Tu]rpidius C. f. Severus f(ilius) u(ixit) a. XVI*
> Parentibus praesidium, amíceis gaudium
> pollicita pueri uirtus indigne occidit.
> quoius fatum acerbum populus indigne tulit
> magnoque fletu funus prosecutus est.[84]

> *Gaius Turpidius, son of Publius of the tribe Horatia;*
> *Gaius Turpidius Severus, son of Gaius. The son lived 16 years.*
> A help to his parents, a joy to his friends, the promised virtue of the boy has unworthily perished. Whose harsh fate the people bore severely and followed the funeral with great weeping.

The inscription, the bulk of which is written in iambic senarii,[85] is generally considered to belong to the Republic;[86] Colafrancesco and Massaro date it to the first century BCE.[87]

The non-metrical superscript indicates that the grave was for a citizen father and son:[88] the first line contains the name, filiation, and tribe affiliation of the father Gaius Turpidius, and the second the name, filiation, and age of the son, Gaius Turpidius Severus. The content of the metrical portion makes it clear that the son is the subject of the poem. The poem has more 'literary' features than others we have looked at thus far: Kruschwitz reports that the iambic senarii are of high quality,[89] and there is marked alliteration throughout the metrical portion: ***p****arentibus* ***p****raesidium…****p****ollicita* ***p****ueri…****f****letu* ***f****unus.*

---

[84] CLE 69: the inscription was found near the crossroads-town of Urbs Salvia. The material was not noted, and the current location of the inscription, if it still exists, is unknown (Kruschwitz 2001, 54).
[85] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.
[86] Degrassi includes it in his *ILLRP*, and Kruschwitz and Keuleers in their works on Republican inscriptions.
[87] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.
[88] Keuleers 2003 ad loc. suggests that both father and son are freedmen, but without support.
[89] Kruschwitz 2001, 55.

In terms of content, the first verse conforms to a pattern seen in the examples above: the deceased is praised, and each word of praise is accompanied by an indirect object indicating the recipients of the praised quality. But instead of the laudatory adjectives seen above, here we have nouns, arranged synchysistically with their indirect objects: *parentibus praesidum, amiceis gaudium*.[90] *Praesidium*, "a source or means of security (physical or otherwise), defense, protection,"[91] appears nowhere else in our corpus, but the idea of offspring-as-*praesidium* appears elsewhere in Latin literature, and in at least one later inscription.[92] Here its use seems somewhat proleptic, since Severus' death at sixteen came before he had much chance or need to provide protection for his parents. The second noun, *gaudium*, here "a source or cause of joy,"[93] seems straightforward, an assertion of the pleasure the boy provided his friends (cf. *gratissima amiceis* in CIL I² 1270 above).

In the second line, this poem offers an element not seen in any of our previous examples:[94] a statement of death, *pollicita pueri uirtus indigne occidit*. But in fact the statement focuses on the unjustness of that death: the periphrasis[95] *pollicita pueri uirtus* (and indeed the use of the noun *uirtus* in particular, a quality of an adult male) highlights the fact that the boy had not yet reached manhood; and the adverb *indigne* asserts the fact that the death has violated the natural order of things. Such was a common attitude in cases of immature death, a situation all too often

---

[90] Kruschwitz draws attention to the asyndeton in this line, and notes that the grammatical relation of the two nouns to the rest of the clause is not clear; he takes them as accusatives, dependent upon *pollicita*, but acknowledges that they may also be nominative subjects in addition to *uirtus* (ibid., 55 n.21).

[91] *OLD*, s.v. *praesidium* 1.

[92] Kruschwitz (2001, 55) directs his reader to *TLL* s.v. *praesidium* 890.25 ff. and specifically to Sall. *Iug.* 14.15; cf. also Lucr. 3.898. For the inscriptional example, see *IL Jug* 3.2159 from Dalmatia.

[93] *OLD* s.v. *gaudium* 1.b.

[94] Cf., though, the Scipio epitaph CIL I² 10: *mors perfec*[*it*] *tua ut essent omnia | breuia*; see discussion at ch.1 p.35.

[95] For the periphrasis, see Mankin (2012) on Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.32, where he directs the reader to Hor. *Odes* 3.21. 11-12 *prisci Catonis…uirtus* ("the virtue of ancient Cato" = "the virtuous ancient Cato") where Horace is parodying a style of epic periphrasis (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.781, ἔστασαν ἀμφὶ βίην Διομήδεος ἱπποδάμοιο, where "the might of Diomedes" = "the mighty Diomedes").

described in ancient Greek and Roman epitaphs;[96] indeed, when facing the loss of a

child, a Roman parent had to deal not only with the grief naturally arising from such

an event,[97] but also with the more pragmatic consequences: children were integral to

the continuation of the family name and fortune, as well as to the parents' own

burial.[98]

Whereas the first couplet of the poem focuses on the deceased himself

(albeit in relation to others), the second couplet describes the reaction of others to

that death. In line three, the poem reports that the *populus* bore the boy's *fatum*,

characterized as *acerbum*, with difficulty (*indigne*, used a second time in two lines,

in the same line-position but with a different meaning than the previous usage).[99]

The adjective *acerbum* is found elsewhere in this context, associated with an

untimely death: we will see it again in CIL I² 1603, discussed below in chapter four;

such a usage also appears in contemporary literature.[100] While the sentiment is what

we might expect in the case of premature death, the focus on the reaction of the

public (as opposed to family members) is marked. Such a focus on public mourning

appears nowhere else in the corpus, not even among the epitaphs of the publicly

---

[96] For the Greek preoccupation with and attitude towards those who died too young (ἄωροι), see
Griessmair 1966; Verilhac 1978, 7-11; and Garland 1985, 77-8. Lattimore devotes several pages to
descriptions of and reactions to untimely death in Greek and Latin inscriptions (1962, 184-199), and
Lier addresses many of the related *topoi* found in Latin inscriptions in particular (1903, 453-477).
N.b., though, Cicero's dismissive reaction to this preoccupation at *Tusc.* 1.93-94 (noted by Dixon
1992, 100).

[97] Contra Stone 1977, 70, who (writing about England in the 16th through 19th centuries) argues that
parents in societies with high infant-death rates would grieve less for the loss of a young child; cf.
also Hopkins 1983, 217-219, and Golden 1988, who takes a more nuanced view. For a summary of
the valuation of children as reflected by the evidence of epitaphs, see Shaw 1991, 79-80.

[98] Cf. Dixon 1992,108-116 (who directs the reader to Burn 1953, 4, Hopkins 1983, 225, and Bradley
1986, 217, as well as to Wiedermann 1989, 39-42 for a list of explicit expressions of this idea from
antiquity); Carroll 2006, 198-201.

[99] Antanaclasis*, literally "echoing," also called diaphora (Mankin 2011, 298). Kruschwitz (2001, 55-
6) notes that in the expression *indigne ferre* the adverb has a meaning similar to *aegre* or *indignanter*
and directs the reader (n. 24) to *TLL* s.v. *indigne* 1194.45ff.

[100] Cf. Catull. 68.90, *acerba cinis*; indeed, *acerbus* can perhaps in this context be taken as a gloss for
the Greek ἄωρος: Ellis, commenting on the phrase in Catullus (1889, 419), notes that Cicero
translates Euripides' (*Theseus* fr. 392 Nauck) θανάτους ἀώρους as *mortem acerbam*.

oriented Scipio family;[101] nor is such a focus noted as common in Roman epitaphs by Tolman, Lier, or Lattimore.[102] Unfortunately the question of why the commissioner or author chose to focus on public mourning must remain largely unanswered; we have no indication that the family was an especially prominent one.[103] We can suggest, however, that such a focus can be seen as an extension of the desire, seen in above examples, to establish, upon each reading, the place of the deceased among his fellow men: whereas above this has been done both by praise for the deceased in relation to others, and by a description of the example provided to others by the deceased, here what is established and continually reified by each reading is the pain felt by the whole *populus* for the loss of the boy.

That theme continues in the fourth line, which describes the funeral and the mourning that took place there: *magnoque fletu funus prosecutus est*. The description of the funeral itself is also singular in the corpus; although we have, as we will see, descriptions of mourning throughout the corpus, a mention of the public funeral itself appears only here.

The overall effect of the poem, then, is less about the deceased boy than the injustice of his death, and the mourning occasioned by it: only the first line describes the boy himself. Furthermore even in that one line of praise, the focus (as has been the case in previous examples) is on his qualities relative to others; and

---

[101] The idea of mourning by a larger civic body is also rare in Greek grave poetry, but for literary sepulchral examples cf. Simonides *AP* 7.302 and Posidippus epigram 55 A-B, in both of which the *polis* is described as mourning the deceased. In Latin literature, cf. Cic. *De. Or.* 3.8, on the death of L. Crassus: *fuit hoc luctuosum suis, acerbum patriae, graue bonis omnibus.*

[102] Lattimore 1963 includes a section (224-7) on public burials (i.e. tombs erected and paid for by public decree) but nothing about public lamentation per se; Carroll (2006, 138-142) notes anecdotal cases of public mourning for certain individuals, along with public contribution of funds for construction of monuments (for the latter, cf. also Mouritsen's evidence from imperial Ostia (2005, 46), but suggests that this was most commonly in return for public service or benefaction in life.

[103] It does seem, however, like a reasonable guess, given the tone of the inscription and the modest scale of the town.

indeed, the use of the seemingly proleptic descriptor *praesidium* reminds the reader of the lost potential of the boy, rather than of a role he actually fulfilled in life.[104] The picture then expands to show the reaction of the public to the boy's death; here again, then, we have a sort of hierarchy like the one seen in CIL I² 1270 (*iucunda sueis, gratissima amiceis, omnibus officiosa fuit*), going from private relationships to public: first the boy is depicted in relation to his parents, then to his friends, and finally in relation to the wider public. And so the picture that is created upon each reading, firmly situated in the past by the verbs *occidit*, *tulit*, and *prosecutus est*, shows only briefly the boy himself; the reader, speaking the poem aloud, confirms rather the unjustness of his death, the loss to parents and friends, and the strong reaction of the public to such an untimely death.

In this first section of the chapter, we have considered five epitaphs in which the deceased is the only individual implicated.[105] We have seen that the content is primarily praise for the deceased, but that this praise is never, at least in these extant examples, absolute: the depiction of the deceased is always cast in relation to others. In this final example, CIL I² 1924, we have begun to see how that focus on others can be expanded, with the result that the picture created by a reading of the epitaph

---

[104] Cf. Sigismund Nielsen's (1997, 197-8) suggestion that the frequent use of epithets relating to *pietas*, when applied to deceased sons and daughters, is on the part of the parents (as Carroll 2006, 199-201 puts it) "an expression of frustrated hopes, of parents outliving their children and not being able to count on the *pietas*, the filial obligation or duty, of their children later in life."

[105] Left out of this section has been one poem that fits the criteria but is too fragmentary to justify its inclusion in the main discussion, CIL I² 1208:

Quoius forma(m) t[…] | uicerunt mores fi[…]

The poem, found by the Esquiline gate at Rome and now in the National Museum, is dated to the Republic by the CIL (ad loc.) and has been restored as a Saturnian by Ritschl (*Quoius forma*[*e decorem*] *uicerunt mores*) and Bücheler (*Quoius forma*(m) *t*[*enaces*] *uicerunt mores fi*[*dei*]). Nothing can be determined about the gender or class of the subject; due to the inscription's proximity to the better-known epitaph of Marcus Vergilius Eurysaces (CIL I² 1203), it has been suggested that the subject was a member of his family, but there is no other evidence for such a conclusion. The inscription is remarkable mainly for its resemblance to the third line of the epitaph of Scipio Barbatus (CIL I² 6, cf. ch.1 p.28), *quoius forma uirtutei parisuma fuit*. As Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) notes, the similarity could be due to imitation of the more prominent Scipio epitaph (a suggestion complicated by the fact that the Scipio tomb was not, as far as we know, open to the public) or, more likely, to the fact that the phrase was a common sepulchral formula.

becomes less about the deceased him- or herself, and more about those others affected by the death. That expansion will continue as we proceed through the remainder of the chapter, investigating four poems in which other individuals are implicated: as has been the case in this last example, the implication of others in the poem brings an increased range of content, including descriptions of mourning and the construction of the tomb, with the result that the picture created by a reading of the epitaph is about others just as much as it is about the deceased.

In the next two poems we will consider, the subjects of the inscriptions have again died before their time; and in each of them, the mother of the deceased is implicated in, and plays a primary role in the picture created by, the poem. In the first we will consider, CIL I² 2139, the poem contains praise for the deceased, but as was the case in CIL I² 1924, the expression of that praise is inextricably tied to the subject's premature death:

> Mater monumentum fecit | maerens filio,
> Ex quo nihil | unquam doluit, nise cum is non fuit.[106]
>
> A mother made the monument, lamenting, for her son,
> from whom she has never suffered any pain, except when he was no more.

The poem, written in iambic senarii and containing, as did the previous example, marked alliteration (*mater monumentum…maerens, fecit…filio*), is considered by Colafrancesco and Massaro to be no later than the first century BCE.[107] At the time it was recorded, no super- or subscript accompanied the metrical inscription, and as such we do not know the name or class of the deceased boy.

The primary figure implicated in the inscription, other than the deceased boy, is his mother; and with the inclusion of this additional figure, the content

---

[106] CLE 152: the inscription was found in the Cremona Cathedral, deeply inscribed in old-fashioned letters on a pedestal to which an altar may have once been attached; it is now in the collection of the Castello Sforzesco in Milan, but has been damaged since it was first recorded by Mommsen (CIL ad loc., Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

[107] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.

expands, as it did in CIL I² 1924, to include elements other than praise for the deceased. The first line focuses on the mother's mourning, via the present participle *maerens*, and her construction of the tomb, *monumentum fecit*; the deceased boy figures in the first line only as an object of his mother's actions, and is identified only via his familial relationship to her (*filio*).

And while the second line provides the reader with the praise for the deceased to which we have become accustomed, that praise is relative to his mother and furthermore tied to the circumstances of his death: via a relative clause dependent on *filio*, the poem states that he caused her no pain, except by his premature decease. Lattimore considers such an expression as a "Latin commonplace of mourning for the young" (citing this poem as one of his examples) but suggests, having found it in only two Greek inscriptions, neither of them pre-Roman, that the *topos* is a Roman one.[108]

And so while this inscription shares certain points with the first five examples we saw above (e.g. praise for the deceased, relative to others) its inclusion of the mother of the deceased as a primary (literally – she is the grammatical subject of the first line) figure expands both the nexus of interaction and the content: as in CIL I² 1924, it is no longer only the figure of the deceased who is invoked, and the content is no longer simply praise, but descriptions of mourning and construction of the tomb; thus the picture created by the reading of a passer-by is a multi-faceted one, as opposed to the simple portrait of the deceased we have seen in most of the examples above. Furthermore, although the main verbs *fecit* and *fuit* place the action of the inscription in the past (as has been the case in previous examples), here

---

[108] Lattimore 1962, 198.

we see a present participle, *maerens*, which when read aloud creates a reification of the mother's mourning-act more vivid than any other part of the inscription.[109]

As mentioned above, one feature of the current example that stands out from others we have looked at is the description of the construction of the monument, *mater monumentum fecit*; and in fact, the phrase provides a piece of information that we have lacked in all of our examples thus far: the identity of the commissioner of the monument. Such a statement and identification are not unusual in Greek and Roman epitaphs; indeed, as we will see, when considering other individuals implicated in the inscriptions, the commissioner is a common figure. In some cases the deceased has arranged for his or her burial while still alive, and that fact is noted within the text of the inscription; but if not, it becomes the duty of family or friends,[110] and the person who fulfills this duty often wishes to have that act publicly noted.[111]

That the act of burial is a duty expected from family members is explicitly asserted in our next example, CIL I² 1798, again for a boy who died young:

> *L. Aufidio L. f. | Plauto*
> Quot par parenti fue[r]|at faceret filius, |

---

[109] As Dixon (1988, 200) points out, the capacity or likelihood for mourning by a mother for her son seems to have been proverbial; she directs the reader to Cic. *Fam.* 9.20.3: *patriam eluxi iam et grauius et diutius quam ulla mater unicum filium*. For a consideration of whether we should conclude an especially strong attachments between mother and son, see 200-202; Dixon suggests that such a particular attachment would be attributable to the preference for and importance of males in Roman society, and on the fact that a son would be the focus of a mother's political and social ambitions (212).

[110] For various possible identities of dedicators, see Carroll 2006, 180-181, and for the legal aspects of the obligation of burial, 185; she directs the reader to Cic. *Leg.* 2.48, where the obligation is said to belong most to those legally associated with the deceased via inheritance or property.

[111] Cf. Tolman 1910, 44; Purdie 1935, 49-51; Lattimore 1962, 220-224; Valette-Cagnac 2000, 35-36; Carroll 2006, 127-8: "Pobjoy (2000, 90-2) sees the propagation of inscribed texts, particularly on public buildings, as influenced by the desire to record permanently and very visibly the completion and fulfillment of an obligation involving compulsory services or benefaction, as well by the desire to advertise one's virtues in having dutifully supervised or paid for the construction of buildings and other public works…A sense of duty virtuously fulfilled is also conveyed by funerary inscriptions naming the deceased and the dedicator, particularly those inscriptions that advertise the generosity of the dedicator." Much work has been done on various facets of the "epigraphic habit" in the last several decades, beginning with MacMullen's now-classic study on inscriptions of all kinds (1982), and subsequently specifically on epitaphs by Meyer (1990); cf. also Woolf 1996 and Mouritsen 2005.

mors inmatura fec[it]|| mater faceret filio.[112]

For Lucius Aufidius Plautus, son of Lucius.
That which[113] it had been suitable that a son do for a parent, immature death has caused a
mother to do for her son.

The poem, written in iambic senarii,[114] is accompanied by a non-metrical super-
script comprised of the name (Lucius Aufidius Plautus) and filiation (son of Lucius
– again, a marker of the freeborn-class) of the deceased boy. The inscription is
dated by Colafrancesco and Massaro to the first century BCE; Keuleers notes that
the use of a cognomen by someone free-born suggests a date after 55 BCE.[115]

As has been the case in the two preceding examples, the poem displays
marked alliteration: *fue*[*r*]*at faceret filius… fec*[*it*]*…faceret filio, m*ors
*imm*atura*…m*ater*. Indeed, other literary elements also highlight the care with
which the poem was composed: the assonance of *par parenti* and *immatura…mater*,
and the similar but syntactically inverted line-endings *faceret filius* and *faceret filio*.

But whereas formally the poem shares literary qualities with the preceding
example, one aspect of its content sets it apart from all of the poems we have seen
thus far: it contains no praise for the deceased. In the previous example, the praise
was integrated with the assertion of a reversal of the natural order; here, such an
assertion occupies the entirety of the metrical portion of the inscription and has
displaced the praise entirely. Indeed, other than the name and filiation of the
deceased in the non-metrical superscript, the inscription provides no information
about the deceased himself: the first line, a relative clause dependent on the second,

---

[112] CLE 167: the inscription, carved in old-fashioned letters, was found in the private home in
Interpromium (CIL ad loc.). Later variations of the poem (with only the final word or words of the
second line changed) appear in CLE 164, 165, and 166.
[113] *Quot* for *quod* (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.; cf. Sommer 1914 §281); cf. *aput* for *apud* in, e.g., CIL I
593. For the claim that final <d> and <t> represented essentially the same sound by the end of the
Republic, see Leo 1912, 225-228.
[114] Colafrancesco and Massaro (1986 ad loc.) declare the implementation of the meter '*uitiosa*,' but
in fact the only sticking point is that the first syllable of *fuerat* must be scanned long (*fŭ(u)erat*) – an
archaism (Weiss 2009, 426-427) we see elsewhere in archaic Latin poetry, e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 181
Skutsch.
[115] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

points out that the burial of a parent should be carried out by the child, and the second line describes the fact that in this case, *mors immatura* has caused the mother to bury the son.[116]

And as was the case in the preceding example, CIL I² 2139, here the role of the deceased is de-emphasized even grammatically. In 2139, the deceased boy, referred to by the demonstrative pronoun *is*, serves as the subject of only a *nisi*-clause appended to a relative clause with (faint and apparently formulaic) praise; the mother is the subject of the main clause. Here in CIL I² 1798, Lucius Aufidius Plautus' grammatical role is an entirely passive one, as he is named only as *filio* and serves only as an indirect object in the main clause; *mors* and the *mater* are the subjects of *fecit* and *faceret*.

And so, with this shift in the focus of the content, the effect of the epitaph has more in common with the preceding example than with any of the others: the role of the mother as dedicator is re-asserted upon each reading by a passer-by, as is the reversal of the natural order in which a child should carry out the burial of the parent; but whereas the previous example contained at least token praise for the deceased, here no such praise was or will be spoken by the reader of the poem; the place of the deceased in society is asserted only by a mention of his death's violation of its expectations.

In our next example,[117] however, the first of two in which the deceased's master or mistress is implicated, we see a return to the accustomed praise; indeed, in CIL I² 1547 the very act of praise is the central element:

---

[116] Perhaps also of interest is that in this example and in the previous one, it is the mother rather than the father who is mentioned and thus credited as the commissioner of the burial. In fact, although there are four examples of father-daughter dedications in our corpus (CIL I² 1214, 1215, 1222, 3449h), there are no examples of father-son dedications. Saller and Shaw's numbers for parent-child dedications (limited as they are for this period) show that contrary to the trend in our corpus, father-son dedications are the most common; next in number are father-daughter and mother-son, with no examples noted of mother-daughter (1984, 147).

[117] CIL I² 1378 ([*…*]*o L. l. Scurrae, homini* [*pii*]*ssumo, maxumae* [*probitatis*]*, optumo leiberto* [*patronus*] *fecit*) was considered for inclusion in this section, but ultimately has been left out of this

76

...]ueinctius Gaius Protymus
...]mma qum laude probatus.
...]enium declarat pietatis alumnus
...]tius Valgus patronus.[118]

... Gaius [Q]ueinctius Protymus, esteemed with [high]est praise [...] [whose] nature his alumnus of devotion, [Gaius Queinc]tius Valgus, his patron, declares.

The inscription is dated to the time of Cicero, based on the use of the letter <y> in *Protymus* and the fact that the dedicator Gaius Quinctius Valgus is known from other inscriptions.[119] The meter is more difficult to determine: Bücheler suggests the verses be read as Saturnians, noting the resemblance of its first line (specifically the inversion of the *praenomen* and *nomen*) to that of the Saturnian Barbatus-epitaph, CIL I² 7, but subsequent scholarship has concluded that this example should rather be considered *commatica*.[120] Both Kruschwitz and Keuleers note other poetic aspects of the text: the fact that each line ends in -*us*, and the symmetrical arrangement, whereby names appear in the first and last lines, framing the praise of the deceased in the second and third lines, with a subject change after the first two verses.[121]

---

study due to doubts about its metricity: Bücheler did not include it in CLE, but Kholodniak did in CSL (763b), referring the reader to Zander, who writes (1890, cc) that it seems to include '*italicos uersus*;' Massaro (2002, 936) notes the triplicate structure of the praise, but denies its metricity ("Qui naturalmente non sorge alcun 'sospetto' metrico...") and Keuleers (2003) does not include it in his collection of Republican metrical inscriptions. The inscription, commissioned for a freedman presumably by his former owner, is severely damaged on the left side but appears to include the expected praise for the deceased and also notation of its erection.

[118] CLE 12: the inscription, now lost, was found in ancient Casinum in Latium; the left side of the tablet was already missing when it was recorded (CIL ad loc.). Bücheler's restoration is as follows (see body-text below for discussion of particular restorations):
    Heic est situs Q]ueinctius Gaius Protymus
    ameiceis su]mma qum laude probatus
    quoius ing]enium declarat pietatis alumnus
    Gaius Queinc]tius Valgus patronus.

[119] Kruschwitz 2002,175; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[120] For a detailed discussion, see Kruschwitz 2002, 175-177; cf. also Allen 1891, 74, who suggests alternate reconstructions so that all four lines can be read as hexameters, and Fitz-Hugh 1912, 134-5, who supports the CIL and CLE reconstructions whereby the lines can be read as Saturnians. Most recently, Mercado (2012, 219-221) supports the view that Satunians are a likely possibility.

[121] Kruschwitz 2002, 176; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

Unfortunately the damage to the inscription must limit our conclusions about it, but enough remains to make it valuable to our study. The deceased man, probably a freedman,[122] is the grammatical subject of the first two lines. The first line contains his name, Gaius Quinctius Protymus, and the damaged section of that line most likely contained the main verb: *heic est situs* is the CIL restoration, and Kruschwitz accepts that possibility, but suggests as an alternative *heic situs*, with the *est* left out, noting that the latter restoration would allow a continuous dactylic rhythm.[123] The second line contains praise for the deceased, *[su]mma qum laude probatus*; the prepositional phrase paired with *probatus* is not at all common, in extant inscriptions or in literary evidence, but the laudatory epithet *probatus* appears fairly frequently in the CLE.[124] For the damaged first section of the second line the CIL and CLE suggest *amiceis*; Kruschwitz, while he does not declare the suggestion untenable, suggests that a genitive, indicating the reason for the praise, is also possible, and concludes that a secure restoration is impossible.[125] In fact, the suggestion of *amiceis* has the advantage of establishing a connection of this praise to others, a connection we might expect from all the examples seen above.

The third and fourth lines require a change of grammatical subject: the deceased's (presumed) former master, Gaius Quinctius Valgus (whose names the deceased apparently took) is the subject. The third line characterizes him, in relation to the deceased, as an *alumnus pietatis*, and establishes him as the

---

[122] Such, at least, is the conclusion of Keuleers (2003 ad loc.), who sees the deceased's Greek cognomen as evidence of former slavery, and sees furthermore the fact that he shares his *praenomen* and *nomen* with his *patronus* (named in 4) as an indication that he had belonged to, and been freed by, that *patronus*. While Kruschwitz also offers that scenario as a possibility, he does not consider it the only one: he suggests that C. Quinctius Protymus could have been a Greek (but not necessarily a slave) who sought out the patronage of C. Quinctius Valgus.

[123] For a discussion of the phrase *heic est situs* vel sim., see chapter 3; as the deixis here is reconstructed rather than extant, it has seemed best to treat this poem here rather than in chapter 3, where the poems containing extant deixis are discussed.

[124] Kruschwitz 2002, 177: the phrase, albeit with the preposition and adjective reversed (*cum summa laude*), occurs in one other recorded Latin inscription, *AE* 1987, 107; in literary texts it occurs as such only at Caes. *Gall.* 5, 44, 13.

[125] Kruschwitz 2002, ibid.

commissioner of the monument by describing the act of his praise: [*ing*]*enium declarat*;[126] his name and a second indicator of his relationship to the deceased, *patronus*, occupy the fourth and final line. Here, then, the commissioner of the monument (named here, whereas none of our previous examples have included the name of the commemorator) plays a sizable role.

The characterization *alumnus pietatis* is distinctive: Kruschwitz notes that the phrase appears first here, and just four times elsewhere in extant Latin literature. Furthermore, it seems to be associated with funerary inscriptions: of the four uses, two are in sepulchral contexts:[127] at Ovid *Met*. 14. 443-444, a fictitious grave-inscription for Aeneas' nurse Caietas, the phrase *notae pietatis alumnus* is applied to Aeneas in his role as commissioner of the pseudo-inscription; and in the Spanish grave-inscription CIL II 1699, *pietatis alumna* is applied to the female subject of the epitaph. Kruschwitz suggests that the former example from Ovid and our example, both applying as they do the phrase to the commissioner of the monument, may spring from a lost common source in earlier sepulchral poetry, but notes that they differ in their respective uses of *pietas*: in Ovid the word, modified by *notae*, should be taken as a *genitiuus qualitatis* referring to Aeneas' piety in general; whereas in CIL I² 1547, Kruschwitz suggests, the phrase should indicate that Valgus has fulfilled his duty of *pietas* to the deceased Protymus specifically by commissioning the inscription.[128] Kruschwitz does not specifically say so, but such a reading seems to characterize our *pietatis* as another genitive of quality – problematic without an epithet.[129] Such being the case, we can rather take *pietatis* as a *genitiuus auctoris,*

---

[126] Both CIL and Bücheler (CLE ad loc.) suggest *ingenium*, and Kruschwitz (2002, 178) concurs that it is the only viable choice: "[*Ingenium*] scheint das einzige auf -*enium* endende Wort zu sein, das in diesem Rahmen sinnvollerweise ergänzt werden kann."

[127] The two non-sepulchral uses appear in the *carmina* of Venantius Fortunatus, where he uses the same line (*officiis uenerande sacris, pietatis alumne*) twice as an apostrophe to his addressee (*carm.* 5, 12, 13 = 9, 8, 3).

[128] Kruschwitz 2002, 178-179.

[129] For Housman's treatment of the question of whether a genitive of quality requires an epithet, see Diggle and Goodyear 1972, 520-522; cf. also Löfstedt 1928, 120-123.

"ward of" or "reared by" piety, in which case the piety belongs not to the commissioner-patron, but to the deceased freedman, with the idea that Quinctius Gaius Protymus was an older man who, despite his non-citizen birth, helped raise the citizen-patron Quinctius Valgus[130] who then goes on to free Protymus and commission his monument.[131]

The phrase [*ing*]*enium declarat* in the same line describes, and continually reifies, the fulfillment of that duty: the subject of the phrase is Valgus, and the object the *ingenium* of the deceased; thus the phrase is a self-referential description of the act of the inscription (or at least the first two lines of it, which focus on the deceased himself). And indeed, Kruschwitz notes that such is the established usage of *declarare* in other sepulchral inscriptions: in each of the four other extant uses of the verb in grave-poetry (CLE 88, 273, 610, and 1604) the monument or *titulus* serves as the subject of the verb, and some qualities of the deceased or his *nomen* as the object.[132]

The inscription concludes with a fourth line containing the name of the commissioner (reconstructed as Gaius Quinctius Valgus based on the freedman's name in the first line and on other inscriptions containing his name),[133] and the epithet *patronus*. As mentioned above, no other example considered thus far has contained the name of the commemorator; here Valgus' name occupies most of the final line of the poem. From the epithet, applied presumably in relation to the deceased freedman, we can conclude that Valgus wished to advertise that his relationship to the deceased, after the latter had been freed, was that of a *patronus*.

---

[130] For a parallel situation, cf. *AP* 7.178.
[131] One other interpretation remains: that *pietatis* goes not with *alumnus*, but with *ingenium*, i.e. the *patronus*/*alumnus* declares the *ingenium pietatis* of the deceased (the "nature of his piety" = his pious nature). Such a reading could include a pun on *ingenium*/*ingenuus*: though the deceased was not freeborn, he had the qualities of a free-born man.
[132] Kruschwitz 2002, 177-178.
[133] Cf. Dessau 1883, 620; Kruschwitz 2002, 180 n.849.

The ultimate effect of the first couplet of this inscription is similar to those of examples seen above: the voice of a passer-by reading the inscription aloud gives the name of the deceased, and praise for him (relative to others, if we accept the reconstruction of *amiceis* in the second line), thus establishing upon each reading the deceased's presence in and effect on society. In the second couplet, specifically in the phrase [*ing*]*enium declarat* of which the deceased's former master Valgus is the subject, we see an element also present in the two examples preceding this one: a notation of the commissioner of the monument and inscription. But whereas in each of the two preceding examples this notation was comprised simply of a noun and a past-tense form of the verb *facere*, here the verb *declarat* has a more complex effect: the word is self-referential, referring to the preceding lines of the inscription itself, and furthermore in the present tense, with the remarkable result that each time a passer-by reads the inscription, his voice not only repeats the name and praise of the deceased, but re-enacts in present time the declaration by the commissioner of that name and praise, thereby establishing also the fulfillment of the commissioner's duties to the deceased.

A focus on the commissioners and a re-enactment of their role in the burial also appear in our next inscription, CIL I² 1213, the penultimate poem we will consider in this chapter:

> …] est s(e)pulta uirgo [eg]regieis moribus
> …] quae in delicieis fu[e]rat Vettiae
> qua[…|…]it. Eam morte ob[i]ta diligunt
> mon[umentum…]|[…f]letu ac muneribu[s r]eplent,
> seque ipse[i…|…]am esse ereptam sibei
> s[erua]e suis deliciis uitam ap[…

> A maiden is buried…with outstanding manners […] who had been among the favorites of Vettia, who […] They love her after her death and they fill [her] monument with weeping

and with gifts, and they themselves […] (themselves) that the […] of their [servant] was snatched from them, [her] life by her charms [...[134]

The poem, restored by Bücheler as iambic senarii,[135] is generally dated to the Republic: Bücheler suggests the time of Caesar (in part based on the unsupported idea that the Vettia mentioned in the second line could be the wife of Verres); Gatti, on the basis of letter-shapes, dates it to the time of Sulla; and Colafrancesco and Massaro date it to the first half of the first century BCE.[136] As was the case in the previous example, the damage to the inscription requires us to piece together the evidence: the subject of the epitaph is female, and apparently a slave; her name does not appear in the remaining metrical inscription, and no super- or subscript has been preserved.

The first two lines focus on the deceased: in the first line there is a statement of burial: *est s(e)pulta*[137] (before which Bücheler has restored the deictic pronoun *heic*[138]), with the noun *uirgo* as subject, indicating that the deceased girl had not yet borne children (a circumstance, together with death before marriage, especially to be mourned[139]). Praise fills the remainder of the line: *egregieis moribus*; the adjective contains implicit comparison to her peers, whom she outstripped by the quality of her *mores*. Only one variant of this phrase occurs elsewhere among

---

[134] CLE 1867: comprised of two fragments of peperino, the inscription was found at the Vigna Serventi, a vineyard on the ancient Via Labicana; the two fragments had been used to prop up wine barrels in the dining-room (Gatti 1901, 106).

[135] Bücheler (CLE ad loc.) reconstructs the poem as follows (see discussion of individual lines in the body-text):
heic] est s(e)pulta uirgo [eg]regieis moribus
Philema,]quae in delicieis fu[e]rat Vettiae
qua[e domino placu]it: eam morte ob[i]ta diligunt
     mon[umentumque eius f]letu ac muneribus [r]eplent,
     seque ipse[i deflent uit]am esse ereptam sibei
     s[erua]e suis deliciis uitam ap[tae deum.

[136] CLE ad loc.; Gatti 1901, 107; Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.

[137] Possibly an example of "syllabic notation," an Old Latin spelling convention whereby a whole syllable is indicated by means of a consonant; see Vine 1993, 323-344.

[138] See n.135 above.

[139] Cf. Lattimore 1962, 193-194. As a slave, the girl could not legally marry, but we can take *uirgo* to mean that she had not achieved any sort of conjugal or child-bearing situation.

inscriptional *carmina* (*egregios mores* in the non-sepulchral CLE 1403), but praise

for the deceased's *mores* is well precedented (as in, e.g., Scipio-epitaph CIL I² 15

discussed in the preceding chapter).

In the second line, Bücheler has suggested that the deceased's name

occupied the damaged first section, using Philema as a metrically appropriate

example; he and Gatti suggest that the name was probably a Greek one.[140]

Thereafter a relative clause states that she was among the favorites of a woman

named Vettia: *quae in delicieis fu*[*e*]*rat Vettiae*.[141] Of *deliciae* and variants *delicia*

and *delicium*, Harrod finds eighty-three uses in CIL VI.[142] This characterization is

praise, of a sort, and indeed the sort we have come to expect, in which the praise is

given in relation to others; but the phrase is also the beginning of a shift in focus

from the deceased to her mistress and master who set up the tomb: what remains of

the next three lines describe for the most part not the deceased herself, but the

reaction of that master and mistress to her loss.

The third line begins with another relative clause, of which only the first and

last few letters remain. To restore it, Bücheler has suggested the formula *quae*

domino placuit, which would serve well as a counterpart to the phrase in the second

line describing the deceased's value to her mistress; Gatti suggests as an alternative

a phrase in which the *dominus* plays a more active role: *quam dominus aluit*.[143] The

extant latter part of the line asserts the love of her patrons for their deceased slave

---

[140] CLE ad loc.; Gatti 1901, 107.

[141] For this usage, cf. *OLD* s.v. *delicia* 3d.

[142] Harrod 1909, 74. *Delicium* is by far the most frequent, and he declares it a '*vox blandiens*,' which "expresses no definite relationship" (although he notes that it is generally applied to children: in the thirty-three cases where the age of the *delicium* is specified, the average age is seven and a half years); but he finds three usages (CIL VI 14559, 19673, and 24345) that he classifies as meaning 'pet slave girl of a woman,' which, although he is speaking of *delicium* rather than *deliciae*, applies well here. A variant of the entire phrase (with restored *domino*) appears in the later CLE 2289: [*domino*] *suo fuit in deliciis*, but unfortunately the inscription is too damaged to indicate the gender or class of its subject. The *TLL* does not include a section on sepulchral uses in the entries for *delicia* or *delicium*.

[143] CLE ad loc.; Gatti 1901, 107.

even after her death: *eam morte obita diligunt*; the present tense of the verb *diligunt* is vivid, and the ablative absolute *morte obita* seems to be an especially poetic touch.[144]

Also remarkable is the image created by the fourth line, in which her patrons are described (again with a present-tense verb) as filling her tomb with tears and gifts: *mon*[*umentum eius f*]*letu ac muneribu*[*s r*]*eplent* (the restoration carried out by Bücheler here is no great stretch, given the extant letters). That interested survivors of the deceased should bring gifts such as food, wine, and flowers to the tomb is well precedented,[145] but the image of filling the tomb with tears is less common; it appears nowhere else in the corpus and is not mentioned as a *topos* by any of the modern scholars of Latin inscriptions.[146]

The fifth line continues to describe their mourning, and characterizes the deceased as having been snatched away from them: *seque ipse*[… …]*am esse ereptam sibi*; the use of the verb *eripere* is well paralleled in cases of immature death.[147] As for the restoration of a main verb, Gatti points out that in addition to Bücheler's *deflent* there are several other metrically viable possibilities, but both seem to agree that a present-tense verb is most likely, given *replent* in the preceding line.[148]

In that next and final line the content seems to be once again praise for the deceased: the genitive possessor of the extant *uitam*, restored as *seruae* by Bücheler,

---

[144] Cf. *Aen*. 10. 641 and Lucr. 1.235 = 4.734; also Cic. *Sest*. 83.7. There is one other occurrence of the phrase in the CLE, in a later epitaph, 1563*: morte obita ut monumentum haberemus fecimus uiui studium*.

[145] Cf. Galletier 1922, 35-37; Purdie 1935, 49-51; Lattimore 1962, 132-136.

[146] For mentions of the physical act of weeping onto the grave in Greek (literary) sepulchral *carmina*, see *AP*. 7.166 (Dioscorides or Nicarchus) and 7.476 (Meleager); cf. also, in Latin literature, Catul. 101.7-9: *haec…accipe fraterno multum manantia fletu*. None of these, however, has the image of filling the tomb with tears; I have yet to find examples of this specific image elsewhere. Cf. also the discoveries of so-called lachrymatories, jars or bottles placed in the tomb in which mourners were said to have collect their tears (Eschenburg 1860, 303); although current opinion is that the jars held unguents rather than actual tears, the symbolic value still relates to our poem's imagery.

[147] Cf. several examples cited by Lattimore 1962, 162-163.

[148] CLE ad loc.; Gatti 1901, 107.

is characterized by a lost adjective beginning *ap-*, because of her charms (*suis deliciis*; another example of so-called antanaclasis[149]); Bücheler's suggestion for the adjective and remaining space in the final line is *aptae deum*.[150]

And so as was the case in the preceding example, the picture created by a reading of this epitaph is a greatly expanded one, relative to the simpler examples seen earlier in the chapter; the poem and the resulting picture focus as much or more on other individuals as on the deceased. The voice of the passer-by reads aloud the praise of the deceased, which establishes the superiority of her *mores* among her peers (and, presumably, her name that is lost to us), but almost immediately the voice describes her relations to her mistress and master, and their reaction to her death; the establishment of the deceased's place in society, other than the comparison to peers implicit in *egregeis*, is here accomplished only in respect to her mistress and master. The presumed commissioners of the tomb, they receive several lines worth of attention as their actions are reified and, thanks to the poem's use of the present tense, re-enacted by each reading long past the time when they might have wept at, and brought gifts to, the tomb.

Such, then, are nine early Latin poetic epitaphs that do not acknowledge any audience or addressee: five in which the deceased is the only individual implicated, and four in which other individuals play a role. We can observe that these poems have much in common: praise for the deceased is, not unexpectedly, a central feature. Perhaps less expected is the fact that the praise contained even in the simplest of these poems is not absolute, but describes the good qualities mentioned in relation to others with whom the deceased interacted in life. The four more

---

[149] See n.99 above.

[150] Bücheler (CLE ad loc.) based the reconstruction on the Terentian phrase *deorum uitam apti* (*Heaut*. 692), with *aptae* "having obtained," from *apiscor*; Gatti (1901, 107), thinking perhaps of the other *aptus, -a, -um* ("fit for," from *apio*) notes a parallel sentiment in CLE 94: *tam dulcem obisse feminam, puto quod deorum est uisa coetu dignior*. The latter interpretation reminds one of Ganymede (cf. Ovid *Met*. 10.155ff.).

elaborate examples introduce other individuals, particularly the commissioners of the poems; and in these examples the content expands accordingly, to include descriptions of the erection of the tombs, and the mourning of those left behind.

Our final endocentric example from the corpus, however, CIL I² 708, does not at first appear to share the characteristics described above: among the group it is singular, for while it, too, introduces an individual other than the deceased, the content is markedly different:

> C. S]ergius M. f.
> Vel. Mena
> C. Sergius C . f. Vel.
> quom Q(uinto) Caepione | proelio est occisus.
> C. Sergius C. Sergius[151]
>
> [Gaius S]ergius Mena, son of Marcus,
> of the Velina tribe,
> Gaius Sergius son of Gaius of the Velina tribe,
> died in battle together with Quintus Caepio.
> Gaius Sergius Gaius Sergius

The inscription is also unique among the ten in this chapter in that, thanks to internal evidence, it can be dated to a particular year: 90 BCE.[152] Kruschwitz concludes that the third and fourth lines comprise the metrical portion of the inscription and should be read together as a Saturnian; he notes also as evidence of poetic intent the alliteration in *quom Q(uinto) Caepione…occisus.*[153] Four related men are named in

---

[151] Found slightly less than two miles outside of Rome in a vineyard outside of the Porta Ostiensis, the inscription is carved on peperino and accompanied on the right side of the stone by an illustration of a door, which may be intended to represent the underworld (Kruschwitz 2002, 170). The stone is now lost, but was examined and described by Hülsen in 1898 (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

[152] The date is based on the year of the battle of the Marsic wars in which Quintus Servilius Caepio (the grandfather of Marcus Junius Brutus) died in an ambush with most of his soldiers. Keuleers notes, however, that this stone was, for the subject of the metrical portion who died in battle, most likely a cenotaph (the body having been buried at or near the battlefield) and as such might have been commissioned slightly later than the actual event. For a discussion of the funerary conventions surrounding death in battle, including a discussion of cenotaphs, see Carroll 2006, 159-168.

[153] Kruschwitz 2002, 172; the lines were first identified as a Saturnian by Zander (1890, 68), and later by Engström (1912 ad loc) as well. Mercado's conclusion (2012, 221-222): "I hesitate to make a firm pronouncement that CIL I² 708 is a Saturnian, although I suspect it was meant to be one."

the inscription and as such, we can take it as a stone meant to accompany a family grave: the non-metrical superscript lists what is most likely a father and son; the subscript, carved in markedly larger letters (and as such possibly a later addition[154]) probably names two other male descendants of the C. Sergius Mena named in the first line of the superscript, whose Greek cognomen most likely marks him as the son of a freedman.[155] Keuleers believes that it is the C. Sergius Mena named in the first two lines who was killed in battle and as such is the subject of the metrical portion of the epitaph.

And so in this final verse-epitaph that lacks any acknowledgement of space or audience, it is the fact that the death of its subject came in battle that is presented in the single metrical line. No explicit praise is given, but rather an element of content we have not yet seen: cause of death. Such content must remind the reader of the poetic tradition of Homeric *kleos aphthiton*; in fact, then, we can see the content of this epitaph as a form of implicit praise and as such conforming to some extent to the content of the other nine verse-inscriptions discussed above.

We should note further, in considering the effect of this poem, that it is the name of the commanding officer Quintus Servilius Caepio, rather than that of the deceased subject Gaius Sergius Mena, that is incorporated into the metrical portion of the inscription. Surely this prioritization seems counterintuitive: if one purpose of couching the description of Sergius Mena's death in battle in a Saturnian is to confer on him hero-status, we might expect that *his* name be metrically incorporated, rather than confined to a non-metrical superscript. It is, in fact, the information that Sergius Mena died in battle with Quintus Caepio that has allowed us to know the specific context of the former's death; but even so, the seemingly inverted prioritization of the metricity requires comment. Keuleers does not address

---

[154] Kruschwitz 2002, 170 n.810; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.
[155] Kruschwitz 2002, 170; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

this anomaly, noting only that the use of the Saturnian here would indicate the intended heroic character of the inscription, and underline the truth of its content.[156] We can suggest further, however, that the statement of his death in battle specifically under the command of Q. Servilius Caepio evokes the valor of the fight (as, for example, "served with Patton"),[157] conferring implicit praise on the deceased – praise that also situates his life and death within a specific social context.

In comparison to the images called forth by the readings of previous examples, the effect of CIL I² 708 is quite stark: the voice of a passer-by, having read aloud several names, would declare that one of them had died in battle, along with his commander, whose name was also read aloud. No characterizing portrait of the deceased is created, nor are any scenes played out of the construction of the tomb, or of survivors mourning nearby; the very spareness of the content focuses all the reader's attention on the simple statement of death in battle, and it is in that social context that the deceased is indefinitely depicted. One is further reminded of Plutarch's report that in Lycurgus' Sparta, the only notation allowed to accompany the burial of a man was that he had died in battle.[158] With this parallel in mind, we can conclude that this epitaph belongs to a different subset of the genre than the nine examples described above, a subset that bears more resemblance to the tradition of Greek military epitaphs. And in fact, notation of war as a cause of death is relatively rare among Latin epitaphs (due at least in part to the custom of burying soldiers where they fell);[159] and so it is not surprising that this inscription offers the only such example in our corpus.

Having set out to discover the basic nature of early Latin epitaphs by examining those examples among our corpus that, by their lack of exocentric

---

[156] Keuleers 2003 ad loc: "De opstelling in een Saturnische versmaat moest dan het heldhaftig karakter aanduiden en het waarheidsgehalte onderstrepen."
[157] Cf. *AP* 7.246 by Antipater of Sidon, for Persian soldiers who "followed King Darius."
[158] *Lyc.* 27; cf. Lattimore 1962, 142.
[159] Carroll 2006, 159.

elements, focus the reader's attention on their content, we can draw certain conclusions about what was the fundamental stuff of such poems.

In the five simplest examples, in which the deceased is the only individual implicated, the content is exclusively praise for the deceased; but in addition to establishing the good character of the deceased, each of these poems establishes his or her place in society by relating that praise to others. In the first three examples, as well as in the fifth, the poems mention other groups who were the beneficiaries of the described good qualities: in CIL I² 1259, *ominibus*; in 1283, *sueis*; in 1270 an increasingly inclusive tricolon of *sueis*, *amiceis*, and *omnibus*; and in 1924 *parentibus* and *amiceis*. In the fourth example, CIL I² 1761, the relation of the praise to others comes in the form of a wish, expressed following the praise, that others might imitate the goodness of the deceased. The result in each of these cases is that a portrait of the deceased is created and re-created upon each reading by a passer-by that depicts not only his or her good qualities but also his or her place in society.

In the last of those five, CIL I² 1924, we also see how the content of the poem can expand to include elements other than praise: there, the reaction of the *populus*, and its mourning at a public funeral, are described, and the picture created by a reading becomes more elaborate; we also see again a seeming hierarchy of those others affected, arranged in descending order of intimacy. Such an expanded picture is also created by a reading of the next four examples, in which an individual other than the deceased is implicated in the inscription: in each of the first two discussed, CIL I² 2139 and 1798, the mother plays a primary role as she mourns her son and is credited as the commissioner of the monument; in the third, CIL I² 1547, a named former master is credited as commissioner; and in the fourth, CIL I² 1213, the master and mistress are depicted as mourning the loss of the deceased and bringing gifts to her tomb.

The effects of the expanded nexus of interaction are various, but one trend can be noted: the focus of the poem, and as such the focus of the picture created thereby, shifts from the deceased, whose role is to some extent diminished, to those others left behind. In CIL I² 2139, the mother is the primary figure, and her mourning is re-enacted upon each reading by the present participle *maerens*; the deceased is referred to only as her *filius*, and is praised only in that he gave her no pain but by his death. The mother is also the grammatical subject of CIL I² 1798, and again the deceased is only referred to as *filio* within the metrical portion; no portrait at all of the deceased emerges here, as the poem serves only to note that the mother's construction of the tomb for her son is a reversal of the outcome expected by society. In CIL I² 1547 the deceased must share equal billing, as it were, with his former master, who is credited as the commissioning the monument, which action is re-enacted upon each reading via the present-tense verb *declarat*. And the last in this group, CIL I² 1213, after briefly praising the deceased slave-girl, devotes several lines to the actions of her mistress and master – actions also depicted in the present tense, and as such re-enacted with each reading – as they mourn her and bring gifts to her grave.

And finally, there is CIL I² 708, the content of which differs markedly from the nine poems presented before it; the metrical content is a simple assertion that the deceased died in battle with his named commander. Despite the apparent difference in content, the poem shares effects with the preceding examples: the fact of having died in battle serves as implicit praise, and that praise is situated within a social context; further, just as in the two preceding examples the social position of each subject is continually reasserted by the depiction of their relations with their masters, here too the deceased is characterized by his position within a social hierarchy, by the naming of the commander under whom he served. And so while 708 seems to belong to a separate subset of the genre, less well-represented both in

our corpus and in Latin sepulchral inscriptions generally, it does in fact accord with the basic picture of the genre we are attempting to establish.

From these ten examples, then, we can suggest the basic content of the genre: praise for the deceased, consistently related to others, which sometimes comprises the whole of the inscription, and sometimes vies for space with depictions of those affected by the life and death of the deceased.

CHAPTER THREE: DEIXIS

Having considered and reached certain conclusions about those poems we have called 'endocentric,' which contain no acknowledgement of space or addressee, let us turn now to those five poems that do contain an 'exocentric' element:[1] an acknowledgement of real space, through the use of the deictic adverb *hīc* or a form of the corresponding pronoun/adjective *hic*. Although these five poems contain no acknowledgement of an audience, we might expect that the inclusion of this element, a gesture to the real space in which a reader was intended to encounter the text, might affect the content of the poem; but as we will see, these examples conform for the most part, other than the addition of a locative statement itself, to the patterns we have found in the preceding examples that lack such a gesture. The power of the locative statements themselves, however, should not be underestimated: they both confirm the establishment and location of the monument in real space, as a marker for the deceased among the still-living, and also create a bond between the reader, the text, and that spatial location.[2]

---

[1] CIL I² 1347, 1406, 1861, 2274, and CIL X 2971. Of these, one is dated to the second century BCE and four to the first century BCE; three were found at Rome and two elsewhere in Italy. Again, see discussion of individual poems for more information.
    Also considered for inclusion in this chapter but rejected due to insufficient consensus as to its date (Keuleers includes it in his collection because Koch dated it to the first cent. BCE, but notes that the latter does so without evidence (2003 ad loc.), and Colafrancesco and Massaro (1986 ad loc.) consider it undateable) was CIL I² 3449h from Carthago Nova: *Fíliola*[*m*] *amisit pa*[*ter heu*] *materque sequtast / ípsa. huius nomen Saluiol*[*ae*] *fuerat.*
    One further poem would have been included in this chapter (and likely will be in any subsequent version of this project), but came to my attention too late for it to be incorporated (although it was discovered in 1926, it is not in the CLE, nor does Keuleers (2003) include it in his collection): CIL I² 3449g, also from Carthago Nova: *Quem pietas coluit heic est situs Pontilienu*[*s*] / *Luci progeniem Publium habes Acheruns / ereptum e manibus maiorum luctibus summ*[*is*] / *quem pudor inginiumq*(*ue*) *frequens decorabat in aeuo / puerili florens ut foret ante alios / hunc natura potens luctu lacrumeisque leuauit / at productores omnibus heis honerat.*
[2] Cf. Lattimore 1962, 126: "The ordinary man must rely on the recognition of a stranger, and on the cult kept up by his family or heirs. This attention after death is grounded directly on the physical existence and identity of the tomb itself; that is so important because it is all that there is, the last link between the dead and the living."

In each of the first three we will examine, CIL I² 1347, 1406, and 2274, only the deceased is implicated, and praise for the deceased is the main content of the poem; in two of these three that praise is related to others, as we have come to expect from the examples seen in the previous chapter. In the fourth and fifth examples in this chapter, biographical information is presented rather than explicit praise, with the result that the portraits created by these two poems are placed within a specific social context in addition to a spatial one: in the fourth, CIL I² 1861, the poem presents information about the deceased's profession, and in the final example of this kind, CIL X 2971, information is given that illustrates the lifestyle of the deceased, and possibly also his profession. In addition to the above content, each of the five contains a locative statement using either the adverb *hīc* or a form of the pronoun/adjective *hic, haec, hoc*; we will see how those statements complement the other content of the poems, and what impact their inclusion has on the overall effects of the poems.

In CIL I² 1406, a simple locative statement and a laudatory description of the deceased occupy the whole of the metrical portion:

> a. heic sunt ossa | *Variae C. l. Glucerae* | feminae sanctissum(ae).
> b. *frugi piae*[3]
>
> a. Here are the bones of *Varia Glucera, freedwoman of Gaius*, a most venerable woman.
> b. *Modest and loyal*

Kholodniak dates the inscription to the first century BCE, and notes that the first and third lines of the inscription carved on the lid of the urn can be read as a trochaic senarius.[4] Massaro confirms the metrical nature of the lines, but suggests rather a trochaic septenarius.[5] The non-metrical name and libertination of the

---

[3] CSL 940f: the inscription is on a round marble urn, found and still present in the Villa Mattei in Rome; a) appears on the lid of the urn, and b) on the urn itself (CIL ad loc.), and as such they would presumably be seen separately by the reader.
[4] CSL ad loc.
[5] Massaro 2007a, 155.

deceased freedwoman Varia Glucera, in the genitive, occupy the second line of the lid-inscription, and a further bit of text, the adjectives *frugi* and *piae*, are inscribed on the body of the urn.[6]

Beginning the poem, and serving as its main clause, is the locative statement *heic sunt ossa*. Although it is the first we have seen in this study, such locative statements are common in Latin epitaphs; Tolman notes that this phrase and its variants occur over a hundred times in the CLE. The effect of such statements in Latin epitaphs, however, and specifically of the deictics that are a fundamental part of them, has not received much attention; Tolman's attitude is typical: "It is not worthwhile to consider at any length these much-worn expressions."[7] On the contrary, because these statements are so common it is all the more necessary that we consider them fully to appreciate the effect they might be expected to have for the deceased and for the reader of the poem.

Deixis plays a central role in genre of Greek epitaph,[8] and, as demonstrated by Tolman's statistics, continues to do so in that of Roman epitaph. It has been suggested by scholars of Greek epitaphs that a basic function of such deixis in that genre was to confirm verbally the physical location of the monument as a metonymic marker for the deceased: the inscribing, and subsequent reading, of a locative statement establishes and continually reifies the fact that the subject, though deceased, has a physically located presence among the living, in the form of the inscription accompanied by the monument or remains.[9] But such deixis has the further effect of establishing connections between the text, the monument or remains, and the reader. In this case, the *ossa* of the deceased are said to be *heic*, an

---

[6] The adjectives together make two iambs; for discussion of these epithets, see pp.53-54 (*frugi*) and p.64 (*pius*) of ch.2 above.

[7] Tolman 1910, 23.

[8] For a concise summary of the changing use of deixis in Greek epitaphs, see Tsagalis 2008, 217-219.

[9] Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 140ff.; Bruss 2005, 11-12.

adverb that requires a reader (who was, in antiquity, likely also a speaker) to give it meaning via his utterance and location.[10] Divorced as the poem now is from its original environment, the power of the deixis remains: a modern-day reader, encountering the word *heic*, must imagine him- or herself near to the text and monument, as a reader in antiquity would have been, to give the adverb meaning. In this example, the present-tense verb *sunt* complements both of the above-mentioned functions of the deixis, affirming for the graveside reader the continuing presence, in his time, of the remains, referred to here specifically by *ossa*, [11] and for the modern reader creating a vividness that belies the poem's separation from its intended environment.[12]

The following line characterizes the deceased as a *femina sanctissuma*. The epithet is a common one in this context, especially for women: Harrod notes that it is applied to the deceased 386 times in CIL VI, and that it is "distinctly the epithet of women, both wives and virgins. It implies purity and chastity."[13] The superlative also occurs frequently enough to be included in Sigismund Nielsen's statistical sample from CIL VI, where she notes that it is applied almost exclusively in

---

[10] Cf. Lowrie 2006, 117: "Deictics are indexical, so that their meaning shifts according to the context of their utterance. "This" (demonstrative *hic*) and "here" (adverbial *hīc*) have no intrinsic reference, but take their meaning from the place occupied by the speaker." For an introduction to the linguistics of deixis, Lowrie directs the reader to Klein and Jungbluth 2002 and Felson 1999; cf. also Felson 2004.

[11] For references to physical remains in the epitaphs of the CLE, see Tolman 1910, 23. Massaro (2007a, 155 n.148) notes that it is more common for *ossa hic sunt* to appear with *sita*, and indeed, that more complete variant of the formula occurs elsewhere in the corpus once in the metrical portion of the inscription (CIL I² 1209, discussed later in this chapter) and once in a non-metrical superscript (CIL I² 1603).

[12] Cf. Edmunds (2007, 87) on the effects of Latin demonstratives: "the past is brought forward into the present timeframe of the performance."

[13] Harrod 1909, 22. He notes that when an epithet is applied to a vestal virgin, *sanctissima* is the chosen epithet in almost half of the examples. The positive degree of the adjective is far less common, modifying the deceased only thirty-six times in CIL VI, and Dickey (2002, 137) notes that, in her non-sepulchral corpus, the general use of the superlative had weakened it such that the positive had more heft.

epitaphs for spouses.[14] We do not know the identity of the commissioner in this

case, but the above tendency suggests Varia Glucera's spouse as a likely candidate.

Unlike the praise seen in the examples of chapter two, this laudatory epithet

stands absolute, with no mention of those affected by the good qualities of the

deceased. The overall effect of the poem, then, lacks the establishment of the

portrait of the deceased among family, friends, or larger society seen in those

examples. The locative statement, however, establishes an enduring presence of the

deceased among the living in a different way, as discussed above. Although here

we have the establishment of a physically located presence via deixis, rather than a

portrait socially embedded by relative praise, we will see in the next two examples

that these two methods of establishing a place for the deceased are not mutually

exclusive: in those two poems, the continuing presence of the deceased is affirmed

both by relative praise and by locative statements.

In CIL I² 1347, those two elements comprise the whole of the metrical

portion of the inscription:

> *C. Numitorius | Asclepiades, | Mummia L. l. | Zosima*
> heis sunt duo | concordes | famaque bona | exsituq(ue) hones(to) | felixs[15]
>
> *Gaius Numitorius Asclepiades; Mummia Zosima, freedwoman of Lucius.*
> These are two harmonious people with good reputation and honorable end. Happy…

The names of the two subjects, and the libertination of the second, make up a non-

metrical superscript; the meter of the remainder of the inscription is still the object

of some discussion. Mommsen and Bücheler suggest that it can be read as

Saturnians, if *felixs* is restored to *felices*;[16] but more recent authorities do not find

this suggestion convincing: Massaro notes that those lines, excluding *felixs*, can also

---

[14] Sigismund Nielsen 1999, 178.
[15] CLE 15: the inscription was carved on a small sarcophagus found in a cemetery in the Villa
Pamphilia in Rome, with fragments of sculptures nearby (CIL ad loc.).
[16] Mommsen CIL I ad loc.: he specifies that 5-6 could be read as the first hemistich of a Saturnian,
and 7-9 as a whole Saturnian (cf. Massaro 2002, 31-32); Bücheler CLE ad loc.; cf. also Zander 1890,
70. Also see n.18 below.

be read as an iambic septenarius,[17] and Kruschwitz simply declares the question of meter still open.[18]

Warmington dates the inscription to the first half of the first century BCE, and Colafrancesco and Massaro concur; Keuleers, however, suggests that there is insufficient evidence for such a conclusion, and that a date in the early Empire is just as likely.[19] The first of the two subjects, Gaius Numitorius Asclepiades, is probably a freedman,[20] and the second, Mummia Zosima, is clearly indicated as such by her libertination; that they were a married couple is suggested both by their joint burial and by the use of the epithet *concordes* (see discussion below). Although this is the first example we have seen of a joint poetic epitaph for a married couple, there are several other such examples in the corpus.[21]

The metrical portion of the inscription begins by introducing, as it were, the reader to the subjects: *heis sunt duo…* Rather than the adverb *hīc* seen in the previous example, the locative statement in this inscription uses *heis*, a form of the deictic adjective/pronoun *hic haec hoc*.[22] Whereas in the previous example the deictic pronoun establishes the physical space in which the deceased's metonymic marker exists, and ties the inscription and the reader to that space, here the demonstrative adjective ties the inscription and thereby its reader to the deceased themselves – both their physical remains and their metonymic marker, and possibly also representative sculptures, if the sculptural fragments found near the

---

[17] A suggestion only viable with apocope of the first *-que*.

[18] Massaro (2002, 31-32 and 2007a, 155) further concludes that the rhetorical effect of the tricolon was the primary aim of the composer, and a metrical outcome secondary; Kruschwitz (2002, 207) does not choose to give the inscription full treatment in his *Carmina Saturnia Epigraphica*, nor does Mercado (2012) include the inscription in his study of Saturnian poetry.

[19] Warmington 1940, 46; Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[20] Based on the use of his cognomen (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

[21] Cf. CIL I² 1221a-b, 1259, 1319, 1347, 1408, and 1930.

[22] An alternate form of *hi* (earlier *hei*); see Weiss 2009, 223-224, who suggests that such a form likely arises "from a crossing of thematic **hei* and the old *i*-stem nominative plural *quēs*, 'who.'" See also *heis sunt horti* in CIL I² 1319 discussed in ch.5; there is also a by-form *hisce/heisce*, found in Plautus, Terence, and ILLRP 707, Capua (Weiss 2009, 344).

sarcophagus were originally a part of this monument. Again the present-tense verb *sunt* is used, which affirms the continuing presence of the remains and monument as well as the reader's proximity, actual or imaginary, to them at the time of reading.

The present tense of the verb *sunt* also vivifies the remainder of the undisputedly metrical portion of the inscription: a tricolon of praise, comprised of the adjective *concordes* followed by two noun-adjective pairs that serve as ablatives of quality, *famaque bona* and *exsituq*(*ue*) *hones*(*to*).

The epithet *concordes* serves as praise for each individual as a partner in the marital state, and for the harmonious state of the relationship itself. Treggiari recognizes *concordia* as one ideal aspect of Roman marriage, and notes praise of this virtue in several inscriptions in CIL VI;[23] and indeed, the epithet is applied to married couples in two other epitaphs in the corpus, CIL I² 1215 and 1732. Just as a specific reference to *concordia* is common enough in the corpus and elsewhere, so too is general praise for the married state in Roman epitaphs: Lattimore notes that "records of devotion between husband and wife are enormously frequent in Latin inscriptions, both verse and prose."[24] The frequency of such praise, and of the epithet itself,[25] might lead us to wonder whether its application here is sincere or formulaic; but as we cannot answer that question we must simply note that that the harmony of their marriage was an aspect of their lives that the deceased man and woman, or the commissioner of the inscription, wished to emphasize.

---

[23]Treggiari 1991, 245: "Agreement between husband and wife resulting from trust and sympathy may be called *concordia*, a happy state occasionally claimed on tombstones, especially in conjunction with long length of marriage," and further, 251: "An ideal marriage was ensured by harmony, *concordia*, or even identified with it." For relevant uses of the word in literature, see 251 n.76. Cf. also Dixon 1992, 70.

[24] Lattimore 1962, 275.

[25] Oddly, Harrod does not seem to include the adjective in his study: he lists one example of the singular *concors* (1909, 43) but does not list any examples of plural usage, e.g. *concordes*, although we know plenty exist.

The next element of the tricolon, the ablative phrase *famaque bona*, is, in sepulchral inscriptions at least,[26] more unusual: the phrase appears in only one other epitaph in the CLE: 839, in a line that seems to use our example as a model.[27] The content is less distinctive than the diction, however: it seems to be a simple assertion of the sort of relative praise we have seen before, i.e. the fact that the deceased subjects were well thought of by their contemporaries.

The second ablative phrase that comprises the final element of the tricolon, *exsituq*(*ue*) *hones*(*to*), is also distinctive in expression, and in content: like the preceding phrase, it appears in only one other example in the CLE – in fact, in the same, seemingly imitative example, CLE 839 – and its content, an assertion that the death of the deceased was *honestus*, is not common in sepulchral inscriptions. Keuleers suggests that the import of the phrase is that the deceased couple had long full lives before they died, and thus translates "with dignity in their passing,"[28] but no such lexical stretch is necessary; such an application of the adjective, more common elsewhere in Latin literature, has the sense of "honor-bringing,"[29] so we can take it to mean that the manner of their deaths was in no way disreputable.[30]

The final element of the inscription is the somewhat enigmatic *felixs*. As discussed above, to be included in the metrical portion the word must be restored to *felices*; in that case, it would be another epithet applied to the deceased husband and wife, with various meanings possible: either as a quality of theirs in life (perhaps

---

[26] The adjective-noun pair is common enough elsewhere in Latin literature: see *TLL* s.v. *fama*, 207.39-40: *ad uitam moresque hominum* (*exercituum, gentium*) *pertinens, -a bona et mala.* Cf., e.g., Hor. *Sat.*1.2.61 and Catull. 61.62.

[27] CIL VI 10021, found at Rome and dated by Colafrancesco and Massaro to the first century CE: *Vita bona fama fuit*, *mors exitu honesto.* The correspondence to the second and third elements of the tricolon of our example argues for imitation, or perhaps a lost common source.

[28] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.: "met…waardig in hun heengaan."

[29] *TLL* s.v. *honestus*, 2913.71ff.: *de actionibus, quae honorem adferunt…*(*sic de morte gloriosa*); cf., e.g., Cic. *Quinct.* 49: *etenim mors honesta saepe uitam quoque turpem exornat.*

[30] Cf. Prop. 2.26.57-58, in which Propertius considers laying down his life for Cynthia's sake (or rather, for the sake of her body) "a not dishonorable end": *quod mihi si ponenda tuo sit corpore uita / exitus hic nobis non inhonestus erit.*

reiterating the marital felicity suggested by *concordes*);[31] taken more closely with the ablatives, i.e. happy in their good reputation and honorable end; or, as Keuleers takes it, as an assertion of their satisfaction in their burial.[32] Should we retain *felixs*, the word would be excluded from the metrical portion, and could be understood as a cognomen, perhaps that of the commissioner,[33] or perhaps as a salutation/well-wishing to the passer-by.[34]

The overall effect of the poem, then, is complex, containing as it does both a locative statement and variegated elements of praise for the deceased man and wife. First of all the deictic *heis* ties the inscription to the remains of the deceased couple, and also possibly to sculptures of them that may have been a part of the monument; it furthermore ties the reader, upon his utterance of the adjective, to that physical location. The present-tense verb *sunt* reiterates and makes vivid both the locative statement and the praise that follows: the first phrase of the tri-colonic praise asserts that the married couple lived harmoniously (and, given the present tense of *sunt*, continue to do so in whatever capacity they continue to exist); the second that they enjoyed, and continue to enjoy, a good reputation in society; and the third that their end was and is *honestus*. The combined effect, then, is that as the voice of the passer-by speaks these words, a portrait of the deceased couple is created – a portrait including, via *fama bona*, their relation to their peers – and established in the real time of the reader by the present-tense *sunt*; the creation of the portrait is accompanied by a gesture that ties together the various elements of the monument

---

[31] Per Harrod (1909, 44) the epithet is twice elsewhere applied to the deceased in CIL VI, at 30113 and at 15927; in the latter example it is used in discussing a wife's quality relative to her husband. Dickey (2002, 325) concludes that in her non-sepulchral corpus, *felix* is a "term or praise or envy, *esp. for the dead* [my emphasis] or those distanced from the speaker."

[32] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[33] Ibid.; cf. *TLL* s.v. *felix* 440.32. For an example of the cognomen in the corpus, cf. CIL I² 1283.

[34] I.e. "(May you be) happy;" *TLL* s.v. *felix* 445.81; cf. CIL I² 2161 (discussed below, ch.6) *opto ut seis felicior*.

(sarcophagus, inscription, and possibly sculptures) as their metonymic marker, and that furthermore establishes the physical proximity of the reader to that marker.

Similar elements are present in our next example, CIL I² 2274, for the citizen Lucius Sulpicius:

> *L. Sulpicius Q. f. Q. n. Col(lina)*
> hic situs est | ille probatus
> iudicieis | multeis cognatis atque | propinqueis.[35]

> *Lucius Sulpicius, son of Quintus; grandson of Quintus, of the tribe Collina*
> lies here. He was praised in the judgments of many kinsmen and acquaintances.[36]

As was the case in the previous example, the extent of the metrical portion is a matter of some debate: Bücheler suggests that the metrical portion begins at *hic*, with *hic situs est* and *ille probatus* showing dactylic rhythm,[37] and the remaining words, from *iudiceis* to *propinqueis*, a dactylic hexameter;[38] but Massaro and Gómez Pallarès believe the metrical portion begins with *ille probatus*, citing for support the fact that *hic situs est* is written in larger letters, corresponding to the script of the non-metrical name and filiation, whereas the three inscribed lines beginning with *ille* are written in smaller letters, indicating, they suggest, an intentional division between prose and poetry. Massaro notes that those lines can be read as an anapestic octonarius, but says that that outcome may be unintentional;[39] Gómez Pallarès prefers to regard them as simply having a dactylic rhythm with a canonical hexametric ending.[40] To cover all bases, as it were, we will consider *hic situs est* as a part of the metrical portion.

---

[35] CLE 363: the inscription, carved on a tablet in old-fashioned and very well-formed letters, was found in Carthago Nova (modern Cartagena, Spain) in a Franciscan monastery; it is now kept by the Museo Arquelógico (CIL ad loc., Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

[36] Alternately, we could understand "praised for his judgments on behalf of (i.e. advice to) many kinsmen and acquaintances."

[37] And in fact forming the beginning and final sections of a dactylic hexameter (with prodelision of *est*); he supplies, as an example, *fortis uir et integer* for a hypothetical central section of a hexameter.

[38] CLE ad loc.

[39] Massaro 1992, 28; 2007a, 156.

[40] Gómez Pallarès 2007, 227-228.

The approximate date of the inscription is more securely established: it seems to belong to the earlier part of the first century BCE. More specifically, Keuleers points out that the use of a cognomen makes a date after 90 BCE likely, and further that Sulpicius' tribe affiliation suggests a date earlier than 49 BCE.[41] That Lucius Sulpicius was free-born is clear from his filiation, but Keuleers suggests that rather than a descendant of the patrician Sulpicii, he was a descendant of one of their freedmen.[42]

In the locative statement of this example, *hic situs est*, we see the phrase that was to become so common in later centuries that an abbreviation (*h.s.e.*) sufficed to express it. The earliest extant example occurs elsewhere in our corpus (*heicei situst*, CIL I² 1861, from the second century BCE; see below), and variants of the phrase appear in three other examples.[43] In discussing a variant of this formula, Kruschwitz directs the reader to a fragment of Ennius (preserved in Cicero) that uses the same four words as our example, albeit in a different order: *hic est ille situs*; Cicero, who mentions that the term *situs* refers specifically to the practice of inhumation, reports that Ennius' phrase referred to the burial of Scipio Africanus.[44] Kruschwitz goes on to suggest two possible relationships between the early sepulchral uses of the phrase and the Ennius fragment: either the sepulchral uses are imitations of the Ennian phrase (which would provide a *terminus post quem* for

---

[41] *Col.* in the superscript establishes that he was a member of the Collina tribe, one of the four urban tribes, but after 49 BCE residents of Carthago Nova were inducted into the Sergia tribe. Degrassi suggests that *Col.* stands rather for *colonus*, but Keuleers' is the predominant view; for a detailed discussion, see Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[42] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.: based on the Collina tribe-affiliation (the patrician families are rarely found in the urban tribes) and on the fact that the family generally used the praenomina Gaius, Quintus, Servius, and Decimus.

[43] CIL I² 1325, 1547, 2273; for further examples and a brief discussion of the phrase see Cugusi 2007, 14-15.

[44] Enn. *var.* 19 Vahlen(= epigr. 5-6 Warmington = fr. 43 Courtney), quoted at Cic. *de Leg.* 2, 57: *declarat enim Ennius de Africano: 'Hic est ille situs', uere, nam siti dicuntur ii qui conditi sunt*.

their dating) or, far more likely given the simple usefulness of the phrase, the Ennian phrase is an adaptation of a formula present in Saturnian sepulchral poetry.[45]

The *ille* that connects the locative statement to the praise that follows is also a deictic pronoun, but seems to be used here in the same way as in the Ennius fragment: not to gesture at a physically remote object, but to indicate a famous or well-known one, i.e. "here lies that well-known man…"[46] Indeed, Koch agrees with this interpretation, suggesting that Lucius Sulpicius may have been an eminent man in Carthago Nova.[47]

The form of the praise that follows affirms that he was a man well-valued by his contemporaries: he is reported to have been *probatus iudiceis multeis cognatis atque propinqueis*. For an epitaph to assert that a man was approved of by his peers fits in well with the trend of relative praise discussed above, and indeed, is fairly common (cf. *fama bona* above, as well as the praise of Barbatus' son Lucius in CIL I² 9),[48] and *probatus*, as a laudatory epithet in the sepulchral context, is paralleled if not especially common: Harrod finds three other cases where it is applied to the deceased in CIL VI,[49] and Hernández Pérez notes a similar example in CIL X 2483, which pairs the related adjective *probus* with the noun *iudicium*: *proba iudicio cunctorum*.[50] Two groups, *cognatis* and *propinqueis*, are mentioned as the groups in whose judgment L. Sulpicius was esteemed.[51] Whereas in previous examples, such groups have been easily distinguishable (e.g. *sueis…amicis…omnibus* in 1270),

---

[45] Kruschwitz 2002, 101-102.
[46] Kühner-Stegmann II.1.622.
[47] Koch 1993, 206 n.72; cf., however, Keuleers 2003 ad loc. n.607; he argues that the lack of *cursus honorum* vel. sim. in the inscription argues against such a conclusion.
[48] Hernández Pérez (2001, 140-143) discusses it as a feature of sepulchral poetry in Roman Spain, citing this poem as one of his examples.
[49] Harrod 1909, 45: CIL VI 21225, 23685, and 34001.
[50] Hernández Pérez 2001, 143; he also directs the reader to Cic. *de Orat*. 2.347, in which Cicero mentions as a source of honor (in his discussion of panegyric) *res gestae iudiciis hominum comprobatae*.
[51] Or for whom having made judgments (see n. 36 above) he was praised.

here both terms mean 'kinsman,'[52] and there seems to be no clear pattern of distinct usage; in fact, the pairing is formulaic and seems to be used for emphasis and inclusivity.[53]

This poem affords us, then, quintessential examples of the two elements we have been concerned with so far in this section, and also of the effects that result from such elements. The basic locative statement, which would later become so common, serves to establish the monument in its physical space as a metonymic marker for the deceased, and also to create the two-fold connection we have seen previously: the deictic pronoun *hic* ties the monument to its original physical space, and at the same time, via its utterance by a passer-by, ties him to the inscription and to the space as well. The second deictic pronoun *ille*, used, as it seems, to mean "that well-known man," has an effect that echoes and strengthens the connection established by the first: its use makes the assumption that the reader, too, will be familiar with the man; and the reader, by speaking of the deceased as *ille*, confirms himself as a part of nexus of interaction of L. Sulpicius' life. The praise here for L. Sulpicius is entirely relative: we learn nothing about him except the reaction he occasioned among the members of his family, so that the portrait it creates of the deceased is as much about his place among his peers as it is about him. And so the poem's effect is threefold: it serves to create a metonymic marker, located in physical space relative to the reader; a nexus of interaction around the deceased, of which by reading the text the passer-by becomes a part; and a continuing portrait of the deceased as he was (and is, thanks to the present-tense verb) firmly ensconced in his familial environment.

---

[52] See *TLL* s.v. *cognatus*, 1479.79, where "*i.q. propinquus*" begins the entry on meaning and usage.
[53] Cf. usages at Cic. *S.Rosc.* 96, *Lig.* 8, and *Verr.* 3.106, Liv. 25.3.15, and Verg. *Aen.* 3.502.

In our next (and penultimate) example in which deixis is the only exocentric element, CIL I² 1861, we see a shift in the content that accompanies the locative statement:

> Protogenes Cloul(i) suauei(s) heicei situst mimus,
> plouruma que fecit populo soueis gaudia nuges.[54]

> Protogenes, the genial mime-actor, slave of Cloelius, lies here; he gave the people great pleasure with his clowning (trans. Courtney).

As has been the case in several other examples, the metrical scheme of the epitaph has been the subject of some debate. In this case, most scholars have concluded that Bücheler's initial supposition, that the verses were intended to be hexameters, is the correct one – although a certain amount of creativity is necessary to make the verses, especially the first, scan.[55] Due to this inexpert implementation of the meter, Courtney suggests that the inscription should be dated to the period when Ennius had just introduced the hexameter to the Roman poetic landscape; and indeed, most scholars propose a date in the first half of the second century BCE.[56] Both the shapes of the letters and the orthography show a mix of old and new forms, which give an idea of antiquity but are too inconsistent for clear conclusions.[57] Unlike many of the inscriptions discussed above, CIL I² 1861 has received a good deal of

---

[54] CLE 361: the inscription, carved on a limestone tablet, was found at Amiternum (see Massaro 2007a, 131 for a discussion of the historical context of Amiternum at the time) where it had been used to form part of a church wall; it is now kept by the Museo Aquileia.

[55] See Mercado 2012, 200 for a list of the metrical difficulties involved. Bücheler (CLE ad loc.) proposed hexameters; Wachter (1987, 417-418) choliambs; Gentili (1990, 131) Saturnians; but Courtney (1995, 233-234, including a detailed discussion of the various peculiarities), Massaro (2007a, 131), Kruschwitz (although he includes it in his *Carmina Saturnia Epigraphica*, and notes certain features typical of Saturnians: 2002, 110-115), and Mercado (2012, 199-200) conclude that Bücheler's suggestion of hexameters is most likely correct.

[56] Bücheler (CLE ad loc.) suggests the age of Ennius; Plessis (1905, 54) Galletier (1922, 171), and Warmington (1940 ad loc.) c.160 BCE; Wachter (1987, 416) c.170 BCE; Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) and Massaro (2007a, 131) the first half of the second century BCE (but n.b. in the *Concordanze* (1986), Colafrancesco and Massaro suggest A2 (the *latter* half of the second century BCE).

[57] E.g. the letter L is carved in some places with a (more old-fashioned) rising second stroke, but in some not; the orthography is also inconsistent, with some straightforward older spellings, but others that are harder to account for (see notes on individual words).

scholarly attention, as demonstrated by the plurality of opinions as to its meter and date;[58] as such, it will be sufficient here to give only a brief discussion of its content, and focus rather on the effects of that content.

The subject is a slave named Protogenes: his name and pseudo-filiation, '(slave) of Cloelius' begin the first verse.[59] The name is Greek, but several scholars have suggested that to be such a success on the Roman stage, the actor must have been able to perform in Latin.[60] The next element of the first verse is the adjective *suauei*(*s*),[61] "pleasant to the mind or feelings, charming, delightful,"[62] a laudatory epithet that appears nowhere else in our corpus. Harrod finds four uses of *suauis* in CIL VI, and fifteen of its superlative *suauissimus*, but notes that these epithets are most commonly (in eleven of the nineteen examples) applied to children.[63] This is not the first time we have seen our data disagree with Harrod's conclusions,[64] nor should such discrepancies surprise us, given the more focused nature of our corpus: his body of evidence, so much larger and covering so many more centuries, is bound to show different trends than our smaller, time-defined corpus. In this case, given the content of the following line, the intended meaning of the adjective seems

---

[58] For a comprehensive bibliography, see Buonocore 2007, 215.

[59] Granarolo's suggestion (1971, 209) that *libertus*, rather than *servus*, is elided is unlikely, as Kruschwitz notes; for discussion of this issue, and of the name *Cloulei* including other suggested readings, see Kruschwitz 2002, 111.

[60] For discussion including bibliography, see ibid., 111 and 113.

[61] Classical Latin *suauis*; in the second syllable the di-graph <ei> represents /ĭ/, a spelling that Ernout (1957, 79) characterizes as 'inexplicable,' along with the <ei> for /ĕ/ in the second syllable of *heicei* (but for the latter see n.66 below). But in fact, the second syllable of *soueis* in the second line must scan short, by iambic shortening; and so assuming that monophthongization from /ei/ to /i/ was complete, this situation would give license for spelling /ĭ/ (in *soueis* by monophthongization and iambic shortening) as <ei> (in *suaueis*). In *suauei*(*s*) the -*s* of the nominative ending is missing, as occurs elsewhere in early Latin inscriptions (Weiss 2009, 221); cf. Courtney 1995, 254, Kruschwitz 2002, 112 n.523.

[62] *OLD* s.v. *suauis* 5a.

[63] Harrod 1909, 46.

[64] The epithet is also applied to adults elsewhere in contemporary Latin literature: cf., e.g., Enn. *Ann.* 280 Skutsch.

to be "delightful," i.e. giving delight to others[65] – an epithet suited to the relative praise we have come to expect.

The next element of the first verse, the locative statement *heicei situst*, is the earliest example, though formally different,[66] of *hic situs est*, the eventually common phrase we saw in CIL I² 2247 discussed above. Thereafter comes the last word of the first verse, *mimus* (Kruschwitz notes that this is the only mention of a *mimus* in this early period[67]), and it is here and in the next verse that the content of this poetic epitaph departs from the patterns we have recognized in the previous examples of this section. For in this word, and in the verse that follows, the poem presents information about the profession of the deceased: that he was an actor, and a very successful (or at least well-appreciated) one.

The profession of the deceased appears in only one of the ten 'basic' epitaphs we considered in the previous chapter – CIL I² 708, that of the soldier Gaius Sergius. There we noted Plutarch's report that in Lycurgus' Sparta, the only people legally entitled to epitaphs were men who had died in war and women who had died in childbirth – a law by which one's profession and epitaph, or lack thereof, were inextricably bound. Obviously no such restriction applied at Rome; and as we saw in the simplest epitaphs, mention of the deceased's profession is not nearly as common as praise for the characteristics of the deceased. That trend has continued in this section: of the five poems that include deixis as their only exocentric element, only this one mentions the profession of the deceased.[68] Nor is

---

[65] See above ch.2 n.59 for the interchange of *suauis*, *gratus*, *dulcis*, and *iucundus*; on *suauis* itself in Cicero and elsewhere, cf. also Mankin on *De Or*. 3.103., who directs the reader to Clausen on Verg. *Ecl.* 2.49.

[66] *Heicei* = Classical Latin *hīc*, with the first syllable reflecting its original diphthong and the second the particle *-c(e)* (<*-ke*) (Weiss 2009, 354) extended by the "hic et nunc" particle *-i* (contra Ernout (1957, 79) who does not seem to note the presence of the "hic et nunc" particle and as such objects to what he considers a case of the digraph <ei> representing /ě/). For the prodelision of *situst*, see Kruschwitz 2002, 112.

[67] For a bibliography of modern studies of the term and profession, see Kruschwitz 2002, 113 n.533.

[68] Cf., however, the next example, CIL X 2971, in which the deceased's profession may be implicitly if not explicitly noted.

it especially common in the remainder of our corpus: roughly a quarter of the epitaphs for adult males mention the profession of the deceased.[69] Such a trend goes against Purdie's suggestion that notation of the deceased's profession appeared in "most" Roman epitaphs;[70] and indeed, Tolman and Lattimore, in chronicling the content of Roman epitaphs, do not mention profession at all as a common element.[71]

The following line elaborates on the information given in the first, and connects it to Protogenes' contemporaries: this *suaueis mimus* endowed the *populo* with *plouruma*[72] *gaudia*, by his *nuges*.[73] We would hardly expect to read in Protogenes' epitaph that he was a *bad* actor; but in fact Kruschwitz reports that, in

---

[69] Seven of twenty-eight epitaphs: CIL I² 7, 9, and 10 (all Scipio-epitaphs), 708 discussed above, 1209, 1210, and 1861 (this example). Free-born women could not be expected to have a profession per se, and indeed, none of the epitaphs for that demographic category mentions any professional activity. Women of other classes, on the other hand, might; and indeed, among those eighteen epitaphs we find three examples (again, a fairly small percentage) wherein something like profession is mentioned: one, CIL I² 1214, mentions that its freedwoman subject appeared on the Greek stage, and three refer specifically to housework that could be considered a woman's default profession: CIL I² 1211 (class unknown), 1570 (freedwoman), and 2273 (freedwoman).

[70] Purdie 1935, 86, discussing the entire corpus of Roman epitaphs, prose and poetic; he does offer a broad, if anecdotal, collection of epitaphs including various professions. He seems to be following Galletier, who, describing the same monumental (pun intended) corpus, mentions profession, name, and age as the most basic elements (1922, 96). Galletier does not support his assertion with organized evidence (as in fact would be difficult with so overwhelming a corpus); he mentions the Scipio epitaphs and only a few others, mostly from the Empire.

[71] For an overall study of the notation (or not) of profession in epitaphs, see Joshel 1992.

[72] Although the view that *plouruma* is a false archaism is commonly held (Ernout 1957, 16 and 79; Leumann 1977, 65-67; Wachter 1987, 310f. and 478f.; Courtney 1995, 234; Kruschwitz 2002, 114; for a full treatment, see Weiss 2009, 360, who suggests that *plūrimo-* comes from an earlier **plo-isṃmo-*, which "in turn, probably results from contamination of **pleisṃmo-*, the etymologically expected pre-form…and the comparative *plous*."), Alan Nussbaum has made the argument that because the *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, which is reliable in its etymologically correct spellings, has the comparative *plous* (19), we should conclude that the OI spelling, while attested elsewhere (famously in CIL I² 9 *ploirume*; see ch.1 n.95) is not etymologically correct, but created by analogy (e.g. in CIL I² 9 based on OINO for *ūnus*); whereas the form here, *plouruma*, is just as it should be ("Archaic Latin" class lecture, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, April 12, 2005). Whichever reconstruction we prefer (cf. Varr. *L.L.* 7.27), Latin orthography (demonstrably flexible here and elsewhere even in this small corpus) allowed for a spelling based on pronunciation (cf. *Clouli* for *Cloeli* in the first line).

[73] The ablative plural, Classical *nugīs*, with the sound that had been a diphthong /ei/ (cf. *soueis* for Classical Latin *suīs*) and would eventually become /ī/ (Weiss 2009, 224) here represented by <e> (as also in *que* in this line); cf. Kruschwitz 2002, 114-115.

other inscriptions for actors, a reference to their belovedness to the people is commonplace.[74]

And so when a passer-by reads aloud this epitaph, he first pronounces the name of Protogenes, and the name of his master (a social contextualization in itself); the locative statement *heicei situst* establishes the bonds previously discussed among reader, inscription, and monument. The description of Protogenes as a *suaueis mimus* that frames the locative statement creates a portrait more specific than any we have yet seen: the fact of Protogenes' profession becomes an enduring and continual part of his final portrayal. The second line elaborates on this portrait, asserting upon each reading that Protogenes endeared himself to his contemporaries – a situating of the portrait within a social context, as we have come to expect. Overall, the identity presented is an extremely unified one – even the laudatory epithet, *suaueis*, can be taken as referring to the pleasure he provided by his performances – with the result that the effect of the epitaph is primarily to establish, as long as the monument is read, Protogenes' bona fides as an actor, while also situating this identity within a physical and social context.

The portrait created by the next and final example of this chapter, CIL X 2971, is also socially embedded as well as unified in its content:

> Stallius Gaius has sedes Hauranus tuetur
> ex Epicureio gaudiuigente choro.[75]

> Gaius Stallius Hauranus is in possession of this abode, a member of the revelling Epicurean band (trans. Courtney).

---

[74] 2002, 113, citing Leppin (1992, 128); he points out that such protestations are at variance with the derisive attitude toward the theater, and towards the slaves who were its main performers, already in place at the time (cf. Naev. *com.* 72-74 Ribbeck).

[75] CLE 961: the inscription, carved on a long marble tablet, was found at Naples, accompanied by urns carved with Greek names; it is now in Florence (CIL ad loc., CLE ad loc., Ruggiero 1888, 12-13). Leiwo calls it "exceptional" to find an epigrammatic epitaph in Naples written in Latin, as Greek was more usual for that poetic form there (1994, 131).

The two verses form an elegiac couplet. Courtney suggests and Obbink agrees, based on the fact that the final 's' (in Stallius and in Hauranus) does not make position, that the poem dates to the Republic, since that metrical practice fell out of use in the 50's BCE;[76] Colafrancesco and Massaro date it to the first half of the first century BCE, but Cugusi prefers to place it closer to the end of that century.[77]

The inscription begins with the name of the deceased, Gaius Stallius Hauranus, reordered (for metrical reasons, per Courtney, but according to Schumacher to focus attention on the name of the *gens*)[78] and interlocked (*a a b b a b*)[79] with a locative statement. Details about the identity of the deceased have been the subject of some discussion: Courtney suggests, and Obbink accepts, that the subject of the epitaph is the C. Stallius who is credited by *IG* III 541 as one of the rebuilders of Athens' Odeon of Pericles;[80] but the (otherwise unattested) cognomen Hauranus does not appear in that inscription, leading Schumacher and Rigsby to conclude that our Gaius Stallius Hauranus should not be identified with the C. Stallius mentioned therein.[81] Rigsby suggests, based on the possible Syrian and Semitic connections of the cognomen,[82] that our C. Stallius Hauranus was a foreign freedman manumitted by a C. Stallius, possibly the one mentioned in the Odeon

---

[76] Courtney (1995, 241) notes, however, that the abandonment of the metrical practice may have taken longer for inscriptions, 'sub-literary' as they are; Obbink (2007, 38) nonetheless accepts Courtney's suggestion, declaring such a dating "guaranteed."

[77] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Cugusi 2007, 55.

[78] Courtney 1995, 241: "Here the writer did not wish to scan *Gaiu' Stallius* leaving *-ŭ* before *St-* (though Lucretius permits this at 6.195 and 943) and preferred to reverse the names." Cf. Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 304 (*Cornelius…Cethegus Marcus*). Schumacher 2007, 302 considers the reversal rather an example of a poetic technique used to focus attention on a certain element by fronting it, observed in Saturnian grave poetry and Republican literature (cf. Kruschwitz 2002, 38). As for the ultimate metrical outcome, the scansion of Gaius remains unusual despite the re-ordering: the latter syllable must scan as long, even though *-s h-* should not make position (Weiss 2009, 63).

[79] For further on the effects of this interlocking, specifically the idea that *Hauranus* is also in a marked position, see Schumacher 2007, 302-303.

[80] Courtney 1995, 241; Obbink 2002, 100 and 2007, 38.

[81] Schumacher 2007, 300-301; Rigsby 2008, 20.

[82] Leiwo (1994, 130-31) also sees an eastern connection, suggesting that Hauranus is not a cognomen proper but rather an ethnic, referring to the Palestinian region called Hauran or Auranitis, south of Damascus; for another suggestion as to the significance of the cognomen, see n.95 below.

inscription.[83] The latter suggestion seems more viable: the omission of such a

distinctive cognomen from *IG* III 541 is indeed hard to explain away (and neither

Courtney nor Obbink address the issue).

As mentioned above, interlocked with the name of the deceased is the

locative statement that occupies the remainder of the first line: *has sedes tuetur*.

The phrase is more distinctive than any we have yet seen, with more lexical and

metaphorical heft. The deictic adjective *has* modifies *sedes*, turning the inscription-

site, gravesite, and monument (bound to the reader by the deictic pronoun), into an

eternal home. The metaphor is not uncommon: Tolman mentions it as a common-

place, and finds several such examples that use *sedes* in the sepulchral poems of the

CLE. Sullivan makes a further suggestion that may be pertinent here, given our

discussion of the deceased's identity above: that the metaphor is more common in

epitaphs of "people of servile or eastern extraction."[84] As for *sedes* itself,

Schumacher asserts that the plural is rarer in this context, and further that in this

case its use is meant to lend 'poetic color' to the inscription;[85] but we have an

example of another such plural usage even in our limited corpus (CIL I² 1202,

gratum est quom apud meas restitistei seedes)[86] and furthermore, as Schumacher

himself notes, the singular is not metrically viable here. While forms of *sedes* occur

often with this metaphor, *tuetur* is unexpected: more common with *sedes*, reports

Schumacher, are forms of *quiescere*, *tenere*, and *iacere*. Schumacher goes on to

---

[83] Rigsby 2008, 20-21. Rigsby also concludes, rightly I think, that Hagenbuch's suggestion of
Gauranus for Hauranus (entertained also by Courtney 1995, 241) is unnecessary; for a detailed
discussion see Schumacher 2007, 302-303.

[84] Tolman 1909, 45-46 and 108-109; cf. also Van Bleek 1907, 76-77. Sullivan 1939, 507-508
suggests that the metaphor may have originated in ancient Egypt, but Lattimore (1962, 165-167)
points out (166 n.63) that the use of hut urns indicates an early (pre-Greek-intellectual-influence)
Italic tradition as well.

[85] Schumacher 2007, 304; and indeed, the sepulchral uses that Tolman finds in Vergil are both
plural: *Aen*. 6.328 and 6.371 (1909, 46).

[86] Tolman cites one other sepulchral poem in the CLE with the plural as 'typical': CLE 574, *has
sedes genitor dum uita manet sibi fecit* (1909, 46). For discussion of CIL I² 1202, see ch.6 below,
p.230.

offer an explanation for the atypical use of *tuetur* here: as we will learn from the

second line of the epitaph, C. Stallius Hauranus was an Epicurean, and *tuetur* is a

common line-ending in an urtext of Latin Epicureanism, Lucretius' *De rerum*

natura, also generally dated to the middle of the first century BCE.[87]

In fact, two separate ideas are being combined here: that of the grave as

eternal home (*sedes*), and that of protection (*tuetur*) of the gravesite. The latter idea

is also fairly common,[88] but the result – that the deceased remains to protect his

gravesite that is also his eternal home – is distinctive enough to merit further

consideration; we will return to it after investigating the contents of the second line.

The whole of the pentameter is occupied by a prepositional phrase, which

informs us that C. Stallius Hauranus was one of a joy-making Epicurean group: *ex*

Epicureio gaudiuigente choro.[89] Many scholars have analyzed the hapax compound

gaudiuigens (Bücheler's suggestion, that it is based on Lucr. 3.149-150, *animus… /*

laetitia…uiget, is attractive, given the Epicurean connections of the poem)[90] and

have suggested Greek equivalents on which the whole Latin phrase is modeled;[91]

for us it will be sufficient to note the poetic ambition of the verse, and the

implications of its content. By using such a compound, the author (and/or the

commissioner) shows himself as willing to engage with the Latin poetic tradition in

general (indicated by the use of a unique, correctly formed, Latin compound)[92] and

---

[87] Schumacher 2007, 304.

[88] Lattimore 1962, 106-126: he finds many references to, and examples of, protection of the tomb in both Greek and Latin sepulchral poems.

[89] For the use of *ex*, see Kühner-Stegmann II.1.214.

[90] On the formation of such compounds, see Leumann 1977, 396 and Bader 1962, 484; for examples in the CLE, and this one in particular, see Sblendorio-Cugusi 2005, 31. Bücheler (CLE ad loc.) suggests ἡδυθαλής as a model, but later scholars (e.g. Leiwo 1994, 131) note that such a compound is not in fact attested in Greek; on Bücheler's suggestion described above (CLE ad loc.) cf. Leiwo 1994, 131 and Schumacher 2007, 306. Leiwo also sees a possible reference to the muses Terpsichore (= *gaudium*) and Thaleia (= *uigeo*). We would suggest further that the use of the verb *uigeo* in the compound forms a pleasingly ironic contrast with the dead man.

[91] Courtney (1995, 241) notes Ἐπικουρείων χορόν in Dion. Hal. *De. Comp. Verb.* 24.8, and Rigsby (2008, 21) suggests χαρίεις χορός. For *choro*, Courtney also directs the reader to Cic. *De Fin.* 126: *tu quidem totum Epicurum paene e philosophorum choro sustulisti*.

[92] Cf. Schumacher 2007, 306.

with Lucretius in particular (indicated by the suggested Lucretian model for the compound, and the imitative use of line-ending *tuetur*). As for the content, what is clear is that the deceased considered himself an Epicurean (and in fact, Obbink suggests that the adjective *Epicureio* should mean that the deceased was not only a follower of Epicureanism, but also a teacher)[93] but, as Courtney notes, one for whom the pleasurable aspects of Epicurean philosophy were foremost:[94] "Stallius however seems not to have been a serious Epicurean, but one who took the creed as an excuse for a voluptuous life; the tone is very much that of *Epicuri de grege porcum* [Hor. *Epist.* I. 4,16], sharpened in Cicero's attack on Piso."[95]

And indeed, the suggestion that the Epicureanism of C. Stallius Hauranus was of the pick-and-choose variety may be strengthened by an observation Schumacher makes about the epitaph as a whole: he points out that a true Epicurean should hardly expect to be hanging around his gravesite indefinitely,[96] as Epicureanism asserts that just as the atoms that compose a man's body disperse after his death, so too do the atoms that comprise his spirit or soul.[97] Schumacher's observation is rather literal-minded; we have seen and will continue to see that the Romans' conceptions of their fate after death were often imbued with ideas from diverse traditions, nor did they necessarily demand or apply logic in the application

---

[93] Obbink 2002, 100 n.56; it is generally agreed that Epicureanism was "flourishing" (Courtney 1995, 241) in the region at the time (see also Leiwo 1994, 131; Cugusi 1996, 158); one is reminded of the Epicurean teacher Siro, who appears in Cicero (*De Fin*. 2.35) and the Appendix Vergiliana (*Catalepton* 5 and 8).

[94] In this reference to the pleasure-loving aspect of his life we have an example of yet another sepulchral *topos*: Tolman (1909, 95) notes several epitaphs in which "the Epicurean doctrine of a number of the popular poets that life is short and consequently one should have the best time possible while on earth is continually emphasized."

[95] Courtney 1995, 241. Furthermore, if the deceased, in the company of his *gaudiuigens* band, especially favored drinking, we could take his much-discussed cognomen *Hauranus* as a nickname, word-play on the verb *haurio*, "drink."

[96] Lattimore (1962, 167) says of the metaphor of the eternal home: "I suppose there can be no doubt…that the idea when it was fresh represented a groping, at least, after the conviction of immortality; but an immortality of the most limited sort, confined as it would be to the grave." Cf. also Galletier 1922, 27-29.

[97] Schumacher 2007, 304-5; for the Epicurean bibliography, see his n.32.

of these conceptions. Obbink likens the continuing presence of the deceased in this case to that of "a sort of a guardian deity, continuing to keep a benign watch over the property." He becomes, then, a minor garden-god, a sort of Priapus-figure,[98] keeping watch over his (Epicurean) gardens for all time.

While questions remain about C. Stallius Hauranus' identity and the extent of his Epicureanism, the overall effect of the epitaph is multi-faceted and vivid, but ultimately unified. In reading aloud the hexameter, a passer-by pronounces the main clause of the inscription, which contains three basic elements we have seen in all the examples of this chapter: the name of the deceased, a locative statement, and the main verb. Basic though they are, there are aspects of each of these elements to give the reader pause. The function of the name is as ever – an establishment of identity, and a revival of that identity in the living world – but here we have also an unusual cognomen, which would draw additional attention. The locative statement fulfills its usual function as well, tying the reader to the inscription and the inscription to the physical location; but it goes further in that it establishes the metaphor of the gravesite as home for the deceased. And finally the main verb: not colorless like the *sunt* that appears in the first two examples of this chapter, nor literal like the *situs est* that appears in the second two, but *tuetur*. Just as did the verbs in those other examples, *tuetur* in the present tense places the scene in the current time of the reader and ensures such a placement with each reading, no matter how much time has passed; but here the verb, with its more substantial lexical content, creates a vivid scene in which the deceased continually *acts*, protecting his tomb, now designated a home (or garden), with each reading.

The pentameter offers a prepositional phrase that provides the reader with

---

[98] In his role as a *hortus* god, specifically as a protector of gardens: see e.g. *tuentur* in *Priapea* 52: *accedent duo, qui latus tuentur, pulcre pensilibus peculiati*.

non-essential, but illuminating, biographical information about the deceased: C. Stallius Hauranus was (or at least chose to identify himself as) an Epicurean, maybe even a teacher of the doctrine, but also an enjoyer of the more sensual aspects of the philosophy. The effect is a very distinctive portrait, situated within a social context: for as long as the inscription is read, the portrait of the deceased created for the still-living is that specifically of an Epicurean. Furthermore, when we read the second line in connection with the first, we note that while Hauranus may have neglected a basic tenet of Epicureanism by envisioning (and creating, via the inscription, a continually reified vision of) his continuing existence after death,[99] he has created a very Epicurean environment in which to place the depiction: he endures as the protector of his patch of earth, a guardian of his garden.

Such, then, are the five examples in our corpus that contain no acknowledgement of audience, but that do acknowledge, via a deictic marker, the real space in which they are located. In each case, as the reader utters the locative statement, bonds are created between the reader, the inscription, and the monument, establishing the physical space in which the monument originally existed, and the reader's proximity, real or imaginary, to the inscription and monument; the portrait of the deceased created by the inscription is tied to that physical space and to the reader himself.

In the first example, the content accompanying the name and locative statement is simple praise; the portrait of the deceased is located physically by the deictic adverb, but not tied to a social environment. In each of the next two examples, praise again is the main content, but it is praise relative to others, which

---

[99] That such a spirit would remain in or around his *sedes* is, on the other hand, consistent with Lucretius' denial of the existence of the underworld (3.978ff.). Furthermore, if we take the overall tone of the epitaph to be whimsical (not such a stretch for anyone familiar with the Hellenistic epitaphs of the Greek Anthology), we need not take the envisioned presence of the spirit as a serious assertion of belief in immortality, but rather as a whimsical image; that is, the formerly *gaudiuigens* Epicurean is just joking.

we saw in most of the 'basic' examples in the preceding chapter; as a result the inscription creates a portrait situated both in a social context by the bonds implicit in the praise, and also in a physical context by the deictic markers.

In the fourth example, although praise is implicit, the focus of the inscription, and of the resulting portrait, is on the deceased's profession as an actor, and his audience's reaction to him; again, the inscription effects the establishment of the deceased's portrait both socially and physically. In the final example the content provides information about the deceased's philosophical leanings and possibly his profession, and the locative statement itself has significantly more lexical and metaphorical impact; here the deixis actually works *with* the content: we as readers are presented with a remarkable portrait of the deceased remaining at the gravesite, his final home – to which we as readers are bound by the deixis – to protect his monument.

CHAPTER FOUR: SPECIFIED AUDIENCE

Thus far we have considered in chapter two those examples that I have called endocentric, i.e. those that show no acknowledgement of themselves as texts or of their potential audiences, and then in chapter three those that acknowledge, at least, the physical space in which they operate (both of which categories are classified by Conso as devoid of "fictive orality").[1] Now we will turn to our last set of examples in which the deceased plays no active role, those that do show some degree of fictive orality: eleven poems that acknowledge their audience in some way.[2] In all but the last two, that audience is clearly the passer-by; in the penultimate example it may be the deceased who is addressed, and in the last he certainly is. Of the first nine, addressed to the passer-by, the first four have no first-person referent, no acknowledged "voice," but the latter five do have such a first-person referent; the final two, treated last because of their difference in audience, do not. Throughout we will consider how the presence or absence of such acknowledgement of audience and speaker affects the content and intended effects of the epitaphs.

In the first, CIL I² 1219, the whole of the metrical portion is taken up by an expression of gnomic wisdom, with an address to the audience in the form of advice:

> *Prímae | Pompeíae | ossua heic*
> Fortuna spondet multa | multis, praestat nemini:
> Viue in dies | et horas, nam proprium est nihil.
> *Saluius et Heros dant*[3]

---

[1] Conso 1994, 292.

[2] In the order considered: CIL I² 1219, 1702, 1930, 1210, 1209, 1212, 1211, 1837, 1222, 2273, and 1603. Six of them are dated to the first century BCE, and four of them may date as early as the second century BCE; five were found at Rome, four elsewhere in Italy, and one at Carthago Nova. See the discussion of each poem for more detailed information.

[3] CLE 185: the inscription, carved on marble tablet, was found at Rome in the vineyard of Conte Pellucchi outside the Porta Pinciana, and is now in the collection at the Villa Albania. The lines of

Here lie the bones of Prima (*slave of?*) *Pompeia.*
Fortune pledges many things to many people, but pays up to none. Live for the day and the hour, for nothing is held in perpetuity.
The gift of Salvius and Heros (trans. Courtney).

Two verses written in iambic senarii form the metrical portion, lines 4-7 of the inscription; the first verse is hypermetric, and some scholars have attempted to emend it as a result,[4] but none of the emendations alter the sense of the text. The date of the inscription is also a matter of some debate;[5] it will be sufficient for us to note that a date sometime in the first century BCE is most likely.

The metrical portion of the inscription gives no information about the subject or the commissioners of the epitaph; those details are relegated to non-metrical super- and subscripts. The superscript, *Primae Pompeiae ossua heic*, is a deictic phrase that establishes the identity of the deceased – although the nuances of that information are, as we will see, somewhat open to interpretation – and the

---

letters vary in size: the lines containing the *carmen* itself (4-7) are small, the letters of the one-line subscript (8) slightly larger, and the letters of the three lines of superscript (1-3) larger still.
[4] Mommsen (CIL I ad loc.) suggests *fors* instead *fortuna*; Ritschl 1878, 238-254 suggests removing *multis*, or *multa*. Courtney (1995, 240) favors the former, suggesting a mistake in copying from a pattern-book or some other model, and Massaro (1992, 20 n.25) the latter, suggesting that the stonecutter might have mistakenly written *multa* for the intended *multis*, but realized his mistake and attempted to mitigate it by then also writing *multis,* and that as such, the 'most economical' correction would be to expunge *multa*, not *multis.* Massaro's suggestion is a good one: perhaps the cutter wrote *multa* as an object for *spondet*, but the verb is intransitive. (N.b. this would-be scholar can attest to the likelihood of *multa*/*multis* confusion, having confused various scholars' positions on the two words in the original version of this footnote.) For further discussion, see Kruschwitz 2000, 246f., in which he argues that each of these emendations do more (aesthetic) harm than (metrical) good, and points out that metrical mistakes are common in inscriptions of this kind. He argues further that the metrical mistake is more likely attributable to the composer of the inscription than to the stonemason, and as such should not be emended; in response to the suggestion that it arises from faulty use of a copy-book or some other model, he points out that we have very few examples from this period at all, and none to indicate (via mutually similar phrasing) the use of pattern-books at this time. He does acknowledge, however, the possibility that the epitaph was based on a popular folk-saying.
[5] See ibid., 243f.; Warmington (1935, 15) suggests the late second century BCE, De Rosalia (1978, 140) the late second or early first; Solin (1996, 7) believes it to date to the period from Sulla to Caesar, and Sanders (1991, 451) to the first century BCE. Kruschwitz suggests two *termini post quem*: 125 BCE based on the use of the I-longa, and 100 BCE based on the use of a marble tablet; he goes on to suggest that, because the inscription likely commemorates a slave and was commissioned by slaves or freedpeople, a date during the time of Augustus is more probable than during the Republic (and thus the latter part of the first century BCE). Colafrancesco and Massaro (1986 ad loc.) believe it should be dated no later than first century BCE.

presence of her physical remains[6] in the space of the monument.[7] From the phrase *Primae Pompeiae*, it is clear at least that the subject of the epitaph is a woman called Prima.[8] Scholars have argued that Pompeia could be the latter part of her name, or, more likely, the name of her mistress, if she was in fact a slave.[9] The subscript tells us the names of the monument's commissioners: *Saluius et Heros dant*; both Courtney and Kruschwitz point out that the cognomen Saluius often signals a slave or freedman,[10] and Kruschwitz suggests that the same is true of the Greek name Heros. He furthermore points out that the likelihood that both were slaves or freedpeople lends strength to the suggestion that the subject, too, was a slave, and as such that the first two words of the superscript should indeed be understood as *Primae Pompeiae* (*seruae*), that is, 'For Prima, slave of Pompeia.'[11]

With these conclusions in mind, then, we can turn to the metrical portion of the inscription. As mentioned above, the two iambic senarii contain no mention of the deceased or her life, or at least no explicit mention; one may suggest that the sentiment of the *carmen*, and its tone, may give an idea of the commemorators' reaction to the deceased's life and death, despite the lack of direct reference to the

---

[6] For the form *ossua*, see Kruschwitz 2000, 244 n.9 and Courtney 1995, 240, who directs the reader to *TLL* s.v. *ossua*, 1094.47; for references to physical remains in Latin epitaphs, see n.11 of ch.3 above.

[7] For a discussion of the effects of deixis in the metrical portion of the epitaphs, see ch.3 above.

[8] The Roman practice of using ordinal praenomina in cases of multiple daughters is well-known (cf. Tertia in CIL I² 1217), but in fact the name Prima appears only rarely: the first daughter would be known by the feminine version of her father's nomen (Kajava 1994, 60-62, 122). De Rosalia (1978, 140) believes that it is used as a proper praenomen here (cf. Kruschwitz 2000, 245); Warmington (1935, 14) and Massaro (1992, 80) take it to mean she was a first daughter.

[9] With the latter idea suggested first by Galletier (1922, 81) and taken up again by Solin (1972, 183-190). Courtney (1992, 240) notes the possibility, and adds (but mistakenly attributes to Solin, cf. Kruschwitz 2000, 245 n.25) the possibility that Prima was a freedwoman, but does not himself take a position on the issue.

[10] Courtney 1992, 240 and Kruschwitz 2000, 246; both direct the reader to Kajanto 1965, 134 and 177.

[11] Burial of slaves by other slaves noted as such seems to be quite rare; such a category does not even appear in Saller and Shaw's (1984) charts. For a literary reference to such a practice, (i.e. burial of slaves by fellow slaves, though not necessarily with a monument) see Horace *Sat.* 1.8f. Generally the very poor, including slaves, were buried in mass graves or belonged to burial clubs (see Hopkins 1983, 205-217); neither of those situation seems to apply here, however.

deceased herself. And indeed, the two verses contain respectively a pithy sentiment and consequent advice to the passer-by, both related to Fortune's rewards and promises, to life and death.

Since scholars have already commented extensively on the content of the two lines, it will be sufficient to note those comments briefly and then move on to the effect of the lines. The first verse asserts the emptiness of Fortune's many promises, perhaps indicating frustration on the part of the commissioners on behalf of the deceased: *Fortuna spondet multa multis, praestat nemini*. Fortuna stands as the Latin equivalent of the Greek Tyche; the sentiment is a common one in both Greek and Latin epitaphs,[12] as is the advice that follows, to live life to the fullest while it lasts – a popular watering-down of Epicurean philosophy:[13] *Viue in dies et horas, nam proprium est nihil*. In fact, another idea is activated by the imperative *uiue* and the content of the advice in the second line, one identified by Sourvinou-Inwood with regard to ancient Greek epitaphs: that of the passer-by as a "point of reference, a standard of comparison, of identification or of contrast," [14] here, as often, emphasizing the contrast between the state of the subject of the epitaph (that is, deceased) and that of the reader (living, here explicitly acknowledged as such by the diction and nature of the advice).

What then, would be the effect of these lines for the deceased and the commissioners, and for the passer-by who might lend his voice to read them? The

---

[12] Tolman 1910, 75; Lattimore (1962, 154-5) quotes this epitaph as an example of the 'wilful, meddling' manifestation of Fortuna; cf. also Courtney 1992, 240, who directs the reader to Sullivan 1939, 505-7 for the fact that such a depiction is more common among 'persons of servile condition and foreign origin.' For fickle Fortuna in literature, see, e.g., Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.133-136, and *Odes* 3.29.
[13] Galletier 1922, 17; Purdie 1935, 37; Lattimore 1962, 262 (where he again cites this poem), Sanders, 1991, 451 n.63; Courtney (1992, 240) notes that *proprius* can mean, in a legal sense, 'held in perpetuity' (*OLD* 1a), and directs the reader, for the overall sentiment, to Lucr. 3.971.
[14] Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 213: "…for archaic and fifth-century epitaphs the passer-by is not only a person whose co-operation is desired in order to activate and preserve the memory of the deceased but also a point of reference, a standard of comparison, of identification or of contrast, that serves to point out the poignancy of the deceased's death and so also of the prospective death of the passer-by."

passer-by would learn, and repeat, the identity of the deceased whose remains are present here in reading aloud the superscript. But the names and locative statement, excluded from the metrical portion, lack the monumentalizing effect they might have had were they part of the *carmen*; so too the names of the dedicators and the fact of their commissioning the epitaph, as the passer-by reads aloud the non-metrical subscript. Although the sentiments expressed in the metrical portion would most likely already be familiar to the reader from popular sources or other epitaphs, the second-person imperative *uiue* highlights the contrast between his living state and the opposite state of the subject of the text; the immediacy of the imperative demands his attention and insists that he hear the advice to which he is giving voice. In fact, the lack of specified speaker in the epitaph makes each passer-by as he reads aloud both the receiver and giver (to anyone within earshot) of the advice. To speak of the lack of an identified speaker is to risk an argument *ex silentio*, but we can note, at least, that here it results in the advice standing unattributed, leaving a reader or listener ignorant of its source.

Perhaps the ultimate effect for the passer-by, as he reads, would be an association of the identities of the deceased girl, and of the commissioners, with the content of the metrical portion – that is, with the poetic expression of frustration with the circumstances of life and the advice directed at this particular reader and others, to which he now gives voice, of how best to deal with those unfair circumstances. We must assume that these elements of content had meaning for the commissioners, that this chosen content somehow reflects their relationship with, and desire to commemorate, the deceased girl. As such, the effect the dedicators seem to have intended was not so much the poetic memorialization of the girl's identity, or of their act of commissioning the inscription, but for passers-by to hear, and heed, for the sake of girl and her mourners, the expression of this sentiment and advice.

Our second example that acknowledges an audience but has no first-person referent, CIL I² 1702, also seems to contain advice to the passer-by, although our understanding of it is limited by damage to the stone (since lost) at the time of transcription:

> …*spe*] sei legis, ne uituperes.
> …]*u*s. L. f. praeco.
> …]*o*s aeternum hoc sibei,
> …]*m e*sse, quod natura tr*ad*[
> …]*t reb*us cu(m) ameiceis su*eis*[
> …] *uiuos* utarus. uale.[15]

> [Stranger?] if you read this, do not find fault.
> …us, a herald, son of Lucius.
> …he […] this for himself, an eternal […]
> …to be, that which nature […] handed over…
> …that you use […] while living. Farewell.

Bücheler reconstructs the lines – excepting the second, which seems to have contained notation of the deceased's name, filiation, and profession – as iambic senarii, and Massaro accepts Bücheler's judgment of metricity.[16] Bücheler dates the inscription to the time of Cicero, based on the spelling of /ī/ with <ei> (*sei*, *sibei*,

---

[15] CLE 57: found at Venusia, at a water-source outside a city gate. Mommsen saw it there in 1845, and reported that the letters were then already worn down by water; when he looked for it again in 1873, the stone was gone. Certain letters too worn down by Mommsen's time are recorded in the description of Pontanus (cod. Chigianus I.VI. 203 f.45'), here represented in italics (CIL ad loc.).

[16] CLE ad loc., Massaro 2007a, 146. Bücheler's reconstruction (included here, n.b., not to indicate support for his reading, but to illustrate his suggestion of its metricity):
> Hoc nomen ho]spe[s] sei legis, ne uituperes.
>   …us. L. f. praeco.
> domicilium fecit uiu]os aeternum hoc sibei,
> ratus hospitiu]m esse, quod natura trad[idit,
> fructusque recte es]t rebus cu(m) ameiceis sueis.
> sic tu tueis fac] uiuos utarus. uale.

L.T. Brown offers an alternative reading:
> Monumentum hoc, ho]spe[s], sei legis, ne uituperes
>   …us. L. f. praeco.
> hominis optanti]s aeternum hoc sibei.
> oblitust breve (*uel* paruom?)] esse quod natura tradidit.
> melius uti esse]t rebus cu(m) amiceis sueis!
> ergo tueis tu] uiuos utarus. uale.

122

ameiceis sueis);[17] Colafrancesco and Massaro agree, placing the inscription in the first half of the first century BCE.[18]

The first line of the inscription differs from any we have seen thus far, in both form and content: it is a request, explicitly addressed to the passer-by who might read the inscription (*sei legis*), not to find fault with the monument (*ne uituperes*). In addressing the passer-by (and indeed, the word-fragment *spe* noted by Pontanus at the beginning of the first line may well have originally read *hospes*) as a potential reader, the inscription shows more self-awareness, as it were, of its status as a text than any inscription we have yet seen – the first example we saw in this chapter offers advice, but without acknowledging that the advice is part of a text intended to be read. As we will see, an explicit address to the passer-by (addressed most frequently as *hospes*, but also in other ways) is an important element of many of our remaining examples. The effect of the statement here, *sei legis*, which acknowledges both the passer-by and also his potential reading-act, is to make explicit something we have taken as implicit in considering all of our previous examples: that the silent written text awaits a passer-by who will read it aloud in order to complete its task of communication.[19] Here, somewhat paradoxically, although the reference to the potential reading-act is within an if-

_____

[17] For the various stages of monophongization of *ei* to *ī*, see Weiss 2009, 101: although the monophthongization was certainly complete by Cicero's day, orthography took some time to catch up; furthermore, a tendency to archaize in inscriptions, including epitaphs, leads to the use of the <ei> digraph even when <i> had replaced <ei> in other contexts. In *sei*, *sibei*, and the ending *-eis*, the <ei> is an etymologically correct archaic spelling, but the in the second syllable of *ameiceis* the diphthong is spurious (Allen 1897, 5); as we will see, there are several examples among our inscriptions of <ei> for /ī/ in syllables in which the /ī/ is not of diphthongal origin.

[18] CLE ad loc., Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.

[19] Cf. Svenbro 1993, 45: "The writer, who is present only at the action of producing the written statement and soon disappears for good, has foreseen the vocalization of his writing. Absent as he is, he depends on the voice that the reader will lend him." Cf. also Wolff 2000, 53: "Ensuite, l'oralisation est une médiation nécessaire, c'est par ce biais que la passant délivre une parole rendue muette par la mort et la pétrification. En prononçant les mots de l'inscription, le lecteur fait passer le défunt du néant au monde de la mémoire, nouvelle forme de vie." See below for further discussion of the effects of this assumption and its manifestation here.

clause – a protasis – rendering the act of reading only a hypothetical possibility, by the time he encounters it the passer-by must already be reading the inscription.

The next words to which the reader gives voice, the apodosis of the if-clause, is a request not to find fault with the monument (*ne uituperes*) – the inscription's first act, having acknowledged itself and the reader, is to attempt to protect itself, and the deceased as the commissioner of the monument (*sibei*; see below), from criticism, presumably as to the size or nature of the monument.[20] Who precisely would be in a position to criticize, given that the deceased commissioned the monument for himself, is unclear; but perhaps this is a version of a theme we will see more explicitly later,[21] that of deprecation of the tomb relative to the merits of its subject.

With self-acknowledgement and a defense against criticism out of the way, the inscription moves on to what is arguably its most important content: the name and filiation of the deceased, here accompanied by notation of his profession. Unfortunately for the deceased man, the section of the line containing his name has been destroyed – not by any malicious act,[22] but by nature (ironic, perhaps, given the reference to *natura* in 4): streams of water from a nearby water-source wore down the letters on the sides of the inscription over time.[23] What does remain is his filiation, *L(ucius) f(ilius)*, which marks him as a citizen, and notation of his profession, *praeco,* "herald" or "auctioneer."[24]

---

[20] Or perhaps he feared criticism of his behavior in life, specifically the aspects of it described later in the poem; unfortunately damage to the text makes it impossible to know the content of the subsequent lines.

[21] Tolman 1909, 45 and Lattimore 1962, 228-229; see discussion of 1211 below, 150ff.

[22] On the possibility of such a malicious act, and attempts to prevent it, see 146ff. on 1212 below.

[23] See n.15 above.

[24] For attitudes toward the trade of the *praeco*, see Gowers' note (2012) on Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.43: she refers to the profession as "emblematic of the arriviste." Horace refers to his father's association with this profession in his account of the care that man took with Horace's education (*Sat.* 1.6.85-86). There is another *praeco* noted as such in our corpus: CIL I² 1210, discussed later in this chapter; for the notation of profession in our corpus and in epitaphs in general, see ch.3 pp.107-108 above.

Each of the remaining four lines has several intact words, but only in the first of those four are the words sufficient to suggest the full original content with any security: the words *aeternum hoc sibei* were likely part of a poetic notation of the monument's construction. These remaining words both make a deictic gesture at the monument (*hoc*) and indicate that it was the subject of the epitaph himself who was responsible for its commissioning (*sibei*); finally, they characterize the monument as *aeternum*, "eternal." The attribution of this quality to the tomb often accompanies the complementary idea that the tomb serves as a dwelling place or home for the deceased (recall the latter characterization in CIL X 2971, *has sedes*, discussed in the previous chapter).[25]

The remains of the three following lines, the last of which seems to contain advice to the reader, are scant enough to make secure comprehension or restoration impossible. The third line seems to discuss the deceased's lot in life, given by nature (*…m esse, quod natura trad…*) and the fourth the use of his property with friends (*…t rebus cu*(m) *amiceis sueis*); the latter, at least, seems to place this final description of the deceased's life in a social context, in a manner reminiscent of the praise relative to others seen in many examples discussed above. And finally, the last line advises, via the second-person singular subjunctive *utarus*,[26] that one make use of something (the object is lost)[27] while still living (*uiuos*[28]), and bids the reader good-bye (*uale*). We cannot know for certain what it is exactly that we are being enjoined to use, but it seems reasonable to suggest that the overall sense of the advice is similar to that seen in the previous example – that one's possessions are of

---

[25] See ch.3 p.111-112; and indeed, Bücheler suggests (in his restoration quoted above) *domicilium* as the noun to be modified by *aeternum* in this line.

[26] An alternate form of the more usual *utaris*; Weiss 2009, 390: "in some kinds of Latin the recharacterization [of the 2nd sg. middle ending with -*s*] occurred before the weakening of the final -*o* [of the generalized secondary ending *-*so*], producing first *-*ros* and then -*rus*." See also Palmer 1954, 264.

[27] Bücheler suggests *tueis*, "those things that are yours."

[28] With OL -*os* retained here as is common when preceded by *u̯* (Weiss 2009, 220).

no use after death (except, of course, one's tomb) and as such that we should use them to the fullest while still living. Such advice, like that of our first example, serves as discussed there to highlight the contrast between the status of the deceased and the living reader.

At the end of this line stands *uale*, a farewell to the passer-by, indicating that the inscription is over and sending him on his way. Words of greeting (*salue*, *aue*) and farewell (*uale*) appear frequently in Roman epitaphs (and in our corpus),[29] continuing a tradition begun with the use of χαῖρε in Greek epitaphs. These words can be addressed to the reader by the inscription itself, as here, or by the imagined voice of the deceased; or the greeting can go the other way, spoken by the poem (and, via the poem, by a reader) to the deceased (though as Poccetti has noted, to wish good health to a dead person is somewhat paradoxical).[30] In fact, as we will see, it is not always easy to tell who is envisioned as pronouncing the greeting, or to whom. Sourvinou-Inwood has looked closely at the use of χαῖρε in ancient Greek epitaphs,[31] and concludes that the word was *not* used to addressed the deceased in the archaic period of the genre, such a usage being in fact precluded by beliefs at the time about the nature and state of death (i.e., a version of the paradox mentioned above); she suggests that the later (fourth-century BCE and onward) practice of addressing χαῖρε to the deceased was an extension of such addresses to those who were entitled to the immortality such a greeting implies (e.g., heroic figures or gods). She goes on to suggest that the other use of χαῖρε in sepulchral inscriptions, that is, addressed to the passer-by, is thus highlighting the contrast (a theme mentioned above with regard to the advice offered in each of these examples)

---

[29] Cf. CIL I² 1202, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1349, 1408, 2206, 2273.
[30] 2010, 106-111: he offers a thorough discussion of such usages in Latin sepulchral inscriptions, suggesting that "such inscriptions form an imaginary dialogue, whose purpose was to compel the wayfarer/reader to pay some regards to the deceased in the manner of verbal interaction between living persons." He does not, however, fully acknowledge the ambiguity of many examples.
[31] 1995, 180-215.

between the dead-ness of the deceased and the alive-ness of the passer-by. We will of course consider each example of greeting and farewell as we encounter it;[32] here, given the accompanying *utarus*, it seems safe to conclude that *uale* is addressed to the passer-by, by whatever unidentified voice speaks the rest of the inscription.

With the addition of certain kinds of content, the effect for the deceased, and on the passer-by as he reads the inscription, becomes more multi-faceted and complex. While in the previous example the only acknowledgement of audience is the imperative *uiue* (and even that a marked departure from the strictly third-person examples we had seen thus far), here the text acknowledges not only the reader but also itself and the reading-act in the very first line; in doing so, it might draw the attention of a passer-by more so than simple third-person examples. As discussed above, this seeking of attention on the part of the inscription highlights the importance of the reading-act for the completion of its communicative, and metonymic, function; whereas the examples we considered in chapters two and three took for granted that they would be read and thus fulfill that function, here the author of the inscription has preferred to be more proactive in seeking and addressing his audience. After catching the attention of the reader with the protasis *sei legis*, the inscription goes on to ask that he not criticize the monument, and thus to ensure that every reader would be enjoined by this request, as well as anyone hearing the spoken words of the reader – a tactic of self-protection that attempted to ensure a friendly reception for the monument and its text. The next line, before it was damaged, would have used the voice of the reader to announce the identity, filiation, and profession of the deceased, establishing metonymically not only the deceased's presence there, but also reifying the place he had held in society, in a

---

[32] For a discussion of the use and effect of such expressions addressed to the deceased in Latin, as opposed to Greek, examples, see the discussion of CIL I² 2273, which may contain such an address, and of CIL I² 1603, which certainly does, later in this chapter.

familial, social, and professional context.[33] The third line, damaged though it is, expresses a good deal: it makes a deictic gesture at the monument (*hoc*), creating a real-space relationship between the reader and the site; it characterizes the monument as *aeternum*, and, though damage prevents us from being certain, likely further as an "eternal home" for the subject, strengthening the idea that some aspect of him continues to dwell there among the living; and finally, the reader's voice would declare that the deceased had done it for himself, *sibei*, ensuring that the deceased and no one else receives credit for the construction of the monument. The content of the next two lines is difficult to reconstruct and as such so is its effect, but it seems that the inscription went on to discuss the deceased's lot in life (*quod natura tradidit*), and how he enjoyed it with his friends (*rebus cu*(*m*) *ameiceis sueis*), further establishing upon each reading an image of the deceased in a social context. As it comes to an end, the inscription returns to a second-person address, with an imperative addressed to the reader that would once again demand his attention: it advises the reader, characterized as *uiuos* in contrast to the dead man about whom he is reading, to use what he has (presumably) while still on the right side of the divide between them. And finally, it bids him *uale* – not only "good-bye," but also "fare well," a wish that again highlights the contrast between the deceased subject and the living reader. As was the case in the previous example, the inscription includes no first-person referent; that is, the words on the stone, including the advice, are not attributed to any specific "voice," but are spoken by an unidentified narrator, perhaps by default envisioned as the inscription itself, or the stone, as in examples we will see later.[34]

---

[33] Although the fact that this line was likely not metrical would have, as in 1219 above, reduced the monumentalizing effect of the notation.

[34] But see ch.2 n.4 for Sourvinou-Inwood's suggestion that the default voice in such cases is the collective memory of the deceased's community.

Our next example, CIL I² 1930, the third we will consider that acknowledges an audience but lacks a first-person referent, although shorter than our previous one contains several of the same elements:

...ma ca |
...us coli |

[H]ospes reseiste et aspice aet[ernam] | domu(m)
pro mereitis statui[t] | coiux coiugei e[t sibei].[35]

> Stranger, stop and look at this eternal home: a spouse has set this up according to merits for his spouse and himself.

What to make of the fragmentary four words at the top of the inscription has been much discussed, but no consensus has been reached;[36] we will focus on the undisputedly metrical portion of the inscription, two verses for a husband and wife. The restorations included above, accepted in both the CIL and CLE, seem secure; the resulting verses are iambic senarii.[37] The inscription is generally agreed to belong to the first century BCE,[38] although to what point in that century is not so agreed upon: Degrassi tags it as belonging to the first half of the century, although he notes elsewhere that certain aspects of the illustration suggest the time of

---

[35] CLE 177: the inscription, on a limestone cippus damaged on both sides, was found near Ancona and is now in the museum there. The text is accompanied by two carved illustrations: the four word-fragments here in italics appear above an illustration carved in relief, on the left side, of a *calathus* (a basket used to hold wool); Degrassi saw one more letter, L, carved into the basket and suggests it stood for *lana*, 'wool' (*ILLRP* 972). To the right of the *calathus* is carved an illustration of a woman's head; the three lines of the metrical portion run underneath these two illustrations.

[36] Two suggestions have been made (for a detailed discussion, see Kruschwitz 2001, 60): Bücheler suggests that the original words might have been metrical (iambs), and offers for the second line a restoration [...*fus*]*us coli* (CLE ad loc.); Warmington (1935, 38) in turn offers for the first *...ma ca*[*lathus*...]. Degrassi rejects this suggestion, but does not offer an alternative, and Frenz (1985 ad loc.) suggests that the fragments are of the names of the deceased couple. Kruschwitz favors Bücheler's position, suggesting that the iambs might have given more detail about the *merita* of the female subject, to complement the illustration of the *calathus*. *Coli*, at least, can also refer to wool/weaving, if we take it as a form of *colus*, "distaff," or "wool on a distaff."

[37] Kruschwitz (2001, 60) notes that the senarii are correctly constructed with a third-foot caesura; he points out, however, that the first verse can also be read as trimeter. He also notes that the phrase *pro mereitis statuit* forms a hemiepes, perhaps a playful use of heroic rhythm in referring to the deceased couple's merits, and draws attention to the polyptoton of *coiux coiugei*.

[38] Thus Colafrancesco and Massaro (1986 ad loc.).

Augustus; Kruschwitz asserts that the style of the letters is Republican.[39] The inscription shows two old-fashioned digraphs (*reseiste* and *mereitis*) but neither of them is etymologically correct.[40]

The first senarius begins with the word *hospes*; this term in particular is noted by Massaro as a frequent line-beginning among inscriptions written in iambic senarii,[41] and that assertion is to some extent borne out by the evidence of our corpus.[42] This example, however, is our first definite encounter with such an element, so we should consider it carefully. Like elements of greeting such as *aue*, *salue*, and *uale* discussed above, this use of *hospes*[43] has a clear precedent in ancient Greek epitaphs: ὦ ξένε, "O, stranger!"[44] Lattimore characterizes such addresses as "both early and frequent" in Greek examples, and "of course much in evidence in Latin epitaphs."[45] The intended effect is straightforward: by addressing the passer-by specifically, the composer of the inscription hopes to draw the attention of a reader; as Lattimore puts it, such an address "expresses an almost frantic reaching out for some connection with the living, for a short period when someone pays attention to the dead and they are rescued for a moment from

---

[39] Degrassi ad *Imagines* 331; Kruschwitz 2001, 59.

[40] For the orthographic <ei> for /ī/, see n.17 above; here the digraphs do not represent original *ei*: the -*i*- in *resisto* should be short, and in *mereitis* too, the second syllable should be short, with an unmonophthongized form *meriteis*, as Bücheler (CLE ad loc.) notes. Perhaps the stonecutter simply reversed the intended orthography of the second and third syllables. Cf., however, *mereto* in CIL I² 9 for Barbatus' son; we do have another OL inscriptional example (*ILLRP* 514 from near Cadiz, Spain) where <ei> is used for /ĕ/ (*inpeirator*, Weiss 2009, 101 n.30).

[41] Massaro 1992, 89.

[42] *Hospes* appears, in addition to this example, four times in the corpus as a line-beginning (always of the first line) of an iambic senarius: CIL I² 1211, 1212, 1837, and 2161. It also appears twice, however, as a line-beginning in verses of other meters (CIL I² 1202, Saturnians, and 3449d, elegiac couplets) and twice elsewhere in a different line-position in an iambic senarius (1210, 1836).

[43] For *hospes* itself and its other uses, see Dickey 2002, 148-9 and 330-1; she points out, among other things, that the word is only ever used to address men.

[44] Courtney 1995, 214. Dickey notes some minor differences in usage, but they are only minimally applicable here: "[*Hospes*] does not, however, have the limitations of Greek ξένε 'stranger, guest', which is used by natives to foreign visitors but not vice versa. […] In inscriptions, *hospes* is sometimes used to address future readers of the inscription; the readers' nationality cannot of course be specified."

[45] Lattimore 1962, 231f.; cf. also Tolman 1910, 5.

nonentity."[46] It is important to make a distinction, however, between the examples such as this one wherein it is an unidentified narrator, or the stone, who speaks the address to the passer-by, and those in which the dead subject is envisioned as doing so;[47] of course in the latter case, as we will see in the following chapter, such a reaching-out becomes even more poignant.

Once the inscription has called for the passer-by's attention, it asks him to stop and look at it: *reseiste et aspice*. Such a directive (for the forms are in fact imperatives) frequently accompanies *hospes* or a similar word in beginning an address to the passer-by; Cugusi has collected several different variants of 'stop and look/read' (many of which appear elsewhere in our corpus),[48] and in connection with them cites two passages of Ennius, which, he suggests, show that Ennius was engaging with the tradition of inscribed funerary poetry.[49] Here, the second element is 'look,' not 'read,' with the result that although the monument acknowledges itself, it does not acknowledge the reading-act as integral in the way that the previous example did with *sei legis*.

Kruschwitz prefers to punctuate with a colon after these words, making the following two words, *aet*[*ernam*] *domu*(*m*), the object of *statui*[*t*] in the second verse rather than of the imperatives; in support of this suggestion, in neither of the other two examples in the corpus with *aspice* as the second imperative does that verb take a grammatical direct object. Such a change has little effect on the sense

---

[46] Lattimore 1962, 234.
[47] Most scholars fail to make such a distinction, treating all addresses to the passer-by together, regardless of speaker/"voice;" cf. Lier 1903, 467-9; Galletier 1922, 38f.; Purdie 1935, 52-3; Van Bleek 89-92. Wolff (2000, 45ff.) is more careful to make the distinction.
[48] Cf., later in this chapter, CIL I² 1915 (*re*[*s*]*iste et perlege*), 1212 (*resiste et…aspice*), 1211 (*asta ac pellege*), 1837 (*resiste et…perlig*[*e*]), 1209 (*aspicias…legas*).
[49] Cugusi 2007, 20-21: he cites Ennius *var.* 16-15 V.² (*FPL* fr. 45),
   aspicite o ciues senis Enni imaginis formam,
        hic uestrum pinxit maxima facta patrum
and *scaen.* 287-288 V.² (239-240 Jocelyn),
   asta atque Athenas anticum opulentum oppidum
   contempla et templum Cereris ad laeuam aspice.

of the lines, as one would supply the tomb as the object of *statuit* in any case; furthermore it is perfectly possible that there is *apokoinou* here, with *aet*[*ernam*] *domu*(*m*) serving as the object of both verbs. However we punctuate the lines, here again we have the characterization, seen already in two examples above, of the tomb as an eternal home, borne out as common indeed by its frequent appearance in our corpus.

The second line of the inscription is an explicit notation of the construction of the tomb, an element we have seen in both the metrical and non-metrical sections of other examples;[50] but here the statement includes certain details that we have not seen before: that the husband (*coiux*)[51] built (*statui*[*t*]) the tomb for himself (although the *sibei* is restored rather than extant) and his wife (*coiugei*), and that he did it according to, or in return for, their merits (*pro mereitis*[52]).

Pro meritis is an expression more often seen in later inscriptions; in fact, Huttenen, in his study of Republican uses of the word *mereo/mereor*, declares, "in Republican epitaphs the virtues of the deceased were defined by various expressions, but *mereo* (*mereor*) was not one of them," citing this as the only example.[53] Kruschwitz, however, in noting and responding to this assertion,[54] points out that Huttunen's study failed to include another Republican example, this one probably prose (although it ends with a dactyl and a spondee): CIL I² 1332, *patronae pro meriteis dant ubei eorum ossa quiescant*.[55] Forms of this expression

---

[50] Cf., in ch.2 above, CIL I² 2139, *mater monumentum fecit* (metrical) and, earlier in this chapter, CIL I² 1219, *Saluius et Heros dant* (non-metrical).
[51] For the alternate spelling, see *OLD* s.v. *coniunx*.
[52] Sic; see n.40 above for the orthography.
[53] Huttunen 1966, 50; he considers every fifth inscription in CIL I² and VI, a methodological choice that must have been intended to make his corpus more manageable but also causes him to miss relevant passages, as here.
[54] Kruschwitz 2001, 60-61; he does acknowledge that the expression is rather vague ("recht unkonkret und nebulös") but suggests that the virtues of the woman, at least, might have been further clarified by the now-damaged text above the illustration of the *calaphus*.
[55] Not included in this study due to doubts as to its metricity; Bücheler had suggested that it could be Saturnian *commaticum* (CLE ad loc.); Massaro (1992, 34-5) sees the possibility of a choriambic

certainly do become common later: Tolman, in his study of the CLE, finds more than seventy examples of such phrases (including *pro meritis*, *merenti*, *merito*, and *merito fecit*).[56] The phrase, in any case, is clearly an abbreviated form of praise, an assertion that the worthy deeds of the deceased (or in this case, of the deceased couple) merited a tomb. The use of the phrase at this early stage means we should not consider it formulaic here, but rather attribute it to a distinct choice on the part of the deceased himself, the commissioner of the inscription. Also evidence of a distinct choice is the word-order of *coiux coiugei e*[*t sibei*]: Kruschwitz notes the resemblance to the common phrase *sibi et sueis*, but that the order is reversed here, and attributes that reversal to "modesty" on the part of the husband.[57]

As in the previous example, the effect of the epitaph is heightened by an explicit address to the passer-by; but whereas in that example the passer-by is not called to as such, but only acknowledged as the agent of the hypothetical reading-act (*sei legis*), here the inscription (we can assign the words to no other "voice" – as in each of the previous examples, no speaker is specified) calls out specifically to the *hospes*, and commands him to stop and look. When spoken aloud by a passer-by, these words would have the effect not only of stopping him, but also reaching any other listeners nearby. The remainder of the poem includes, for the most part, content of which the effects have already been discussed above: the tomb is characterized as an *aeternum domum*, suggesting its function as a continued dwelling-place for the deceased couple, and a statement of construction establishes and repeats upon each reading that it was the husband who carried out this important step for his wife and himself. The addition of the phrase *pro mereitis*,

---

dimeter followed by an adoneus, but also acknowledges that it might be prose, and Kruschwitz (2001, 61 n.51) and Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) reject outright the possibility of metricity.

[56] Tolman 1910, 46; for similar uses in literature, he cites Ovid *Met.* 13.372 (*hunc titulum meritis…reddite*, as Ulysses argues that he should receive Achilles' armor) and *Am.* 3.6(5).105 (*at tibi pro meritis…sint*, to a river preventing Ovid from crossing on his way to his mistress).

[57] Kruschwitz 2001, 61: "Bescheidenheit."

however, at this early point not yet formulaic, adds personalized praise to the statement with each reading, and the reversal of the normal order of recipients ("for his spouse and himself" – if this is the correct reading – as opposed to the more common "for himself and…") further sets apart this epitaph, indicating and memorializing the priority of the wife in the life of the husband, a prioritization further emphasized by the illustrations accompanying the inscription. One point is left to be made: the metrical portion of the inscription does not contain the name of the deceased or his wife, and the superscript has been too damaged for us even to guess whether it included their names, or if so what they were; as a result, the portrait created by the inscription, of a husband and wife living together in their well-deserved eternal home, must remain that of an anonymous couple, memorialized but nameless.

The next example we will consider, CIL I² 1210, the last of these first four with no first-person referent,[58] includes the name of the deceased in both the metrical portion and in a non-metrical subscript:

> rogat ut resistas, hospes, t[e] hic tacitus lapis,
> dum ostendit quod mandau[i]t quoius umbram te[git].
> pudentis hominis, frugi, c[u]m magna fide,
> praeconis Oli Grani sunt [o]ssa heic sita.
> tantum est. hoc uoluit nescius ne esses. uale.   5
> *A. Granius M. l. Stabilio, praeco.*[59]

> This stone, silent as it is, requests you to halt, stranger, while it discloses the instructions of the man whose shade it covers. Here lie the bones of a modest, thrifty, trustworthy man,

---

[58] Also considered for inclusion in this first section, but rejected as too fragmentary (and because as such, dating it is difficult, but note the digraph in *domei*), was CIL I² 1915:
> *qui proper*]as re[s]iste et perlege […
> …*m*]odestus domei nun[…
> …*q*]uoniam leto inmatu[*ro*…
The inscription was found at Ascoli Piceno; Bücheler suggests that the lines might have been iambic senarii. It includes for the most part elements we see in other examples in the corpus: imperatives directing the passer-by to stop and read (1), praise of its subject, most likely female due to the nature of that praise (2), and an assertion that her death was untimely (3).

[59] CLE 53: the marble tablet on which the inscription is carved was found at Rome along the Via Appia in 1851; it is now kept in Rokeby Hall in England.

the auctioneer Aulus Granius. That is all. He did not want you to be unaware of this.
Farewell.
Aulus Granius Stabilio, freedman of Marcus Granius, auctioneer (trans. Courtney).

Five regular iambic senarii make up the metrical portion of the inscription, accompanied by a non-metrical subscript that shows the deceased's name, filiation, and profession (again, with the first and last of those elements also included in the metrical portion); Colafrancesco and Massaro consider it among the oldest of our examples, dating it to the latter half of the second century BCE, but Keuleers (rightly, it seems to me) prefers a later date: late Republic or early Empire, based on the use of marble, and certain aspects of the diction and content.[60]

In the first line we see again an address to the passer-by, referred to as *hospes*, requesting that he stop (*resistas*); but whereas in our previous example a similar request stood unattributed to any specific agent, here we are told who it is who makes it: *hic tacitus lapis.* Again, in previous examples where no speaker is specified, we could assume the stone or inscription as the default imagined speaker, but here no such assumption is necessary – we are explicitly told that it is the stone that is doing the asking, and is thereby transformed into a "speaking object," a device recognized by Burzachechi as common in Greek inscriptions of the sort 'X made me;'[61] we will discuss this concept further below, when we encounter examples that include first-person referents like the ones Burzachechi discusses. Here, however, the assertion of the stone's speech-act, though addressed to a second-person audience (*t*[*e*]) remains in the third person, *rogat*. The characterization of the stone as *tacitus*, "silent," seems intriguingly paradoxical,[62]

---

[60] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc., citing Massaro (1998, 202ff.), points out the use of the word *lapis* for a sepulchral stone/inscription (not attested, he says, until Cicero) and the fact that the praise for the deceased resembles the list given by Cicero in *Mur.* 30. A Q. Granius (also a *praeco*; perhaps the father of the Marcus mentioned in the subscript?) was a contemporary of Lucilius and Crassus in the late second/early first cent. BCE (see Cic. *De Or.* 2.244 and *Brut.* 172, and A.D. Leeman et al. (1981, Bd. 3) on the former passage).
[61] Burzachechi 1962: 'oggetti parlanti.'
[62] Courtney (1995, 236) directs his reader to a parallel in CLE 512, *hic ego qui taceo, uersibus mea*(*m*) *uita*(*m*) *demonstro*, and to *GVI* 1887.9, 1994a.1, p.689; cf. also Häusle 1980, 60 and Wolff

juxtaposed as it is with the report that it is the stone who is asking; but after all, it is true: the stone *is* silent; as we have alluded to above and will discuss in more detail below, the inscription itself has no voice, and must therefore co-opt the voice of the passer-by.

The second verse, a *dum*-clause dependent on the first, details how long and why the passer-by should stop: for the period of time necessary for the stone to show "that which (*quod*) the one whose shade it protects (*quoius*[63] *umbram te*[*git*]) has instructed (*mandauit*)." The verb *tego* is used twice elsewhere in the corpus to describe the act of the monument in relation to the deceased, [64] and *umbra* also appears elsewhere;[65] Galletier reports that *umbra* refers, in this context, to "le simulacre du mort encore vivant au fond de son tombeau.:[66]

The first two verses, then, are essentially an introduction to the main content of the inscription contained in the third and fourth verses (the fifth being, as we will see, a conclusion and farewell). The third line is comprised of praise for the deceased: he is characterized as a modest and thrifty man, *pudentis hominis frugi*, (with the genitives anticipating [*o*]*ssa heic sita* in the next line) and one with great trustworthiness, *c*[*u*]*m magna fide*. *Frugi* we have seen before; as mentioned above,[67] Harrod reports that it is applied seventeen times to the deceased in CIL VI; but *pudens* appears only once elsewhere in that collection, there also paired with *frugi*.[68] The phrase *cum magna fide* fits into the pattern discussed in chapter three,

---

2000, 53. For a literary parallel, see Cic. *Catil.* 1.18, as Cicero describes the *patria* speaking to Catiline: *quae tecum, Catilina, sic agit et quodam modo tacita loquitur …*

[63] An alternate spelling of *cuius*; see Weiss 2009, 351.

[64] Cf. CIL I² 1222, discussed later in this chapter, and 1217, discussed below, 218ff.

[65] Also in CIL I² 1222.

[66] Galletier 1922, 27 n.6; cf. Courtney 1995, 236.

[67] In CIL I² 1259; see ch.2.51ff. It also occurs in the non-metrical subscript of CIL I² 1406 and in CIL I² 1408 discussed below.

[68] Harrod 1909, 44, 46: he cites CIL VI 9882: *Lysis sarcinatrix / uixit annos XIIX / frugi pudens*. The *TLL* (s.v. *frux*, 1458.10) cites also CIL XII 4917, *Iulia Olympi l. ingenua frugi pudens hic est sepulta*, but mentions no literary examples of the pairing. *Pudens* appears once elsewhere within the corpus, in CIL I² 1221 discussed below in ch.6 (see also n.70 below).

where praise for the deceased often relates to his behavior to others; unlike in most of those examples, however, here no specific recipients of the praiseworthy quality are mentioned. The phrase does not seem to occur anywhere else in the sepulchral corpus;[69] it does, however, occur at Plautus *Trin.* 1096, where it also follows a list of adjectives: *probo et fideli et fido et cum magna fide*. Massaro compares *cum magna fide* in our current example to the phrase *studio pariliqum* in CIL I² 1221,[70] where the phrase occurs after two adjectives (forms of *fidus*, as in the Plautus just cited: *fido fida viro…studio pariliqum*). Keuleers suggests that this particular compliment may involve a pun on the deceased's cognomen Stabilio, from *stabilis*, 'steadfast.'[71]

The fourth line finally identifies the deceased, and his profession (*praeconis*, 'auctioneer') – this example is often cited in connection with others for freedpeople that mention a profession[72] – and his metrically incorporated name, Oli Grani (Aulus Granius, with the orthography suggesting a pronunciation of the diphthong *au* nearer to monophthongized *ō*);[73] these are dependent upon the deictic phrase that fills out the remainder of the line: *sunt* [*o*]*ssa heic sita*. The locative phrase, with its mention of the physical remains of the deceased, is similar to those we discussed in chapter three, and in fact, as mentioned there, is the formulation Massaro considers most typical;[74] we will see it again in CIL I² 1209, our next example.

---

[69] Nor does the *TLL* make mention of the phrase.

[70] The same poem just cited, in n.68, as also including *pudens*.

[71] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[72] Cf. Massaro 2007a, 140: he says that they are of the class that today would be known as "lavoratori" and "piccoli impreditori," "employees" and "small-business owners." Cf. also Massaro 2007b, 277 and Wolff 2000, 83. N.b., however, that there were free-born/citizen auctioneers as well: cf. the Q. Granius mentioned by Cicero (see n.60 above). For mentions of profession in our corpus, see ch.3 pp.107-108.

[73] But cf. A(ulus) Granius in the subscript (for the <au>-<o> alternation, see Weiss 2009, 473-474), characterized by Courtney as "less vulgar;" for the Olus-Aulus alternation, he directs the reader to Salomies 1987, 24.

[74] See ch.3 n.11.

The beginning of the fifth and final verse signals that the content the stone was pledged to pass on has ended: *tantum est,* "that is all."[75] The next sentence returns to the second-person address seen in the first line, as it explains why the deceased entrusted to the stone the task of passing on this information: *hoc uoluit nescius ne esses.* The phrase is similar to one that concludes a well-known literary epitaph, that of the poet Pacuvius, who died c. 130 BCE: *hoc uolebam nescius ne esses.*[76] There has been much discussion of what the relationship might be between these two examples as well as one other (mentioned just above as having the same locative statement as the current example), that of Philotimus, CIL I² 1209.[77] The general conclusion seems to be that this example and the epitaph of Philotimus (which resembles the Pacuvian epitaph even more closely) are imitations of the older and more famous epitaph of Pacuvius, but that Pacuvius himself (or the author of his epitaph) was in turn imitating models, now lost, from the earlier Roman (inscriptional) funerary tradition.[78] Finally, the poem sends the reader on his way (as do the other two examples just mentioned) with a farewell: *uale*, seen and discussed above in the second example in this chapter.

---

[75] *OLD* s.v. *tantus* I.C.1.b. I am even more partial to a translation suggested by Claude Pavor, in an online Classics discussion group (http://comments.gmane.org/gmane.education.classics/54024, retrieved 2/23/2013), which seems to capture both the sense of the Latin and the idea that the phrase is the beginning of a dismissal: "so long." Cf. also Poe's *The Raven* (30): "Merely this and nothing more."

[76] Ap. Gell. 1.24.4 (= Courtney *FLP* pp.47-50), possibly written by the poet himself but possibly apocryphal :

       adulescens, tam etsi properas, hoc te saxulum
       rogat ut te aspicias, deinde quod scriptum est, legas.
       hic sunt poetae Pacuuii Marci sita
       ossa. hoc uolebam, nescius ne esses. uale.

Courtney (1993, 49) notes that *uolebam ne* (cf. *uoluit ne* in our current example) is a rare construction; the only parallel he finds is at Cic. *Ad Att.* 1.6.2*, uelim…ne praetermittas*.

[77] See discussion below, p.140:

       adulescens, tametsi properas, | hic te saxsolus
       rogat ut se | aspicias, deinde ut quod scriptust | legas.
       hic sunt ossa Maeci Luci sita | Pilotimi uasculari. |
       hoc ego uoleba(m) | nescius ni esses. uale.

[78] See Massaro 1992, 16ff.; Courtney 1993, 49; Courtney 1995, 236; Massaro 1998, Suerbaum 2002, 80-81, Cugusi 2007, 24-25; Massaro 2007a, 140.

In effect, then, the poem can be divided into two sections, a frame for the central content, and the central content itself: the first, second, and fifth lines, which greet the wayfarer and introduce him to the narrator who will be borrowing his voice and then, after explaining the reason for taking this liberty, bid him farewell; and the third and fourth lines, which could stand on their own as a basic epitaph of the type we surveyed in chapters two and three. The first line shows an element not seen in any of the examples considered thus far, an identification of the 'speaker': after the inscription calls to the wayfarer (*hospes*) and asks him to stop (*resistas*), it informs him (and anyone listening) just who is making this request: the stone, silent as it is, needs his voice to relay its message: *rogat ut…t*[*e*] *hic tacitus lapis*. This introductory section goes on to explain that this request comes at the behest of the deceased, characterized as an *umbra*, a spirit still present though covered (*te*[*git*]) by the monument; a spirit who, though present, is also silent, having to convey his request to borrow the voice of the reader through words carved on an equally silent stone. Then the passer-by would read aloud the lines of the inscription that create a portrait of the deceased as he lived: modest and frugal, trustworthy to others (with this last element establishing a portrait of him among his contemporaries, though they are not specifically named); then comes the deceased's profession, further embedding this last image of him in the social context of his life, and his name, metrically incorporated, making this reification of his identity monumental in itself. Ending these two lines comes a locative statement, *sunt* [*o*]*ssa heic sita,* which asserts the presence of the deceased's remains on this spot and, via deixis, establishes a real-space relationship between the reader (and listeners) and the physical location of the tomb. In the final line, the passer-by would read the words (*tantum est*) that signal that the information has come to an end; then, before a final farewell (*uale*), the stone attributes to the deceased a final wish, repeated upon each

139

reading (*hoc uoluit nescius ne esses*), that the passer-by should not be ignorant of these facts – the facts, essentially, of the deceased's existence.

We have seen so far, then, four examples that address an audience but lack any first-person referent, with no "voice" imagined as speaking them; such examples are classified by Conso as having only "minimal" or "intermediate" fictive orality.[79] In the first, the address to the audience took the form of advice that comprised the whole metrical portion of the inscription, delivered to an unspecified audience (*Viue…*). In the second, the acknowledgement of the audience was confined to the opening and closing lines of the inscription – a trend that we will see continued in later examples; in the first line, the inscription acknowledged a potential reader (*sei legis…*), and asked that he not criticize the monument (*ne uituperes*), and in the last, it too gave advice (*utarus*), here more explicitly addressed to the potential reader referred to in the first line, and went on to bid him farewell (*uale*). In the third, an address to the passer-by and a request that he stop and look *([H]ospes reseiste et aspice)* begins the inscription, an opening of a sort we will see frequently in other examples. In the fourth, the sections addressed to an audience again form a sort of frame for the rest of the poem, appearing at the beginning and end of the inscription and surrounding the more personalized central content, written in the third person: the first line again calls to the passer-by and requests that he stop (*rogat ut resistas, hospes, t*[*e*]), and here we learn who is doing the asking: it is a silent stone (*hic tacitus lapis*), using the voice of the reader. In the final line there is another second-person acknowledgement of the addressee: the stone asserts that the deceased wished that the audience not be unaware of the facts expressed in the central portion of the epitaph, and he bids the reader "fare well": *hoc uoluit nescius ne esses. uale.*

---

79 Conso 1994, 294-295.

Let us turn then to our next set of examples, those that include, even more markedly than the example just discussed, a "voice" that co-opts the voice of the reader: these examples include a first-person referent, an "I," and as such engage in what Conso terms "full fictive orality."[80] The first we will discuss is CIL I² 1209, cited in connection with 1210 above for its resemblance to that poem and the epitaph of Pacuvius:

> adulescens, tametsi properas, | hic te saxsolus
> rogat ut se | aspicias, deinde ut quod scriptust | legas.
> hic sunt ossa Maeci Luci sita | Pilotimi uasculari. |
> hoc ego uoleba(m) | nescius ni esses. uale.
> *posteris ius. | L. Maeci L. l. Salui, Manchae Manchae f(iliae). | Rutilia · Rutiliae l. Hethaera, | Maecia L. f.*[81]

> Young man, even if you are in a hurry, this little stone asks that you contemplate it and then read what is inscribed. Here lie the bones of Lucius Maecius Philotimus the vessel-maker. I wanted you not to be unaware of this. Farewell.
> [Later additions] (trans. Courtney).

There are four lines of text in the metrical portion; the first, second, and fourth are regular iambic senarii. Courtney says that the meter is "abandoned" in the third line to incorporate the metrically non-viable name, but then is unable to explain the order of the *tria nomina*; Massaro, however, sees in the third verse a trochaic octonarius, a "seemingly elegant solution" to the difficulty of incorporating the name and profession metrically.[82] The inscription is generally dated to the end of the second century BCE,[83] in part due to its resemblance to the Pacuvius epitaph; Keuleers prefers a slightly later date (the first quarter of the first century BCE)

---

[80] Conso 1994, 296.

[81] CLE 848: The inscription, carved on Tiburtine stone *litteris bonis et antiquis*, was found at Rome, but no more specific location was noted. It was then taken to the University of Vienna (CIL ad loc.) but has since been misplaced (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

[82] Courtney 1995, 137; Massaro 2007a, 139-140: "soluzione elegante, come sembra…" As the praenomen and nomen are metrically equivalent, however, this still fails to explain the re-ordering of those two elements; perhaps we should see some influence, either directly or via the Pacuvius epitaph, from another famous example of such reordering: the Barbatus epitaph (CIL I² 6-7). In fact the dislocation is not uncommon; it can be used to single out an individual by putting the emphasis on his praenomen (see Ogilvie on Liv. 4.23.1).

[83] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1984 ad loc.; Solin 1991, 159; Panciera 1995, 334.

based on the use of the cognomen as well as other factors.[84] Underneath the inscription are various names, written in smaller, messier letters than the metrical sections, agreed to be later additions.[85]

As noted just above in our discussion of 1210, this poem has much in common with that one (and even more with the Pacuvius epitaph);[86] nonetheless much of it is distinctive enough to merit discussion. As in 1210, the substantive content of the epitaph (3) is framed by greeting (1), introductory (2) and concluding/farewell (4) addresses to the passer-by; here, the distinction between sections is even more marked by the difference in meter.

At the beginning of the first verse, the passer-by is addressed not by the more common *hospes*, but as *adulescens*; the field of intended readers is narrowed thereby, from men in general to young men, perhaps tapping into the contrast theme discussed above.[87] Dickey reports that *adulescens* is frequently used when addressing a stranger for the first time (and like *hospes*, it is used only for a male addressee),[88] but it is rare in the CLE: it appears, according to the *Concordanze*, in only one other poem, CIL VI 17130 (most likely dating to the early Empire), addressed by the deceased to a specific but unnamed young man still alive and grieving.[89] The following two words introduce an element we have not yet seen in our corpus but which is a logical extension of the request to stop, and appears in at

---

[84] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.; he claims that the spelling of Philotimus without <h> rules out a dating after his suggested range, and that the use of the phrase *ni nescius esses*, unattested epigraphically and rare in literature before this time, argues against an earlier date.

[85] Added in installments; see Courtney 1995, 237 and Degrassi *ILLRP* 821.

[86] See n.77 above.

[87] Or the use of the term could provide a clue as to the original location of the stone: perhaps it was located in place where young men were the most likely audience, e.g. an exercise-place.

[88] Dickey 2002, 252 and 308.

[89] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 s.v. *adulescens*; CIL VI 17130 was considered for inclusion in ch.6, but rejected as too late: *sed tu, adulescens, quem Phrygia edidit tellus / desiste lamenteis me exciere.*

least one other poem from this period:[90] the idea that the passer-by should stop despite the fact that he is hurrying, *tametsi properas*.[91]

After the concessive clause, we learn who it is that is making this claim for the passer-by's attention (and ours), and what we are asked to do. Again, as in our previous example, it is the stone that is pictured as speaking, though here referred to by the distinctive form *saxsolus* (*hic te saxsolus rogat…*).[92] As was the case in 1210 above, this attribution of speech to the stone renders it a "speaking object;" furthermore, as we will see shortly, this stone is invested not only with speech but with what we may call, for lack of a better term, "I-ness." Although that which the stone asks (again, the verb *rogat* is used, with subjunctives, politer than imperatives) takes a whole verse to say, it is simply a variant of the stop-look-read formula we have seen above (here with the latter two elements): *ut se aspicias, deinde ut quod scriptust*[93] *legas*.

Thereupon follows, in the metrically distinct third verse, the main content of the inscription, the *quod scriptust* just mentioned: a locative phrase asserting the presence of the deceased's physical remains on that spot, with the deceased's name and profession in the genitive. The locative statement is the same four-word phrase we saw in the previous example, *hic sunt ossa…sita*, cited by Massaro as the most canonical example of such a phrase;[94] the notation of the deceased's profession,

---

[90] Both of the other two poems with this theme considered for inclusion in the corpus, CIL I² 1915 and CIL I² 2997, were deemed too fragmentary (and in one of them, CIL I² 1915, the reference to hurrying is restored rather than extant; see n.57 above).

[91] Such a clause also appears in the Pacuvius-epitaph cited above. Nisbet-Hubbard (1975) on Horace *Odes* 1.28.35 (*quamquam festinas…*) cite both inscribed and literary Greek examples with such an element, as well as Quint. *Decl. maior.* 5.6.

[92] The diminutive, which also appears at Cic. *de Or.* 1.196, is masculine here, an early example of a "drift" that would lead to the elimination of neuter as a grammatical category in the Romance languages (Courtney 1995, 237); the form in the Pacuvius-epitaph is neuter. The diminutization of the stone and its message is a theme we will see again shortly, in our discussion of 1211, pp.150 below.

[93] For prodelision/aphaeresis manifested in orthography, as happens primarily in early Latin, see Nyman 1974 and Pezzini 2011.

[94] See ch.3 n.11.

uasculari, "vessel-maker," marks him as part of the class of small-business owners or employees mentioned above.[95]

As was the case in 1210, the final line completes the frame, as it were, for the main content just given; here, although we lack the tag *tantum est* seen in that example, a return to the meter of the first and second lines signals the resumption of the frame. And so here, in terms very similar to the ones that concluded our previous example, we are given a justification for the demand on our time; but in this case it is not the deceased himself to whom the desire to pass on this information is attributed, but the stone, which now speaks in the first person: *hoc ego uoleba*(*m*)[96] *nescius ni*[97] *esses*.

With this *ego…uoleba*(*m*), then, suddenly the stone is invested with "I-ness," hearkening back to a convention seen in archaic Greek inscriptions, which often take the form, "I am the σῆμα ('sign') of…" Svenbro has famously discussed these "egocentric" inscriptions,[98] disagreeing with Burzachechi's "animist's interpretation" – that the use of such an expression represented a tendency on the part of primitive society to endow objects with speech and thereby, a soul – and concludes instead that the outcome of such a device is to demand the attention of a potential reader:

> Is not the plot of setting up an object that is designed to carry the message, an object that must not, or cannot, be physically separated from the first person statement that it bears, the most "economical"[99] way of drawing attention to the presence of the object before its beholder?[100]

---

[95] See n.76 above.

[96] According to Courtney (1995, 237), final *-m* was generally written in non-Saturnian Republican inscriptions, so it is the line-break that causes it to be left out here.

[97] An alternate form for *nē*, from that negative particle plus the particle *–i* (hence *nei*, monophthongized here); cf. *nei* in CIL I² 582 (Weiss 2009, 82), and in our own CIL I²1837, discussed below.

[98] Svenbro 1993, 26-43, esp. 41-42.

[99] Svenbro attributes the term to Pietro Pucci, used in a talk in June 1984 at the Centre de recherches comparées sur les sociétés anciennes (1993, 42 n.66).

[100] Ibid. 42.

And further, on the effect of such "I-ness," when the inscription is read by a passer-by:

> The most it can do is *provoke* a reading, prompt its own rendering in sound, get the reader's voice going – the voice that, as has been argued, is part of the text. For the text to achieve complete fulfillment, the reader must lend his voice to the writing (or, in the last analysis, the writer). At the moment of reading, the reading voice does not belong to the reader… If he lends his voice to these mute signs, the text appropriates it: his voice becomes the voice of the written text.[101]

With the use of the first-person verb *uoleba*(*m*), therefore, the process that we have taken as implicit in considering all these inscriptions – that is, the co-opting of the voice of the reader as an integral part of the communicative act of the inscription, a tool on which the inscription relies to complete its function – goes one step further: the identity of the reader himself must recede, to make room for the "I" of the inscription. Thereby, the reader *becomes* the speaker, identifying even more closely with the stone and the text, and anyone standing nearby becomes part of the audience.[102] The effect of all this is to further draw attention to the text, so it can complete its function of communication. Having done so, it uses the voice of the reader for a final word, presumably addressed to the passer-by himself and to anyone listening: *uale*.

The effects of these four lines for the deceased and for the reader are slightly different, then, than those of any example we have yet seen, different even from the effects of the similar 1210 just discussed. This inscription reaches out with its first word, *adulescens*, to a narrower group than does the similar address *hospes*: it is

---

[101] Ibid. 46. Cf. also the continuation of the quote from Wolff above (2000, 53, cf. n.18): "*Vox tua nempe mea est*, «Car ta voix est en réalité la mienne». Ce passage de *CIL* XV, 356 (en prose) met en relief le procédé de substitution nécessaire au fonctionnement de l'épitaphe. L'essentiel pour le défunt est de passer sur les lèvres du lecteur."

[102] Svenbro 1993, 46: "A number of consequences ensue from the act of reading aloud, making it a different act from the silent reading of today; and the instrumental nature of the reader in this act is one of the more important of those consequences. The writing is there to produce speech destined for the ear. The text's "listeners," from the ancient Greeks' vantage point, are not – as the dictionaries hold – its "readers" in the true sense of that word; they are the individuals who are listening to that reading."

only young men this inscription seeks to address, an audience that, by its youth, contrasts even more strongly with the deceased subject of the epitaph. Furthermore, this address would be made more eye-catching by its rarity: it appears in only one other poem in the CLE. Perhaps upon reading it, then, a young man's steps might slow, allowing him to read the remainder of the first two lines that serve as an introduction to the main content: the stone introduces itself, as it were, pointing to itself with a deictic pronoun (which, when spoken by the reader, would bind him to the real space of the inscription and the stone) and diminutizing itself as a *saxsolus* ("little stone though I be"), asks that the *adulescens* stop and read what is written.

Should the passer-by continue, his voice would then announce the information that is the point of the whole inscription: the name of the deceased and his profession, together with a deictic phrase that ties his still-present physical remains – and the stone bearing his name as his metonymic marker – to that spot in close proximity to the reader. Finally, the voice of the passer-by-turned-reader would, by reading the final line, complete his *becoming* of the voice of the stone: whereas in the previous example, it was the deceased who was depicted as having wanted, over and over again with each reading, to relieve the ignorance of the passer-by, here the stone explains via the first-person *ego…uoleba*(*m*) that *it* wished that the reader not be unaware of this (*hoc*, referring back to the content of the previous line). And so although the stone itself coopts the voice of the reader more thoroughly than in any example we have yet seen, none of that voice, none of the volition attributed to the speaker, belongs to the deceased subject; he remains present but silent in the portrait created by the third line of the inscription. Finally, the speaking stone bids good-bye to the reader, wishing that he fare well, perhaps in thanks for lending his voice for a brief time.

In our next such example, CIL I² 1212, the first-person referent is again delayed to the final line, and there it makes a specific request:

Hospes, resiste et hoc ad grumum ad laeuam aspice,
ubei | continentur ossa hominis boní, misericordis, amantis | pauperis.
Rogo te, uiator, monumento huic, níl male fecerís. |
C. Ateilius Serrani l. Euhodus, margaritarius de Sacra | 5
Via, in hoc monumento conditus est. Viator, uale. |
Ex testamento in hoc monumento neminem inferri neque |
condi licet, nisei eos lib(ertos), quibus hoc testamento dedi tribuique.[103]

Stranger, stop and look at this little heap to your left, where are held the bones of a good
man, a compassionate man, loving of the poor. I ask, traveller, that you do no ill to this
monument.
*Gaius Ateilius Euhodus, freedman of Serranus, pearl-dealer of the Sacred Way, on which
this monument has been set up. Traveller, be well.*
*According to (my) will, it is not permitted for anyone to be brought in or interred here,
except for those freedmen to whom by the will I have granted and allowed this.*

The first three verses of the inscription, up to the name of the deceased, have

generally been classified as iambic senarii, but with differing arrangement of those

verses, and with various irregularities noted.[104] Colafrancesco and Massaro date the

inscription to the first century BCE. Keuleers points out, as a *terminus post quem*,

that pearls were not readily available in Rome until the end of the second century

BCE, and that the use of marble makes a date before 65 BCE unlikely;[105] but

Bücheler's suggestion (in an attempt to provide a *terminus ante quem*) that the Atilii

Serrani family did not survive into the time of Caesar is incorrect.[106]

The non-metrical subscript informs us that the subject was a man named

Gaius Ateilius Euhodus,[107] a freedman of the Atilii Serrani family mentioned above,

---

[103] CLE 74: the marble tablet on which the inscription is carved was found at Rome along the Via
Appia near the Torre Selce; it is still on display nearby.

[104] Bücheler CLE ad loc. sees three verses (*tres ex ambitiosa loquentia distorti atque interpolati sunt
senarii*), as does Lindsay (1893, 147), who notes that the meter is "destroyed by certain additions;"
Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) follows Ritschl (1878, 365) in preferring four (still inconsistently metrical
and flawed) verses. Massaro (2007a, 159-160), after offering his metrical analysis of each of three
verses, suggests that they are essentially a collection of pre-established iambic formulae, chosen to
frame the "key message" of the inscription – the deceased's compassionate treatment of the poor.

[105] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[106] Bücheler CLE ad loc. (cf. Egger (1863, 352), who quotes various inscriptions involving the
family, and attributes to Henzen the original observation of their seeming disappearance from
records); but the *MRR*, published 1951-1986, shows a member of that family as politically active in
the middle of the first century BCE: Sextus Atilius Serranus Gavianus was quaestor in 63 BCE
(*MRR* II.168; cf. Cic. *Red. Pop*. 12) and tribune of the plebs in 57 (*MRR* II.201; cf. Cic. *Sest.* 72 and
77, *Hor. Resp*. 32, *Pis.* 35 etc.).

[107] For the name Euhodus, see Egger 1863, 354.

and that he was a seller of pearls (*margaritarius*) on the Appian Way. Thereafter follows a notation of the tomb's construction along that same road, and a farewell (*uale*) to the traveler/reader, but then the subscript goes on, with a legal clause asserting that no one but those whom the deceased has chosen may also be buried there. Collected in the subscript, then, we have the deceased's name, profession, a notation of construction, a farewell to the reader, and a protective legal clause; what can be left for the metrical portion?

The first job of the metrical verses, it turns out, is to catch the eye of a passer-by, with an address to the *hospes*, as well as to command that he stop and look (*resiste et…aspice*). The imperatives are accompanied by even more specific instructions to look *hoc*[108] *ad grumum ad laeuam*; this seems to be the only use of *grumus* to refer to a burial mound,[109] arguing for some originality of composition. There, the inscription tells us, are located the physical remains of a good man, a compassionate man, one loving of the poor.[110] This is no formulaic praise: Egger, and Northcote after him, point out that compassion and love for the poor were not virtues much prized by contemporary Romans.[111] Such was the praise chosen to be included, however,[112] and in fact, these last two characterizations, *misericordis* and *amantis pauperis*, do fit the pattern we saw in chapter two, that praise even in the

---

[108] *Hoc* for *huc* (Egger 1863, 352).

[109] *TLL* s.v. *grumus*, 2338.40.

[110] So the phrase *amantis pauperis* has generally been taken (cf. CIL ad loc.: "*coniunge amans pauperis*"). For the sing. (*pauperis*) for plur. ('poor folk'), see K.-S. I.67; they have no examples of this word in particular, but cf. Ter. *Ph.* 276-7 and Hor. *C.* 2.18.33, 39, etc. Keuleers points out that although such a reading is not required (*amans* being able to function absolutely), it has common sense on its side, since pearl-dealers were rarely poor (2003 ad loc.). And indeed, it fits well with *misericors*, and could serve as a *captatio beneuolentiae* in the case of poor people among the readers/passers-by.

[111] Egger 1863, 356 and Northcote 1878, 148; they both mention Cicero's warning in *Tusc.* 3.20 that pity (*misericordia*) can be an unfortunate quality in a man, going hand in hand with envy (*cadit igitur in eundem et misereri et inuidere*), and Vergil's description in the *Georgics* of a happy man (2.499): *neque ille | aut doluit miserans inopem ant inuidit habenti*.

[112] And considered by Massaro to be the "key message" of the epitaph (see n.104 above).

most basic Roman epitaphs is predominantly relative, that is, related to the deceased's conduct towards others.

The concluding content of the metrical portion conveys a request to do no harm to the monument – the inscription's final act is to attempt to protect itself from harm, which might rob it of its capacity to continue to fulfill its function. Such requests are (understandably) common in other Greek and Latin grave-inscriptions,[113] though Lattimore notes certain distinctions in usage: Latin examples are simpler, he says, and less threatening.[114] Lattimore also notes one motive for the inclusion of such a clause that is especially pertinent to our readings in this study: the fact that the physical monument is "the last link between the dead and the living," a necessary tool for a common goal, "to attract the attention of the wayfarer, to make him at least read the name on the stone, to have some value attached to that name alive in his consciousness for a while."[115] For the reading act – an integral part of the inscription's function – to occur, the writing needs to be present and legible. In the introduction to this request we see the element that sets the current examples apart from those we considered earlier: the second-person request (*nil male feceris*) is introduced by the first-person *rogo te*, *uiator*. Just who is doing the asking is not specified: unlike in the previous example, where we were told it was the *saxsolus* who was speaking, here we must imagine for ourselves who the speaker might be, perhaps the stone or the inscription itself. The content highlighted by the first-person address is a request not to harm the monument; and indeed, as we noted, if the text is harmed, it can no longer fulfill its function of being read.

---

[113] Lattimore (1962, 106 n.40) directs the reader to Cic. *de Leg.* 2.64 for a 'Solonian' law concerning tomb-robbing.

[114] He notes (1962, 125), "There is…in many of the Latin instances an air of courtesy and good breeding totally lacking in the Greek…" Cf. also Tolman 1910, 8; Galletier 1922, 33-35; Purdie 1935, 53-56.

[115] Lattimore 1962, 126.

Just as in the two previous examples the beginning and ending lines frame the line containing the most pertinent information, here the verses serve essentially as an introduction to the non-metrical portion, which contains the basic biographical facts about the deceased: his name, libertination, and profession. The address to the wayfarer, *hospes*, is followed by the commands to stop and look at the burial mound: *hoc ad grumum ad laeuam*, with the deictic adjective establishing a real-space locational relationship between the reader and the tomb; these elements set out to catch the attention of a potential reader, and to compel him to lend his voice to the inscription. With this task accomplished, the next section uses that voice to establish the continued presence of the deceased's physical remains on that spot, and to confer upon him rather distinctive praise, praise that, as we have frequently seen, establishes the picture of the dead man (not yet identified by name) in the context of his interactions with others. And finally, with the word *rogo*, the inscription explicitly co-opts the voice of the reader, another attention-seeking technique, expanding the role of reader/listener from him to others nearby hearing his voice. Again, the inscription calls out directly to a potential passer-by, with a different term than the *hospes* used above: *rogo…uiator*, that *te* ('you' being both the reader and anyone hearing the reading) not harm the monument, a basic but important task of self-preservation. Furthermore, by using the first-person verb *rogo* to make this request in particular, the inscription cannily makes the reader a partner in that task of self-preservation: it is at just this moment that the reader must identify most closely with the inscription and the stone, no doubt making the request to do no harm even more effective. The inscription then gets down to brass tacks, as it were, announcing the identity of the deceased and the other information discussed above. The "*uiator, uale*" in the non-metrical portion most likely marks the end of the portion intended to be read by the passer-by (the legal clause that follows being rather dry, and more in the nature of a just-in-case warning), wishing

him well in gratitude for the borrowing of his voice, and returning it as the inscription sends him on his way.

No such non-metrical subscript accompanies our next example, CIL I² 1211, in which an unidentified speaker again co-opts the voice of the reader; the name and description of the deceased are incorporated entirely into the metrical inscription:

> hospes, quod deico paullum est, asta ac pellege.
> heic est sepulcrum hau pulcrum pulcrai feminae.
> nomen parentes nominarunt Claudiam.
> suom mareitum corde deilexit souo.
> gnatos duos creauit; horunc alterum   5
> in terra linquit, alium sub terra locat.
> sermone lepido, tum autem incessu commodo.
> domum seruauit, lanam fecit. dixi. abei.[116]

> Stranger, what I have to say is brief, halt and read it. This is the unlovely tomb of a lovely woman. Her parents gave her the name Claudia. She loved her husband with all her heart. She gave birth to two sons; one of them she leaves on earth, the other she places (placed?) beneath it. She was charming in conversation and modest in gait. She kept to the house and made wool. That is all I have to say; be on your way (trans. Courtney).

Keuleers follows Bücheler and Warmington in dating this inscription, based on the orthography, to the period of the Gracchi; Massaro suggests rather the time of Catullus, based on aspects of the meter.[117] The poem is written in iambic senarii[118] for a woman named Claudia. Massaro concludes that she was most likely free-born of freedmen parents; Keuleers agrees with Massaro, for various reasons, that it is unlikely that the subject of the epitaph is one of the patrician Claudii, albeit with the disclaimer that we cannot reach a "secure" conclusion based on the text.[119]

---

[116] CLE 52: the inscription was carved on a travertine *cippus*, found at Rome near the bridge at St. Bartholomew over the Tiber; the stone is now lost, but various manuscript copies survive (CIL ad loc., Keuleers 2003 ad loc.; see also Fassbender 2007, 186).

[117] Massaro 1992, 81; Courtney 1995, 235; Wolff 2000, 126; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[118] For a detailed discussion see Massaro 1992, 86-88.

[119] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.: he, following Massaro (1992, 80-81), notes that we have no other *elogia* from this period for patrician women; that *elogia* for patricians (or rather, patrician men) were composed in Saturnians, rather than the senarii favored by the lower classes; and that certain aspects of the content (specifically the reference to the deceased's beauty, and the assertion of marital affection) do not fit with what we might expect from a patrician *elogium*. It seems to me, however, that to assert what does and does not belong in a verse-epitaph for a patrician woman, for the very reason that we lack any examples from this period, is risky. In the question of the statement of marital affection, for example, we find no such thing in any of the epitaphs for male individuals from

As we will see, this inscription, like several of those we have just considered, has what I have called a frame – an address to the passer-by at the beginning, and a tag and farewell at the end – that surrounds the more personal content of the inscription, which is entirely in the third person. Here, though, the amount of space that the frame takes up, relative to the more substantial content, is much less: in those examples, the frame took up half or more of the metrical space; the more personal content was in one case confined to the non-metrical portion (1212), and in the others to one (1209) or two (1210) lines of the metrical portion. In this poem, longer to begin with, the address to the passer-by accounts for only the first line, and the tag and farewell only the final part of the last, leaving more than six lines of verse for substantial and personal comment on the deceased woman. These lines and their content have received much scholarly attention,[120] due both to their quality[121] and to the portrait they offer of a virtuous Roman wife; as such, we will defer to many of those previous studies, and focus rather on the effect of the lines.

The first line includes an element that we have seen in our last two examples: an address specifically to the passer-by (*hospes*, again at the beginning of an iambic senarius), requesting that he stop and read: *asta ac pellege*.[122] Here, then, as we saw also in 1702 above, the inscription acknowledges its nature as a written text, intended to be read. This example goes further, however, by referring to its content in a phrase that includes a first-person referent: *quod deico*[123] *paullum est*.

the Republic, but in several of the epitaphs for women; so the inclusion or exclusion of that element seems to be based on gender rather than on class and as such an assertion that it was 'un-patrician' seems erroneous.

[120] See, for example, the very thorough treatment by Massaro (1992, 78-114).

[121] The wordplay especially led Sihler (1905, 6) to attribute the lines to a professional poet, a member of the so-called *collegium poetarum* (see ch.1 n.3), commissioned to write the poem based on information given by the surviving husband.

[122] With both forms showing assimilation of the prefixes: *asta*: *adsta*, *perlege*: *pellege* (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

[123] With the spelling reflecting accurately here the earlier unmonophthongized first syllable; see Weiss 2009, 101. Massaro (1992, 85) notes that this spelling is consistent throughout the inscription

In fact, as just mentioned, this example is longer than several similar ones we have just considered; but to deprecate the size (and beauty, as in the second line here) of the monument relative to its subject is itself a sepulchral *topos*, although it appears nowhere else in our corpus;[124] the phrase here can also be taken as a variant of the "though you hurry" element seen in 1209 above.[125] In considering this phrase we should also note that whereas in the previous two examples the first-person referent by which the inscription co-opts the voice of the reader is delayed until late in the inscription, here the stone claims the voice of the passer-by in the very first line, as soon as it has addressed him. Thus, at the beginning of the inscription, the juxtaposed *deico* and *pellege* combine two separate sepulchral elements: the request that the passer-by stop and read, and the notion that the stone itself speaks the text; to us as silent readers, these elements may seem at first to conflict with each other: "Read…what I speak." But if we keep in mind that in antiquity the act of reading was generally bound up with the act of speaking, we can see that there need be no conflict except for that which arises from "*you* read" what "*I* speak," via the co-opting of the reader's voice discussed above.

And so in the second line we move from the frame to more substantial content, first about the tomb and its relation to the deceased herself. The first element of this is a deictic phrase (*heic est sepulcrum*), but one that takes up the whole line, continuing the theme of self-deprecation seen just above by referring to the tomb's lack of beauty (*hau*[126] *pulcrum*;[127] note the wordplay between *pulcrum*

---

for *ī* in open syllables (*heic, mareitom, deilexit, abei*); in the final line, the first syllable of *dixi* is closed, and the second loses its quantity by elision with the following *abei*. The <ei> digraphs do not, however, all accurately represent original diphthongs (cf. *deilexit*).

[124] Lattimore (1962, 228-9) cites several Greek examples, but only a few Latin ones, calling this poem the "earliest and best" Latin example; he notes that "the usual theme is that the dedicator has done all he could, not all he wished, for the dead."

[125] Massaro (1995, 89): he cites as a parallel CLE 1451.2: *quod peto, parua mora est*; thus also Wolff 2000, 126.

[126] A variant of *haud,* correctly used here according to the original alternation of *haud* before a vowel, *hau* before a consonant (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.; *OLD* s.v. *haud*).

and *sepulcrum*[128]) relative to the beauty of the subject (*pulcrai*[129] *feminae*). As mentioned above, such self-deprecation appears elsewhere, with one Greek example expressing a similar contrast, although there the quality discussed is magnitude rather than beauty: σμεικρὸς οὐ σμικρὸν καλύπτω τύμβος ἄνδρα, "I, a small tomb, conceal no small man."[130] In reference to *pulcrum/pulcrai*, Massaro suggests another intended contrast, that of the stated physical perfection of the deceased in life and the "cadavere corrotto" covered by the tomb. He notes further, however, that the adjective *pulc(h)er* is rarely applied to women in inscriptions, and suggests that the word here may be intended to refer not only to the deceased's aesthetic beauty, but her moral qualities as well.[131] Finally, Wolff suggests another motivation for the use of *pulc(h)er* in particular: that Claudia was a member of, or somehow related to, the Claudii Pulchri family.[132]

The next line tells us, while engaging in a *figura etymologica* (*nomen - nominarunt*),[133] that her parents named the girl Claudia; Courtney points out, however, that it is unlikely that the parents would have actually chosen the name, at least if they were citizens.[134] In any case, the expression serves effectively to

---

[127] With no orthographic indication of aspiration: the velar stop in *pulcer*, a native Latin (or at least non-Greek) word, was originally unaspirated, but by the time of Cicero a pronunciation with aspiration had become so common that even he felt compelled to adopt it (*Orat.* 48.160). See also Allen 1897, 62, and Weiss 2009, 59.

[128] See Massaro 1992, 91-92; Courtney 1995, 235; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[129] For the lack of aspiration, see n.127 above; in this word and the following, the stonecutter or composer has chosen to represent the same sound with two different spellings, perhaps indicating a recent or ongoing change; see Weiss 2009, 103: "the spelling <ae> probably indicates that the second half of the diphthong was lowered to e…the first evidence for this change is found in the *SCdB* (186 BCE): AEDEM 'temple' beside AIQUOM 'just.' [For the latter, see also CIL I² 1837 discussed below.] The old spelling AI hangs on as a sporadic variant until around 120 BCE." Cf. also Lindsay 1897, 80.

[130] *EG* 106, I (Athens, 3rd cent. BCE), trans. Lattimore (1962, 228).

[131] Massaro 1992, 92-93; he comments also on the more elevated choice of *femina*, as opposed to the metrically equivalent *mulier* (93-4).

[132] Wolff 2000, 127; Keuleers 2003 ad loc. (but see n.119 above for Massaro's and Keuleers' doubts as to the likelihood that this is a patrician epitaph).

[133] Massaro (1992, 94-95) directs the reader, for parallels, to Plaut. *Asin.* 780 and Ter. *Phorm.* 739, but cf. n.134 below.

[134] Courtney 1995, 235; Massaro also discusses the difficulty (1992, 95) and concludes that the only case in which the sentence is strictly true is if the parents were *liberti* freed before Claudia's birth,

incorporate metrically the name of the deceased, as well as to bring her parents, albeit as unnamed figures, into the portrait created by the epitaph.

In the next line yet another figure is introduced into the nexus of involvement surrounding the epitaph: that of Claudia's husband, to whom the third verse reports that Claudia was devoted: *suom*[135] *mareitum*[136] *corde deilexit souo*.[137] The diction of the line is rather singular: the verb *diligo* is far less common than *amo*,[138] and to find it (rather than *amo*) paired with the intensifier *corde* (itself found nowhere else in the CLE) is even more rare.[139] This line, then, is no mere formulaic expression, but was, it seems, written specifically for this case; as such, the request for an expression of the sentiment contained therein must have come from the commissioner of the epitaph. The emotion described is not, as might be expected, that felt by the still-living husband for his deceased wife, but rather by the deceased wife for her husband. The question of whether love was an expected part of Roman marriage during our period is somewhat fraught,[140] but Treggiari cites this line in particular as evidence of the fact that "from early times it was clearly part of the wife's role to become attached to her husband."[141]

---

and gave her a name that would signify her free-born status; another possibility, however, is that she was adopted, in which case the adoptive parents might have named her. Massaro also brings up another interpretation of the line: that *nomen* should not be understood here not as "name," but as the Greek cognomen Nome (attested, according to Solin, eleven times at Rome), hence "her parents named her Claudia Nome."

[135] With the earlier *-om* retained (as opposed to later *-um*) after *-u-* (see Weiss 2009, 221).

[136] For <ei> here and in *deilexit*, see n.123 above.

[137] *Sou-* for *su-* in the reflexive possessive, reflecting the middle stage of **seu̯- > OL sou̯- > CL su-*; again, as with *-ai* and *-ae*, the alternation seen here (cf. *suom*) suggests that the change was ongoing or recent.

[138] The verb is often translated as "feel affection for" (see, e.g., Falconer's translation of Cic. *Amic.* 28), as opposed to the perhaps stronger *amo*; there does seem to be an element of romantic passion (the *TLL* (s.v. *dīligo*, 1177.20) refers first to *amor inter utrumque sexum*); see, e.g. *Aen.* 1.344, *magno miserae dilectus amore*.

[139] Massaro 1992, 99-100; he cites contemporary literary examples of the use of each.

[140] Dixon (1992, 84), citing Veyne 1978, Hallett 1984, and Bradley 1987, writes that "Scholars have argued that Roman marriage, especially within the political elite … engaged little of the partners' emotions and that there was scant likelihood that affectionate feelings would develop in such a milieu," but concludes (85-90) that this view is misguided; see also the discussion of CIL I² 1347 in ch.3, p.96 above.

[141] Treggiari 1991, 247.

We learn in the next two lines that she had engaged in another important aspect of that role, child-bearing – *gnatos*[142] *duos creauit* – but that only one of her sons survived, *horunc*[143] *alterum in terra linquit, alium*[144] *sub terra locat*.[145] While there should be little doubt that these facts are mentioned because they are the simple truth, Massaro notes the careful diction of the expressions,[146] and Courtney points out that the lines "seems to imitate" a literary epitaph in the Greek Anthology attributed to Heraclitus of Halicanassus[147] that describes a similar situation.[148] Courtney suggests that the composer of our example might have been familiar with the Greek precedent through the *Garland* of Meleager, or from Antipater of Sidon, a Hellenistic Greek poet who had himself imitated Heraclitus' poem (*AP* 7. 454) and visited Rome.[149] The connection seems to me a weak one, as the only parallels between the two poems are the reported circumstance of the loss of one twin (surely not all that rare) and the address to a passer-by;[150] but a relationship cannot be ruled out.

---

[142] With the initial *gn-* cluster retained; see Housman 1928, 1-10 and Weiss 2009, 169.

[143] From **horum-ke*, with the particle *-c* (< *-ce*) (later lost from this form but retained elsewhere in the paradigm) and the accompanying assimilation (Weiss 2009, 343-344).

[144] Bücheler suggests, and Courtney agrees (1995, 235), that the pairing of *alterum* and *alium* is dictated by the meter; Massaro, however, draws attention to what may be similar uses in Lucr. 4.688 and 5.835 (1992, 102).

[145] The form could be either a present or a contracted perfect; Pisani (1960, 34) argues for the latter interpretation, but Courtney (1995, 235) prefers the former; for a summary of opinions, see Massaro (1992, 104-106) who believes present is more likely, seeing a parallel in the "dramatic climax" of this woman's biography to that of the masculine biography of Barbatus, which uses the present-tense *subigit* and *abdoucit*.

[146] 1992, 101-106: he reports that (*g*)*natus* is used more often in poetry than *filius*, and that *creauit* used of a woman has no epigraphic or literary parallels until Vergil (*Georg.* 1.279 and *Aen.*12.271); he also notes and discusses at length the diction and parallelism of *in terra linquit* and *sub terra locat*.

[147] The friend so memorably described as engaging in late-night talks with Callimachus in *AP* 7.80 (= Call. *epig.* 2 Pfeiffer).

[148] *AP* 7.465; in the last two lines the deceased woman tells a similar tale: "I was the wife of Euphro and I did not escape travail, but bringing forth twins, I left one child to guard my husband's steps in his old age, and I took the other with me to remind me of him" (trans. Paton).

[149] Courtney 1995, 235: he offers the latter possibility in part because the publication date of the *Garland* is generally believed to be later than our epitaph, although a date as early as 125 BCE is possible.

[150] So too Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

The next four clauses, which, in the penultimate and final lines, form the end of the personal biography of the deceased, describe Claudia herself and her activities: we learn, via two ablative substantive-attribute pairs, that she was endowed with charming conversation (*sermone lepido*) and a modest walk (*incessu commodo*); furthermore, we read in two verb-object pairs that she looked after her household (*domum seruauit*) and made wool (*lanam fecit*). Massaro cites several precedents for the praise of a woman's speech, but none of them is epigraphic; he reports that the adjective *lepidus* is also rare in epigraphy, appearing only twice more in the CLE.[151] In discussing the next phrase, both Massaro and Courtney note that other mentions of a woman's walk take their tone very much from context – the *incessus* can be provocative,[152] or dignified.[153] Here, Courtney takes the adjective *commodus* as "becoming,"[154] as does Keuleers, who cites this as an early Latin meaning of the word,[155] but Massaro points out that the adjective can be ambiguous as well, used as it is by both Plautus and Terence of prostitutes.[156] It seems absurd, however, to suggest that the composer intended, by the use of these words in particular, to cast any aspersions on Claudia's character,[157] especially as the next two clauses attest further to her modest, housewifely virtues: *domum seruauit* indicates that she managed her household well (an idea discussed often in literary

---

[151] Massaro 1992, 106-107; *lepidus* also appears, applied to a person, at CLE 888.6 and 480.2.
[152] Cic. *Cael.* 49, discussing Clodia; Austin, commenting on the Cicero passage (1960), writes: "'bearing'; [*incessus*] takes its colour from its context; …it implies not simply 'walk' but the whole demeanour." Cf. also, per Courtney, Catullus 42.8.
[153] As in, per Massaro, Plaut. *Mil.* 872 and Verg. *Aen.* 1.405; cf. also Cugusi 2007, 32.
[154] 1995, 236: "…not like that of a harlot."
[155] 2003 ad loc., citing Lindsay 1897, 80 and Ernout 1970, 78.
[156] Massaro 1995, 108: Ter. *Haut.* 521-523, Plaut. *Most.* 255.
[157] Though Massaro considers it a near thing (1992, 108): "Insomma, solo il tono generale del contest potrebbe salvare dal pericolo di una certa ambiguità le espressioni di elogio adoperate per Claudia, alla luce degli usi linguistici attestati in età repubblicana e augustea."

sources but less frequently in inscriptions)[158] and the making of wool is a common, almost cliché, activity for a good Roman housewife.[159]

At this point, in the last line of the inscription, the end of the biographical section of the epitaph – entirely in the third-person – is marked by the rather curt *dixi*, *abei*.[160] In function this tag and farewell are similar to others we have seen (e.g. *tantum est…uale* in CIL I² 1210). *Dixi* in the perfect tense marks the end of the speech referred to by *deico* in the first line; this is the only such use in the CLE.[161] *Abei*, also unparalleled in the CLE,[162] stands as the concluding counterpart to *asta* in the first line,[163] sending the passer-by-turned-reader on his way (albeit without the well-wishing inherent in variants like *uale*), once again the full owner of his voice.

We have much content to consider as we turn to the question of this epitaph's effects. The effect of the opening address to the *hospes*, and of the request that he stop and read, is much the same as in previous examples; but in this case the voice of that *hospes* is co-opted almost immediately, when the inscription describes its own action with *deico* in the first line. With the second line begins the section, entirely in the third person, that creates a portrait of the deceased; with the voice of the passer-by the inscription points to the monument with the deictic *heic* that ties him to the physical space, and asserts that the monument cannot equal the woman in beauty. The third line begins the biography at its beginning, as it were, by reporting that Claudia's parents gave her that name;[164] as such, with each

---

[158] For a detailed discussion of the idea in literary sources, see ibid. 109-110.

[159] So Keuleers 2003 ad loc., who cites Purdie (1935, 67), Courtney (1995, 235 [*sic*:234], and Wolff 2000, 127. Cf. also the illustration of the *calathus* accompanying CIL I² 1930 discussed above, and CIL I² 2161 discussed below in ch.6.

[160] For <i> in *dixi* and <ei> in *abei*, see n.123 above.

[161] For a discussion of literary examples, see Massaro 1992, 112-113.

[162] *Abi* appears elsewhere only in the later CLE 1286, where it appears not at the end of the inscription but in the third of four lines: *quaiso, abi, ne uiola*.

[163] Massaro (ibid., again including numerous literary examples) finds a parallel of the pairing at Plaut. *Epid*. 63.

[164] See n.134 above.

reading, figures of the parents (albeit unnamed) form a part of the scene being created of the deceased in life.

Indeed, other figures enter the scene in nearly every element of this section: in the next line we read that Claudia was devoted to her husband. What would be the effect of such a declaration? If we assume the husband to be the commissioner, the assertion could serve as a form of self-praise for the husband, i.e. that he earned the love of his wife; such a declaration might function as an advertisement, for anyone reading the inscription, that he makes a good husband – a valuable endorsement, perhaps, in a society where re-marriage was common.[165] The husband, however, is nowhere named in the inscription, meaning that the only audience to be reached by this advertisement would be those who already knew the identity of the deceased and her husband. A simpler interpretation is that by recording the love of the deceased for her husband, the commissioner, whether a parent or the husband himself, was praising her by noting the fulfillment of her wifely duty of devotion to her spouse and furthermore, providing consolation with the fact that she did love him, and the fact that her marriage was a happy one.[166]

In the next two lines we read further evidence of Claudia's fulfillment of her wifely duty: she bore two children, although only one of them survived. Again the scene being created by the passer-by's voice expands to include others: the son who survived and the one who died; the latter, though unnamed, receives through this mention a memorialization that, depending on how old he was when he died, he may not have received on his own.[167] We learn, in the next two lines, more about the deceased's bearing and behavior: she is commended for her conversation and her walk, and noted as an excellent housekeeper.

---

[165] Treggiari 1991, 501. Cf. also Humbert 1972.
[166] Cf. the discussion of CIL I² 1347 (*heis sunt duo concordes…*) in ch.4.
[167] For the extremely small number of epitaphs for infants, see Hopkins 1983, 225.

One final aspect of this section deserves our attention. We saw in chapter two in our discussion of CIL I² 1270, Carfinia's epitaph, and of CIL I² 1924 for the boy Gaius Turpidius Severus,[168] how the other people mentioned in an epitaph could be arranged in a sort of hierarchy (in the former case Carfinia's family, then friends, then "everyone," and in the latter, the boy's parents, his friends, and then the public);[169] I suggest that Claudia's biography is arranged in a similar list. The biographical details, beginning after the first two lines, can be divided as follows: line 3: parents; 4: spouse; 5-6: children; and to stretch the idea further, the qualities described in 7-8 are those observable by, and having effects upon, more casual friends and relations. The order of this list seems to be based on chronology rather than intimacy, however: the picture, or rather series of pictures, that is created show the deceased with various members of her changing family over time, and then as one might have seen her from a distance. After this series of scenes, the inscription switches abruptly back to the first-person with *dixi*, and the reader is told to depart (*abei*), signaling that the show is over; his voice is his own once again and the depiction that he has created by his narration is at an end.

We turn now to two more poems addressed to the passer-by with a first-person referent; but whereas in the previous three examples the "I" could be assumed to be the voice of the stone or inscription, in these two cases that assumption is less certain: in the first case, it may be the mother of the deceased, and in the second, it is mourners, possibly the deceased's parents. Nor, in each case, is the first-person referent is so clearly part of a standard 'frame' or introduction of the sort we have seen in the three previous examples.

---

[168] See, respectively, 59ff. and 67ff. above.
[169] Cf. also CIL I² 2273 discussed below, and in ch.6, CIL I² 1215.15: *iucunda…ameicis noteisque omnibus.*

There is such an introduction in the first of the two, CIL I² 1837, but the first-person verb, *credo*, appears in the middle of the inscription, in the midst of the description of the deceased:

> *Posilla Senenia Quart(ae) f.; Quarta Senenia C. l.*
> Hospes resiste et pa[riter] scriptum perlig[e:
> matrem non licitum ess[e uni]ca gnata fruei,
> quam nei esset, credo, nesci[oqui i]nueidit deus.
> eam quoniam haud licitum [est u]eiuam a matre ornarie[r,
> post mortem hoc fecit aiq[uo]m extremo tempore,   5
> decorauít eam monumento quam deilexserat.[170]

> *Posilla Senenia, daughter of Quarta; Quarta Senenia, freedwoman of Gaius.*
> Stranger, stop and peruse what is [duly] written, that it was not permitted for a mother to enjoy her [only] daughter, to whom, I believe, a certain god begrudged existence. Since not at all was it permitted that she, living, be adorned by her mother, after her death she (the mother) has done this fitting thing, at the last time: she has adorned with this monument her whom she cherished.

Six lines of iambic senarii make up the metrical portion of the inscription. Colafrancesco and Massaro date it to the first half of the first century BCE; Keuleers, following Bücheler, suggests the time of Sulla.[171] The *carmen* is concerned with two people, a mother and a daughter,[172] whose names appear in the non-metrical superscript – that of the daughter, Posilla Senenia, and that of her

---

[170] CLE 54: found in the remains of the Sabine settlement of Trebula Mutuesca, near modern Monteleone Sabino; now in the museum at the ruins of the palace of the Caesars on the Palatine. The inscription is carved onto a tablet of four sections that fit together; the left side of the lower tablet is damaged resulting in the lacunae (the restorations above are those found in the CIL and CLE). Across the top of the assembled panels (above the non-metrical filiation) run various carved illustrations: on the left and right edges are bull-heads; inside those, above the two names, are protomes, and in the middle two birds are depicted eating grapes (CIL and CLE ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

[171] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[172] The mother herself is the most likely dedicant; for Roman mothers and daughters in general, see Dixon 1998, 210-232, including a section (212-214) on the statistical frequency of a tomb erected by a mother for a daughter. Dixon notes (213), "dedication of an epitaph by the mother alone strongly suggests that the mother was widowed (or possibly divorced) and that any such loss would be exacerbated by loneliness and the fear that the child's death put her own funeral rites at risk of omission." For the possibility that in this case the girl was illegitimate, see n.173 below; in this case, the mother may have dealt with this by commissioning her own monument, to be shared with her deceased daughter.

mother, Quarta Senenia, as well as their respective filiation (*Quart*(*ae*) *filia*)) and libertination (*G*(*aii*) *l*(*iberta*)).[173]

The first line addresses the passer-by with the same elements we have seen in earlier examples in this chapter: the iambic senarius begins with *hospes*, and then asks that he stop and read what is written (with the inscription acknowledging, as we have seen before, its status as a written text intended to be read): *resiste et par*[*iter*][174] *scriptum perlig*[*e*]. The rest of the inscription is more personalized, describing the mother's reaction to the loss of her only (if we accept [*uni*]*ca* in 2) daughter; we learn little about the daughter herself. The fact that the remaining five lines of the inscription deal primarily with the mother's actions can be explained in part by the fact that this is her monument as well as her daughter's; but as we have seen in other epitaphs for young children (e.g., CIL I² 2139, 1798, and 1924 discussed in chapter two), the focus is often on the reaction of the parents or other mourners rather than on the deceased child.

Indeed, the content of this epitaph is similar to the first two just mentioned, with the tone being one of lamentation, and the emphasis on the burial carried out by the mother. The section begins by reporting that it was not permitted for the mother to enjoy her only daughter (*matrem non licitum ess*[*e*[175] *uni*]*ca gnata*

---

[173] I have followed CIL and CLE in preferring *Quart*(*ae*) *filia*, "daughter of Quarta (Senenia)," to *Quart*(*i*) *f*(*ilia*), "daughter of Quartus," suggested by Degrassi and Kajava (per Keuleers 2003 ad loc.). It is admittedly unusual for a filiation to use the name of the mother rather than of the father, even in the case of illegitimacy (again per Keuleers, see Cagnat 1914, 61 and Sandys 1927, 214); a more normal way to indicate illegitimacy was *Spuri f.* (cf. Harrod 1909, 74-75). The focus in this case, however, on the mother and daughter's relationship could explain such a choice. And in fact *Quart*(*i*) *f*(*ilia*), 'daughter of Quartus' would also be unusual – it would require either that the father was being referred to by his cognomen in the filiation, or the equally unusual circumstance that he had Quartus as a praenomen (again, see Cagnat 1914, 61 and Sandys 1927, 214) – while being less suited to the context than *Quart*(*ae*) *filia*.

[174] Henzen suggests the possibly better *par*[*uom*]; cf. *quod deico paullum est* in the just-discussed CIL I² 1211.

[175] For the perfect passive *licitum esse* = *licuit*, see Lease 1901, 1-2 and Nussbaum 1994, 168 n.28.

fruei[176]); the ambiguity left by the impersonal *licitum esse* is cleared up in the next line, when the agent of that loss is asserted to be some unidentified god: *quam*[177] *nei*[178] *esset, credo, nesci*[*oqui i*]*nueidit*[179] *deus*. The insertion of *credo* into this claim sets this example aside from those we have seen so far: in each of those cases, the first-person referent is confined to the frame, i.e., the introduction or conclusion of the epitaph (while the central, personalized section is entirely in the third person); here, however, the 'voice' of the inscription makes itself known in the middle of the main section. Furthermore, whereas in previous examples the first-person referent has laid claim only to the actions duly carried out by the inscription itself (*uolebam*, referring to a desire for the passer-by to know the contents of the inscription; *rogo*, in a request not to harm the monument; and *deico*, referring to the text itself), here *credo* invests the speaker with a belief, an opinion; for that reason I suggest that the voice seems less likely to belong to the stone or inscription, and more likely to belong to the mother of the deceased girl.[180]

The idea that a death, particularly that of a child, is attributable to the *inuidia* of a god is well precedented, although such a pernicious influence is most often attributed to Fortune, the Fates, Pluto, or Proserpina; an accusation against an single unidentified god is more distinctive.[181] An expression such as *non licuit*

---

[176] For *gn-* in *gnata*, see n.142 above; the <ei> in the deponent infinitive *fruei* is not etymological, the *–ī* ending attached directly to the root being from **i̯i̯V*, syncopated to *–ī* in an open syllable (Weiss 2009, 446).

[177] The verb *inuideo* generally takes a dative, so we might expect *cui* here rather than *quam*, but Cicero discusses (and to some extent defends) its use with the accusative (*Tusc.* 3.20): *male Latine uidetur, sed praeclare Attius; ut enim uidere, sic inuidere florem rectius, quam flori. Nos consuetudine prohibemur; poeta ius suum tenuit et dixit audacius.*

[178] For *nei*, see n.97 above.

[179] The perfect stem *u̯īd-* of *uideo* may come from an e-grade aorist **u̯eid-* (Rix 2001, 664), in which case <ei> is etymologically correct, or from a reduplicated perfect **u̯i̯u̯id-* (Weiss 2009, 409, citing Jasanoff 2003, 228-233), in which case the <ei> reflects the same confusion as *fruei* and *ueiuam* (see n.176 above and 183 below).

[180] This can of course be only a suggestion, as the voice is nowhere identified; the mother is elsewhere in the inscription referred to in the third person. For more verifiable examples of a deceased subject 'speaking,' see ch.5 and 6.

[181] Lattimore 1963, 153-158; see also Lier 1903, 469-477 and Tolman 1909, 33-40. See the last for several examples of *inuidia* (most often attributed to the fates) in Latin literature; both Lattimore and

(here, *licitum ess*[*e*] in 2, and *licitum* [*est*] in 4) is often used to describe the

circumstance.[182] The following line goes on to describe a specific aspect of her

daughter's life that the mother regrets missing, *eam quoniam haud licitum* [*est*

u]*eiuam*[183] *a matre ornarie*[*r*],[184] and how she has attempted to rectify that by

carrying out a similar activity after the girl's death: *post mortem hoc fecit*

aiq[*uo*]*m*[185] *extreme tempore, decorauit eam monument quam deilexserat*.[186] And

indeed, the tomb is well decorated.[187]

This inscription shares certain effects with examples discussed above, but

the addition and modification of various elements result in others that we have not

considered before. The effect of the first line is much the same as that of similar

introductions we have seen in previous examples: it seeks the attention of the

passer-by by addressing him as *hospes*, and by commanding that he stop and read

what is written, thereby acknowledging its own status as a written text. A

distinctive touch, however, appears in the more personal section that comes after:

the first-person verb *credo* invests this section with more immediacy that those we

have seen only in the third-person. The voice of the inscription (and perhaps, in

fact, the voice of the mother) asserts itself, as it also co-opts the voice of the reader,

causing him to add his voice to the opinion it expresses – enlisting him, as it were,

on her side. The present tense of the verb makes the expression of the belief that

much more vivid, grounding the statement at each reading in the reader's own time.

Tolman cite only this example for the *inuidia* of a single, unidentified god in the epitaphs. For *nescioqui deus* cf., perhaps, the Greek δαίμων τις; see E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (1913).

[182] Tolman 1909, 39-40.

[183] Here, as in *fruei*, the <ei> is not etymologically correct: Rix (2001, 215) suggests a pre-form *$g_u ih_3$-$uó$-.

[184] An alternate ending for the passive infinitive, showing a recharacterization with the passive-marking -*r* (Weiss 2009, 446). For the sort of decoration (in life) the epitaph may refer to, see Bartman 2001: she notes (4) that hairdressing scenes appear so frequently on funeral reliefs for women "that they may be said to represent the essence of female life itself."

[185] For <ai>, see n.129 above on *pulcrai*.

[186] For <ei> in *deilexserat*, see n.123 above; for the verb *diligo* in a sepulchral context, see p.155 above on CIL I² 1211.

[187] See n.170 above for a description of the carvings above the inscription.

The effects of the remaining content are similar to those of the two examples mentioned above from chapter three: the picture that is created upon each reading is of the loss to the mother of her child and of the mother's construction of the monument for that child. As a result, the daughter Posilla Senenia receives no real portrait of her own; she is memorialized only in relation to her mother. Here, however, because the mother, Quarta Senenia, is also a subject of the *carmen*, the inverse is also true: we see no picture of her life in general and learn nothing about her but the fact that she lost her daughter; the picture repeatedly created with each reading of the inscription captures only one moment of her life – her loss and mourning of her daughter.

A parent grieving for his daughter is also the main figure of the next example, CIL I² 1222, the last we will consider in this chapter that is clearly addressed to the passer-by:

> Sei quis hauet nostro conferre dolore,
> >   adsit nec parueis flere quead lachrymis.
> quam coluit dulci gauisus amore, puella(m)
> >   …] infelix, unica quei fuerat,
> >   …] fatorum tempora Numphe;   5
> >   …]a domu cara sueis tegitur.
> >   …]us et eo laudata figura
> >   …]c est paruos et ossa cinis.[188]

If anyone wishes to join in our sorrow, let him pay heed and be not able to weep with but small tears. The one whom he has raised (or cherished?[189]), having delighting in her sweet love, the girl the unlucky man […], the only one he had, a bride (or named Numphe?) for the period of her fate […]; […] from her home, dear to her family, she is buried. […] and therefore praised for her beauty, […] and her bones inconsiderable ashes.

---

[188] CLE 969: carved on a marble tablet with very small letters, found in a columbarium at Rome near the Praenestine Gate; the lower left corner was broken off and missing. The tablet is now in the Museo Nazionale Romano delle Terme (CIL ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.; Fassbender 2007, 181-2). N.b. the stone shows, in 2, *flereque ad*, but I have followed the generally accepted restoration to *flere quead*.
[189] *OLD* s.v. *colo* 7a; see n.198 below.

The inscription is written for a girl of unknown class.[190] The meter seems to be elegiac couplets, although the first line is a foot short of a hexameter;[191] the date is the matter of some debate: Massaro and Colafranceso date it to the first half of the first century CE, and Massaro reiterates elsewhere that he believes it to date to the age of Augustus,[192] but Keuleers prefers to date it to the time of Cicero and Caesar, citing the use of marble and certain aspects of the spelling,[193] as well as the fact that the appearance of the dead girl is praised.[194]

The first two lines address the passer-by, but here the composer does not use the standard introduction with which we have become so familiar. Instead of simply calling out to any *hospes*, the first line sets the tone of the inscription and specifies the sympathetic audience that it seeks: *sei*[195] *quis hauet*[196] *nostro conferre dolore*, anyone who wishes to join[197] in "our" pain. The first-person referent *nostro* appears in the first line, establishing immediately that a particular voice is speaking, and moreover the voice of one who suffers; the voice is unidentified, but it obviously belongs to someone mourning the deceased – possibly the male figure designated *infelix*, most likely her father.[198] Furthermore, rather than ask the passer-

---

[190] But *Numphe* in 5, if it is the girl's name rather than the word for "bride" (see below), would suggest that she was a slave.

[191] Bücheler CLE ad loc. suggests adding *proprium* after *nostro*; and indeed, *conferre* should take an object, specifically *se* for the idiom that seems to be used here (*OLD* s.v. *confero* 4b)…perhaps *se ipsum*?

[192] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Massaro 2007a, 137 n.67.

[193] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.: he points out that the use of the marble makes a date before 65 BCE unlikely; also, the letter Y came into use, he says, at the end of the Republic, and the seemingly transitional state of the vowel-orthography points to the late Republic.

[194] But see n.119 above on the perils of using such standards for dating given the lack of evidence.

[195] For the digraphs in *sei, parueis*, and *sueis*, see n.17 above; for *quei* see n.204 below.

[196] *Hauet = auet* ("be eager" + inf.); for initial *h-* where it does not belong, see Weiss 2009, 62-63.

[197] Though, as mentioned above, to translate *conferre* as 'to join,' we ought to have a *se*.

[198] Although he is not identified clearly as such; the man in question could also have been her husband. Our conclusion depends on how we translate *coluit* – "raised," or "cherished"? – and how we understand *unica quei fuerat* – the only daughter he had, or the only wife? For the first question the two alternatives seem equally valid, but *unica quei fuerat* seems to me more likely to refer to a daughter, hence my suggestion that he was her father (cf., however, 1221 in our next chapter where a husband refers to his *coniunxs una*). *Numphe* in line 5, however, if it means 'bride' here, could be taken as evidence against my interpretation.

by simply to stop and look or read, this voice requests that he not only be sympathetic, but weep himself, and with no small tears, *adsit nec parueis flere quead*[199] *lachrymis*.[200] For the inscription to ask the passer-by to weep for the deceased is common enough – it appears in several other examples in the CLE[201] – but a request specifying copious tears is, as far as I know, unique in that corpus. We should also note in considering these first two lines that, although they address the passer-by, in neither of them is there a second-person referent: the invitation to the passer-by is couched entirely in the third person, with the only non-third-person referent being the first-person *nostro*.

The third line, the last that is undamaged, continues in the third person as it begins to describe the deceased girl. It describes her, however, only in relation to the mourning male figure; he is the subject and she the object of the relative clause, in a trend that we saw in similar epitaphs from chapter two mentioned above (CIL I² 2139 and 1798): *quam coluit dulci gauisus amore*. She is, at least, the agent of the "sweet love" in which he delighted.[202] He, designated *infelix*, is again the grammatical subject (and she the object, *puella*(*m*)) of the main clause, which spills over into the fourth line; here, however, the damage begins to impede our reading. The deceased girl seems to be the subject of what follows over the next two lines: she was the only daughter (or wife)[203] he had (*unica quei*[204] *fuerat*), *Numphe* (a bride, or perhaps her name) while she lived, taken (Bücheler suggests [*erept*]*a*,

---

[199] Although the PIE secondary 3rd sg. ending *-t* does have an outcome of -*d* in Latin, reflected in some Old Latin inscriptions (cf. FECED and SIED, *ILLRP* 2), the final -*d* had already been replaced by the primary ending -*t* (< PIE *-ti*) (Weiss 2009, 155) by this time (cf. *adsit*). The -*d* here must be some sort of sandhi-spelling; cf. also ch.2 n.113 on *quot/quod*.

[200] For the Y, see n.193 above; the use of the Greek letter is especially striking combined with the seemingly Hellenizing orthography of <ch>.

[201] See Tolman 1909, 6 and Lattimore 1962, 234-235; for Greek examples inviting others to mourn, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 177.

[202] For *dulcis*, used especially of children, see ch.2 pp.57-58 above.

[203] See n.198 above.

[204] *Quei* = CL *cui*; *quei* may be an etymologically correct archaic spelling (Weiss 2009, 351: CL *cui* < *$k^w o\underset{\circ}{i}\underset{\circ}{i}ei$*, cf. QUOIEI in *ILLRP* 312).

"snatched,") from her home (*domu*); dear to her family, *cara sueis*, she is buried, *tegitur*. Here too the focus is not entirely on the deceased: again, she is depicted in relation to her father, then her household, then her family. In the final two lines she seems at last to take center stage: the damaged lines seem to present an image of her beauty in life (albeit in the judgment of others, *laudata figura*) contrasted with the state of her physical remains (*paruos*[205] *et ossa cinis*).[206]

In considering the effect of this epitaph, we are most interested in the first two lines; the effect of the other lines would be similar to those of others we have seen (e.g. CIL I² 2139 and 1798) commissioned by parents for a prematurely deceased child. What, then, differentiates the effect of the distinctive introduction here from that of others we have seen? Lacking as it does a direct address to the passer-by, it would perhaps be less likely to catch his attention; but on the other hand, perhaps a passer-by conditioned to expect such an address would be equally or more attracted to a poem that offered a more singular introduction.[207] Furthermore, the epitaph does not wish to be read by just anyone: the speaker – the deceased's girl's father, perhaps – who asserts his claim on the reader's voice in the first line, *nostro*, addresses only those willing to join him in mourning the deceased girl, and with no small tears. How many of the passers-by would be willing to perform such a task is difficult to say; perhaps primarily those who had suffered such a loss themselves (and indeed, in antiquity that number would be higher than today) and as such could truly sympathize. The selectivity shown by the opening line is complemented by a certain diffidence in the manner of address: not only does the epitaph not call out to the passer-by as such, it does not address him

---

[205] For -*os* after *u,* see n.28 above.

[206] For what may be a similar contrast, see p.154 above; a similar phrase appears in the later (first cent CE) CLE 1178, 23: *hic cinis exigu*(*u*)*s ossaq*(*ue*) *parua manent*.

[207] *Si quis* is used as an opening in several later poems in the CLE (e.g., CLE 1086, from the first century CE: *si quis forte leget titulum…*), but this is the only extant early example; it seems safe to assume, then, that it was a far less common way to engage the passer-by than, as we have seen, some combination of *hospes* and imperatives for 'stop and read' vel sim.

directly. As a result of these choices, the imagined and actual audience that would be reached by the text might have been smaller, but more likely to respond with the real emotion sought by the commissioner, composer, and the imagined speaker of the epitaph.

Such, then, are the first nine poems of the chapter, each of which acknowledges, in various ways and to varying extents, the assumed audience of passers-by. In the first four examples, although there is an acknowledged audience, there is no specified speaker, that is, no first-person referent. But in the last five, a first-person referent endows the inscription with "I-ness," a self-realization carried out by the co-opting of the voice of the reader; the implications of this have been discussed in detail above. In the first three of those cases, the "I" was apparently the voice of the inscription or stone, and the first-person referents describe activities appropriate to such a figure (wishing to relieve ignorance, asking the reader not to harm the monument, and simply asserting the act of speaking). In the latter two cases, however, the first-person referents seem to go beyond the role duly carried out by the stone, expressing an opinion in the first case (*credo*), and referring to the pain it suffers in the latter (*nostro dolore*); as such, I have suggested that the envisioned speaker might not have been the stone in these cases, but the mother and father respectively. We have seen that the first- and second-person addresses remain, for the most part, confined to a frame that surrounds the more personalized content, beginning and ending the inscriptions; these addresses to the passer-by take on fairly conventional forms. Each of the last two poems discussed, however, departs from these conventions: in 1837, *credo* interrupts the central portion of the inscription, otherwise in the third-person, to vivid effect when spoken by the reader, and in 1222, the standard address to the passer-by and request, in the second person, that he stop and look is replaced by a more singular hypothetical protasis and

169

apodosis, entirely in the third person except for *nostro* (*dolore*), asking that he join the speaker in mourning.

We now turn, then, to the last two poems that belong in this chapter in that they have an acknowledged audience; in the first, who is being addressed is not clear – it may be the passer-by, or the deceased, or both – and in the second, the deceased is the acknowledged audience. As we will see, the content of these examples does not differ markedly from those we have considered thus far, but it will prove worthwhile to consider the change to the intended effects.

In the first of these examples, CIL I² 2273, the second-person address is isolated at the end of the poem, with the rest entirely in the third person:

> *Plotia L. et Fufiae l.*
> Prune haec uoc[i]|tatast ancilla, heic sitast.
> haec | qualis fuerit contra patronum patro|nam parentem, coniugem,
> monumen|tum indicat. salue. saluos seis.[208]
>
> *Plotia, freedwoman of Lucius and Fufia.*
> This woman, called Phryne as a maidservant, is placed here.
> Of what sort she was to her patron and patroness, to her father, and to her spouse, the
> monument shows. Greetings. May you be well.

Warmington dates the inscription to the first century BCE; Keuleers suggests, based on epigraphic evidence, that a date as early as the end of the second century BCE is possible.[209] The meter is generally characterized as *polymetra commatica*: verses 1 and 3 each lack one foot to form a complete iambic senarius, and verse 2 ends with the final two feet of a dactylic hexameter. Keuleers asserts that these elements are sufficient to assume metrical intent,[210] and, following Kruschwitz,[211] notes as well the tricolon of *haec…heic…haec*, assonances in *uocitatast…sitast* and in *patronum*

---

[208] CLE(Engström) 410: the inscription is carved on a limestone tablet, found in the stairs of a city-building in Carthago Nova (Carthagena, Spain).
[209] Warmington 1940 ad loc; Keuleers 2003 ad loc. Kholodniak (CSL 731) dates it to the reign of Claudius, but without justification, and Kruschwitz declares (2002, 48) that Kholodniak was mistaken in doing so.
[210] Though Massaro (2007a, 161) considers it a stretch to call it *commatica*.
[211] 2002, 49; he discusses the question of metrical intent, but does not declare a conclusion.

patronam parentem coniugem monumentum, and the alliteration of *patronum patronam parentem* and *salue saluos seis* as further evidence of poetic aspiration.[212] The poem is preceded by a non-metrical superscript, which indicates that it was written for a freedwoman named Plotia (also called, in the metrical portion, Phryne; for the orthography of the latter, see below).

As mentioned above, the second-person address does not appear until the end of the inscription, and as such there is no introductory part of a framework; nor is there any first-person referent in this case – no "speaker." The portion generally considered to be metrical is thus primarily in the third person, and begins with elements we have seen before: a notation of the deceased's name (cf. *nomen parentes nominarunt Claudiam* in 1211 discussed above), *Prune*[213] *haec uoc*[*i*]*tatast*,[214] here specifying the name (Phryne) by which she was known as an *ancilla* (as opposed to later as a *liberta*, when she was called Plotia),[215] and a locative statement, *heic sitast*, which establishes the real-space presence of the monument and remains. Kruschwitz suggests that *haec* here and in the next sentence originally gestured at a portrait, possibly a sculpture, now lost.[216]

The presence of a sculpture or relief might also help to explain the content of the next section, which asserts that the monument shows how the deceased woman behaved to various members of her circle: *haec qualis fuerit contra*[217] *patronum patronam coniugem monumentum indicat*. The sentence provides a list of those people whom she benefited by her (presumably good) nature, and as such is another version of the relative praise we have seen in previous examples, and more specifically of the lists we saw in two examples (CIL I² 1270 and 1924) in

---

[212] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.
[213] With <u> for the Greek upsilon [y] (see Weiss 2009, 481) and Greek phi represented without aspiration.
[214] For the prodelision/aphaeresis here and in *sitast*, see n.93 on *scriptust* in 1209.
[215] Kruschwitz 2002, 49-50.
[216] Ibid., 50.
[217] For this unusual use of *contra*, see ibid., 50.

chapter three and, as I suggested earlier in this chapter, in 1211. Here the former

master and mistress come first, followed by a parent, and finally her spouse. The

priority of the couple listed first may suggest that they commissioned, or

contributed financially to, the monument, an idea strengthened by the fact that they

are both named in her non-metrical libertination; conversely, the list might be

intended to represent increasing degrees of closeness, with her spouse in the

emphatic final position. How to understand *indicat* is a matter of interpretation: as

this sentence ends the text, the "showing" is obviously not being done by the text

itself – unless, as Kruschwitz also suggests,[218] the very fact that some one or more

of those individuals named commissioned a monument on her behalf indicates their

appreciation and esteem, and thus indirectly how she treated them. Thus we can

take *indicat* as referring to a lost illustration, but equally possible is that the

existence of the monument at all is a testament to the deceased's merits; we see the

verb used in a similar way in its other appearance in the corpus, in CIL I² 1216,

discussed below in chapter six, and such a usage would also call to mind CIL I²

1547, where, as we saw in chapter three, a similar present-tense verb refers to the

act of the inscription and its testimony: [*ing*]*enium declarat pietatis alumnus*

…Valgus patronus.

   Thereafter we come to the second-person addresses, a greeting (*salue*) and a

well-wishing (*saluos*[219] *seis*[220]). Unlike the farewells in previous examples (*uale* at

the end of 1702, 1210, and 1209; *abei* at the end of 1211, all seemingly addressed to

the passer-by), this pair has engendered a certain amount of debate as to its

speaker(s) and addressee(s). Cholodniak first proposes that *salue* should be

imagined as spoken by the passer-by to the deceased, and *saluos seis* spoken by the

---

[218] Ibid, 49 n.34.

[219] For *-os* after u̯, see n.28 above.

[220] The <ei> digraph here does not reflect an etymological diphthong: Classical Latin *sīs* replaced
OL *siēs* (< PIE optative h_1s- $i̯éh_1$-s) on the basis of the plural stem in *sīmus* and *sītis*.

deceased to the passer-by in return, but without any justification for the claim;[221] Beltran follows him, asserting that such an interpretation is "according to other examples," but citing none.[222] A brief survey of the use of the expressions in proximity to each other in Plautus and Terence does indeed seem to indicate that these two expressions are more likely to be used by two individuals respectively to each other than successively as a unit.[223] Nonetheless some scholars do treat them as a unit here: Koch takes the two greetings together as corresponding to the Greek χαῖρε that, as discussed above, could be addressed by the passer-by to the deceased, or vice-versa.[224] Poccetti also takes the two addresses as a unit, citing them (from this inscription in particular) as evidence for the fact that a combination of two different greeting-expressions is a "particularly Latin feature;" he seems to suggest, however, that they should be taken as spoken by the passer-by to the deceased[225] (although he notes elsewhere, citing Conso, that "it is not always easy to identify the parts in such dialogues").[226] Keuleers follows Cholodniak and Beltran; Kruschwitz notes the controversy, but does not himself take a position.[227] The explanation most in accordance with the other examples we have seen of such an element (i.e., a greeting/well-wishing at the end of an inscription)[228] seems to me to be that *salue, saluos seis* is addressed by the inscription to the passer-by, but that interpretation is to some extent belied by the evidence of the usage of the expressions separately in Plautus and Terence.

---

[221] CSL 731 ad loc.: *salue dicit uiator, saluos seis respondet defuncta*.

[222] 1950, 419: "según se conoce por otros ejemplos."

[223] I found no examples of the expressions used successively by one person, but several examples wherein they form an exchange, e.g. Plaut. *Stich.* 316, *Truc.* 358-359, *Mil.* 902; Ter. *Andr.* 802.

[224] 1993, 205.

[225] Poccetti 2010, 106-107: he does not say so explicitly, but includes them in a set of examples apparently addressed to the deceased. He does go on, however, to note other examples where *uale* is addressed to the passer-by as an end to the communication (110-111).

[226] Ibid., 111 n.4, citing Conso 1996, 300.

[227] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.; Kruschwitz 2002, 50.

[228] Cf., discussed above, *uale* in 1702, 1210, 1209, and the non-metrical portion of 1212.

The effects, then, of the first part of the epitaph are fairly straightforward: after the non-metrical superscript that identifies the deceased and her former master and mistress, Plotia is established with each reading as present in the real space of the reader and monument by the locative statement, and her former name of Phryne, together with her former status as an *ancilla*, is noted; the latter element acknowledges the earlier part of her life, making it a part of the enduring portrait each reading of the inscription creates of her. The statement that follows, that the monument shows how she behaved to the people she interacted with in life (arranged, as we saw, in a list similar to those seen in other examples but prioritizing her former master and mistress as likely dedicants) may have referred to a lost illustration of that behavior; but in the absence of a physical portrait, a reading of this statement establishes a textual one of Plotia surrounded by her friends and relations. It is difficult to discuss the effect of the two final addresses, lacking as we do scholarly consensus as to their intended function,[229] but I suggest that they as a unit serve in the same way that *uale* does in the examples discussed above: that is, that the greetings, addressed by the inscription to the passer-by, signal an end to the speech and send him on his way with good wishes as thanks for the use of his voice. We cannot rule out, however, that one or both of the phrases is intended to address the deceased,[230] or to be spoken by the deceased, the implications of which, as we will see in the next chapter, are more complex.

---

[229] Two other examples concluding with a greeting to an unclear addressees were considered for inclusion in this section but rejected, one for lack of support for its metricity (CIL I² 1349, found at Rome: *D. Octavi D. l. Modiari | D. Octavi D. f. Col | Pontia uxsor |fruge, bona, pudica, | aue*; see Massaro 2007a, 158) and one due to the fact that it is too fragmentary to offer much evidence (CIL I² 2206, found at Aquileia: *[…]diphilus | […]ne auaritie | […]it ad | […] uenit uale*). See n.230 below for one further such omission.

[230] In support of that possibility, i.e. showing *salue* as a greeting seemingly addressed to the deceased, cf. one other epitaph considered for inclusion in this section but rejected for lack of support for its metricity, CIL I² 1408: *C. Veius T. f. Mai(us) Basilia Sp. f. Posilla. Homo frugi et tu, optuma femina, salue*. The inscription, found at Rome, is included by Cholodniak in his *CSL* as a possible (albeit faulty) hexameter, but Bücheler does not include it in the CLE, nor does Keuleers in his study.

For an example that clearly does address the deceased, let us turn to our final poem in this chapter, CIL I² 1603:

> *Cn. Taracius Cn. f. vixit a. XX, ossa eius hic sita sunt*
> Eheu heu Taracei, ut acerbo es deditus fato. |
> non aeuo exsacto uitai es traditus morti,
> sed cum te decuit florere aetate | iuenta,
> interieisti et liquisti in maeroribus matrem.[231]

> *Gnaeus Taracius, son of Gnaeus, lived twenty years. His bones are placed here.*
> Alas, Taracius, how harsh a fate have you suffered. With the period of your life not yet run out, you were handed over to death, but when it was proper that you bloom with the age of youth, you died and you left your mother in sorrow.

The inscription, written in dactylic hexameter,[232] is generally dated to the first half of the first century BCE.[233] The non-metrical superscript indicates that the subject was a young man named Gnaeus Taracius, marked as free-born by his filiation, who lived to be twenty years old; the superscript also includes a locative statement establishing the presence of his physical remains (*ossa*). As we will see, although this poem shares with the previous examples in this chapter the fact that it is addressed to a specified audience, the fact that it is explicitly addressed to a different audience – the deceased himself, rather than a passer-by – changes its effect, although the content is not especially different from other examples we have seen for the prematurely dead. We should note also that nowhere is there a first-person referent – no "speaker" identifies himself or explicitly claims the voice of the passer-by, as in certain examples we have seen above.

The inscription begins vividly, with exclamations of mourning: *eheu heu*; although neither Lattimore nor Tolman explicitly mentions the inclusion of such

---

[231] CLE 362: the inscription, carved on a marble tablet and accompanied by a bust of a young boy, was found at Capua and is now kept in the garden of an amphitheater there (CIL ad loc.; Solin 2007, 204).

[232] With elision of final -*s* in three of the hexameters; see Massaro 1995, 51 and 2007a, 133f. Kruschwitz considers it one of the oldest examples of epigraphic *carmina* entirely in hexameters (2003, 67; for a detailed discussion of the metrical features, see 68-69).

[233] Thus Bücheler (CLE ad loc.), Warmington 1940 ad loc., Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc., and Solin 2007, 205; for a summary of the evidence, see Kruschwitz (2003, 67-68) who concludes that a date in the nineties or eighties BCE is most likely.

exclamations in epitaphs, within the corpus we have at least one other example, perhaps notably in another poem in which the deceased plays a role.[234] Thereafter the first word is the deceased's name in the vocative, *Taracei*,[235] our first indication that the (unidentified) speaker is addressing the deceased. The exclamation that follows, lamenting the harsh fate Taracius has suffered, confirms the fact that we are talking to the deceased with a second-person verb: *ut acerbo es deditus fato*.[236] The fate of the deceased is characterized as *acerbus*, as it was in CIL I² 1924, where we saw that the adjective could essentially be used as a gloss for the Greek ἄωρος.[237] A further periphrastic description of the boy's death, with an emphasis on the untimely nature of it, continues over the next three verses: the second verse asserts that Taracius was handed over to death when the period of his life had not yet run out, *non aeuo exsacto*[238] *uitai*[239] *es traditus morti*;[240] the third uses an image for youth common in this context, that of blooming[241] (*sed cum te decuit florere aetate iuenta*[242]); and the fourth begins with the bald, final summary of death, *interieisti*,[243] and describes the event in relation to the deceased's mother: *et liquisti*

---

[234] CIL I² 1221b, where the deceased wife speaks; *heu* is also reconstructed, but not extant, in CIL I² 3449h, discussed above in ch.3. Massaro (1992, 51) cites a Greek parallel with ἀιαῖ, and Sourvinou-Inwood (1995, 177) mentions Greek examples that include οἴμοι.

[235] For the name, see Kruschwitz 2003, 70.

[236] For the passive here (in the context of the wider use of the passive in Republican poems in the CLE), see de Melo 2007, 109f.; Kruschwitz (2003, 69) notes the parallel structure of *es deditus fato* and *es traditus morti*.

[237] See ch.2 n.96.

[238] For the orthography, see Kruschwitz 2003, 68.

[239] For <ai>, see n.129 above on *pulcrai*.

[240] The periphrasis of being "given to death" with *do, dare* or a compound thereof appears nowhere else in our corpus but several times elsewhere in the CLE; see, e.g., 419 *tradita morti,* 471 *reddita morti*, 555 *morti dari*; cf also Enn. *scaen.* 334 and Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.197.

[241] Lattimore 1962, 195-197: he mentions the verb *florere* as common in Latin examples; see also, per Kruschwitz (2003, 70), Morelli 2000, 70-71.

[242] For the orthography, see Sandys 1910, 828; for its use as an adjective, see Kruschwitz 2003, 71.

[243] The <ei> here is not an etymologically correct archaic spelling but probably reflects a dissimilatory avoidance of -ii- (Allen 1893, 11). Weiss (2009, 429) points out that the *SCdB* does have ADIESE (CL *adiisse*), ADIESET, and ADIESENT, but although he reports that Meyer (1998, 223) believes them to be the outcome of an old perfect $*h_1ih_1oi$-, Weiss believes that they too are examples of dissimilation.

in maeroribus matrem.[244] In this figure, perhaps, we have a candidate for the role of speaker, although we cannot be sure; but the description of a mother in mourning accords well with the *eheu heu* that begins the inscription.[245]

And so we see that the tone and content of this inscription, apart from the addressee, are not very different from that of other examples we have seen for the prematurely deceased: there is a tone of lament throughout, with periphrastic descriptions of the loss of the deceased, focusing on the disturbance of the natural course of life, and a depiction of the mourning of those left behind, particularly the mother. What differentiates it, then, is only that it is addressed to the deceased himself. Other than the Scipio epitaph CIL I² 11,[246] also for a young man prematurely dead,[247] this is the only example in our corpus that addresses the deceased; an address to the deceased, then, is a far rarer mode of fictive orality in poetic epitaphs than, say, an address to the passer-by, the commonness of which we have seen in this chapter. And indeed, the convention of addressing the deceased has received relatively little scholarly attention:[248] Tolman is the only one of the classifiers of sepulchral *topoi* to mention it, and he does so only briefly.[249] Conso includes it as a possibility in his framework of fictive orality, but with the assumption of an accompanying first-person referent, an element that, as mentioned

---

[244] For a parallel, Cugusi (2007, 18 n.88) directs the reader to Cicero's translation of Solon's *elogium* at *Tusc.* 1.117, *linquamus amicis maerorem*.

[245] For the device of a speaker referring to himself in the third person, see Mankin (2011) on *De Or.* 3.4.

[246] Discussed above in the introduction, pp.38-44, and in the conclusion, pp.283-285.

[247] Courtney's only comment (1995, 226) on the fact that CIL I² 11 is addressed to the deceased is that such an address "emphasizes, though in a restrained fashion, the pathos of his early death."

[248] The formula *sit tibi terra leuis*, so common in later inscriptions, is itself an address to the deceased, but considerations of the formula (e.g. Lattimore 1962, 65-73) do not tend to address in what capacity the deceased is imagined to hear them.

[249] Tolman 1909, 3; he cites sixty examples in the CLE. No discussion of the convention as such appears in Lier 1903 or Lattimore 1962; studies of Roman epitaphs in general (Galletier 1922, Purdie 1935, Wolff 2002) also fail to address the convention specifically.

above, is absent here.[250] We are left, then, to fend for ourselves in considering the effects of such an address in this context. The question of to what extent the spirit or some other aspect of the deceased was believed genuinely to remain at the gravesite, i.e. of immortality, is a fraught one, and outside the scope of this study; what we are interested in is what effect of a reading of such an inscription would be intended to have. What would be the effect, then, for the deceased and for the reader? We have argued that the naming and description of the deceased in other examples would call up a portrait of the deceased in life, with varying focus, elements, and detail depending upon how he or she is depicted in the epitaph; the reader effects this portrait with his reading aloud of the inscription. We have seen further that the voice of the reader could be co-opted by the inscription to express the desires and beliefs of the inscription or stone, and in some cases, its commissioner and/or composer. We see here a different calling-up, and the co-opting of the voice of the reader for a different purpose: the deceased would be summoned in the capacity of listener, silent but attendant, as the dedicant of the epitaph (perhaps the boy's mother) speaks to him through the borrowed voice of the passer-by. With each reading, then, the dedicant could communicate once more with the deceased, albeit with a silent, unresponding version. The deceased would be another spectator, a silent witness, of the portrait created of his life by the inscription. In this case, the voice of the reader would re-enact the lament of the mourners (or again, of the mother in particular if we understand her to be the speaker), just before summoning the deceased as listener by the vocative *Taracei*; with each reading, the reader exclaims at the harshness of the fate Taracius has suffered, seeming to sympathize with him personally by means of the second-

---

[250] Conso 1994, 295-296, under II.3.1., "full fictive orality," together with addresses by the dead to the living. Apostrophes to the dead in literature, while not uncommon (see Mankin (2011) on *De Or.* 3.12), also tend to have a clear speaker.

person address. With the second and third lines the reading creates a portrait of the deceased in his blooming youth, and with the fourth an image of his mother, captured indefinitely in a state of mourning her son. As the reader creates these images, the silent, listening Taracius stands by and receives the address, receives the laments and knows that he is mourned. By its address to the deceased, then, the poem adds another figure to the picture it creates: the silent listener, the witnessing shade of the deceased.

In order to summarize the evidence we have seen in this chapter (that is, in epitaphs that acknowledge an audience in some way, but in which the deceased plays no active role), it will be useful to note general trends we have observed, and then make certain more specific observations. In these examples, acknowledgement of audience has most often meant speech directed at the passer-by, the default audience for such inscriptions, and it has come in certain forms: a call to that passer-by with a term such as *hospes*; a request to stop and look at or read the inscription; a request not to criticize or harm the monument; and finally, a dismissal or farewell. For the most part these audience-directed elements appear at the beginning or end of the inscription, framing content about the deceased, generally presented in the third-person and including for the most part elements that we have come to expect from our investigations in the previous two chapters: the name of the deceased, certain elements of biography, praise that depicts him or her in a social context, and locative statements that establish the location of the monument or remains relative to the reader. In many cases the imagined speaker of the text is unidentified, and we are left to assume that the speaker is the inscription itself; in some cases that is made explicit, when the inscription itself notes that the stone is speaking. In certain cases this assumed speaker is endowed with "I-ness," and refers to itself in the first person; in these cases the voice of the reader is fully and explicitly co-opted by that of the imagined speaker, be it the stone or some

179

other figure (the latter being more likely when the self-described action goes beyond the duties appropriate to the stone itself). All of the above elements can be said to attract the attention of the passer-by, to engage him as a reader of the inscription and thereby to enlist him as a participant in the act of communication, of depiction, of the message the inscription was commissioned to convey. Finally, we have seen that the deceased could also be an addressee, though this is a far rarer occurrence in our corpus; the content in such a case is not drastically different than in other examples, but an element is added to the effect of each reading: the deceased must be imagined as present in some capacity to hear the text, standing as a silent witness to the portrait created of him by the content of the inscription. We will see in the next chapter that the deceased can also play a more active role in the "fictive orality" created upon each reading of the inscription.

CHAPTER FIVE: DEAD SPEAK, NO AUDIENCE

The eighteen poems we will consider in these next two chapters are in one way markedly different from all those considered thus far: each of them is, at least in part, 'spoken' by the deceased subject of the epitaph. As we will see, much (but not all) of the content – the information presented – is similar to what we have seen in other examples, albeit presented in a different way and, to some extent, to different effect; as such, we will divide these poems along lines parallel to the divisions used for previous chapters. The nine poems in this chapter show no acknowledgment of their audience; the first group of three poems also contains no explicit locative statement, but the second group of six poems does contain such a statement of location, through deixis or some other means. In the subsequent chapter (our last), we will consider the nine poems spoken by the deceased to a specified audience.

These first three poems, then, are parallel to the 'endocentric' poems we considered in chapter three; here, however, spoken by the deceased (and as such engaging in Conso's 'intermediate' level of fictive orality[1]), they are to a degree tied by default to the location of the monument, by virtue of the fact that the monument stands as the metonymic marker of the deceased among the living. And indeed, each of these three poems, while lacking an explicit locative statement, acknowledges in some way its surroundings. In the first, CIL I² 1822, the speaker mentions the *aeterna domus*, presumably referring to the tomb:

> *...lleius L. l. Philoxsenus |*
> *...Ɔ. et M. l. Philocratea |*
> *...leius L. et Ɔ. l. Philocalus |*
> *...leius L. l. Philadelpus |*
> …]u ullius uixsi quom fide.

---

[1] 1994, 294: when the deceased speaks, but to no one in particular.

>...]runt, uítam laudarunt meam.
>...ho]nestam aeternam deueni domu[m.][2]

> *...leius Philoxsenus, freedman of Lucius; ...Philocratea, freedwoman of...and Marcus;*
> *...leius Philocalus, freedman of Lucius and of Gaiae; ...leius Philadelpus, freedman of*
> *Lucius.*
> I have lived with loyalty [without…] from anyone. They […], they praised my life. […]
> honorable life I have reached my eternal home.

The metrical portion of the inscription, damaged though it is, is generally considered to be iambic senarii.[3] Massaro notes that the poem is comprised of monostichs rather than distichs (the latter being far more common in epigram), and that the predicate occupies the penultimate position in each line (taking *quom fide* in the first line as one unit).[4] The inscription is generally dated to the first century BCE, with Keuleers tentatively suggesting a date between 100 and 75 BCE.[5]

This inscription is unique in our corpus in that although it is spoken in the first-person singular (*uixsi, deueni*), it seems to be generic, intended to serve as an epitaph for each of the four freedpeople whose names are listed above it:[6]

---

[2] CLE 72: carved on a limestone tablet found in 1888 at Massa d'Albe (the ancient Marsi settlement of Alba Fucens) in a Barnabite monastery; the left side was already missing. The current location is unknown (CIL ad loc., Keuleers 2003 ad loc., Buonocore 2007, 213).

[3] Bücheler's (CLE ad loc.) restoration (which has Massaro's approval):
> Sine lite et quest]u ullius uixsi quom fide.
> qui bene cogno]runt, uítam laudarunt meam.
> post uitam ho]nestam aeternam deueni domu[m].

Massaro (2007a, 148) says that the remains of the verses are metrically correct: 'ineccibili.'

[4] Ibid.

[5] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) cites the fairly consistent spelling of aspiration (but notes the lack thereof in the last syllable of *Philadelpus*), and the archaic spellings of *quom* (cf. CIL I² 708) and *uixsi* (for the orthography, cf. *Philoxsenus* in the non-metrical portion, *saxsolus* in CIL I² 1209, *uixsit* (CIL I² 1218 and 1761), and *deilexserat* (CIL I² 1837)), but notes that these may also be cases of deliberate archaizing.

[6] In looking at this generic/collective epitaph, we should perhaps note that collective military epitaphs were by no means as common among the Romans as among the Greeks (cf., e.g., the Spartans' Thermopylae epitaph reported by Herodotus (7.228) and attributed to Simonides; in fact, there is only one extant example, found in Romania (Hope 2003, 90-92). It is also possible that the *carmen* was intended to serve as an epitaph for only one of the freedpeople listed, perhaps the last (a situation parallel to our next example, CIL I² 1570). The inscription is now lost, so we cannot investigate whether differences in the epigraphy suggest that the names were added at the same time or at different times, or that the *carmen* was added at the same time (with similar letter shapes) as one of the names in particular. The generic nature of the content (as far as we can tell, given the damage) seems to me, however, to support the idea that it was intended to serve as a collective epitaph; such is also the interpretation of Keuleers (2003 ad loc.).

Philoxsenus, Philocrates, Philocalus, and Philadelpus.[7] We should expect the qualities described, then, to be very basic, default examples of praise, and such is indeed the case. Moreover, the nature of the praise here reflects a tendency with which we have already become very familiar: the speaker praises himself not absolutely, but in relation to his contemporaries.

The first part of the first line is lost, but in the remaining section the speaker asserts that s/he has lived with good faith, that is, loyalty to others: *uixsi quom fide*. The same phrase appears also (in the same line-position) in CIL I² 1218, which we will see in our next group of poems; we also saw *c[u]m magna fide* in 1210 in the previous chapter. In each of those examples the subject was a freedman, as are the subjects here; *fides* seems to have been a quality particularly valued in slaves, or former slaves.[8] To see three similar variants in so small a corpus seems to indicate that this was indeed a common form of praise in this context: loyalty to others was a quality clearly valued in this particular class by contemporary society, to such an extent that it frequently makes up a part of the content chosen for inclusion in the small space devoted to the memorialization of the deceased.

In the second line, the speaker asserts that others praised his life: *uitam laudarunt meam*. Just who praised it is unclear, but Bücheler's suggestion of [*qui bene cogno*]*runt* seems as good as any; the point, once again, is that the speaker wishes to assert the value he held in the eyes of his contemporaries. Again, praise of this sort is not unique even in our small corpus: we saw, in CIL I² 1547,

---

[7] Three of them, Philoxsenus, Philocalus, and Philodelpus, were freed by a man named Lucius, although in the case of Philocalus the inverted G (for Gaia, a generic name for a married woman; see Allen 1908, 63) attributes the former ownership and manumission to Lucius' wife as well. They may all have been freed by the same Lucius, or by, for example, a father and son who both used that praenomen. The fourth name is that of a woman, noted as freed by a different master, Marcus; Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) suggests that she may have been the wife of one of the freedmen, or a member of the same burial association. The shared prefix of all four names seems too striking to be a coincidence, but no one has commented on it; perhaps it suggests that the four were relatives, part of a family that favored that prefix in naming.

[8] See *TLL* 6.1.680.18 s.v. *fides*.

Queinctius Gaius Protymus called [*su*]*mma qum laude probatus*.[9] What remains of the praise in these first two lines, then, is both fairly generic and also in accordance with what we have come to expect from many of the examples we have already seen.

It seems likely that the beginning of the third line concluded the praise for the (generic) subject: [*ho*]*nestam* seems a likely restoration of the remaining damaged word, and Bücheler's full restoration of the section, [*post uitam ho*]*nestam*, should remind us of the first line of CIL I² 1761: *honestam uitam uixsit*....[10] The latter part of the third line, *aeternam deueni domum*, should also sound familiar: we have seen several references to the tomb as an eternal home for the deceased,[11] an idea that accords well with another relevant idea, that of the tomb as an enduring metonymic marker for the deceased among the living. The diction here, however, includes an element we have not yet seen: the speaker does not simply mention his eternal home, or characterize his tomb in that familiar way, but states that he has reached – *deueni* – his eternal home. We might be tempted to take this rather as a reference to some sort of afterlife,[12] but no specifics are mentioned; given the frequent characterizations in other examples of the tomb as an eternal home, the latter interpretation seems more likely here.

In considering the effects of this epitaph for its four subjects and on the passer-by who might read it, two factors especially stand out. The first factor is one we will discuss throughout this chapter: that the epitaph is delivered in the first person, imagined as being spoken by its deceased subject, as indicated already in

---

[9] Cf. also in our next example (CIL I² 1570) *boneis probata*.

[10] See discussion 62ff. above.

[11] Cf. CIL X 2971 (discussion 109ff. above), CIL I² 1702 (121ff. above), 1930 (128ff. above), and also 1215 and 1319 discussed later in this chapter.

[12] The question of people's expectations of immortality in the Greco-Roman world is a fraught one (see Lattimore 1962, 44ff.): various conceptions of an afterlife are attested, but the evidence is scanty and hard to reconcile. We can at least conclude that no one unified view existed comparable to the modern Christian concepts of heaven and hell; see Pikhaus 1978 and Wypustek 2012.

the very first line by the first-person verb *uixsi*. The second is unique in our corpus: the fact that the poem was meant to serve for all four subjects but spoken as if by only one person, a generic representative.

In regard to the first: we have argued that a reading of many of the epitaphs seen thus far would create a portrait of the deceased, that is, that such a reading would reify the deceased's former existence, or at least the version presented by the epitaph. These portraits have had more and less detail, and have also been framed by interactive elements that catch the attention of the deceased, co-opt his voice, and then release it and send him on his way. The identification of the first-person referent with the deceased, however, changes drastically the presentation of the portrait: the deceased is envisioned as speaking on his own behalf. The "I-ness" discussed in the previous chapter no longer belongs to the stone or the inscription (Burzacechi's "oggetti parlanti"), but to the deceased him- or herself; as such, the image or portrait called up by each reading is no longer remote and silent, but active, engaging directly by means of the reader's voice, both with that reader and anyone else nearby. By this device the deceased can, as it were, live again – engage among the living via the inscription carved on his or her metonymic marker, and via the voice of the passer-by who reads it – and the reader becomes an extension of the monument as well as a listener.

In the current case, however, this powerful effect is dulled by the second factor mentioned above: the poem is a generic one, and as such, the figure called up by it has no name, nor even gender (three of the subjects are male, one of them female, and the poem itself (deliberately, perhaps) gives no indication as to the gender of its subject). Nor are the qualities attributed to it by the praise in the poem distinctive; the figure is loyal, praised, and honest – surrounded by his approving contemporaries – but these are qualities frequently mentioned in this context, and do little to create an individualized portrait. We must assume, nonetheless, that the

185

claim to even this dim portrait was preferable for the subjects of the epitaph to no portrait at all; they (presumably: no other commissioner is mentioned) went to the effort to pay for the monument and choose the text, so it must have had some value to them. The passer-by would declare the admirable qualities claimed by the (not fully identified or identifiable) deceased speaker, and perhaps thereby be inspired to emulate them; he would also, with his voice, assert and reify the arrival of that representative deceased speaker to his or her eternal home, the tomb itself.

Our next example, CIL I² 1570, is also accompanied by several names, but the poem is clearly spoken by one of them in particular, with deictic references to certain others also named (and as such presumably buried) there:

> *P. Larcius P .l. | Neicia*
> *Saufeia A. l. | Thalea*
> *L. Larcius P. f. | Rúfus*
> *P. Larcius P. f. | Brocchus*
> *Larcia P. ꓛ. l. | Horaea*
> Bonéis probáta, inuéisa sum á nulla probá.
> fui parens dominéis senibus, huic autem opsequens.
> ita leíbertáte illei me, hic me decoraat stolá.
> á púpulá annos ueiginti optinui domum
> omnem. supremus fécit iúdicium diés,
> mors animam éripuit, non ueitae órnátum apstulit.
> *L. Eprius Chilo uiat(or) tr. pl. [E]pria cpi…*[13]

Publius Larcius Nicia, freedman of Publius; Saufeia Thalea, freedwoman of Aulus; Lucius Larcius Rufus, son of Publius; Publius Larcius Brocchus, son of Publius; Larcia Horaea, freedwoman of Publius and Gaia
Praised by good men, I was not disliked by any good woman. I was obedient to my elderly masters, moreover to this man I was accommodating. Thus they ornamented me with my freedom, and he with a stola. From when I was a little girl, for twenty years I administered the whole household. My final day made a judgment: death snatched my soul, but has not taken away the beauty of my life.
Lucius Eprius Chilo, traveller, tribune of the plebs,…

The inscription is dated by Colafrancesco and Massaro to the first half of the first century BCE; Keuleers suggests the period of Caesar, based on the use of the apex,

---

[13] CLE 56: the inscription was found at Minturnae, but then lost; our text comes from three manuscript versions: Pontanus (1st ed, (1481) f. 9; 2nd ed. (1538) p. 72); Iucundus (cod. Ver. f. 163 and f. 208), and Bononius (cod. Ottob. f. 34; cod. Traiect. f. 128) (CIL ad loc., Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

the notation of aspiration in the Greek names, and the form *huic* (as opposed to earlier *hoic*).[14] The metrical portion is written in iambic senarii; Massaro is impressed with the structure and originality of the verses.[15]

The monument serves for all five people named in the superscript, but the poem itself is an epitaph specifically for the last-named figure, a freedwoman named Larcia Horaea. The content offers a narrative generally agreed upon by scholars: she was the slave of, and subsequently freed by, the married couple (also freedpeople) listed first;[16] the two intervening names are the sons of the couple (born after the parents' manumission, as indicated by their filiations), one of whom Larcia Horaea married (likely P. Larcius Brocchus, whose name is listed just before hers). The name underneath the metrical portion is most likely the superscript of the next poem documented in the manuscript, rather than a part of this one.[17]

The poem begins with praise for the deceased (spoken by the deceased Horaea herself); as we have seen in so many examples, the praise is related to her interactions with others: first wider society, and then her family. She was *boneis probata*; we have seen this particular epithet before, in CIL I² 1547, where Queinctius Gaius Protymus was called [*su*]*mma qum laude probatus*.[18] Here the praise goes one step further: Horaea was *probata* by not just anyone, but by *boneis*.[19] Further, no good woman looked askance at her: *inueisa sum a nulla*

---

[14] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc., Keuleers 2003 ad loc.; cf. Plessis 1905, 164-5, who considers the <ei> for *ī* spelling an archaizing affectation (certainly the case for *inueisa*, at least, as the *ī* in *inuisa* is not of diphthongal origin). In fact *huic*, as the Classical Latin form, is not that informative; *hoic*, the variant Plessis and Keuleers cite as the earlier form, is quite rare, appearing just three times in the CIL.

[15] Massaro 2007a, 146: "insomma, un carme che denuncia un autore non solo tecnicamente esperto, ma anche capace di una certa originalità sia nella struttura che nelle espressioni."

[16] For the notation *G*(*aiae*) *l*(*iberta*), see n.7 above.

[17] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[18] Which in turn reminds us of *laudarunt uitam meam* in the example discussed just above, 1822; Plessis (1908, 165) cites two similar phrases in later sepulchral poems: CIL VI 23685 *bonis probata*; II 3476 *uixit probus, probis probat*(*us*).

[19] Plessis (1908, ibid.) cites, in connection with this sentiment, Accius 314 Ribb., Livy 27.8.6, and Ovid *Pont.*1.2.140.

proba.[20] We have seen a form of *inuideo* before, in 1837 discussed in chapter four (*quam…nesci*[*ioqui i*]*nueidit deus*) but there, as seems to be more common in this context, it was describing the jealousy or grudge of a malicious deity.

Horaea then goes on to describe her relations with her family. She was obedient to her elderly masters, *parens domineis senibus*, and accommodating (*opsequens*) to a certain man (presumably her husband) indicated by the deictic pronoun *huic*. The adjective *parens* is not a surprising one to find attributed to a slave/freedwoman (cf. the popularity of *fidelis* as an epithet in this context discussed above); *obsequium*, according to Treggiari "less an attitude of mind than a manner of behaving obligingly," is a standard wifely virtue, with *obsequens* and its variants frequently applied to wives in epitaphs.[21] In the next line Horaea describes the results of this good behavior: they (*illei*: her masters) ornamented her (*decoraat*[22]) with freedom, and this man (*hic*: Brocchus, most likely) with a *stola*, that is, he married her.[23] The deictics here are likely textual, that is, gesturing at the names listed above the inscription (the parents' names are further from the text of

---

[20] The specification *nulla proba* makes one wonder whether she did after all suffer being *inueisa* (for her freedom and marriage, a swift rise in status) by women (or men) who were not *probus*. For the passives, including the use of *inuideo* (cf. also n.181 in ch.4) see de Melo 2007, 110.

[21] See Treggiari (1994, 238-240), who gives a substantial discussion and notes that the term was also (though not as frequently) applied to children in relation to their parents, as well as other relationships. Harrod (1909, 45) summarizes its use as applied to the deceased in CIL VI as follows: "*obsequens* and *obsequentissimus* are used of a wife 7 times; of a freedman or freedwoman 5 times; of a son 4 times; of a husband twice; and of a mother once. That it sometimes had little of its proper meaning 'submissive' is amusingly shown by 20158, wherein the son is called *obsequentissimus* and at the same time *huius loci totius dominus*."

[22] There has been much discussion, but no consensus, as to whether this form is a present (with the geminate vowel showing the original quantity of the 3rd pres. ending) (Allen 1908, 63; Plessis 1908, 165-6, although the latter suspects archaizing here too) or a syncopated perfect (Pontanus (one of the original transcribers of the inscription), Bücheler (but he doubts the reading, preferring *decorat*; CLE ad loc., cf. Cholodniak CSL ad loc.), and Massaro (2007a, 146)). The use of the geminate vowel does seem odd, given the use of apices elsewhere in the inscription; also, such geminate spellings were often reserved for accented syllables (see Vine 1993, 267-286).

[23] The stola being the garment characteristic of a Roman matron, as a toga was of a citizen (Plessis 1908, 166; Allen 1908, 63). For a list of examples from the CIL reflecting other such marriages, see Purdie 1935, 83 and Wolff 2000, 67-68.

the poem than Brocchus', hence *illei* and *hic*); they also may gesture at the physical remains of those mentioned, present in the same tomb.[24]

Horaea then goes on to describe her role in the household, apparently an important one: starting from her girlhood, *a pupula*,[25] she managed the entire household for the next twenty years, *annos ueiginti optinui domum omnem*. That management of the household fell to the Roman *matrona* is well known,[26] although it was usually the *materfamilias* who held this role. In this case, at least according to the epitaph, the role fell to Horaea rather than to her husband's mother, Saufeia Thalea; the latter woman may have died earlier. Perhaps the commissioning of the family tomb, and the accompanying inscription, was one of the services Horaea carried out, which would help explain the focus on her rather than the other members of the family.

In closing, the inscription refers to Horaea's death, but the focus remains nonetheless on her life. According to Allen, the periphrasis *supremus fecit iudicium dies*[27] should mean the final day "pronounced judgment" on her life,[28] looking forward to the next two clauses, which assert that although death took her soul (*mors animam eripuit*[29]), it could not take away the adornment of her life, *non*

---

[24] For an additional interpretation of the deixis here, see discussion of effect below.

[25] Although the meaning is clear (based on the male version *a puero*), the phrase is distinctive: Plessis (1908, 166) finds no other uses of it. He reports that for *pupula*, to mean 'little girl' is itself rare (*TLL* 10.2.2672.44 records only this example and one other, CIL III 804), though he is able to cite two examples of *pupulus* meaning 'boy' (Catull. 56.3 and Sen. *Ad Lucil.* 12.3).

[26] We have seen praise of housewifely qualities elsewhere, especially in the epitaph for Claudia (CIL I² 1211).

[27] For the personification of *supremus dies*, cf. *Aen.* 2.324 (*uenit summa dies*) and Prop. 2.28.32 (*et deus et durus uertitur ipse dies*). On Hor. *C.* 1.13.20 (*suprema citius…die*), Nisbet and Hubbard write that "*suprema* is the ordinary adjective for the day of death."

[28] Allen 1908, 63.

[29] As previously noted, the verb is common in this context; for this particular instance as well as others, see Cugusi 2007, 37.

ueitae ornatum apstulit. *Ornatum* may look back to *decoraat* in 3; death could not change her status as a freedwoman and wife.[30]

Here again we have the deceased speaking on her own behalf, as indicated almost immediately by the first person *sum*, with the dramatic effects involved therein: the portrait created by the inscription is no longer a silent image, but a figure brought to life, as it were, by the voice of the reader, engaging once again among the living. As is often the case, the deceased is not alone in the portrait of her life, but other figures appear with the reading of the inscription: first we see her among her contemporaries in general, praised by good people (*boneis*) in the background; the remainder of the first line denies the existence of, and thus excludes from the portrait, negativity directed at her by any good woman.

Then, beginning in the second line, she gestures at members of her household. The monument is for them too, and we might wonder that it is Horaea herself, a woman and a former slave, who receives the honor of a metrical inscription; but perhaps it was she (in her role as manager of the household) who commissioned the inscription. And indeed the presence of three of those family members in the graveside-portrait is asserted not only by their names before the inscription, but also, perhaps, by the deictic pronouns Horaea uses to refer to them: as discussed above, the deictics may be meta-textual, but they also may indicate that the individuals described (the masters, *illei*, and her husband, *huic/hic*) are present there with her as she speaks, part of the portrait created by the reading; and so the inscription turns out after all to be for them too, though the perspective and the voice are Horaea's.

---

[30] The idea of decoration in this sepulchral context also calls to mind CIL I² 1837, the epitaph in which Posilla Senenia's mother has to make do with ornamenting her daughter in death rather than in life.

Horaea refers to her death in the last line, but in part to repudiate its power to strip her of the honors with which she was decorated in life; and indeed, the portrait the inscription creates of her reifies, again and again upon each reading, her status as wife and freedwoman.

Status also plays a role in our next example, CIL VI 142111, the last of these first three that lack an explicit locative statement:

> *Calpurnia Anthis fecit*
> Dextera fama mihi fuit et fortuna, patrona
>   magnifici coniunx Caesaris illa dei,
> qua bene tutus eram, caris nec uilis amicis,
>   quis etiam mecum plurima cura fuit.
> Anthis causa meae uitae, quae cara sepulcro
>   condidit ossa suo. nominor Ikadium.[31]

> *Calpurnia Anthis made (this).*
> Favorable[32] were my fame and fortune, my mistress that famous spouse of the great god Caesar, by whom I was well protected, of no little value to dear friends, for whom also with me [for my part] there was the highest care. Anthis was the cause of my life, who established (my) dear bones in her own tomb. I am called Ikadium.

The inscription, written in elegiac couplets, seems to belong to the second half of the first century BCE:[33] the dedicator Calpurnia Anthis was a slave-woman of Calpurnia, the third wife of Julius Caesar, and the second line indicates that the inscription was commissioned some time after Caesar's deification in 42 BCE.

The superscript *Calpurnia Anthis fecit* names the slave-woman as the dedicator (and the last couplet of the metrical portion establishes that she would

---

[31] CLE 964: The stone has not been seen for centuries, but the inscription appears in Gruter's 17th-century collection of inscriptions. Bücheler notes that in some manuscripts the name in the superscript is Calpurnius Anthius, and in the fifth verse Anthius (and adds a sentiment with which I am forced to disagree: *pater sane melius quam mater causa uitae dicitur*) (CLE ad loc.), but the feminine pronoun *quae* in 5 supports a reading with the feminine version of the name.

[32] For *dexter* as "propitious, favorable," (OLD 2) see *TLL* 5.1.924.11. For *fortuna dextera*, see *Aen.* 2.388; the *TLL* records no other uses of *fama dextera*. Another possibility is that *dextera* means "my right hand," which would indicate that Ikadium grew to be old enough to be skilled at a particular profession; see n.36 below.

[33] Thus Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc. N.b. the orthography in the inscription, at least as it comes down to us, is not marked by any archaic/archaizing elements as are many others from this period.

also be buried there), but she is not the speaker: the inscription is spoken by her son Ikadium, and as such he is generally considered the subject of the metrical portion. If we believe, as the superscript seems to indicate, that it was Calpurnia Anthis who commissioned the inscription,[34] that circumstance suggests that Ikadium was not yet grown at the time of his death. We cannot know for sure – no information is given about the boy's age (and in fact, some of the content seems to argue against such a conclusion), but here, as we have seen before in cases of premature death, very little information is give about the boy himself.

In the first line he claims a fitting (or fortunate) fame and fortune (*dextera fama mihi fuit et fortuna*;[35] note the alliteration); this assertion perhaps argues against the suggestion of an untimely death, as such an event would hardly be characterized as a *dextera fortuna*. He goes on to explain that he had (presumably through his mother) as his patroness the wife of the great god Caesar: *patrona magnifici coniunx Caesaris illa dei*. She took good care of him, he reports in the next couplet (*qua bene tutus eram*), and he was surrounded by friends who valued him and whom he valued, *caris nec uilis amicis, quis etiam mecum plurima cura fuit*. In the last couplet the boy describes how his mother was the source of his life (*Anthis causa meae uitae*), and how, in a poignant juxtaposition, she was also the one who took care of him after his death: she established his dear bones in her own tomb, *quae cara sepulchro condidit ossa suo*. It is possible that Calpurnia Anthis had purchased and established the tomb for herself and was already buried there, and that Ikadium arranged his own burial there, and the inscription to honor them both.[36] In any case, it is only in the final words of the inscription that the speaker identifies himself: *nominor Ikadium*.[37]

---

[34] See below for an alternate suggestion.

[35] But see n.32 above.

[36] A scenario in which Ikadium does grow to maturity seems to me to accord better with the characterization of his *fortuna* as *dextera* than a scenario in which he died prematurely. The lack of epigraphic/archaeological information about the monument and inscription seem to leave room for

The seemingly joint nature of the burial (and to some extent of the inscription) might have confused a reader: the superscript might lead him to assume that the subject of the epitaph was the woman Calpurnia Anthis (although perhaps the lack of a *sibi* in the superscript would have been a clear enough indication that the inscription was for someone else). That the inscription will co-opt the voice of the reader in order to speak in the third person is clear from the third word, *mihi*, but the first indication that the speaker is someone other than Calpurnia Anthis does not come until the masculine form *tutus* in the third line. The relationship between the dedicator and the speaker does not become clear until two lines later, when the latter identifies her as his mother. His identification of himself is delayed until the last two words of the inscription.

One seeming result of this delay would be that the portrait would be an incomplete one until this last line: in the first couplet, the picture created is of a nameless, genderless speaker – it is his patroness Calpurnia who is identified and thereby clearly depicted, accompanied by the shadowy figure of the famed Julius Caesar in the background, but with nothing to fill out the image of the deceased speaker himself. In the second couplet we learn, at least, that he is male, and valued by his friends, who also join the portrait being enacted; in the third, we meet his mother, identified as the rightful owner of the tomb. Only at the very end does the central figure, the speaker, declare a name for himself. Once again we see that the portrait of the deceased himself is by no means clearly drawn; others inhabit the

---

the interpretation described above: perhaps the superscript was older, carved in a different hand, and as such noted the construction of the tomb rather than the commissioning of the inscription. Retroactive credit and thanks to Calpurnia Anthis for sharing her tomb might have been made part of the inscription long after her death. Alternatively, she may have bought the tomb for herself while still living and then buried her (mature) son there before she herself passed away.

[37] "Mr. Twentieth," in honor of Epicurus (whose celebration-day was May 20th), according to Armstrong (1993, 200 n.29). He follows Boyancé (1955, 113-120) in interpreting the epitaph as a whole as reflective of Epicurean values, based on the association with Calpurnia (a Piso; cf. Cicero's accusations concerning the Epicureanism of L. Calpurnius Piso in *In Pisonem*). I certainly would not rule out such an interpretation, but the evidence in the text itself (the name, and an allusion in 3-4, per Boyancé, to the Epicurean principles of *amicitia* and *contubernium*) seems scanty.

picture created by "his" inscription, and what is continually reified upon each reading is not the story of the deceased himself but the story of his interaction with others.

Such then are the first three poems of this chapter, which give no explicit acknowledgement of their location.[38] I suggest, however, that their being spoken by the deceased is itself a form of locational establishment, given that the monument served as the metonymic marker for the deceased among the living. And indeed, in each of these cases the poems do in fact make some acknowledgment of the (original) space around them: in the first, CIL I² 1822, the speaker notes that he has reached his *aeternam domum*, presumably referring to the tomb itself; in CIL I² 1570, Larcia Horaea uses deictic pronouns to gesture at the family members buried in her tomb (and textually, as they are named in a superscript just above the *carmen*); and finally, in this last example, Ikadium refers to the *sepulcro* in which his *ossa* are established.

Our next six examples also do not acknowledge an audience, but they do include more explicit notation of their original space, thereby creating a bond between reader, inscription, and the real space of the monument, as discussed in chapter three above. In them we see some elements and effects already familiar to us, but also some different and remarkable content and effects exclusive to this kind of fictive orality.

In the first example of this set, CIL I² 1319, the space surrounding the monument is of particular importance:

> *C. Hostius C. l. Pamphilus | medicus. Hoc monumentum | emit sibi et Nelpiae M. l. Hymnini | et liberteis et libertabus omnibus | postereisque eorum*
> haec est domus aeterna, hic est | fundus, heis sunt horti, | hoc est *monumentum nostrum.*

---

[38] Three other inscriptions (spoken by the deceased) were considered for inclusion in this section, but ultimately rejected as too fragmentary: CIL I² 1251, 1572, and 3196.

in fronte p. XIII in agrum p. XXIII[39]

*Gaius Hostius Pamphilus, freedman of Gaius, doctor. He bought this monument for
himself, for Nelpia Hymnis freedwoman of Marcus, for their freedmen and freedwoman and
for all of their descendants.*
This is the eternal home, this is the estate; these are the gardens, this is *our monument.*
Thirteen by twenty-four feet

Bücheler suggests that the text from *haec* to *hoc est* is a trochaic septentarius, and

Colafrancesco and Massaro follow his lead;[40] for his own part, however, Massaro

says that the text should not be considered actually metrical, but as showing a

"widespread trochaic rhythm."[41] The inscription is generally dated to the first

century BCE, specifically the late Republic or early Empire.[42] A non-metrical

superscript informs us that a freedman *medicus*, Gaius Hostius Pamphilus,

commissioned the monument and inscription for himself and a freedwoman of a

different master, Nelpia Hymnis (generally assumed to be his wife,[43] although that

status is not noted), and for all of their freedpeople and descendants. A subscript

notes the size of the plot, thirteen by twenty-four *pedes*.[44]

The section considered metrical or rhythmic is comprised of four assertions

about the tomb and the space around it, parallel in structure and showing anaphora

with forms of the deictic pronoun and the copulative verb: "this is…, this is…;

these are…, this is…"[45] The first assertion is one with which we are already

familiar,[46] *haec est domus aeterna*, and the last (of which the latter two words are

---

[39] CLE 247e: carved on a travertine tablet; first seen at Rome in the collections of Emiliano Sarti and
now kept in the Capitoline Museum (CIL ad loc., Fassbender 2007, 175).
[40] CLE ad loc.; Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.
[41] Massaro 2007a, 158: he includes it under "iscrizioni non propriamente metrica, ma in qualche
modo ritmica."
[42] Colafrancesco and Massaro (1986 ad loc.) designate it as no later than that century; Keuleers
(2003 ad loc.) points out that the aspiration in *Pamphilus* suggests a date no earlier than that century,
and, citing Sandys (1927, 64), notes that the notation of plot size indicates late Republic/early
Empire. Note also the digraphs in *liberteis* and *postereisque* in the superscript.
[43] See, e.g., Liebs 2010, 8.
[44] For a literary example of such a notation, see Hor. *S*.1.8.10-13, where Priapus describes the
dimensions of a former mass grave.
[45] On anaphora in general and here specifically see Palmer 1917, 59.
[46] For a list, see n.11 above.

extra-metrical) is also fairly straightforward: *hoc est monumentum nostrum*, with the emphasis presumably on the (first-person) possessive adjective occupying the final position. The second and third assertions, however, are of additional interest in expanding the metaphor suggested by the first: *hic est fundus, heis*[47] *sunt horti*. We suggested above that the idea of tomb-as-garden might be implicit in the epitaph for C. Stallius Hauranus, the Epicurean who was said to protect his tomb/home (there *sedes*),[48] but here the identification is explicit. The existence and nature of Roman tomb gardens (*cepotaphia*) is well established,[49] but to characterize the tomb as a *hortus* is without parallel in the CLE: this appears to be the only example.[50] Nor do we see elsewhere in that corpus a reference to the tomb area as a *fundus*.[51] It seems unlikely that the assertions are meant in this case to be taken literally: in so modest a burial plot, to refer to the space as a *fundus* is surely hyperbolic.[52]

That being the case, what are the intended effects of these assertions, for the subjects and for the passer-by who might read them? No portrait of the deceased commissioner is created by the metrical portion; his identity is established by the non-metrical superscript, together with that of his wife. The inscription would thus serve as a metonymic marker for him and for her, and assert their place in society and their relationship to others buried there later, but without the memorializing effects of a poetic portrait. The metrical portion describes only the space itself.

---

[47] For *heis*, cf. CIL I²1347 *heis sunt duo concordes*, ch.3 n.22 and see Bakkum 1994, 28.
[48] See ch.3 p.109 for discussion of CIL X 2971.
[49] See, e.g., Campbell 2008, 31-43 and Brundrett 2011, 51-69.
[50] There are, however, eleven examples in prose epitaphs (a number nonetheless quite small relative to that vast corpus): CIL II 3960, VI 6031, 2176, etc. (TLL s.v. *hortus*, 3017.79).
[51] Again, I found no other examples in the CLE, nor in this case does TLL mention any sepulchral usage.
[52] See Brundrett 2011, 62: "…but the reality of the size of the plot given as 13 x 23 feet meant that all of these features had to be contained within a modest area. Even assuming a tomb of diminutive size, there could not have been room for a generous garden space within this monument."

A reader would first of all give voice to the deictic adjective *haec*, which would establish a relationship (as discussed in chapter three above) between the reader, the inscription, and the physical space of the monument; the combination of the preceding names and the deixis would locate this metonymic marker of the subjects in the land of the living, specifically in relation to the reader and potential listeners. The remainder of the first assertion characterizes the tomb as an eternal home, an idea we have seen several times, which may suggest the continued presence of some aspect of the subjects on that spot (an idea borne out, perhaps, by the first-person possessive later in the inscription). The reader would then assert that this plot is also a farm or estate, and a garden (again, each time with a deictic adjective and its attendant effects); it is impossible to know whether a garden, productive or not, actually accompanied the tomb, but *fundus* must certainly, based on the size of the plot, have been an exaggeration. Most likely these second and third assertions were to some extent metaphorical like the first.

Rather than use the metrical section to create a portrait of himself, the commissioner chose to effect an image – superimposed, perhaps, over the more humble reality – of the space surrounding his gravesite and the monument that served as a metonymic marker for him; claiming for himself via the voice of each reader an environment where he would be happy to remain.[53] The last clause is both a locative statement, again with a deictic adjective, and an assertion of possession: the statement ends with the (extrametrical) adjective *nostrum*, our first and only indication that it is the deceased subject himself who is speaking; this last claim,

---

[53] Erasmo (2008, 3) makes a similar suggestion about this epitaph: "Representation by a tomb and epitaph that mark the location of one's remains can be seen as an act of arrogance by the deceased who tries to exert control beyond death and stretch the limits of their biological life…The dead are agents of transformation (of self and imposed on nature) whose desire for permanence, even in death, transforms the landscape by their burial and by the cultivation of the land for their own commemoration. The living continue to interact with the dead who in turn continue to assert their presence and even exert their influence in death."

then, asserts and reifies upon each reading both the deceased's continued presence there and his ownership of the space.[54]

Our next example, CIL I² 1325, makes a gesture at the surrounding space, and while it creates a distinctive image of the deceased, that image is devoid of personalized details:

Heic situs sum Lemiso, | quem numquam nisi mors | feiniuit labore.[55]

Here I, Lemiso, am placed, whom never anything save death freed from labor.

Bücheler classifies the inscription under *commatica*, but according to Massaro the inscription forms a trochaic octonarius.[56] Scholars have been hesitant to date the inscription,[57] but Fassbender asserts that its position in its archaeological context suggests a date in the second half of the first century BCE.[58]

The main clause of the inscription is a locative statement of the kind we have seen many times before, *heic situs*,[59] but in this case the verb is the first-person *sum*; the deceased then identifies himself by name as *Lemiso*. Metrically incorporated names appear in slightly less than half of our inscriptions; in most of these cases, as here, no filiation or libertination is included, so we have no explicit notation of Lemiso's social status.[60] The following relative clause, however,

---

[54] For a slightly different (literary) view of the dichotomy between territory in life and after death, see Juv. 10.168-173:

unus Pellaeo iuueni non sufficit orbis,
aestuat infelix angusto limite mundi
ut Gyarae clausus scopulis paruaque Seripho;   170
cum tamen a figulis munitam intrauerit urbem,
sarcophago contentus erit. mors sola fatetur
quantula sint hominum corpuscula.

[55] CLE 1851: the 10x24cm *tabella* was found in a columbarium in the necropolis under the Piazza di Porta Maggiore (Praenestine Gate) (CIL ad loc., Fassbender 2007, 182).

[56] CLE ad loc.; Massaro 1992, 27 and 2007a, 154.

[57] Keuleers, although he includes the inscription in his collection of Republican *carmina*, says that there are no conclusive data for dating (2003 ad loc.); Colafrancesco and Massaro (1986 ad loc.) suggest no later than the second century CE.

[58] Fassbender 2007, 182.

[59] See ch.3, pp.94-95.

[60] Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) reports that the name appears nowhere else in extant records, and that the lack of praenomen and nomen suggest that he was a slave. A Venetic origin seems possible, given the Venetic PN Lemetor (ES 28).

certainly suggests that he was required to work for a living: *quem numquam nisi mors feiniuit labore*.[61] The idea of death as a release from the travails of life appears nowhere else in our corpus, but Lattimore finds parallels in several other Latin epitaphs in his larger collection; Tolman also mentions the theme and cites several examples from Latin literature.[62] The theme can vary a good deal in tone, from cheerful/consolatory to more starkly pessimistic, as here.

And so, although we have seen some striking examples of social mobility for slaves (compare the case of Larcia Horaea in the second example in this chapter), in this case Lemiso, if indeed a slave, seems not to have been freed in his lifetime, but continued to labor until death relieved him of that burden.[63] Moreover, such was the aspect of his life that Lemiso, or the commissioner of his inscription, chose to memorialize; not for him a happy portrait surrounded by friends and contemporaries. No spouse, family, or peers are mentioned, and so Lemiso is more isolated in his portrait than most of our subjects. Upon each reading by a visitor to the columbarium, a speaking image of Lemiso would be called up, alone, to repeat again and again his terse account of his life, unrelieved of work until his death. Surely there would be little comfort there, for mourners or for the reader, but perhaps (indeed, presumably) the creation of this pessimistic account afforded some satisfaction to the commissioner of the brief *carmen*, be it Lemiso himself or some other.

---

[61] The *OLD* (s.v. *finio* 10) uses this inscription as its example of the verb with an accusative and an ablative of separation, to mean "rid someone (acc.) of something (abl.)," and suggests that the usage is modelled after Greek παύω.

[62] Lattimore 1962, 213: he cites this example, and gives several others in n.304; Tolman 1910, 88 notes, "Cicero tells us, *Tusculan Disputations* i. 83, that this doctrine of escape from troubles of life through death was taught so extensively by Cyreniacus of Hegesia that King Ptolemaeus had to prohibit it, because many when they heard of this committed suicide." See also, for other sepulchral examples of the idea of death as a *finis laborum*, Hernández Pérez 2001 §104.

[63] If, that is, we take *labor* literally; the noun can also mean 'trouble' (cf. *Aen*. 1.241, where Venus asks Jupiter *Quem das finem, rex magne, laborum*?), in which case here Lemiso may be referring more generally to the difficulties of his life.

Our next example in this set, CIL I² 1218, creates a far more typical portrait – the deceased praises herself in relation to others – but with a strong emphasis on her control over her own fate:

> *Θ Manlia T. l. Gnome*
> Haec est quae uixsit semper | natura proba.
> clientes habui | multos, locum hoc unum optí|nui mihi.
> itaque quoad aetatem uolui | exsegi meam:
> nemine unquam | debui, uixsi quom fide. |
> ossa dedi Terrae, corpus Volchano dedi|di
> eco ut suprema mortis mandata edidi.[64]

> *Manlia Gnome, freedwoman of Titus, is dead.*
> This is one who lived always with a proper character. I had many clients, but I chose this one place for myself. Thus I have led my life as long as I wished: I have not owed anything to anyone; I have lived with good faith. I gave my bones to the earth and surrendered my body to Vulcan, when I gave forth the last orders of death.

The metrical portion of the inscription (accompanied by a non-metrical superscript giving the name and libertination of the deceased freedwoman, as well as a notation of her death[65]) is generally classified as iambic senarii, with certain caveats: according to Massaro, the first verse (based on the arrangement of lines and verses depicted above, from CLE et al.) is an iambic senarius, as are the third, fifth, and sixth; the other verses have certain iambic rhythms, but cannot be so easily scanned/classified.[66] Bücheler designates the poem as a *cento senariorum* or a *conlectarum ex senariis dictionum*,[67] and Massaro agrees that it seems to be an assemblage of "locuzioni di repertorio." Kruschwitz remains non-committal, saying only that to analyze the inscription metrically is problematic.[68] The date is a matter of more consensus: Colafrancesco and Massaro say that the inscription is no

---

[64] CLE 67: the inscription is carved on a travertine tablet found on the Via Tiburtina near the Ponte Mammolo in 1878 (CIL I² ad loc.; Fassbender 2007, 181); the CIL reports that it was at that time kept in the Campo Verano, but Massaro (2007a, 144) says that it has now been lost. The lettering features several ligatures, for which see CIL ad loc. and Keuleers 2003 ad loc.
[65] For this use of theta, see Kruschwitz 2002b.
[66] Massaro 2007a, 144-5; cf. also Massaro 1992, 31 n.37.
[67] CLE ad loc.
[68] 2001, 51.

later than the first century BCE; Solin suggests the period from Sulla to Caesar, and Kruschwitz agrees that based on the orthography and the use of travertine a late Republican date is most likely.[69]

The first verse of the inscription is similar to many we have seen before: written in the third person, it begins with a deictic statement (*haec est…*), followed by a relative clause that praises the deceased: *quae uixsit semper natura proba*.[70] We have seen various forms of *probus*/*probatus*,[71] and it conveys the sort of praise we have come to expect: a valuing of the deceased that is not absolute, but in the eyes of his or her contemporaries. Here the assertion is even more emphatic (indeed, Kruschwitz finds it somewhat redundant[72]), applied to the deceased's *natura* and with the whole phrase modified by *semper*.

In the next line, the "voice" of the inscriptions speaks in the first person (*habui*); Kruschwitz sees a switch of person here, which he finds difficult to explain.[73] But in fact in the first line *haec est…* can also be interpreted as a form of "I": the deictic pronoun with a third-person verb can function like Greek ὅδε, gesturing at the speaker.[74] In a case like this, where the statement is followed by an explicitly first-person speech, this interpretation seems especially likely.

In this first clause the deceased declares that she had many *clientes*. Taking this statement at face value, we would understand that there were many people for whom Manlia Gnome did favors, that is, for whom she served as a *patrona*. Were this the epitaph of a prominent male citizen this assertion might not give us pause, but the fact that Manlia Gnome is a female former slave has caused scholars to wonder about the interpretation of the phrase. In fact, the assertion is fairly unique,

---

[69] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Solin 1996, 3.1288; Kruschwitz 2001, 51.

[70] The meter allows *proba* to be either ablative or nominative, nor is there any great distinction in meaning; for the purposes of translation I have taken it as ablative.

[71] See above in this chapter CIL I² 1547 and 1570.

[72] 2001, 52; he also notes that *natura* is unusual here: *ingenio* would be more conventional.

[73] Ibid.

[74] *OLD* s.v. *hic* IB; see also Kühner-Stegmann I.620.

regardless of the gender or status of the subject: Kruschwitz reports that he knows

of no other cases in the CLE (nor among any of the prose inscriptions he has

encountered) in which the subject (regardless of gender or class) makes this

particular claim, i.e. to have had many clients. Furthermore, as for this case in

particular, he reports that he has found no other inscriptional cases (sepulchral or

otherwise) from the Republican period where *clientes* are mentioned as associated

with a *liberta*.[75] Some scholars have suggested, he says, that we take the word

clientes in its later (from the Augustan period on) sense of *amicus*;[76] he hesitates to

accept this explanation because the inscription seems to predate such a usage,[77] but

in fact there are Republican examples of the word being grouped together with

amici and *hospites*.[78] On the other hand, the content of the fourth verse (*nemine*

unquam debui, uixsi quom fide; see discussion below) does seem to suggest that

Manlia Gnome engaged in business, at least the business of exchanging favors. In

any case, her claim to have had many *clientes* asserts a certain prominence or

popularity among "her people."

It is also unclear precisely what the seeming antithesis of the verse (*multos*

habui clientes vs. *locum*[79] *hoc unum optinui*[80] *mihi*) is intended to convey: the

overall sense seems to be that she performed many favors for others, but just this

one service for herself, but the diction and expressions here are not so precise.[81]

---

[75] 2001, 53.

[76] *TLL* s.v. *cliens*, 1346. 49; for more recent bibliography, see Dyck on Cic. *Off.* 2.69.

[77] 2001, 54.

[78] Cic. *Div. Caec.* 66 and *Att.* 1.207.

[79] Neuter *locum* for masculine; Kruschwitz (2001, 54) suggests that this usage is another Republican feature, but in fact Adams (discussing the alternate plural, perhaps originally collective form *loca* from which the singular we see here was likely back-formed) reports examples in later Latin (2013, 439).

[80] The first <i> in this verb is larger than the other letters, but the quantity is short, and so the larger letter is generally agreed to be a slip of the stonecutter rather than an intended *i-longa*. Kruschwitz (2001, 54) also notes that the phrase *obtinere locum* usually means to take a certain rank (in, e.g., business or the military), and there is perhaps (in addition to the meaning of *locum* as tomb-site) a play on that meaning, as the deceased takes her place in the ranks of the dead.

[81] Ibid.

What is clear from the latter clause of this line is a fact taken up again by the final line of the inscription: that it was the deceased herself who arranged for the monument and inscription. It should perhaps be noted that no spouse or family members are mentioned in the inscription; if Manlia Gnome was indeed on her own, it is no surprise that taking care of herself was a priority in her life and in her preparations for death.

The deceased's control over her circumstances is also highlighted in the third verse, where she asserts that she has led her life just as long as she wished,[82] *itaque quoad aetatem uolui exsegi meam. Itaque* points forward to the next two clauses, where the deceased specifies further the way in which she lived: she was in debt to no one (*nemine*[83] *unquam debui*), and she lived with trustworthiness (*uixsi quom fide*). The first assertion, taken in conjunction with Manlia's claim to have had many *clientes*, calls to mind a passage of Cicero discussing people's reluctance to admit themselves in debt as a *cliens* (as opposed to the more socially acceptable position of bestowing favors as a *patronus*).[84] As for the second claim, we have seen the phrase *cum fide* in two other examples,[85] and in each case we have taken in to mean that the deceased showed loyalty or good faith to those with whom s/he

---

[82] Kruschwitz (2001, ibid.) wonders whether the line indicates that the deceased ended her own life (interesting in light of our last example; see n.62 above), but finds parallel phrases elsewhere in the CLE (965.10, 991.1, 992.1) that do not carry that implication, and so ultimately rejects it here.

[83] Neither Kruschwitz nor Keuleers comments on the orthography here: a dative is required, so we assume that <e> represents /ei/ (from PIE dative *-*ei*, spelled <ei> in even earlier inscriptions; see Weiss 2009, 201); while not as common as the spellings <ei> or later <i>, <e> for /ei/ is precedented in the *SCdB* (Weiss 2009, 223): *compromesise*, 'to enter into an agreement,' from **komprōmeisisse*, Classical Latin *comprōmīsisse*.

[84] *Off*. 2.69: *At qui se locupletes, honoratos, beatos putant, ii ne obligari quidem beneficio uolunt; qui etiam beneficium se dedisse arbitrantur, cum ipsi quamuis magnum aliquod acceperint, atque etiam a se aut postulari aut exspectari aliquid suspicantur, patrocinio uero se usos aut clientes appellari mortis instar putant*.

[85] In the generic epitaph 1822 (the first poem in this chapter) and in 1210, for the auctioneer Aulus Granius; in each case the phrase appears at the end of an iambic senarius, suggesting that it was indeed a commonplace in this context and meter.

interacted; here, in light of what comes before, the phrase may have been intended to refer to the deceased's business of receiving and giving favors.[86]

In the next two lines the speaker moves from describing her life to describing the measures she took for the distribution of her physical remains. She asserts that she gave her bones to the earth (*ossa dedi terrae*, or possibly personified *Terrae*), and her body to Vulcan (*corpus Volchano*[87] *dedidi*).[88] A more typical antithesis in Greco-Roman epitaphs would be that the body/bones return to the earth and the soul to heaven,[89] but as Kruschwitz notes, the process described here does make sense: in the case of ancient cremation, the flesh is turned to ash, but remnants of bones remain to be buried.[90] Here, however, the order (bones to earth, body to fire) is an example of hysteron proteron.

The next line seems to suggest that she made these arrangements on her deathbed, *eco ut suprema mortis mandata edidi*;[91] we cannot know whether this last line is the literal truth, or a literary flourish. Kruschwitz finds the fronting of *eco* (for *ego*[92]) "unnecessary and seemingly without function," and suggests that it

---

[86] Kruschwitz (2001, 53) asserts that the phrase usually refers to loyalty between spouses; that tendency is not reflected in our corpus, but may apply in later examples. He suggests that the phrase is intended as a double entendre here (as he had also suggested for "taking one's place in the ranks," see n.80 above), used both in the way he claims as the norm (although given that no spouse is mentioned, his suggested meaning seems less likely here) and as a technical term for credit-worthiness.

[87] I have found no other attestations of the aspiration, but see Allen 1965, 26-26, who cites Marius Victorinus (Keil 6:21): *uideo uos saepe et Orco et Vulcano h litteram relinquere ,et credo uos antiquitatem sequi*.

[88] The metonymic use of the name of Vulcan for (funeral) fire seems straightforward, but there seems to be only one other case in the CLE, 1168 (designated un-dateable by Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986), 5-6, where the body-fire/earth-bones dichotomy is also present: *in Phrygia miserae corpus, Volcane, cremasti / sumeret ut tellus muneris ossa mei.* Nor is such a usage well represented in literary texts; cf. only Stat. *Theb.* 6.233-7, where the funeral pyre is called Mulciber. Indeed, Stephenson (1878, 228) calls the usage here "noteworthy" ("cosa degna di nota").

[89] See, e.g., Lattimore 1962, 31-38 and Wypustek 2012, 42-43.

[90] 2001, 53; he sees the language here as reminiscent of religious sacrifice.

[91] Kruschwitz (ibid.) notes the "unglücklich" heaping up of forms of *dare* in these last two lines, which he says is the cause of a certain amount of dental alliteration, along with that seen in *mortis mandata*. For an expression similar to the one found here, Kruschwitz cites Prop. 3.7.55-6: *Flens tamen extremis dedit haec mandata querelis cum moribunda niger clauderet ora liquor.*

[92] A very old-timey spelling, if the reading is correct; for the introduction of <g> into the Latin alphabet, see Weiss 2009, 27-28.

stems from a lack of poetic ability on the part of the author.[93] It seems to me, however, that the most basic explanation for the use/highlighting of *ego* can apply here:[94] elsewhere in the poem effort has been made to emphasize the will of the deceased, and her control over her destiny; I suggest that here *ego* serves in its usual way to focalize the doer of the action, in this case Manlia Gnome herself.

The various parts of this inscription have in turn varying effects. The non-metrical superscript announces the identity of the deceased, her status as freedwoman, and the fact of her death. In the *carmen*, with its memorializing effects heightened by its metricity, we first read a rather generic, seemingly third-person line including a locative statement and praise for the deceased, with the adjective *proba* implicitly making reference to the judgment of her contemporaries; a portrait is thereby created, against the background of those contemporaries. And in fact, the *haec* here, in addition to creating a relationship between the reader, monument, and space, may invest even this opening line with a first-person perspective, if we take it like Greek ὅδε, viz. "this here = I" – an interpretation strengthened by the following first-person speech.

With the second line, then, the portrait becomes explicitly animated, speaking to and through the reader as signaled by the first-person verb *habui*. The first fact that the deceased announces about herself is that she had many *clientes*, thereby adding many other figures (i.e. "her people") to the scene surrounding her. She then asserts that she chose this place for herself, with another deictic gesture at the monument, reinforcing the bond between her, the reader, and the space (with, perhaps, a double entendre, with the phrase itself calling up the idea of taking one's

---

[93] Ibid., 53-4.
[94] Kruschwitz (ibid. 54) sends the reader, for a discussion of *ego* in prominent verse position, to Adams 1999, 97-134; see 100 for the emphatic use to which I refer here.

place among the ranks, in this case of the dead). She makes no mention of family, so none appear in the portrait created by the epitaph.

She then declares, rather remarkably, that she has lived her life as long as she has wished, in certain ways: she has been in debt to no one, and she has lived with *fides*. Certain elements are added to the portrait thereby: most of all an impression of Manlia Gnome as in control of her own life, and more specifically, that she was a self-sustaining and reliable business woman; there is also another possible double entendre in the last-mentioned quality, with it perhaps both referring to her credit-worthiness and also being used in the sense more common in our corpus, i.e. to indicate loyalty and good faith in general. Finally, the figure of Manlia goes on to announce that she herself gave these orders at the very end of her life; again, here the focus seems to be on Manlia's control of the situation: the speaking portrait claims credit, with the emphatic *ego*, for taking care of her own final rites on her deathbed. The inscription and the portrait it creates, then, are similar to others we have seen before, but distinctive in their assertion and depiction of Manlia's control over her life and over the message through which she lives on via her metonymic marker; here the fact that the bulk of the poem is spoken by the deceased herself strengthens this message that the content was designed to convey to a reader.

Proprietary pride in one's life and final arrangements also permeates our next example, CIL I² 1216, but here with more of an emphasis on family:

> *C. Caninius C. f. |Arn. Labeo pater*
> Omnes hei mei sunt: filius illum manu,
> ille illam mereto missit et uestem dedit.
> Quoad uixsi, uixsere omnes una inter meos.
> Eundem mi amorem praestat puerilem senexs.
> monumentum indiciost saxso saeptum ac marmori   5

circum stipatum moerum multeis millibus.[95]

Gaius Caninius Labeo, son of Gaius, from the tribe Arnensis. The father:[96]
These are all my people: (my) son set that man free, and that man set free that woman, deservedly, and gave her a dress. As long as I lived, they all lived together among my people. As an old man, he maintains the same boyish love for me; the monument is evidence, enclosed by stone and around (it) a wall fenced by marble, at a cost of many thousands.[97]

The metrical portion of the inscription is comprised of six regular iambic senarii, with the lines in the layout matching, at least in the surviving portion of the text, the verses.[98] Kruschwitz is impressed with the quality of the verses and notes among other poetic features the polyptoton and alliteration found in the passage.[99] Scholars generally agree that the inscription should be dated to the latter half of the first century BCE.[100]

Interpretation of the poem, more specifically who is envisioned as speaking the last three verses, is a matter of less agreement. The non-metrical superscript refers to a father and son: we read first the name, filiation, and tribal affiliation of the son, Gaius Caninius Labeo, and then the word *pater* (also named Gaius, and hence presumably also Gaius Caninius Labeo). It is generally agreed that the father speaks the first three lines, in which he mentions his son, as well as a freedman of his son, and that freedman's (freedwoman) wife; *pater*, then, in the superscript may

---

[95] CLE 58: the inscription, carved on a marble tablet, was found in 1550 on the Caelian Hill near the Porta Asiniana (CIL I² ad loc., Keuleers 2003 ad loc.); Fassbender (2007, 186) notes that as this location is within the Servian Wall and the Pomerium, it cannot be the original location of the burial/monument. The tablet was broken sometime after its discovery into two pieces; the bottom half is kept in the Vatican museum, but the fate of the top half is unclear (we have the text from Pighius' transcription): Degrassi believed to it belong to the *Museo Nazionale*, but Kruschwitz (2002a, 43) reports that the museum has no record of the inscription in their database.

[96] For the punctuation, see the possibility discussed below that *pater* is a tag indicating the speaker of the following lines.

[97] The syntax of these last two lines is unclear; see discussion below.

[98] Bücheler (CLE ad loc.) had noted with disapproval the length of *-us* in *filius* in the first verse, but Kruschwitz (2002a, 44) and Massaro (2007a, 141, citing the license of the loci Jacobsohniani) agree that *breuis in longo* in this position is not unusual.

[99] Kruschwitz 2002a, 44; see also Massaro 1992, 19.

[100] Based on the use of marble, the letter-forms, the cognomen Labeo, and the orthography, in particular *moerum* for *murum* (no longer used after Vergil) and the double-l of *millibus* (first found in Augustus' *Res Gestae*; see Kruschwitz 2002a, 46 n.22 and 23): Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Kruschwitz 2002a, 43; Keuleers 2003 ad loc. Mommsen, however, suggested a later date (see Kruschwitz 2002a, 44 n.10).

be a tag to indicate who is envisioned as speaking the following text.[101] Mommsen suggests that the latter three lines are spoken by the son's (unnamed) freedman,[102] but I find no evidence to support this idea; Warmington's suggestion that it is the son who speaks the last three lines seems more reasonable,[103] but nonetheless unnecessary: it is far simpler to understand the father speaking the entire poem, in which case the son as an old man (the *senex* of 4) has commissioned the monument for both of them.[104]

We have anticipated some of the content in the above discussion, but let us now turn to it in order. The poem begins with an assertion by the deceased father that "all these people are mine," *omnes hei mei sunt*; the first-person speaker is signaled by *mei*, and the fact that it is the father speaking is suggested by *filius*; the deictic *omnes hei* suggests that the other people the father will discuss are buried with him, although only he and his son are named.[105] Further deictics confirm this idea, as the speaker gestures at others nearby: we learn that the son freed another man ("that one (lying there)," *filius illum manu*) and then, in the second verse, that that freedman (*ille*)[106] went on to free another female slave and marry her, *illam* "that woman (over there)," *mereto missit et uestem dedit*.[107] In a previous case we

---

[101] Thus Kruschwitz 2002a, 43; Keuleers (2003 ad loc.), on the other hand, suggests that the word *pater* is included in order to make clear that Gaius Caninius Labeo was the head of the household, but it is not clear whether he means Gaius the elder or the younger.

[102] Ad CIL I 1012.

[103] Warmington 1935 ad loc.

[104] Thus also Kruschwitz 2002a.

[105] Massaro (2007a, 141) regrets here our ignorance of the original archaeological context, suggesting that there may have been an upper part of the tablet providing reliefs of, or more information about, the other people buried there. Kruschwitz (2002a, 45) also suggests that the *hei*, which he translates "die du hier siehst," might have been ecphrastic, gesturing at actual portraits; he also suggests that *omnes* seems rather expansive for the mere four people mentioned, but concludes simply "man muss es wohl hinnehmen."

[106] Keuleers (oddly, and it seems to me, mistakenly) takes the second *ille* to refer to the son rather than the son's freedman designated as *illum* in the previous line; he argues that the freedman lacked the legal power to free a slave (*illam*) from the household of the son/father. True enough, but *illam* could perfectly well refer to a female slave he acquired as a freedman, which is how I (and Kruschwitz 2002a, 45) take it, i.e. that *ille* refers to the freedman, and *illam* to a slavewoman of his own (but part of the larger Caninius Labeo household) whom he freed and married.

[107] For *uestem dedit*, see n.23 above; see also Kruschwitz (ibid., 45).

suggested that similar deictics could be textual, gesturing at names above the *carmen*,[108] but such an explanation cannot apply here, as the figures being gestured at are unnamed; the gestures could be to their physical remains, lost portraits, or, as we will discuss below, to the figures imagined as appearing in the gravesite-tableau created by a reading of the inscription. The speaker then summarizes with seeming pride his continued domestic relationship with these individuals, among others in his household: *quoad uixsi, uixsere omnes una inter meos*.[109]

It is the next line that has led to a certain amount of debate as to the speaker: *eundem mi*[110] *amorem praestat*[111] *puerilem senexs,* "as an old man, he offers the same boyish love for me." Specifically, there are differing interpretations of the juxtaposed *puerilem* and *senexs*: those who believe that the speaker of this and the next two lines is the son, or the son's freedman, take *senexs* to refer to the father, and the "boyish love" to be the father's love for the boy; the other interpretation, in which the father continues to speak, takes *senexs* to refer to the son now grown old, and the "boyish love" his love for his father, hearkening back to his childhood. As discussed above, I favor the latter interpretation, and so understand the line as the deceased father referring to love from his now elderly son, a love manifested by the monument as described in the next line: *monumentum indiciost*. The present tense of *est* is vivid here, and calls to mind a similar expression in CIL I² 2273, discussed in chapter four: *haec qualis fuerit…monumentum indicat*.[112]

The remainder of the poem describes the monument itself: it is enclosed by stone, *saxso saeptum*, and around the monument, *circum* (*monumentum*), there is a

---

[108] See discussion of CIL I² 1570, p.59 above.
[109] Kruschwitz (2002a, 45) would have preferred something like *omnes uixsere una mei*, to keep the emphasis on these individuals, but the sense of the text seems to be that these are only some of "his people," i.e. there were others living in his household who were not buried there (yet).
[110] For the position of the enclitic personal pronoun, see Kruschwitz (ibid., esp. n.17).
[111] Kruschwitz (ibid.) reports that the *TLL* (s.v. *praesto* 914. 65) offers evidence only from Augustan poetry for *amorem praestare*.
[112] Kruschwitz (ibid.); for the present tense, cf. also CIL I² 1547 discussed in chapter two, [*ing*]*enium declarant pietatis alumnus*.

wall fenced with marble, *moerum marmori stipatum*, at a cost of many thousand (sesterces, presumably), *multeis millibus*.[113] The syntax here is open for interpretation – Kruschwitz declares it "*mehrdeutig*,"[114] – but the overall sense seems to be that there was fencing of stone and marble around the plot, which cost a good deal of money.

Thus the deceased's family and household play a much larger role in the portrait created by this inscription than in our previous example. The non-metrical superscript indicates to the reader that both father and son will be memorialized here; with each reading, their shadowy figures appear. It is clear from the first line of the metrical portion that is the father who speaks: with his first words, he gestures at his son and at unnamed others in the vicinity (with the deictics, as we have seen before, creating a relationship between reader, inscription, and space), and claims them as his family. He then describes his son's freeing of one slave (identifying thereby one of the other figures) and that freedman's subsequent freeing of, and marriage to, a slavewoman of his own. The deictic pronouns make it clear that the father is pointing as he speaks to the others buried there with him; the freedman and freedwoman are unnamed, but perhaps their names, or portraits of them (as well as of the father and son) were included at the original location. Finally, the third line depicts the four figures as unified amidst a bustling household.

The speaking father then turns back to his son, asserting that it was love for that father that led him to build this monument; in the next line, the present tense of *indiciost* causes that testimony of love to be continually reified upon each reading

---

[113] In this understanding of the text, *ac* connects *saeptum* and *stipatum,* with *saxso* with the former and *marmori* with the latter (describing two separate enclosures). The other interpretation Kruschwitz (ibid. 45-46) suggests is that *ac* connects *saxso* and *marmori* (both with *saeptum*) and *stipatum* goes more closely with *multeis millibus*; in that case, we could understand only one enclosure, of stone and marble.

[114] Ibid.; he suggests that the lines might have been easier to interpret for a passer-by who could actually see the described monument.

by a passer-by. The monument itself, its materials and its cost, then becomes the subject of the speech; no doubt the son, as the commissioner of the monument, wished to claim credit for the financial investment made in the tomb, and he deflects any potential accusation of boasting by putting the words in the mouth of his father.

And indeed, it is as well that the son made the choice to include this textual description of the monument and its surroundings: by the father's description an image of the tomb is also created upon each reading even now, despite the fact that the inscription has become divorced from its original setting. The full portrait thus includes the speaking father, his son and freedman, both depicted as generous in their acts of manumission, and the freedwoman wife of the last, ornamented with the *uestis* of a Roman wife; they are depicted both as members of a larger household and as dwellers in this final resting place, the shape and cost of which are also envisioned, an ever-present and continually reified reminder of the love of the son for his father.

While certain scholars have suggested that this previous example could be construed as featuring two different speakers, in our next two examples such is undisputedly the case. In each of the last two examples of this set of poems in which the dead speak but without acknowledging an audience, both a husband and a wife speak, though, as we will see, not to each other. In the first of these, CIL I² 1221, there are in fact two inscriptions, each with a name and libertination above:

> a.
> *L. Aur]elius L. l. | [H]ermia | [la]nius de colle | Viminale*
> H]aec quae me faato | praecessit, corpore | casto
>   c]oniunxs una meo | praedita amans animo |
> f]ido fida uiro ueixsit, | studio parili qum |
>   nulla in auaritie | cessit ab officio.
> b.
> *Aurelia L. l. | Philematio*
> Viua Philematium sum | Aurelia nominitata |

211

casta pudens, uolgei | nescia, feida uiro. |
Vir conleibertus fuit, | eidem, quo careo | eheu, |
ree fuit ee uero plus | superaque parens. |
Septem me naatam | annorum gremio | ipse recepit,   5
(quadraginta) | annos nata necis potior.|
Ille meo officio | adsiduo florebat ad omnis.[115]

Lucius Aurelius Hermia, freedwoman of Lucius, butcher from the Viminal hill:
This woman who has preceded me in death, of chaste body, my only and loving spouse endowed with my soul, lived faithfully to her faithful husband, with matching zeal; never in self-will did she give up her duty.

Aurelia Philematium, freedwoman of Lucius:
Living I was named Aurelia Philematium, modest, chaste, ignorant of the crowd, faithful to my husband. My husband was my fellow-freedman, that same man, alas, whom I miss; but in fact he was more than a parent (to me). He himself received me into his lap when I was seven years old; at forty years old I gain experience of death. That man, by my constant care, succeeded in the eyes of everyone.[116]

The first of the two inscriptions appears on the left side of the stone, and the second on the right. Between the two appears a relief which depicts a man (on the left) and a woman (on the right) facing each other; the woman holds the man's right hand up to her face and seems to be kissing it.[117] Both inscriptions, written in elegiac couplets, appear to have been carved by the same hand, and are generally agreed to date to the first half of the first century BCE, based on the accompanying relief and the orthography of the poems.[118] The proper names above the two poems are those of a freedman and freedwoman of the same master, and the content of the inscriptions makes it clear that the two were married.

Inscription 1221a, above which the name and libertination of the freedman L. Aurelius Hermia are written (as well as his profession[119] and locality), is spoken

---

[115] CLE 959: the inscriptions are carved on a travertine tablet found in 1592 in Rome, along the Via Nomentana in the Vigna Martella near the city wall; the tablet is now in the British Museum. The left side of the tablet has crumbled, but we can restore the text based on manuscripts of Sirmondius (ms. Paris Lat. 1419. 458) and Donius (ms. Vaticanus 7113 f. 91), recorded before the damage (CIL ad loc., Keuleers 2003 ad loc., Fassbender 2007, 181).

[116] See below for a discussion of *ad omnis*.

[117] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[118] Warmington 1940 ad loc; Vessberg 1941, 181-183.; Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[119] He appears to have been another of the small-business owners of which we have seen several examples.

by the voice of that man. We might therefore expect that this first poem is his

epitaph, but such does not seem to be the case. His first word is the deictic *haec*,

indicating that the subject of inscription 1221a is in fact his wife; here the pronoun

seems to be used both in the sense that is most common in this context, viz. to

gesture at the deceased (as represented by a name or description, as well as any

physical remains), and also, in this case, to gesture at the portrait of her that

accompanies the inscription. Massaro suggests further that the use of *haec* here by

one person to refer to another has much in common with the use of such pronouns

on the Roman stage, when one character gestures at another[120] – appropriate, given

our suggestion that these epitaphs conjure up graveside scenes. In a relative clause,

the husband reports that she died before him: *quae me faato*[121] *praecessit*.[122] After

introducing (as it were) his wife, and the circumstance of her death, he goes on to

praise her: she was of modest body (*corpore casto*),[123] and his only and loving

spouse, endowed with his soul, [*c*]*oniunxs una meo praedita amans animo*.[124]

    In the second couplet he asserts that she lived faithfully to her faithful

husband, [*f*]*ido fida uiro ueixsit*; it is notable that the adjective *fidus* is applied to

---

[120] 2007, 278-279.

[121] For the geminate spelling of long vowels (supposedly introduced by Accius and attested in inscriptions from the 2nd century BCE to the end of the Republic), see Vine 1993, 267-282 and Weiss 2009, 29.

[122] Per Massaro (2007b, 279-280) the *TLL* records this as the earliest use of *fatum* in the sense of "death;" he believes, however, that *fatum* may in fact have its simpler sense of "fate, that which is ordained" here, with the verb *praecessit* conveying the idea of "precede in death."

[123] We saw the adjective in CIL I² 1259 (discussed in ch.2) and will see it again in I² 1836 in the next chapter. For *castitas* as a marital virtue, and the common application of its adjectival forms to women in epitaphs, see Treggiari 1991, 232. As for the whole phrase, Massaro (2007b, 280) reports that both of the two other Republican uses have a context that strongly associates body and soul, and that as such we should take the praise here to indicate not only bodily but also spiritual chastity.

[124] For what may be another reference to the sharing of souls, see 1217 discussed next in this chapter. Massaro finds even more depth in the arrangement of the line: certainly the word order was to some extent dictated by the meter, but in addition to the straightforward semantics of the two phrases (*coniunx una…amans*, and *meo praedita…animo*, with *meo* and *animo* each at the end of a hemistich), the juxtapositions of *una* with *meo* and *amans* with *animo* suggest in the first case the reciprocity and exclusivity of their affections, and in the latter the "intimate depth" of that reciprocal affection (ibid. 280-281; he also discusses in more depth the use of *praedita* here (n.33)).

him, as well as to her.[125] With matching zeal (*studio parili qum*), he says, she never

out of self-interest gave up her duty (*nulla in auaritie cessit ab officio*).

Warmington offers two different translations for *studio parili qum*: in his translation

proper he writes "in fondness equal to her other virtues," but in a note he suggests

that the phrase could mean with *studium* "equal to mine;"[126] the latter option seems

more likely to me, given the emphasis on reciprocity throughout, and certain

parallels elsewhere in the corpus.[127] As for the main clause, Massaro finds it rather

obscure (specifically, how to take *auaritie*; some editors, including Warmington,

accept an emendation to *amaritie*), but ultimately concludes that we should

understand it as translated above, i.e. with *auaritie* referring to a desire for selfish

gain.[128]

So in fact, 1221a, although it bears the husband's name, reads rather more as

if intended as an *elogium* for her than for him. What, then, about 1221b? Aurelia

Philematio's name and libertination head the inscription, and the poem is spoken in

her voice. In the first couplet she presents her identity (note the inclusion of the

name in the metrical portion of the epitaph,[129] not paralleled in the facing

inscription), *Viua Philematium sum Aurelia nominitata*,[130] and then describes

---

[125] Treggiari (1991, 237) notes, although she cites the phrase [*f*]*ido fida uiro* from this inscription as an example of the possibility of reciprocal *fides*, that the application of such an adjective (according to her, associated with sexual loyalty) to a husband is less common. Massaro (2007b, 281) notes the same tendency, but cites two examples from literature (Cic. *Fam.* 14.6.6 and Ov. *Fast.* 2.815).

[126] Warmington 1935 ad loc., per Massaro 2007b, 281-282; the latter's treatment includes a substantial discussion of the phrase and others' interpretations of it.

[127] Cf. *pari coniugio* in 1221, and *pari ingenio* in CIL I² 1732, both discussed later in this chapter.

[128] Ibid. 283-285; in support of his interpretation he cites passages from Columella (12. praef. 7-8) and Cicero (*Inv.* 2.35).

[129] Massaro (2007b, 287) is impressed by the line, in which the author has managed to incorporate the name metrically without any alteration or metrical mistakes; he suggests that the use of the Greek form in the *titulus* and the Latin form in the *carmen* is a deliberate choice, rather than one dictated by the meter – the Greek cognomen Philematio (a diminutive of φίλημα, "kiss"; see ibid. 286 n.58) is her "official" name, and as such appropriate to the *titulus*, whereas the Latin Philematium would be what she used in daily life. He also provides a summary (286-287) of other appearances of the cognomen.

[130] For the use of the frequentative, see ibid. 287-288; *nominito* is otherwise used only in Lucretius.

herself with four elements of praise: *casta, pudens, uolgei nescia, feida uiro*.[131] The

first and last of these echo the terms used by her husband: respectively, *corpore*

casto and [*f*]*ido fida uiro*. Treggiari reports that adjectives describing the

deceased's *pudicitia*, although not as commonly applied as adjectives related to

castitas, are also frequent,[132] and indeed, *pudens* appears elsewhere in our corpus.[133]

Volgei nescia, on the other hand, seems to be rather singular.[134]

After introducing herself, she speaks of her husband: he was her fellow

freedman, *uir conleibertus fuit*;[135] thereafter follows an expression of grief, as she

asserts that she misses him: *eidem quo careo eheu*. Both the present tense of the

verb and the elision between *careo* and *eheu* make the expression strikingly

vivid.[136] According to Massaro it would be more expected for this sentiment to be

expressed by the survivor rather than the deceased;[137] but in this case the surviving

husband, as the presumed commissioner of the monument, has chosen to attribute

this feeling and expression to his deceased wife. She goes on to say that in fact (the

rather redundant – or at least very emphatic – *ree…ee uero*) he was much more than

---

[131] Massaro (ibid., 288-289) notes the careful diction and arrangement of the line as a whole: he points out that the first two elements are absolute whereas the latter two are each defined by a substantive, with the conceptual opposition of the (alliterative) *uolgei* and *uiro* highlighted by the chiastic (syntactic) arrangement of the adjective-substantive pairs; furthermore, the chiasmus is conceptual as well, with *feida uiro* being a manifestation of Aurelia's *castitas* and *uolgi nescia* a manifestation of her *pudicitia*.

[132] 1991, 232-3; of the distinction between the two qualities, she writes, "*Castitas*, stainless purity, has cult associations and relates to physical and mental integrity; *pudicitia* connotes rather the conscience which keeps a person from shameful actions."

[133] Applied to a man: CIL I² 1210 for A. Granius Stabilio, *pudentis hominis frugi cum magna fide*.

[134] The use of *nescia* here is, per Massaro (2007b, 289-290), unusual in two ways when compared to the (relatively few) other examples of the word in Republican literature: it is not as is often the case in litotes, and rarely does it indicate ignorance/lack of awareness of people rather than things.

[135] Massaro (ibid., 290) finds this line more labored than the last, due perhaps in part to the particular information that the commissioner wished to be included; he notes with approval, however, the polyptoton of *uiro*/*Vir*. He also suggests that the use of *conleibertus* here might have called to mind a formula that appears elsewhere (but not in our corpus), *collibertae/-o et coniugi or coniugi et colliberto*.

[136] For the rarity of elision in this position, see Massaro, ibid.

[137] Massaro 2007b, 291; he gives several such examples.

215

a father to her: *fuit…plus superaque parens*.[138] The fifth verse sheds some light on

what she means by this declaration: their relationship began (*me…gremio ipse

recepit*; this expression most likely indicates that he became a guardian of sorts for

her, before their marriage[139]) when she was seven years old (*septem…naatam

annorum*). In conclusion, she says that having lived forty years (*quadraginta

annos*[140] *nata*), she gains experience of death (*necis potior*[141]); this expression ends

the fourth couplet, framing the more detailed bibliographical information that began

with *Viua Philematium sum*.

A final hexameter summarizes her role in her husband's life: *ille* (a deictic

pronoun, but one indicating more distance than the *haec* he has used for her above)

meo officio adsiduo florebat ad omnis; here again we have an echo of the facing

inscription: cf. *nulla…cessit ab officio*. Massaro suggests that we are missing a

final pentameter, perhaps inscribed on the base of an attached (but now lost)

sarcophagus; he believes that a poet of such skill as indicated by the preceding lines

would not end with an isolated hexameter. Furthermore, he says, the content of the

lost pentameter might help explain two aspects of the last line he finds problematic:

how to take the expression *ad omnis*, and the tense of *florebat*.[142] While the odd

---

[138] "Much more than a father" is the translation suggested by Martinez and De Rosalia, which requires us to understand an ellipsed *quam*; Massaro (ibid., 292) suggests as an alternative "he was much more (than a fellow-freedman): a father."

[139] Thus Massaro (ibid., 294), who offers a discussion of the expression, which he finds an "emotionally engaging" way to present the information.

[140] On the switch from the genitive in the preceding line (n.b. such genitives are found mostly in inscriptions, Kühner-Stegman I.284.) to the accusative here, see ibid.: Massaro suggests that the genitive of quality is appropriate as the poet describes the age of the deceased when she was adopted, and the accusative to indicate the duration of her life.

[141] Both elements of this expression are more complex than my translation suggests. Warmington (1935 ad loc.) and Massaro (2007b, 295) note that *nex* generally indicates a violent death, as opposed to a natural one (*mors*); Massaro suggests that it may have been chosen here for the sake of alliteration with *nata*. The *OLD* (s.v. *nex* 2) cites this as the first example of *nex* = *mors*. *Potior* is rather odd here (see Massaro, ibid.; the *OLD* (s.v. *potior* 4) suggests "gains experience of death", cf. Lucr. 4.766 (of a dead man seen in a dream), *eum mortis letique potitum* and Kühner-Stegman I.383-4. I have found no parallels for the combination (of *potior* and *nex*).

[142] For other scholars' interpretations of *ad omnis*, see Massaro 2007b, 296 (he reports, e.g., that the *TLL* (917.62) suggests that this is a comparative use of *ad*, i.e. he succeeded beyond all others); for the tense of *florebat*, see ibid., 297.

number of verses does make the suggestion of a missing final line reasonable, neither of the expressions mentioned by Massaro seem to me to need more text to make sense: *ad omnis* can mean "in the eyes of everyone" (the image is that of a tribunal),[143] and the tense of *florebat* could indicate that Aurelia Philematio's husband flourished as long as she was alive, but then no longer. Minor questions of interpretation aside, the sense here is clear: the husband's success was in large part attributable to her support.

As mentioned above, two voices are heard in the inscriptions 1221a and b. Investigation of these voices – how they are presented, to whom they speak, and what they say – can further illuminate our understanding of the function and effects of these inscriptions, specifically how they serve to create images that reinforce the content of the epitaphs.

Although the name of the husband stands above inscription 1221a, it is not until the word [*c*]*oniunxs* in line 2 that the reader becomes aware that it is that man who speaks the words of that inscription through the reader's voice. The inscription begins with the deictic gesture intimated by *haec*, indicating the as-yet-unidentified speaker's proximity to the deceased, and thereby her presence (although this presence could refer either to her physical remains, her image in the relief, or an imagined figure of her, which later will speak the words of 1221b).[144] In the relative clause, of which *haec* is the antecedent, *me* invests the speaker with first-person perspective; the identity of this individual who co-opts the voice of the reader is revealed by the first word of the second line, [*c*]*oniunxs*. In the praise that follows, the present tense of the participle *amans* causes that emotion to be reactivated with each reading. Despite the proximity of the deceased as indicated by *haec*, her

---

[143] *OLD* s.v. *ad* 17a-b.
[144] Cf. Kühner-Stegmann II §118.

husband does not address her directly, nor any specific audience; his words, then, must be imagined as directed to the reader himself or anyone who might hear.

Given the correlation between the name above inscription 1221a and the voice which speaks its words, when the reader moves on to 1221b and finds the name of the deceased wife at its head he perhaps assumes that she will now speak; and indeed, indication that such is the case is not long in coming, as the speaker identifies herself as Aurelia Philematium with a first-person verb in the first line of the metrical inscription. Whereas in 1221a her husband has noted in the relative clause that she preceded him in death, she, in a relative clause in line 3, declares with an expression of grief that she misses him (*careo eheu* – the present tense of *careo* ensures that that sentiment, like *amans* in the facing inscription, will be reactivated upon each reading). In the last line of the inscription she refers to her husband as *ille* – a deictic pronoun like the *haec* he used above to refer to her, but indicating more of a distance between them. One reason for this distinction may be that at the time of composition she was dead (and thus receives a form of the standard *hic* for the deceased subject) but he was still alive – her gesture must cross the divide in the opposite direction, from dead to living, thus *ille*. In considering the arrangement of the deixis within the poem, it should perhaps be noted that *haec* begins the first line of the inscription he speaks, and *ille* begins the last line of the inscription she speaks.

Thus each epitaph conjures up an image of its speaker, able to communicate through the voice of the passer-by, but the figures of husband and wife are unable to communicate with each other. In 1221a, it is the man whose name appears above the *carmen* who speaks, but not about himself: he gestures at and describes his dead wife. In 1221b, the wife, also named above the metrical portion, speaks about her relationship with her husband, and gestures at him in the final line. No mention is made of other family members or peers; the scene each figure creates includes the

other but no one else, thereby reinforcing the message presented by the content:
their love was all-encompassing and exclusive. Nonetheless, neither figure speaks
to the other: the moment in time captured by the epitaphs is one in which they are
separated, and that is the state of affairs reified by each reading of a passer-by.

Such is also the case in our next example, CIL I² 1217, parallel in many
ways to 1221 just discussed:

>   …]e pulchre d[…
>   …]te hoc uoluit monumento am[…
>   …]ogaui ut faceret monumentum m[…
> …]mpetraui id ab eo – laudo beneuolen[…
> …]ni heic animo duo et essemus siti.   5
>   pari coniugio, uirtute, summa industria
> uixsi et fortunam, quoad uixi, toli.
>   Tertiam quom essem, me primam speraui fore.
>
> quom quod sperarem eciem me retinere potesse,
>   spe amissa uoluit me Fortuna heic retine(re),   10
> quoniam me Fortuna iniqua non siuit frui,
>   nihil timeo nec confido: moriundum scio.
> uiuam quam ornare studui, ornaui mortua(m).[145]

(Wife:) […] beautifully […];
he wished that […] by this monument.
…] that he make a monument [for me?],
…I obtained it from him (I praise his kind[ness]!),
also that we two with […] soul be placed here.
I lived with a well-matched spouse, with virtue, with the highest industry and I bore my lot
as long as I lived. Although I was "Third", I hoped that I would be first.

(Husband:) Although that which I hoped indeed to be able to keep, hope being lost Fortune
has wished me to keep (it) here; since cruel Fortune has not allowed me to enjoy (it), I fear
nothing and I trust nothing: I know I must die. She whom I have been eager to adorn while
she lived, I have now adorned, dead.

Both Bücheler and Massaro include the inscription in their sections on iambic

senarii, but only a few of the thirteen lines are correct representations of that

---

[145] CLE 68: this inscription appears on a large marble tablet in St. Paul's monastery in Rome, with
damage to the top and upper part of each side (CIL ad loc., Keuleers ad loc.); Fassbender (2007,
186-187) suggests that a likely original location was the large necropolis near the intersection of the
Via della Sette Chiese and the Via Ostiense.

meter.[146] Colafrancesco and Massaro agree with Keuleers that this inscription should be dated to the first century BCE, although Keuleers further specifies that it belongs, based on the paleography, to the last decades of the Republic.[147]

Although there is no relief accompanying this inscription like the one that separates the two parts of 1221, the first eight lines of the inscription are separated from the last five by an unfilled space on the stone. And just as the two sections of 1221 are spoken respectively by the still-living husband and the deceased wife, here the first section is spoken by the deceased wife and the second by the still-living husband. No names accompany this inscription, likely due to the loss of the top of the tablet; the figures depicted must remain nameless for us modern readers of the damaged text (although the last line of the wife's speech may, depending on our interpretation, reveal her name), nor can we determine with any certainty their social status.

The opening lines of poem are badly damaged enough to impede comprehension. In the first line all that remains is the adverb *pulchre*; in the second we can see a bit more: *uoluit*, "he wished," with "he" most likely being the surviving husband, and "by means of this monument," *hoc monumento*. More still remains of the third line, where we see another reference to the monument, and, via

---

[146] Damage to the first five lines makes metrical claims for them difficult: Bücheler has reconstructed them as iambic senarii (n.b., the first line includes text clearly contrary to what appears on the stone):

> Funusque orn]auit pulchre deces[s]um [dolens,
> > hone]ste hoc uoluit monumento am[bustam tegi.
> et quod r]ogaui ut faceret monumentum m[ihi,
> sic i]mpetraui id ab eo (laudo beneuolen[tiam!).
> commu]ni heic animo duo et essemus siti.

Massaro (2007a, 143-144) considers 8, 12, and 13 iambic senarii, and says that the others have iambic or dactylic rhythms; Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) notes that 9 and 10 can be scanned as hexameters. In the chunk of the inscription in which whole lines have survived intact, alternating lines are indented as depicted above. The alternation obviously does not represent elegiac couplets, but Massaro (ibid., n.90) suggests that the divisions into couplets follow a "logico-sintatta" structure. To summarize, there is certainly metrical intent here, but no unified meter: 9-10 are dactylic hexameters, and 5-8 and 11-13 seem to be attempts, some more successful than others, at iambic senarii.

[147] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

a remnant of a first-person verb, learn that he (again, the husband) was responsible for it, possibly by her request: [*r*?]*ogaui ut faceret monumentum m*[*ihi*?].[148] The content of the next line seems to confirm this guess, as she states that she gained what she requested from him, and praises him for it: …[*i*]*mpetraui id ab eo – laudo beneuolen*[*tiam*]. Only the first word of the next line is damaged, and the speaker seems to be elaborating on the request she made of her husband: she wished them to be placed in that spot together, […]*ni heic animo duo et essemus siti*. What is likely to be an adjective modifying "soul" is lost here; Bücheler suggests *communi…animo*, perhaps on the basis of a potential parallel discussed in 1221 just above, where the husband refers to his wife as endowed with his soul.

Beginning with the sixth line the remaining verses are intact. In a clause with enjambment over the sixth and seventh lines, the wife informs us that she lived with a well-matched spouse, and (with a change in the use of the ablative) with virtue and the highest industry: *pari coniugio* (cf. *studio parili qum* in 1221a just discussed [149]), *uirtute, summa industria uixsi*. Furthermore, she says, she bore her *fortuna* as long as she lived: *fortunam, quoad uixi, toli*. The final line she speaks is certainly a pun of some sort,[150] but one with more than one interpretation; literally, she says, "although I was Third (*Tertia*), I hoped I would be first (*prima*)." It seems likely that Tertia was her cognomen,[151] but there are at least two ways to understand her desire to be "first": does she mean that she wished to be first in virtue,[152] or in

---

[148] For the suggested restorations, see n.146 above.

[149] And, in 1732 discussed later in this chapter, *pari ingenio*.

[150] Cf. (with thanks to Michael Weiss for the reference) Plaut. *Amph.* 304-6: *Formido male, ne ego hic nomen meum commutem et Quintus fiam e Sosia*; *quattuor nudos sopori se dedisse hic autumat; metuo ne numerum augeam illum*, "Oh, but I'm awfully scared my name will be changed here and now, from Sosia to Sosia the fifth. Four men he's sent already to slumberland, so he says: I'm afraid I'm going to swell that list" (trans. Nixon).

[151] Although Bücheler makes reference to, but disagrees with, an earlier suggestion that *tertia* might mean that she was his third wife (CLE ad loc.). Keuleers suggests (2003 ad loc.) that this cognomen might suggest citizen-status, as it was widely used among the aristocracy, but notes also that by the end of the Republic it was used in all social ranks.

[152] Garrucci's interpretation (1877 ad loc. (nr. 1337)); he cites as evidence another epitaph in which a freedwoman is praised as a *femina prima*.

favor[153] (among her sisters, or in the eyes of her husband)? Or that she wished to be the first to die? Keuleers favors the last interpretation, given her husband's suffering at her loss, but some version of the former seems more likely to me.[154]

Her husband's reaction, as depicted in the second part of the poem, does indeed show the emotional perils of being the one left behind. He begins with a concessive clause, expressing his frustrated hope to "keep" his wife, *quom*[155] *quod sperarem eciem*[156] *me retinere potesse*, and in the main clause expresses what happened instead: with that hope being lost (*spe amissa*), Fortune has wished him to keep his wife here, i.e. at her burial site, *uoluit me Fortuna heic retine*(*re*). Furthermore, he says, the fact that cruel fortune has not permitted him to enjoy his wife (*quoniam me Fortuna iniqua non siuit frui*) has had a drastic effect on his state of mind: he fears nothing, nor does he trust (*nihil timeo nec confido*), and he is aware of his own mortality: *moriundum scio*.

We have seen *fortuna* and *Fortuna* mentioned elsewhere in the corpus, and we will see them again; the wife in this case has used the term in its more neutral sense, of one's lot or fate[157] (*fortunam, quoad uixi, toli*), but her husband speaks of Fortuna, the cruel and changeable goddess.[158] The idea that another's death might serve as a *memento mori* for survivors is widespread;[159] we will see a somewhat more threatening version of it in CIL I² 2138 discussed in our next chapter. The husband's assertion that he no longer fears or trusts may remind us of an expression from the Greek Anthology, Ἐλπὶς καὶ σὺ Τύχη μέγα χαίρετε,[160] but such

---

[153] Cf. Ter. *Eun*. 2.2.17: *quia sum apud te primus*.

[154] Bücheler seems to offer a variant of this interpretation: he writes "*Tertia nomine prima tamen fortunae praemia expectaui*."

[155] For *cum*, as seen earlier in the poem and in several other poems in the corpus.

[156] According to Bücheler (1965, 400), a vulgarism (from **ecidem*) for *equidem*; Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) agrees, but I have found no evidence for such a spelling elsewhere. *Et iam* would fit the meter.

[157] Cf. CIL VI 14211 discussed earlier in this chapter.

[158] See CIL I² 1219 discussed in ch.4, and 3449d discussed in the next chapter; Lattimore (1962, 155; 183) cites the lines currently under discussion as an example of the resignation Fortuna can inspire.

[159] Lattimore 1962, 256-258.

[160] *AP* 9.49 and 134, cited by Tolman 1909, 95; he gives several Latin versions as well.

expressions are usually given as a sentiment of the deceased him- or herself, rather than at the loss of another. Finally, the husband reports with seeming resignation that instead of adorning his wife when living, as he had been eager to do, he now adorns her dead: *uiuam quam ornare studui, ornaui mortua*(*m*). We saw a similar claim earlier, by a mother mourning her daughter.[161]

What scene, then, is depicted by this epitaph? Damage to the upper part of the tablet makes it difficult to reconstruct the reading experience of a passer-by in antiquity, but we can at least treat the poem as we have it. The third-person verb *uoluit* (with no clear indication as to the identity of the erector whose action it describes) in the second line leaves unclear whose voice is speaking through the reader (no non-metrical names head these inscriptions), nor is any audience addressed or acknowledged. [*R*]*ogaui* in 3, however, and what is likely a first-person pronoun at the end of that line, belatedly make us aware that it is the deceased who speaks, going on to praise the *beneuolentia* of the erector (4). He is identified as male by *eo*; note, however, the use of the determinative pronoun rather than the deictic, a choice that suggests that she does not consider him present to hear her speech.[162] In describing her life she mentions prominently her *pari coniugio*, offering us a probable identity for the tomb-erector she has referred to above. The only present-tense verb in the speech is *laudo*, with the resulting effect that while the actions situated in the past (the erection of her tomb and her life; the circumstances of her death are not mentioned) fade into the background, her praise remains constant and will be reactivated by the voice of the passer-by at every reading.

---

[161] CIL I² 1837, 4-6, discussed in ch.4: *eam quoniam haud licitum* [*est u*]*eiuam a matre ornarie*[*r*], *post mortem hoc fecit aiq*[*uo*]*m extremo tempore, decorauít eam monumento quam deilexserat.*
[162] See Kühner-Stegmann II §118.

A new voice begins to speak through the reader in the first line of the latter section, although a clear indication of this is delayed until the third and fourth lines of this second speech (11-12), where the reader must realize that the figure speaking these lines is not yet dead (*moriundum scio*); he asserts an identity separate from the deceased. This speaker must be identified from the content as the above-mentioned spouse of the deceased, and this speech confirms his identification as erector of the tomb. Just as earlier in the inscription the wife spoke to an unspecified audience rather than directly to her husband, here too the husband does not directly address his wife. Whereas the deceased Tertia foregrounds her praise of her husband with her use of the present tense *laudo*, the unnamed, as-yet-living husband speaks in the present tense only of his state of mind – resigned realization of his own mortality – in 12, and so it is this expression of resignation in present time which is reactivated by each reading.

As was the case in the graveside scene depicted by inscription 1221, only the deceased wife and her still-living husband appear as speakers, and each of them, as they speak, is alone: no family members or other contemporaries join them in these depictions. Unlike the husband and wife in 1221, however, these spouses do not even gesture at each other with deictic pronouns; although each of them gestures at the space (she with *hoc* in 2 and *heic* in 5, he with *heic* in 10), neither of them gives any deictic indication that the other is envisioned as present. As such there is no contact depicted between these separated lovers in the epitaph: they cannot cross the divide between the living and the dead, and will not be reunited until the husband joins his wife in death, a reunion foreshadowed by the wife's assertion that they would eventually be reunited in the tomb (*heic…duo…essemus siti*).

Thus are the last two examples in this second subset of this penultimate chapter, in which we have considered those poems that are spoken by the deceased

but do not acknowledge an audience. In the first set of three, no space is explicitly acknowledged, but we saw that nevertheless some reference to the surroundings does in each case appear; we suggest that the very fact that it is the deceased who is envisioned as speaking grounds the narrative of the epitaph in the physical location of the gravesite, with the monument standing as a metonymic marker for the deceased among the living. The following six do acknowledge explicitly their original physical space. In several cases we saw the fact of the deceased being the speaker, as well as the explicit deixis, serving to reinforce the messages contained in the poems. In the two individual graves, each speaker made highly personalized assertions about themselves and their lives: Lemiso bemoaned that only death had ended his labor; he would repeat this message, tied "here" by the deictic pronoun, during the rest of his very permanent retirement; and taking a different attitude towards the work that had dominated her life, Manlia Gnome makes a point of taking credit for claiming "this one spot" for herself, controlling her destiny after death as she had in life. In two cases several people were interred in the graves: in one, a married couple claims very emphatically the space, designated as a *fundus* and a *horti*, as "ours" for themselves and their freedpeople; and in the other, a man "gestures" through deixis at the other members of his household, all interred with him in a space whose features and cost he describes with great pride. Finally, in two epitaphs for married couples, each man and woman speaks; in neither case do the spouses address each other, but their speeches establish their relationships with each other and with the space. In one of them, the husband and wife gesture at each other with deictic pronouns, each including the other to create exclusive but unified portraits; and in the other, each spouse gestures at the space they will eventually share.

Now, in the next and final chapter, we will turn to the last two sets of examples in this study: in the first set of seven, the deceased addresses the passer-

by, and in the last two, the deceased is envisioned as speaking to surviving family members.

CHAPTER SIX: DEAD SPEAK TO SPECIFIED AUDIENCES

Nine poems remain to be discussed, of the forty-nine in our corpus. These are the poems in which the deceased subjects speak to a specified audience: the first seven address a passer-by,[1] and in the last two, the deceased is envisioned as speaking not just to a passer-by, but to a particular mourner.[2] These poems, then, engage in what Conso terms "full" fictive orality.[3] In these poems we will see several elements of content we have not yet encountered in any of the other categories, with different effects for the deceased and for the reader, confirming that they belong in a category of their own.

The first example we will consider, however, is not very different from those we have just discussed (that is, poems in which the dead speak, but to an unidentified audience); it opens with an address to the passer-by, but otherwise differs little from the poems in the previous chapter. The new content begins with the second and third poems, which include well-wishes from the deceased to the passer-by; the fourth, fifth, and sixth have a far different tone, reminding the reader of his own impending death or offering pessimistic advice; and the last of this first set requests that the reader speak a formula of rest for him, an element that would become so common as to be formulaic in later epitaphs. Our eighth and penultimate example also contains such a request, but in addition the deceased addresses his mother directly; and in our final example the deceased speaks, through the reader, to his parents.

In our first example, then, CIL I² 1732, it is only the first lines, addressed to the passer-by, which distinguish it from those discussed in the previous chapter:

---

[1] CIL I² 1732, 1202, 2161, 2138, 1836, 3449d, 1214; also considered for inclusion in this section, but rejected as too fragmentary, was CIL I² 2997.
[2] CIL I² 1223 and 1215.
[3] 1994, 295-298.

> Tu qui secura spatiarus mente uiator
>   et nostri uoltus derigis inferieis,
> si quaeris quae sim, cinis en et tosta fauilla,
>   ante obitus tristeis Heluia Prima fui.
> coniuge sum Cadmo fructa Scrateio
>   concordesque pari uíximus ingenio.
> nunc data sum Diti longum mansura per aeum
>   deducta et fatali igne et aqua Stygia.[4]

> You, traveller, who stroll with an easy mind, and whose face turns to our shades, if you ask who I am: here! ashes and burnt cinders; before my sad death I was Helvia Prima. I delighted in my spouse, Cadmus Scrateius, and we lived in harmony, with matching mind. Now I have been given to Dis, to stay for a long time, led down both by the fatal fire and the Stygian water.

The poem is written in elegiac couplets, "irreproachable," according to Massaro, except for a missing foot-and-a-half in the fifth line; he suggests, rather than attributing the error to the difficulty of incorporating metrically the name of the husband, that the stone-carver left out a word or words of the commissioned text.[5] As for dating, some scholars have preferred a post-Republican date due to several supposed echoes of late Republican and early Imperial poetry,[6] but others suggest that these parallels of metrical practice and phrasing are instead attributable to shared use of earlier Greek models, and that our poem belongs to the Republic.[7] No non-metrical super- or subscript accompanies the inscription; the names of the deceased and her husband are included in the metrical portion, and most scholars suggest on the basis of those names that the couple were freedpeople.[8]

---

[4] CLE 960: the inscription was found at Beneventum, among the stones used to build the church of Santa Maria delle Grazie, and is now in the museum of Naples (CIL ad loc., Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

[5] Massaro 2007a, 138; Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) suggests *dilecto fructa* (following Bücheler, CLE ad loc.) or *caro tum*. Garrod (1913, 58) takes the emendation further (indeed, too far), suggesting *coniuge sum Catulo fructa actore Isocrateio*.

[6] Plessis (1905, 182) suggests the period of Augustus, and Popova (1968, 65-66) the first or second century CE. The form *spatiarus* (see n.9 below) and the spelling *aeum* (n.16) likely rule out such a late date, however.

[7] Alfonsi (1965, 60-65) offers the most comprehensive discussion of these parallels; he and Massaro (1992, 47) prefer to attribute the echoes to Greek sources. Keuleers (2003 ad loc.). reports that the paleography makes a date in the Republic more likely; Bücheler (CLE ad loc.) and Cugusi (2007, 47) suggest the time of Caesar.

[8] See, e.g., Keuleers 2003 ad loc., Massaro 2007a, 138.

The inscription opens with an extended address to the passer-by, which fills the first couplet – the first such address we have seen in our study addressed to the passer-by by the deceased him- or herself. The address begins rather forcefully with the pronoun *tu*: the equivalent, perhaps, of "Hey, you!" A further designation, *uiator*, is delayed to the end of the line by the first part of a relative clause, *qui secura spatiarus*[9] *mente*. Keuleers reports that *tu qui…uiator* is a common way to address the passer-by, and although we have no other examples of it in our corpus, his assertion is borne out by many such examples in the CLE, including one with a similar sense using the phrase *secura mente* in the same line position.[10] As with certain other features we have seen, we can suggest that the phrase, though common later, was not yet so frequent in the period of our corpus, where a simple *hospes* is the norm. The characterization of the potential reader as having a "secure mind" as he walks and looks at the gravestones (*et nostri uoltus derigis inferieis*[11]) seems to acknowledge that he is not necessarily emotionally invested in the fates of the dead about whom he is reading, but also hints, perhaps, from the perspective of a *memento mori*, that such security of mind should not, and indeed cannot, last.

And indeed, the next couplet highlights the contrast between one's living identity and what remains of it after death: the deceased answers anyone who asks (*si quaeris quae sim*) that although before her death she was Helvia Prima, now she is ash and burnt cinders, *cinis en et tosta fauilla*. For the poem to anticipate a reader asking the name of the deceased is well-precedented, both in Latin epitaphs and in earlier Greek examples;[12] another such example appears in our corpus, also

---

[9] For the old Latin byform, see ch.4, n.26 on *utarus.* The verb *spatior* can imply a leisurely stroll (*OLD* s.v. *spatior* 1; cf. Hor. *S.* 1.8.15) or a stately 'ritual walk' (see Austin (1955) on *Aen.* 4.62.).

[10] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 s.v. *tu*; CIL VI 12652 (first half of the first century CE): *Tu qui secura procedis mente…*

[11] For a parallel in our corpus, see the opening line of CIL I² 1214 discussed later in this chapter: *heus oculo errante quei aspicis leti domu*[*s*].

[12] Cugusi 2007, 33 n.177. For the question-and-answer trope (as old as Cato *Agr.* 1.7 *praedium quod primum siet*, *si me rogabis*) in other, non-sepulchral, contexts, see Marx (1995) on Lucil. fr. 515.

addressed by the deceased to a passer-by.[13] Also common is the highlighting of the

contrast between the deceased as once alive but now only burnt remains,[14] although

nowhere else in our corpus do we see such a clear expression of it.

In the next couplet the speaker declares that she delighted in her husband,

whose name is also metrically incorporated here (an inclusion that suggests him as a

likely dedicator), and that they lived *concordes* and with matching *ingenio*; this

couplet is very similar, then, to others we have seen expressing contentment

between husband and wife.[15]

In the final couplet, Helvia Prima describes her death in various

mythological ways: she is given to Dis to stay for a long time, *data sum Diti longum

mansura per aeum*,[16] led down by the fatal fire (*fatali igne*[17]) and the Stygian water

(*aqua Stygia*). Dis, a name used to refer to the Roman god of the underworld or the

underworld itself, appears in one other example in our corpus, and there are many

such references in the larger corpus of the CLE.[18] Here in particular we may see a

contrast with the preceding couplet: in life she was happily married to Cadmus

Scrateius, but now she is given to the god of the underworld.[19] The phrase *mansura

per aeum* is one of the echoes of Latin poetry mentioned above, appearing in Ovid

---

[13] CIL I² 2161, discussed later in this chapter; the trope, then, seems to be used frequently in this specific context, that is, when the deceased him- or herself is envisioned as speaking to the passer-by.

[14] Cugusi 2007, 47; he cites this epitaph in connection with Propertius 2.11.5-6 *et tua transibit contemnens ossa uiator, nec dicet 'Cinis hic docta puella fuit.'* Cf. also Hor. *C*. 4.7.15-16 *quo pius Aeneas, quo Tullus diues et Ancus, puluis et umbra sumus*.

[15] See, e.g., CIL I²1347 *heis sunt duo concordes* (ch.3 96ff.) and 1217 *pari coniugio…uixsi* (ch.5, 218ff.).

[16] With <u> for /ṷu/; see Gröber 1906, 472. For a detailed look at the various stages of pronunciation and orthography of /ṷo/ to /ṷu/ see Anderson 1909, 99-105.

[17] The elision at the caesura as seen here is considered characteristic of Catullus, but appears also in earlier Greek epigram (Keuleers 2003 ad loc,) as well as in early Latin (Porcius Licinus fr. 7.2 *FLP* and Lucil. fr. 625 *ROL*) and Republican (Prop. 1.5.32, 3.22.10) poetry.

[18] CIL I² 1214, discussed later in this chapter: *bis hic septeni mecum natales dies tenebris tenentur Ditis aeterna dom*[*u*]. For examples elsewhere in the CLE, see Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 s.v. *Dis*, *Diti*, etc. See also Tolman 1910, 61 and 104-5 and Lattimore 1962, 190.

[19] For *deducta* as the term used to escort a bride to her husband, see on Munro (1864) on Lucr. 1.96.

and in the *Appendix Vergiliana*.[20] The phrase *fatali igne* occurs in Ovid as well, albeit in a different line position and with different associations;[21] here, although we could take the phrase as referring to the act of cremation, the fact that it is parallel to *aqua Stygia* and follows the mention of Dis also calls to mind the flaming river Phlegethon. A reference to *aqua Stygia* occurs in Vergil's *Aeneid*,[22] but in this last case there is a possible Greek precedent from which our poet may have drawn, Homer's Στυγὸς ὕδωρ.[23]

The four couplets of the *carmen* are each self-contained in their content and can be summarized as follows: the first calls for the attention of the passer-by, in a rather extended form of such an address; the second announces, at the imagined asking by a reader, the name of the deceased in life, and offers a contrast between that living identity and the state of her physical remains after death; the third offers the only biographical information other than her name, specifically that she lived in harmony with her spouse, also named; and the last couplet describes her death in mythological terms.

These couplets show various effects for the deceased and for the reader or listener, some similar to those we have seen before, but also some that we see for the first time in this context. The emphatic opening "you" would likely catch the eye of a reader, and the ear of any potential listeners; the characterization of the reader or listener as walking with a "secure mind" through the gravestones might serve as something of a reproach, especially in light of the second couplet. *Nostri* in the second verse would signal the reader that some other speaker has claimed his

---

[20] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.: Ov. *Met.* 5.227 *quin etiam mansura dabo monimenta per aeuum*; *Culex* 38 *gloria perpetuum lucens mansura per aeuum.*
[21] *Epist.* 9.156, describing the death of Meleager: *alter fatali uiuus in igne situs.* The phrase occurs nowhere else in the CLE.
[22] *Aen.* 6.374: *tu Stygias inhumatus aquas amnemque seuerum*. The phrase also occurs in Propertius (2.9a.26), Tibullus (1.10.36), several times in Ovid, and in the *Appendix Vergiliana* (*Culex* 240).
[23] In the Greek form of the phrase, however, the reference to Styx is a genitive rather than adjectival; I was unable to find a likely Greek precedent with an adjective equivalent to *Stygia*.

voice; that speaker anticipates a reader's (or listener's) question as to her identity (*si quaeris*, one element of content that is new here: in our corpus, at least, the anticipation and inclusion in the text of such a question is limited to this and one other example wherein the deceased addresses the passer-by) and answers it by gesturing at the physical remains located at the gravesite. Only then does she give her identity, and she specifies that she was Helvia Prima *before* her death.

The next couplet conjures up an image of the kind we saw in our two previous examples, where the deceased woman identifies herself primarily in relation to her spouse: the only portrait of Helvia Prima that the poem creates is that of her as part of a harmonious marriage. Her spouse, named in the line after she gives her own name, would join her in this brief picture of their life together. The image is short-lived, however, as Helvia then turns to describing her death and the fact that she now resides in the kingdom of Dis. It is difficult to say what the effect of this couplet might have been, in terms of the scene created by the inscription; presumably the reference to Dis and the two underworld rivers would conjure up a picture of the deceased in that gloomy environment (hardly comforting!), but are we to imagine that the deceased speaks to us from that remote location? Or that, given her identification of herself with her physical remains in the third line, a separate aspect of her self remains here than that which was sent down to Dis? The picture is somewhat confused, but such is often the case with ancient conceptions of the afterlife.[24] In any case, it is worthwhile to note that this too is an element of content we have not seen before in our corpus, this claim by the deceased that she is in the underworld; we will see one other like it later in the chapter.

---

[24] Cf. Homer *Od.*11.601-604, where Odysseus describes meeting Heracles (or at least some aspect of him) in the underworld: τὸν δὲ μετ' εἰσενόησα βίην Ἡρακληείην, / εἴδωλον· αὐτὸς δὲ μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.

Our next example, CIL I² 1202, also contains elements of content we have

not seen before, and despite its seeming simplicity its interpretation is also

complicated:

> hoc est factum monumentum | Maarco Caicilio. |
> hospes, gratum est quom apud | meas restitistei seedes. |
> bene rem geras et ualeas. | dormias sine qura.[25]

> This memorial was made for Marcus Caecilius. Thank you, stranger, for stopping at my
> resting place. Good luck, good health, and worry-free sleep to you (trans. Courtney).[26]

Henzen proposes reading the lines as Saturnians, and that has been the general

consensus since;[27] the line divisions mark the cola within each verse (as well as, in

the first and third verses at least, logical/syntactic divisions).[28] Although earlier

scholars had suggested that the poem belongs to the Augustan period, taking the

orthography as deliberate archaism, more recent scholars conclude that the

orthography as well as the paleography, and the omission of the cognomen, indicate

a date in the third quarter of the second century BCE.[29] This example, then, is

among the oldest in our corpus.

---

[25] CLE 11: the travertine tablet on which this inscription is carved was found at Rome, along the Via Appia near the grave of Caecilia Metella (CIL ad loc.), where Courtney reports (1995, 214) it still stands; it is broken vertically about a third of the way across, and worn at the edges, but all of the text is still legible. The stone has holes bored into it, which seem to indicate that it was hung on a wall, part of a larger monument (Kruschwitz 2002, 162; Fassbender 2007, 175).

[26] See below for the possibility that the last wish, *dormias sine qura*, is meant to be spoken not by the deceased but by the passer-by.

[27] Kruschwitz 2002, 163, and Mercado 2012, 30; see also Massaro 1992, 65-77, Courtney 1995, 214-215, and Massaro 2007a, 129. Courtney suggests that the colon comprised of the name of the deceased is non-metrical, but Kruschwitz (2002, 164) does not agree; Mercado (2012, 62) also considers the name part of the metrical portion.

[28] On the possible metrical divisions of the second verse, see Kruschwitz 2002, 164. He also lists certain abnormalities of word-order that argue for understanding the inscription as a metrical text: the inversion of *factum est*; the division of *hoc…monumentum* such that the members of this pronoun-noun pair sit at the edges of their colon; the name as the completion of the metrical period; the hyperbaton of *meas seedes*; and the initial position of *bene*, which results in chiasmus with the other adverbial element in the verse, *sine qura*.

[29] Kruschwitz (2002, 162) and Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) judge the letter-shapes to be Republican. As for the orthography, the features in question include not only <ei> for *ī* (here applied only when etymologically correct and not in, e.g., the second syllable of *Caicilio*) but also *quom* for *cum*, <q> in *qura*, and the Accian geminate vowels (see ch.5 n.121; Courtney 1995, 214 suggests that *seedes* in particular indicates a date between 175 and 135 BCE). For a full discussion of dating, see Kruschwitz 2002, 162, esp. n.769.

At least two scholars have done very comprehensive treatments of the diction and contents of this inscription,[30] so we will consider these elements only briefly in order to focus on the effects of the poem. The first line is extremely simple, and contains three basic elements we have seen before: it begins with a deictic pronoun, *hoc*, which forms part of a statement of construction, *est factum*[31] *monumentum*, followed by the name of the deceased in the dative, *Maarco Caicilio*.[32] The inscription includes no filiation or libertination (and in fact the name is the only information given at all about the deceased), so we cannot know Marcus Caecilius' class; our M. Caecilius is not generally identified with any of the better-known figures of that name from the Republican period,[33] although some scholars have suggested a connection with Quintus Caecilius, an uncle of Atticus.[34] According to Keuleers, several factors suggest that our Caecilius was a member of the upper classes,[35] but this can be only speculation, especially since we have so few examples from this (presumably) earlier period.

Although the first verse is entirely in the third person, with no clear speaker or addressee, in the second line it becomes clear that the passer-by (*hospes*) is being addressed by the deceased himself, who thanks the *hospes* for stopping at his grave: *gratum est quom*[36] *apud*[37] *meas restitistei seedes*. As several scholars have pointed

---

[30] Massaro 1992, 65-77 and Kruschwitz 2002, 161-169.

[31] For the inversion here, as well as the use of *factum* in this context, see Kruschwitz 2002, 165.

[32] For the dative here, see ibid., 166 and Massaro 1992, 71-72.

[33] Kruschwitz 2002, 166, citing the fact that Muenzer (*RE* 3.1188) makes no attempt to identify this M. Caecilius with any of the others with that name mentioned in the Republican period.

[34] Kruschwitz 2002, 166: Bücheler (CLE ad loc.), Plessis (1905, 51), and Massaro (1992, 66) all suggest the connection.

[35] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.: the location of his tomb, the use of Saturnians (as opposed to iambic senarii, according to Keuleers more popular among the lower classes), and the seeming familiarity with/imitation of Greek funerary *topoi*.

[36] Kruschwitz (2002, 167) points out that *gratum est quom* (for *cum*) is unparalleled; we would expect an accusative-infinitive construction, or at least *gratum est quod*. Massaro (1992, 72-73) suggests, and Kruschwitz agrees, that the use of the expression *gratum est*, which appears frequently in Cicero's letters, shows a certain urbanity here.

[37] Massaro (1992, 74-75) notes that *apud* is generally avoided in poetic diction, other than in the early comic poets (an assertion confirmed by *TLL* s.v. *apud,* 2.336.35); but Kruschwitz (2002, 167)

out,[38] this is our oldest extant Latin epitaph wherein the deceased addresses the

passer-by,[39] a trope that as discussed above seems to imitate the Greek address ὦ

ξένε.[40] Given its status as the earliest extant Latin example, it is interesting to note

(while keeping in mind that it is random chance that has preserved only this

particular example for us) that in this case the speaker does not ask the passer-by to

stop and read, as we see in many examples from the next century, but rather takes

for granted that he has done so and thanks him for it.[41] The reference to the tomb as

a home or dwelling-place (*seedes*), however, is certainly an element shared by

many later examples.

Perhaps as a sign of appreciation for the passer-by's (assumed) willingness

to stop, the third line begins with good wishes spoken by the deceased: he wishes

the reader good luck and good health (*bene rem geras et ualeas*). Kruschwitz

reports that the wish *bene rem gerere* as a part of a farewell makes two appearances

in Plautus, including one paired with a form of *ualeo*, as here.[42] The next wish, for

which Cugusi finds a Plautine parallel as well,[43] is that the addressee may sleep

without care, *dormias sine qura*. We have seen good wishes to the passer-by

before, in the poems of chapter four (e.g. *uale, salue*), but none this elaborate. In

one case there we reported disagreement as to whether two greeting formulae given

in succession (*salue*; *saluos seis* in CIL I² 2273) should be taken as both spoken to

the passer-by, or as forming a dialogue, with *salue* spoken by the passer-by to the

---

points out that such may not have been the case for Saturnians (cf. *apud uos* in the Scipio epitaphs); there is too little evidence to know.

[38] See, e.g., Massaro 1992, 88-89 and Kruschwitz 2002, 166-167.

[39] The other epitaphs in the corpus dated to this period or earlier are certain of the Scipio epitaphs (which were not on public display but in a private family tomb, hence unlikely to address a passer-by) and CIL I² 1861 for the actor Protogenes, entirely in the third person (see discussion in ch.3); CIL I² 1211 for Claudia, discussed in ch.4, is usually considered slightly later than this example.

[40] See p.130 above.

[41] See Massaro 1992, 89-90 and 143-146; Kruschwitz (2002, 167-168) suggests that the poet wished to play with the more common *topos* of asking the passer-by to stop by offering this slight variation.

[42] Ibid.: *Cas.* 87 (in the prologue, addressed to the audience of the play: *ualete, bene rem gerite*) and *Mil.* 936 (*bene ambula, bene rem geras*).

[43] Cugusi 2007, 12: *Trin.* 621, *tuam quom rem credideris, sine omni cura dormias*.

deceased and *saluos seis* in turn by the deceased to the passer-by;[44] a similar suggestion has been offered here, viz. that *bene rem geras et ualeas* is envisioned as spoken by the deceased to the passer-by, and *dormias sine qura* by the passer-by to the deceased. Kruschwitz considers this suggestion reasonable, since he reports that the verb *dormire* is more often used in inscriptions to refer to the sleep of the dead.[45] It is true that the other three examples of the verb in the CLE refer to the sleep of the dead,[46] but three examples is a small number on which to base such a claim; again, it would seem, we cannot know for sure.

As for our overall understanding of the epitaph, Kruschwitz suggests two alternatives: first, that all three verses are envisioned as spoken by the deceased; and second, that the first verse is spoken by the stone, and the second and third verses by the deceased, after being introduced, as it were, by the stone. At first glance the first verse seems to be in the third person, but as we saw in discussing 1218 in our last chapter, a form of *hic* can function like Greek ὅδε with a third-person verb, gesturing at the speaker to serve as a form of first-person speech.[47] Alternately, we have the comparandum of 1215, the final example in this chapter, in which what is clearly a third-person introduction precedes a speech by the deceased. Both of these alternatives, then, are reasonable; we cannot with any certainty recommend one over the other.

And so despite its brevity the intended effects of this epitaph, and the imagined voices that speak it, continue to engender much discussion. Although the second verse and part of the third clearly address the passer-by, the epitaph does not open with an address to him, or a request to read; instead, the inscription takes the reading act for granted and begins with a simple deictic statement of construction

---

[44] See ch.4, pp.172-173.
[45] Kruschwitz 2002, 169; see also Massaro 1992, 76-77.
[46] CLE 188, 1977, and 2204.
[47] See p.200 above.

and identification of the deceased recipient of the tomb. These elements would have effects we have discussed before: the deictic *hoc* creates a relationship between the inscription, the reader, and the space, and the reading of Marcus Caecilius' name would designate the monument as his metonymic marker among the living. We can take this first line as spoken by the stone as an introduction, in which case we must then understand (as the reading passer-by would have understood) a change in speaker, or we can take *hoc* as functioning like ὅδε, spoken by Marcus Caecilius as he gestures at himself. In any case, Marcus Caecilius then begins to speak to the passer-by, addressing him as *hospes* at the beginning of the second verse. But the image of Marcus Caecilius as he speaks must remain devoid of detail: he says nothing about himself, but rather thanks the passer-by for visiting. In lines like this the co-opting of the reader's voice causes him to become both speaker and listener, giving voice to another as he reads for himself and anyone else listening. The question of voices becomes still more complex in the last verse, in which there may be another change of speaker: Marcus Caecilius wishes the passer-by (and any other listeners) good luck and good health, but then, if we take *dormias sine qura* as addressed to the deceased, the passer-by speaks for himself, albeit in words written by another. Thus in one interpretation M. Caecilius speaks the entire *carmen*, but according to other interpretations there may be up to three envisioned speakers in this brief poem: first, it may be the stone that speaks, introducing the deceased; then the deceased himself, as he thanks the reader for stopping and wishes him well; and then finally perhaps the passer-by himself, as he reads a wish that the deceased may sleep without care.

The overall tone of the poem, dictated by its carefully chosen content, is pithy and dignified: we receive no information about the deceased other than his name – nothing about his accomplishments in life, his family, or the circumstances of his death; nor are there any complaints or expressions of grief by or on behalf of

237

the deceased.[48] Nonetheless it serves its purpose by causing the dead man to be mentioned: we read the name of the deceased, which, combined with the deictic pronoun, serves also as an announcement of the monument as a metonymic marker, then thanks and good wishes to us as visitors, and then what seems to be, in turn, a wish for the deceased, that he may sleep without care.

Our next example, CIL I² 2161, also includes good wishes to the reader, but this well-wishing is contrasted to the sad fate of the deceased:

> *C. Paguri C. l. Gelotes*
> Hospes resiste et tumulum hunc excelsum aspic[e],
> quo continentur ossa paruae aetatulae.
> sepulta heic sita sum, uerna quoius aetatula.
> grauitatem officio et lanificio praestitei.
> queror fortunae cassum tam iniquom et graue[m].   5
> nomen si quaeras, exoriatur Salviae.
> ualebis hospes, opto ut seis felicior.[49]

3 *heic* Gruter, Bücheler; cod. HAEC.
6 Bücheler. cod. NOMEN EI QUAERAS EXORATURI SALVIAE.
8 *seis* Bücheler; cod. SANCTIS.

> *Gaius Pagurius Gelotes, freedman of Gaius*
> Stranger, stop and look at the tomb here made high,
> where the bones of small youth are held.
> I am buried here, whose youth was in springtime.
> I brought dignity to my duty and wool-making.
> I lament a calamity of fortune so unjust and heavy.

---

[48] Massaro (1992, 66-68; 2007a, 129) believes that this tone is very much related to the choice of Saturnians: he suggests that poems in this meter tend towards solemnity and nobility, avoiding expressions of grief or unmoderated emotion. Again, our evidence is too scanty to confirm or negate this suggestion; the only other poems in the corpus written in Saturnians are certain of the Scipio epitaphs, a group set apart by their age, archaeological context, and content, and CIL I² 708, for the unnamed soldier killed in battle. These examples do indeed fit Massaro's characterization, but conclusions based on so few examples cannot be secure.

[49] CLE 63: the inscription is known to us only via an 11th century manuscript (*codex Palatinus* 833, in the Vatican), with obvious textual problems; I use here the text generally accepted by modern scholars, which includes emendations by Gruter (16th-17th cent. compiler of inscriptions) and Bücheler. Bücheler's *seis* is based on the idea that our manuscript was from another copy, not the original, and that the copyist misinterpreted SЄIS vel sim. as SCIS, an abbreviation for *sanctis*.

Although Gruter reports in his compilation that the epitaph was found at Rome at the church of Saints Peter and Paul (today the church of Saint Francesca Romana), the manuscript itself designates this and an accompanying Christian epitaph as from Eporedia, a Roman colony in Cisalpine Gaul (De Rossi *ICVR* ad loc. (pp.36-37); Jansen 2007, 262); modern scholars, including the editors of the CIL and Bücheler in the CLE, consider Gruter's assertion a mistake and accept the latter *Fundort* (CIL I² ad loc., CLE ad loc.; see also Massaro 2007a, 145).

> If you ask my name, let (the name) of 'Salvia' arise.
> Be well, traveller, I wish that you may be luckier.

The poem is written in iambic senarii, with seven verses. Dating the inscription is difficult due to the lack of any archaeological or paleographical information, but Colafrancesco and Massaro suggest the first century BCE, presumably based on the orthography.[50] The subject of the poem seems to be a young woman named Salvia, but the name recorded as inscribed above the *carmen* is that of a freedman, C. Pagurius Gelotes; he was presumably the dedicator of the inscription, Salvia's master, father, or husband. We can only speculate as to her social status, with those guesses depending on the relationship between Salvia and the freedman Gelotes.[51]

The poem opens with the common request that the *hospes* stop and look at the monument: *hospes resiste et tumulum hunc excelsum aspic*[*e*]. This is the only use of the word *tumulum* in our corpus, but it appears frequently in the CLE;[52] *excelsum* as an adjective applied to the burial mound, however, seems to be unique in that collection.[53] The idea of height that the adjective brings may be intended to form a contrast with the characterization of the deceased and her physical remains in the next line, after an assertion of the presence of the those remains, *quo continentur ossa paruae aetatulae*.[54] The next line switches into the first person, but reiterates the same two messages: there is a somewhat redundant statement of

---

[50] Examples of seemingly archaic spellings include *quoius, praestitei,* and *iniquom*. For discussions of dating, see Keuleers 2003 ad loc. and Jansen 2007, 266, who cites also the popularity of iambic senarii in this context in the closing decades of the Republic.

[51] See Keuleers 2003 ad loc., Jansen 2007, 269-270. She may have been his slave (Warmington's interpretation (1935 ad loc.)), his daughter (in which case her status would depend on whether she was born before or after he was freed), or his wife (in which case she was likely also a freedperson, freed either by him or by some other master).

[52] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 s.v. *tumulum* etc.

[53] Cf., however, Catul. 64.363 *denique testis erit morti quoque reddita praeda /cum teres excelso coaceruatum aggere bustum / excipiet niueos perculsae uirginis artus.*

[54] Either a possessive genitive, or a genitive of quality. For the pleonasm here of *parua* plus a diminutive, see *LHS* II 776; Jansen (2007, 266-267) discusses the diminutive, used mostly in Republican Latin, in detail. The phrase obviously indicates someone not yet grown to maturity, but could apply to quite a large range of ages within that specification: Jansen reports that of the three uses of the variant *aetas parua* found by Kruschwitz (2002, 96-97) among metrical epitaphs, one is for a one-year-old, one for an eight-year-old, and one for a twenty-year-old.

burial, with a second use of deixis (*sepulta heic sita sum*,[55] with *sepulta* and *sita* indicating that the speaker is female) and a relative clause again emphasizing her youth, characterized as in its springtime (*uerna quoius aetatula*, with the diminutive ending two lines in a row, albeit in different cases).[56]

In the fourth verse the deceased speaker gives us a brief summary of her life: she claims that she brought dignity, *grauitatem...praestitei*, to her fulfillment of her duty (*officio*) and her task of wool-making (*lanificio*). We should understand *grauitatem...praestitei* as "I brought seriousness," i.e., "I took seriously my household duty and my wool-making." The assertion of *grauitas* is interesting: nowhere else in our corpus is this quality mentioned. In the CLE it appears attributed to the deceased in six other cases, and although the *TLL* makes no mention of its application to children in particular,[57] in five of the seven total cases (including this one) it is applied to a subject whose youth is emphasized.[58] We can suggest from all this that *grauitas* was an unusual quality in youth, and valued when found there, enough that it merited mention especially for young people in this context. As for Salvia's devotion to her duties, we saw a similar assertion about the deceased Claudia in CIL I² 1211, *domum seruauit et lanam fecit*;[59] the subject's *officium* mentioned here likely also refers to household duties.[60] The reference to these activities may indicate that the deceased girl was married, young as she may

---

[55] As noted above *heic* is Gruter's widely accepted emendation for the manuscript's *haec*; the redundancy here, however, makes me wonder whether two burial formulae were originally unsuccessfully combined, i.e. *sepulta haec...* (third-person) and *...sita sum* (first-person).

[56] For the combination of the adjective with *aetas*, see Catul. 68.16 *iucundum cum aetas florida uer ageret*. There could also be wordplay here on the other meaning of *uerna*, that is, a slave born in the master's house.

[57] In fact, the entry on *grauitas* (2305.70) seems to leave out these inscriptional uses altogether.

[58] Per Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 s.v. *grauitate*: CLE 649, 1337, 1385, 1388, 1390, and 1403, of which all but 1385 and 1390 are for immature subjects. We should keep in mind, however, that these examples are drawn from a far larger time period.

[59] For discussion, see ch.4 pp.156-157.

[60] Thus also Keuleers (2003 ad loc.).

have been; wool-making and care of the household were generally the province of Roman *matronae*.[61]

In the next line the deceased laments (*queror*) the fate she has suffered (*fortunae cassum*), a fate which she characterizes as *iniquom* and *grauem*, but the nature of which she does not specify; presumably it is her youth that makes her death so unfair. She then, anticipating a question from the reader, reveals her name: *nomen si quaeras, exoriatur Saluiae*. Such hypothetical questions, and their attendant responses, are common among Latin inscriptions;[62] indeed, we saw one two poems ago, although there the speaker responded with a dramatic gesture at her physical remains before giving her name.[63] One explanation of *exoriatur* here is that it refers to the pronunciation of the name by the passer-by as he reads the line, although Massaro suggests that this emendation by Bücheler (which we have accepted *faute de mieux*)[64] would be more justified if the poem were an acrostic of her name.[65] But another interpretation is especially interesting given our suggestion that these sepulchral inscriptions call up portraits of the deceased: *exorior* can also be used of ghosts,[66] in which case we could take the line as an explicit description of that process: should the passer-by ask the name of the deceased, a figure of her will appear to enlighten him.

The final line contains good wishes to the passer-by, addressed again as *hospes*: after a general valediction (*ualebis*[67]), Salvia tells the reader that she hopes

---

[61] Treggiari 1991, 243-4.

[62] Jansen 2007, 265; he reports that the most frequent introduction of such questions is *si quaeris,* as opposed to the subjunctive here.

[63] CIL I² 1732: *si quaeris quae sim, cinis en et tosta fauilla*.

[64] *Exoratur*, the reading in the manuscript, could work if we understand "be obtained by entreaty."

[65] Massaro 2007a, 145-146 n.107; for such acrostics, see Tolman 1909, 17.

[66] *OLD* s.v. *exorior* 1 cites Cic. *Tusc.* 1.106, where the verb is used to describe a man rising from the earth to beg his mother for proper burial rites: *ecce alius exoritur e terra, qui matrem dormire non sinat*.

[67] In the second-person future, rather than the more common *uale*; we will see this same form in the same line position, also followed by *hospes*, in an upcoming example, CIL I² 1836. Jansen suggests that there may be an optative meaning intended here, but that the form was most likely chosen for metrical reasons. The form *ualebis* is common in the letters of Cicero (see, e.g., *Fam.* 7.20.2.6).

he will be luckier than she has been: *opto ut seis felicior*. In this one wish we see a weaving together of multiple themes: that of the contrast between the dead subject and the living passer-by, a theme related to that of the gravestone/inscription as a *memento mori*, and finally good wishes for the reader in return for his stopping to read.[68]

The elements of content of this poem, then, are fairly clearly divided: only the first and second verse are syntactically linked, with each successive verse containing a separate element of content, most of which are common enough to be considered formulaic, but carried out with diction that is distinctive. Each element has varying effects for the subject and for the reader. The first line, beginning, as have several examples we have seen, by addressing the passer-by as *hospes* and asking him to stop and read, would thereby seek to claim his attention; having done so, it would direct that attention to the monument, and establish a relationship between reader, space, and monument with the deictic gesture contained in *tumulum hunc excelsum*. The second verse, a relative clause dependent on the first, would assert the continuing presence of the deceased's remains there, via the present-tense verb *continentur*, as well as give the first information about the deceased: the bones belong to small youth, *parua aetatulae*. Up to this point there had been a second-person address to the passer-by, but no first-person speech; this changes in the third verse, where the fourth word, *sum*, indicates that it is the deceased who is speaking. Other than the fact that the deceased speaker is female, as indicated by *sepulta* and *sita*, the line presents no other new information, but rather reiterates the ideas conveyed by the second verse, even reusing *aetatula*: speaking for herself now, the deceased girl asserts that she is buried here (*heic*, accepting Gruter's emendation),

---

[68] Lattimore (1963, 237) cites only one parallel for this sentiment, in the last line of CLE 473 (a poem which Colafrancesco and Massaro (1986 ad loc.) designate as *aetas incerta*) the more baldly expressed *quisque legis, doleas*; *deuites talia fata*.

242

again activating the connections between herself, the monument and the reader, and re-emphasizes her youth.

The still-unnamed figure then gives the only other information about her life: she says that she brought dignity to her *officium* (likely household duties) and her wool-making. Although no family members or peers are named in the metrical inscription, the content of this verse would create an image of the deceased girl within a household; furthermore, it might suggest that she was a married woman, young as she was. Her youth at the time of her death is likely the main cause of lamentation in the next verse: she complains (*queror*, with the present tense of the verb causing her complaint to be reactivated upon each reading) of her unfair and harsh fate. After all this, the deceased girl finally reveals her name, in response to an anticipated question from the reader; this device ensures that her name will in fact arise (*exoriatur*), spoken by the reader's voice. An even more intriguing possibility is that *exoriatur Saluiae* refers to the appearance of a figure of Salvia herself, speaking the words of the epitaph, but we should not get too attached to this idea, given that *exoriatur* is an emendation. In any case, the deceased girl thus named then goes on to wish the passer-by well, first generally with *ualebis*, and then more specifically with the hope, tinged with a hint of *memento mori*, that he may be luckier than she has been.

Our next example, CIL I² 3449d, also contains a wish spoken by the deceased that others will not share her fate, as well as advice as to how to avoid such a fate:

> *C. Licinius C. f. Torax*
> Hospes consiste et Thoracis perlege nomen: |
>   inmatura iacent ossa relata mea. |
> saeua parentibus eripuit Fortuna m[eis] | me
>   nec iuenem passast ulteriora frui. |
> nihl simile aspicias. timeant uentura | parentes,

<div align="center">nec nimium matres concupiant parere.[69]</div>

> *Gaius Licinius Torax, son of Gaius*
> Stranger, stop and read the name of Thorax: my immature bones, brought back, lie (here).
> Cruel Fate snatched me from my parents, nor has she suffered me to enjoy my boyhood any
> longer. May you look upon nothing similar. Let parents fear what is to come, and let
> mothers not desire too much to bear offspring.

The metrical portion of the inscription, preceded by a non-metrical subscript giving

the name and filiation of the deceased (with the latter indicating the subject's free-

born status), is written in elegiac couplets. As illustrated above, in the first couplet

the lines and verses coincide; in the remaining couplets, the beginning of each

hexameter coincides with a line-beginning, but the last word of each hexameter has

spilled into the following line.[70] Colafrancesco and Massaro classify the inscription

as *aetas incerta*, but other scholars generally date it to the latter half of the first

century BCE.[71]

The first hexameter of the inscription begins in a way now familiar to us,

calling to the passer-by and ordering him to stop (*hospes consiste*).[72] As we have

seen, this first imperative is frequently accompanied by a second, ordering the

passer-by to look or read;[73] the latter is used here, as the speaker commands the

passer-by to read his name: *et Thoracis perlege nomen*. Common as these elements

are (that is, commands to stop and look/read, and a naming of the deceased), this is

the only example in our corpus where they are combined in this way (i.e., that the

speaker bids the passer-by to read the name itself). In the pentameter the speaker

---

[69] CLE 980: the inscription is carved in lower-case letters with word-dividers on a limestone tablet found at Carthago Nova (modern Cartagena) and still kept in the museum there (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.)

[70] See Massaro 2007a, 138-139 and Gomez Pallarès 2007, 230-231.

[71] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.; Cugusi (2007, 21) labels it as belonging to the first century BCE but without citing any evidence; Gomez Pallarès (2007, 239) reports (but without specific citations) that the *consensus opinionum* places it in the latter half of that century. Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) suggests it may be even earlier, based on the lack of aspiration (*Torax*) in the superscript.

[72] The similar line-beginning *hospes resiste*, common in iambic senarii, must be adapted here to fit the hexameter (see Hernández Pérez 2001, 218).

[73] For the many variations and examples, see Cugusi 2007, 20-21 and Hernández Pérez 2001, 219.

(identified as the deceased subject by *mea*) asserts the presence of his remains there, characterized as "not yet mature" (*inmatura iacent ossa*).[74] The other modifier in that line, *relata*, is straightforward in its translation, but open to interpretation: it could simply refer to the "bringing back" of bones to the earth, as part of the larger idea of the earth as the beginning and end of life;[75] but in fact, in each of the few other examples of *ossa relata* in inscriptions and literature it has a more specific meaning.[76] Unlike in those cases, our text offers no other hints as to what precisely is meant here; we can speculate that Thorax died in war (there was plenty of fighting in Spain in the first century BCE[77]), hence the need to "bring back" his bones, but as there is no textual support it must remain mere speculation.

In the next couplet, the speaker expands upon the theme introduced by *inmatura*: cruel Fortune, he says, has snatched him from his parents (*saeua parentibus eripuit Fortuna m*[*eis*] *me*); furthermore, she has not allowed him to enjoy his youth any longer: *nec iuenem passat ulteriora*[78] *frui*.[79] These are expressions we have seen before: it is often to Fortune that the snatching of children is attributed, and we have also seen her, as here, disallowing enjoyment.[80] The

---

[74] In their commentary, Goméz Font and Hernández Pérez (2011, 33) find two parallels for *ossa immatura*, one literary (Tib. 2.6.29: *parce, per immatura tuae precor ossa sororis*) and one epigraphical (CLE 1066, from the first half of the first cent. CE: *inmatura sinu tellus leuis accipe Grati ossa*); as is often the case with such parallels, it is difficult to say in which direction the influence has flowed.

[75] See, e.g., Lattimore 1962, 31-38 and Wypustek 2012, 42-43. In CIL I² 1218 discussed in the previous chapter (pp.199-205), we saw the dichotomy *ossa dedi Terrae, corpus Volchano dedidi*.

[76] Collected by Goméz Font and Hernández Pérez (2011, 33-34): in the one inscriptional example CLE 1099 (2nd cent. BCE according to Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986), there is a dichotomy between the bones having been "brought back" home and the ashes that remain at the gravesite: *ossa relata domum, cinis hic adoperta quiescit*; in Ovid's *Tristia* (3.3.65), the poet hopes that his bones will be "brought back" from exile: *ossa tamen facito parua referantur in urna*; and in Statius (*Theb.* 8.736-739) Tydeus repudiates any desire to have his bones "brought back" to Argos: "*Inachidae: non ossa precor referantur ut Argos / Aetolumue larem; nec enim mihi cura supremi / funeris: odi artus fragilemque hunc corporis usum, / desertorem animi.*"

[77] See, e.g., Rodá 2013.

[78] The *OLD* (s.v. *ulterior* 2) cites this as the only example of the adverbial use of the neuter plural.

[79] For *fruor* with the accusative, see *TLL* 6.1.1423.66; there are many other inscriptional examples.

[80] Cf. CIL I² 1217, discussed in the previous chapter: *quoniam me Fortuna iniqua non siuit frui*; for *Fortuna* in Latin epitaphs, see Lattimore 1962, 154-156.

mention of the boy's parents suggests that they perhaps were the commissioners of the inscription.

It is in the final couplet that we encounter material we have not seen before. We have seen well-wishing from the stone or the deceased to the passer-by, but here the wish is more specific, viz. that the reader may look upon nothing similar, *nihl simile aspicias*. To some extent the fulfillment of such a wish would benefit the passer-by, in that he would not be saddened as he may have been here by another such sad story; but the wish is even more for others still living, that they will not suffer such a fate in their families. And indeed, the final element of content, filling out this last couplet, is rather pessimistic advice as to how to avoid such a fate: the speaker advises parents (or, highlighting the participial force, "those trying to reproduce,") to fear coming events, *timeant uentura parentes*, and (proleptic) mothers to be not too eager to bear children: *nec nimium matres concipiunt parere*. Though this is its only appearance in our corpus, such a sentiment is well-precedented in Greek funerary poetry, and paralleled in later Latin examples.[81]

Upon encountering this inscription, then, a passer-by might or might not read the non-metrical name and filiation of the deceased carved above the inscription; it is the first line of the metrical portion that is designed to catch his eye, with the command *hospes, consiste!* Even if the passer-by had skipped the name written above, however, the incorporation of that name into the first metrical line, *Thoracis*, ensures that a passer-by who has chosen to read it will have already followed the second command, *perlege nomen*.[82] At that point there is no indication

---

[81] See Goméz Font and Hernández Pérez 2011, 35; they cite as a Greek example *AP* 7.261, μὴ τέκοι εἰ μέλλει παιδὸς ὁρᾶν θάνατον, and several Latin examples from the CLE (for another Latin example, see Tolman 1909, 94). Goméz Font and Hernández Pérez also note, as does Massaro (1992, 48) the figura etymologica of *parentes/parere*.

[82] Goméz Font and Hernández Pérez (2011, 33) suggest that the pronunciation of the name here establishes a link between the deceased and the living, an idea that is in keeping with our suggestion

of who is speaking the verses; that information comes at the end of the pentameter, in which the speaker asserts the presence of his physical remains, brought back when they were not yet mature: *inmatura…ossa relata mea*. The speaker thus identified as Thorax himself goes on to blame his premature death on cruel Fortune, who snatched him from his parents, and did not allow him to enjoy the remainder of his youth. Here, then, we have our only depiction of Thorax in life: he had, before the interference of Fortuna, been enjoying his boyhood with his parents, who by their mention here join him, albeit briefly, in the portrait created by the inscription.

Having thus described and depicted the end of his life, Thorax turns his attention back to the reader; by his wish that a reader may look upon nothing similar, he is wishing not only that the reader not again have to suffer the sadness of learning of such a thing, but also that others might not suffer the pain of such a circumstance. He ends his speech by enjoining parents to fear what is to come (and perhaps thereby to be prepared for misfortune) and mothers to restrain their desire to give birth – advice unlikely to be followed, perhaps, but extremely poignant when placed on the lips of a lost child. As we have seen in other such cases, the reader learns little about the deceased child himself; the focus is on the disruption and pain caused by the boy's loss, and here, an attempt to prevent others from suffering such a loss.

In these last two examples we have seen hints of *memento mori*; in our next two we see that theme in its full form. In the first, CIL I² 1836, a well-wishing for the passer-by is followed by what is likely a warning of impending death:

> *Manlia L. f. Sabi*[*na*]
> Parentem amaui qua mihi fuit […
> parens, uirum parenti proxum[…
> ita casta ueitae constitit rat[io? …

---

that a monument bearing the name of the deceased serves as his metonymic marker among the living.

ualebis, hospes, ueiue, tibi iam m[ors?….[83]

Manlia Sabi[*na*]*, daughter of Lucius.*
I loved my father, as he was a […] father to me;[84] […] my husband nearest to my father;
thus the [account?] of my life has remained virtuous. Be well, traveller, and live, for even
now to you [death? …]

Scholars generally agree that the four verses under the non-metrical name and

filiation were iambic senarii.[85] Dating here is made more difficult by the fact that no

reports of archaeological or paleographical evidence survive, but most scholars

suggest a date in the first century BCE, before the end of the Republic.[86]

The *carmen* is preceded by the non-metrical name and filiation of the

deceased, with the latter indicating her free-born status: Manlia Sabi[na], daughter

of Lucius. Manlia begins by declaring that she loved her father, *parentem amaui*.

How we interpret the latter part of this verse (*qua mihi fuit parens*) depends on

whether we believe that we have the whole clause here (as per Bücheler's layout),[87]

or that an adjective was lost between *fuit* as the end of the first verse and *parens*

beginning the next (Kruschwitz suggests *optumus*),[88] but the sense is clear: she

loved her father for his fulfillment of that role. The latter part of the next verse is

lost, but it is clear that she then refers to her husband, *uirum*; the next words,

parenti proxum[…], seem to suggest that she described that man's place in her life

as nearest to that of her father.[89] Thus (*ita*), she says, the account of her life is

---

[83] CLE 62: the inscription was found at Masacci, in the territory of the Sabini. The stone is now lost;
the text comes to us from two transcriptions by Hieronymus Amatus, codices Vaticani 9752 f.27 and
9776 f.153. Of the two texts, which differ slightly, the former is clearly better (showing a more
complete text with fewer corruptions) and as such is the one used by modern editors (see Kruschwitz
2003, 59). For a thorough bibliography see Buoncore 2007, 218-219.

[84] For the various possible shades of meaning for *qua* here, see Kruschwitz 2003, 62.

[85] Kruschwitz 2003, 61; Massaro 2007a, 147. Bücheler's restoration (CLE ad loc.) differs slightly:
he considers *parens* part of the first verse, i.e. *Parentem amaui qua mihi fuit parens / uirum
parenti…*

[86] Colafrancesco and Massaro (1986 ad loc.) classify it as belonging to the first century BCE;
Keuleers suggests the first part of that century or even the end of the previous one, based on the
orthography; and Kruschwitz considers the orthography Republican, with the caveat that such
evidence is not necessarily sufficient for dating.

[87] See n.85 above.

[88] That is (2003, 60): *qua mihi fuit* [*optumus*] *parens*.

[89] Thus Bücheler (CLE ad loc.): *uirum parenti proxum*[*o colui loco*].

248

satisfactory: *ueitae constitit rat*[*io*] – Kruschwitz reports that *ratio constat* is a technical term in business with the meaning "the account balances."[90] The epithet *casta*, though grammatically modifying *ratio*, surely applies in sense to *ueitae*, and thereby to the deceased herself.[91] In the final verse Manlia shifts her attention back to her reader: she wishes him well (*ualebis, hospes*, just as we saw in CIL I² 2161) and tells him to live, *ueiue*. The final words of the verse are lost, but what we have, "even now for you…" (*tibi iam*) certainly seems to be the beginning of a warning, and the initial *m-*, combined with the likelihood of contrast with *ueiue*, makes *m*[*ors uenit*] a reasonable suggestion.[92] We have seen hints of *memento mori* – that is, reference to the fact that death is common to all, used not as consolation, but rather as a warning or threat – in other inscriptions; here, if the restoration is correct, we have it explicitly. Lattimore finds several examples of this *topos* in Greek epitaphs, and reports that it is still more frequent in Latin examples.[93]

As has been the case with several other examples, the damage to the text limits our ability to understand its intended effects, but we will make of it what we can. This inscription does not call out to the passer-by or request that he stop and read; it rather takes that reading for granted. That it is the deceased (identified by a non-metrical superscript) who is speaking becomes clear with the second word of the metrical *carmen*, the first-person verb *amaui*; Manlia claims the reader's voice almost immediately, then, to speak her epitaph. As we have often seen, however, Manlia's depiction of herself is almost entirely in relation to others. The first word of the inscription names another figure, Manlia's *parens* (identified as Lucius in her filiation), and reports her devotion to him while also, perhaps, praising him for his fulfillment of his role; the first word of the next clause is *uirum*, and that clause

---

[90] Kruschwitz 2003, 63.
[91] For a discussion of the epithet, see ch.2 pp.54-55 above.
[92] Thus Bücheler (CLE ad loc.); Cholodniak (CSL ad loc.) approved, as does Kruschwitz (2003, 60).
[93] Lattimore 1962, 256-258.

likely described her appreciation of that other important male figure. It is through

those relationships (*ita*) that she considers her life well-lived, or at least such is the

narrative that the commissioner has chosen to attribute to her in this final depiction.

The adjective *casta*, applied to *ratio* but referring in sense to Manlia herself, is the

only absolute element of praise given, and in fact her *castitas* would have been

defined by her behavior in relation to her father and husband.

   After this limited view of her life, this inscribed version of Manlia then uses

the reader's voice to wish him well; she bids him, and any other *hospites* in hearing,

to live, *ueiue*, emphasizing the inherent contrast between her state and theirs. The

damaged final part of the verse likely made explicit the warning that they would

eventually share her fate. The motives behind the inclusion of such a *topos* no

doubt varied, but here, paired as it is with good wishes and a reminder to live, the

warning seems to be intended to help the reader remember to appreciate the

remaining days of his life.

   No such good wishes, however, soften a similar warning in our next

example, CIL I² 2138:

> *M. Statius M. l. Chilo hic.*
> Heus tu, uiator las|se, qu[i] me praete|reis,
> cum diu ambula|reis, tamen hoc | ueniundum est tibi.
> *in f. p. X in ag. p. X.*[94]

> *Marcus Statius Chilo, freedman of Marcus, (lies) here.*
> Hey you, tired traveller who pass me by,
> although you may walk for a long time, nevertheless you also must come here.
> *In fr. ten feet, in ag. ten feet*

The inscription is comprised of three parts: a non-metrical subscript giving the

name and libertination of the deceased freedman, Marcus Statius Chilo; a *carmen* of

---

[94] The inscription, carved on a limestone tablet now broken into two pieces, was found in 1765 at Cremona (Mantua) at the Porta Margerita; it is now in the Castello Sforzecso in Milan (Kruschwitz 2002a, 46; Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

two iambic senarii,[95] and a non-metrical subscript giving the dimensions of the

burial plot. The inscription is generally agreed to belong to the first century BCE,

with certain scholars suggesting more specific dates within that period.[96]

The first verse begins with an attention-demanding hail to the passer-by –

heus tu! – and seems to assume that the traveler, characterized as tired, will pass by

the inscription (and the deceased speaker, identified by *me*[97]): *uiator lasse, qu*[*i*] *me*

praetereis. Heus appears at the beginning of one other poem in our corpus,[98] and

these two cases are the only examples in the CLE where *heus* begins the poem,

addressed to the passer-by.[99] The application of the adjective *lassus* to the passer-by

is unique in our corpus, but appears in two later poems in the CLE,[100] and seems to

be an extension of the "although you hurry" theme.[101] Perhaps in response to the

passer-by's assumed lack of attention, the speaker then issues a warning that no

matter how far he walks (*cum diu ambulareis*[102]), he too must come to this place,

---

[95] With synizesis of *diu* (Kruschwitz 2002a, 47); see also Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) and Massaro (2007a, 149).

[96] Colafrancesco and Massaro (1986 ad loc.) and Kruschwitz (2002a, 47) prefer not to be more specific; Warmington (1940, 17) dates it to the first half of the first cent. BCE, but without citing evidence, and Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) suggests the late Republic based on the mention of grave-dimensions.

[97] I have assumed here that *me* refers to the deceased, but in fact it could also refer to the inscription, if the monument is a "speaking stone" like those considered in previous chapters (e.g. CIL I² 1209) . The impossibility here of distinguishing between those two alternatives argues, perhaps, for the close identification we have discussed of the stone with the deceased– that is, the fact that the stone marked with the deceased's name stands in for him as his metonymic marker among the living.

[98] CIL I² 1214, discussed next in this chapter.

[99] The only other poem in which it appears in the CLE is CLE 1260, where it appears in the third line, seemingly addressed to the deceased: *heus, immatura mors properata tibi.*

[100] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 s.v. *lasse* etc.: CLE 77 and 1125.

[101] Axelson (1945, 29-30) reports that *lassus* is the more vulgar alternative to poetic *fessus* (cf. Dickey and Chahoud 2010, 53); Mankin notes (on Hor. *Ep.* 2.44), however, that while *fessus* continued to be preferred by formal prose writers, *lassus* does appear in Ennius, Horace, and Vergil.

[102] Kruschwitz (2002a, 48) reports that the form has been interpreted in two ways: as a subjunctive passive with concessive/adversative sense (although it is unclear to me what the passive meaning would be; he does not comment), and as a future II; he prefers the former explanation in light of *tamen* in the next clause. An imperfect subjunctive (=*ambulārēs*) seems possible to me, if we understand /ē/ spelled <ei>; such an interpretation would keep the desired concessive sense but not introduce the complication of a passive form; so too a future perfect/perfect subjunctive, if we take this form as contracted from *ambulaveris* (an idea supported by the Seneca passage quoted in n.104 below). The verb *ambulo* is, like *lassus* above, unpoetic (see Mankin on Hor. *Ep.* 4.5): "although you amble…".

i.e., the grave: *tamen hoc*[103] *ueniundum est tibi*. This seems to have been a popular folk-saying: we have a version of it in Seneca, and in several other grave-poems in the CLE.[104]

In the reading of this inscription, then, no portrait of M. Statius Chilo is created; he is, however, envisioned as speaking the text of the inscription to the passer-by. Instead of describing himself or his life, he uses the opportunity to warn passers-by of their own oncoming death, perhaps in response to (or retribution for) their assumed unwillingness to stop, as indicated by the first line – by reminding them that they will share his fate, he warns them not only of impending death but also of the neglect or lack of attention he assumes he will receive from them. As has been the case with certain other poems we have seen, it is hard to imagine what sort of consolation or satisfaction this poem offered the commissioner (most likely Chilo himself, since no other dedicant is mentioned) – perhaps the hope that such a message would encourage due remembrance of the dead, for himself and others? – but the frequency of the theme does seem to indicate that it appealed to plenty of commissioners.[105]

From this very brief poem we turn to the one which is the longest in the corpus, CIL I² 1214, the last of this first set addressed only to the passerby.[106] In the

---

[103] For *huc*, "to here" (see Hallidie (1905) on Plaut. *Capt.* 480); cf. also *Aen.* 8.423.

[104] Sen. *Fr.* p.447 Haase: *peregrinatio est uita: cum multum ambulaueris* [*diu*], *redeundum est tamen*; cf. CLE 83, 120, and 242. See also Lier 1903-4, 57 and Tolman 1909, 78.

[105] Cf., per Lier (1903-4, 574), Seneca *Cons. ad Polyb.* 1.4: *maximum ergo solacium est cogitare id sibi accidisse, quod ante se passi sunt omnes, omnes passuri*.

[106] Also considered for inclusion in this section, but rejected as too fragmentary, was CIL I² 2997, found at Rome and dated by Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) to the late Republic; only the first and last verses of this eight-verse poem are at all restorable. The first verse plays with the notion of "although you hurry," and the last offers a tantalizing glimpse of a seemingly unconventional claim to deification of some sort:

> [S]ei properas, i, no[n ten]e[o]; sein otium habes, sta;
>> perl[ege… …]um
> Cor[…]is i(u)ueni
>> com[… …]ans
> sed […]nibus o[…]   5
>> quo […]tur
> et qu[… pro]fecto

252

final line we see an element of content we have not seen in any other examples, a request that the passer-by recite a blessing-formula for the deceased:

> *Eucharis Licini*[*ae l.*]*, docta, erodita omnes artes uirgo, u*[*ixit an*(*n.*) *xiiii*]
> heus oculo errante quei aspicis léti · domu*s*
> morare gressum et titulum nostrum perlege,
> amor parenteis quem dedit natae suae,
> ubei se reliquiae conlocarent corporis.
> heic uiridis aetas cum floreret artibus   5
> crescente et aeuo gloriam conscenderet,
> properauit hóra tristis fatalis mea
> et denegauit ultra ueitae spiritum.
> docta, erodita paene Musarum manu,
> quae modo nobilium ludos decoraui choro   10
> et graeca in scaena prima populo apparui,
> en hoc in tumulo cinerem nostri corporis
> infistae Parcae deposierunt carmine.
> studium patronae, cura, amor, laudes, decus
> silent ambusto corpore et leto tacent.   15
> reliqui fletum nata genitori meo
> et antecessi, genita post, leti diem.
> bis hic septeni mecum natales dies
> tenebris tenentur Ditis aeterna dom*u*
> rogo ut discedens terram mihi dic*as leuem*.[107]   20

Eucharis, freedwoman of Licinia, a virgin learned and cultivated in all accomplishments; she lived for fourteen years.
Ho there, you who with random eye survey the homes of death, stay your step and read my epitaph, which the love of my father (of my parents?) gave to his daughter so that the remains of my body might bestow themselves there. When my blossoming youth was flowering here on earth with accomplishments and, as my age grew, was mounting glory's chariot, the gloomy hour of my destiny hurried and denied the breath of life any longer. I was taught and educated, one might say, at the hands of the Muses, I who lately adorned the games of the nobility with my dancing and was the first woman to appear before the people on the Greek stage. Behold, the Fates, turning their chant to hostility, laid the ashes of my body in this tomb. Now that my body is burnt the favour of my patroness [Licinia], her concern and love, my glories and distinction are silent and quiet in death. I left tears to my father and, though born later, preceded the day of his death. Fourteen birthdays are held with me here in the eternal house of Dis. I request that, as you depart, you wish the earth to rest light on me (trans. Courtney).

---

corpore consumpt[o] uiua anima deus sum.
[107] CLE 55: the inscription is carved on a marble tablet found at Rome; unfortunately we have no record of a precise *Fundort* (Fassbender 2007, 175). It has been damaged since with some loss of text at the ends of the superscript and of the last two lines, but an earlier transcription by Metellus (Vaticanus 6039 f.222 and Vaticanus 6040 f.34) records the lost text, represented here in italics in the metrical portion, and with brackets in the non-metrical superscript. The inscription is now kept in the De Rossi collection at the Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.).

Twenty iambic senarii form the metrical portion of the inscription.[108] No consensus has been reached as to the date – suggestions range from the first century BCE to the first or second century CE – but enough scholars have placed it in the last decades of the Republic to justify its inclusion here.[109] Detailed studies have been made of the metrics, diction, and content of the inscription,[110] so here we will pass quickly through these aspects in order to focus on the effects of the poem.

A non-metrical superscript precedes the metrical portion, which informs us that the subject was a freedwoman named Eucharis. The superscript goes on to praise Eucharis as *docta* and *erodita omnes artes*, and to assert that she was a *uirgo*, fourteen years old at the time of her death, with this last (damaged) element reconstructed from the notation of age in the *carmen*; indeed all of this information, except for her status as a *uirgo*, is available in the extended metrical section. We have seen a few cases of more elaborate non-metrical super- or subscripts (e.g. CIL I² 1212 for C. Atilius Euhodus, whose subscript includes notation of his profession and good wishes to the passer-by), but they are the exception rather than the rule in our corpus. That being said, a longer-than-normal superscript fits in with the rest of this inscription, in which we find many familiar elements made longer and more ornate.

The *carmen* begins in such a familiar way, with a hail to the passer-by (*heus*, seen only here and in our previous example) and a request that he stop and

---

[108] For a detailed discussion of the meter, see Massaro 1992, 121-123 and 132-134.

[109] Among those who have considered it Republican are Mommsen, Degrassi, and Solin (Massaro 1992, 118); cf. also Cugusi 2007, 55, who suggests the middle of the first century BCE. Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc. simply date it to the first century BCE; attempts to date it more specifically within the first cent. BCE often conflict: Keuleers (2003 ad loc.), for example, suggests a *terminus post quem* of 65 BCE based on the use of marble and a *terminus ante quem* of 55 BCE based on the perfect stem *deposi-* (13)*,* rare in inscriptions after Catullus (Catul.'s *deposiuit* at 34.7 is generally considered an archaism, but cf. *posiuerunt* at Cic. *Tusc*. 5.83), but Courtney suggests a *terminus post quem* of 40-30 BCE based on the use of postposed *et*. Popova argues for a later dating, based on certain parallels with Augustan poetry, in which case, she says, features that seem to suggest earlier dating must be deliberate archaisms. For further discussion see Massaro 1992, 118-121 and Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

[110] See, e.g., Massaro 1992, 115-195, Courtney 1995, 238-240, and Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

read; like many other elements of this poem, however, the version here is more elaborate than elsewhere. The elements of the third and fourth verses are also common: a notation of the dedication of the tomb (by the deceased girl's father) and an assertion of the presence of her physical remains there. The next sentence, occupying four verses, describes her youth and her premature death (again, rather long-windedly and in terms with which we are familiar[111]).[112] The next three verses give elements of praise and biography: taught by the hand of the Muses, as it were, Eucharis says that she was a dancer, "adorning the games of the nobles with my dancing," and appeared *prima* on the Greek stage. What precisely is meant by the last clause here has engendered much discussion, but little consensus.[113]

Eucharis then returns her attention to the tomb, blaming the hostile Fates for her death and her subsequent cremation and burial there, and creating a contrast between the blessings of her life, including the attentions of her *patrona* Licinia, with the silence of those blessings after death (*silent ambusto corpore et leto tacent* – the good things grow silent, i.e. are no longer spoken of). She then goes on to

---

[111] The one element that stands out as less familiar is the boast *gloriam conscenderet* (on which the following verses elaborate), for which see Massaro 1992, 158-159 and Courtney 1995, 239.

[112] Scholars have been at pains, however, to explain the *heic* that begins this sentence. Certain commentators, including Courtney (1995, 239), have followed the suggestion of Cholodniak (CSL ad loc. (nr. 395)) that we should understand *in terris*, i.e. "here (on earth)," but it seems to me that such a meaning here would be jarring for a reader expecting the more common sepulchral usage (gesturing at the space around the monument). Another suggested reading of *heic* is temporal (Plessis 1905, 158 and Popova 1968, 63), but Massaro suggests (1992, 154), and I agree, that there are insufficient contextual markers for such a meaning here. Various emendations have been suggested (*haec, hei,* and *heu*, see ibid; of these *haec* seems to me the best, given the possibility that thereby the girl might gesture at herself in the manner discussed in two cases above), but none of them is especially convincing. I find more convincing Massaro's suggestion that we could take *heic* in its normal sepulchral meaning (i.e., gesturing at the space around the monument) even if it results in a certain amount of anacoluthon: it can both go in sense with the reference to the physical space that precedes it, and also refer to the deceased's ultimate location after the end of her life referred to in the seventh and eighth verses, also perhaps anticipating the *hoc in tumulo* in 12.

Finally, I would offer one last suggestion, one similar to but not quite the same as the "here (on earth)" reading: that the *heic* refers not just to the space around the monument, nor to the too broad "on earth," but to some middle-ground combination of the two, i.e. "here (at Rome)," or "here (among you)," with rather the same sense as *apud uos* in the Scipio epitaphs.

[113] A discussion too substantial to be summarized here; see, inter al., Massaro 1992, 168-169, Courtney 1995, 238-239, and Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

255

make a complaint we have seen in many other examples: that her premature death

has inverted the natural order of things – she who was born after her father has died

before him, leaving him in mourning. In the next two lines she gives her age, but

that information (already given in the superscript) is embedded in a description of

her current state: fourteen birthdays are taken with her in the eternal house of Dis.

There is only one other reference to Dis in the corpus, in CIL I² 1732 discussed at

the beginning of this chapter, but as we noted there we find many other such

references in the later sepulchral poems of the CLE.[114]

It is in the final line that we encounter an element of content we have not

seen in any other examples in our corpus: the deceased Eucharis asks (the present-

tense *rogo*) that, as the reader departs (*discedens*), he speak the words, "may the

earth be light upon" her: *terram mihi leuem*. The phrase *sit tibi terra leuis*, based

on an earlier Greek sentiment,[115] would become formulaic among later Roman

epitaphs, abbreviated *s.t.t.l.*,[116] but in our corpus forms of it appear only here (and in

fact, Lattimore suggests that this is likely our earliest example in Latin[117]) and in

our next example, CIL I² 1223. Precisely what thinking – about the afterlife or the

continued presence of the deceased under the earth – lies behind such a formula is

not clear, but as Lattimore points out in reference to this theme, consistency in

one's view of the afterlife is hardly to be expected from the Romans any more than

from ourselves.[118] What is clear is that the use of such formulae offered some

---

[114] See n.18 above.
[115] Lattimore (1962, 65) sends the reader to Eur. *Alc.* 463-464 and *AP* 7.461, and notes that it must
have been fairly common in inscribed Greek examples, becoming as it does a source of play for the
Hellenistic poets of the *Anthology*.
[116] Tolman 1909, 27 and Lattimore 1962, 68-74.
[117] Ibid., 71.
[118] Ibid., 73-74; he cites Lucr. 3.876-893 on man's inability to process fully his own mortality, and
writes himself: "Naturally, then, the layman who caused his epitaph to be inscribed could think as
hard as he pleased of himself after death, as a shadowy ghost, as a citizen of Hades' world or of
Elysium, as nothing at all, and still there would remain a certain concern about the remnant of the
body still in its urn or coffin, and a very immediate sensation of discomfort at the thought of its
being cramped or suffocated under a heavy weight."

comfort to the dedicants of many epitaphs, whether they were commissioning the inscription for themselves or for others.

We have strayed, it seems, into a discussion of the effects of the epitaph; let us begin that discussion over, then, at the beginning. First of all, the passer-by might, upon seeing this monument, be struck by the length of it – far longer, likely (based at least on the sample that comprises our corpus) than any of the others surrounding it. He might as a result be more likely to give it attention; in this way the expenditure of the father might have been repaid. Even if the passer-by read nothing more than the non-metrical *titulus*, he would learn the basic information about Eucharis: her name, status as a freedwoman, certain elements of praise/biography, and her age at the time of her death; again, the investment in a longer, more elaborate version of this common element seems likely to have paid off. The aggressive (and uncommon) *heus!* that begins the metrical portion may have encouraged the passer-by to continue reading.

Indication that the deceased Eucharis was speaking the inscription would come in the second verse with *nostrum*. The following verse adds another figure to the portrait, that of her loving father, who receives credit upon each reading for the commissioning of the monument; the fourth verse asserts the presence of her physical remains in the vicinity of the monument/inscription. How to understand *heic* at the beginning of the next verse (5) remains up for debate,[119] but taking it as I have suggested, viz. as "here (at Rome)" or "here (among you)" would establish the portrait of Eucharis' youth created by the remainder of the clause in the wider context of living Rome; it is into this bustling picture that the sad, fatal hour of Eucharis' death intrudes.

---

[119] See n.112 above.

This sequence essentially repeats itself over the next five verses (9-13), in which Eucharis further describes her life and again in periphrastic terms her death: she was well educated, and a successful professional dancer (the latter scenes are specific and vivid, depicting her performing at nobles' parties and on the Greek stage); her death is this time attributed to the hostile *Parcae*. Here Eucharis makes an unambiguous deictic gesture at the tomb where their song has laid her ashes, *in hoc tumulo*, establishing the spatial relationship between inscription (and the figure imagined as speaking it), tomb, and reader.

In the next two verses (14-15) the sequence from life to death is reiterated for a final time: Eucharis depicts the blessings she experienced in life (including the *studium*, *cura*, and *amor* of her patroness Licinia, with that figure thereby made a part of this third depiction of Eucharis' life) and contrasts them with the desolation of death, when all these blessings *silent* and *tacent*. But in fact each reading of the epitaph would combat that very assertion: whenever a passer-by lends his voice to the inscription, the silence of her death is broken by his description and reification of these blessings once again.

Eucharis then (16-17) reintroduces the figure of her father, unmentioned since he was described as the dedicator of the tomb: upon each reading he is left alive, but alone and weeping, since she has preceded him in death. She depicts herself, on the other hand, finally as in the darkness of the eternal house of Dis (18-19), forever fourteen years old. Thus these final images of Eucharis and her father remain separated; no mention is made of any hope of a future reunion in the tomb, as in certain other examples we have seen.

Eucharis makes one final request of the reader, a request made vivid by the present tense of the verb *rogo*: that he wish that the earth may rest lightly upon her, or at least upon whatever aspect of her remains under the earth. We need not wonder at the seeming conflict of such a request with the assertion that she has just

258

made of her presence in the house of Dis; as Lattimore notes, the comfort derived from envisioning the continual speaking of such wishes – just in *case* of sensation of one's remains under the ground – would far outweigh any eschatological questions that might be raised thereby. By embedding the words themselves (*terram leuem*) in the poem, the author has ensured that any reader will speak them at least once,[120] and perhaps he will speak them again of his own accord upon finishing the poem.

We turn now to our final two examples, in which the deceased subject as speaker addresses not a random passer-by, but particular mourners: family members left behind. The first of these, CIL I² 1223, may in fact be two epitaphs (as illustrated below); in the first section we see what is likely another request for a light-earth formula, and in the second section a speech by the deceased to his mother:

a.?   *...lius P. et Clodia*[*e*] *l. Optatus* | *uixit annos VI m. VIII.*
        … me] florentem mei combussere parentes.
        uixi d]um licuit superís acceptior unus
        quoi nemo po]tuit uerbo maledícere acerbo.
                …ad superos quos pietas cogi…
                …modeste nunc uos quon…   5
                        …tis dicite 'Optate, sit [tibi terra leuis'.

b.?   …o annorum nundum…
                c]um ad mortem matris [de gremio rapior.
        Manibus carus fui uiuos cari[ssimus illi,
                aduersis quae me sustulit o[minibus   10
        desine iam frustra, mea mater, [desine fletu
                te miseram totos exagitare die[s.
        namque dolor talis non nunc tibi [contigit uni,
                haec eadem et magneis regibus [acciderunt.
        Clara Amaranto...
        |*Au…*[121]

---

[120] Here, perhaps, is an argument for the fact that the Romans read aloud: for the passer-by to read the formula to himself, i.e. silently, would be of little use to the deceased; its inclusion seems to argue for the assumption that it would be read aloud.

[121] CLE 970: the stone, now lost, is preserved in the eighteenth-century collections of Giorgius (sched. Casanat XVI) and Amadutius (= Marini, codex Vaticanus 9127 f. 231); found at Rome

a.? *...lius Optatus, freedman of Publius and Clodia, lived six years and eight months.*
Here my parents have cremated me, as I was flourishing. I have lived, while it was
permitted, as one quite pleasing to those above; one whom no one could criticize by a harsh
word,
…to those above whom piety…
…with moderation now you…
…speak, "Optatus, let the earth be light upon you"…

b.? …not yet…years old…
…when at death I am snatched from the lap of my mother.
…dear to the Shades, I was dearest to her when I was living,
she who has taken on my rearing under unfavorable omens.
Cease now, my mother, cease from in vain tormenting your wretched self day-in and day-
out with weeping. For such grief has not now touched you alone; these same things have
happened also to great kings.
Clara for Amaranthus…
Au…

The two sections (designated here a. and b.), are separated by a space in Amadutius'

manuscript. The inscription as a whole is dated by Colafrancesco and Massaro to

the first half of the first century BCE.[122] As far as we can tell, there is a change in

meter partway through the first section: the first two lines are hexameters, and the

remainder (3-4, 5-6, etc.) seem to have formed elegiac couplets.[123] The change in

meter is paralleled by CLE 971, a later poem either modeled after, or sharing a lost

model with, this example:[124] it has seven hexameters followed by eight verses of

elegiac couplets.

---

outside the Porta Pinciana, the stone is described as having been of red marble with small and
elegant letters, with the damage already present at the time of transcription (CIL ad loc., Keuleers
2003 ad loc.). All of the restorations except for the light-earth formula in 6 are based on two other
extant (later) poems: 1-3 of our poem are restored on the basis of CLE 971 (2nd cent. CE according
to Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc.), 2-4: *cum me florentem mei combussere parentes / uixi
ego dum licuit superis acceptior unus / quoi nemo potuit uerbis maledicere acerbo*, and 8-10 of our
poem on the basis of CLE 1544 (1st or 2nd cent. CE according to Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986
ad loc.), 2-4: *cum ad mortem matris de gremio rapior / omnibus cara fui uiua, carissuma matri /
aduersis quae me sustulit ominibus*. 11-12 as shown here appear in both of these other poems, and
13-14 appear as shown here (albeit with *magnis* for *magneis)* in CLE 971 (Keuleers 2003 ad loc.,
Massaro 2007a, 135).
[122] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 ad loc. Keuleers' dating to the time of Cicero (2003 ad loc.) is
based on an incorrect identification of the subject of CLE 971 (a later poem likely modeled on our
example, or on a lost mutual source; see previous note), Arbuscula, with the mime-actress of the
same name known in Cicero's time (see Hor. *Serm.* 1.10.76-77).
[123] Although the first half of 6, *-tis dicite 'Optate…* is unmetrical; the latter half of the line as it is
reconstructed can form the second half of a pentameter (*sit* [*tibi terra leuis*]).
[124] See n.121 above.

As mentioned above, certain evidence suggests that we should take the two sections as *carmina* for two different boys: the superscript is for a young freedman named Optatus, and both his parents are mentioned in the first verse as carrying out the funeral; but the subscript below the second section notes the dedication of an inscription for an Amaranthus by someone named Clara, and sure enough, in the latter part of the inscription the mother is prominently featured (and addressed by the deceased), but no father is mentioned. Keuleers also suggests that a request for a light-earth formula such as we seem to find in the sixth verse more often appears at the end of a poem.[125]

The narrative generally proposed here is that these were epitaphs for two separate boys carved on the same stone, likely sons of the same mother, a slave named Clara. The subject of the first, Optatus, was freed before or at the time of his death, hence his libertination in the non-metrical superscript; also, his father was alive at the time of his death and is thus mentioned as playing an active role at the funeral. The subject of the second poem, however, Amaranthus (a Greek nomen or cognomen, often suggesting slave-status), receives no libertination, and there is no mention of a father; Massaro suggests that Clara had been widowed by the time of Amaranthus' death.[126] We can speculate further on this scenario (although speculation is all it can be), based in part on *sustulit* (10), which can mean "took up," i.e. "took on my rearing":[127] perhaps both boys were (bastard) sons of Clara with Publius, mentioned as Optatus' former master, and Publius and his wife Clodia "took up" the first boy, Optatus, to raise as their own (hence his freedom and the

---

[125] Keuleers 2003 ad loc.
[126] Massaro 2007a, 135; see also Keuleers 2003 ad loc. Cholodniak (CSL ad loc. (nr. 447)) and Kaibel (1900, 570-572), on the other hand, consider them two separate epigrams for the same boy, taking Amaranthus as another name for Optatus; neither addresses the presence of the father in the first but not the second poem.
[127] *OLD* s.v. *tollo* 2b.

mention of parents in his inscription), but not the second, Amaranthus, leaving the mother Clara to raise (*sustulit*) the latter and commission his monument.

Optatus' epitaph, then, begins with a hexameter describing his funeral (possibly, if the restoration is correct, including the deictic *hic*), carried out by his parents, while he was still young (*florentem*, standard language in this context). The next hexameter begins a section of praise, given in relation to others as we have seen so often: Optatus declares that he was quite pleasing to those above, *superis*, likely referring to the gods; this poem is the only one in the corpus to mention *superi*.[128] The next line, the hexameter that begins the section in elegiac couplets, is a relative clause, perhaps dependent upon the previous line or possibly a new sentence (given the change in meter) with *quoi* as a connective relative:[129] Optatus asserts that no one could speak a word against him, a claim that reminds us of a similar one made by Larcia Horaea in CIL I² 1570, *inueisa sum a nulla proba*.[130] The next three verses are too damaged for comprehension, but editors generally supplement the last to include the archetypal rest-formula: …*dicite*, '*Optate, sit* [*tibi terra leuis*].' The suggestion seems reasonable, given that it is clearly a request for passers-by to speak certain words to Optatus, words which begin with *sit*.

The beginning of the second section, likely a separate epitaph for a boy named Amaranthus, is also damaged. The first line of it (7) includes the phrase *annorum nondum*, and thus was likely a notation of Amaranthus' age. The remaining lines, though damaged, can be reconstructed on the basis of other poems.[131] The second verse (8) gives a figurative depiction of his death that

---

[128] In fact they are mentioned again in the fragmentary fifth verse, *ad superos quos pietas*… Keuleers (2003 ad loc.) suggests, citing Gaffiot s.v. *superus* 2, that it is not the gods being referred to here, but rather those people still living on earth, as Optatus is speaking from the underworld; such an interpretation seems to me possible here, but not imperative. The word makes plenty of appearances in the CLE, with both meanings well-represented (Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 s.v. *superi* etc.).

[129] K.-S. 2.319.

[130] See ch.5, pp.186-187 above.

[131] See n.121 above.

emphasizes his young age: he was snatched (*rapior*) from the lap of his mother, an expression that appears only here in our corpus, but makes several other appearances in later poems of the CLE.[132]

In the next verse the deceased Amaranthus asserts that he was dear to the *manibus*. *Dis manibus* was, of course, a phrase that became extremely common at the beginning of epitaphs of later centuries, as a gesture of reverence to the spirits of the dead,[133] but here the word seems to be used in a more particular way; Keuleers suggests that the word refers to Amaranthus' family members who had known and loved the boy but died before him, but it seems to me that there is a contrast here as indicated by the remainder of the line, in which Amaranthus says that living (*uiuos*) he was dearest to *illi* (his mother, as indicated by the following verse, *aduersis quae me sustulit o*[*minibus*]). The line is asyndetic, and as such my understanding of a contrast can be only a suggestion,[134] but taking it thus the first clause (*manibus carus*) would refer to his status when *mortuus*, as opposed to *uiuos*: as he was dear to his mother in life (*fui uiuos cari*[*ssimus illi*]), he is now dear to the shades with whom he keeps company in death. We cannot know precisely what is meant by *aduersis ominibus* (the phrase appears in the CLE only here and in the later poem on which the reconstruction is based, CLE 1544); it may refer to particular circumstances accompanying Amaranthus' birth and early life,[135] or simply to the fact of his early demise.

The next four lines offer an element of content we have not seen in any other examples: the deceased speaker addresses a speech not to a hypothetical passer-by, but to a particular individual, his mother. The content of the speech

---

[132] Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 s.v. *gremio*.
[133] Lattimore 1962, 95.
[134] If instead we omit the comma/contrast, Keuleers' interpretation makes sense: "while I was living I was dear to [those who would become] *manibus* and dearest of all to my mother."
[135] Perhaps, according to the scenario discussed above, the unwillingness of Publius and Clodia to adopt a second bastard.

makes it clear that she is imagined as still in mourning for her son: he tells her to leave off tormenting herself (*desine*, emphatically repeated) day in and day out with weeping. Such a directive from the deceased to a mourner is well precedented in Greek examples, and although it is relatively rare in our corpus (it occurs only here and in our next, final example), Lattimore reports that is also frequent in other Latin examples.[136] Whether the relative rarity of this element in our corpus is due to the age of the inscriptions, or rather to the requirement of meter, remains to be investigated.[137]

As consolation the boy offers not an assurance that he is well, but rather a reminder that she is not alone in her suffering: death, or the suffering surrounding death, comes to everyone, even kings (*haec eadem et magneis regibus* [*acciderunt*]). Here again, as in connection with CIL I² 2138 discussed earlier in this chapter, we can cite Seneca's assertion that awareness of the universality of death was a consolation.[138] Here, however, we have a more specific element: in addition to the universality of death in general, the poem refers to the fact that death also affects kings, a consolatory theme whereby the deceased (or the mother, if *haec eadem* refers to the suffering of those left behind rather than to death itself) is implicitly compared, or at least seen as in good company with, these lofty figures. Citing this poem as an example of a common theme, Tolman also quotes Lucretius 3.1027: *inde alii multi reges rerumque potentes occiderunt, magnis qui gentibus imperitarunt.*[139]

---

[136] 1962, 217-220; cf. also Tolman 1909, 10.

[137] The first step would be to see how frequently it appears in the oldest prose epitaphs, a rather ambitious undertaking and outside the scope of this project.

[138] See n.105 above.

[139] 1909, 83; he also notes that Lier (1903, 575) compares this theme to a similar one in Greek epitaphs: there the comparandum is heroes. For the theme in general cf. also Lattimore 1962, 250-256 (with additional bibliography, 250 n.280), who asserts (252) that, in Greek epitaphs at least, the theme is frequently paired as here with requests not to mourn.

The effects of the first of these two poems, then, and the tableau it creates, are similar to others we have seen in this chapter. The non-metrical superscript above Optatus' epitaph would introduce him as freed slave who died at the age of six; thereafter Optatus himself takes over the narration, as indicated by *me* in the first metrical verse. The speaking figure of Optatus credits his parents with carrying out his funeral, but when he was still *florentem*; our first image of the boy is not of his life but of the aftermath of his premature death. He does speak of his life – such as was permitted to him, *dum licuit* – in the next two verses, with praise that situates him in relation to others, as in so many other examples: he was dear to those above (*superis*: the gods or alternately, those still living, not yet in the underworld), and no one could speak a harsh word about him. The next verses are damaged, but it seems likely that the final verse of this section (6) contained a request for a rest-formula like the one discussed in our previous example; its inclusion in the text guarantees that any passer-by who read to the end would speak it aloud. This verse is also an indication as to intended audience, otherwise unspecified: the imperative *dicite* seems to indicate an assumed plural audience.[140] So too *uos* in the damaged previous line; lacking the remainder of that line, which might have indicated a particular audience, we assume here that *uos* and *dicite* address the passers-by and any others listening as it is read, who would thus be commanded to speak the formula as well.

The next poem creates a different tableau, and though also spoken by its deceased subject, it coopts the voice of the reader for a different purpose – to speak to the boy's still-living mother. The first damaged verse (7) announces the boy's age; it is possible, if the age differed from that of Optatus, that such a notation of a

---

[140] Although, as noted above (see n.123), *dicite* forms part of the only non-metrical line-section and as such is not an especially secure reading, *uos* in the previously line indicates the same plural audience.

differing age would have been sufficient signal to the reader (in addition, perhaps, to a space on the stone between the two sections) that a second epitaph had begun, for a different boy. In the second verse (8) the boy (Amaranthus, but we do not learn his name until the subscript) depicts his death with a compelling, if common, image that emphasizes the untimeliness of that death: he was snatched from the lap of his mother. The indication that the deceased boy is speaking is (securely) reconstructed at the end of this second verse, but there may have been such an indication in the damaged first line as well. As was the case in Optatus' epitaph, others form an integral part of the image Amaranthus creates of himself: he was dear to the *Manes* (either those who loved him in life but died before him, or those with whom he keeps company after death), and dearest of all to his mother, whom he credits with taking on his upbringing.

Up to this point the boy has not indicated to whom he is speaking, and so we assume the reader as the default intended audience; but in the last four verses (11-14) the boy addresses his mother (*desine, iam frustra, mea mater…*). It is clearly a change in audience from the first four lines (i.e., it is not his mother being addressed there): not only would his mother already be aware of the information he is presenting in those lines, but there he refers to her with the third-person pronoun *illi*. It is unclear how precisely we should take the deictic pronoun: it could be simply textual/endophoric, indicating the antecedent of the relative clause ("that woman who…"), or it could gesture at her name, which (according to the view we have taken) forms a part of the non-metrical subscript, *Clara Amaranto...* . But one other possibility is that his mother is envisioned as present, as a part of the portrait he has created of his life; having gestured at her and described her, he then, as it were, turns to her to speak, entreating her to cease from the mourning that still fills her days.

The effect of such a speech for the mourner addressed – in this case the mother, seemingly the commissioner of the inscription – is clearly consolatory: one could derive comfort from imagining such a request on the lips of a lost child, even if one had put it there oneself in commissioning the poem.[141] As mentioned above, though, for the passer-by such a speech represents an even more dramatic coopting of his voice: the deceased uses the reader's voice not only to pass on information about the former's life and death, but also to speak from the grave to his (that is, the dead boy's) own mother; this playing of a role happens at every reading of the inscription.

Comforting as such an imagined speech might have been, the scene the epitaph preserves and reenacts upon each reading is nonetheless one of separation and suffering. Our next and final example, CIL I² 1215, although it depicts similar suffering and contains another such speech, has a rather more comforting end to be reified upon each reading:

a.
…]ulia Quincti Ranci feilia
…l]iberti Proti, quoi fatum graue
…] Parcae ac finem uitae statuerunt,
…]et bis decem anneis nata, indigniter.
…c]oncepit leiberum semen duplex,   5
…] pareret patrono auxsilium ac decus,
…]ta commode atque incommode
…] mors eripuit sueis parentibus.
…s]ummo in luctu ac sollicitudine
…]rio gnatae fletus in dies   10
b.
edunt, sibei esse talem ereptam filiam.
'pater mei et genetrix germana, oro atque o[…
desinite luctu, questu lacrumas fundere.
sei in uita iucunda uobeis uoluptatei fuei
uiro atque ameiceis noteisque omnibus,   15
nunc quoniam fatum se ita tolit animo uo[lo]

---

[141] Lattimore (1962, 217) takes a slightly more cynical view: "it is a device to make to make the whole relation between living and dead more gracious than if the composer of the epitaph avowed his own intention not to lament overlong."

aequo uos ferre concordesque uiuere.'
quas ob res hoc monumentum aedicauit [pater]
suae gnatae, sibeique, uxori hanc constituit [domum]
aeternam, ubei omnes pariter aeuom dege[rent].[142]   20

…ulia, daughter of Quinctius Rancius…
…freedman of [Quinctius] Protus, for whom a grave fate…
…the Fates determined, and the end of life
… twenty years old; unworthily.
…she was pregnant with a double seed of offspring
…might obey her patron, a help and ornament;
…favorably and unfavorably…
…death snatched from her parents.
…in the highest grief and anxiety
…of their daughter day by day weeping,
they produce, that such a daughter was snatched from them.
"My father and my own mother, I beseech and […], cease from your grief, leave off
pouring tears with complaint. If in life I have been pleasant [and] a source of delight to
you, to my husband, to my friends, and to all those known to me, now, since fate has borne
itself thus, [I want] you to bear yourselves with calm mind and live in harmony."
For which reasons [her father] built this monument for his daughter, and established for
himself and for his wife this eternal [home], where [they] might all spend eternity in share.

The inscription, generally dated to the first century BCE and more specifically by

Bücheler to the period of from Sulla to Caesar,[143] is recognizable, despite the

damage, as iambic senarii; there are metrical problems in 14, 15, and 19, but the

meter is otherwise correct.[144] No superscript or subscript accompanies the

inscription: the name (albeit damaged), filiation, and age of the subject are given in

the *carmen*: she was a free-born daughter of a freed slave, who died at the age of

twenty.[145]

---

[142] CLE 59: the travertine tablet on which the inscription was carved in two separate columns (here
designated a. and b.) was found on an island in the Tiber at Rome (although Fassbender (2007, 186)
doubts that that was its original location), with the damage to the stone already present; it was lost
thereafter, so our reading comes from manuscript collections, including that of Gruter (CIL ad loc.,
Keuleers 2003 ad loc.)

[143] Bücheler does not, however, provide evidence for this assertion. Colafrancesco and Massaro
(1986 ad loc.) date the inscription to the first century BCE; Keuleers points out that the use of I-
longa dates it after 100 BCE, and that the use of <ei> for ī, in some places etymologically correct, in
some places not, suggests a date not long after that change took place (2003 ad loc.).

[144] 14 has an extra syllable, and 15 is short one foot; Bücheler (CLE ad loc.) emends 14-15 as
follows: *sei in uita iucunda* [*ac*] *uoluptatei fuei* / [*uobeis*] *uiro atque ameicis noteisque omnibus*. 19
has at least one extra syllable, and the added oddity of the asyndeton of *uxori*; both of these
difficulties could be resolved by removing that word under the assumption that it was added by a
well-meaning stonecutter.

[145] For further details and discussion of the various ways in which the name of the girl and her father
have been reconstructed, see Keuleers 2003 ad loc.

Unlike our previous example, the only other poem to include a speech to a surviving mourner, the bulk of this inscription is in the third person, rather than first person: the narrative describing the deceased girl's life and death is given by an unidentified narrator, with no specified audience, like many of the examples we saw in chapters two and three. The elements of content in this third-person narrative (1-11) are for the most part similar to others we have seen, although the presentation is distinctive in certain ways, as are the circumstances.

The inscription opens with a full metrical filiation of the deceased, as well notation of the freedman status of her father. For the filiation of the deceased to be incorporated into the metrical portion of an epitaph is rare in our corpus: it occurs only here and in certain of the Scipio epitaphs.[146] Having introduced the deceased girl and her father (the commissioner of the inscription, as we will learn later) and noted their social status, the inscription then gives an ornate description of her death, one which emphasizes the prematurity of that death with elements we have seen before: the death is blamed on the *Parcae*, and characterized as a *fatum graue*. Her *finem uitae*, we learn, came when she was only twenty years old (with age being another element more often consigned to a non-metrical section), unworthily (*indigniter*[147]). Such a characterization might well apply to any premature death, but here we learn a particular circumstance that makes her fate especially grievous: she was pregnant with twins (*leiberum semen duplex*), offspring who would have supported (*pareret*[148]) her *patronus*. According to Keuleers, this assertion makes it likely that the *patronus* was the father of the unborn children,[149] but we cannot know for sure; a *uir* is mentioned in 15, but he is not further identified, and in fact it

---

[146] See ch.1 27ff.

[147] Although this is the only example of *indigniter* in the CLE, *indigne* is extremely well represented (Colafrancesco and Massaro 1986 s.v. *indigniter, indigne*); the latter form appears in CIL I² 1924, discussed in ch.2.

[148] An alternative reading would be *pararet*, "so that she might furnish."

[149] 2003 ad loc.; another supposition seems possible to me, that the *patronus*, whether or not he was the father of her unborn children, was her father's former master.

269

would seem rather odd that, if she was married, she was buried by, and identified by her connection with, her father rather than her husband. No cause of death is described, but the mention of her pregnancy, as well as the fact that the composer knew that she was pregnant with twins, suggests that she may have died in childbirth (together with the children – the contrary-to-fact *pareret* indicates that they did not, after all, fulfill that function).

The seventh verse is somewhat unclear, but it seems to be a further summary of her life – Bücheler supplements [*expertam mul*]*ta commode atque incommode* – and the eighth verse again emphasizes the prematurity of her death with familiar diction: *mors* seized her (*eripuit*) from her parents. The final three lines of this third-person narrative describe the mourning of those parents in poignant terms: that such a daughter was snatched (*ereptam* – another form of *eripio* only three verses later) from them causes them to spend their days weeping in the greatest grief and worry, with the present-tense *fletus edunt* investing the image created with real-time vividness.

The speech by the deceased girl, marked as such by the second word *mei*, interrupts this third-person narration, which, as we will see, resumes once she has spoken. The girl begins by addressing each parent individually and making it clear the request is her own (*oro atque*…). The request itself is in terms similar to our other example (*desinite luctu*) but with a distinctive image: she entreats her parents to stop pouring tears (*lacrumas fundere*).[150] The girl here does not, as was the case in the previous example, offer an aphorism about the commonality of death as a reason to cease from mourning; instead, she makes her request conditional, reminding her parents of the happiness she provided them and others in life: *sei in*

---

[150] For the phrase, which appears at (inter al.) Catull. 66.17 and Verg. *Aen.* 3.348, see *TLL* s.v. *fundo*, 6.1.1564.42.

uita iucunda uobeis uoluptatei fuei / uiro atque ameicis noteisque omnibus…[151]
And so here in the midst of this request, we have a list of the kind we saw so
frequently in earlier chapters, a list of the people with whom the deceased interacted
in life, in decreasing order of intimacy. Assuming the condition is met, the
deceased girl goes on to make her request: since fate has borne itself thus (with
nunc functioning like Greek νὺν δέ, "but as things stand,") she would have them
bear themselves (with both clauses using a form of *ferre*) with calm soul, and live in
harmony with each other.[152]

At this point the third-person narrative resumes: as a result of these things
(likely the events described, rather than the speech), the inscription reports, the
father built this tomb for his daughter, himself, and his wife,[153] to serve as an
eternal home (another image with which we are very familiar), where they might all
spend eternity. Here is an idea that, intuitive though it may seem (and indeed,
Lattimore reports that it occurs fairly often in both Greek and Latin epitaphs),[154] we
see relatively rarely in our corpus: comfort in the fact of being buried together.[155]

What, then, are the effects of this epitaph, and who are the individuals
implicated? Whose voices speak in this epitaph, and who are the people envisioned
as present at the gravesite?

In the first eleven verses, the reader's voice is borrowed by an unspecified
(but not, as shown by judgments like *indigniter*, impersonal) narrator. The passer-
by, in reading aloud the first four lines, is made a witness to the identity of the

---

[151] The metrical problems in these two lines suggest they may be corrupt, but the sense is clear.
[152] The latter specification is a technical term for a happy marriage; one wonders if the death of the
daughter had caused friction between her parents (a common situation even in modern times: see
Rogers et al. 2008), which the father hoped to soothe by placing these words in particular on the lips
of his daughter.
[153] But see n.144 above for the possibility that *uxor* does not belong in that line.
[154] 1962, 247-250.
[155] CIL I² 1217 is the only other place where such a sentiment seems to be expressed (see discussion
p.220 above): [*sic i*]*mpetraui id ab eo* (*laudo beneuolen*[*tiam*) /*commu*]*ni heic animo duo et essemus
siti*. For a seemingly romantic, but rather more sinister, version of the idea, see Prop. 4.7.94-5: *nunc
te possideant aliae: mox sola tenebo: / mecum eris, et mixtis ossibus ossa teram.*

deceased, given in relation to her father, and in turn his former master; this memorializing identification is given emphasis by its metricity. The first image that the inscription creates after the naming of the deceased is a depiction not of the girl's life, but of her death, cast in the common imagery of a decision by the Fates; by reading this account, the passer-by also testifies that the girl's death was undue (*indigniter*). The inscription then gives, perhaps as an explanation for this characterization, the only information about the girl's life in this first section, information which may in fact have been tied in with her death: the deceased was pregnant with twins. Nor is even that fact presented absolutely, i.e. as a piece of information to do with the deceased girl herself: the narrator asserts that these twins would have served as a help and ornament to the girl's *patronus*, thus introducing this shadowy figure – possibly the father of the twins, and/or the former master of the girl's father[156] – into the scene. By reading the lines describing her death and her parents' grief, the reader reenacts the unfair loss of their daughter and their subsequent continuous mourning; the repetition of the forms of *rapio* (*eripuit, ereptam*) emphasizes the sudden violence of their loss, and the present tense of the verb *edunt* places the depiction of their mourning in the real time of the reader.

This scene is then, however, interrupted by words from the deceased herself, who in turn co-opts the voice of the reader to address her grieving parents. Again, as was the case with the statement of her identity and the narration of her death and her parents' mourning, every time a passer-by reads the inscription, the deceased begs her parents to cease from their grief and carry on with their lives, shifting the focus from the undeserved death so emphasized above to the joy she provided them during her life.

---

[156] In the latter case, he would already have been introduced, named as he is in 2, *liberti Proti*.

In the previous example the poem ended with the speech by the deceased, with the result that what was continually repeated upon each reading was a depiction of sadness and separation, albeit with some small comfort from an assertion of the universality of death and its power to touch even kings. Here, however, the narrator reclaims the reader's voice to present a rather more hopeful epilogue, describing the erection of tomb by the father for himself, his wife, and his daughter, and expressing the father's intention – again affirmed by its reading by the passer-by – that the tomb serve as a place for them to spend eternity together.

Let us summarize, then, the tableau created by the reading of the inscription by the passer-by. The unspecified voice of the inscription creates in 1-11 a portrait of the deceased; this portrait offers scant details about the girl herself, but casts her, as we have often seen, in relation to others, who also appear in the portrait created upon each reading: her father, her ill-fated twins, and the *patronus* whom they would have served. Furthermore, the girl has but a passive role to play in the actions described in the narrative and thus carried out in the tableau: her fate is determined by the *Parcae*; she is snatched from her parents, and then mourned by them. Such a portrait is one with which we have become familiar in looking at many other examples dealing with premature death, with the focus less on the deceased him- or herself than on the consequences of the loss to survivors.

Here, however, the deceased does eventually claim a more active role, as she herself takes over the voice of the reader in order to address her parents. Even then, however, her speech is more about others than herself; the information she adds to the heretofore sketchy depiction of her life is also relative to others, in the form of a list of her relationships like the ones we have seen in far simpler epitaphs (*uobeis…uiro…ameiceis…noteis omnibus*), and she is most concerned with her parents' future happiness and harmony.

In the final image created upon each reading, the shade of the deceased has faded again into the background, as the narrator speaks again through the voice of the reader, re-affirming the father's intention that the monument serve as an eternal home where his family, divided for now by death, can reunite; that final image created upon each reading, then, is a consoling one, of the whole family together for all time, albeit in the cold comfort of the tomb. For the time being, she is alone, severed from all those connections that the epitaph describes, but the end of the epitaph assures us that she will be resituated within her familial context once her parents join her in the grave.

Thus, then, are our final nine poems, those in which the deceased subjects speak to specified audiences: in each of the first seven the deceased subject addresses the passer-by, and in the last two they speak to survivors who are mourning their loss. We have seen that most of these cases have certain elements of content that have not appeared in the other poems with lesser levels of fictive orality, and in turn effects that differ from those we have seen before.

Our first example, CIL I² 1732 for Helvia Prima, we found to be very similar to those in the previous chapter, in which the deceased subject speaks, but to an unspecified audience; the only element of content that sets it apart is the opening hail to the passer-by, which is in turn similar to those we saw in chapter four spoken by the stone or some other, unspecified speaker. In our second example, however, CIL I² 1202 for Marcus Caecilius (generally considered the oldest example of this type) we meet an element specific to this level of fictive orality: good wishes spoken by the deceased to the passer-by. Although this element is also paralleled by others we have seen in poems spoken by a figure other than the deceased (cf. *aue*, *uale* etc. at the end of certain poems in chapter four), we find that in poems of this type, in addition to the change in effect brought about by the fact that it is the deceased him- or herself wishing the passer-by well, the *topos* consistently

manifests itself more elaborately, in forms longer and more varied than the one-word salutations that appeared in those other examples. There is also introduced a certain inherent element of contrast between the figure of the deceased (decidedly unwell) and the reader whom he wishes well.

That implicit comparison is made explicit in our third example, CIL I² 2161 for the girl Salvia, in which the wished-for well-being of the passer-by is cast in opposition to the fate of the deceased girl. A further extension of the theme appears in CIL I² 3449d, where the deceased boy Thorax hopes that the reader of his epitaph will look upon nothing similar, displaying a marked awareness of the textuality of the inscription through which he speaks, and of the other gravestones that are the surroundings of the metonymic marker on which that inscription is carved; he goes on to give the reader advice as to how to avoid the equally sad fate of the parents who suffer at his loss. In our fifth example, CIL I² 1836, the deceased woman Manlia Sabina wishes the passer-by well, but also engages in a fuller version of the *memento mori* theme hinted at in the previous two, warning the passer-by that death is coming for him, too. M. Statius Chilo, the subject of our sixth example, CIL I² 2138, gives a similar warning to his reader, but does not even soften it with good wishes.

At the end of our seventh example, the lengthy CIL I² 1214 for the dancer Eucharis, we see an element that, although it introduces a formula that would become quite common later, appears only twice in our corpus: a request that the reader speak certain words on behalf of the deceased, wishing the earth to rest lightly upon her. A second example of such a request may come in our penultimate example, CIL I² 1223, at what is likely the end of an epitaph for Optatus; in the latter section of CIL I² 1223, for a different boy named Amaranthus, we have our first speech by the deceased to a mourner: there the boy addresses his mother, telling her to give up her continual laments for him. There, despite the speech

275

meant to comfort and relieve the mother, the state of affairs re-enacted upon each reading is one of suffering and sadness. Such is happily not the case in our final example in this chapter, CIL I² 1215: there, a similar speech made by the deceased to her parents is followed by an epilogue of sorts, which asserts their ultimate togetherness in the grave.

All that being said, these poems also have a good deal in common with the many others we have considered, most of all the fact that the portraits they create of the deceased via praise or biography of any sort are almost inevitably cast in relation to others; this social interconnectedness seems to have been a basic quality of such depictions, indicative of a value deeply ingrained in Republican society.

CONCLUSIONS

Before we discuss our general conclusions, let us return to the epitaphs of
the Scipios; we looked at the content of these poems in chapter one, as these
epitaphs include the earliest poems in the corpus and are set apart from the
remainder of the corpus by both their environment and the fact that they are written
for members of the same eminent family. Now that we have explored the
remainder of the corpus and established a better understanding of the elements and
effects present therein, we can return to the epitaphs of the Scipios to consider what
the effects of each poem would be upon reading, and how these poems relate to the
remainder of the poems in the corpus.

As discussed in chapter one, these five epitaphs are inscribed not on stones
or other monuments along a roadside (as we assume for all our other examples), but
within a family tomb that was closed to visitors other than family members; as such,
the intended reader was not a passer-by, but rather one of those family members.
As we will see, in some ways the portraits created by these examples are similar to
the many others we have seen, but in certain ways the content, and the portraits they
create, are markedly different.

When a visitor encountered the sarcophagus of L. Cornelius Scipio
Barbatus, the earliest of the Scipios to receive a metrical *carmen*, he or she would
likely read first the non-metrical name and filiation of the deceased, carved in large
letters along the top of the sarcophagus; that prominent simple inscription carries
out, then, the most basic function of an epitaph, naming the deceased in connection
with his tomb. Lower on the front he would encounter the metrical *carmen* written
in Saturnians (CIL I² 7).[1] The first information presented in the metrical section

---

[1] See discussion at ch.1 pp.24-30.

echoes that of the non-metrical superscript: the name of the deceased, reordered in a way common to Saturnian poetry (either for metrical reasons or to emphasize an individual's praenomen[2]) *Cornelius Lucius Scipio Barbatus*. As we have seen, the inclusion of the name of the deceased in the metrical portion of an inscription is common enough in our corpus, appearing in slightly less than half the examples; the metricization of the deceased's name could be part of the memorialization process, one way of establishing the *kleos aphthiton* sought by an epitaph in verse.

Far less common, however, is the next element a reader would encounter (and pronounce), a full metrical version of the deceased's filiation: *Gnaiuod patre prognatus.* A metrical filiation appears in three of the five extant Scipionic *elogia* (CIL I² 7, 9, and 10), but in only one other poem in the corpus.[3] What, then, is the function of these metrical filiations, and what is their intended effect for the deceased, and for the fathers who are named? One primary function of notation of filiation is to establish for readers the free-born or citizen status of its subject, but such a function would scarcely apply here, as the renown of the Scipios likely assured that their social status was a given; furthermore, if we accept that the inscriptions were only viewed by members of the family, such a notation becomes even less necessary. Furthermore, two of the three inscriptions (CIL I² 7 and 9) are accompanied by brief superscripts that themselves present the same information through the standard non-metrical filiation.

As previously discussed, the use of meter in epitaphs taps into a long-standing Greek and Roman tradition in which continued renown is secured by the poem itself; in light of this, we can suggest that the decision to include a filiation in each of these three early *elogia* of the Scipios shows a desire to formalize, by means of the poetic medium (we should also note the archaic diction and alliteration

---

[2] See ch.1 n.77 and ch.4 n.83.
[3] CIL I² 1215; see n.5 below.

present in these poems), the relation between father and son, and establish the identity of each individual within the family's hierarchy and tradition. Such metrical filiations offer a reciprocal reflection of accomplishment: the inclusion of the name of the father in the epitaph of the son (in addition to procuring for the father continued commemoration by the reading of his name) associates the prominence and deeds of the father with the son, and establishes the deeds of the son as further ornament to the accomplishments of the father.[4]

But why do metrical filiations appear in these three epitaphs, and almost nowhere else?[5] The three *elogia* in which we find our examples, all dated to the first half of the second century BCE or earlier, are all written in Saturnians and are considered, along with CIL I² 11,[6] the oldest of the Scipio *elogia* and indeed, the earliest among all the inscriptions in the corpus.[7] The conclusion, then, that the inclusion of a metrical filiation, and the attendant emphasis on the association of the deeds of the son with the father and vice-versa, is characteristic of the early stage of the genre is tempting. The paucity of contemporary examples, however, must make

---

[4] Cf. the explicit declaration *facta patris petiei* in CIL I² 15.

[5] The only other example of a metrical filiation in the corpus appears in CIL I² 1215, a first-century BCE epitaph in iambic senarii for a free-born woman discussed at the end of the previous chapter. The filiation, *…ulia Quincti Ranci*, appears in the first line of the poem, followed by the libertination of her father. The verse inscription is not accompanied by any non-metrical filiation, so we may conclude that in this case the primary function of the filiation was the standard notation of free-born status (particularly desirable for the first free-born generation of the family), with the additional motivation, perhaps, of honoring the former master of her father, mentioned later in the poem, by the inclusion of her father's libertination just after his name in her filiation.

[6] CIL I² 11, also in Saturnians, includes no metrical filiation. It is difficult to say why it should break the pattern established by the previous three Saturnian *elogia*; there is a non-metrical superscript, *L. Cornelius Cn. f. Cn. n. Scipio*, which includes not only filiation but also notation that the deceased was the grandson of Gnaeus. As we saw, the tone of the epitaph is apologetic; perhaps, then, lacking the accomplishments highlighted in the other three *elogia* of this period, this Scipio was considered unworthy of the poetic insertion into the familial tradition. Furthermore, if the subject is the son of Africanus (see ch.1 n.110), he was the *ultimus generis* (having adopted Scipio Aemilianus; see Astin 1967, 12-14), making his incorporation into a (would-be) continuous familial tradition even more tricky.

[7] The only other poem in this date range is CIL I² 1861 for the slave Protogenes, written in faulty dactylic hexameters. Because the subject of the epitaph is a slave, we cannot expect filiation as such, but we do find a corresponding notation of social status in the metrical section, immediately following the name of the deceased: the genitive of the nomen of Protogenes' master, *Cloul*(*i*).

this conclusion tentative at best; furthermore, we must also take into account certain attributes of the Scipionic *elogia*: the fact that they are the only inscriptions in the corpus that form a set, memorializing several individuals within the same family, and the fact that that family was a prominent one, likely eager to highlight the continuity of the line.

Thus far, then, a reading of the inscription would establish, in meter and as such tapping into the tradition of *kleos aphthiton*, the name of the deceased; the metrical filiation would ensure that in the background of the portrait of Barbatus created by the inscription stood his father, Gnaeus. After the metrical filiation, the poem goes on to praise Barbatus, adding individualized characteristics to the portrait: *fortis uir sapiensque, quoius forma uirtutei parisuma fuit*. Unlike nearly all the other praise found in the examples of our corpus, the elements of praise here are given not in relation to others, but rather absolutely; as an explanation for this difference I would suggest that other elements of the *elogium* here carry out the task borne by relative praise in other examples in the corpus, i.e. the establishment of the relationships of the deceased with his contemporaries.

Indeed, the next line asserts the position of the deceased in his society, listing the offices he held: *consol, censor, aidilis quei fuit apud uos*. The *uos* is generally taken to apply to the Roman public,[8] and this suggestion seems the only plausible explanation: the statement that the deceased held certain public offices "among" the other two possible plural audiences – the deceased *maiores* in the tomb, or the later family members visiting the tomb – would not make sense.[9] How to explain, then, this address to the Roman public within a space where no members of that public outside of the family would be expected to go? It has been suggested

---

[8] Flower 1996, 179; cf. Zevi 1970, 66-7 and Van Sickle 1987, 47.
[9] Furthermore, the possibility that the *uos* in the epitaph of Barbatus in particular addresses an audience of deceased *maiores* is even less likely: as he was the founder of the tomb, no earlier *maiores* would be entombed at the time of his installation there.

that the *apud uos* in these inscriptions is retained from the *laudatio* given at the public funeral for each of these Scipios, but if indeed *uos* must address specifically the Roman public, the resulting incongruity between the addressed audience and the actual environment of the inscription remains. Van Sickle suggests that this incongruity results from the adaptation of the Greek epigrammatic conceit of an imagined audience to its new Roman environment; Flower declares herself unconvinced by this solution, but does not offer any suggestion of her own, aside from her general conclusion that the *tituli* accompanying *imagines* in the home served as a link between the public *laudationes* and the private *elogia*.[10]

Closer consideration of the word *apud*, however, offers one other possibility, one which seems to be able to unite the above-mentioned audiences, namely the Roman public, and visiting family members: if we take the phrase *apud uos* as meaning simply "among you, the living,"[11] there need be no incongruity between the actual audience of the inscriptions and the audience addressed in the text of the epitaph: this interpretation of *apud uos* is sufficiently inclusive that the *uos* can refer both to the surviving relatives and also to the Roman public at large. Here, then, the epitaph seeks to establish a connection not only between the deceased Barbatus and his contemporaries, but also with any still-living reader of the inscription.[12]

Having described, then, the activities of Barbatus among his fellow Romans, the epitaph goes on to describe his activities abroad: he captured Taurasia and

---

[10] Van Sickle 1987, 49; Flower 1996, 180 n.85.

[11] *OLD* s.v. *apud* 5b.

[12] As we have seen, the addresses to an unspecified plural audience that we see in three of the five Scipio epitaphs are a rarity in the rest of corpus: most of the other epitaphs which contain second-person elements address a singular audience. The only exception to this trend is in the fragmentary CIL I² 1223 discussed in ch.5, where we have the second-person pronoun *uos* and the plural verb *dicite*, as the deceased seems to ask an unidentified audience to speak for him a formula of rest. We cannot know, however, whether this audience might have been more clearly addressed or identified in the damaged portions of that inscription.

Cisauna in Samnium[13] and subjugated Lucania, bringing home hostages. By this depiction of these military activities the epitaph creates a much more expansive portrait than any others we have seen in the corpus: the portrait established by a reading of the inscription depicts not only the deceased himself, family members, and other Romans, but whole cities and peoples far away. The only other example outside of the Scipio epitaphs with an element even remotely similar is CIL I² 708, which describes its subject's death in war.

A similarly expansive picture also emerges from a reading of CIL I² 9 for Barbatus' son Lucius,[14] although there are some differences in the way in which the portrait is created. Once again, the reader would likely first encounter a non-metrical superscript giving the name and filiation of the deceased Lucius; here, however, the superscript also includes a brief *cursus honorum*, listing the offices he held: *aidiles, cosol, cesor*. A further difference would come when the reader began the metrical section: whereas in the Barbatus epitaph the name of the deceased (followed by his filiation) begins the *carmen*, immediately establishing the named figure of the deceased as the center of the portrait created by the inscription, here those elements are delayed until the third line. Instead, the reader would first declare others' opinions about the deceased, specifically that most men agree that he was the best of good men. The portrait is thus immediately populated with other people, around the still-shadowy figure of the deceased: the good men among whom he was the best, and those "most" who judge him thus. We should note the contrast of the verb-tenses: the perfect infinitive *fuise* places that status of the deceased firmly in the past, but the present-tense *cosentiont* causes this belief to be reified upon each reading.

---

[13] See ch.1 n.88.
[14] See discussion at ch.1 pp.30-33.

Only then would the reader speak the metrically incorporated name and filiation of the deceased, granting him, as discussed above, poetic *kleos apthiton*, and memorializing poetically his place in the familial line; added to the figures in the portrait created by a reading of the inscription, then, is his father Barbatus. The following verse is similar to the corresponding one in the epitaph of the father: the reader would declare the list of offices Lucius held, but here the line includes a deictic gesture at the deceased, *hic*, the reading of which would establish, as discussed in chapter three, bonds between the reader, the inscription, and the figure of the deceased. Once again we see *apud uos* (assuming, as is likely, that the reconstruction is correct), and again we take it to mean "among you, the living," situating the portrait among those still on earth (as did *cosentiont* above). As was the case in CIL I² 7, the epitaph then concludes with a description of other activities of the deceased, expanding the portrait still further as it describes his military activities; finally here the epitaph and the depiction of the deceased returns to Rome, noting Lucius' construction of a temple, the location of which is unknown to us but was likely known to most contemporary readers. And so we see that the narratives and the resulting portraits of these first two epitaphs are very similar, but the opening lines of Lucius' *carmen* creates a picture with even more ties to the living: in place of the absolute praise for Barbatus, the praise for Lucius is given both in relation to others (*duonoro*(*m*) *optumo*(*m*) *uiro*(*m*)) and in the eyes of others (*ploirume cosentiont*). Lucius' *carmen* engages in the same kind of fictive orality as that of Barbatus, addressing the imagined audience of the living (*apud uos*), but also includes a deictic *hic*, causing the reader to gesture at the deceased; and finally, the poem ends by noting the construction of a temple, likely still present among the living and known to readers for at least several more generations.

The next Scipio epitaph, CIL I² 10,[15] engages in a different kind of fictive orality, using the reader's voice to address the deceased; the portrait it creates is also very different from the previous two examples. No metrical subscript was found in the vicinity of this *carmen*, so a reader would begin immediately with the first metrical line. As the reader speaks the first verse (which may be a later addition), he addresses the deceased, referring first of all to his role as *flamen Dialis*; it is wearing the cap of that priesthood, then, that the image of the deceased manifests itself, present to hear the words spoken to him, in the portrait created by the inscription. Such a depiction might prepare the reader for the deceased's lack of public accomplishments: this priesthood carried with it certain privileges but also many restrictions, and one holding it was very limited in his other activities.

The menacing figure of death intrudes into the portrait at the opening of the second verse, as the reader declares that death caused "everything of yours" to be short-lived; the third verse provides a list of those truncated elements, *honos fama uirtusque, gloria atque ingenium*. Even as the epitaph acknowledges the loss of these qualities, by causing the reader to mention them it asserts and reifies their previous existence, brief though it was, and adds these characteristics to the figure of the deceased in the portrait created by the inscription. The inscription (and, through it, the reader) goes on to assert that had it been permitted for the deceased to take advantage of these qualities over the course of a long life, he would easily have surpassed the *gloria* of his ancestors. True or not, this assertion serves as a consolatory device: it superimposes, as it were, a theoretical, contrary-to-fact depiction over the previous one based on reality, a depiction in which the deceased carries out a full life and fulfills the expectations of the family. The ancestors, as the possessors of the *gloria* for which the deceased was expected to strive, are the

---

[15] See discussion at ch.1 pp.33-38.

first figures other than the deceased to be introduced into the tableau around the portrait; this Scipio is far more isolated in his graveside depiction than the previous two subjects, but he does eventually receive the company of his *maiores* in the portrait created by the inscription.

The final image is also consolatory: the reader, speaking the words of the inscription, assures P. Scipio that as such (i.e. because of his potential, thwarted though it was) the earth receives him gladly into her bosom. The name of the deceased (with the cognomen given first – he is identified first as a Scipio, and only then as Publius Cornelius) and the metrical filiation is interspersed with this assertion in the last verse, making for halting progress for the reader through this emotional claim. Only at the end of the poem, then, is the figure in the portrait identified and established within the familial tradition, just as the speaker assures him that he has been judged worthy of honor despite his early demise.

The entire poem is endowed with pathos, addressed as it is to the deceased himself; a living visitor can still connect with him through the inscription, despite his death. The portrait goes through several distinct stages with the reading of this epitaph: first we see the deceased, as yet unidentified, wearing the cap of the *flamen Dialis*; then death intrudes, cutting off the qualities that are nonetheless attributed to the figure by their mention; then there is a hypothetical depiction of what might have been; and finally, a return to reality, but with the comforting image of earth welcoming the young man, finally named and given his place in the familial line, into her bosom.

The fourth Scipio *elogium*, CIL I² 11,[16] the last in Saturnians, also discusses the effects of a premature death, but returns to the rather more impersonal tone of the first two; it also engages in the same degree of fictive orality as those first two

---

[16] See discussion at ch.1 pp.38-44.

examples, addressed not to the deceased but to an unidentified plural audience. As was the case for the first two *elogia*, a reader approaching the sarcophagus would first encounter a non-metrical subscript identifying the deceased, L. Cornelius Scipio; here in addition to the traditional filiation there is also notation of the deceased's grandfather, *Gn*(*aei*) *n*(*epos*), an expansion that reflects the family's desire to highlight the continuity of the family line.

At the beginning of the metrical section, a reader would speak what might at first seem to be praise for the deceased (as well as an acknowledgement of the brevity of the subject's life), but at the end of the second verse he would discover that these qualities (*magna sapientia* and *multae uirtutes*) are said rather to belong to the stone: *posidet hoc saxsum.* Clearly the praise *is* meant for the deceased; here we have, then, an association more explicit than usual of the stone with the deceased himself: we have argued all along that the stone and its inscription must serve as a metonymic marker for the deceased, a stand-in for him on earth among the living, and this trope – the attribution of qualities belonging to the deceased to the stone – supports this view. We also have here the deictic adjective *hoc*, which creates as we have seen bonds between the reader, the stone, and the space. No portrait is created yet by the inscription; no image of the deceased emerges until the third and fourth verses, where the reader would announce that a man is placed here (with a second use of deixis, this time the adverb *hīc*) whose brevity of life, rather than any lack of honor, denied him office, a man never defeated in virtue. The first characteristics explicitly attributed the deceased, then, and as such made part of the portrait of him created by the reading, are the brevity of the man's life and his lack of public office. Furthermore, both elements of praise are somewhat litotic: the deceased did not lack *honos* (in the sense of honor), nor was he ever defeated in

uirtus.[17] Like the subject of the previous *carmen*, this Scipio is fairly isolated in his portrait; at this point the only possible company he might have in the tableau created by the inscription are those peers who failed to defeat him in virtue.

Nor do the final two verses give him any more company, or add much detail to the portrait: in reading these lines, a visitor would announce only the information that the deceased had been entrusted to his grave at the age of twenty, and we ought not (therefore) ask why public office was not entrusted to him. Here, as in the first two examples, the epitaph addresses an unidentified plural audience, a rarity in the corpus. The possibilities for the identity of the audience here are less restricted than for the *apud uos* we saw above: in this case, the narrator might be addressing the Roman public, or the deceased *maiores*, or living family members visiting the tomb, or indeed, all three of these groups.[18]

We should note that none of these first four epitaphs have an identified 'voice' – there have been no first-person referents, no clues as to who is envisioned as speaking the inscription. This changes in the last of the Scipionic *elogia*, CIL I² 15:[19] the deceased himself, Cn. Cornelius Scipio Hispanus, speaks the text of the inscription, but without specifying an audience, thus engaging in the same level of fictive orality as the poems discussed in chapter five. A visitor approaching the inscription would first read a carved non-metrical superscript more elaborate than any of those attached to preceding examples, including the name and filiation of the deceased as well as a more detailed *cursus honorum.* The layout of the metrical section would likely make it clear to the visitor that the *carmen* is not, like those preceding it, in Saturnians, but rather in elegiac couplets, the meter of choice for

---

[17] 'Undefeated,' perhaps, because he never contended; cf. Virgil's description of the deceased Marcellus at *Aen*. 6.878-879: *inuictaque bello / dextera.*
[18] According to Van Sickle (1988, 149) the Roman public is not directly addressed here (although he considers them an "assumed audience") because this Scipio was not politically active.
[19] For discussion of the content, see ch.1 pp.44-48.

Greek funerary verse and one that would be more commonly used for epitaphs during the Empire.[20]

As soon as the visitor begins to read the metrical section, it becomes clear (specifically, from the third word *mieis*) that his voice is being co-opted by the 'voice' of the deceased. Through the voice of the reader, the figure of the deceased Hispanus creates a portrait of his life that is different from any of the previous four. Like the first two epitaphs, its depiction is markedly positive, but unlike those examples it is rather vague as to the deceased's actual accomplishments; it also shows an even more emphatic focus on family than any of the others, being comprised entirely of statements wherein the deceased describes his actions in relation to various parts of the family. We have discussed the content in detail in chapter one, so it will be sufficient to note here that in the portrait that results, the speaking figure of the deceased is surrounded by those various parts of the family referenced by the epitaph. First he mentions, and thereby adds to the portrait, his *genus* (*uirtutes generis mieis moribus accumulaui*), then members of the generations preceding and following him (*progeniem genui, facta patris petiei*). Then he asserts that his *maiores* rejoice that he was born to them (*maiorum optenui laudem ut sibei me esse creatum / laetentur*), with *laetentur* in the present tense: the reading of the text activates, and brings into the time of the reader, this rejoicing of the ancestors who were both physically in the tomb and, via the inscription, figuratively present in the tableau created by the reading. Finally Hispanus refers again to the family as a whole, *stirps*, ennobled by his honor. With this strong emphasis on family, and a tableau heavily populated with members of that family, comes an accompanying dearth of detail about the deceased himself – the image of

---

[20] See ch.1 p.17.

him created by the *carmen* remains fuzzy, as we learn nothing about him apart from these assertions about his contributions to the family.

And so it is not only in their environment that the epitaphs of the Scipios differ from the other inscriptions in our corpus. These earliest Latin grave poems show a strong emphasis on family, and manifest that focus in distinct ways, specifically by the inclusion of metrical filiation of the deceased in CIL I² 7, 9, and 10, and in 10 and 15 by the depictions of the deceased's relations to the family as a whole. The inclusion of these elements reveals a particular motivation behind the commissioning of these inscriptions: the surviving members of the family sought, through the poetry of the inscription, to formalize and commemorate the continuity of the family itself and of the accomplishments of its members. The depiction of the *maiores* judging the accomplishments of their descendant in the tableau of CIL I² 15 is a fitting representation of the emphasis on family found in these inscriptions: each Scipio was expected in life to glorify both earlier and later members of the family, and the inscriptions serve to memorialize and preserve the resulting deeds and confer on their deceased subjects the approval of their revered ancestors.

Remarkable too is the fact that in CIL I² 7, 9, and 11 the texts imagine an unspecified (but variously identified) plural audience, given that such plural audiences are almost unparalleled elsewhere in the corpus. In the first two, *apud uos* grounds the portrait of the deceased created by the inscription in the land of the living; in the third, the address to an unidentified but potentially critical audience attempts to ensure that those addressed, be they the deceased *maiores* or still-living family members, accept the right of the subject to be included in the illustrious family tradition.

Thus, then, are the effects of the oldest set of epitaphs in our corpus, first introduced in chapter one; now we will explore our conclusions about the other forty-four poems in the corpus, discussed in chapters two through six.

Chapter two: 'Endocentric' poems

In chapter two, the first of three chapters that offer discussions of those poems in which the deceased plays no active role, we examined the ten 'endocentric' poems in the corpus, those that show no acknowledgement of their space or audience; we set out to investigate what elements of content appear in these most basic examples of the genre. We found, not surprisingly, that praise for the deceased is a central element. A particular aspect of the way in which that praise is delivered, however, stands out, a characteristic that runs through most of our examples and, as such, an awareness of which is one of the fundamental conclusions of this study: **each of the poems in this chapter praises the deceased not absolutely** (i.e. by simply attributing a quality to the deceased with no one else mentioned: 'George was a good guy,' or 'Martha was a pleasant person') **but rather in relation to others.** In the first several poems we saw that even if no other individual was mentioned, groups were: for example, Quintus Brutius was *frugi, castus*, and *amabilis* to everyone (*ominibus*) and Publius Clodius Felix was *dulcis* to his family (*sueis*). **As a result, the portrait of the deceased created by a reading of the inscription becomes a tableau in which he or she is depicted in a social context. In many of these examples, we see clearly delineated depictions of the various spheres in which the deceased engaged in life, and epithets that indicate expected behavior within those spheres.** The temporal boundaries of these depictions are generally set at the boundaries of the deceased's life by the use of past tense verbs (e.g. *fuit* in the epitaph of P. Clodius Felix mentioned above). In one of these five, we also seem to see the epitaph attempt to associate the portrait of the deceased it creates with those still alive, by describing its hoped-for effect on

those reading it: *ut sibi quisque exoptet se honeste uiuere*. Here, then, emerges another trend that will appear in many of our examples, and that as such we consider one of our main conclusions: **many of the epitaphs, even this 'endocentric' one, attempt to establish some engagement with the living, some connection between the deceased and the reader or listeners via the monument as the deceased's metonymic marker.**

In the next several poems we saw how, with the mention of other individuals, the content of the epitaphs expands to include elements other than praise, and furthermore that when other individuals appear in the epitaphs and as such in the tableau created by them, the focus shifts away from the deceased. We saw depictions of townspeople mourning the loss of a young boy, mothers mourning and building tombs for their sons, and finally two in which patrons, former masters and mistresses, memorialize and mourn their late servants. In these last two we saw **another manifestation of the way in which the actions described in the epitaph, and as such in the portrait created by it, attempt to connect with the living audience: both of these examples use present-tense verbs to describe those actions, causing them to be reactivated upon each reading, and placing them in the real time of the reader**: Gaius Quinctius Valgus declares (*declarat*) the virtues of Gaius Quinctius Protymus, and the commissioners of a tomb for a slave-girl love her (*diligunt*) and fill her tomb with tears (*replent*). **Just as the present tense of these verbs would have affected an ancient reader, so too do they affect the modern reader: as we ourselves read the inscriptions, the present-tense verbs situate the action in our own time.**

The final example in this chapter seems to belong to another tradition, that of the military epitaph; there the praise is implicit (in the notation of the subject's death in war) rather than explicit, but there too the portrait of the deceased includes another individual, his commander in war.

291

Chapter three: Deixis

In the third chapter we considered those five poems that do acknowledge their space, that is, the original environment of the tomb, by means of deixis; often the deixis is part of a locatival statement of the sort that would become so common later that an abbreviation (*h.s.e.*, for *hic situs est*) suffices to express it. We have concluded that the addition of deixis does not correspond with any great change in content, but that **the deixis itself leads to certain effects: such a textual gesture references and thereby reifies the physical presence of the monument, a metonymic marker for the deceased, in the world of the living. Furthermore, the deixis requires a reader to give it meaning via his utterance and location, and in speaking it, that reader creates a bond between himself, the inscription, and the space around it, strengthening that connection between the monument-as-metonymic-marker and himself, the living reader.**

We found that the first four examples were very similar to those in chapter two save for the addition of the locative statement, but in the fifth we saw how **the deixis could work with the other content to reinforce the message of the epitaph, and the connection with the world of the living.** Gaius Stallius Hauranus is envisioned as remaining to protect his gravesite (*has sedes tuetur*), and as we saw the present-tense verbs do in chapter two, *tuetur* causes the action to be reactivated upon each reading, and places it in the real time of the reader; here, however, the deixis performs the same function in terms of space, locating the scene (and the deceased) in the space of the reader. Thus, as the epitaph claims that the deceased protects the tomb, and gestures at the space that he would protect, the tableau featuring the deceased is located in both the time and space of the living readers and listeners. **As was the case with the present-tense verbs discussed above, here too the deixis also affects the modern reader: although we are less likely to speak the text aloud, reading the deixis requires us to imagine**

ourselves in proximity to the inscription, and as such, sharing the space with the monument and the deceased.

We noted also that none of the poems belonging to these first two categories covered in chapters two and three gives any indication of 'voice;' that is, none of them includes first-person references or indications of who is envisioned as speaking the epitaph. Such voices emerge only in the examples of the fourth chapter, those poems that do acknowledge an audience. We can suggest, then, that **these two aspects of 'fictive orality' go hand-in-hand, at least in one direction: while we do find examples that acknowledge an audience but do not speak in a particular voice, there are no examples of a voice speaking in an epitaph that does not acknowledge an audience.**

Chapter four: Acknowledged audience

The poems of the fourth chapter, the last set in which the deceased plays no active role, do acknowledge an audience of some sort. Nine of the eleven address the passer-by; such a clear majority suggests, perhaps, that the passer-by is the default envisioned audience for these inscriptions. The tenth example contains a greeting formula that is variously interpreted as addressed to the passer-by, to the deceased, or as a dialogue between the two; the last, like the Scipio epitaph CIL I² 10 discussed above, is addressed entirely to the deceased.

We have found that the level of fictive orality present in the first nine examples, i.e. the acknowledgement of the passer-by as a potential reader, brings with it certain additional elements of content, elements that reflect more of an awareness of the environment around the epitaph and of the role the epitaphs are expected to play on behalf of the deceased. **Whereas examples in the previous chapters engaged only implicitly with the living (as suggested above, by means of present-tense verbs and deictic markers situating the portraits in the time**

and space of the reader), these epitaphs seek explicitly to engage with the living reader in various ways.

Several inscriptions include requests that the passer-by stop and look or read, thereby indicating an awareness of themselves as texts seeking potential readers and making explicit the fact that such monuments and inscriptions were intended to engage with the living. One example contains advice for the reader of the '*carpe diem*' sort, an element of content that takes for granted the idea that these poems could affect the behavior of living passers-by. We also see requests not to harm the monument; the physical survival of the monument and the legibility of the inscription were integral to its ability to carry out its function as a metonymic marker for the deceased. Statements of dismissal and farewell also acknowledge the reality of the texts' setting, i.e. that a living passer-by would encounter them, engage with them, and then move on. Divorced as modern readers are from the original setting of the poems, for us certain of these elements lack some of their intended resonance; but on the other hand, these references to the original context help recreate that environment for the modern reader, causing it to exist at least in the reader's mind even if it no longer exists physically.

The self-awareness of these texts also manifests itself in another way that has marked effects for the reader, and in some cases other individuals implicated in the inscriptions: some of these poems have an additional element of fictive orality, claiming a 'voice' of their own. As mentioned above, no such 'voice' appears in any of the poems that do not acknowledge an audience; as such, it seems that acknowledgement of an audience is required to license such a voice. In one case it is the stone that speaks, but only through the voice of the reader: the stone itself is characterized, on the one hand paradoxically but on the other quite literally, as "silent" (*rogat…hic tacitus lapis*). In that example the epitaph, even as it attributes the delivery of its content to the stone, does so still in the third-person;

294

but in five other examples, the epitaph does engage in first-person speech, endowing itself with, for lack of a better term, "I-ness." **We have seen in previous examples the necessity of the reader's voice to the fulfillment of the text, but by engaging in this "I-ness," these epitaphs fully co-opt the voice of the reader: his voice becomes the 'voice' of the text, and he thereby must identify with the voice and the words it speaks, becoming a part of the memorialization process, a tool of the monument as it carries out its task of representing for a living audience the life of the deceased.** In the first three examples that claim this "I-ness," the actions claimed by the voice are such as can reasonably be undertaken by, or attributed to, the stone as messenger, but in the fourth and fifth examples, the voice seems to go beyond the actions appropriate to the stone, and as a result we have suggested that in those cases someone other than the stone is envisioned as speaking, likely the commissioner(s) of the inscription. In these cases, then, we must then understand another figure in the tableau created by a reading of the inscription: not a passive, silent figure playing a role within the depiction of the deceased's life, but an active narrator. In the examples in chapters five and six we see how the deceased can be called up as an active, speaking figure by the reading of an inscription, but here the narrating figure is someone other than the deceased. **Remarkably, then, we see that in these examples (few though they are) it is possible for the epitaph to serve as a vehicle for continued existence and speech among the living, via the voice of the reader, for individuals other than the deceased subject represented by the monument.** These peripheral figures may have had their own epitaphs elsewhere, but they make guest appearances, as it were, in the tableaux of their lost loved ones. The memorialization they could receive by such a presence in the inscription – and a continuing connection, reified upon each reading, with the deceased subject – may have been an additional motivation for commissioning a monument and a text of this kind.

In all but one of these first nine examples,[21] as well as in the following one where greetings in the last line have various interpretations, these elements of fictive orality have been confined to the beginning and/or end of the inscriptions, which leads to another conclusion: **the markers of this particular kind of fictive orality, rather than imbuing the whole poem, tend to serve as a frame for a central section, which is generally in the third person and resembles the examples we saw in chapters two and three.**

The markers of 'fictive orality' are not, however, confined to the frame of the final poem in this chapter: although there is no 'voice,' no 'I' present in this poem (and as such it fails to qualify for Conso's designation of 'full fictive orality'), the entire poem is in the second person, addressed to the deceased, indicating that this variety of address is of a different sort than those above, which generally form a frame for the poem but do not imbue the whole of it.[22] **In this case, the deceased subject must be imagined as present in some capacity to hear the entirety of the epitaph; the epitaph serves as a tool whereby a living reader can engage directly with the deceased, albeit a silent version of him. Here is yet another way, then, that the monument serves as a metonymic marker for the deceased among the living.** Such examples are quite rare in the corpus, however: whereas nineteen of the forty-nine poems involve speech by the deceased, only two are addressed to the deceased.

---

[21] Every rule must have an exception, and in this case the exception is CIL I² 1837, mentioned above as one of the examples in which the 'voice' seems to claim an action beyond what could be attributed to the stone: in that example, *credo*, claiming for the speaker the opinion expressed (that some god begrudged existence to the deceased girl) interrupts the central section of the poem. As an explanation I would suggest that while it was conventional to limit these markers of fictive orality to the edges of the inscription, an especially inventive poet (or an insistent commissioner) might cause it to be otherwise. The effect is powerful: the interruption as the speaker breaks from the third-person narrative calls to mind the device of apostrophe, in which the poet interrupts his narrative to address a character, often at moments of high emotional tension.

[22] Such is also the case in the only other example in the corpus with an address to the deceased, the Scipio epitaph CIL I² 10: there too the whole poem is addressed to the deceased subject (see discussion above, pp.281-283.

Chapter five: Dead speak, but no acknowledged audience

Like the last example in chapter four, in the examples in chapter five the markers of fictive orality – in this case, the speech of the deceased subject – permeate the whole inscription, rather than being confined to the beginning or end.[23] **In these inscriptions it is the deceased him- or herself who coopts the voice of the reader for the whole inscription; here, then, we have a fuller, more explicit manifestation of a situation we have understood implicitly in all the poems: the monument and inscription serve as a metonymic marker for the deceased, a stand-in, allowing him or her to continue to engage, even after death, with the world of the living. Furthermore, the figure of the deceased as summoned by a reading of the inscription – here, as in other examples, often in a tableau with other figures – is no longer silent as the inscription casts an image corresponding to the content of the epitaph, but speaks, narrating the scenes as they appear**. While a reading of preceding examples has brought about a *tableau vivant* (the irony of the terminology is noted but not intended), for these a reading creates a *tableau parlant*.

In the nine poems in this chapter, the deceased subject, though speaking through a living reader, does not make a connection with a specific audience; but as we have seen in previous examples, these inscriptions strive to create a connection with the real space and time in which the reader finds himself, and as such engage with the living world.

Each of the first three examples, although they lack explicit deixis, include some other acknowledgement of the space around the inscription; **from this fact we suggest that poems including a speech by the deceased are more strongly tied to the real space of the inscription (and reader): spoken as they are by the**

---

[23] So too the one Scipio epitaph that engages in this level of fictive orality, CIL I² 15; see discussion above, pp.285-286.

figure of the deceased, these portraits are bound by default to the location of the gravestone as the metonymic marker, the memorial that activates and focuses the memory of the deceased.

The remaining six examples all include explicit examples of deixis, gesturing at (and causing the reader to gesture at) the space around the monument; as we have seen in preceding examples, deixis requires a reader to give it meaning, and creates a bond between the inscription, space, and reader. **In these cases, however, with the deceased subject co-opting the voice of the reader, the figure of the deceased becomes an active party in the nexus of ties created by the deixis, engaging in the real space of the living world. As was the case with the examples of deixis in chapter three, we see here how these additional elements – the attribution of the speech to the deceased and the use of deixis – can work with the content to reinforce the message of the epitaph.** In the first case, for example, Gaius Hostius Pamphilus uses deixis to gesture at the surroundings of the monument as he claims them as his own, *haec est domus aeterna, hic est fundus, heis sunt horti, hoc est monumentum nostrum*; it is his characterization of the space, and his presence there, that would be reified upon each reading by a passer-by. Even for a modern reader, divorced from the setting that the inscription describes, such insistent deixis combined with the description of the physical space calls up a clear image, recreating the space, and the deceased's claim on it, in the reader's mind. The epitaph of Manlia Gnome emphasizes most of all her self-sufficiency and her control of her own fate; as she asserts "I chose this one spot for myself," *locum hoc unum optinui mihi*, the reading of the epitaph in her voice reinforces her control over the situation, and her continuing ownership.

In two epitaphs for married couples, we also see how **the combined elements of speech by the deceased and deixis can cause the reactivation and reinforcement even after death of relationships created in life.** In the first, the

298

still-living husband and the deceased wife eulogize each other, creating portraits in which only the two of them appear; although they never speak to each other, the deictic gestures each uses to indicate the other depict and reinforce their relationship, both in memory and in the reality of the gravesite where they are both buried. The second example also depicts a still-living husband and a deceased wife; they gesture not at each other, but at the space around the monument where they will be reunited, reinforcing their eventual joint presence there. In both cases present-tense verbs, as the husbands and wives describe their feelings about each other, also situate the actions in the tableaux created by the reading of the inscriptions in the real time of the reader.

Chapter six: Dead speak to a living audience

In the nine poems of chapter six we see the culmination of the idea that these early Roman verse-epitaphs, serving as metonymic markers for their subjects, sought to endow the figure of the deceased with a means to engage, even after death, with the living: in each of these examples the figure of the deceased in the portrait created by the inscription speaks to a living audience.

In the first seven examples, that audience is the passer-by. Such a high proportion here strengthens the suggestion we made, based on the poems of chapter four, that the passer-by was the default assumed audience for these inscriptions. In these seven examples, although the deceased is envisioned as speaking the entire poem, the second-person speeches to passers-by occupy only discrete parts of the inscriptions, often at the beginning or end. **We have thus seen a pattern emerge among the various modes of fictive orality: speech to the deceased** (as in the Scipio epitaph CIL I² 10 and CIL I² 1603, the last poem in chapter four) **or speech by the deceased** (as in all the examples in chapter five and six) **tend to occupy the**

299

entire poem.[24] **Second-person addresses to the passer-by, however, as among the poems of chapter four and here, tend to form only part of their inscriptions, being limited to the beginning and end of the inscription.**

The manifestation of fictive orality we see in these seven examples – the deceased subject addressing the passer-by – is accompanied by certain elements of content not seen elsewhere, each of them inextricably tied to this mode of presentation. We see good wishes from the deceased to the passer-by, with an accompanying theme of contrast between their respective states; advice from the deceased to the passer-by, colored by the former's perspective as dead; reminders to the living from the deceased that they, too, will die; and finally, requests from the deceased that the living passer-by speak a 'light-earth' formula on their behalf. This last element in particular strengthens the argument that these epitaphs would be read aloud: the incorporation of the formula into the text of the *carmen* reflects the expectation that, by reading the inscription, the passer-by would lend his voice to the formula. **Again, the inclusion of these elements of content makes clear the fact that the living were expected to continue to engage with the deceased, and that these inscriptions were the means through which they did so.**

In the final two inscriptions we see the deceased engaging with specific individuals who were still living at the time of inscription. At the end of the first example, spoken entirely by the deceased subject, the figure of the boy addresses a four-verse speech to his mother, telling her to cease from weeping. In the second example, a six-verse speech by the deceased to her parents interrupts an otherwise third-person narration: she, too, tells her parents to cease from their grief. **Whether and how this mode of fictive orality (deceased to specific, still-living**

---

[24] As was the case in ch. 4, the exception proves the rule: in the final poem in ch.6, CIL I² 1215, a speech by the deceased to her parents interrupts an otherwise third-person narration.

individuals) manifests itself outside of the corpus should be the subject of further study, but among these extant early verse-epitaphs it is clearly limited to a specific scenario: the boy and girl each died before their time, and speak to the parent(s) who commissioned their monuments. **Furthermore, the message is also the same**: although they employ different reasoning, the boy and girl both request that the parents cease from their all-consuming grief.

We therefore have in this chapter two very different manifestations of speech by the deceased to a specified audience, with markedly different motives and effects; one is rather common, it seems, and diverse in its content, but the other is rarer and far more limited in its application. In both sets of examples the inscription and monument serve as a metonymic representation of the deceased, a stand-in that allows him or her to engage with a living audience. In each of the first seven, **the inscription seeks out a passer-by in order to use his voice to allow the figure of the deceased to address a broad audience, the wider world of the living, and offers content appropriate to that audience; the goal here is similar to many other examples we have seen, specifically to provide a medium within the world of the living for a generalized portrait of the deceased to be activated and focused by a reading of the inscription. In the last two examples, however, the inscription co-opts the voice of the reader for a more specific, consolatory purpose: the figure of the deceased, summoned by the voice of the reader, can then address specific mourners, offering comfort by telling them to cease from their grief.**

Scipio epitaphs

When, having built this framework of conclusions, we return to the metrical epitaphs of the Scipios, we find that these earliest examples, set apart by their nature as a set and by their environment, share some features with the wider corpus but also show distinctive features of their own. **The first two especially include**

301

content unparalleled elsewhere in the corpus, content that reflects the prominent public status of the deceased subjects and their accompanying public deeds, and as such create more vast, expansive tableaux than we see anywhere else in the corpus. The other distinctive feature in terms of content is the focus on family: the inscriptions each highlight the place of the deceased in the larger family, with the result that each portrait is populated with the deceased *maiores* and, in some cases, succeeding generations of the family. Some of this focus can be attributed to the fact that unlike any of other poems in the corpus these five form a unit, all for the same family, but it seems to me that the emphasis on family requires an explanation beyond that circumstance: these epitaphs sought to highlight (and in some cases to rewrite history in order to establish) a continuous family line of prominent public figures.

In their use of fictive orality too the *elogia* of the Scipios stand both with and apart from our other examples: the first two *carmina* contain an address to a plural audience (*apud uos*, which we have argued should mean "among you, the living"), a feature almost unparalleled in the corpus, but which accords well with our understanding of the epitaphs' overall task, i.e. to engage with the living; the fourth example, also addressing an unidentified plural audience (*ne quairatis*), seems to anticipate critical readers and listeners, even within the quiet tomb. The remaining poems fit easily into the other categories of fictive orality we have explored elsewhere in the corpus.

And so, as a final summary: we have found overwhelming evidence in this corpus of forty-nine early Roman verse-epitaphs that these inscriptions and the monuments on which they were inscribed were intended to serve as metonymic markers for their deceased subjects, allowing them to engage in various ways with the living. These inscriptions required reading by a visitor or passer-by to complete their task; upon such a reading, a portrait would emerge, depicting the content of

the epitaph. The default portrait is one given in relation to others, with the manifestation depending on social status and circumstances. By the use of present-tense verbs and deixis, this tableau can be situated in the world of the living reader; the epitaphs can engage still more explicitly with the living by addressing the passer-by. In a certain number of inscriptions, the deceased himself engages with the reader and listeners: the figure of the deceased called up by a reading of the inscription can (rarely) be addressed by the reader, or (more commonly) speak through him. All of these devices serve to allow the deceased to continue to be represented and engage in the world of the living, even after his or her death.

The Romans set out, by commissioning gravestones, to maintain a presence in the land of the living; they sought, by means of the accompanying inscriptions, to engage with, and even speak to, those still living. As we have seen, the devices by which the composers set out to accomplish these aims could be very effective: through these inscriptions, the dead could, and no doubt did, reach out to their surviving contemporaries and following generations. Indeed, the inscriptions in our corpus have succeeded beyond all expectation, as through these poems the Roman dead not only spoke to members of their own society, but continue to speak to later societies, including our own. Even as we read them, divorced as they may be from their original setting, the devices used by the composers of these inscriptions remain effective across two millennia: images of the lost world that was Republican Rome appear, depicting individuals and relationships, accomplished deeds and failed expectations, lost ways of life and ways of thinking. The voices of these figures still speak to us, the living, and they have much to say.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, K. 1944. "Ictus, accent, and statistics in dramatic Latin verse," *TAPA* 75: 127-140.

Adams, J. N. 1999. "Nominative personal pronouns and some patterns of speech in Republican and Augustan Poetry." In: *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry*, ed. by J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer, 97-134. Oxford – New York.

Adams, J. N. 2013. *Social variation and the Latin language.* Cambridge.

Alfonsi, L. 1965. "L'elegia 960 Bücheler C.L.E.," *Epigraphica* 27: 60-65.

Allen, F. D. 1879 [2nd ed. 1908]. *Remnants of early Latin.* Boston.

Allen, F. D. 1891. "Gajus or Gaïus?" *HSPh* 2: 71-87.

Allen, F. D. 1898. "Suspicions about 'Saturnian'," *HSCP* 9: 44-47.

Allen, W. Sidney. 1965. *Vox Latina.* Cambridge.

Anderson, A. R. 1909. "Some questions of Plautine pronunciation," *TAPA* 40: 99-107.

Armstrong, D. 1993. "The addressees of the *Ars Poetica*: Herculaneum, the Pisones and Epicurean protreptic," *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 31: 185-230.

Austin, R. G. 1955. *Aeneidos liber quartus.* Oxford.

Axelson, Bertil. 1945. *Unpoetische Wörter.* Lund.

Bader, F. 1962. *La formation des composés nominaux du latin.* Paris.

Bakkum, G. C. L. M. 1994. "The second-declension nominative plural in *-eis, -es, -is*, and the first-declension nominative plural in *-as*." In: *Linguistic studies on Latin: selected papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, ed. by Jozsef Herman, 19-40. Amsterdam.

Bartman, E. 2001. "Hair and the artifice of Roman female adornment," *AJA* 105: 1-25.

Beltran, A. 1950. "Las inscripciones funerarias en Cartagena," *AEA* 23: 385-433.

Bettini, M. 1992. *Anthropology and Roman culture.* Baltimore.

Bodel, John. 2001. *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions.* London.

Boyancé, P. 1955. "Sur une epitaphe epicurienne," *Rev. Etud. Lat.* 33: 113-120.

Brundrett, Nadine. 2011. "Roman tomb gardens: the construction of sacred commemorative landscapes," *The Brock Review* 11: 51-69.

Bruss, Jon S. 2005. *Hidden presences*: *monuments, gravesites, and corpses in Greek funerary epigram.* Leuven.

Bücheler, F. 1965. *Kleine Schriften,* vol. 1. Osnabrück.

Buonocore, Marco. 2007. "Sui CLE repubblicani della *regio IV Augustea.*" In: Kruschwitz 2007, 209-222.

Burzachechi, M. 1962. "Oggetti parlanti nelle epigrafi greche," *Epigraphica* 24: 3-54.

Cagnat, R. 1914. *Cours d'épigraphie latine*. Paris.

Campbell, Virginia. 2008. "Stopping to smell the roses: garden tombs in Roman Italy," *Arctos* 42: 31-43.

Carroll, Maureen. 2006. *Spirits of the dead: Roman funerary commemoration in western Europe.* Oxford.

CLE = Carmina Latina Epigraphica, 2 vols, ed. by F. Bücheler, 1895-1926. Stuttgart.

Cholodniak, J., ed. 1897. *Carmina Sepulcralia Latina*. Petropoli.

Church, J. 1901. *Beiträge zur Sprache der Lateinischen Grabinschriften: 1. Theil*. Munich.

Clausen, W. 1994. *Vergil: Eclogues*. Oxford.

Clary, Todd. 2009. *Rhetoric and repetition: the figura etymologica in Homeric epic*. Ph.D. diss., Cornell University.

Coarelli, F. 1972a. "Il sepolcro degli Scipioni," *Guide di Monumenti* I.

Coarelli, F. 1972b. "Il sepolcro degli Scipioni," *DArch* 6: 36-106.

Colafrancesco, P. and Massaro, M. 1986. *Concordanze dei Carmina Latina Epigraphica.* Bari.

Cole, T. 1969. "The Saturnian verse," *Yale Classical Studies* 21: 3-73.

Conso, Daniele. 1994. *Les structures de l'oralité en Latin*. Paris.

Cooley, Alison E. 2012. *The Cambridge manual of Latin epigraphy.* Cambridge.

Cornell, T. J. 1995. *The beginnings of Rome*. London - New York.

Courtney, E. 1993. *The fragmentary Latin poets*. Oxford.

Courtney, E. 1995. *Musa lapidaria*. Atlanta, GA.

Cugusi, P. 1985 [2nd ed. 1996]. *Aspetti letterari dei Carmina Latina Epigraphica*. Bologna.

Cugusi, P. 2007. "Ricezione del codice epigrafico e interazione tra carmi epigrafici e letteratura latina nelle eta repubblicana e augustea." In: Kruschwitz 2007, 1-62.

Day, Joseph. 2007. "Poems on stone." In: *Brill's companion to Hellenistic epigram*, ed. by Peter Bing and Jon S. Bruss, 29-48. Leiden - Boston.

Day, Joseph. 2010. *Archaic Greek epigram and dedication: representation and reperformance.* Cambridge.

Degrassi, A. 1957-63. *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae*, 2 vols. Florence.

de Melo, W. D. C. 2007. "Zur Sprache der republikanischen carmina Latina epigraphica: Satzumfang, Satzkomplexität und Diathesenwahl." In: Kruschwitz 2007, 97-120.

De Rosalia, A. 1978. *Iscrizioni latine arcaiche*. 2nd ed. Palermo.

Dessau, H. 1883. "C. Quinctius Valgus, der Erbauer des Amphitheaters zu Pompeii," *Hermes* 18: 620-623.

Dickey, E. 2002. *Latin forms of address from Plautus to Apuleius*. Oxford.

Dickey, E. and A. Chahoud. 2010. *Colloquial and literary Latin.* Cambridge.

Diggle, J. and Goodyear, F. R. D., eds. 1972. *The Classical papers of A. E. Housman.* London.

Dixon, Suzanne. 1988. *The Roman mother.* Norman, OK.

Dixon, Suzanne. 1992. *The Roman family.* Baltimore.

Dyck, Andrew. 1996. *A commentary on Cicero, De Officiis.* Ann Arbor, MI.

Eck, W. 1984. "Senatorial self-representation: developments in the Augustan period." In: *Caesar Augustus, seven aspects*, ed. by F. Millar and E. Segal. Oxford.

Edmunds, Lowell. 2007. "Deixis in Ancient Greek and Latin literature: historical introduction and state of the question," *Philologia Antiqua* 1: 67-97.

Egbert, J. C. 1893. *Introduction to the study of Latin inscriptions*. New York.

Egger, Émile. 1863. *Mémoires d'histoire ancienne et philology*. Paris.

Eisenhut, W. 1973. *Virtus Romana: Ihre Stellung im römischen Wertsystem.* Munich.

Engström, E. 1912. *Carmina Latina epigraphica post editam collectionem Buechelerianam in lucem prolata*. Göteborg - Leipzig.

Erasmo, M. 2008. *Reading death in Ancient Rome.* Columbus, OH.

Ernout, A. 1957. *Recueil de textes latins archaïques*. 2nd ed. Paris.

Eschenburg, J. 1860. *Classical antiquities.* Philadelphia.

Fassbender, Andreas. 2007. "Republikanische CLE aus Rom: eine Topographie." In: Kruschwitz 2007, 169-198.

Fay, E. W. 1920. "Scipionic forgeries," *CQ* 14: 163-171.

Felson, Nancy. 2004. "The poetic effects of deixis in Pindar's ninth Pythian ode," *Arethusa* 37: 365-389.

Fitz-Hugh, T. 1912. *Indoeuropean rhythm*. Charlottesville, VA.

Flower, H. 1996. *Ancestor masks and aristocratic power in Roman culture*. Oxford.

Forbis, E. 1996. *Municipal virtues in the Roman Empire: the evidence of Italian honorary inscriptions*. Stuttgart.

Ford, A. 1992. *Homer: the poetry of the past*. Ithaca, NY.

Fowler, D. 2000. "The ruin of time: monuments and survival at Rome," In: *Roman Constructions*, 193-217. Oxford.

Frenz, Hans G. 1985. *Römische Grabreliefs in Mittel- und Süditalien.* Rome.

Gaertner, J. F. 2005. *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto, Book 1*. Oxford.

Galletier, E. 1922. *Étude sur la poésie funéraire Romaine d'après les inscriptions*. Paris.

Garland, Robert. 1985. *The Greek way of death.* Ithaca, NY.

Garrod, H. W. 1913. "The Epitaph of Helvia Prima," *CQ* 7: 58.

Garrucci, Raffaele. 1877. *Sylloge inscriptionum Latinarum aevi Romanae rei publicae usque ad C. Iulium Caesarem plenissima*. Torino.

Gatti, G. 1901. "Notizie di recenti trovamenti di antichita in Roma e nel suburbia," *BCAR* 29: 86-89.

Gentili, Bruno. 1990. "L'epitafio del mimo Protogene: esametri o saturni?" *QUCC* 63: 131-141.

Goldberg, S. M. 1993. "Saturnian epic: Livius and Naevius." In *Roman epic*, ed. by A. J. Boyle, 19-36. New York.

Goldberg, S. M. 2005. *Constructing literature in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge.

Gómez Font, Xavier and Ricardo Hernández Pérez. 2011. *Carmina latina epigraphica carthaginis novae*. Valencia.

Gomez Pallarès, Joan. 2007. "Carmina Latina epigraphica de la Hispania republicana." In: Kruschwitz 2007, 223-240.

Gordon, A. E. and Gordon, J. S. 1958. *Album of dated Latin inscriptions*. 2 vols. Berkeley.

Granarolo, J. 1971. *D'Ennius à Catulle*: *recherches sur les antécédents romains de la poésie nouvelle.* Paris.

Gratwick, A. S., ed. 1993. *Plautus: Menaechmi*. Cambridge.

Griessmair, Ewald. 1966. *Das Motive der mors immatura in den griechischen metrischen Grabinschriften*. Innsbruck.

Gröber, Gustav. 1906. *Grundriß der romanischen Philologie*, vol. 1. 2nd rev. ed. Strasbourg.

Gruen, Erich S. 1990. *Studies in Greek culture and Roman policy.* Leiden.

Habinek, Thomas. 2001. *The politics of Latin literature.* Princeton.

Hallidie, Archibald R. S. 1905. *The Captivi of T. Maccius Plautus: with introduction and notes*. New York.

Harrod, S. G. 1909. *Latin terms of endearment and family relationships.* Princeton.

Hartmann, M. 2005. *Die frühlateinischen Inschriften und ihre Datierung.* Bremen.

Häusle, H. 1980. *Das Denkmal als Garant des Nachruhms*. Munich.

Hellegouarc'h, J. 1972. *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la republique.* Paris.

Hernández Pérez, Ricardo. 2001. *Poesía latina sepulcral de la Hispania Romana: estudio de los tópicos y sus formulaciones*. Valencia.

Hope, Valerie M. 2003. "Trophies and tombstones: commemorating the Roman soldier," *World Archaeology* 35: 79-97.

Hopkins, K. 1983. *Death and renewal* (Sociological studies in Roman history, vol. 2). Cambridge.

Horsfall, Nicholas. 1976. "The *collegium poetarum*," *BICS* 23: 79-95.

Housman, A. E. 1928. "Prosody and method II: the metrical properties of *gn*," *CQ* 22: 1-10.

Humbert, M. 1972. *Le Remariage à Rome*: *étude d'histoire juridique et sociale*. Milan.

Huttunen, P. 1966. "Some notes on the use of the verb *mereo* (*mereor*) in Republican political terminology and in pagan inscriptions," *Arctos* 4: 47-61.

ICVR = *Inscriptiones Christianae Vrbis Romae*, ed. by G.B. De Rossi, 1857-1888. Rome.

ILLRP = *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae*, 2 vols, ed. by A. Degrassi, 1957-1963. Florence.

Jansen, Ulrike. 2007. "CLE 63: Ein Grabgedicht für Salvia." In: Kruschwitz 2007, 261-270.

Joshel, Sandra. 1992. *Work, identity, and legal status at Rome*. Norman, OK.

Kaibel, G. 1900. "Sepulcralia," *Hermes* 35: 567-572.

Kajanto, Iiro. 1965. *Latin cognomina*. Helsinki.

Kajava, Mika. 1994. *Roman female praenomina: studies in the nomenclature of Roman women*. Rome.

Keuleers, Wouter. 2003. *Latijnse epigrafische poëzie uit de republiek*. Ph.D. diss., Vrije Universiteit Brussel.

Knox, Peter. 1986. "Adjectives in *-osus* in Latin poetic diction," *Glotta* 64: 90-101.

Koch, M. 1993. "Die Römische Gesellschaft von Carthago Nova nach den epigraphischen Quellen." In: *Sprachen und Schriften des Antiken Mittelmeerraums*, ed. by F. Heidermanns, H. Rix, and E. Seebold, 191-242. Innsbruck.

Kruschwitz, Peter. 2000. "Notizen zu CIL I² 1219," *ZPE* 133: 243-247.

Kruschwitz, Peter. 2001. "Zu republikanischen Carmina Latina Epigraphica," *ZPE* 136: 51-61

Kruschwitz, Peter. 2002. *Carmina Saturnia epigraphica*. Stuttgart.

Kruschwitz, Peter. 2002a. "Zu republikanischen Carmina Latina Epigraphica II," *ZPE* 140: 43-50.

Kruschwitz, Peter. 2002b. "Die Gebrauch von Θ in republikanischen Grabinschriften," *ZPE* 138: 109-112.

Kruschwitz, P., ed. 2007. *Die metrischen Inschriften der römischen Republik.* Berlin.

K.-S. = Kühner, R. and C. Stegmann. 1955. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. 2 vols. 3rd ed. Leverkusen.

Lattimore, R. 1962. *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs*. Urbana, IL.

Lease, E. B. 1901. "Licet and its use," *The New York Latin Leaflet* 1(22): 1-2.

LHS = M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, 1965. Munich.

Leiwo, M. 1994. *Neapolitana: a study of population and language in Graeco-Roman Naples.* Helsinki.

Leo, F. 1912. *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*. 2nd ed. Berlin.

Leumann, M. 1977. *Lateinische laut- und formenlehre*. 2nd ed. Munich.

L'Hoir, Francesca Santoro. 1992. *The rhetoric of gender terms*: '*man', 'woman', and the portrayal of character in Latin prose.* Leiden.

Liebs, Detlef. 2010. "Ewiges Gedenken durch freigelassene Sklaven." In: *Leben nach dem Tod*: *Rechtliche Probleme im Dualismus*, ed. by Andrzej Gulczynski. Graz.

Lier, B. 1903. *Topica carminum sepulcralium Latinorum*. Tübingen.

Lindsay, W. M. 1893. "The Saturnian meter. Second paper." *AJP* 14: 305-334.

Lindsay, W. M. 1897. *Handbook of Latin inscriptions*. Boston.

Lindsay, W. M. 1922. *Early Latin meters*. Oxford.

Löfstedt, E. 1928. *Syntactica*, vol. 1. Lund.

Lowrie, M. 2006. "Hic and absence in Catullus 68," *CP* 101: 115-32.

MacMullen, R. 1982. "The epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire," *AJP* 103: 233-246.

Mamoojee, A. H. 1981. "*Suauis* and *Dulcis*: a study of Ciceronian usage," *Phoenix* 35: 220-236.

Mankin, D. 1995. *Horace: Epodes*. Cambridge.

Massaro, M. 1992. *Epigrafia metrica latina di età repubblicana*. Bari.

Massaro, M. 1998. "Gli epigrammi per L. Maecius Pilotimus e A. Granius Stabilio," *Epigraphica* 60: 183-206.

Massaro, M. 2007a. "Metri e ritmi nella epigrafia latina di età repubblicana." In: Kruschwitz 2007, 121-168.

Massaro, M. 2007b. "Una coppia affiatata: CLE 959*." In: Kruschwitz 2007, 271-298.

McDonnell, Myles. 2006. *Roman manliness*: *virtus and the Roman Republic.* Cambridge.

Mercado, A. 2012. *Italic verse: a study of the poetic remains of Old Latin, Faliscan, and Sabellic* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 145). Innsbruck.

Meyer, Elizabeth. 1990. "Explaining the epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire: the evidence of epitaphs," *JRS* 80: 74-96.

Meyer, Ernst. 1991. *Einführung in die lateinische Epigraphik*. 3rd ed. Darmstadt.

Moir, K. 1986. "The Epitaph of Publius Scipio," *CQ* 36: 264-6.

Mouritsen, H. 2005. "Freedmen and decurions. Epitaphs and social history in Imperial Italy," *JRS* 95: 38-63.

MRR = Magistrates of the Roman Republic, 3 vols., ed. by T. Robert S. Broughton, 1951-1952. New York.

Northcote, J. S. 1878. *Epitaphs of the catacombs*; *or, Christian inscriptions in Rome during the first four centuries*. London.

Nussbaum, A. 1994. "Five Latin verbs from a *root *leik-*," *HSCP* 96: 161-190.

Nyman, M. 1974. *Ubi est and ubist: the problem of Latin aphaeresis and the phonology of esse.* Turku.

Obbink, Dirk. 2002. "Vergil, Philodemus, and the lament of Iuturna." In: *Vertis in usum: studies in honor of Edward Courtney*, ed. by John Miller, Cynthia Damon, and K. Sara Myers, 90-114. Munich.

Obbink, Dirk. 2007. "Lucretius and the Herculaneum library." In: *The Cambridge companion to Lucretius*, ed. by. S. Gillespie and P. Hardie, 33-40. Cambridge.

Olcott, George N. 1904. *Thesaurus linguae Latinae epigraphicae*: *a dictionary of the Latin inscriptions*, vol. 1. Rome.

Palmer, Leonard Robert. 1954. *The Latin language*. London.

Palmer, W. H. 1917. "Anaphora: its origin and use," *Washington University Studies*, Humanistic Series 5: 51-66.

Panciera, S. 1995. "La produzione epigrafica di Roma in età repubblicana. Le officine lapidarie." In: *Acta Colloquii epigraphici Latini* (*Helsingiae 1991*), ed. by H. Solin et al., 319-142. Helsinki.

Parsons, J. 1999. "A new approach to the Saturnian verse and its relation to Latin prosody," *TAPA* 129: 117-137.

Petrucci, A. 1998. *Writing the dead: death and writing strategies in the western tradition*. Trans. Michael Sullivan. Stanford, CA.

Pezzini, G. 2011. "Contraction of *est* in Latin," *Transactions of the Philological Society* 109: 327-43.

Pikhaus, Dorothy. 1978. *Levensbeschouwing en milieu in de latijnse metrische inscripties.* Brussels.

Pisani, Vittore. 1960. *Manuale storico della lingua latina*. Turin.

Plessis, F. 1905. *Poésie Latine: Epitaphes*. Paris.

Poccetti, Paolo. 2010. "Greeting and farewell expressions as evidence for colloquial language: between literary and epigraphical texts." In: *Colloquial and literary Latin*, ed. by Eleanor Dickey and Anna Chahoud, 100-126. Cambridge.

Popova, A. 1968. "Pour dater les CLE du Bücheler 990; 55; 960," *Eirene* 7: 57-66.

Purdie, A. 1935. *Latin verse inscriptions*. London.

RE = Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, ed. by August Friedrich von Pauly and Georg Wissowa, 1894-. Stuttgart.

Rigsby, K. J. 2008. "Hauranus the Epicurean," *CJ* 104: 19-22.

Ritschl, F. 1862. *Priscae latinitatis monumenta epigraphica: ad archetyporum fidem exemplis lithographis repraesentata*. Berlin.

Ritschl, F. 1878. *Philologische Schriften IV*: *zur Lateinischen Inschriften- und Sprachkunde*. Leipzig.

Rix, H. et al., eds. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden.

Rodá, Isabel. 2013. "Hispania: from the Roman Republic to the reign of Augustus." In: *A companion to the archaeology of the Roman Republic* (Blackwell companions to the ancient world), ed. by Jane DeRose Evans. Oxford.

Rogers, C. H., Floyd, F. J., Seltzer, M. M., Greenberg, J., and Hong, J. 2008. "Long-term effects of the death of a child on parents' adjustment in midlife," *Journal of Family Psychology* 22: 203-211.

Ruggiero, M. 1888. *Degli scavi di antichità di Terraferma*. Naples.

Saller, R. P. and B. D. Shaw. 1984. "Tombstones and Roman family relations in the Principate," *JRS* 74: 124-156.

Sanders, G. 1960. *Bijdrage tot de studie der Latijnse metrische grafschriften van het heidense Rome*. Brussels.

Sanders, G. 1991. *Lapides memores. Païens et Chrétiens face à la mort*: *le témoignage de l'épigraphie funéraire Latine*. Faenza.

Sandys, J. E. 1910. *A companion to Latin studies.* Cambridge.

Sandys, J. E. 1927. *Latin epigraphy: an introduction to the study of Latin inscriptions.* New York.

Sblendorio-Cugusi, M. T. 2005. *L'uso stilistico dei composti nominali nei Carmina Latina Epigraphica*. Bari.

Schumacher, M. 2007. "Ein Epikureer in Neapel: Notizen zu CLE 961." In: Kruschwitz 2007, 299-308.

Schwarzlöse, W. 1913. *De titulis sepulcralibus Latinis quaestionum capita quattuor*. Ph.D. diss., University of Halle.

Segal, C. 1989. "Song, ritual and commemoration in early Greek poetry." *Oral Tradition* 4: 330-359.

Shaw, Brent. 1991. "The cultural meaning of death: age and gender in the Roman family." In: *The family in Italy from antiquity to the present*, ed. by D. Kertzer and R. Saller, 66-90. New Haven, CN.

Sicking, C. M. J. 1993. *Griechische Verslehre*. Munich.

Sigismund Nielsen, H. 1997. "Interpreting epithets in Roman epitaphs." In: *Roman family in Italy: status, sentiment, space,* ed. by B. Rawson and P. Weaver, 169-204. Oxford.

Sihler, E. G. 1905. "The *collegium poetarum* at Rome," *AJP* 26: 1-21.

Solin, Heikki. 1972. "Analecta epigraphica VII-XIV," *Arctos* 7: 163-205.

Solin, Heikki. 1996. *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen: ein Namenbuch*. 3 vols. Stuttgart.

Sommer, F. 1914. *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Heidelberg.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1995. *'Reading' Greek death*. Oxford.

Stephenson, E. 1878. "Escavazione di un antico diverticolo al quarto miglio della via Tiburtina," *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 6: 215-238.

Stone, Lawrence. 1977. *The family, sex, and marriage in England, 1500-1800*. New York.

Suerbaum, Werner. 2002. *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike. Erster Band: die archaische Literatur.* Munich.

Sullivan, Francis. 1939. "Romans and non-Romans in the Latin metrical epitaphs," *TAPA* 70: 503-514.

Svenbro, J. 1993. *Phrasikleia: an anthropology of reading in Ancient Greece*. Trans. Janet Lloyd. Ithaca, NY.

Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman revolution*. Oxford.

Tatum, W. Jeffrey and K. M. Moir. 1988. "The epitaph of Publius Scipio reconsidered," *CQ* 38: 253-259.

Till, R. 1970. *Die Scipionenelogien.* In: *Festschrift K. Vretska*, ed. by Doris Ableitinger and Helmut Gugel, 276-286. Heidelberg.

TLL = Thesaurus linguae Latinae, 1900-. Leipzig.

Tolman, J. A. 1910. *A study of the sepulchral inscriptions in Bücheler's Carmina Epigraphica Latina*. Chicago.

Traina, A. 1969. *Comoedia: antologia della palliata*. Padua.

Treggiari, S. 1991. *Roman marriage.* Oxford.

Tsagalis, Christos. 2008. *Inscribing sorrow*: *fourth-century Attic funerary epigrams.* Berlin.

Valette-Cagnac, E. 1997. *La lecture à Rome*. Paris.

Van Bleek, G. 1907. *Quae de hominum post mortem condicione doceant carmina sepulcralia Latina*. Ph.D. diss., Free University of Amsterdam.

Van Sickle, J. 1987. "The *Elogia* of the Cornelii Scipiones and the origin of epigram at Rome," *AJP* 108: 41-55.

Vérilhac, Anne. 1978. *Paides aōroi: poésie funéraire*. Athens.

Vessberg, Olof. 1941. *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik.* Stockholm.

Vine, Brent. 1993. *Studies in archaic Latin inscriptions.* Innsbruck.

Wachter, R. 1987. *Altlateinische Inschriften*. New York.

Walbank, F. W., A. E. Astin, and M. W. Frederiksen. 1990. *The Cambridge ancient history*. Cambridge.

Warmington, E. H. 1940. *Remains of old Latin, IV: Archaic inscriptions.* Cambridge, MA.

Weiss, M. 2009. *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin.* Ann Arbor.

West, M. L. 1974. *Studies in Greek elegy and iambus*. Berlin.

Wiseman, T. P. 1970. "Pulcher Claudius," *HSPh* 74: 207-221.

Wiseman, T. P. 2006. "Fauns, Prophets, and Ennius' Annales." *Arethusa* 39: 513-529.

Wolff, Etienne. 2000. *La poésie funéraire épigraphique à Rome*. Rennes.

Wölfflin, E. 1892. "Die Dichter der Scipionenelogien," *Sizt. Bayer. Akad.*: 188-219.

Wölfflin, E. 1908. *Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik*. Leipzig.

Woolf, G. 1996. "Epigraphic culture in the early Roman Empire," *JRS* 86: 22-39.

Wypustek, Andrzej. 2012. *Images of eternal beauty in funerary verse inscriptions of the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman periods.* Leiden - Boston.

Zander, Carl. 1890. *Versus Italici antiqui.* Lund.

Zevi, F. 1973. "Sarcofago di. L. Cornelio Scipione Barbato." In: *Roma medio repubblicana*, 236-239. Rome.