

On semantic redundancy in the epigraphs of Moesia Superior

DRAGANA KUNČER* 

Institute of History, Belgrade, Serbia

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Received: November 6, 2022 • Revised manuscript received: March 31, 2023 • Accepted: April 2, 2023

Published online: May 16, 2023

© 2023 Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest



ABSTRACT

In this paper, the principle of semantic redundancy is examined as evidenced in the corpus of the Moesia Superior inscriptions (*Inscriptions de la Mésie supérieure – IMS*). The objective is to identify pleonastic phrases within the epigraphic material and to distinguish instances of unmotivated redundancy. The starting point is the observation made by Hofmann, Löfstedt, Herman, and others that this type of redundancy, contrary to the pragmatically motivated or “rhetoric” one, could reflect the ongoing semantic change in Vulgar Latin. Given the scarcity of semantic redundancy findings in the *IMS* corpus, this paper also serves as an introduction to this linguistically important topic.

KEYWORDS

redundancy, pleonasm, Vulgar Latin, epigraphy

Redundancy, as its name suggests, is excess information. When a sender transmits a message, they include identical or nearly identical segments of information more than once. This ensures the message travels through the communication channel as undamaged as possible, ultimately reaching the receiver. The sender’s idea is that these identical, or nearly identical, segments are needed because they anticipate that some might be lost in the noise of the communication channel. If these segments are many, there is a greater probability that at least one of them will survive and reach the receiver, who will then still receive the information in its totality. The content of the message may include not only spoken or written words but also various

* Corresponding author. E-mail: dragana.kuncer@iib.ac.rs

types of signals, such as different sounds, images, gestures, light beams, and similar forms of communication. Thus, communication should be regarded as a general concept consisting of features that can be measured (and one of those is redundancy). This theory was first developed by Claude Shannon and expressed in his famous book *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* (1949), with the introduction by Warren Weaver.¹ It is a groundbreaking book which allowed information technologies to develop to the extent that we see now. In the information theory developed by Shannon, “the word communication is used in a very broad sense to include all of the procedures by which one mind may affect another. This, of course, involves not only written and oral speech, but also music, the pictorial arts, the theatre, the ballet, and in fact all human behaviour”.² Consequently, the communication system always has the same structure, irrespective of the kind of signal that goes through it. For example, in oral speech, the information source is the brain, the transmitter is the voice mechanism producing the varying sound pressure (the signal) which is transmitted through the air (the channel). The receiver is a sort of inverse transmitter, changing the transmitted signal back into a message, and handing this message on to the destination. In oral speech it is the receiver’s ear and the associated nerve.³ This explanation is intended to underline the generality of information theory and the concepts used in it, such as redundancy. All the formulae for calculating redundancy, for example of radio waves, can be applied to the calculation of redundancy of linguistic features. The models are the same.

And here we are interested in the principle of redundancy in relation to languages or “linguistic redundancy”.⁴ It is worth mentioning that it is a phenomenon which exists in all natural languages, and also in artificial languages.⁵ An explanation could be the cognitive pressure to make the communication efficient.⁶

Linguistic redundancy is a phenomenon that exists at all levels of language, including phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical aspects.⁷ Despite its importance, the problem of redundancy in Latin linguistics has been explored by only a few researchers. Notably, József Herman applied Shannon’s formulae for relative entropy and redundancy to linguistic data in his paper *Théorie de l’information et recherches diachroniques* (1969),⁸ while Wolfgang Dressler discussed the preservation of redundancy in Latin language in his article *Die Erhaltung der*

¹SHANNON, C. E. – WEAVER, W.: *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. University of Illinois Press 1949.

²SHANNON–WEAVER (n. 1) 3.

³SHANNON–WEAVER (n. 1) 7.

⁴For a list of various definitions of linguistic redundancy, see CHIARI, I.: *Ridondanza e linguaggio. Un principio costitutivo delle lingue*. Roma 2002, 147–151, and WIT, E. C. – GILLETTE, M.: *What is Linguistic Redundancy?*. Technical Report. The University of Chicago 1999, 3–4. For a concise definition, see LEHMANN, CH.: Pleonasm and Hypercharacterisation. In BOOIJ, G. E. – VAN MARLE, J. (eds): *Yearbook of Morphology 2005*. Heidelberg 2005, 120.

⁵CHIARI (n. 4) 179–180, 186–192.

⁶GIBSON, E. et al.: How Efficiency Shapes Human Language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 23 (2019) 389–407. For a detailed list of linguistic redundancy functions, see CHIARI (n. 4) 169–179.

⁷See e.g. PULGRAM, E.: The Role of Redundancies in the History of Latin-Romance Morphology. In HERMAN, J. (ed.): *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif I. Actes du Ier Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Pécs, 2–5 Septembre 1985)*. Tübingen 1987, 197.

⁸HERMAN, J.: *Théorie de l’information et recherches diachroniques. Actes du Xe Congrès international des linguistes, Bucarest 28 août – 2 septembre 1967*. Vol. I. Bucarest 1969, 467–477.



Redundanz. Lateinische Beispiele für ein wenig beachtetes Prinzip der Sprachentwicklung (1969).⁹ Ernst Pulgram also contributed to the subject with his works *The Reduction and Elimination of Redundancy* (1983) and *The Role of Redundancies in the History of Latin-Romance Morphology* (1987).¹⁰

Although all these studies deal with the concept of redundancy in Latin, none of these exclusively deal with semantic redundancy, the topic examined here.¹¹

However, this does not imply that there is no previous research altogether. It is a well-known topic and there are a considerable number of different papers that have explored it. The difficulty in finding them lies in a differing terminology. Semantic redundancy in linguistics is called *pleonasm* or *hypercharacterisation*. There are special chapters in the works by Johann Baptist Hofmann,¹² or by Einar Löfstedt,¹³ that are exclusively dedicated to pleonastic expressions, or the paper by Eduard Schwyzer, *Sprachliche Hypercharakterisierung* (1941), also dedicated to semantic redundancy.¹⁴ It is a language feature which was known not only to modern but also to Roman grammarians and rhetoricians. The terms which they used to designate the phenomenon are *abundantia*, *adiectio* and *pleonasmos*:

inveniuntur et nostri abundantia utentes ut 'loquere dicens' et 'stude properans'. (Prisc. Gramm. III 374. 9),

soloecismus quot modis fit ? Quattuor. Quibus ? Adiectione... cum quaelibet pars orationis ex abundanti et non necessarie adiecta uitium facit, ut si quis dicat... 'adhuc nondum factum est', cum 'nondum factum' est aut 'adhuc non factum' dici debeat. (Victor. Fr. p. 33),

Est et pleonasmos vitium, cum supervacuis verbis oratio oneratur : 'ego oculis meis vidi' (sat est enim 'vidi'). (Quint. Inst. 8. 3. 53).¹⁵

Among the modern philological works related to Latin pleonastic expressions, Hofmann-Szantyr's *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (1965) stands out with its comprehensive list of examples and their well-structured division and subdivision.¹⁶ These include pleonasmos characterized by the accumulation of synonyms, such as *memini et scio, cognovi atque intellexi*

⁹DRESSLER, W.: Die Erhaltung der Redundanz. Lateinische Beispiele für ein wenig beachtetes Prinzip der Sprachentwicklung. *Classica et Orientalia, Studi in onore A. Pagliaro II*. Roma 1969, 73–84.

¹⁰PULGRAM, E.: The Reduction and Elimination of Redundancy. In AGARD, F. et al. (eds): *Essays in Honor of Charles Hockett*. Leiden 1983, 107–125; PULGRAM: The Role (n. 7) 189–197.

¹¹The categorization of “semantic redundancy” is not commonly used, but it is justifiable since redundant semantic phenomena are studied. See LEHMANN (n. 4) 123: “pleonasm is a purely semantic (or stylistic/rhetorical) concept”.

¹²HOFMANN, J. B.: *Lateinische Umgangssprache*. 3rd ed. Heidelberg 1951, 90–102.

¹³LÖFSTEDT, E.: *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins. Syntaktisch-stilistische Gesichtspunkte und Probleme II*. Lund 1933, 173–232; LÖFSTEDT, E.: *Late Latin*. Oslo 1959, 22–24, 169–173.

¹⁴SCHWYZER, E.: *Sprachliche Hypercharakterisierung* [Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Nr. 9]. Berlin 1941.

¹⁵There are other expressions related to semantic redundancy in ancient rhetoric, such as *perissologia*, *macrologia* and *tautologia*. For the examples and differences in meaning, see LAUSBERG, H.: *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. 3rd edition. Stuttgart 1990, 268–269.

¹⁶HOFMANN, J. B. – SZANTYR, A.: *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München 1965, 784–808. For how challenging this classification task is, see LÖFSTEDT: *Syntactica* (n. 13) 175.



atque arbitror, salutem et sanitatem, faustum et felicem, and solus ac solitarius. There are also *figura etymologica* pleonasms, exemplified by phrases like *pugnam pugnare, ludo ludere, ne dentes dentiant, Venerem hanc veneremur, cupide cupis, and tacitus tace.* Pleonastic word groups with same and distinct roots are present, for instance, *incipit... initium, fretus tua, Fides, fiducia, festinationem properare, and similitudinem... imitemur.* Additionally, pleonastic negations are observed, such as *non est relictus ex eis neque unus, numquam nihil peccavi, iura te non nociturum... nemini, and numquam... non debuit.* Finally, the various *iuncturae pleonasticae* are noted, including *hic ibidem, vero autem, mox deinde, ne quid minus aliquid, omnis totus, and neque ulla re aliqua.*¹⁷

Apart from the emblematic examples, in Hofmann–Szantyr’s book there is an observation which deserves to be cited here. Namely, in the preliminary remarks to the chapter, it stands:

„In Spätlatein... ist freilich oft nicht zu entscheiden, ob sie direkt (oder indirekt als Archaismen) aus der Volkssprache geschöpft oder rein rhetorischen Ursprungs sind und unter dem Einfluss des Asianismus der schwülstigen Überladung des Stils dienen.“¹⁸

In this passage, it is conveyed that discerning the motivation behind pleonastic expressions is challenging. It is difficult to determine whether their occurrence is unmotivated or pragmatically motivated, whether they originate from everyday speech (“aus der Volkssprache”), or if they represent a rhetorical device.

The aim of this paper is to explore the everyday speech underlying pleonastic expressions in the selected epigraphic corpus. Confidence in the feasibility of this exploration can be found in Löfstedt’s and Herman’s writings. Namely, Löfstedt offers examples from Romance languages that, although not pleonasms themselves, originate from pleonastic expressions. For instance, Italian *soltanto* is derived from the pleonastic Latin *solum tantum*, Italian *ambidue* from the pleonastic Latin *ambo duo*, and Italian *medesimo* as well as French *même* from **metipse* or **metipsimus*.¹⁹ Moreover, Italian *da* comes from Latin *de ab*. The list expands to include, among others, the French preposition *dès* and its cognates in Romance languages, deriving from Latin *de ex*,²⁰ then Spanish *conmigo*, Portuguese *comigo* (both derived from *cum mecum*),²¹ Old French *plus forçor* (from *plus fortior*), Provençal *plus melhor* (from *plus melior*), and Old Spanish *mas mejor* (from *magis melior*).²²

Herman, on the other hand, demonstrated that many linguistic phenomena can be credibly traced in Latin inscriptions.²³ The origin of the aforementioned French preposition *dès* serves as a representative example. Testimonies supporting this etymology in Late Latin texts are scarce, with Löfstedt able to cite only verbal prefixe (*deexhortari*). The sole syntagmatic example

¹⁷This enumeration is illustrative. For the complete list with sources, see HOFMANN–SZANTYR (n. 16).

¹⁸HOFMANN–SZANTYR (n. 16) 785.

¹⁹For more examples from Romance languages, see ELCOCK, W. D.: *The Romance Languages*. London 1960, 73, 94.

²⁰LÖFSTEDT: *Late Latin* (n. 13) 171.

²¹LÖFSTEDT: *Late Latin* (n. 13) 172. For more examples from Romance languages and detailed discussion, see SANTESSON, C. G.: *Le particule CUM comme préposition dans les langues Romanes*. Thèse pour le doctorat. Paris 1921, 75–140.

²²LÖFSTEDT: *Syntactica* (n. 13) 202–203.

²³HERMAN, J.: *Vulgar Latin*. Tr. into English by R. Write. The Pennsylvania State UP 2000, 18–21.



mentioned by Löfstedt is an epigraphic one and he seems to consider it insufficient, asserting that the question should remain open:²⁴

C 14, 5210 *Dis Manibus Audiae R[...] mulieri castissimae quae vixit ann(is) X[...] d(iebus) XV fecit Iovianus coiugi karissime que vixit cum eo de ex die virginitatis sue annis XVIII diebus XLV (Roma).*²⁵

In contrast, Herman, in his comprehensive monograph on Vulgar Latin, unreservedly presents the derivation of French *dès*, and the prefix *des-* in Spanish *después*, from Latin *de ex*.²⁶ The acceptance of this etymology by French and Spanish lexicographers further supports Herman's arguments in the validity of inscriptions as evidence.²⁷

In addition to this inscription containing pleonastic expression that can be claimed to have existed as typical, unmarked construction in everyday speech, Löfstedt's work mentions several others. Interestingly, most of these epigraphs exhibit the same phenomenon, that of double negation:

C 5, 6520 ...*viva fecit quaestori aerarii qui numquam rei publicae nil debuit Baebia Ateronia coniugi karissimo* (Regio XI, II),

C 10, 7173 *Florentina pia bona Crestiana dulcissimae coiugi ego Maius fec[i] que vixit mecum annis XXIII mensibus IIII diebus V sene nula querela seper in pake...* (Roma, IV),

ILCV 3311 *Acceptit requiem post septuaginta non minus annos nulli numquam nocuit...* (Regio X, IV),

C 8, 5370 *Sei[i]us Fuanus nutritiv natos duo in prima aetate ex Germana coniuga in studiisque misit et honores tribuit post tantos sumptus non fruitus nemine funeravit natos...* (Africa proconsularis),

DefTab. 111 ...nec mater huius catelli eum defendere potuit sic nec advocati eorum e[0]s defendere non possint... (Aquitania).

As with other cases of pleonastic constructions, it is challenging to discern between those used emphatically and those that were colloquial.²⁸ However, in the list of inscriptions containing double negation cited by Löfstedt, it seems that their use was indeed typical of spoken language. The main reason for this belief is that the negation system in these inscriptions reflects the system prevalent in Romance languages, the so-called Negative Concord system, where “two negators are counted for one.”²⁹ This characteristic, present in Romance languages,

²⁴LÖFSTEDT: Late Latin (n. 13) 171.

²⁵See a different reading, *cum eode(m) ex*, in CALDELLI, M. L. et al.: *Epigrafia Ostiense Dopo Il CIL*. Venezia 2018, 64 nr. 128. Due to the visible space between *eo* and *de* in the inscription, the reading of a single word *eode(m)* might not be preferred over Wickert's reading.

²⁶HERMAN: Vulgar Latin (n. 23) 96.

²⁷*Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, 9^e édition, at <https://www.dictionnaire-academie.fr/>, s.v. *dès* and *Diccionario de la lengua española*, at <https://dle.rae.es/>, s.v. *después*.

²⁸PINKSTER, H.: *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Vol. I. The Simple Clause*. Oxford 2015, 728.

²⁹PINKSTER (n. 28) 726. For example, the sentence *Nemo non videt* translates to ‘everyone sees’ (Cic. *Lael.* 99). See MOSEGAARD HANSEN, M.-B. – MOLINELLI, P.: Negation from Late Latin to Early French: Pragmatics, discourse traditions, and directionalities. In A. CARLIER, R. – EUFE, C. – GUILLOT-BARBANCE, – SELIG, M. (eds): *Bridging the Gap between Late Latin and Early French: Empirical Investigations of (Morpho)syntactic Changes*. De Gruyter (accepted/in press). For more examples, see PINKSTER (n. 28) 724–6.



contrasts with the prescriptions of Classical Latin grammar, which follows the so-called Double Negation system, “in which the effect of the second negator is cancelled out”.³⁰ Moreover, Negative Concord can also be found in Latin texts that demonstrate aspects of colloquial language, such as Plautus’ works, or in Late Latin texts.³¹ In addition to these factors (its prevalence in Romance languages and occurrences in Late Latin texts), the presence of Negative Concord as an actual attribute of everyday speech may be confirmed by the repudiation of grammarian Diomedes in the 4th century AD, who says: *duodecimus modus (sc. soloecismi) fit per geminationem abnuendi, ut <si> dicas numquam nihil peccavi, cum debeat dici numquam peccavi, quoniam duae abnutiuae unam confirmatiuam faciunt*.³²

The other examples mentioned by Löfstedt include two inscriptions featuring pleonastic prepositional phrase with *erga*:

C 6, 6469 *Hermion[e] Cai Minuci Galli Philadelpho avonculo suo ob pietatem erga in se* (Roma, I),

C 6, 8543 *Tito Flavio Augusti liberto Saturnino tabulario a vehiculis Flavia Pythias coniugi suo carissimo erga de se bene merenti fecit...* (Roma).

Löfstedt characterizes this use of *erga* as “strange”.³³ These cases, along with some others mentioned earlier, could be examples of what Lehmann referred to as “safety pleonasm”. The term refers to the use of additional words when a speaker feels that a shorter expression could be semantically insufficient. In the case of *erga*, it may have been used to reinforce the monosyllabic prepositions *in* and *de*, which were perceived as having weak meanings.³⁴

To achieve our goal of identifying occurrences of unmotivated semantic redundancy, we conducted an examination of the *IMS* corpus, consisting of five volumes and selected for its relatively small size. The investigation unfolded in two stages. In the initial stage, we marked every occurrence of pleonasm within the corpus. The subsequent stage concentrated on assessing if these instances signified evidence of spoken language. Consequently, our examination uncovered four instances of pleonasm in the corpus during the first stage:

IMS 1. 90:

//////////

[I]ovi s(acrum ?) / [Iup]piter / Cresces (!) / Mucati / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

IMS 1. 94:

I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) / Iuppiter / M. Aur(elius) Cre[s] / centio pr(o) se et suos (!) / et cives (!) / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

³⁰PINKSTER (n. 28) 724.

³¹For examples from various sources, see PINKSTER (n. 28) 729.

³²GL I 455.

³³LÖFSTEDT: Late Latin (n. 13) 170. The characterization of being unusual seems appropriate. Both searches in the LatinISE corpus (cf. MCGILLIVRAY, B., KILGARRIFF, A.: Tools for historical corpus research, and a corpus of Latin. In BENNETT, P. et al. (eds.): *New Methods in Historical Corpus Linguistics*. Tübingen: Narr 2013, 247–257) and the *Digital Library of Late Latin Texts* (at <https://digilibt.uniupo.it/>) for either phrase yielded no results.

³⁴On categorization of “safety pleonasm”, see LEHMANN (n. 4) 130.



The first two are similar and they consist of the repetition of a god's name (*Iuppiter*) in two cases: in dative and vocative (or maybe nominative). This polyptotic repetition probably refers to ritual and represents the invocation of the god. It does not reflect any linguistic habit, but rather a pragmatic usage of the god's name.

IMS 1. 41:

D(is) I(nferis) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Aur(elius) Victor vet(eranus) et Aur(elia) / Victoria coniuges / vivi sibi posuerunt / titulo suo (!) et Aure[lio] / Alpino (?) patri genetivo / qui vix[it] an(nis) XC / et P. Aure(lio) A[lu]mn(o) (?) / qui vix[it] ann(is) [...] / et Au[r]el(io) [A]pro (?) v(ixit) an(nis) [...] / [...] CE[.]FIA ET ICUS (?) / annonario posuit.

This inscription contains the expression *patri genetivo*. Although it can sound like a pleonasm, it also could have expressed the semantic difference from the *pater adoptivus*, which the heirs, maybe, wanted to stress.³⁵

IMS 6. 212:

[. . .] *M(ithrae) / Fano Mag(no) / pro sal(ute) Aug[[g(ustorum)]] nn[[o(estrorum)]] / Apolonides / eorund(em) vect(igalis) Il / lyr(ici) ser(vus) (contra)sc(riptom) stat(ionis) / Lamud() **quam vove- / rat** (contra)sc(riptom) stat(ionis) Vizi(ani) / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).*

In the fourth inscription the same meaning is conveyed twice: first through the relative construction with the verb *voverat*, and then through the noun *votum*. This may have occurred because the abbreviation was not understood, with the *v* standing for *votum*. The phenomenon resembles what Lehmann termed “abbreviation elaboration”, a type of pleonasm that occurs when “the added noun repeats a semantic component already contained in the abbreviation”.³⁶ An inscription from Aquincum, Pannonia Inferior (237 AD), provides an illustrative example.

TitAq 0332:

[Si]vano Magno // *Cl(audius) Maximi/nus pro sal(ute) / Cl(audi) Probini / fili **quod / voverat / v(otum)** s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito) / III Idus Iuni(as) / Perpetuo / et Corneliano / co(n)s(ulibus).*³⁷

However, it must be acknowledged that, unlike this purely pleonastic use, our inscription bears more resemblance to the inscription from Bordeaux, Aquitania.

AE 1922, 0116:

*Deae Tutel(a)e Boudig(ae) / M(arcus) Aur(elius) Lunaris IIIII/vir Aug(ustalis) col(oniarum) Ebor(aci) et / Lind(i) prov(inciae) Brit(anniae) inf(erioris) / **aram quam vover(at) / ab Eboraci(!) avect(us) / v(otum)** s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito) / Perpetuo et Cornel[[liano] co(n)s(ulibus)].*³⁸

³⁵DUŠANIĆ, S. (ed.): *Inscriptions de la Mésie supérieure* I. Belgrade 1976, 69 ad n. 41.

³⁶LEHMANN (n. 4) 147.

³⁷TitAq = *Tituli Aquincenses: Tituli sepulcrales et alii Budapestini reperti. Vol. I–V*. Edd. G. ALFÖLDY(†) – P. KOVÁCS – Á. SZABÓ. Budapest 2009–2021.

³⁸AE = *L'Année Épigraphique*, Paris 1888–.



The relative clause in both our case and the Bordeaux inscription functions to indicate the time when the vow was made, as seen in the phrases *quam voverat (contra)sc(ri)ptor stat(ionis) Vizi(ani)* and *aram quam vover(at) / ab Eboraci(!) avect(us)*.³⁹ However, despite their restrictive usage, the relative constructions in this context convey the same meaning as *votum*, rendering its use in the *VSLM* abbreviation redundant. It could have been the case, as mentioned, that the abbreviation was either not understood or perceived as representing a decoration or image. An illustrative example of abbreviation misinterpretation (or its perception as having weak meaning) comes from Pompeii. Despite the presence of the abbreviation *DRP*, which stands for *dignus rei publicae*, the inscription is pleonastically extended with the phrase *dignus est*.⁴⁰ All these instances of pleonasm in relation to abbreviations can be attributed to the process of writing and reading written text. They do not reflect spoken language usage.⁴¹

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is important to emphasize that while previous studies have identified instances of unmotivated semantic redundancy in epigraphic material, such occurrences are relatively scarce and primarily limited to double negation. Our examination of the *Inscriptions de la Mésie supérieure* corpus did not yield any examples. This is likely due to the relatively small size of the corpus. However, a larger epigraphic dataset is expected to provide a greater number of occurrences of this specific Vulgar Latin feature.

³⁹I would like to express my gratitude to the anonymous reviewer for providing the examples of inscriptions from Aquincum and Bordeaux.

⁴⁰For the first part of the inscription, see C 4, 07237: *P(ublium) P(aquium) P(roculum) Ilvir(um) o(ro) v(os) f(aciatis) d(ignum) r(ei) p(ublicae)*. For a facsimile of the entire inscription see WALLACE, R. E.: *An Introduction to Wall Inscriptions From Pompeii and Herculaneum*. Illinois 2005, 105. I would like to express my warmest gratitude to Ádám Rung for drawing my attention to this inscription, as well as for sending me a picture of it along with its reference.

⁴¹See, for example, *IMS 2.14: Cocceius Cassius / cot b(ene)f(iciarius) leg(ati) vovit b(ene)f(iciarius) co(n)s(ularis) / solvit*. When the abbreviation is not written, possibly due to the writer's insufficient literacy as evidenced by the misspelling of *quod* as *cot*, the pleonasm does not occur.

