

ONOMASTIC STUDIES IN THE
EARLY CHRISTIAN
INSCRIPTIONS OF ROME
AND CARTHAGE

By
IIRO KAJANTO

Helsinki—Helsingfors 1963

CONTENTS

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	V
Sources	V
I The early Christian inscriptions of Rome	V
II The early Christian inscriptions of Carthage	V
III Other collections of inscriptions	V
Literature	VI
INTRODUCTION	1
THE LATIN NAME SYSTEM IN THE CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS	3
I <i>The Latin name during the Early Empire</i>	3
II <i>The designation of the social status</i>	4
§ 1. The disappearance of the <i>tribus</i> and filiation	4
§ 2. The disappearance of the designation of slaves' and freedmen's status	6
III <i>From the tria nomina to the single name system</i>	9
§ 1. The proportions of the different name forms in the pagan and Christian inscriptions	9
§ 2. The chronology of the name forms in the Christian inscriptions	11
§ 3. The causes of the break-up of the Latin name system	13
IV <i>The use of nomina as cognomina</i>	18
V <i>Inversion</i>	23
VI <i>Double cognomina</i>	24
VII <i>The problem of the supernomen</i>	31
§ 1. The classification of supernomina	31
§ 2. The detached signa	33
§ 3. The origin of detached signa	35
§ 4. Cognomina in <i>-ius</i> cut detached	43
§ 5. Detached signa in Christian epigraphic material	45
§ 6. Signa proper and agnomina	47
VIII <i>The transmission of personal names</i>	50
§ 1. The transmission of the nomen	50
§ 2. The transmission of the cognomen	52
ON THE ORIGIN AND FORMATION OF COGNOMINA IN CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS ..	55
I <i>Latin, Greek and barbaric cognomina</i>	55
II <i>The use of suffixes in late Latin nomenclature</i>	61
III <i>The new cognomina in -ius-ia</i>	70
§ 1. The frequency of cognomina in <i>-ius-ia</i> in pagan and Christian inscriptions	70
§ 2. The origin of the new cognomina in <i>-ius-ia</i>	72
§ 3. The new cognomina from a linguistic point of view	75
§ 4. A list of the new cognomina in <i>-ius-ia</i> found in the Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage	78
THE ORIGINS OF A CHRISTIAN NOMENCLATURE	87
I <i>The criteria of a «Christian» name</i>	87
II <i>Names of saints</i>	92
§ 1. The ideas of the Fathers on the adoption of the names of saints	92

IV	ONOMASTIC STUDIES IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS . . .	
§ 2.	Biblical names	93
§ 3.	Names of martyrs	97
III	<i>Christian theophoric names</i>	100
§ 1.	The classification of theophoric names	100
§ 2.	Names derived from <i>Deus</i> and <i>Θεός</i>	101
§ 3.	Names derived from <i>Κύριος</i> and <i>Dominus</i>	104
IV	<i>Date names of Christian origin</i>	105
§ 1.	The Christian reshaping of the Roman calendar	105
§ 2.	Names derived from names of days	107
§ 3.	Names commemorating Christmas and Epiphany	107
§ 4.	Names commemorating Lent, Pentecost and Easter	109
V	<i>Names expressive of Christian ideas</i>	110
§ 1.	A general note	110
§ 2.	Names embodying Christian dogmas	111
§ 3.	Names suggestive of Christian virtues	113
VI	<i>Summary of Christian nomenclature in Rome and Carthage</i>	115
VII	<i>Special problems</i>	117
§ 1.	The chronology of Christian names	117
§ 2.	The problem of a baptismal change of name	118
§ 3.	The social aspect of Christian nomenclature	121
	SUMMARY	122
	INDEX OF SCHOLARS	124
	INDEX OF PERSONAL NAMES DISCUSSED	125
	A GENERAL INDEX	137

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

I *The early Christian inscriptions of Rome*

- RO = G. B. DE ROSSI, *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae saeculo septimo antiquiores I*, Romae 1857—61 & I. GATTI, *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae*, Voluminis Primi supplementum, fasc. I, Romae 1915.
- SI = *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*, Nova Series I—II, edidit A. SILVAGNI, Roma 1922; 1935.
- FE = *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*, Nova Series III, ediderunt A. SILVAGNI et A. FERRUA S. I., Roma 1956.
- RS = G. B. DE ROSSI, *Roma Sotterranea I—III*, Roma 1864—77.
- ARM = M. ARMEILINI, *Il cimitero di S. Agnese sulla via Nomentana*, Roma 1880.
- SICV = *Sylloge Inscriptionum Christianarum Veterum musei Vaticani*, Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae I, Helsinki 1963.
- Bull = *Bulletino d'archeologia cristiana*, Roma 1863—94.
- NBull = *Nuovo Bullettino d'archeologia cristiana*, Roma 1895—1923.
- RAC = *Rivista d'archeologia cristiana*, Roma 1924—.

II *The early Christian inscriptions of Carthage have been published in:*

- C VIII = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum VIII*, edited by G. WILMANN; R. CAGNAT; J. SCHMIDT; H. DESSAU, Berolini 1881—1959; the Christian inscriptions of Carthage 1083—1106; 10538—10550; 13393—14096; 14115—14269; 25036—25361a.
- ILT = *Inscriptions Latines de la Tunisie*, par A. MERLIN, Paris 1944; Christian inscriptions 1110—1147; the last number contains a multitude of epitaphs.

III *Other collections of inscriptions*

- AE = *L'année épigraphique*.
- C = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.
- CIG = *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*.
- DIEHL = E. DIEHL, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres I—III*, Berolini 1925—31.
- IG XIV = *Inscriptiones Graecae Siciliae et Italiae*.
- ILA = *Inscriptions Latines d'Afrique*, par R. CAGNAT, A. MERLIN, L. CHATELAIN, Paris 1923.
- ILALg = *Inscriptions Latines de l'Algerie I*, par St. GSELL, Paris 1922.
- ILS = *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae I—III*², edidit H. DESSAU, Berolini 1954—55.
- ILT = see sub II.
- IRTr = *The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, edited by J. M. REYNOLDS and J. B. WARD PERKINS, Roma, 1952.

Literature

Articles in works of reference, as well as a number of brief quotations from periodicals, have been omitted. The names of the periodicals have been abbreviated in accordance with the system of l'Année philologique. ALL stands for Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik.

- AIGRAIN R., *L'hagiographie, ses sources, ses méthodes, son histoire*, Paris 1953.
- BARDY G., *La question des langues dans l'Église ancienne*, Paris 1948.
- BARROW R. H., *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, London 1928.
- BAUER = BAUER W., *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin 1952.
- BAUMGART J., *Die römischen Sklavennamen*, diss., Breslau 1936.
- BECHTEL = BECHTEL Fr., *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle a.d.S. 1917.
- *Die attischen Frauennamen nach ihrem Systeme dargestellt*, Göttingen 1902.
- BHL = *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, *Subsidia hagiographica* 6, Bruxelles 1898—1901.
- BLAISE = BLAISE A., *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs chrétiens*, Paris 1954.
- BLANT E. LE, *L'épigraphie chrétienne en Gaule et dans l'Afrique romaine*, Paris 1890.
- *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule antérieures au VIII^e siècle I*, Paris 1856.
- BORGHESI B., *Oeuvres complètes III*, Paris 1864.
- BUCK C. D., *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, Chicago 1948.
- BURY J. B., *A history of the Later Roman Empire I*, London 1889.
- CAGNAT R., *Cours d'épigraphie latine* ⁴, Paris 1914.
- CANNegiETER H., *De mutata Romanorum nominum sub principibus ratione*, Lugduni-Batavorum 1774.
- CERESA-CASTALDO A., *'Αγάπη nei documenti anteriori al Nuovo Testamento*, Aegyptus 1951, p. 269 ff.
- *'Αγάπη nei documenti estranei all'influsso biblico*, RFIC 1953, p. 347 ff.
- CHASE G. D., *The origin of Roman Praenomina*, Harvard Studies in classical philology VIII, 1897.
- Comment. mart. Romanum = Martyrologium Romanum ad formam editionis typicae scholiis historicis instructum*, Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Decembris, Bruxellis 1940.
- CUMONT F., *After life in Roman paganism*, New Haven Yale Univ. Press, 1922.
- DACL = *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, ed. F. CABROL O.S.B. and H. LECLERCQ O.S.B., Paris 1907—.
- DEISSMANN A., *Licht vom Osten* ⁴, Tübingen 1923.
- DELATTRE A.-L., *L'épigraphie funéraire chrétienne à Carthage*, Tunis 1926.
- DELEHAYE H., *Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique*, *Subsidia hagiographica* 21, Bruxelles 1932.
- *Comment. mart. Hieron. = Hippolyti DELEHAYE commentarius perpetuus in martyrologium Hieronymianum*, Acta Sanctorum Novembris, Tomi II pars posterior, Bruxellis 1931.
- *Les légendes hagiographiques* ³, *Subsidia hagiographica* 18, Bruxelles 1927.
- *Origines = Les origines du culte des martyrs* ², *Subsidia hagiographica* 20, Bruxelles 1933.
- *Sanctus, essai sur le culte des saints dans l'antiquité*, *Subsidia hagiographica* 17, Bruxelles 1927.

- DIEHL *Signum* = DIEHL E., *Das Signum*, RhM 1907, p. 390 ff.
- DOER B., *Die römische Namengebung*, Stuttgart 1937.
- DOERFLER P., *Die Anfänge der Heiligenverehrung nach den römischen Inschriften und Bildwerken*, Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen Seminar München, IV Reihe Nr 2, München 1913.
- DUFF A. M., *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, Oxford 1928.
- ERE = *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by J. HASTINGS, Edinburgh 1908—1927.
- ERNOU, A., *Aspects du vocabulaire latin*, Paris 1954.
- FERRUA A., *Epigrafia sicula pagana e cristiana*, RAC 1941, p. 151 ff.
- FICK-BECHTEL = FICK A. & BECHTEL FR., *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt und systematisch geordnet*, Göttingen 1894.
- FRANK T., *Race mixture in the Roman Empire*, AHR 1915/16, p. 689 ff.
- FREY = FREY J. B., *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum, Recueil des inscriptions juives qui vont du III^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ au VII^e siècle de notre ère, Vol I Europe*, Città del Vaticano 1936.
- *Les Juifs avaient-ils des dogmes?* Gregorianum 1927, p. 497 ff.
- GARDTHAUSEN V., *Namen und Zensus der Römer*, RhM 1917/18, p. 353 ff.
- GORDON MARY L., *The nationality of slaves under the Early Roman Empire*, JRS 1924, p. 93 ff.
- GOTTANKA H., *Epigraphische Beiträge*, Programmschrift, Augsburg 1912.
- GROSSI GONDI Trattato = GROSSI GONDI F., *Trattato di epigrafia cristiana*, Roma 1920.
- HARNACK ADOLF VON, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten I* ⁴, Leipzig 1923.
- HIRZEL Name = HIRZEL R., *Der Name, ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte im Altertum und besonders bei den Griechen*, Abhandl. d. K. Sächsischen Gesellsch. d. Wissensch., Phil. hist. Klasse XXXVI 11, Leipzig 1918.
- HOLDER = HOLDER A., *Alt-celtischer Sprachsatze I—III*, Leipzig 1896—1913.
- JEREMIAS J., *Die Kindertaufe in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten*, Göttingen 1958.
- KRAUS, F. X., *Real-Encyclopädie der christlichen Alterthümer II*, Freiburg 1886.
- KRETSCHMER P., *Zu den weiblichen Signa auf -ius*, Glotta 1913, p. 207.
- KROLL W., *Alte Taufgebräuche*, Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 1905, Beiheft, p. 27 ff.
- KUBITSCHKE W., *Grundriss der antiken Zeitrechnung*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft I: 7, München 1928.
- LAMBERTZ Supernomen = LAMBERTZ M., *Zur Ausbreitung des Supernomen oder Signum im römischen Reiche*, Glotta 1913 and 1914, p. 78 ff and p. 99 ff.
- LANCKORONSKI K. & NIEMANN G. & PETERSEN E., *Städte Pamphylens und Pisi-diens I*, Wien 1890.
- LEMONNIER H., *Étude historique sur la condition privée des affranchis aux trois premiers siècles de l'empire romain*, Paris 1887.
- LEON H. J., *The names of the Jews of Ancient Rome*, TAPhA 1928 p. 205 ff.
- LEUMANN M., *Lateinische Cognomina auf -inus und -illa*, Romanica Helvetica 1943, p. 150 ff.
- LIDDELL-SCOTT = LIDDELL H. G. & SCOTT R., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, a new edition by JONES H. S. & MCKENZIE R., Oxford 1958.
- LIETZMANN H., *Geschichte der alten Kirche II* ², Berlin 1953.
- *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament IX*, Tübingen 1931.
- LThK = *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. M. Buchberger, 1930—.

- MARQUARDT J., *Das Privatleben der Römer*, Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer VII: 1², Leipzig 1886.
- MARTIGNY = MARTIGNY M. l'abbé, *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes*, Paris 1889.
- MARUCCHI O., *Le catacombe romane*, Roma 1933.
- MEYER W., *Das lateinische Suffix ō, ōnis*, ALL 1888, p. 223 ff.
- MEYERSAHL H., *Deorum nomina hominibus imposita*, diss. Kiliae 1891.
- MOHRMANN Études = MOHRMANN Christine, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, Roma 1958.
- *Les origines de la latinité chrétienne à Rome*, VChr 1949, p. 67 ff. and p. 163 ff.
- MOMMSEN TH., *Cognomina Africana*, Ephemeris epigraphica IV 1881, p. 520 ff.
- *Zur Lebensgeschichte des jüngeren Plinius*, Hermes 1869, p. 70 ff.
- *Die römischen Eigennamen der republikanischen und augusteischen Zeit*, Römische Forschungen I², Berlin 1864.
- *Römisches Staatsrecht I³*, Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer, Leipzig 1887.
- *Signum = Sallustius — Salustius und das Signum*, Hermes 1902, p. 443 ff.
- MOWAT L'élément = MOWAT R., *De l'élément africain dans l'onomastique latine*, RA 1869 I, p. 233 ff.
- NIEDERMANN M., *Notes sur le cognomen latin*, Mélanges Ernout, Paris 1940, p. 267 ff.
- NOGARA B., *Il nome personale nella Lombardia durante la dominazione romana*, Milano 1895.
- NORDBERG H., *Biometrical Notes*, Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae II:2, Helsinki 1963.
- ODCC = *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, edited by F. L. CROSS, London 1958.
- OLCOTT GEORGE N., *Studies in the word formation of the Latin inscriptions*, Rome 1898.
- OTTO W., *Nomina propria Latina oriunda a participiis perfecti*, JBB Kl. Phil. Suppl. XXIV 1898, p. 743 ff.
- Oxf. Class. Dict.* = *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford 1950.
- PAPE-BENSELER = PAPE W. & BENSELER G. E., *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen³*, Braunschweig 1884.
- PETERSEN E., Ἀγάπη, Biblische Zeitschrift 1932, p. 378 ff.
- PG = *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J. P. MIGNE, Paris 1857—66.
- PIR = *Prosopographia Imperii Romani saec. I. II. III.*
- PL = *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J. P. MIGNE, Paris 1844—64.
- PREISIGKE FR., *Namenbuch*, Heidelberg 1922.
- RAMSAY SIR W., *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, London, no date.
- RAntChrist = *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Stuttgart 1950—.
- RE = *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*.
- REINACH S., *Sur une classe de noms grecs théophores*, RA 1924, p. 153 ff.
- ROSSI G. B. DE, *I collegii funeraticii famigliari e privati e le loro denominazioni*, Commentationes philologicae in honorem Theodori Mommsen, Berolini 1877, p. 705 ff.
- *L'epigrafia primitiva priscilliana*, Bull 1886, p. 34 ff., continued in
- *Nuove scoperte nel cimitero di Priscilla*, Bull 1887, p. 109 ff. and
- *Continuazione delle scoperte di epigrafi cristiane antichissime nel nucleo primordiale del cimitero di Priscilla*, Bull 1892, p. 57 ff.
- see also sources, sub I, RO and RS.
- ROSTOVITZEFF M., *The social and economic history of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1926.

- RUNES M., *Die Vererbung der Personennamen im Griechischen*, WS 1924/5, p. 170 ff.
- SCHNEIDER A. M., *Die ältesten Denkmäler der römischen Kirche*, Festschrift zur Feier des 200-jährigen Bestehens der Akademie d. Wissensch. in Göttingen, II Phil. hist. Klasse, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg 1951.
- SCHNORR, H. VON CAROLSFELD, *Das lateinische Suffix -anus*, ALL 1884, p. 177 ff.
- SCHRIJNEN J., *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein*, Studia ad serm. lat. Christ. pertinentia I, Nijmegen 1932.
- *Namengebung = Die Namengebung im altchristlichen Latein*, Mn 1935, p. 271 ff.
- SCHULZ FR., *Classical Roman Law*, Oxford 1954.
- *Roman registers of births and birth certificates*, JRS 1942 and 1943, p. 78 ff. and p. 55 ff.
- SCHULZE *Eigennamen* = SCHULZE W., *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*², Abhandl. der K. Gesell. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, Phil. hist. Klasse, Neue Folge, Band V:5, Berlin 1933.
- *Graeca Latina*, Göttingen 1901.
- SCHWARTZ E., *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln*, Abhandl. d. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, Phil. hist. Klasse, Neue Folge VIII 6, Göttingen 1905.
- SITTIG E., *De Graecorum nominibus theophoris*, Hal 1911.
- SOLMSEN F., *Indogermanische Eigennamen als Spiegel der Kulturgeschichte*, herausgegeben und bearbeitet von E. FRAENKEL, Heidelberg 1922.
- SOMMER = SOMMER F., *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, Heidelberg 1948.
- STOLZ-SCHMALZ = STOLZ F. & SCHMALZ J. H., *Lateinische Grammatik*, 5th ed. by M. LEUMANN and J. B. HOFMANN, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II: 2, München 1928.
- STYGER P., *Die römischen Katakomben*, Berlin 1933.
- SUNDWALL J., *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Römertums*, Helsingfors 1919.
- *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier nebst einem Verzeichnisse kleinasiatischer Namenstämme*, Klio Beiheft 11, Leipzig 1913.
- SVENNUNG J., *Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre*, Uppsala universitets årskrift 1936: 7.
- TEEUWEN ST. W. J., *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian*, Paderborn 1926.
- TESTINI P., *Archeologia cristiana, nozioni generali dalle origini alla fine del sec. VI*, Roma 1958.
- Thes. = Thesaurus linguae Latinae*
- THYLANDER = THYLANDER H., *Étude sur l'épigraphie latine*, Acta instituti regni Sueciae, Series in 8° V, Lund 1952.
- TOUTAIN J., *Les cités romaines de la Tunisie*, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 72, Paris 1896.
- USENER H., *Götternamen*³, Frankfurt am Main 1948.
- VÄÄNÄNEN = VÄÄNÄNEN V., *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*², Abhandl. d. deutschen Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1958, Nr. 3, Berlin 1959.
- WALDE-HOFMANN = WALDE A. & HOFMANN J. B., *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*³, Heidelberg 1938—54.
- WALLON H., *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité III*², Paris 1879.
- WESTERMANN W. L., *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman antiquity*, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 40, Philadelphia 1955.
- WILHEM A., *EYTYXEI EYENI*, WS 1902, p. 596 ff.

WILPERT J., *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms*, Freiburg 1903.

WUILLEUMIER Hélène, *Étude historique sur l'emploi et la signification des signa*,
Mém. prés. à l'Acad. des Inscr. XIII 2, Paris 1932.

WUTHNOW H., *Die semitischen Menschnamen in griechischen Inschriften und
Papyri des vorderen Orients*, Studien zur Epigraphik und Papyruskunde I 4,
Leipzig 1930.

ZIMMERMANN A., *Die griechische Femininendung -is bei lateinischen Personennamen*,
ALL 1902, p. 585.

— *Die lateinischen Personennamen auf -o, -onis*, ALL 1904, p. 225 ff., 415 ff., 475 ff.

INTRODUCTION

In contrast to the single-name system of the Greeks, Latin nomenclature is complicated, for it has a social and political as well as an individual aspect. The gentile name (nomen) or the lack of it, the filiation and the *tribus* indicated a person's place in society, whereas the cognomen, in most cases freely chosen by parents, distinguished one individual from another. Such a complicated onomastic system was likely to become affected by social and political as well as cultural changes. This is what happened to Latin nomenclature during the Later Empire, that is to say, after the beginning of the third century A.D., through the social and political development of the third century and through the victory of Christianity during the fourth. In the present work, I have set out to discuss all the features in which the Latin nomenclature found in the early Christian inscriptions of the two most important centres of Western Christianity, Rome and Carthage, differs from the nomenclature of the Early Empire.

Because of the double aspect of Latin nomenclature, the present study is divided into two parts. The first is about the name system, the alterations in the number and order of the different elements of a name, and other similar problems; the other concerns the cognomen. Cognomina may also be considered from different points of view, either from a formal one of their origin and formation, or from that of the meaning of the names. As to the former, I have discussed the changes in the proportions of Latin and foreign cognomina and in the use of suffixes. In regard to the latter, the origins of a specific Christian nomenclature have been explored. In each section it has been my purpose to work out the fundamental causes of the changes in Latin nomenclature. In addition to the social and political and cultural causes discussed, one must also consider the influence of purely onomastic factors, for some of the changes may be the logical outcome of tendencies inherent in the very nature of the Latin name.

As to the material of the study, the early Christian inscriptions of Carthage have all been published (see the bibliography, sources II), whereas the publication of the Christian inscriptions of Rome is far from complete.¹ I have, however, tried to collect as much Roman material as possible (see the bibliography, sources I), and the number of persons whose names form it amounts to a little under 10,000 in the section on the name system, to 11,000 in the section on cognomina (for the explanation of this

¹ Three volumes of the new series of *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae* have so far been published (see bibliography, sources I), but at least eight more are planned, see P. TESTINI, RAC 1956, p. 107.

difference, see p. 56). Besides being more numerous, the Roman material has some other advantages. We have fairly reliable time limits set by archeological and historical evidence, for the majority of the early Christian inscriptions of Rome are taken from catacombs. It is nowadays held that the first catacombs were established at the beginning of the third century A.D.,¹ that the time of their greatest importance was the fourth century,² that after the sack of Rome by Alaric in A.D. 410 the catacombs practically went out of use and that the whole output of Roman inscriptions was almost at an end by the beginning of the seventh century.³ Moreover, about one tenth of the Roman inscriptions are dated, so that in discussing the changes in Latin nomenclature this greatly helps us to arrive at an exact chronology. Many Roman inscriptions also give the names of relatives, thus making it possible to study the transmission of personal names. The Carthaginian material is harder to date, for dated inscriptions are here exceptional. Historical evidence, however, implies that Carthaginian inscriptions on the whole date from a later period than the Roman ones, as the occupation of the city by the Vandals (A.D. 439) and the invasion of the Musulmans (A.D. 695) came later than corresponding catastrophes in Rome. The Carthaginian inscriptions are largely brief, containing only the name of the deceased, and a great number of them are fragmentary. The Carthaginian material has therefore been neglected when discussing a few important problems.

Because the present study is concerned with the changes in the Christian nomenclature in comparison with the pagan one, the pagan inscriptions must also be considered. I have tried to do this, but the vastness of the pagan material of Rome has imposed some practical limits. In discussing all the other problems except the origins of a Christian nomenclature, I have drawn upon the epitaphs published in the two supplementary volumes of *CVI*: 4, 2—3 (34030—36602 and 37858—39082a). I think they represent the average features of the whole pagan inscriptional material of Rome.

In the present work I have consistently observed the statistical method, which makes it possible to present such vast material in a handy and comprehensive form. Whereas the absolute figures in themselves convey little, the proportions of the frequencies are the decisive point. I think that my material is large enough to give percentages which are not likely to be affected by new discoveries and publications of inscriptions.

¹ DE ROSSI, *RS I* p. 185, still believed that the first catacombs came into being in the Apostolic age, but STYGER, *Die römischen Katakomben*, p. 349, puts the establishment of the first catacombs at the middle of the second century A.D., and SCHNEIDER, *Die ältesten Denkmäler der römischen Kirche*, p. 190, denies the existence of Christian catacombs in Rome before A.D. 200.

² STYGER, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

³ *RO* p. cvii.

THE LATIN NAME SYSTEM IN THE CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS

I. THE LATIN NAME DURING THE EARLY EMPIRE

At the beginning of the Empire, after the final establishment of the cognomen as the individual name, the Roman name had reached its most perfect form.¹ A free man bore *tria nomina* — the praenomen, nomen and cognomen — and a free woman *duo nomina*, women as a rule having no praenomen.

During the Empire, however, the Latin name system underwent great changes. The final phase of this transmutation will be the subject of the subsequent discussion. Its first phase may be summed up by saying that it meant the disappearance of the praenomen and its replacement by the cognomen as the individual name that served to distinguish one person from another.² The praenomina had early lost a great deal of their importance through the fact that their number had eventually been limited to about 30, of which only 16—18 were in common use.³ The importance of the praenomina was further restricted when it became the rule to give all sons their father's, and all freedmen their master's praenomen. This change took place towards the end of the republic and under the Early Empire. The praenomen consequently lost its distinctive function and became superfluous. It began to go out of use during the first and second centuries A.D., though the aristocrats retained it to the end of the fourth century.⁴

¹ For the history of the Latin name system, see MOMMSEN, *Die römischen Eigennamen der republikanischen und augusteischen Zeit*; SCHULZE *Eigennamen*, p. 487 ff.; CAGNAT, *Cours d'épigraphie latine*, p. 37 ff.; SOLMSEN, *Indogermanische Eigennamen als Spiegel der Kulturgeschichte*, p. 135 ff.; E. FRAENKEL, *Namenwesen*, *RE XVI* col. 1648 ff. DOER's work *Die römische Namengebung* is unfortunately marred by a considerable lack of clarity and numerous blemishes in scholarship, see A. VON BLUMENTHAL's criticism in *Klio* 1939, p. 434 ff.

² See SCHULZE *Eigennamen* p. 487 ff.

³ *Inc. auct. liber de praen.* § 3: *Gentilicia nomina Varro putat fuisse numero (mille), praenomina circa xxx.* For the praenomina in general use, cp. CHASE, *The origin of Roman praenomina*, *Harvard Studies in classical philology* VIII, 1897, p. 151 ff.

⁴ THYLANDER pp. 58; 67; 77 ff.

Whereas the general tendency of the Imperial times was towards diminishing the number of names, various causes contributed to a multiplication of names among the aristocracy; this reached its peak with the 38 names of the consul of A.D. 169 (C XIV 3609 = ILS 1104). The numerous adoptions of the Imperial age were one of the causes.¹ The republican practice of tacking the former nomen with the suffix *-anus* on to the regular three names obtained from the adoptive father was abandoned and new names were simply added to the old ones.² Again, it became fashionable to inherit names from the mother as well, and this tended to swell the number of names.³ It has been suggested that this practice was of Etruscan origin, maternal institutions being a peculiarity of Etruria.⁴ Further, many an aristocrat wanted to display the grandeur of his family by combining the names of his illustrious ancestors in his own name.⁵

After this brief outline, we may turn to the changes in the name system found in the Christian inscriptional material.

II. THE DESIGNATION OF THE SOCIAL STATUS

§ 1. *The disappearance of the tribus and filiation*

In a society based upon human slavery, it was important to know whether a man was free-born, a freedman or a slave. The Latin name system usually gave answers to all these questions. Only a free man could bear the *tria nomina*, and *tria nomina* in fact became a synonym of free status (cf. e.g. Iuven. *Sat.* 5, 125—27). To distinguish the free-born from freedmen, freedmen replaced the filiation of the free-born by their master's praenomen. Slaves had a single name followed by the genitive of the master's name, with or without the words *verna* or *servus-va*. The stating of the *tribus* fortified the claim to Roman citizenship.

This system, however, was far from being universally adhered to in actual practise. In my material from C VI (see p. 2) the *tribus* is indicated in 3,5 %, and in the pagan material from Carthage in 2,5 % of the cases. There is not a single instance of the *tribus* in the Christian ma-

¹ Cp. FRAENKEL, *Namenwesen*, RE XVI, col. 1662, 41.

² MOMMSEN, *Zur Lebensgeschichte des jüngeren Plinius*, Hermes 1869, p. 72 ff.

³ BORGHESI, *Oeuvres complètes III*, p. 493.

⁴ DOER, *Die römische Namengebung*, p. 95 f.

⁵ Cp. DOER's analysis of the names of the consul of the year 169 A.D., *op. cit.* p. 128 ff.

terial. Its disappearance was due to political factors. The *tribus* implied that a person was a Roman citizen, but after Caracalla had extended Roman citizenship to all subjects of the Empire, that distinction lost its significance, and the *tribus* went out of use after the third century A.D.¹

More importance was attached to the filiation. In republican inscriptions, the names of most free-born persons include that element. I have examined about three hundred inscriptions from Rome and Latium in *CI*: 2^a 26—363. The filiation is found in 183 names out of 267, or in 71 % of the cases. Moreover, the grandfather was often indicated too, e.g. 268: *L. Samiarius C. f. N. n.* In my material from *CVI*, men record the filiation in 6,5 %, women in 5,5 % of the cases; the corresponding figures for the pagan material from Carthage are 4,5 % and 8 %. The decline of the use of the filiation in Imperial times may ultimately have been due to the fact that it was the rule for father and son to have the same praenomen (see p. 3). It was consequently superfluous to write, e.g., *L. Marcius L. f.*, for the very name *L. Marcius* implied that the father's praenomen was also *Lucius*. Women had no praenomen, so this cause of the disuse did not affect them. It is, however, likely that it *ex analogia* reduced the use of the filiation in women's names too. Fashion is a powerful factor in matters of nomenclature, and when a development has once been initiated, it has a tendency to gather momentum and spread wider and wider. The rapid decline of the filiation in Imperial times is also proved by the distribution of the material in *CVI*. The name form without a cognomen, which on the whole represents the oldest stratum, gives the filiation for men in 42 % and for women in 43 % of the cases; there are only a few sporadic examples in the much later name forms with the praenomen or the praenomen and nomen lacking.

The same tendency continued in the Christian inscriptions. There are only five examples of the filiation in the Latin material from Rome. The examples from Greek inscriptions are more numerous, but cannot be included here: the ethnic which was often tacked on to the names reveals that the persons were largely of Eastern origin, e.g. *SI* 2896: *Ἡλιόδορος Ἀλεξάνδρου Ἀντιοχεύς*. People coming from the Greek East had retained the traditional Greek nomenclature of a single name followed by the genitive of the father's name. In the Latin examples, the disappearance of the praenomen had made the use of the classical formula for the filiation impossible, and the cognomen was used instead, e.g. *SI* 4468: *Honeratia Sanctipe filia Lepori piscatoris*, and the cognomina of both parents could be given, as in *RAC* 1930, p. 190: *Adeodatus filius Erclani et Fortunules*.

¹ See CAGNAT, *Cours d'épigraphie latine*, p. 62.

§ 2. *The disappearance of the designation of slaves' and freedmen's status*

The *tribus* and the filiation were minor items in comparison with the designation of the status of freedmen or slave, and it is precisely here that the first great difference between pagan and Christian epigraphic practice attracts attention. The frequencies of the designations in our Roman and Carthaginian material are tabulated below:

Table 1. *The designation of the social status in the pagan and Christian inscriptions of Rome*

	C VI : 4, 2—3, epitaphs				Christian			
	men	women	total	%	men	women	total	%
Free	1.785	1.467	3.252	71 %	5.176	4.477	9.653	99,9 %
Freedmen	733	485	1.218	26 %	12	4	16	0,1 %
Slaves	104	34	138	3 %	1	—	1	—
Total	2.622	1.986	4.608		5.189	4.481	9.670	

Table 2. *The designation of the social status in the pagan and Christian inscriptions of Carthage*

	pagan				Christian			
	men	women	total	%	men	women	total	%
Free	437	352	789	63,5 %	464	376	840	—
Freedmen	41	27	68	5,5 %	—	—	—	—
Slaves	276	112	388	31,0 %	—	—	—	—
Total	754	491	1.245		464	376	840	

Most freedmen's names in our pagan material observed the classical formula of the patron's praenomen and the sigla *l.* or *lib.* written after the nomen, but a number omit this, and the real status is betrayed by some such word as *conlibertus* or *patronus*. But there may have been epitaphs of freedmen which, though leaving out the sigla, furnish no clues about the status of the persons. A number of slaves are also probably masquerading as free-born. The slaves as a rule had a single name, and 16,5 % of the men and 15 % of the women in our pagan Roman material, and 25,5 % and 31 % in our pagan Carthaginian material bear only a cognomen (see p. 9 f.). Though the cases admit of several explanations (see p. 14), it is likely that a number of them, in particular those in which all the members

of a family bear a single name, can be included in the category of the names of slaves, e.g. *C VI 34426a: Antiochianus et Agne Antiochiano filio melleo*, has every likelihood of being the epitaph of slaves. But though making allowances for cases of that type, one should be chary of attempting to estimate the size of freedman and slave populations on the basis of inscriptional statistics. This is most obvious in regard to Carthage, for the bulk of the pagan inscriptions of the city comes from two sepulchres of Imperial slaves.¹ The surprisingly high percentage of slaves has thus a natural explanation. But even where, as in Rome, the stones of the free and of slaves have come down to us in like numbers, the inscriptions are far from giving us a correct idea of the actual situation, for different social strata are not equally represented in epitaphs. We can be certain that wealthy freedmen, for instance, were much more often commemorated on sepulchral monuments than common slaves.

The tables above show the enormous difference there is between pagan and Christian inscriptions in regard to the designation of social status. There are no examples of freedmen or slaves in the Christian material from Carthage, and even in Rome the number of cases is insignificant. Moreover, the interpretation of some of them presents difficulties.

There is only one definite case of a slave, *SI 3679 = DIEHL 767A: Notatus servus*. The word *servus* is found in two more epitaphs, *SI 4486: ... Zoe con[pari / et c]onser[vae in] ✕* and *SI 6337: ... forus con[serbus bene/merenti]*. Both epitaphs are fragmentary; in the latter the name is probably [*Sym*]forus. If we accept the reading [*in*] ✕ in the former epitaph, the meaning of the term *conserva* will be quite different from what is usual in pagan inscriptions. The Christians often called themselves *servi* or *ancillae Dei* (examples *DIEHL 1454—71*), and married couples could consequently be called *conservi Dei* (e.g. *DIEHL 1458*). Because the terms *servus* or *conservus* were accordingly used in these new meanings with the qualifications *Dei* or *in Christo*, the meaning of the first epitaph depends upon the supplement of *in*; though the latter epitaph is fragmentary, it is likely that *conserbus* should here be taken in the old, pagan meaning.

In the cases of Christian freedmen, the term *libertus* is unequivocal, e.g. *NBull 1902, p. 227 = DIEHL 763A: Aur. Sozon Augg. lib.* and *SI 3818 = DIEHL 764: Suagrio liberto*. With the exception of Imperial freedmen, who number six in all, the classical formula with the sigla and the patron's name is found only in *ARM p. 11 = DIEHL 763a: Clodia Ispes lib. Clodi Crescentis*. But *patronus* cannot always be assumed to imply a patronage of freedmen, e.g. *SI 2914 = 3771 = DIEHL 4127C: Felicitas et Bitalio | Nonio Sabiniano patrono*; here the persons who set up

¹ See MOMMSEN, *Ephemeris epigraphica* V, p. 105 ff.

the stone may equally be *alumni*, new-born children exposed and rescued by people willing to nurse them. *Alumni*, who were not slaves proper¹, were in fact more numerous than freedmen in Christian inscriptions (e.g. DIEHL 757—762A), and foster-parents were called *patroni*, e.g. SI 2759 = DIEHL 1509adn: *Sozomeneti alumnae / audienti / patronus fidelis*.

The insignificant percentage of slaves and freedmen in the Christian inscriptional material must have been due to specific causes. One can certainly adduce the fact that slavery was declining towards the end of antiquity, the new caste society replacing it by serfdom.² But though it is incontestable that the numbers of slaves and freedmen were much smaller than during the Early Empire, it is doubtful whether they were small enough to account for the enormous difference between pagan and Christian inscriptional material in this respect. We have in fact indirect evidence of the presence of freedmen in the population which furnished the Christian inscriptions of Rome, e.g. inscriptions like RS III 22,2 = DIEHL 159: *Petroniae Auxentiae c(larissimae) f(eminae)* — — *liberti fe[cerunt]*³ imply the continuance of the ancient practices of manumission. One can also refer to the literary evidence of large-scale manumissions in Christian times.⁴ Further, since Christianity largely began as a religion of the poor and the humble, one would be entitled to expect a considerable percentage of slaves and freedmen in the earliest strata of Christian inscriptions. There are, however, only two instances in the inscriptions mentioned (p. 11 f.) which date from the period before the *pax*.⁵

GROSSI GONDI⁶ ascribes the absence of freedmen's and slaves' designations to the desire of the Christians to do away with social distinctions among themselves. But I do not think that the aversion to designating a person as a slave or as a freedman was simply due to the Christian ideal of equality. GROSSI GONDI concedes that in the post-Constantinian times — which give us the majority of Christian inscriptions — distinctions of rank were habitually displayed in epitaphs⁷, and a rapid consultation of DIEHL suffices to prove this. There are some three hundred inscriptions in DIEHL in which the members of the higher orders distinguish themselves by the sigla *v(ir) c(larissimus)*, *v(ir) p(er)fectissimus*, *v(ir) h(onestus)*,

¹ See *DACL I: I*, col. 1291.

² BURY, *A history of the Later Roman Empire I*, p. 26 f.

³ A similar case is RS III p. 318 = DIEHL 751: *Aurelio Scolacio patrono* — — *in pace liberti fecerunt*.

⁴ *DACL I: I*, col. 556 f.

⁵ RO 5 = DIEHL 3332a: *M. Aurelius Augg. lib. Prosenes*, A.D. 217, and Bull 1886, p. 130 (early Priscilla): ... *Aug. lib* ...

⁶ *Trattato* pp. 72 and 100.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 108 f.

etc., or by some other means (56—346). Tradesmen, doctors and the like did not allow their titles to pass unnoticed (*ibid.* 580—749), and the different grades of clerical hierarchy were conscientiously recorded (*ibid.* 951—1326). The infrequency of freedmen's and slaves' designations cannot, then, be attributed to a tendency to disregard social differences. Nevertheless it is a fact that the attitude of the Church towards slavery differed from that of the pagan world. Though the Church had to adapt herself to the existing world after her victory and to accept slavery as part of the social order, the Fathers recognized that slavery was incompatible with true Christian ideas.¹ It is possible that the rejection of the idea of slavery influenced the etiquette of cemeteries so that it was considered un-Christian to reveal that the deceased was, or had been a slave.

III. FROM THE TRIA NOMINA TO THE SINGLE NAME SYSTEM

§ 1. *The proportions of the different name forms in the pagan and Christian inscriptions*

Another major difference between pagan and Christian nomenclature will be clear from the tables below, where the material is classified according to the name forms. The Latin and the Greek inscriptions of Rome are tabulated separately in the tables. To make an adequate comparison of the Greek material possible, I have drawn upon the Greek epitaphs of pagan Rome, published in *IG XIV* 1314—2238. For reasons to be set forth in another connection (p. 21), the cases in the Christian material in which a woman bears only a nomen have been included in the cognomen-

Table 3. *The name forms in the Latin inscriptions of Rome*

	C VI: 4, 2—3, epitaphs				Christian			
	men	%	women	%	men	%	women	%
praen. + nomen or only nomen	37	1,5 %	45	2,5 %	3	—	—	—
»tria nomina»	1.792	71,5 %	4	—	83	2,0 %	7	—
»duo nomina»	268	10,5 %	1.606	82,5 %	729	15,5 %	777	19,5 %
single or double cognomen	419	16,5 %	295	15,0 %	3.856	82,5 %	3.232	80,5 %
total	2.516		1.950		4.671		4.016	

¹ See WALLON, *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité III*, pp. 2—8 and 299 ff. WESTERMANN, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, p. 149 ff., however, thinks that the early Christian condemnation of the idea of slavery has been overestimated; according to him, the Christian attitude was rather that of indifference: »For those converted to the belief in Christ, free or slave status was not a matter of consequence» (p. 156).

Table 4. *The name forms in the Greek inscriptions of Rome*

	IG XIV Roman epitaphs				Christian			
	men	%	women	%	men	%	women	%
praen. + nomen or only nomen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
»tria nomina»	110	15,5 %	—	—	2	0,5 %	—	—
»duo nomina»	147	20,5 %	141	35,5 %	65	12,5 %	72	15,5 %
single or double cognomen	460	64,0 %	253	64,5 %	451	87,0 %	393	84,5 %
total	717		394		518		465	

system. In both pagan and Christian groups the names of slaves, because they entirely differ from the general pattern, have been excluded.

A comparison of the two tables shows that there was considerable difference in the name forms between Latin and Greek inscriptions: the cognomen-system was much more frequent in the latter, especially in the pagan material. In the pagan material, the frequency of the single name form must largely have been due to the fact that a large number of *peregrini*, who were mostly Greek-speaking and had retained the Greek name form, were buried in Rome. As to the Christian material, the significance of the slightly higher percentage of the cognomen-system in the Greek inscriptions is increased by the fact that the Greek epigraphic material on the whole dates from an earlier period than the Latin one. Whereas the persons recorded in Greek epitaphs number 9 % of the total, in the early stratum of Christian inscriptions prior to the *pax* (see p. 11 f.) the Greek element is as high as 28,5 %. Because the early inscriptions in general show a smaller percentage of the cognomen-system than the later ones (see p. 12), one must conclude that even in the Christian material the cognomen-system was much more frequent in the Greek inscriptions than in the Latin material. To account for this, we may adduce the pagan factor mentioned above: a

Table 5. *Name forms in the pagan and Christian inscriptions of Carthage*

	pagan				Christian			
	men	%	women	%	men	%	women	%
praen. + nomen or only nomen	4	1,0 %	—	—	—	—	—	—
»tria nomina»	274	57,5 %	—	—	—	—	—	—
»duo nomina»	75	16,0 %	262	69,0 %	9	2,0 %	4	1,0 %
single or double cognomen	121	25,5 %	117	31,0 %	464	98,0 %	372	99,0 %
total	474		379		473		376	

large number of the people recorded in Greek inscriptions must have been *peregrini*. That it in fact was so is shown by *SI-FE*, for instance, where about 70 of the persons recorded in Greek epitaphs indicate a native place in the East.

A comparison of the Roman and Carthaginian tables shows that the nomina were less frequent in the pagan material of Carthage than in the corresponding Roman material, and had all but disappeared from the Christian inscriptions. It has been suggested that in Africa the onomastic tradition of the native population had reasserted itself in a tendency towards simpler name forms.¹ But though this contention is partly true (cf. p. 17), it is unnecessary where pagan Carthage is concerned to adduce the native element to account for the large-scale disappearance of the praenomen and the nomen. The bulk of the epigraphic material of Carthage came from the sepulchres of Imperial slaves which were in use during the second century A.D. (cf. the work of MOMMSEN cited on p. 7, fn. 1). At this time the Latin name system had already begun to break up. Furthermore, many slaves must have been buried in the Carthaginian sepulchres without the revealing words *servus* or *verna*, and this swelled the number of single names (for Christian Carthage, see p. 14).

Both in Rome and Carthage, the differences in the name forms between pagan and Christian inscriptions were enormous. Whereas in the pagan inscriptions — with the exception of the Greek epitaphs — the majority of men and women had the classical *tria* or *duo nomina*, in the Christian material praenomina were exceptional and nomina were also in a minority, the prevalent name form being the one composed of a single, sometimes double cognomen or a nomen used as a cognomen.

§ 2. *The chronology of the name forms in the Christian inscriptions*

The Christian epitaphs, in particular the Roman ones, were often dated, in sharp contrast to the pagan usage. This was probably due to the Christian belief that the *dies depositionis* was the true *dies natalis* of a Christian and should be commemorated.² These dated inscriptions make it possible for us to follow the development of the Latin name system through the different periods of Christian Rome. I have gone through all the dated inscriptions of Rome published in *RO* and *SI-FE*, together with a few occasional cases found in *AE* and *RAC*. Because the dating of epitaphs did not become common until the fourth century, there is a limited number of dated material from the period before the *pax*. To get more material from this period, I have included the epitaphs found in the most ancient

¹ TOUTAIN, *La cité romaine de la Tunisie*, p. 188 ff.

² GROSSI GONDI, *Trattato* p. 186.

stratum of the catacomb of Priscilla¹, probably dating from the third century A.D. (see p. 2). I give the material in four groups: first, the epitaphs prior to the *pax*; secondly, the epitaphs from 313 to 410, that is to say, the sack of Rome by Alaric, which marked the beginning of the final decay of the city; the third and fourth groups are formed by the material from the fifth and sixth centuries respectively.

Table 6. Name forms in the different periods of dated Christian inscriptions of Rome

Men

	<i>ante pacem</i>		A.D. 313—410		A.D. 410—500		A.D. 500—600	
»tria nomina»	18	10,5 %	—	—	—	—	—	—
»duo nomina»	54	32,0 %	31	9,5 %	5	5,0 %	3	4,0 %
cognomen	98	57,5 %	292	90,5 %	98	95,0 %	72	96,0 %
total	170		323		103		75	

Women

»duo nomina» cognomen	80	50,0 %	28	10,0 %	3	3,5 %	1	2,0 %
	79	50,0 %	245	90,0 %	82	96,5 %	47	98,0 %
total	159		273		85		48	

In addition to the above tables, we may cite DE ROSSI, who remarks that in the oldest stratum of the catacomb of St. Agnese the number of the cases of *tria* and *duo nomina* was greater than that of a single cognomen.²

The significance of the findings is enhanced by the fact that whereas the early material is largely composed of the epitaphs of humble people, higher social orders begin to figure in epitaphs after the *pax* (see p. 8), the material of the latest period being almost entirely formed by the epitaphs of magistrates, priests and members of the nobility. Because the higher orders were more tenacious of the traditional name forms than humble people³, the disappearance of the nomen after the *pax* seems all the more thorough. Again, Greek material formed almost a third of the early inscrip-

¹ DE ROSSI, *L'epigrafia primitiva priscilliana*, Bull 1886 p. 34 ff.; 1887 p. 109 ff.; 1892 p. 57 ff. Cf. bibliography.

² RS I p. 192 f.

³ In the inscriptions of the Roman magistrates of senatorial rank in C VI 1651—1796, we find one or more nomina followed by one or more cognomina still in common use in the fifth century A.D. It was not until the sixth century that the cognomen-system began to affect the nomenclature of the nobility. In his biographies of the »Last Romans», SUNDWALL gives information about c. 375 persons, mostly from the first half of the sixth century (*Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Römertums*, p. 84 ff.). Only about 85 persons have more than a single

tions and this, in the light of what has been previously discovered (see p. 10), must have increased the percentage of the single name system in the early period. It is, then, obvious that the age of Constantine the Great marked the turning-point in the history of the Latin name system. Before that time, the nomen was an inseparable part of the name in half of the cases, after the *pax* the number of similar cases was less than one tenth. The name forms in the Christian inscriptional material of the early period do not much differ from those in the pagan material. There is, it is true, a considerably larger number of cases in which the praenomen, or the praenomen and nomen are lacking, but most Christian inscriptions of the period prior to the *pax* date from the third century, while the majority of the pagan material dates from the two first centuries A.D. Moreover, most early Christians were humble people.

The above also gives us useful criteria for the dating, if not of single inscriptions, at least of a sufficient number of them, e.g. the whole of our Christian material from Rome. Because the percentage of the cognomen-system was considerably higher in the whole of the Roman material than in the dated inscriptions of the first period (cf. tables 3—4 and 6), but a little lower than in the inscriptions of the second period, the conclusion seems justified that a minority of the inscriptional material from Christian Rome dates from the period prior to the *pax*, the majority from the later period, probably from the century between the *pax* and the sack of Rome by Alaric. This tallies with the archeological criteria (see p. 2). Conversely, most of the inscriptional material containing the nomen must belong to the period before the *pax*. In regard to *tria nomina*, considering that no dated inscriptions of the later periods show this name form, the criterion is so reliable that it may even be applied to individual cases. These onomastic criteria may also hold good for the Carthaginian material. Because nomina are found only in 1,5 % of the Christian inscriptions found in the city, it is likely, making allowances for the mutilated state of most of the inscriptions and for the general brevity of the epitaphic style of Christian Carthage, that the bulk of the Christian material from Carthage dates from a later period than the corresponding Roman inscriptions. This again tallies with the historical evidence (see p. 2).

§ 3. *The causes of the break-up of the Latin name system*

In considering the cases in which the praenomen or the praenomen and the nomen are lacking, one should remember that the disappearance may be only apparent; the praenomen and the nomen may have been left

name, in many cases a conglomeration of cognomina. If a nomen is found, it is mostly *Flavius*. The resistance of the classical tradition had finally yielded to the pressure from below.

out to save space, being easily supplied from the other names on the stone. In an epitaph like *C VI 35819*:

Martius Alexan[der] — Martia Earine

|
L. Martius L.f. Alexan[der]

or *C VI 38879*:

Polytimu[s] — Hermetilla

|
M. Seius M.f. Secundianus

the praenomina and the nomina of the fathers are easily supplied from the sons' names. I think that cases of this type largely explain the high percentage of single cognomina in pagan epitaphs. While a number of the bearers of single cognomina were no doubt slaves, in particular in Carthage (see p. 11), in not a few cases the praenomen and the nomen had been suppressed to save space, only the individual cognomen being left. It has been suggested that etiquette in the cemeteries required the full name of the deceased, whereas space could be saved by cutting only the individual cognomina of the relatives¹, e.g. *C VI 35124: Domitiae Florae | Lais sorori | posuit*, where the full name of the sister must have been *Domitia Lais*. Yet it was not always the name of the deceased that was written in full, e.g. *C VI 35119: L. Domitius | Eros | Urbico f(ilio) | Augene | uxs(ori)*; here the deceased bear cognomina, whereas the name of the father and husband who set up the stone is given in full. Individual cognomina conveyed more affection than the full official name, and this may explain the usage.

But though the omission of the praenomen or praenomen and nomen was not always genuine, the facility with which this was done was symptomatic of the small degree of importance attached to them in comparison with the individual cognomen. The revolutionary changes in the Christian name system were accordingly a consummation of tendencies which were also operative in the pagan material. The cause of the decline in the use of the praenomen has been mentioned (p. 3). The problem which faces us here is the disappearance of the nomen.

A number of the cases in the Christian material in which a nomen is lacking admit of similar interpretations as in the pagan inscriptions. Servile status was reluctantly designated in Christian inscriptions (see p. 9), and this increased the single name category. But the number of slaves was hardly great enough to explain why most persons in Christian

¹ SCHULZE *Eigennamen*, p. 494 f.

epigraphic material bear only a cognomen. Slavery was on the decline during the Later Empire, and we may safely assume that slaves were fewer in Christian than in pagan epitaphs. Again, in a few cases the deceased or the relatives were designated only by cognomina in a way similar to the pagan usage discussed, e.g. *SI* 3398 = *DIEHL* 4124: *Flavius Fortunius | et | Lutatia Prisca | Communioni filio*, and *FE* 8792 = *DIEHL* 2278: *Legitimus et Amantia Aurelio Urso | filio dulcissimo*, where the missing nomina are easily supplied. However, the number of similar cases is too small to affect the statistics.

GROSSI GONDI argues that the prevalence of the cognomen-system was due to the Christian idea of equality: all distinctions between slave and free were abolished even in nomenclature, many Christians of illustrious families designating themselves by a single name, as if they were slaves.¹ Though assigning other causes, too, to the break-up of the Latin name system (see p. 16), NOGARA contends that Christianity facilitated it, for being a restricted community, the Christians did not need a complicated onomastic system to know each other.² GROSSI GONDI's and NOGARA's explanations may be called respectively ideological and practical. But if the explanations were correct, the omission of the praenomen and the nomen would be most noticeable in the period prior to the *pax*. The Christian community of these early days was distinguished by a more whole-hearted adherence to true Christian ideals than the *ecclesia triumphans*, and the number of the believers was restricted. Even the epitaphic style of the early period differed from the one in the post-Constantinian days.³ The epitaphs of the early Christians were simple and brief; hidden in the darkness of the catacombs, they were not primarily intended to preserve the worldly memory of the deceased. After the *pax*, when the Christians were no longer a persecuted sect, they could pay more attention to secular affairs, and their ranks were swelled by converts who did not always share the ardour of the early Christians. This brought about a change in the epitaphic style. Epitaphs became longer, often affected and rhetorical, and the memory of the worldly career of the deceased was conscientiously recorded (cf. p. 8 f.). It would accordingly seem justifiable to find single cognomina in the early period and fuller name forms after the *pax*. But the discussion of the chronology of the name forms in the Christian inscriptions of Rome has proved that the reverse is true.

But if the victory of the single name system was not due to factors specifically Christian, how do we account for it? I think the break-up of the old system was due to at least four main factors.

One of the causes may have been the weakening of the traditional

¹ *Trattato*, p. 72.

² *Il nome personale nella Lombardia durante la dominazione romana*, p. 106.

³ *RO* p. cx ff.; GROSSI GONDI *Trattato* p. 403 ff.

unity of the *gens*.¹ The use of the same nomen implied that its bearers were supposed to be the descendants of a common ancestor, but when the unity was less strongly felt, the desire to indicate it by a nomen also became weaker. Again, during the Later Empire the *tria nomina* had not the same value as before. The possession of *tria nomina* was earlier considered an outward token of Roman citizenship (see p. 4); slaves never had nomina, but *peregrini* had no right to bear them either.² Roman citizenship, however, largely forfeited its political and social value after the Antoninian constitution of A.D. 212 had granted citizenship to all subjects of the Empire. The real purpose and scope of this measure are disputed; ROSTOVITZEFF asserts that it meant very little in practice; its real importance lay in the fact that it symbolized the death of the old Roman state: because everybody was now a Roman citizen, this title was no longer of any particular importance.³ But as Roman citizenship had lost its value, people certainly no longer took such care to display it through nomenclature as before.

Yet the most decisive factor seems to have been purely onomastic. It will be remembered that the cause of the disuse of the praenomen was the fact that the name had lost its distinctive function after all the sons of a father and all the freedmen of a master began to bear the same praenomen (see p. 3). The decline in the use of the nomen was due to a similar cause. If the majority of people share only a few nomina, the nomina must suffer a loss of their distinctive function. This is what happened to the nomina during the Later Roman Empire. It may be seen from tables 3 and 4 (p. 9 f.) that 1738 persons have a nomen in our Christian material from Rome. The number of different nomina is about 310. Most of them, however, are found only once or twice. If we count the nomina of which there are more than 20 instances, we find that 51 % of the persons with a nomen shared eight nomina between them. The nomina and their frequencies are listed below:

<i>Aelius</i>	84	<i>Flavius</i>	149
<i>Antonius</i>	20	<i>Iulius</i>	94
<i>Aurelius</i>	411	<i>Valerius</i>	64
<i>Claudius</i>	52	<i>Ulpius</i>	24

The total is thus 898. With two exceptions, all the nomina had been borne by Roman emperors, the most frequent nomina, *Aurelius* and

¹ NOGARA, *op. cit.* p. 102.

² Cp. Suet. *Divus Claudius* 25, 3.

³ *The social and economic history of the Roman Empire*, p. 369 f.

Flavius, being the nomina of the emperors of the Later Empire.¹ Though *Antonius* and *Valerius* were not Imperial nomina, they were most common among the Roman nobility (*RE* gives the biographies of about 400 people belonging to *gens Valeria*). The frequency of the Imperial nomina was due to the fact that the emperors manumitted a large number of slaves and granted citizenship to *peregrini*. On being manumitted by an emperor and on receiving Roman citizenship by him, slaves and *peregrini* adopted the nomen of the emperor.² The singular popularity of *Aurelius* may be due to the fact that Caracalla, who extended Roman citizenship to all provincials, was an *Aurelius*. The nomina passed on to the progeny of the freedmen and new citizens. This explains why *Ulpianus*, for instance, is found among common people several centuries after Trajan's death.³ When, because of race mixture, the descendants of freedmen and *peregrini* came to represent the bulk of the urban population, the Imperial nomina began to prevail. A fate similar to the praenomen befell the nomen, and it began to go out of use. The development very likely commenced with people who had a very common nomen, like *Aurelius* and *Flavius*, and spread *ex analogia* to other and less common nomina.

It is also possible that when the status of the nomen had been undermined by the factors mentioned, the victory of the single name system was furthered by a revival of ancient habits of nomenclature among the Easternized urban population, for in the Greek world the single name system had been in use throughout antiquity. Is it any wonder if people coming from the East or the descendants of Eastern slaves and *peregrini* did not care to bear Latin nomina, which no longer had any social value, and preferred to be called in their ancestral manner instead? Similar causes may have been operative in the other Roman provinces (cf. p. 11).

All these tendencies leading to the single name system could not probably have exerted their full influence unless the official control upon nomenclature had been weakened during the Imperial Age. The ancient Roman *census* was a powerful factor in maintaining the traditional Roman name system. Every Roman citizen had to state his full official name at the *census*⁴, and the censors allowed little change in the traditional number and order of the Roman name. It has been suggested that the disappearance of their control and the transmission of the registration to minor officials during the Empire marked the beginning of the break-up

¹ THYLANDER p. 96 comments upon the surprising infrequency of *Flavius* in Christian inscriptions; he must, however, have made a mistake, for in DIEHL, upon whose index THYLANDER has based his calculations, *Flavius* is found c. 400 times.

² Cf. MARQUARDT, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, p. 26.

³ Cf. THYLANDER p. 97.

⁴ Cf. *Lex Iulia municipalis* (C I: 2² 593, 145—6).

of the name system.¹ A study of the registration of births during the Later Empire confirms this view. Every citizen had to have his children registered within thirty days of the birth.² A number of birth certificates found in Egypt show that boys were designated by the classical *tria nomina* and girls by *duo nomina*.³ The latest birth certificate is from A.D. 240 (AE 1948 n. 121). Though it is known from other sources that the registration of births continued after that date⁴, there is evidence that it was often neglected.⁵ The last reference to registration is in Justinian's times, *Schol. Basilic.* 48, 20, 15: ἡ ἀπογραφὴ τῆς γενέσεως. πολλάκις γὰρ σημειοῦνται τινες πότε ἐτέχθησαν. Notice that the registration is explicitly stated as taking place »often»; it may be that in most cases it was neglected. Moreover, the remark may hold good only for the Eastern Empire. In any case, the clerks who received the registration were subordinate officials with no right to comment upon the names submitted to be registered.⁶ When the official control of nomenclature no longer existed, the factors discussed could more easily bring about the transformation of the Latin name system.

IV. THE USE OF NOMINA AS COGNOMINA

A consequence of the lessening of the importance of the nomen was the extensive use of nomina as cognomina during the Later Empire. The following table gives the frequencies in the pagan and Christian inscriptions of Rome; the Carthaginian material is too small to be considered.

Table 7. *Double and single nomina in the pagan and Christian inscriptions of Rome*

	C VI:4,2—3, epitaphs		Christian	
	men	women	men	women
double nomina	1	6	16	35
single nomina	8	42	144	189
total	9	48	160	224
% of men and women out of the total	0,3 %	2,4 %	3,0 %	5,0 %

¹ GARDTHAUSEN, *Namen und Zensus der Römer*, RhM 1917/18, p. 366 ff.

² SCHULZ, *Roman registers of births and birth certificates*, JRS 1942, p. 78 ff.; 1943, p. 55 ff. Cp. SCHULZ, *Classical Roman Law*, p. 75.

³ SCHULZ, JRS 1942, pp. 78—80 and 85—86.

⁴ Implied in *Cod. Iust.* X 71, 3, A.D. 401.

⁵ Cp. *Tebtunis pap.* II 285 (A.D. 239): παραληφθεῖσαι τέκνων ἀπογραφαί. *Cod. Iust.* V 4, 9 (late third century) contains a similar reference.

⁶ GARDTHAUSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 372 f.

In the Christian material the percentage of the cases doubled with women and grew tenfold with men. The figures for women, however, are not comparable, for most women's single nomina in *C VI* belong to the name form prevalent before the entrance into use of the cognomen and were accordingly genuine nomina inherited from the father. Only the frequencies for men and for women's double nomina can be directly compared.

Cases are not included in the statistics in which double nomina are followed by a cognomen, because they are genuine nomina. Consider, for instance, the following family stemmata, *C VI* 36422:

C. Laelius Alexander — Tetiaena Clara

|
C. Laelius Tetiaenius Firmus

or from the Christian material, RAC 1936, p. 21:

Flavius Iulianus c.v. — Insteia Cilonis c.f.

|
Flavius Insteius Cilo c.p.

In these examples, as no doubt in the overwhelming majority of other similar cases, the second nomen comes from the mother.

The problem of double nomina is more intricate. It will be seen from the table that this name form was specially favoured by women. Double nomina were found as women's names in the republican period (examples *ILS III*: 2 p. 925), but were totally different from later double nomina: the nomen still had an adjectival nature, and the husband's nomen could be added to the wife's to show »belonging to», e.g. *Poublilia Turpilia Cn. uxor* (*C I*: 2² 42 = *ILS* 3234.¹) Because nomina soon lost their adjectival nature, similar interpretations cannot be applied to the double nomina of the Later Empire. In a number of cases the second nomen may have been taken over from the mother, e.g. *C VI* 7308 = *ILS* 8186: *Volussia Cornelia*; her father was *L. Volusius Saturninus*, the consul of the year 3 A.D., her mother was *Cornelia*. Double nomina of a similar origin were found in the Christian material, too.² Men's double nomina sometimes admit of a similar interpretation, e.g. *C VI* 18150:

¹ Cf. SCHULZE *Eigennamen* p. 513.

² E.g. *SI* 554 = DIEHL 4114: father *Aur(elius) Alerius*, mother *Val(eria) Flaviane*, daughter *Aur(elia) Valeri[a]*. Though *Alerius* is a rare name (it is once instanced as a nomen, see *Thes I* col. 1524, 61), there is no need to suggest a reading *(V)alerius*, as DIEHL does. The name may be connected with the name of a Corsican city, *Aleria*.

T. Flavius Eutactus — Paccia Capriola

T. Flavius Paccius

Yet I do not think that all double nomina can be explained in so simple a way. The very fact that double nomina were much more popular in the Christian than in the pagan material militates against it. Considering the rapid disuse of nomina in Christian times, it would be strange if the practice of inheriting nomina from both parents had gained so enormously in popularity. In a large number of cases the second nomen was very likely nothing but a nomen used as a cognomen. There are examples of this usage in the pagan material. Thus *C VI* 9661 = *ILS* 7517 gives the following family stemma:

Ulpus Eutyches — Ulpia Secundina

Ulpus Secundinus, Ulpia Iulia, Ulpia Secundina, Ulpus Iustus

Two of the children bear a cognomen taken over from the mother, the others have cognomina different from those of the parents. *Iulia* has here quite as good a right to be considered a cognomen as *Iustus*.

The following example from Gaul is all the more valuable because all the persons recorded were slaves, and slaves did not bear nomina proper¹, *C XIII* 2533 = *ILS* 7452:

Valentinus — Sacrobena

Valerius

The cognomina of parents and children often belong together etymologically (see p. 52); in the example above the son had been named *Valerius* to recall the name of his father. I shall give one more case in which a nomen used as a cognomen etymologically belongs together with other cognomina current in a family, *C III* 8018 = *ILS* 7247:

Iul. Herculanus — Iul. Vivenia

Iul. Marcianus, Iul. Marcellinus, Iul. Marcia, Iul. Erachia

¹ There are not a few cases in which freedmen have a Latin nomen as a cognomen, e.g. *C VI* 7816: *T. Quinctius A. l. Laelius*, and 15648: *T. Cl. Aug. lib. Petronius* may have been called *Laelius* and *Petronius* as slaves. Cf. also NBull 1921, p. 44 = DIEHL 766: *Aurelio Onesimo, Aurelio Papirio, Aureliae Prim. virg. Aurelius Felicissimus / fratris (= fratribus) et colibert. b.m.f.*, where *Papirius* accordingly must have been a slave name. The Christianity of the inscription is not beyond doubt.

The cognomina of the three first children accordingly derive from the same root, *Marcus*, *Marcus*.

The true nature of double nomina is also proved by the fact that the second nomen does not pass on unchanged to children, as genuine nomina should do. To cite an example, *C XIV 2289 = ILS 2427*, the father is called *Sept(imius) Licinius*, the son *Sept(imius) Licin[ia]nus*. The first nomen was the actual family name and was inherited unchanged by the son; the second was an individual cognomen and passed on to the son after having been extended, as often happened to cognomina (see p. 52), by the suffix *-anus*. There are cases in Christian inscriptions in which the nomina used as cognomina do not pass on to the sons at all, e.g. *C VIII 9973 = DIEHL 3691* Cadn: the father is *[Iu]lius Aemiliu[s]*, the sons *Iuliu[s] D[onatus]* and *Honorius*.

Though the use of double nomina was firmly established in pagan times, our statistics suggest that the use became much more general in Christian material. This is quite natural, for after the importance of the nomina had declined, still less reluctance was felt in giving them to children as cognomina. The greater frequency of this form in women's names was due to the fact that a number of the cases were genuine double nomina, with the second nomen inherited from the mother, and these were more popular with women from the very beginning. But even those double nomina in which the second nomen functions as a freely chosen individual cognomen seem to have been more popular with women. Because women had borne double nomina from the very beginning, the use of a nomen as a cognomen originated and was more common in female nomenclature.

The above makes it possible for us to understand the popularity of single nomina in Christian epigraphic material. In pagan inscriptions, women's single nomina could be classed as an early name form (see p. 19), but in Christian inscriptions no similar interpretation is likely. The mere survival, still less a strengthening, of the ancient name system over the centuries is not probable. This is corroborated by the fact that there are only three examples of the masculine equivalent, the praenomen and nomen form, in our Christian material (see table 3, p. 9). Further, single nomina were almost as frequent with men, but cannot possibly be interpreted as an ancient name form. It is, then, probable that apart from a few occasional cases of disputable interpretation¹ single nomina found in Christian inscriptions were individual cognomina. This is also proved by the fact that like the double nomina, the transmission of single nomina in general observes the same rules as that of cognomina.

¹ *C X 603 = DIEHL 3204*, the name *Iulia*, belonging to the wife of a certain *M. Annaeus Agatho* — notice the *tria nomina* — may be a genuine nomen, but it is also possible that it was an individual cognomen.

Though a single nomen may occasionally pass on to children, e.g. *C V* 1631 = DIEHL 4625, where the father is *Aurelius*, the mother *Prima*, and the daughter *Aurelia*, we should remember that cognomina, too, were often inherited unchanged by children (see p. 52). DIEHL 4493 is significant in this respect: the father is *Ulpus*, the mother *Felicitas*, and the sons *Ulpus* and *Aelianus*. Only the elder son bears the same name as his father; had *Ulpus* been a genuine nomen, designating family relationship, both sons should have borne it. Otherwise a single nomen does not pass on to children, e.g. *C VI* 34728b = DIEHL 3745, where the father is *Sestiliu[s]*, the mother [*Feli*]cissima, the daughter *Adeodata*, or if borne by a child, is not found as the name of the parents, e.g. *RO* 1576 = DIEHL 3253, where the father is *Ursus*, the mother *Seberane*, and the daughter *Iulia*. Etymology is also observed: a nomen may recall a cognate cognomen borne by the parents, e.g. *C III* 9586 = DIEHL 1523: there the father is *Flavianus*, the mother *Archelaïs*, and the daughter *Flavia*.

The table on p. 18 shows that women bore single nomina slightly more often than men. The explanation of this disproportion is the same as that in regard to double nomina: the origin of the use of nomina as cognomina in female nomenclature.

A few significant facts are revealed by the following table, in which I give the frequencies of the most popular nomina used as cognomina in the Christian material of Rome; the frequencies as family names are given in brackets:

<i>Aurelius</i>	16	(411)	<i>Marcus</i>	16	(11)
<i>Domitius</i>	16	(10)	<i>Petronius</i>	27	(11)
<i>Flavius</i>	12	(149)	<i>Valerius</i>	32	(64)
<i>Iulius</i>	36	(94)			

Four of the names listed as the most popular nomina proper, p. 16, have disappeared, and three new ones have been substituted for them, *Domitius*, *Marcus* and *Petronius*. Again, the most frequent nomina proper are by no means the most popular nomina used as cognomina; a comparison of the frequencies of *Aurelius* and *Flavius* is illuminating.

These differences in the frequencies were probably due to the fact that because the etymology of cognomina was always important, those nomina which suggested a clear etymology became popular as cognomina. *Iulius* is the most frequent nomen used as a cognomen, but *Iulius* was also the name of a month, and names of months were very much used as cognomina, e.g. *Ianuarius*, about 100 examples in *ILS*¹, *Aprilis*, nine examples,

¹ The particular favour of *Ianuarius* may also have been due to the fact that the beginning of a year being a time of »good omen», the name could be considered similar in meaning to *Felix*, *Faustus*, etc. *Ianuarius* was in particular favour in Africa, where names of »good omen» were popular, cp. MOWAT *L'élément*, RA 1869 I p. 243.

December seven. *Valerius* became a popular cognomen because it suggested the verb *valere* and the cognate cognomen *Valens* with its derivatives. *Marcia* — almost exclusively the feminine form — was probably used as a substitute for the non-existent female form of *Marcus* (cf. the examples on p. 20). *Domitius* again suggested the word *domus*. All these names, as is proved by a consultation of the index of *ILS*, were also popular as cognomina in the pagan material. The only exception is *Petronius*. Because it was not very frequent as a pagan cognomen (two examples in *ILS*) and because it was seldom used as a nomen in the Christian inscriptions, its popularity must be due to other factors. I think the only possible explanation is the fact that the name could be thought to be a derivative of *Petrus*, a biblical name much in favour among the Christians (see p. 96). A good example is *SI 4280* = *DIEHL 694*, dated A.D. 522, where the father is *Ioannes v(ir) h(onestus)*, the wife *Anastasia h(onest)a f(emina)* and the daughter *Petrunia*.¹ Both parents bore names which were manifestly Christian (see pp. 95; 111), and no doubt wanted to name their daughter in a like manner.

V. INVERSION

In my Christian material from Rome there are 12 cases, 11 women and one man, in which the order of the nomen and cognomen is inverted, the cognomen coming first. This peculiarity is easy to explain in regard to women's names. Though women in general lacked praenomen², they occasionally had one, even in Christian times (see table 3, p. 9). Women's praenomina were often the same as men's and likewise written in an abbreviated form, but could also be names used as cognomina, e.g. numerals — cf. *RAC 1936*, p. 23: *Quinta Mamilia Titiana c(larissimae m(emoriae) f(emina)* — and the frequent *Polla* (see *ILS III: 2*, p. 925). The inversion of women's names must have originated as an imitation of this practice, the cognomen being simply put first, e.g. *C VI 38214: Caliste Clodia* and *38063: Erotis Avi<e>nia*, or from the Christian material, *SI 4826: Augena Decia* and *FE 9365: Volusiana Aufidia*. These cases cannot possibly be confused with genuine women's praenomina. In some cases of double cognomina, too, one cognomen may come before and the other after the nomen, as *RO 1855* = *DIEHL 1482a: Urania Aur(e)lia Domna*, and *SI 1447* = *DIEHL 4339: Veritas Ignatia Gerontia*.³

¹ The form *Petrunia* was not due to a desire to make the resemblance to *Petrus* stronger, for the vowel change $\bar{o} > \bar{u}$ was common in vulgar Latin, see *VÄÄNÄNEN*, p. 30. *DIEHL 3550A*, dated A.D. 528, is another late example of the form *Petrunia*.

² The causes of the lack of praenomen in female nomenclature have been much debated, but no final solution has been found, cf. *THYLANDER*, p. 73 ff.

³ In both cases *DIEHL* has interpreted the other cognomen as a common word, writing *domna* and *veritas*; but *Domna* is a very frequent cognomen (see p. 105), and in the latter case the structure of the epitaph does not permit of an interpretation as a common word: *totius pudicitiae Veritas Ignatia Gerontia*...

The frequency of inversion seems to have risen considerably in Christian times, for among the 1610 women's »duo nomina« in my pagan material from C VI there are four instances of inversion, and 11 among the 856 corresponding cases in the Christian material. This rise in the frequency may have been due to the general confusion in the Latin name system during the Later Empire. In some cases, however, quite a different interpretation is possible. Because nomina were much used as cognomina in Christian times, we may have, instead of a genuine inversion, an instance of double cognomina, e.g. SI 4861: *Barbara Petronia*, the latter name being often considered a derivative of *Petrus* (see p. 23). The only case in our material in which a man's names show inversion, SI 1792 = DIEHL 4222adn: *Seleucus Iulius*, may also be a double cognomen, *Iulius* being the nomen most often used as a cognomen (see p. 22).

VI. DOUBLE COGNOMINA

There is some difficulty in deciding which names are double cognomina, for some other interpretations are also possible where two cognomina are juxtaposed. Christian epitaphs in general being brief, single cognomen the usual form of the name, and the names of different persons often joined without a conjunction, it is possible that not one but two persons might have been meant by a presumable double cognomen, e.g. two sisters or brothers, or father and son, mother and daughter. Cases in which the names have been cut one below the other may seem particularly suspicious, e.g. SI 622: *Prisca / Isidora* and 2601 = DIEHL 3959adn: *Cassus / Domininus*. DE ROSSI, in his RS, considered all similar cases as the epitaphs of two persons, e.g. RS II 43, 46: *Fortunata / Secunda*, in the index as *Fortunata* and *Secunda*. But though we have cases in which the context shows that the cognomina belong to two persons, e.g. SI 1696 = DIEHL 3734A: *Mercura / Laurentia / se bibas cun|pararunt*, the examples in which the context implies one person are more numerous, e.g. SI 567 = DIEHL 4000A: *Clementina / Furtunia vixit / anos III m. VIII* (erroneously considered by SILVAGNI as the epitaph of two persons in the index); SI 2233 = DIEHL 4005D: *Facundo / Artemoni / q(ui) v(ixit) a. I m. I d. XII*; FE 7565: *Eustasius / Trancyllianus / te in pace*. Unless the context clearly shows that two persons were meant, I have included in the category of double cognomina all the cases in which cognomina of the same gender are juxtaposed.

There are also cases in which the cognomina are separated, one being cut at the beginning, the other at the end of an epitaph, e.g. NBull 1907, p. 227 = DIEHL 2279: *I u c u n [d] e filiae quien|tes parentes posuer|uni qui vixit annis / octo. R o d o p e in pace quiesce / dulcis*. Though DIEHL, for instance, thinks that two persons were meant in the epitaph, it is more

likely that the daughter was called *Iucunda Rodope*, but that in cutting the epitaph the other cognomen was separated to make it possible to have a cognomen in the concluding acclamation, too.¹

Another group of double cognomina which may cause difficulty in interpretation are those in which an ordinary cognomen is preceded by a new one, coined with the suffix *-ius -ia* from Latin and Greek names or common words, e.g. FE 7695: *Eustasius Trancyllianus*; SI 2906 = DIEHL 3959Aadn: *Maxentia Secundina*. There are 18 similar cases in the Christian material from Rome. The new cognomina of this type were popular as supernomina and as simple cognomina, too (see pp. 31; 71). But during the Empire new nomina were also often coined from cognomina, especially in Gaul and in soldiers' nomenclature.² In my Roman material such nomina are FE 9059: *L. Palladius Sissinus*, and NBull 1907, p. 233 = DIEHL 4004D: *M. Pervincius Rodo*, coined from the cognomina *Pallas* and *Pervincus*. The similarity of the new cognomina and the new nomina argues a common origin. Because the new nomina were found during the Early Empire³, whereas the new cognomina in *-ius -ia* first came into use towards the end of the second century A.D. (cf. p. 29), the new nomina were the primary, the new cognomina a secondary phenomenon. It is likely that after the nomina had begun to go out of use, the gentile suffix was used as a suffix of cognomina. The extensive use of nomina as cognomina naturally facilitated the process. The Greek names in *-ιος* may have contributed to the generalization of the new cognomina. This suffix was native in Greek in dedicatory names, e.g. *Ἀπολλώνιος*, *Δημήτριος*, *Διονόσιος*, but it was also used in other names (cf. RE XVI col. 1640). Particular attention must be paid to the occasional appearance of this suffix in the names which were usually without suffixes but which later became popular new coinages. BECHTEL, p. 4, records *Εὐαμέριος*, *Εὐβούλιος*, *Εὐτύχιος* from pre-Christian times, the usual forms before the Later Empire being *Εὐήμερος*, *Εὐβουλος*, *Εὐτυχος*, and I have found similar examples in literary documents and papyri.⁴ Such examples cannot have been without an influence on the formation of the new names. But despite such sporadic instances, the new coinages also began to appear

¹ Another similar case is Bull 1863, p. 82 = DIEHL 2193A: *Chresimus* and *Victorina* bury their daughter, cutting *Chresime* at the beginning, *Victoria vivas in deo* at the end of the epitaph. The daughter had obviously been called *Chresime Victoria*; cf. DE ROSSI's comment, *ad loc.*

² SCHULZE *Eigennamen*, p. 48 ff.

³ SCHULZE, *loc. cit.*

⁴ *Ἡσύχιος* 26 B.C. (SB 4380); *Εὐφρόνιος*, the teacher of Marc Antony's and Cleopatra's children (Plut. *Ant.* 72 = PIR III, p. 92 n. 123); *Εὐδόδιος*, the first bishop of Antioch, first century A.D. (Eusebius, *hist. eccl.*, 3, 22); *Μακεδόσιος* A.D. 86 (POxy VII 1028, 2); *Eutychius Proculus*, the *grammaticus Latinus* of Marcus Aurelius (*Vita Marci* 2, 3 = PIR III p. 93, n. 131).

and to become frequent in Greek at the same time as in Latin, that is to say, after the beginning of the third century A.D.¹ Whether this was due to the direct influence of Latin nomenclature or, as FRAENKEL argues (*RE XVI* col. 1664, 30), to a similarity of taste, cannot be discussed here.

Because of the similarity of the new cognomina and new nomina one could argue, however, that the names in *-ius* preceding another cognomen were nomina. But apart from soldiers, the new nomina were never very popular in Rome, whereas the new cognomina were frequent as super-nomina and simple cognomina; in my Roman material, about one sixth of the cognomina were new coinages. This makes it likely that the new coinages preceding another cognomen were in most cases cognomina and not nomina.²

There are, however, cases in which a double cognomen cannot have been meant. In some cases, the second cognomen is an *ethnic*, e.g. *SI 2444: Vernaculus Carpitianus* and *FE 8596 = DIEHL 4451: Ulpus Festus Afer*. Again, an *epithet* may have been tacked on to the name, in particular *pius*, which was very frequent in the pagan epitaphs of Africa.³ In my Roman material, *FE 8748: A(urelius?) Constantius pius* is a similar case. In *SI 3678 = DIEHL 2713B: Niceforus pitinnus*, the last word is probably an epithet, a vulgar form for *pisinnus*, «a boy». The cases in which *peregrinus* is found are difficult, for the word is both an appellative and a very popular cognomen. But because the appellative *peregrinus* is rare in inscriptions — not a single instance is recorded in DIEHL's index — it is more probably a cognomen, e.g. *SI 2274: Honoratus Peregrinus* and *3704: Peregrinus Bassus*.

After deducting the ethnics and the epithets, the double cognomina found in my Roman and Carthaginian material have the frequencies tabulated in table 8 (next page).

In evaluating the figures, some facts should be taken into account. The difference between the pagan materials of Rome and Carthage was largely due to the fact that the latter included the *tituli* of the aristocracy and the magistracies which were absent from the former, and the multiplication

¹ E.g. Ἀλέπιος, the earliest dated example I have found is A.D. 314 (*Flor. I*); Ἀμαζονία A.D. 295 (*POxy I 43*, verso I 22); Ἀθανάσιος A.D. 352 (*POxy XII 1431,1*); Ἐπιφάνιος A.D. 438 (*Stud. XX*); Ἐδδόξιος, fourth century (e.g. *Flor. I 71*, 307); Ἐδνένιος A.D. 295 (*POxy I 43* recto II 26); Ἐδσέβιος A.D. 295 (*ibid.* recto V I, 4); Γελάσιος third century (e.g. *Flor. II 133*); Γεώργιος a popular name in Byzantine times; I have found no examples before the sixth century; Γερόντιος A.D. 316 (*POxy VI 896 i 23*); Γρηγόριος A.D. 265? (*Soc. V 465*, 9).

² In *SI 1171 = DIEHL 4123C: Claudia Romana Benantio (= Venantio) Florentino coniugi*, the first name of the husband, considering that his wife bears «duo nomina», may, however, be a nomen.

³ DELATTRE, *L'épigraphie funéraire chrétienne à Carthage*, p. 89 f.

Table 8. *Double cognomina in the pagan and Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage*

	R o m e		C a r t h a g e	
	<i>C VI:4,</i> 2—3	Christian	pagan	Christian
nomen + double cogn.	15	37	16	1
double cogno- mina	11	118	7	6
total	26	155	23	7
% of the total	0,6 %	1,6 %	1,8 %	0,8 %

of names characteristic of the nomenclature of the nobility swelled the category of double cognomina (cf. p. 4). Further, the fragmentary state of the Christian epigraphy of Carthage may have diminished the number of Christian double cognomina. In regard to Carthage, it is accordingly advisable to suspend judgement. As to R o m e, it may be argued that the frequency of double cognomina rose considerably in the Christian inscriptions. My pagan and Christian materials from Rome are fairly equal from a social aspect, the double cognomina of the nobility not being numerous enough in the Christian inscriptions (eight cases) to affect the statistics.¹ The causes of this rise in the frequency will be discussed at the end of the present chapter.

In regard to their origin, double cognomina may be divided into two groups: the other cognomen may have been added later in life; or both cognomina were given by the parents at birth. As to the former group, the double cognomina borne by freedmen have often been discussed. If Imperial slaves had formerly belonged to private citizens, they received another cognomen coined with the suffix *-anus* from the nomen or cognomen of the ex-master.² On being manumitted, the slaves retained their double cognomina. People bearing two cognomina, the second of which ends in *-anus*, may accordingly be suspected of being or having been Imperial slaves. Cases are not infrequent, for in my pagan material from Rome there are nine, and in the Christian 15 of them. Yet in only two of these, both in the pagan material, are the persons explicitly stated to be Imperial slaves or freedmen.³ It is, then, ill-advised to derive all double cognomina

¹ The cases are *SI* 175 = DIEHL 135; 1168 = DIEHL 286; 1266 = DIEHL 112; 2794 = DIEHL 40b; 3268 = DIEHL 104a; 4789; 4895 = DIEHL 207; Bull 1872, p. 48.

² MOMMSEN, *Römisches Staatsrecht I* p. 323; LEMONNIER, *Étude historique sur la condition privée des affranchis*, p. 176. Examples *ILS III: 2* p. 927.

³ *C VI* 38010: *Primus Caesaris N(ostri) ser. Tychicianus*; 34057: *C. Asinius Aug. lib. Paramythius Festianus*.

of the type discussed from the nomenclature of Imperial slaves, least of all in the Christian material, slavery being on the decline during the Later Empire. The cognomina in *-anus* were very common and could be used as double cognomina independent of any servile nomenclature. The cognomina obtained from nomina with the suffix *-anus* were used as cognomina of adoption, too (see p. 4), but this practice was largely confined to aristocratic circles and to earlier times. The double cognomina in *-anus* found in Christian inscriptions are hardly of this origin.

It is also argued that freedmen sometimes added a more respectable Latin cognomen to their original barbaric or Greek name, which inevitably smacked of slavery and foreign extraction.¹ But it is doubtful whether this holds good in regard to our Christian material, where the freedmen cannot have been many. Moreover, Greek cognomina were so extremely common that it is hazardous to consider, even in freedmen's names, the extra Latin cognomen as an attempt at respectability.² There is, however, one example in which the Latin cognomen may have been given as a translation of the Greek cognomen, ARM p. 262 = DIEHL 4536: *Victoria Nice*. But because barbarian slaves usually obtained a new Latin or Greek name (see p. 59), barbaric cognomina juxtaposed with Latin or Greek ones may have been the ancient, native names of slaves and freedmen or even *peregrini*, which they had preserved and which they recorded besides their new names. A good example is *Tarbius* (= *Tarvius*) *Valens* in SI 574 = DIEHL 4128A, the Latin cognomen *Valens* being a rough rendering of the idea conveyed by his original Celtic name, derived from the Celtic *tarvos* = Latin *taurus*.³ The other cases in our material in which one cognomen is barbaric, the other Latin or Greek, may also admit of a similar interpretation.⁴

It is probable that most of the cognomina which had been later added to the original name were nicknames. This origin is clearest in the names which were otherwise rare or unknown as cognomina. Nicknames may have been given jokingly, as RO 530 = DIEHL 2792: *Lepusculus Leo*, where the first cognomen may have been given to contrast with *Leo*, or

¹ MOMMSEN, *Römisches Staatsrecht III*: I p. 426; DUFF, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, p. 54.

² Cf. LEMONNIER's criticism of this interpretation, *op. cit.* p. 179.

³ See HOLDER, sub *tarvos*.

⁴ SI 69 = DIEHL 3211D: *Septimus Sabras*; 588 = DIEHL 3116A: *GisMEA Bonifatia* (unless corrupt); 5731: *Gaudiosa Dudda*; 6176: [*Euc?*] *hara Hispartara*; RS III 20, 49: *Marta Emiliane*; RS III 23, 40 = DIEHL 4372: *Nars[alu?]'s Stratonicus*; probably also RS II 37, 2: . . . *iva* *Adas*; RAC 1924, p. 64: *Fl. Prima Amevania*, the name, unknown in *Thes.*, is probably Celtic, cf. HOLDER, *Nachtrage*: *fontis Amevi*; RAC 1925, p. 24 = DIEHL 2135: *Iulia Etelia Antonina*, in DIEHL, erroneously *Iulia et Elia Antonina*; RAC 1930, p. 187: *Constantius Salcamarius* (?); RAC 1934, p. 24: *Brybys Aper*.

SI 3666 = DIEHL 3989Cadn: *Mercuria Culina*, where the second name, not instanced as a Latin cognomen¹, suggests a female occupation. In SI 1284 = DIEHL 3990A: *Augustus Decembe<r>*, it is likely that *December* was the original name and that *Augustus*, with its double significance of »venerable» and the name of a month, had been added later. Some nicknames imply parental affection. Thus a child, dying at the age of two, is called *Matronata Matrona* in SI 1692 = DIEHL 2337. The name *Matronata* is otherwise unknown, but there is a noun *matronatus*, denoting »the dress of a matron» or »the order of matrons». The child may have been christened *Matrona*, the cognate name being added as a nickname to strengthen the idea conveyed by her name.

Most of the new coinages in *-ius -ia* used as double cognomina were probably nicknames. There is a good pagan example in a famous pantomimist called *M. Aurelius Augg. lib. Agilius Septentrio* (C XIV 2113 and 2977). The first cognomen was presumably a nickname given to him because of his »agility». ^{# Agilius}² This is, moreover, the earliest example known to me of a new cognomen in *-ius*, being dated A.D. 187 or 192. There are 48 double cognomina in my Christian material from Rome in which one or even both cognomina ^{nomina}³ are new formations, i.e. almost a third of the total. If the new coinages all came from the parents, they should only have amounted to a sixth of the total (see p. 71). It seems, then, justifiable to conclude that a considerable number of double cognomina in *-ius -ia* had been given later in life. As an example we may mention RAC 1931, p. 192:

Phoebus — Festa

|

Gregorius Phoebus

The son had inherited his second cognomen from his father, whereas the first was probably a nickname. The example also shows that the order of the cognomina did not depend upon their origin, for a nickname could precede the original name. As they were expressive names of clear etymology, the new coinages were very suitable nicknames. Though a few were uncomplimentary, e.g. FE 6547: *Allogius Fortutus* and SI 18 = DIEHL 4403: *Stercorius Aly[pius?]*, most of the names implied good qualities, e.g. FE 6574: *Istudius Felix* or the frequent *Constantius* and *Gregorius*.⁴

¹ *Thes. Onom.* II col. 741, 29 records a soldier called *Culinus*; because there is no corresponding common word in Latin or Greek, the name is probably barbaric.

² Cf. LEMONNIER, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

³ SI 2967: *Ulpia Palladia Ursacia*; RAC 1925, p. 24 = DIEHL 2135: *Dracontius Pelagius*, in DIEHL wrongly given as two separate persons.

⁴ *Constantius* in SI 2660; 5986 = DIEHL 2008; NBull 1914, fasc. 2, p. 67; RAC 1924, p. 62; 1930 p. 187; *Gregorius* in SICV 287; Bull 1868, p. 9.

A special group of nicknames is formed by cognomina with Christian implications, probably assumed by new converts at their baptism. There are about ten cases, a typical one being e.g. SI 1672 = DIEHL 2630adn: *Licinia Aeliadora Adeodata*, where the pagan flavour of the original cognomen probably actuated the assumption of a Christian name together with the Christian religion. All the relevant cases will be discussed in detail later (see p. 120 f.).

There are, however, a large number of cases in which neither cognomen resembles a nickname, e.g. SI 2011 = DIEHL 2193Badn: *Modestina Secundina*; SI 1168 = DIEHL 286: *Valerius Victor Paternus v.p.*; FE 8808 = DIEHL 1596: *Cassus Vitalio*. In these cases, both names had probably been given at birth, or, to be more exact, on the Roman day of name-giving, the *dies lustricus*, the eighth (for girls) or the ninth (for boys) day after the birth (see e.g. Macrobian *Saturn.* 1, 16, 36), and may have been inherited from parents or other relatives. There are many examples in pagan epigraphy of double cognomina in which one name comes from the father, the other from the mother.¹ The only example in the Christian material from Rome is the one cited, p. 25, fn. 1, in which a father called *Chresimus* and a mother called *Victorina* have a child bearing the double cognomen *Chresime Victoria*.

The rise in the frequency of double cognomina observed in the Christian material of Rome may have been due to two causes. On the one hand, the practice of bearing »extra names», or agnomina, came to Rome during the second century A.D. (see p. 48). Because it very often depended upon individual choice whether or not the extra name was added to the original one by some connecting expression, the new fashion must have added to the number of double cognomina. On the other hand, the example of the nomenclature of the nobility was a powerful factor. Because the multiplication of the names of the nobility was largely due to the inheritance of names from both parents (see p. 4), it is likely that even the humble began to distinguish themselves in this way. The predilection for double cognomina seems, however, to have been a passing fashion. The tabulation of the material on p. 27 suggests that double cognomina belonged to the early stratum of Christian epigraphy: the frequency of the nomen (24 %) is here higher than in the Christian material of Rome in general (see p. 9, table 3). The elimination of the double cognomina was no doubt due to the tendency towards greater simplicity in the Latin name form.

¹ THYLANDER, p. 114.

VII. THE PROBLEM OF THE SUPERNOMEN

§ 1. *The classification of supernomina*

In discussing the *supernomina*, I shall, because of the complexity of the problem and the relatively low frequency of these names, draw upon all available material from Latin inscriptions and from the Greek inscriptions of the West (see bibliography, sources III). It is also to a large extent necessary to treat the Christian material with the pagan one.

The problem of the supernomen has been much discussed, in particular about the turn of the century, but numerous important questions have been but lightly touched upon.¹ Supernomina are usually divided into *agnomina* and *signa* (thus e.g. *ILS III: 2*, p. 927 ff.). The terms may be accepted if it is borne in mind that they only designate the different ways of adding supernomina to the other names. The term *agnomen* denotes a name tacked on to the other ones by *qui et*, e.g. *C VI 17398: Euthymus qui et Lupus*, or by *sive*, e.g. *C VI 22929: Octavia Rhoia sive Euresis*; the term *signum* denotes a name cut detached from them («detached signum»), e.g. *C VI 3446*, the epitaph of an *Ulpianus Ursinus*, with *Arcadi oxa tibi be(ne) cesquant* cut below; *signum* also denotes a name added to the other names by the expression *signo* («signum proper»), e.g. *C VI 12853: Aufidia Severina signo Florenti*. Other terms must be used to denote the origin of supernomina: nickname, cognomen, *nomen sodaliciarium*.

A large number of supernomina were new coinages in *-ius* (cf. p. 25). They were not, however, equally divided between the different categories of supernomina, as is revealed by the following table. *Heraclius*, *Leontius*, *Olympius* and *Pelagius*, though ancient Greek personal names², have been included in the table, together with a few nomina, occasionally used as supernomina (see p. 45):

¹ The first to have dealt with the problem, though from a special point of view, was DE ROSSI, *I collegii funeraticii famigliari e privati*, Comment. phil. Mommsen, p. 705 ff. At the beginning of the present century, a few important studies on the problem were published, in particular by SCHULZE, *Graeca Latina*; by MOMMSEN, *Signum*, Hermes 1902, p. 443 ff.; by DIEHL, *Signum*, RhM 1907, p. 390 ff.; by LAMBERTZ, *Supernomen*, Glotta 1913, p. 78 ff. and 1914, p. 99 ff.; by Mlle WUILLEUMIER, *Étude historique sur l'emploi et la signification des signa*. In my opinion, the best work is that of LAMBERTZ, but he passes lightly over a few important problems. DE ROSSI, SCHULZE, MOMMSEN and DIEHL advocate a theory which, I think, is rather far-fetched. WUILLEUMIER's work is heavily furnished with facts, but their interpretation is scanty and not always convincing.

² *Heraclius* and *Leontius* are from the Hellenistic age, see *RE VIII*, col. 501 and *XII* col. 2048, *Olympius* from the fifth century B.C., see BECHTEL, p. 525. *Pelagius* is a frequent name in *C VI*, the earliest example perhaps being 8843: . . . *cia Pelagia*, the wife of a *Thyrsus Halys Ti. Claudi Caesaris Aug. Germanici ser(vus)*, i.e. from the first century A.D.

Table 9. *The classification of the supernomina found in the Latin inscriptions and in IG XIV*

	pagan				Christian			
	total	fragm.	-ius	-ius %	total	fragm.	-ius	-ius %
detached signa	237	4	218	94 %	30	—	30	100 %
signa proper	37	2	27	80 %	16	2	6	43 %
agnomina	396	30	50	14 %	60	2	16	27,5 %

The table shows that the most important categories of supernomina were the agnomina and the detached signa, signa proper being of minor importance. Again, whereas the new coinages in *-ius* were not very numerous among the agnomina, the detached signa almost invariably end in *-ius*. The exceptions may be double cognomina, one cognomen being cut detached in imitation of the detached signa, e.g. *C VIII 9214*, where a certain *[Fl]a-via Satura* bears *[Vi]ctoria* detached.¹ The new coinages were also in the majority among the signa proper, but not to as large an extent, and the percentage falls significantly in the Christian material.

In addition to the preponderance of new coinages among the detached signa, there were a few other important differences between them and the other categories of supernomina. Whereas signa proper and agnomina are rarely found in inscriptions other than epitaphs, and whereas they were almost invariably borne by humble people, the detached signa present a different picture. Deducting the cases in which only the detached signum has come down to us, the main inscription having disappeared, the remaining 233 pagan and Christian signa are divided according to the type of inscription and the social origin of the bearers in the following way:

Type of inscription

<i>epitaphs</i>	130 or 56 %
<i>honorary inscriptions</i>	79 or 34 %
<i>votive inscriptions</i>	24 or 10 %

Social origin of the bearers

<i>senatorial class</i>	39 or 17 %
<i>equestrian class, municipal magistrates</i>	79 or 33 %
<i>others</i>	115 or 50 %

¹ Other examples, *C VIII 5260*: *Sittia Veneria que et Iuniane*, with *Nina* have cut detached; *IX 1826*: *Fufius Iustinus*, with *Rusticulus hic* detached.

Half the detached signa were thus borne by titled people and more than a third were cut in honorary inscriptions. Moreover, the very fact that an extra name is cut detached from the other names is unheard-of. There are therefore sufficient reasons for considering detached signa as a category of supernomina different from signa proper and agnomina.

§ 2. *The detached signa*

The detached signa have been shown in the above to be almost equally divided between epitaphs and honorary as well as votive inscriptions. There are, however, variations in the position of the detached signa in different types of inscriptions:

Table 10. *The position of the detached signum in the different types of inscriptions*

	epitaphs	honorary inscriptions	votive inscriptions	total
above	33	73	11	117
below	68	1 ¹	7	76
in the margins	20	3	5	28
other cases	9 ²	2 ²	1 ²	12

Thus epitaphs and votive inscriptions vary the position, though the signum in the former group is usually cut below, and in the latter above the text of the inscription. The signum in honorary inscriptions is almost without exception cut above the die.

The signa are mostly set in the vocative, the genitive in *-ii* being confined to late honorary inscriptions. The dative, too, is often found.³ Women's signa almost always have masculine endings (see p. 41).

In epitaphs, the signum belongs to the deceased, as may be seen from the fact that in almost half the cases the signum is included in an acclamatory phrase, such as *Aeoni chaere* (C V 6693), *Aetheri, anima dulcis* (VI 38082a), *Constanti eudromi* (V 5894 = ILS 6732), *Eudoxi eupsychi* (XIV 656), *Eusebi vale* (XIII 2099), etc., and such acclamations normally

¹ C VIII 2393: *Panacrius*; the signum belongs to the dedicator.

² In some cases the signum is cut both below and above the main inscription, e.g. C VI 10268 = ILS 8127, the signum being *Argenti*. The signum may also appear on the reverse side of the stone, e.g. C XI 863 = ILS 6665, *Gregori*. Acrostichon is also used, e.g. C XII 1981, *Audenti*. In a few cases the signum appears in the text of the inscription, but is set in the vocative and is accompanied by an acclamatory phrase, e.g. C III 5813: *Vincenti vive* (cf. SI 692) or is written vertically, C VI 11005, *Hylochari*.

³ For documentation, cf. DIEHL, *Signum*, RhM 1907, p. 400 ff.

refer to the deceased. A double signum could also belong to one person, e.g. *C VI* 1622 and 21334 = *ILS* 8534—5, where, in two separate epitaphs, a brother and a sister are both addressed as *Meropi Helladi*. It is sometimes argued that double signa belong to other deceased persons or to those who set up the stone. Thus we read *SI* 3547 = *DIEHL* 2193B: *Hilari vivas | in deo ✕ | Heraclie compa|ri sue beneme|renti fecit que vi|xit anis XXI in pa|ce Liberi vivas in | ✕*. *SILVAGNI* quotes *MURATORI*, who thought that the epitaph had been set up for three persons. This does not seem likely, however, as no age and information about the relationship are given. It is much more probable that the names, included in typical acclamations addressed to the deceased, were the signa of *Heraclia*. Again, in *Bull* 1887, p. 20, the epitaph of a certain *Κλαυδία Ἀντωνία Σεκουνδεῖνα* has in the left margin *Leonti*, in the right *Lampadi*, both written vertically. Though *DE ROSSI*, *ad. loc.*, argues that the names belong to the sons of the deceased, who would have set up the stone, it is difficult to understand why the names should be in the vocative. *Leonti* and *Lampadi* were very likely the signa of the deceased. There are certainly cases in which the signum of the dedicator, too, appears on the stone, but it is always set in the nominative (cf. p. 33, fn. 1), e.g. *C XIII* 1880: *have Dulciti, Gaudentius te salutat*.

In honorary inscriptions the signum can only refer to the person honoured, for he is often the only individual person mentioned in the text of the inscription. In the votive inscriptions the signa, with minor exceptions¹, belong to the dedicators for a similar reason.

MOMMSEN and *DIEHL* have argued that first signa are from the second century A.D., but on a closer scrutiny the dates are found to be uncertain.² The earliest datable instance is *C VI* 180 = *ILS* 3703: *Romuli euhemeri — felix Romulius*, the detached signum of a certain *Antonius lib(ertus)* on a marble altar dedicated by him on the safe return of *Septimius*

¹ *C IX* 2123 = *ILS* 3718, *Verzobi vivas* refers to the person »pro» whose »salute» the stone had been dedicated.

² *MOMMSEN Signum*, *Hermes* 1902, p. 448 fn. 4, contends that a detached signum in *C IX* 1161 is from the age of *Pius* (died A.D. 161). But apart from the fact that the signum is fragmentary (*Ca. anii*), modern scholarship is not sure of the date of its bearer, *Betitius Pius Maximillianus* (*RE III* col. 368). *MOMMSEN*'s dating of *Euhodi* in an honorary inscription *X* 5917 = *ILS* 1909 as being from the time of *Commodus* is based upon the assumption, rejected by modern scholarship, that *Marcia Aurel(ia) Ceionia Demetrias*, to whom a similar inscription had been dedicated (*ILS* 406), and who may have been the former's daughter, had been *Commodus*' concubine (*RE XIV* col. 1605, 19). *DIEHL Signum*, *RhM* 1907, p. 392, puts the date of *C X* 1729, where a certain *M. Ulp(ius) Nicephorus Aug. lib.* bears *Gregorio* (dative) detached, as the time of *Trajan*. But though Imperial freedmen usually assumed the emperor's nomen, and *Trajan* was the only emperor coming from *gens Ulpia*, this is an exceptional case, for the man's father, *Nicephorus*, was obviously a slave, his mother, *Ulpia Profutura*, a free woman. On being manumitted, he had assumed his mother's nomen.

Severus and his sons Caracalla and Geta. The only date possible is 202 A.D., the year Septimius Severus returned with his sons from the Orient to Rome.¹ Henceforth dated examples become more numerous², though most of them belong to the fourth century A.D.

§ 3. *The origin of detached signa*

Most scholars ascribe the origin of the signa to the nomenclature of burial clubs. These clubs flourished during the Empire and, besides taking care of their members' funerals, organized periodical feasts. After the Antoninian era, the clubs were often distinguished by a collective name in *-ii*, and it is claimed that the individual members bore the club name in the singular as their *nomen sodaliciarium*, usually written detached from the regular names or added to them by the expression *signo*, sometimes by *qui et*.³

It is certainly true that club names of the type mentioned were not rare. I have counted 43 in the pagan inscriptions, and 14 in the Christian ones. Most club names implied a cheerful and confident attitude to life, e.g. *Eucherii* (C X 2015 = ILS 8235), *Eugrafii* (VIII 16292), *Eutychii* (VI 10274 = DIEHL 809C), *Gaudentii* (VI 10276; SI 3522 = DIEHL 3536D), *Pancratii* (VI 10279—80) etc., or embodied religious ideas, e.g. *Eusebii* (C II 4967, 7; VI 3497 etc.). References to ideas on the after life were also common. The wish of [A]*thanasiolorum* C VI 7649 is obvious, but *Oly<m>pii* VI 5174 = ILS 7945a may imply a similar idea.⁴ *Naucellii* VI 10278 and *Pelagii* (VI 10283; 10284 = ILS 7947; DIEHL 809B) probably allude to the idea that a bark bore the blessed to the abode of delight.⁵ Only a few of the club names have an obscure etymology, e.g. *Brecetii* ILS 9021 and *Pesidii* VI 10285. Such club names may derive from barbaric cognomina, e.g. *Duddasi contubernaless* C VIII 15895 = ILS 7363 from *Dudda*, a cognomen of African origin.⁶ It is worth special attention that though the burial clubs were frequent in Christian inscriptions, there is not a single case in which a Christian burial club bore a distinctively Christian name. It is possible that most Christian burial clubs are from a time when a special Christian nomenclature had not yet come into being (cf. p. 117 f.).

¹ See *RE* IIA col. 1974, 39.

² C XIV 3553 = ILS 3418, A.D. 224; III 1422 = ILS 3636, A.D. 238, etc.

³ DE ROSSI, *Comment. phil.* Mommsen, p. 707 ff.; SCHULZE, *Graeca Latina* p. 5 ff.; MOMMSEN *Signum*, *Hermes* 1902, p. 451 ff.; DIEHL *Signum*, *RhM* 1907, p. 393 ff.

⁴ Cf. WUILLEUMIER, *op. cit.*, p. 64: »qui espèrent habiter un jour sur l'Olympe avec les Immortels».

⁵ Cf. CUMONT, *After life in Roman paganism*, p. 155.

⁶ *Thes. Onom.* III col. 265,30.

These club names were mostly set in the genitive plural, and examples like *C VI 5174 = ILS 7945a: aeterna domus Oly<m>piorum* or *SI 3522 = DIEHL 3536D: sepulcra Gaudentiorum* show that they designated the common burial place of a club. Because a standard feature in the inscriptions was the announcement that the builder of the monument had reserved it for himself and his freedmen and for his and his freedmen's progeny¹, the clubs resembled the old-established *collegia domestica*, which comprised the members of the same household and which were sometimes distinguished by a name in *-anus*, e.g. *C VI 10255 = ILS 7343: collegium Agrippianum* or *VI 10259 = ILS 7344: collegium Phylletianorum*, founded by *Annius Phylles*. Professional clubs seldom had the new type of nomenclature; *C VIII 11549: Decasi valete et semper harena placete*, implies a gladiators' club; *ibid. 24532: venator(um) Taelegeniorum*, a hunters' club; *XIII 2494 = ILS 9439* a boatmen's club is called *Tricontii*, a suggestive name (derived from *contus*, a shipping term).

The problem of the origin of this new nomenclature of burial clubs has so far not been decisively solved. SCHULZE thought that the names had been formed on the analogy of the Greek club names in *-ειοι*², but the theory does not explain why it was in the Later Empire that the new nomenclature came into use and why it replaced the older nomenclature. MOMMSEN argued that the club names were »denatured» by the suffix *-ius* to differentiate them both from *nomina* and *cognomina*³, but the theory is invalidated by the fact that *Leontius* and *Olympius*, for instance, which were old Greek personal names (see p. 31), were popular as club names (*ILS 6022* and p. 35 above). DIEHL contends that the collective names were secondary masculines from club names derived from abstracts, *Constantii* implying a club called *Constantia*, *Augurii* a club called *augurium* etc.⁴ Considering that we do not have a single instance of a club name of that type, DIEHL's theory seems untenable.

The solution of the problem seems to be as follows. The burial clubs which were distinguished by the new type of nomenclature because mostly run in the same household, resembled the ancient *gentes* to such an extent that the members could refer to their club as *familia nostra* (e.g. *C VI 10284 = ILS 7947*). Is it any wonder that there should also have been a tendency to form the names of the clubs on the (analogy of the Latin *nomina* with the gentile suffix? The use of the gentile suffix for this

¹ E.g. *C VI 10271: C. Iulius Honoratus et Corn(elia) Sab(ina) | comparavit sibi et filis | filiabusque suis et lib(ertis) | libertabusq(ue) p(osterisque) eorum. | E v e n t i o r u m*.

² *Graeca Latina*, p. 7.

³ *Signum*, *Hermes* 1902, p. 450.

⁴ *Signum*, *RhM* 1907, p. 415.

purpose had been facilitated by the decline in the use of the nomen. Though the new club names differed from the nomina in their transparent and often significant etymology (see p. 35), the nomina served as a model here, too, for during the Imperial Age a number of new, »artificial» nomina, coined from cognomina, had come into use (see p. 25).

But though the burial clubs of the Later Empire often had a collective name in *-ii*, it is another problem whether, and to what extent, the members of such a club bore the singular of the name as their *nomen sodaliciarium*. Because most detached signa and signa proper ended in *-ius*, it has been concluded that they were the *nomina sodaliciaria* of the club members. But I do not think one is entitled to draw such a conclusion without carefully considering the evidence.

There certainly are cases in which a detached signum is a *nomen sodaliciarium*. The example usually cited is *C XIV 3323 = ILS 8090*, where a certain *Aurelius Vitalio* announces that he has built a sepulchral monument to his progeny and his freedmen, who together constitute a *sodalitas* of *Syncratorum*; and he calls himself *aego Syncratius*.¹ There is another example, so far overlooked, in which the patron of *amatores Romulii* has *Romuli* cut above the die of his honorary inscription (*C XI 7805 = ILS 7365*). Nevertheless it is impossible to interpret all the detached signa borne by patrons of colleges in the same way. In some cases, the college has a name entirely different from the signum of its patron, e.g. *C IX 1683 = ILS 6501*, the patron of *studium Palladianum* is addressed as *Nebuli*, and *IX 1685 = ILS 6504*, the patron of *collegium Martensium infraforanum* has *Verzobio* (dative) cut above the die of his honorary inscription. In *C XI 6362 = ILS 7364*, the patron of *iuvenum forensium* and *studior(um) Apollinar(is) et Gunthar(is)?* is addressed as *Zminthi*.

There are also cases in which a detached signum is found on a monument belonging to a funeral club of the same name. Thus the epitaph of a certain *Vivia Severa*, with the detached acclamation *Pancrati hic*, has been dug up in the same place as the stone of *Pancratorum* (*C VI 10279, —81*). Again, *SI 475* we read: *Dulcitiorum | depossio Dulci et vives*. Because no other name is given, this is somewhat obscure. *Dulcitia* being a common name in Christian times, it may be mere coincidence. The woman may, of course, derive her name from membership of the club, but it remains enigmatic whether her real cognomen had been suppressed or whether she had been given her name at birth by parents who were members of the same club.

Indirect evidence may also be cited. Because the burial clubs of the type discussed were mainly family organizations, the relatives

¹ The importance of this inscription was first pointed out by DE ROSSI, *Comment. phil. Mommsen*, p. 707.

should bear the same signum. There is a number of such cases, the same signum being borne by father and son ¹; by brothers ²; by brother and sister ³; in one case by husband and wife.⁴ But though in a few of the cases the signum may derive from membership of a club, other interpretations are also possible: in numerous cases, *regular cognomina* were cut detached in late honorary inscriptions (see p. 43).

But granting that a number of detached signa were *nomina sodaliciaria*, it is certainly going too far to argue that all of them imply membership of a funeral club. We can in fact cite a great deal of evidence to invalidate this theory.

There is a considerable lack of correlation in the geographic distribution of detached signa and club names of the new type. Detached signa and plural forms are divided between Africa, Rome and the other provinces thus:

	Africa	Rome	other provinces	total
<i>detached signa</i>	89	76	84	249
<i>plural forms</i>	14	32	11	57

More than half the club names come from Rome, whereas only a third of the signa are of Roman origin. Conversely, though detached signa are particularly frequent in Africa, club names were not of a corresponding frequency. If detached signa really were *nomina sodaliciaria*, they should have been much more numerous in Rome. Again, more than half the detached signa belonged to the nobility (see p. 32). MOMMSEN, and after him DIEHL argued that the burial clubs were popular among the magisterial aristocracy.⁵ This is very unlikely, however. The very character of the clubs, run in households and comprising a large number of freedmen (see p. 36), as well as references to them as *collegia tenuiorum* (*Digesta* 47, 22, 1—4), suffice to refute the idea. Finally, though parents and children and husbands and wives sometimes have the same signum, in the majority of the cases members of the same family bear different signa. Thus in *C VI* 25841 the mother is addressed as *Principi*, the son as *Litori*, and the daughter as *Pancrati*. Symmachus bears the detached signum *Eusebii* (*C VI* 1699 = *ILS* 2946), his father that of *Phosphorii*

¹ *C III* 7899 = *ILS* 3849: *Ionius*; *VI* 1723 = *ILS* 1225 and *X* 1697 = *ILS* 1226: *Mavortii*; *VIII* 17904—5 and *AE* 1946, 66: *Optantius*; *C VIII* 22673 and *IRTr* 564, 568: *Heracii*, borne by father, son and another relative.

² *C VI* 1768—69 and 1772: *Asterii*.

³ *Meropi Helladi*, see p. 34.

⁴ *C VIII* 2394—5, 17904 and 2397, 17905: *Sertio*, *Sertiae*; moreover, both once call themselves *Sertii* (*ILS* 5579).

⁵ *Signum*, *Hermes* 1902, p. 452 f.; *RhM* 1907, p. 391.

(VI 1698 = ILS 1257). Numerous similar cases can be cited.¹ With the exception of *Sertii* (see p. 38, fn. 4), husbands and wives always bear different signa.² One could argue that detached signa observe the same rules of transmission as cognomina: though children in a number of cases inherit parental cognomina, their cognomina mostly differ from those of their parents (see p. 53); husbands and wives naturally bear different cognomina, cases of the same cognomina being coincidences. But if detached signa really had been *nomina sodaliciaria*, they should have observed the same family pattern as nomina: all the members of a *gens* bear the same nomen.

It is because of the facts tabulated that we must give up the theory of detached signa being derived from membership of a burial club. A few of them may have been *nomina sodaliciaria*, but the majority admit of some other interpretation. I think it only remains to consider them as individual nicknames. But they were not ordinary nicknames, permanently attached to the bearer. Were it so, it would remain unexplained why, with minor exceptions, all detached signa end in *-ius*, while almost half the signa proper and most of the agnomina were names of another type. The solution of this problem may perhaps be found in the fact that these new coinages often approximated to adjectives in meaning, e.g. *C III* 3982: *memoriae aeternae Aur(elius) Reginus Alexsius. Cara coniux posuit et amantia*, where, whether or not *amantia* is the wife's name, its adjectival nature is certainly played upon. In *C VIII* 8530: *Antonius sive Sinus sive Oniacus cum omnibus concordius*, the last word may be a proper name as well as an adjective. There are a number of other similar cases.³ This use of the new coinages as adjectives suggests that

¹ *ILAlg I* p. 134 gives a family stemma, in which the father bears the detached signum *Iuventi*, the eldest son likewise *Iuventi*, whereas the second son is addressed as *Herachi*. — *C IX* 1640—41 = *ILS* 6494—95 two brothers bear *Verzobio* (dative) and *Navigi*, respectively. — *ILS* 9093: mother *Simplici*, son *Urani*. — *ILS* 9442: mother *Memphi*, daughter *Eugami*. — *C XIV* 418 = *ILS* 6167: mother *Gaudenti*, daughter *Lampadi*.

² *C V* 2044: husband *Γρηγόρι* wife *Ῥοδέσι*; *V* 5869 = *ILS* 6730: husband *Innocenti*, wife *Encratio* (ablative); *V* 7453: husband *Euphilius*, wife *Simplici*; *XIII* 1880: husband *Gaudentius*, wife *Dulciti* (cf. p. 34); *XIV* 2220: husband *Sof[e]ni*, wife *Exuperi*; *FE* 8969 = *DIEHL* 895: husband *Eustathi*, wife *Amantia*.

³ In the following examples the adjectival character of the names is revealed by the fact that they are placed among other adjectives, *C VIII* 10504: *Iulio Vitaliano fr(a)t(ri) | soror carissima | fecit Viren|tio*; 14489: *Caelestinus | dulcissimus | Narcithius*; 21198: *... iciano filio | dulcissimo Crementio*; *ILT* 283: *parentes | dulcissimo | filio fecerunt Byzacio*, the name of the deceased being given at the beginning; *AE* 1913, 156 (Africa): *P. Magnius | Paulinus | v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) a(nimo) | Caelestius*; *C XIV* 2815 = *ILS* 1669: *Aurelius Alexander prox(imus) ab | epistul(is) Lat(inis) Digitius* — notice the suggestive name. *VI* 10210 we read *T. Fl. Maximino*, the text then continuing vertically *Euvipio (= Euhippio) sumo venatori*. The examples could almost be considered as signa, were it not for the fact that they are in the same case as the regular names and not written detached from the text of the inscription.

detached signa may primarily have been improvised nicknames, similar to epithets.

A number of examples may be adduced in support of this theory. Thus *C VI 27140*, an epitaph set up to a *Telephus* by his parents, terminates in the acclamation *Telephi Dulciti*. This cannot have a meaning other than the usual *Telephi dulcis*, and *Dulcitus* had accordingly been created at the moment of setting up the stone. There are other similar cases. The acclamation *Ἀρωμάτι ταῦτα*, cut on the epitaph of an infant *Secundilla*, who *rapta parentibus reliquit dolorem, ut tan dulcis erat tanquam aromata* (*C XII 874*), was probably written to symbolize her sweet nature; *VI 19611: Aeonigregori*, seems to imply a hope of immortality; *XIII 2073 = ILS 8141: <H>arpagi, tibi terram levem*, written on the epitaph of a boy who died at the age of nine, may symbolize a person snatched away by an untimely death (the name is derived from the Greek verb ἀρπάζω). In some cases the signum seems to serve decorative purposes, being formed from the cognomen of the deceased. A certain *Iul(ius) Kapito* sets up a stone to his son of the same name, and cuts above it: *Caefalio ex[imi]ae laudis i[uve]ni* (*C VIII 20758*). The name is derived from the Greek equivalent of the son's cognomen, *Cephalus*. Other similar cases can be cited.¹ The allusion made to the cognomen may be very subtle: as in *C V 7759*, where a certain *Dionysius lib(ertus)* has the detached signum *Nebridius*, derived from *νεβρίς*, the fawn skin worn by Dionysus. There are also cases in which the signum corresponds to an ethnic. Thus *Cart[ilius] Secun[dus]*, buried in *saltus Aurasius*, has *Aurasi* cut below (*C VIII 2476*). But though this is not the only similar case², one must be cautious in regard to signa derived from geographical terms: it is not possible to consider all *Dalmatii*, *Laodicii*, etc. as natives of these places. A signum could also commemorate an exploit of its bearer. The most unequivocal example is found in a Greek honorary inscription from Asia Minor: a certain Bryonianos Lollianos, who had provided the sanctuary of the Nymphs with a water supply, is saluted as *Κτίσταις*.³ His wife is for the same reason addressed as *Πηγαίη* («nymph») in another honorary inscription (*CIG 4346*).⁴ Again, *Dogmatii* (derived from the Greek *δόγμα*, «a decree of the senate»), cut on the honorary inscription of *C. Caelius Saturninus v(ir) c(larissimus)* (*C VI 1704 = ILS 1214*), may allude to his social position.

¹ *C VIII 15630* and *24050*, *Honori* and *Fidenti*, coined from their bearers' cognomina, *Honoratianus* and *Fidus*.

² *IAlg I 16—17*, *Gilventius*, coined from the name of the city Gilva in Mauretania Caesariensis, the neighbouring province.

³ LANCKORONSKI, NIEMANN, PETERSEN, *Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens I*, p. 185.

⁴ Her signum has been rightly interpreted by PETERSEN, *op. cit.* p. 144: «— weniger ihr ständiger Beiname — — — als ein improvisierter».

In most cases, however, the implications of a particular signum are only guesswork, and the above examples are not meant to give a complete picture of all the possible interpretations of detached signa.

The model for detached signa may have been the acclamations usual in Greek and Latin inscriptions, in particular in epitaphs, for the principle, the saluting of the subject of the inscription, was the same. There is not much difference between the acclamation *ἄλνπε χαῖρε* (e.g. *IG XIV* 1583; 1638) and the one in which the adjective had been replaced by the new form, *ἡλεώς σοι*, *Ἀλνπι* (*IG XIV* 1030). Again, an exhortation common in Greek inscriptions was *γοηγόρει* (e.g. *CIG* 9570 and 9599, Christian); it does not differ in regard to its significance from the corresponding signum, *Gregori* (e.g. *C XI* 863 = *ILS* 6665; *XIII* 2621 etc.); in *C VI* 19611: *Aeoni gregori*, cited above, *gregori* could almost pass as another signum. This origin of the detached signa also explains why most of them were set in the vocative and why almost half of the detached signa found in epitaphs were included in acclamatory phrases (see p. 33). But though the model was Greek, the detached signa first came into use, and were mostly found, in Latin epigraphic material.¹ This was probably due to the fact that the new coinages, which were used as detached signa, originated in the West (see p. 25). The detached signa are an example of the intimate way in which Greek and Latin were interwoven in the West during the Empire. Greek influence is also revealed by the fact that in a number of cases the acclamations and the signa were in Greek, the main text in Latin (e.g. *C V* 7380 = *ILS* 8169; *VI* 21808 = *ILS* 8560; *VIII* 789; *XIII* 1854), but there are cases of the opposite, too (see p. 34).

The theory outlined above has also the advantage of making it possible to explain why women mostly bore their detached signa in the masculine. This peculiarity is not confined to detached signa, but is found in women's signa proper, agnomina and even cognomina, provided they were new forms in *-ius*. The material is tabulated in table 11 below. Because women's cognomina in *-ia* were so very numerous, feminine forms are not registered in the last column.

The masculine predominated among the detached signa and signa proper, whereas the feminine was in the majority among agnomina; the masculine forms were of course only a tiny fraction compared with the vast number of women's cognomina in *-ia*. It is worth special notice that the nominative was extremely rare. Among the supernomina the only case is *C XIII* 2591: *Victoriae L[a]tine que et Simplicius*; they are more numerous among cognomina, e.g. *FE* 8748: *A<l>etio Valentinae*, the monogram found on

¹ For the infrequency of signa in Greek inscriptions, see WILHELM, *EYTYXEI EYTENI*, WS 1902, p. 596 ff.

Table 11. Women's supernomina and cognomina in -i u s

	detached signa		signa proper		agnomina		cogno- mina
	mascul. forms	feminine forms	mascul. forms	feminine forms	mascul. forms	feminine forms	mascul. forms
nominative	—	—	—	—	1	14	10
-i or fem. vocative	46	3	6	1	1	—	—
gen. -ii or ae	1	—	—	2	—	—	—
dative	3	1	—	—	1	2	8
accusative or ablative	1	—	—	—	—	1	1
total	51	4	6	3	3	17	19

the epitaph giving the form *Alethius*. Most examples of the nominative come from the Western provinces or from Christian inscriptions and, with two exceptions, all the names were Greek.¹

Three explanations have been suggested for these masculine forms. MOMMSEN and DIEHL argued that women bore the names in the masculine because they were *nomina sodaliciaria*, and masculine was the gender of the plural club name.² But the argument seems untenable: names referring to both men and women were put in the masculine plural in accordance with a well-known rule of Latin, but when referring to women alone, such names naturally stood in the feminine. One can refer to a similar phenomenon, viz. that if several women and men shared the same nomen, the nomen was put in the masculine plural; there are, however, no examples of women bearing their nomen in the masculine. Further, in most cases in our material in which a presumable *nomen sodaliciarium* is borne by women, the names are put in the feminine (see p. 37 and p. 38, fn. 4; *Pancrati*, it is true, is a woman's signum). KRETSCHMER contends that women had taken their signa from their husbands or fathers with the gender unchanged.³ But in the cases in which women bear their husbands' or fathers' nomina or cognomina as agnomina, the names are always put in the feminine.⁴ Moreover, we have a number of women's

¹ C XIII 2070: *Claudian(a) Dulcitus soror*; 3826: *Ypsichius* — — — *Archontus coniugi carissime*; DIEHL 3539 (Hispania): *Rufo* — *coniugi suo Viventius*; C XI 2894 = DIEHL 2261adn: *Secunda Ama[z]onius*; VI 31950 = DIEHL 279a: *Aurelia Amazonius*; VI 37170: *Chrestina Dorcadus h(onesta) f(emina)*; DIEHL 315B (Rome): *Porfirius c(larissima) f(emina)*; SI 2463 = DIEHL 2713A: *Eutolmius mater*; SICV 178: *Flabia Peristerius*. RS III p. 342: *carissima filia Thalassus*, may be incorrect for *Thalassius* or an example of a similar use of the masculine in names in -us also.

² *Signum*, Hermes 1902, p. 452; RhM 1907, p. 415.

³ *Zu den weiblichen Signa auf -ius*, Glotta 1913, p. 207.

⁴ For examples, see LAMBERTZ *Supernomen*, Glotta 1913, p. 80 f.

detached signa which, as they are different, cannot come from fathers or husbands, but the gender is nonetheless the masculine (see p. 38 f.). Though LAMBERTZ has not worked out his theory with sufficient clarity, I think he is in principle right in giving the phenomenon a linguistic explanation.¹ Because the detached signa were originally vocatives often accompanied by a (vulgar) imperative in *-i* (see the examples on p. 33 and p. 44), women's signa took the same form, for it would not have been in harmony to write, for instance, *eupsychi Amantia* instead of *eupsychi Amanti*. In my opinion, two facts facilitated the use of the masculine. First, because the detached signa were improvised coinages, the use of the masculine was limited to the inscriptions. Further, such forms were not a complete novelty, for many Roman women bore Greek cognomina ending in *-ium* derived from the same stems as the names in *-ius* — e.g. C VI 10588: *Iulia L.l. Hesuchium* or 27248: *Terentia M. l. Palladium* — with all the cases exactly similar to the masculines of the names in *-ius* except the nominative, and the nominative was extremely rare among detached signa. The practice which originated among detached signa also influenced the other categories, and women's signa proper, agnomina and even cognomina could be cut in the masculine, especially if the names appeared in cases other than the nominative. This may explain why the masculine was more usual after *signo* than after *quae et*, for the genitive was naturally used in the first group. The nominative was more usual among cognomina, but girls may have been given a masculine form of the name at birth, as is the case in a well-known literary example.²

§ 3. Cognomina in *-ius* cut detached

But though the majority of detached signa were no doubt nicknames, in numerous honorary inscriptions of the aristocracy, in particular in the fourth century, the name in *-ius* cut detached from the main inscription was not a signum but a regular cognomen. Because honorary inscriptions were usually long, and the multiplication of the names of the aristocrats cumbersome, the best-known cognomen was often cut above the die to show to whom the inscription had actually been dedicated; the cognomen was included among the other names in the text, too. Cognomina in *-ius* were in general use in the fourth century (see p. 70), and were similarly treated. A good example is *Anicius Auchenius Bassus* v.c., from the latter half of the fourth century. In an honorary inscription the name cut

¹ *Supernomen*, Glotta 1913, p. 90 ff.

² The aunt of Ausonius was called *Aemilia Hilarius*, and the poet explains the origin of the name as follows, *Parentalia* VI 3—4: *Aemilia, in cunis Hilari cognomen adepta | quod laeta et pueri comis ad effigiem.*

above the die is *Auchenii* (C VI 1679 = ILS 1262), in another *Bassi* (XIV 2917 = ILS 1263). The cognomen *Auchenius* was in fact hereditary in gens *Anicia* (see RE I col. 2200). Cases of this type have been excluded from the statistics.¹ In other cases a cognomen in *-ius* cut detached does not appear among the other names in the same inscription but is treated as a cognomen in some other. C VIII 25525 *Ceionius Iulianus v.c.*, from the latter half of the fourth century, has *Kamenii* above the die, and this resembles a signum, but we have inscriptions in which the name is written in full, *Alfenius Ceionius Iulianus Kamenius v.c.* (C VI 1675 and AE 1953, 238). The name was hereditary, for his grandfather bore it, too (RE III col. 1859, 58; the grandfather is referred to in a Christian epitaph, Bull 1882, p. 92 = DIEHL 96a: *Caeionius Camenius*). Ammianus refers to him as *Camenius* (28, 1, 27), which was thus his best-known cognomen. There are other similar cases.²

MOMMSEN argued that after the general break-up of the Latin name system, the signum (in his terminology, the *nomen sodaliciarium*) often appeared among the regular names, in part ousting the legitimate cognomen.³ But the interpretation given above seems much simpler. Nevertheless it is likely that cutting the best-known cognomen detached in honorary inscriptions originated as an imitation of the signa. Examples of cognomina cut above the die are few before the fourth century A.D. Moreover, a certain preference was given to cognomina in *-ius*, for even if they were not the best-known, they were often cut detached. *L. Turcius Apronianus v.c.*, prefect of Rome A.D. 363, has *Asterii* detached in C VI 1768—69 = ILS 1229, whereas in two edicts issued by him he refers to himself as *Turcius Apronianus* (VI 1770—71). Ammianus calls him *Apronianus* (23, 1, 4; 3, 3 etc). His brother, *L. Turcius Secundus*, has likewise *Asterii* detached in an honorary inscription (VI 1772 = ILS 1230), but in two inscriptions of *opera publica* he is referred to as *L. Turcius Secundus*, *Aproniani praef. urb. fil.*, *Asterius* (ILS 706 and 729), and in an inscription dedicated by him to his wife he calls himself *L. Turcius Secundus Asterius v.c.* (VI 1773). *Asterius* was thus one of the cognomina of the *Turcii*, but not the best-known. Again, ordinary cognomina, when cut detached, were often furnished with the suffix *-ius* to make them

¹ Other examples, C VI 1736 = ILS 1256: ... *Iulius Festus Hymetius c.v.*, the cognomen *Hymetii* being also cut above the die; XIV 1000, the epitaph of one *Faenia Elpidia*, bears *Ἐλπίδια χαίρε* detached.

² C VI 31961 = ILS 8843, *Betitius Perpetuus v.c.* (latter half of the fourth century) bears *Arzygii* above the die, whereas in VI 1702 = ILS 1251 his name runs *Betitius Perpetuus Arzygius v.c.* — IX 1576 = ILS 1239, *Clodius Celsinus insignis et c.v.*, prefect of Rome A.D. 351, has *Adelfi* cut above, whereas in an epitaph set up by him to his wife he calls himself *Clodius Adelfius* (VI 1712 = SI 19). Ammianus 16, 6, 2 refers to him as *Adelfius*.

³ *Signum*, Hermes 1902, p. 453.

conform with detached signa, e.g. *C VI 1722: Honoratianii*, the name of the person being *Fl. Honoratianus*. Examples are particularly numerous in Tripolitania.¹

In a few cases, a *nomen* could also be cut detached. An example is a fourth century member of the senatorial class, whose full name was *Amnius* (or *Ammius*) *Manius Caesonius Nicomachus Anicius Paulinus* (*C VI 1682 = ILS 1220*²), but who in an honorary inscription has his first *nomen* cut detached, *Amnii iun.*, the text giving only *Anicius Paulinus iun. c.v.* (*C VI 1683 = ILS 1221*). The cutting of the *nomina* detached was due to the example of the detached signa, for *nomina* and signa had a similar ending. For a case of a woman's *nomen* being cut detached, see *SICV 177*.

Even though a detached name in *-ius* appearing in a late honorary inscription is not found as a cognomen in other inscriptions, it is still possible that it was one, the absence of cases depending upon chance. *Q. Flavius Maesius Egnatius Lollianus*, prefect of Rome A.D. 342, has *Mavortii* detached (*ILS 1224abc; 1225*). Ammianus 16, 8, 5 calls him *Mavortius*, Firmicus now *Mavortius*, now *Lollianus* (see *RE XIII* col. 1371, 50). His son bears *Mavorti iun(ioris)* in a similar honorary inscription (*C X 1697 = ILS 1226*). Though we have no examples of inscriptions in which *Mavortius* appears among the regular names, the instances of writers preferring that name and the reference to his son as *Mavorti iun(ioris)* make it likely that the name cut above the die was a hereditary cognomen and not a nickname.

However, all names in *-ius* cut detached in late honorary inscriptions cannot be interpreted as regular cognomina. If *Eusebius*, the signum of Symmachus (see p. 38), really had been the cognomen of so well-known a person, we should have more examples of it than the one found in Rome. The name, like the signum of his father, *Phosphorius* (see p. 38), was very likely a nickname.

§ 4. Detached signa in Christian epigraphic material

A lengthy discussion has been necessary to elucidate the origin and significance of detached signa. The history of the names may be briefly summed up. At the beginning of the third century A.D., the new name-coinages in *-ius* often appeared as nicknames in epitaphs and in dedicatory and honorary inscriptions. These nicknames, being modelled upon the acclamations popular in Greek and Latin inscriptions, were largely improvised.

¹ *IRTr 475: Flavianii*, from his cognomen *Flavianus*; 562—63: *Nilii*, from his cognomen *Nilus*; 565 *Nepotianii* from *Nepotianus*; 571 *[Be]nedictii* from *[Ben]e-di[ctus]*; 574 *Romulii* from *Romulus*; 588 *Quintii* from *Quintus*.

² *RE I* col. 2199,61 has erroneously considered the dative *honori*, with which the inscription begins, as a signum, and gives *Honorius* as the last name of the man.

When the fashion had once been established, names other than nicknames also began to be written detached. A number of the names were *nomina sodaliciaria*, and later on regular cognomina were cut detached in honorary inscriptions.

In the above discussion, no distinction has been made between pagan and Christian material. This is so far justified in that the detached signa found in the Christian inscriptions do not deviate from the general pattern. Their frequency does not show any considerable rise in the Christian material (see table 9, p. 32). On the other hand, detached signa went out of use early. The only dated Christian example is *C X 4724* = DIEHL 97: *Aeterii*, A.D. 367, but the name is a cognomen, *Minucius Aeterius* being given in the text of the inscription. The latest example of all detached signa is a pagan one, *Gregarii v.c.*, dated A.D. 400 or 405 (*C VI 1706*). Detached signa, then, came into use at the beginning of the third and vanished at the beginning of the fourth century A.D. They were of much shorter duration than agnomina (see p. 48).

Detached signa, as these dates suggest, belong to the early stratum of Christian inscriptions, and this is confirmed by the distribution of the material among different name forms. Only nine out of the 28 unfragmentary cases belong to the single name system; the others belong to the *duo* and even *tria nomina* systems (see p. 12 f. for the chronological significance of the name forms). Most of the detached signa accordingly date from the ante-Constantinian period. A relatively early date also explains why, with the possible exception of *Refrigeri vivas* (*SI 4704*, see p. 120), the signa have no special Christian flavour, for a Christian nomenclature was late in appearing (see p. 117).

The signa found in the Christian inscripational material are listed below in alphabetical order. The general brevity of Christian inscriptions makes it sometimes difficult to judge whether or not a name is a signum, e.g. *FE 8974: Iustina. Eustorgi*; here *Eustorgi* is obviously a vocative, which implies a signum. Forms in *-i* could be genitives, too, but the use of the husband's or father's name in the genitive is confined to Greek inscriptions (see p. 5). It is of course possible to argue that both names were vocatives, two persons being meant. Such a use of the vocative is rare, however. I have included all similar cases in the list.

Aeterii, see above

Amantia, *FE 8969* = DIEHL 895

Ἀστέριον, *FE 7166*

Audenti, *C VIII 20162* = DIEHL 746

Caenabi Cons[t]an[t]i, a double signum, *C VI 37231* = DIEHL 1585

... *io dulci Constantius suus*, the wife's signum being fragmentary,

C VI 2651

Cynegi, C XI 2700 = DIEHL 143

Δυσκόλι [*A*]στίρε, FE 7251, a double signum? cf., however, FERRUA, *Epigraphica* 1940, p. 12 f.

Εἰναχίω, C V 8766

Euphroni —

Eufroni, ARM p. 152

Eusebi, FE 6681

Eustathi, FE 8969 = DIEHL 895

Eustorgi, FE 8974

Εὐστόργιος

Εὐστόργις, FE 7203

Eutropi vivas, DIEHL 1592

Florentio, RAC 1929, p. 217

Gregor[i], C VI 2655 = DIEHL 4478

Γρωμά[τι], DIEHL 4037

Hesperī quiesce in pace, RAC 1931, p. 196

Heuresi —

Euresi fid[e]l[i]s maneat dei semper, C IX 1563 = DIEHL 1345

Hilari vivas in deo (Christo) — *Liberi vivas in (Christo)*, a double signum, SI 3547, see p. 34

Leonti Lampadi, a double signum, Bull 1887, p. 20; see p. 34 above

Maurici, SI 602

Paludi dulcis, FE 8877

Pancrati in pace, SI 1380

Paramoni, RAC 1936, p. 215

Refrigeri vivas, SI 4704

Simplici dulcis in aeternum, FE 6769 = DIEHL 896

Σωφρόνι χαῖρε, SI 692

Viventio dulci, RS I 31, 2 = DIEHL 4644adn.

§ 5. *Signa proper and agnomina*

It is likely, as LAMBERTZ contends¹, that the expression *signo* did not in principle differ from *qui et*: both tacked permanent »extra names« on to the regular ones. But because the former expression came into use at the end of the second century A.D.², that is to say, at the same time as the new coinages in *-ius* (see p. 25), it is no wonder that most of the *signa proper*

¹ *Supernomen*, Glotta 1913, p. 86 ff.

² C VI 34001 = ILS 9022, from the latter half of the second century A.D., is the first instance of the expression *signum*.

were new coinages. Being fresh and expressive, they made good personal nicknames. This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that though the percentage of the names in *-ius* is smaller among agnomina, the absolute number is double that of signa proper (table 9, p. 32). The new coinages were even more often added to the original names by the familiar expression *qui et*, but because the majority of agnomina were from a time prior to the coining of the new forms in *-ius*, the percentage did not become as high. In Christian times the difference between signa proper and agnomina had largely been levelled down (see table 9). The late origin of the expression *signo* also explains why, in the Christian material, it had become much more important proportionally than in the pagan one: in the latter, signa proper formed 5,5 % of the total of supernomina, in the former 15,0 %.

The curious fact that women mostly had their signa in the masculine has been explained on p. 41 ff.

The agnomina came into being in the East, in particular in Egypt, where native and Greek names were joined by *ὁ καί* long before our era.¹ During Imperial Times, the agnomen came to the West. The earliest example, C VI 975 I 45: *C. Iulius C.l. Ephesius qui et Mascutius*, is from A.D. 136, the latest, XI 941 = DIEHL 253: *Gundeberga qui et Nonnica sp(ectabilis) f(emina)* from A.D. 570. Agnomina were accordingly in use for a much longer period than detached signa (cf. p. 34 f. and p. 46).

A survey of the agnomina shows that there was in principle no difference between agnomina and double nomina or cognomina. As stated (p. 30), it often depended upon individual choice whether or not a connecting expression like *qui et* was used.

Though caution is advised in interpreting the cases in which one of the names is Latin, the other Greek, there seems to be one case in the Christian inscriptions in which the Latin cognomen was given as a substitute for the Greek one, SI 1773 = DIEHL 3890C: *Tribunicius Bubalus qui et Taurus*, the name *Taurus* being a translation of the Greek cognomen. In the other similar cases in Christian material the Latin cognomen is not a translation of the Greek one and it is not possible to suppose that the new names were meant to serve as substitutes for the original, less respectable cognomina. But if the second of the two cognomina is barbaric, it may have been the original name of the person (cf. similar cases among double cognomina p. 28). There are numerous Christian examples, in particular in Africa.²

¹ LAMBERTZ *Supernomen*, Glotta 1914, p. 99 ff.

² C VIII 9890: *Vipi Serelli* (corrupt) *qui et Maccal*; DIEHL 3945: *L. Maevius Valerianus qui et Moflontius*; AE 1917—18, 66 (Africa): *L. P(ontius?) Martius qui et Pattiso*; 1946, 114 (Africa): *Benenata que et Iambaria Castimonialis*; 1953, 39 (Africa): *Aelius Equitius qui et Calvaro*; RO 117 = DIEHL 3239: *Restituta qui Sarama* . . .; AE 1928, 9 (Rome): *Phryne Tertulla quae Sillaria Africana*; C XI 941, cited above.

A number of the agnomina were certainly nicknames, but it is mostly impossible to tell which agnomina belonged to this category. DIEHL 4485: *Anna Gaudiosa sive Africa*, may suggest African origin, though one might have expected *Afra* or *Africana*. C V 6093 (Christian): ... *Felix qui et Acutus*, may have earned his nickname because of his »acumen», but the fact that *Acutus* is a common enough cognomen seems to contradict the idea.¹ To cite a further example, DIEHL 4481: *Asellus qui et Martinianus*, may have been called *Asellus* in derision or, as is more likely, had received the name at birth, *Asellus* being a frequent cognomen, especially in Christian times.² These examples may suffice to illustrate the difficulties encountered in trying to decide the origin of a particular agnomen. There is, however, a group which can be classed as nicknames: the agnomina of Christian origin, e.g. Bull 1867, p. 31 = DIEHL 2952Cadn: ... *sive Anastasia* or FE 6600b: *Barnab[as] qui et Ase[llus]*. Since I shall resume the subject in another connection (see p. 120), I shall here leave it at that.

In most cases the agnomina seem to have been cognomina or nomina given at birth. Though direct evidence is lacking, the frequency of the cases in which a nomen is borne as an agnomen is significant, nomina being unlikely nicknames.³ Moreover, in all the cases the nomen is borne by a man and accordingly is not acquired by marriage, as women's extra nomina sometimes are.⁴ The cases in which the nomen and the cognomen have been separated by *qui et* are worth special notice, e.g. FE 8598 = DIEHL 2947A: <V>olusius *qui et Leoninu<s>* and C VIII 8640 = DIEHL 3622adn: *Istablicius qui et Donatus*. There are about a dozen similar cases in the pagan material.⁵ Because it is unlikely that the persons originally bore only the nomen, we must assume that both names had been given at birth, the nomen and the cognomen being separated in inscriptions on the analogy of cases in which double cognomina or double nomina had been treated in a similar way. The cases confute the contention of MOMMSEN that agnomina were not legitimate names.⁶

¹ *Thes.* I col. 471, 4.

² *Thes.* II col. 780, 41.

³ The cases are C VIII 23012c = DIEHL 3234Aadn: *T.E.D.* (probably the *tria nomina*) *qui et Evasius*; XI 2535 = DIEHL 3916: *Quaelius Iulianus sive Aeburius*; XII 956 = DIEHL 3540: *Ennius Filterius sive Pompeius*.

⁴ LAMBERTZ *Supernomen*, Glotta 1913 p. 80, with pagan examples.

⁵ E.g. C III 14515: *Laricia quae et Meter*; VIII 18525: *Paulus qui et Ovius*; X 4969: *C. Numisius sive Ratiager*.

⁶ *Signum*, Hermes 1902, p. 451.

VIII. THE TRANSMISSION OF PERSONAL NAMES

§ 1. *The transmission of the nomen*

Because of the prevalence of the cognomen-system, the examples of the transmission of the *nomen* are not many. According to THYLANDER, p. 88 ff., children as a rule inherited paternal nomina, the exceptions being illegitimate children, who bore maternal nomina, and those children who had inherited their grandparents' nomina. Including the cases in which only the father's *nomen* is preserved, our Christian material from Rome may be tabulated thus:

	children	
Nomina of both parents preserved	<i>father's nomen</i>	14
	<i>mother's nomen</i>	5
	<i>different</i>	1
Nomen of father preserved	<i>father's nomen</i>	34
	<i>different</i>	10

The number of cases in which children bear nomina which do not come from their father is noticeable: 16 out of a total of 64. Because in most of the cases in the first group the *nomen* which was different from the father's came from the mother, it is very likely to be the same in the cases in which only the father's *nomen* was preserved.

If we were to accept THYLANDER's interpretation of the significance of maternal nomina, the conclusion would be that one fourth of Christian children were illegitimate. But apart from the fact that our scanty material is not perhaps sufficiently representative, we have examples of legitimate children bearing maternal nomina, e.g. *FE* 9363, where the father is *Plotius Clemens*, and the son *Cassius Clemes*; the son probably had a *nomen* from his mother, but he was his father's son, for he bore his cognomen. A still more incontestable example is *FE* 9342:

Val(erius) Scolasticus — Gavinia . . .

|
Gav(inia) Val(eria) Scolastica

Though double nomina were not uncommon, it was the *nomen* of the father which was put first, for the first *nomen* designated the family connection (see examples on p. 19). In our example, the maternal *nomen* preceded that

of the father, but the daughter had also inherited her father's nomen and bore his cognomen, accordingly being a legitimate child. THYLANDER, p. 90 f., certainly contends that a child who bore his father's cognomen but his mother's nomen had been born in a slave marriage *sine conubio* prior to the manumission of the parents, but I think this is untenable. Slaves living in a married state certainly belonged to the same household and accordingly bore the same nomen on manumission, which was that of their master.

Because the transmission of maternal nomina to legitimate children was a fact, THYLANDER's explanation must be rejected. A number of cases may admit of his interpretation, but some other cause must be sought for the majority of them. It is likely, considering the general confusion of the Latin name system during the Later Empire, that the strict rules regulating the inheritance of nomina had broken down, and maternal nomina were passed on to children quite as freely as maternal cognomina (see below). With due allowances for the scantiness of our material, it may be argued that this was fairly common in Christian times.

In a number of cases in which only the mother's nomen is recorded, it is borne by children, too. But despite the commonness of the transmission of maternal nomina, one should be cautious in evaluating cases of this type, for it is possible that the father shared the same nomen. This is no wonder, considering the popularity of a few nomina during the Later Empire (see p. 16). We may adduce e.g. *SI* 5254, where *Aurelius* is the nomen of the father, mother and son. Accordingly a case like *SI* 3564, where mother and son bear the nomen *Iulius*, is not an incontestable example of the transmission of maternal nomina. Even in cases in which mother and children bear some uncommon nomen, e.g. *Ilicus* (*SI* 1301 = DIEHL 4129), a name otherwise unknown, and *Pol<l>ia* (*SICV* 133), a nomen not found in other Christian inscriptions, the possibility of paternal transmission should not be excluded, for there are cases in which husbands and wives share less common nomina, e.g. *SI* 405 = DIEHL 4127E, *Rupilius*, a nomen not found elsewhere in our material, borne by father, mother and daughter; *SI* 3672 = DIEHL 4488, the quite as rare *Modius*, borne by the parents and their son; Bull 1885, p. 78 = DIEHL 4644, the nomen *Lucretius*, found nine times in the Christian material of Rome, shared by father, mother and son. In these cases the husband and wife had probably been manumitted or granted Roman citizenship by the same person.¹

¹ THYLANDER, p. 84 ff.

§ 2. *The transmission of the cognomen*

Except for the hereditary cognomina of the nobility, there were never any fixed rules about the transmission of the cognomen, for the cognomen was an individual name and could be chosen arbitrarily. Nevertheless, the cognomina of parents and children often present striking similarities. If transmitted, parental cognomina were most often borne unchanged by children (see the examples on p. 50). The confusion caused by the similarity of father's and son's names was sometimes avoided by tacking the words *senior* and *iunior* to the names, e.g. SI 4365: *Maximus pater Maximo iuniori*.¹ One must also consider as «unchanged» those cases of transmission in which a woman's name is the feminine equivalent of a man's name, e.g. SI 434 = DIEHL 2990E, where the father is *Felix*, and the daughter *Felicitas*; SI 1885: the mother is *Νεικουμήδία*, the son *Νεικουμήδης*; SI 460: the mother is *Ειρήνη*, the son *Ειρηνέος*. A connection through suffixes was also common; e.g. SI 2390 = DIEHL 2698adn: the father is *Salvius*, the son *Salvianus*; an abbreviated form was less common with children, but was sometimes found, e.g. SI 606 = DIEHL 2709: the father is *Maximianus*, the daughter *Maximina*; NBull 1909, p. 214 = DIEHL 4503: the father is *Iustianus*, the son *Iustus*.

The transmission of Greek cognomina, unless similar to the categories above, could show purely Greek features. In Greek, personal names were «compound» or «short». In the transmission of Greek personal names, one element of a compound name could be transmitted, the other being changed; again, a short name could etymologically recall a compound one.² The Greek cognomina found in the Christian inscriptions of Rome often observed similar rules. In Bull 1886, p. 56 = DIEHL 3574A, where the father is *Timocrates*, the son *Timotheus*, and RS III p. 273 = DIEHL 3024, where the mother is *Filomella*, the daughter *Filomenes*, the first element of a compound name is transmitted. In Bull 1886, p. 130, where the father is *Chrysomallus*, the daughter *Chrysis*; Bull 1892, p. 105 = DIEHL 4516, where the father is *Xrusanthus*, the daughter *Xrysis*, and Bull 1892 p. 58, where the father is *Ὁρῆσιμος*, the son *Ὁρ(η)σιφόρος*, compound and short names etymologically belong together. A similar case is once found in Latin cognomina, FE 8458 = DIEHL 4515, where the father is *Primus*, the daughter *Primigenia*, but because Latin cognomina were almost always «short», such cases are rare.

There were also other, less obvious modes of transmission. In some cases children's cognomina recalled the parental ones by their meaning,

¹ A similar case SI 5504: [T]heodotus senio[r] and [The]odotus iunior.

² RUNES, *Die Vererbung der Personennamen im Griechischen*, WS 1924/25 p. 172.

e.g. *SI* 3564 = *DIEHL* 4523, where the mother is *Felicia*, the son *Furtunatus*, and *SI* 4398, where the mother is *Fortunata*, the daughter *Felicitas*. A similar case is in *Bull* 1886, p. 73 = *DIEHL* 4517, where the father *Auspicalis* and the daughter *A<u>gurina* have names suggesting a religious institution of the Romans. In some cases, a Greek cognomen had been substituted for the Latin one of the parents, e.g. *SI* 57 = *DIEHL* 4145Cadn, where the father is *Felicissimus*, the son *Euty chius*. Cognomina could occasionally be connected through assonance, as in *NBull* 1902, p. 131 = *DIEHL* 3890, where the father *Amiantus* (from Greek *ἀμάρτος*, »pure») and the daughter *Amias* (from Greek *ἀμίας*, »tunny») bear cognomina beginning with *Amia-*. A case of this type is scarcely a coincidence.

I shall finally give the statistics of the transmission of cognomina in the Christian inscriptions of Rome. In the transmission through »etymology» there are included, in addition to the connection through suffixes, the Greek modes of transmission discussed and also the cases in which a nomen used as a cognomen recalled a cognate cognomen (see p. 20 and p. 22).

Table 12. *The transmission of cognomina in the Christian inscriptions of Rome*

	frequency of transmission		modes of transmission			
	total	transmitted	total	unchanged	etymology	meaning, assonance
Cognomina of both parents preserved	191	60 or 31 %	father's 42 mother's 18	36 14	5 3	1 1
Cognomen of father preserved	202	58 or 28,5 %		41	15	2
Cognomen of mother preserved	143	15 or 10,5 %		9	5	1

In the cases in which the cognomina of both parents were preserved, the father's cognomen was transmitted more than twice as often as the mother's; in a similar way, if the cognomen of one parent only had been preserved, the father's cognomen showed a frequency of transmission almost three times that of the mother's. The results may be summed up by saying that parental cognomina were transmitted to children in almost a third of the cases, the father's cognomen being passed on more than twice so often as the mother's. In the great majority of cases, the cognomina were transmitted unchanged.

THYLANDER, p. 115 ff., also discussed the cases in which children's cognomina were different from the parental ones and contended that they had very often been taken over from the g r a n d p a r e n t s. The general brevity of Christian epitaphs unfortunately makes it impossible to say how often this was the case in Christian times, but among the few examples of grandparents' names recorded there are two in which transmission may be observed, *SI* 729 = *DIEHL* 1131, where *Leontius*, and *FE* 6791, where *Leo* is borne by grandfather and grandson alike.

The above discussion has shown that in Christian times the transmission of cognomina within a family was fairly common, perhaps more common than can be established on the basis of epigraphic material. If we had complete family stemmata spanning several generations, it would certainly be found that the same cognomina were borne in some form or other by a large number of the members of a family. The transmission of cognomina was more common in Latin than in Greek, where it is estimated at 4,7 %.¹ The strong family sense of the Latin race may, as has been suggested², account for the popularity of the transmission of the cognomen.

¹ RUNES, *op.cit.* p. 176, fn. 1.

² THYLANDER p. 121.

ON THE ORIGIN AND FORMATION OF COGNOMINA IN CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS

I. LATIN, GREEK AND BARBARIC COGNOMINA

In Imperial Times cognomina of Greek origin were an important element in Roman nomenclature, and far-reaching conclusions about race mixture, with its implications in political, cultural and religious fields, have been drawn from this.¹ Since the present study is concerned with strictly onomastic problems, we may leave race mixture aside. It suffices for us to establish the proportions of Latin, Greek and barbaric elements in the pagan and Christian inscriptional material of Rome and Carthage, and to work out the causes of the possible changes.

Assessing the Latin and foreign elements in nomenclature is not as easy as it may seem. Though in most cases Latin and Greek cognomina are easily distinguished — there can be no doubt that *Firmus*, for instance, is a Latin and *Symphorus* a Greek cognomen —, what about cognomina derived from Greek words which had become old-established loan-words in Latin, e.g. *Hilarus*? There is vacillation over this in studies on Greek cognomina in Latin, for the name is considered Latin by some, Greek by others.² I think J. MAROUZEAU's definition of a loan-word, in a strict sense, as «un mot perçu comme étranger»³, can also be accepted in an onomastic study. A cognomen derived from an early and popular Greek loan-word has been classed as Latin. Thus *Hilarus*, as well as e.g. *Leo*, *Saturus* and *Siricus*, though derived from words not native in Latin⁴, have been included in the Latin group. But unequivocal Greek forms of such names have been counted as Greek cognomina. Thus *Leontius*, derived from the Greek stem *λεοντ-*, must be considered as in the Greek group. On the other hand, all cognomina derived from Greek personal names with Latin suffixes, e.g. *Eutyech-ianus* and *Olymp-inus*, have been counted as Greek.

¹ FRANK, *Race mixture in the Roman Empire*, AHR 1915/16, p. 689 ff.; cf. BARROW, *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, p. 208 ff.

² THYLANDER p. 124.

³ REL 1954, p. 347.

⁴ For the etymology of the words, see WALDE-HOFMANN.

Similar difficulties are encountered in classifying cognomina derived from geographical names. Because most of the names were ethnics, it could be argued that they had been borne by persons of »foreign» extraction and were accordingly felt as »foreign» names. But the matter is not as simple as that, for *Atticus*, for instance, was a very frequent adjective in Latin and was also used in senses other than strictly geographical ones, sometimes implying »civilized».¹ I have therefore included *Atticus* in the Latin group. On the other hand, *Asiaticus* and *Macedo*, for instance, have been counted as Greek cognomina, the corresponding adjectives and ethnics being rarer in Latin. As to the cognomina derived from barbaric geographical names, I have put names which belong to the Greek world and which owe their present shape to Greek influence in the Greek group, e.g. *Assyrius*, *Ninus* and *Syrus*², and in the Latin group, e.g. *Dalmatius*, *Gaetulicus* and *Maurus*.³ But e.g. *Ganga* (SI 1632 = DIEHL 4148A) has been included in the barbaric group, because it is derived from a rare geographical term which had largely preserved its original form.

The greatest difficulties are encountered in assessing the barbaric element. Though it is mostly easy to tell whether a cognomen is of an origin other than Latin or Greek, it is often impossible to decide the particular provenance of a barbaric name. Dictionaries of barbaric personal names often disagree upon the origin of a name.⁴ Moreover, the language in Christian inscriptions was not as correct as in the pagan ones, and when engraving strange barbaric names, stone-cutters must often have corrupted them beyond recognition. I have therefore given up all attempts at classifying barbaric cognomina according to their provenance.

In the tables below, the number of persons bearing cognomina is higher than that recorded in tables 3—5, p. 9 f. This is due to the fact that in drawing up the former tables, a number of inscriptions had to be disregarded, for only inscriptions preserving the full names in an unfragmentary shape could be used in the statistics illustrating the development of the Latin name system. In the present section no such considerations matter, for the only thing important here is the origin of a cognomen, often to be concluded from a few fragmentary letters; thus, for instance, fragments beginning with *Eu-* belong to the large group of Greek personal names

¹ *Thes II* col. 1133, 76.

² See *RE II* col. 1751, 34; *XVII* col. 635; *IVA* col. 1549 ff.

³ *RE XIV* col. 2349, 22.

⁴ Some examples. *SI* 4293 = DIEHL 1736adn, we read the name *Addo*. This name is considered Celtic by HOLDER, as Semitic by WUTHNOW, *Die semitischen Menschennamen*. *Amannus* (*SI* 6478) is Celtic according to HOLDER and Phrygian according to SUNDWALL, *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier*. More similar examples in THYLANDER, p. 163.

composed of *Eὖ*- and some other word, while fragments like *Res*- and *Cres*- suggest the popular Latin cognomina *Restitutus* and *Crescens*.

Finally, all heterogeneous double cognomina and all cases in which a cognomen seems to have been corrupted beyond recognition have been excluded.¹

Table 13. *Latin, Greek and barbaric cognomina in the Latin inscriptions of Rome*

	C VI: 4, 2—3, epitaphs					Christian				
	men	women	fragment	total	%	men	women	fragment	total	%
Latin	1.304	986	62	2.352	41,5 %	3.313	2.840	414	6.567	66,5 %
Greek	1.728	1.364	93	3.185	56,0 %	1.517	1.223	184	2.924	30,0 %
barbaric				143	2,5 %				361	3,5 %
total	5.680					9.852				

Table 14. *Latin, Greek and barbaric cognomina in the Greek inscriptions of Rome*

	IG XIV, Roman epitaphs					Christian				
	men	women	fragment	total	%	men	women	fragment	total	%
Latin	130	108	—	238	21,0 %	165	172	19	356	31,0 %
Greek	582	272	—	854	76,5 %	404	297	53	754	65,5 %
barbaric				27	2,5 %				38	3,5 %
total	1.119					1.148				

The differences in the frequency of Latin and Greek cognomina between Latin and Greek inscriptions were noticeable, the percentage of Latin cognomina being almost twice as high in the Latin inscriptions, both pagan and Christian. The explanation given for the larger percentage of the single name form in Greek epigraphic material also applies here (see p. 10): a considerable number of the persons recorded in Greek epitaphs must have been *peregrini* with their native place in the Greek East. As to the Christian inscriptions, Greek epitaphs are in general from an earlier period than the Latin ones, and the use of Greek cognomina was more

¹ E.g. *SI* 1538 = *DIEHL* 3903B: *Baumassa*, a name not found elsewhere; *DIEHL* suggests *Brumasia* or *Thaumasia*. *SI* 3147 = *DIEHL* 3054Aadn, *Ipitias*, for which *DIEHL* suggests *Hyptias*, an unknown name.

common before the *pax* than after it (see p. 60); moreover, *peregrini* were also numerous in the Christian material.

The Carthaginian material may be tabulated thus:

Table 15. *Latin, Greek and barbaric cognomina in the pagan and Christian inscriptions of Carthage*

	pagan					Christian				
	men	women	frag- ment	total	%	men	women	frag- ment	total	%
Latin	776	410	39	1.225	77 %	457	365	384	1.206	80 %
Greek	208	118	8	334	21 %	87	50	57	194	13 %
bar- baric				29	2 %				105	7 %
total	1.588					1.505				

The tables show that in the pagan material of Rome Greek cognomina were in a slight majority in the Latin, and in a large majority in the Greek inscriptions, while in the Christian material Latin cognomina outnumbered the Greek ones by more than two to one in the Latin inscriptions, their percentage rising in the Greek inscriptions, too, in comparison with the pagan material. In Carthage, Greek cognomina were in a minority even in pagan times, and their proportion further diminished in the Christian material. Both in Rome and Carthage, the proportion of barbaric cognomina was higher in the Christian than in the pagan material.

There were, then, significant changes in the frequencies of the various elements of nomenclature between pagan and Christian inscriptions. The rise in the frequency of barbaric cognomina was solely due to the popularity of a few »Christian» names of Hebrew origin, in particular *Iohannes* and *Paschasius* (see pp. 95; 109). In Carthage, *Paschasius* was one of the most popular cognomina, and this explains the high proportion of barbaric cognomina in that city.

The significance of Greek cognomina in the Latin world has been much debated. The discussion was started by FRANK (see p. 55, fn. 1), who argued that Greek cognomina implied Oriental extraction, being largely borne by slaves and freedmen from the East or by their progeny. FRANK's thesis was subsequently contested by GORDON, who claimed that Greek names had also been given by Greek slave-dealers to slaves of Western origin¹, and by WESTERMANN, who contended that the name was of no value in determining the nationality of a slave.² THYLANDER, p. 149 ff.,

¹ *The nationality of slaves under the Early Roman Empire*, JRS 1924, 104 f.

² *RE suppl.* VI col. 1003.

however, has taken up FRANK's thesis by arguing that slaves from the East in general retained their original Greek names, while slaves from countries where neither Greek nor Latin was spoken usually had their original names replaced by Latin ones.

I think it is the theory of FRANK and THYLANDER which best explains the facts tabulated above. A considerable proportion of the persons recorded in the pagan inscriptions of Carthage were slaves and freedmen (see table 2, p. 6), but Greek cognomina were here much less frequent than in Rome. This can only have been due to the fact that Carthaginian slaves, having mostly been drawn from native African stocks, had undergone a change of name, whereas most Roman slaves, coming from the Greek-speaking East, had retained their old Greek names or had been given new Greek names by the Greek slave-dealers of the Eastern Mediterranean.

The great fall in the frequency of Greek cognomina in Christian inscriptions, above all in Rome, may also be accounted for by the vicissitudes of the slave-trade. FRANK and THYLANDER tabulate some facts to show that people who bore Greek cognomina tended to give their children Latin cognomina in preference to Greek ones.¹ The number of Greek cognomina would therefore have fallen from one generation to another unless the steady flow of fresh supplies from the East had made good the losses. But if the supply of fresh Greek cognomina from the East fell off and the tendency to prefer Latin cognomina continued, the inevitable consequence must have been a fall in the frequency of Greek cognomina. This is what happened during the Later Empire because of the general decline of slavery (see p. 8).

This replacement of Greek cognomina by the Latin ones, however, had been going on for a long time, for there is evidence that Greek cognomina were no longer in disrepute. Whereas in the pagan material the tendency to get rid of Greek cognomina is clear, the available data from Christian inscriptions do not imply any great aversion to Greek cognomina. I have examined all the cases in the Christian epigraphic material of Rome in which the names of father and son are recorded in order to work out the statistics concerning the replacement of Greek cognomina by Latin ones from one generation to another; barbaric cognomina have been included in the Greek group:

Father		Latin cognomen		Greek cognomen		
S on	Latin cognomen		Greek cognomen		Greek cognomen	
	101		26			
						51
						34

¹ *Race mixture in the Roman Empire*, AHR 1915/16 p. 693; THYLANDER p. 124 f.

The figures suggest that Latin cognomina were still slightly preferred to Greek ones: if fathers have Latin cognomina, sons bear Latin and Greek cognomina four to one, whereas if fathers have Greek cognomina, sons bear Greek and Latin cognomina 1,5 to one. These figures are considerably lower than FRANK's; in a similar calculation based on the pagan epitaphs of *C VI*, the corresponding proportions were 8: 1 and 1: 1. It is probable that when slavery declined, Greek and barbaric cognomina were no longer felt to be an indication of the socially inferior status of the bearer, and consequently there was no strong desire to get rid of them.

It is also probable that Christianity contributed to the new respectability of Greek and barbaric cognomina, for many of the Saints revered by the Church bore »foreign» names, and a number of popular cognomina were derived from Greek or Hebrew words embodying Christian beliefs and ideas. A Semitic name in pagan epitaphs argues Semitic extraction, and this is also the case in the Christian material when a person bears names like *Malcus* (RO 1198 = DIEHL 623), *Sabas* (SI 3764 = DIEHL 2949A), *Samso* (SI 1747 = DIEHL 3798B) etc. But the most common Semitic cognomina in our material are *Iohannes*, *Maria*, *Paschasius*, *Sabbatius* and *Susanna*, and these names were popular among the Christians because of their Christian associations. It is the same in regard to the Greek cognomina *Agape*, *Anastasius*, *Cyriacus*, *Petrus*. The extent to which the Christian nomenclature influenced the frequency of Greek and barbaric cognomina may be seen from the following statistical table, which gives the frequencies of Latin and Greek or barbaric cognomina in the dated inscriptions of Rome:

Table 16. *Latin and Greek or barbaric cognomina in the dated inscriptions of Rome*

	<i>ante pacem</i>	A.D. 313-410	A.D. 410-500	A.D. 500-600
Latin	178 52,0 %	463 69,5 %	145 63,0 %	91 57,0 %
Greek or barb.	165 48,0 %	202 30,5 %	86 37,0 %	68 43,0 %
total	343	665	231	159

Though the figures should be used with caution — whereas in the earliest period the epitaphs were mostly set up by the low and the humble, during the last centuries few but the wealthy could afford an epitaph — nevertheless they reveal that the frequency of Greek and barbaric cognomina reached the low-water mark during the century from 313—410, whereas their popularity began to rise during the fifth century and almost reached the pre-Constantinian level during the sixth. While other causes, too, may account for the rise — the Eastern influence should be taken into account

at a time when Rome was governed as part of the Eastern Empire — the main cause was the Christian nomenclature, for I have estimated that during the fifth century more than a fifth, and during the sixth almost half of the Greek and barbaric cognomina betrayed Christian influence.

II. THE USE OF SUFFIXES IN LATE LATIN NOMENCLATURE

A comparison of the indexes of personal names in Christian inscriptions and *CI* will suffice to prove the early origin of a large number of the Latin cognomina frequent in Christian epigraphy. Thus such popular cognomina as e.g. *Atticus*, *Bassus*, *Celer*, *Faustus*, *Felix*, *Florus*, *Fuscus*, *Gallus*, *Hilarus*, *Liberalis*, *Marcellus*, *Maximus*, *Montanus*, *Primus*, *Priscus*, *Rufus*, *Sabinus*, *Saturninus*, *Secundus*, *Silvanus*, *Tertius*, *Urbanus* go back to republican times; *Victor* again came into use during the Early Empire (*RE* *VIIIA* col. 2057). The cognomina derived from present and past participles, which were frequent among the humble during the Empire and formed a large contingent of Latin cognomina in Christian inscriptions (cf. p. 112), were likewise found during the republic, for *CI* records e.g. *Auctus*, *Crescens*, *Fortunatus*, *Optatus*. Many Greek cognomina were even older. *Alexander* is from the 5th century B.C., *Dionysius* from the second, *Eutyches* from the 5th, *Irene* and *Irenaeus* from the first and second, *Theodorus* from the 7th, *Theodosius* from the 5th, *Theodotus* from the 4th centuries B.C. (all dates according to BECHTEL).

But though most of the Latin and Greek cognomina found in Christian epigraphic material were of early origin, not a few of them had undergone considerable alterations, the original forms having often been replaced by suffixed ones. I shall give a few examples. One of the most common Latin cognomina was *Rufus*. But though *Rufus* was the most common form in pagan inscriptions (in *CVI*: 4, 2—3 there are 25 examples of the simple form and 11 of its derivatives), in *SI-FE* there is only one instance of the simple form (5320, fragmentary), suffixed forms being found in all the other cases, the most common of them being *Rufinus* (51 instances) and *Rufinianus* (six). Again, in our material from *CVI*, *Maximus* provides 22 examples and its derivatives six, the corresponding figures for *SI-FE* being 72 and 54. Because the Carthaginian material is to a large extent fragmentary, it is difficult to tell how common suffixed cognomina were there. They must, however, have been of noticeable frequency, for a study of the *index cognominum* of *CVIII* proves the popularity of suffixed forms in Africa. Moreover, African nomenclature had some peculiarities in the use of suffixes. Thus in Rome, even in Christian times, the attachment of suffixes to cognomina obtained from past participles was generally avoided,

whereas in Africa this was rather common; cf. e.g. the derivatives of *Donatus*, *Optatus* and *Restitutus*. Again, a few suffixes were more common in Africa than elsewhere and had probably come into use there, *-icus* and *-osus*.

There were no specific cognomen-suffixes in Latin; on the contrary, those attached to cognomina were also used in appellatives. On the other hand, not all Latin suffixes had been used to coin cognomina. With simple or combined and extended suffixes, a large number of new forms could be obtained from old cognomina. Thus e.g. *Secundus* has the following derivatives: *Secundianus*, *Secundinus* together with the further derivatives *Secundinia* and *Secundinianus*, *Secundio*, *Secundius*, *Secundosa*, and two diminutives, *Secundula* and *Secundilla*. A name like *Ursus* has still more derivatives: *Ursianus*, *Ursinus*, *Ursio*, three diminutives, *Ursella*, *Ursilla*, *Ursulus*, and a multitude of derivatives formed with extended or combined suffixes: *Ursacius*, *Ursatius*, *Ursenia*, *Ursicius*, *Ursicinus*, *Ursiculus*, *Ursilianus*, *Ursulianus*, *Ursinianus*, *Ursinula*.

Most of the suffixes found in Christian inscriptions had been in use in cognomen-coining since republican times, but *-ius-ia* and *-osus-osa* were not so employed until the Later Empire. Again, all of the suffixes were not of equal importance, the most frequent being *-anus* (*-ianus*), *-inus* and *-ius*. Most of the suffixes implied »belonging to», *-anus* (*-ianus*), *-ensis*, *-icus*, *-inus*, *-ius*.¹ It is probable, however, that this function of the suffixes had worn off with time. They were used to obtain new varieties of old cognomina without materially altering their meaning.

The rise in the frequency of the suffixed forms was largely due to the fact that when individual cognomina came into use, the cognomina of the children were often derived from the parental ones with some suffix (cf. p. 52). Though there are examples of parents having the extended, and children the simpler form of a cognomen, the reverse was more often the case. This in the long run swelled the number of forms extended by suffixes. Another factor may have been the desire to renew, with the aid of suffixes, old cognomina which had become hackneyed through long use.²

The simple suffixes found in Christian inscriptions are:

-anus-na, after vowels, *-ianus-na*, after consonants, the latter having developed from the former by false analogy.³ The suffix *-anus* is mostly found in cognomina derived from *nomena*. The number of such

¹ The suffix *-alis*, frequent in theophoric cognomina, is not found as an independent suffix in Christian inscriptions, for *Apollinaris* (passim), *Cerialis* (passim), *Martialis* (passim), *Mercurialis* (FE 7707—08), *Saturnalis* (SI 1748 = DIEHL 4447) were derived from corresponding adjectives. *Mercurilis* SI 2340 = DIEHL 4234 is probably a mistake for *-ialis*; if not, an example of a cognomen formed with the suffix *-ilis*.

² For the use of suffixes in renewing common words, cf. ERNOUT, *Aspects du vocabulaire latin*, p. 190.

³ SCHNORR, *Das lateinische suffix -anus*, ALL 1884, p. 183.

derivatives is very great, the most frequent being *Aelianus*, *Aemilianus*, *Apronianus*, *Aurelianus*, *Cassianus*, *Claudianus*, *Domitianus*, *Gentianus*, *Iulianus* (second in regard to frequency), *Marcianus* (the most common of these cognomina), *Quinctilianus*, *Titianus*, *Valerianus*. It was also attached to cognomina, provided they had a vowel ending: *Mercuriana* (passim), *Venerianus* (SI 2175 etc.); in Greek cognomina, *Cyprianus* (passim), *Demetrianus* (SI 3607 = DIEHL 4272A).¹

-ianus is usually attached to Latin cognomina, the most usual being *Crescentianus*, *Felicianus*, *Maximianus*, *Primianus*, *Priscianus*, *Sabinianus*, *Severianus*, *Victorianus*, *Vitalianus*; it was, however, rather common in Greek cognomina too, e.g. *Diocleti[anus]* (SI 2805), *Eucharistianus* (e.g. SI 1984 = DIEHL 4758), *Eutythianus* (passim), *[He]raclianus* (SI 2270), *Soterianus* (SI 1235 = DIEHL 4029A), *Sinboletianus* = *Symboletianus* (SI 1462 = DIEHL 3503A), *Tryfonianus* (SI 3794 = DIEHL 2826adn).

?-ensis is rare as an independent suffix of cognomina. The only relevant example seems to be SI 5407: *Decoresis* = *Decorensis*, derived from the cognomen *Decor*. But it is also possible that the name had been obtained from the geographical term *Decorianensis* (RE IV col. 2289, 18), the form in the passage cited being a haplology.

-icus-ca was in limited use in Rome, the only name of some frequency being *Victoricus*. It was sometimes used in cognomina derived from names of animals: *Asellicus-ca* (passim), *Leporice* (SI 2311), *Lupicus* (FE 8900), *Sorica* (NBull 1900 p. 168 = DIEHL 2122), and in some other names: *Massuricus* (FE 8752 = DIEHL 4073A), *Natalica* (SI 3675), *Opi-lionica* (SI 5405), *Spenicus* (FE 6674 = DIEHL 4069B). In Africa, however, this suffix was of greater importance. The limited and fragmentary material from Christian Carthage shows a number of such forms: *Maioricus-ca* (C VIII 13770; ILT 1147), *Merulicus* (ILT 1147), *Monica* (C VIII 25132; ILT 1147), *Natalicus-ca* (C VIII 13545; 25262; ILT 1147), *Sorica* (C VIII 25286), *Triumphalica* (C VIII 13976), *Victoricus* (C VIII 25300; ILT 1147), *Vitatica* (C VIII 1094, unless corrupt for *Vitalica*). Such derivatives were naturally much more numerous throughout African inscriptions.² There was a corresponding suffix -ιχος in Greek, e.g. *Hermicus*

¹ Cases like *Hilaranus* (SI 1261 = DIEHL 3154) and *Severanus-na* (FE 6913; 7807) are probably not old forms derived with -anus from consonantal stems. They are rather vulgar forms, the disappearance of -i- in -ri- being a common phenomenon, see SVENNUNG, *Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre* p. 17 ff.

² In the African inscriptions, the following Latin cognomina in -icus may be found (the names without numbers have been registered in the index of C VIII): *Bonica* (barb. in *Thes.* II col. 2072, but cf. *Bonus*, *Bonosus*), *Cassica* (ILT 201), *Felicus-ca*, *Iullica*, *Lauticus* (ILT 1613), *Maioricus-ca*, *Mappalicus-ca*, *Martialicus*, *Massuricus*, *Matronica*, *Messoricus*, *Minorica*, *Monnica*, *Mundicus*, *Mustelica*, *Musticus-ca*, *Natalicus-ca*, *Nonnica*, *Nuptialica*, *Paulica*, *Pistoricus*, *Primulica*, *Pusinnicus-ca*, *Salvicus*, *Soricus-ca*, *Spenica*, *Terticus*, *Triumphalica*, *Urbanica*, *Victoricus-ca*, *Vitalicus-ca*.

(SICV 126), *Irenicus* (Bull 1894 p. 142 = DIEHL 2706). The similarity of the suffixes was naturally due to the fact that both Latin and Greek had inherited it from the parent language¹.

-inus-na as a suffix of cognomina has been discussed by LEUMANN, who contends that the cognomina formed with this suffix were in origin patronymic but that during the Empire they possessed a diminutive force, being the masculine equivalents of names in *-illa*.² A similar idea on the diminutive connotation of *-inus-ina* is held by OLCOTT.³ Yet it is doubtful whether the names in *-inus* or *-ina* can be considered diminutives. Diminutives were a peculiarity of women's nomenclature, but the names in *-ina* do not appear to have been in any particular favour among them. Again, LEUMANN's idea of the names in *-inus* as the masculine equivalents of those in *-illa* is invalidated by the fact that the forms in *-inus* were much more numerous than those in *-illa*. Altogether it is likely that *-inus-na*, though retaining its connotation of »belonging to» in names such as *Saturninus*, *Iovinus*, *Domninus* (see p. 105), did not alter the meaning of the original name in the other cases.

The suffix *-inus-na* is found in a large number of Latin cognomina, the most frequent being *Albinus*, *Augurinus*, *Augustinus*, *Capitolina*, *Celerinus*, *Constantinus*, *Crescentinus*, *Crispinus*, *Faustinus*, *Firminus*, *Florentinus*, *Gemellinus*, *Iustinus*, *Marcellinus*, *Maximinus*, *Rufinus*, *Secundinus*, *Septiminus*, *Severinus*, *Silvinus*, *Valentinus*, *Victorinus*, *Vitalinus*. It was relatively rarer than *-ianus* in Greek cognomina, e.g. *Castorinus* (NBull 1912 p. 183 = DIEHL 2827), *Cyprin(a)* (SI 1 = DIEHL 2999B), *Chrestinus* (passim), *Olympina* (SI 1708 = DIEHL 2799Aadn), *Pardinus* (NBull 1898 p. 172 = DIEHL 3394), *Πλατωεῖνα* (FE 7244), *Tryferina* (SI 2984 = DIEHL 2988).

Though *-anus* was the regular suffix in cognomina derived from *nomen in a*, *-inus* was occasionally used instead, thus *L. Allius Allinus* (SI 469 = DIEHL 4070, the cognomen being naturally derived from the father's nomen), *Antoninus* (passim), *Iulinus* (SI 6454). In a similar way, it was occasionally attached to a cognomen ending in *-ius*, thus *Ianuarinus* (passim).

-io had originated from the suffix *-o-onis* by false analogy⁴, but had acquired a diminutive or hypocoristic connotation.⁵ The influence of Greek diminutives in *-ων*, regularly transcribed in Latin as *-io*⁶, may have con-

¹ BUCK, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, p. 343.

² *Lateinische Cognomina auf -inus und -illa*, *Romanica Helvetica* 1943, p. 166.

³ *Studies in the word formation of the Latin inscriptions*, p. 134.

⁴ STOLZ-SCHMALZ p. 239.

⁵ MEYER, *Das lateinische Suffix -o-onis*, *ALL* 1888, p. 230.

⁶ STOLZ-SCHMALZ p. 262.

tributed to the generalization of this connotation in cognomina. This old suffix seems to have been on the decline during the Later Empire, for whereas there are 36 examples among the 2352 Latin cognomina in our material from *C VI*, among the 4890 Latin cognomina in *SI-FE* the corresponding figure is c. 50, the only forms with some frequency being *Felicio* and *Vitalio*.

- *i u s - i a*, besides being new as a suffix of cognomina, had some other peculiarities. Whereas the other suffixes were in general tacked on to popular old cognomina, *Maximus*, *Rufus*, *Secundus*, *Severus* etc., this suffix mostly appeared in names which had not been very frequent, and it was also much used to form new cognomina from words not before used as cognomina. The tendency to *renew* the cognomina was here even more pronounced than in regard to other suffixes. Because of the importance of this suffix, which more than anything else was a distinctive feature of Christian nomenclature, it will be discussed separately in the following chapter.

- *o - o n i s*, important during republican times, in particular in cognomina derived from names of parts of the body and implying an abnormal largeness¹, had dropped out of use, there being in Christian epigraphic material only fossilized remnants of ancient nomenclature like *Capito* (*SI* 1286 = *DIEHL* 4067), *Cicero* (*SI* 3190 = *DIEHL* 627), *Fronto* (*SI* 1417 = *DIEHL* 4667).

- *o s u s - s a*. According to MOMMSEN, the cognomina in *-osus-sa* originated in, and were largely limited to Western Africa; they began to appear in the first half of the second century A.D., and they were derived from other personal names, being primarily hypocoristic in meaning and borne by women.² The material to be gathered from the Christian inscriptions suggests a few corrections. Cognomina of that type had had time to become known in other parts of the Roman Empire. In the Christian material from Carthage cognomina in *-osus* were borne by 57 persons, or 4 % of the total of cognomina, the corresponding figures for Rome being 110 persons, or 1 %. The names still predominated in Africa, but not to such a degree as earlier. A survey of the material also reveals that there were significant differences in the frequencies of particular names between Rome and Carthage. *Veneriosus-sa* was very common in Rome (29 cases), but is not known in Carthage and is rare in Africa in general (three cases in *C VIII*). *Exitiosus-sa* and *Gloriosus-sa*, much in favour in Africa and Carthage (in Carthage, 14 and 11 cases, respectively),

¹ MEYER *op. cit.* p. 223 f.; ZIMMERMANN, *Die lateinischen Personennamen auf -o, -onis*, *ALL* 1904, p. 225 ff.; 415 ff.; 475 ff. has listed all the cognomina in *-o -onis* or *-io* found in Latin. A large number of the names included in his list are Greek, however.

² *Cognomina Africana*, *Ephemeris epigraphica* IV p. 520 ff.

were unknown or rare in Rome (*Gloriosus* is found once, *Exitiosus* not a single time). This suggests that the cognomina in *-osus* found in Rome were not due to any direct African influence, that is to say, the persons bearing them were not of African origin.

Further, though cognomina derived from adjectives in *-osus*, e.g. *Fructuosus* from *fructuosus*, had been in use long before *-osus* was used as an independent suffix of cognomina¹, similar names became much more frequent during the Later Empire. In my material from Rome and Carthage, the following cognomina in *-osus* were obtained from corresponding adjectives: *Calumniosus* (SI 1471 and 1955), *Charitosa* (passim), *Exitiosus-sa* (see above), *Fructuosus-sa* (Rome, passim), *Generosus-sa* (passim), *Gloriosus-sa* (FE 6960, Carthage, passim), *Gratiosus-sa* (passim), *Gulosus-sa* (Carthage, passim), *Labrosa* (SI 6237), *Lucrosa* (SI 4520 and 5388), *[Lum]i-nosus* (SI 3617), *Mellosus* (Carthage, passim), *Pretios . . . = Pretios . . .* (C VIII 13854), *Studiosus* (SI 904 and 2870). Cognomina of the type of *Fructuosus* had served as a model for those coined with *-osus* as an independent suffix, but when the latter came into vogue, the former also acquired greater popularity.

Most of the cognomina having *-osus* as an independent suffix had been coined from older cognomina, *Candidosa* (C VIII 13541—42), *Catosus* (ILT 1147), *Clarosus* (FE 8501), *Libosu<s>* (SI 4776) from **Libon-sus* < *Libo* through haplology, *Mandrosa* (SI 4985), *Nonnosa* (RO 474), *Primosus-sa* (NBull 1918 p. 80; ARM p. 149), *Secundosa* (C VIII 14213), *Siricosa* (SI 1767), *Veneriosus-sa* (Rome, passim). But there are cases in which a cognomen in *-osus* had been coined from a common word, *Atterbosa* = *Adverbiosa*, probably from *adverbium* (FE 6527), *Agoniosus* from *agonia* (C VIII 25194), *Bonosus* from *bonus*² (passim), *Φοίδωσα* from *joedus*, the adjective (NBull 1914 p. 69), *Gaudiosus-sa* from *gaudium* (passim), *Micosus* (FE 6825d) probably from *mica* (unless from **Miconosus* < *Micon* through haplology). *Tucrosus* (ILT 1147), unless corrupt or incorrectly transcribed, may be of barbaric origin.

Because the cognomina in *-osus* were late coinages, many of them were much more frequent in the Christian material than in the pagan one, and a few were exclusively Christian. It is therefore fallacious to argue, as is sometimes done, that such names had been coined or appropriated by the Christians to embody Christian ideas. In another connection I have tried to refute the idea that names like *Calumniosus*, *Exitiosus*, *Iniu-*

¹ *Imperiosus*, a cognomen of *Manlii Capitolini* during republican times (RE XIV col. 1165 ff.). Pompeian graffiti furnish the following examples: *Copiosus* (C IV 989), *Fructuosa* (5444), *Gloriosus* (2012), *Officiosus* (5214), ?*Studiosus* (875, unless a common word).

² *Bonus* is attested as a cognomen in late inscriptions only, *Thes II* col. 2127.

riosus were Christian »names of humility». These, and other similar names, such as *Stercorius* and *Proiectus*, though used in a pejorative sense and unknown or rare in pagan documents, were completely in the ancient tradition of »uncomplimentary nicknames». ¹ Similarly, one must refute the idea that *Gaudiosus* (and *Gaudentius*) was used by the Christians to express »Christian joy». ² *Gaudiosus* is certainly only found in Christian documents and *Gaudentius* is much more frequent there (see p. 79), but this was due to both being late coinages. The names suggested exactly the same idea as, for instance, the popular cognomen *Hilarus*, and were probably coined as new and expressive substitutes for this hackneyed old cognomen.

Diminutives. The old Latin diminutive suffix *-ulus-la* (or *-olus-la* after vowels) in words of the 1st and 2nd declension, and *-culus-la* in words of the 3rd, 4th and 5th declension, had suffered a decline because of the competition of the forms *-ellus-la* and *-illus-la*; the latter forms had originated through phonological changes in stems in *ro/a*, *no/a*, *lo/a*, and had subsequently become independent. ³ *-culus-la* had almost dropped out of use as a suffix of cognomina in Christian inscriptions. Disregarding old appellatives used as cognomina, such as *Lepusc<u>lus* (RO 530 = DIEHL 2792, cf. p. 28), there is not a single instance of a cognomen formed with this suffix. *-ulus-la* is a little more productive, but is mostly found in old appellatives, *Acutula* (FE 6524 = DIEHL 689), *Domnula* (FE 8849), *Formicula* (passim), *Regulus* (FE 8692) etc. As an independent suffix, it is found e.g. in *Cicadula* (FE 8213b), *Fortunula* (passim), *Marculus* (SI 3644), *Quintula* (FE 9079), *Ursula* (SI 3888). This suffix could be attached to words which normally should have had *-culus*, thus *Adbentulus* (SI 1275 = DIEHL 2799A). The forms *-olus-la* were used after vowels: *Fabiola* (SI 4175 = DIEHL 165), *Ianuariola* (SI 2608 = DIEHL 2997Fadn), *Quintiola* (SI 4666), *Silviola* (RO 554 = DIEHL 3727B). But there is an exception, *Marciulus* (SI 820 = DIEHL 3512Badn), which, however, may be due to the Vulgar change *o>u*. ⁴

In the majority of cases, the diminutive suffix was *-illus-la*. The other variant, *-ellus-la*, appears only in old appellatives like *Agnellus*, *Catellus*, *Gemellus*, or in old cognomina like *Marcellus*. The generalization of the form *-illus-la* may have been facilitated by the influence of Greek diminutives in *-ιλλα*. ⁵ The suffix *-illus-la* was mostly attached to Latin

¹ On the problem of »names of humility» in early Christian epigraphy, Arctos N.S. III (1962) p. 45—53.

² LE BLANT, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule I* p. 155.

³ VÄÄNÄNEN, p. 100 f.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 27.

⁵ LEUMANN, *Lateinische Cognomina auf -inus und -illa*, *Romanica Helvetica* 1943, p. 171 f.

cognomina, *Decimilla* (SI 3145 = DIEHL 3645B), *Firmilla* (SI 1610 = DIEHL 4268A), *Iuvenil[la]* (SI 3015 = DIEHL 2719), *Lupercilla* (passim), *Maximilla* (passim), *Primillus-la* (passim), *Priscilla* (passim), *Quintilla* (SI 3738), *Rufillus* (ARM p. 406 = DIEHL 3257A), *Ursilla* (SI 1795 = DIEHL 4220C) etc. In some cases it was attached to a *nomen*, *Lucillus-la* (passim), *Domitilla* (SI 4465), *Petronilla* (SI 943).

Latin diminutive suffixes were in general rarer in cognomina of Greek or barbaric origin. Examples from Greek cognomina are *Agapitilla* (SI 4858 = DIEHL 3532), *Leucadiola* (RO 177 = DIEHL 4689), *Petrula* (RAC 1927 p. 204), *Θεοτίλλα* (SI 4733), *[T]ryphonilla* (Bull 1894 p. 17 = DIEHL 4528), *Stefanilla* (NBull 1907 p. 96 = DIEHL 136). A few of the forms in *-illa* may be of Greek origin, however. *Saburtilla* (FE 8559), *Sapertill[a]* (8281b) and *Suppestilla* (7487) seem to be barbaric.¹

In addition to the simple suffixes, there are a number of combined ones. These had originated through new suffixes being added to cognomina which already had a suffix, e.g. *Faustus* — *Faustinus* — *Faustinianus*. Such combined suffixes could subsequently become independent and be attached directly to simple forms. In the Christian inscriptions, the following combined suffixes are worth notice:

- *anilla*, from *-anus* and the diminutive suffix *-illa*, e.g. *Flavianill[a]* (SI 2741), *Marcianilla* (Bull 1881 p. 89 = DIEHL 3522A), *Mucianill<a>* (FE 8785 = DIEHL 2726adn).

- *icianus*, in *Lupecianus* (SI 2781 = DIEHL 2610adn), combined from *-icus* and *-ianus*.

- *icinus*, from *-icus* and *-inus*, found in a few cognomina derived from names of animals, *Lupicinus* (SI 1640 = DIEHL 445), *Ursicinus* (passim).

- *illianus-na*, usually *-ilianus* through the weakening of the gemination², combined from *-illus* and *-ianus*, *Bassilianus* (SI 3130 = DIEHL 1258B), *Maximili[ana]* (FE 7449), *Priscilianus* (ARM p. 284 = DIEHL 2545; SI 4026), *Probilianus* (RS III 25,4 = DIEHL 2157). NIEDERMANN has contended that these forms had originated from *-inianus* through dissimilation; he explains the examples in *-illianus* as phonetic or graphic variations.³ But I think that it is rather the reverse that is true. The forms in *-illianus* are to be found in inscriptions in which correct language is to be expected,

¹ The diminutive suffix *-itta*, in our material *Gallita* (FE 8237), is usually considered to be a suffix borrowed from Etruscan (see STOLZ-SCHMALZ, p. 205 and the literature cited there). It is strange that MOMMSEN's excellent explanation of this suffix has escaped the notice of the grammarians. In his *Cognomina Africana*, Eph. epigr. IV p. 523, MOMMSEN argued that *Gallitta*, *Iulitta*, *Pollitta*, *Livittita* had originated from *-illa* through dissimilation, the preceding consonants being *-l-* or *-ll-*.

² For this phenomenon of Vulgar Latin, see VÄÄNÄNEN, p. 58.

³ *Notes sur le cognomen latin*, Mélanges Ernout p. 271 f.

that is to say, in the inscriptions of the nobility in pre-Constantinian times. Thus in *C III* 1118 (idem *IX* 338, 1, 29) and *IX* 1160 = *ILS* 6485 members of the nobility bear the name *Maximillianus*. The first of the bearers is from the beginning of the third century A.D. (*IX* 338, 1, 29 is from A.D. 223). On the other hand, all the bearers of the form *Maximilianus* mentioned in *RE Suppl. V* col. 661 f. are from the fourth century A.D. or later times. The forms in *-l-* are also to be found in Christian inscriptions, which are late and often incorrect in language. This suggests that the forms in *-ll-* were the original ones and that accordingly they cannot have come into being through dissimilation from *-inianus*. It is to be noticed that e.g. *Maximilla* and *Priscilla* were very common names (see the index in *ILS*). Because the inheritance of maternal cognomina by sons was frequent (see p. 52), and because the suffix *-ianus* was often attached to cognomina taken over from parents, the origin of *Maximillianus*, *Priscillianus* and other similar names is clear. There is a number of examples to bear this out, e.g. *C III* 3998, where the mother is *Atticilla*, the son *Atticillianus*; *III* 14360, where the mother is *Lucilla*, the son *Lucil[?]lianus* (the supplement is certain); *X* 2771, where the mother is *Nepotilla*, the son *Nepotillianus*.

-ilio, from *-illus* and *-io* through a similar weakening of gemination, found only in *Maurilio* (*ARM* p. 288 = *DIEHL* 3212A) and *Taurilio* (*SICV* 224).

-inianus -na, from *-inus* and *-ianus*, was rather common; the cognomina most often found formed with this suffix are *Faustinianus*, *Martinianus*, *Paulinianus*, *Rufinianus*, *Valentinianus*, *Victorinianus*.

For combined suffixes with *-ius* as the second element, see p. 77.

Genuine Greek suffixes were exceptional in Latin cognomina. There are sporadic examples, such as *Auguris* (*SI* 2434) and *Lauris* (*SICV* 202), both formed with the Greek feminine suffix *-ις*. *Gentianis* (*SI* 2844 = *DIEHL* 2820) was probably formed with the same suffix from *Gentianus*; cf. a similar case in *C VI* 22145: *Marcia Montanis*.¹ *C VI* 37122 = *SI* 1930 = *DIEHL* 162: *Cassia Pisonis c(larissima) f(emina)* is interpreted as *Cassia Pisonis (uxor)* by all the editors and by *GROSSI GONDI Trattato*, p. 74 fn. 1. But because such a use of the husband's name was unknown in late inscriptions — significantly enough, the above is the only example given by *GROSSI GONDI* — *Pisonis* is more probably to be considered a cognomen obtained from *Piso* with the Greek suffix discussed. *SICV* 268: *Iugati*, dative, suggests a nominative *Iugas*, probably formed with the Greek suffix *-ας* from the noun *iugum* or from *Iuga*, an epithet of Venus.

¹ ZIMMERMANN, *Die griechische Femininenendung -is bei lateinischen Personennamen*, *ALL* 1902, p. 585, gives other examples of Latin cognomina formed with this Greek suffix.

III. THE NEW COGNOMINA IN -IUS-IA

§ 1. *The frequency of the cognomina in -ius-ia in pagan and Christian inscriptions*

The new cognomina in *-ius-ia* have earlier been encountered as nicknames in the categories of double cognomina and supernomina. As pointed out (p. 25), the suffix appearing in these names was the old Latin gentile suffix. In deciding which cognomina ending in *-ius-ia* can be considered as new coinages, one must, however, apply stricter rules than in regard to supernomina. A few supernomina in *-ius* were old Greek personal names (*Heraclius*, *Leontius*, *Olympius*, *Pelagius*, see p. 34), and must be excluded here. Again, in Greek, women's names were early on derived from abstracts ending in *-ia*, popular names of that type being e.g. *Euodia* and *Eutychia*.¹ Numerous cognomina in *-ius* had been derived from cognate adjectives used as men's names, e.g. *Euodius* from *Euodus* and *Euty chius* from *Euty ches*, but the corresponding women's names, because they had long been in use, cannot be included in the category of new coinages. It is not always easy, however, to know which Greek abstracts had been in early use as women's names. The dictionaries of Greek personal names do not record *Eugenia* and *Eusebia*, for instance, before the Later Empire, but in Latin inscriptions these names were much more common than the masculine forms *Eugenius* and *Eusebius*, and were obviously in use since the Early Empire.² Names derived from Greek abstracts, being in general favoured by women of the lower orders³, had a good chance of becoming popular in the West because of the large-scale influx and manumission of slaves. All Greek abstracts in *-ia* had not, however, been appropriated as early women's names; e.g. there is no record of *Eudoxia* before the Later Empire and it can accordingly be considered the feminine of the new coinage *Eudoxius*. Some other Greek words in *-ia* had likewise been in early use as women's names, the corresponding masculines being new formations. *Macedonius* was a new formation from *Macedo*, while *Macedonia* was used as a women's name before our era (BECHTEL, p. 551). *Basilus* was likewise a new formation from *Basileus*, whereas *Basilia* was an old women's name (BECHTEL, p. 523). Similar cases are fewer in the Latin group. Though there were a number of Latin abstracts or divine and geographical names in *-ia* corresponding to participles and adjectives from which new cognomina in

¹ BECHTEL, *Die attischen Frauennamen*, p. 129 ff.

² In C VI *Eugenius* is found four and *Eugenia* 13 times, *Eusebius* five and *Eusebia* nine times. Moreover, name forms like 11329: *Octavia C.I. Eusebia* argue a relatively early date.

³ BECHTEL, *Die attischen Frauennamen*, p. 140.

-ius were derived, e.g. *constantia* to *constans* and *Constantius*, *Florentia* to *florens* and *Florentius*, the only case in which a word of that origin had been used as an early women's name is *Concordia*, derived from the corresponding divine name.¹

Even after all these deductions, the new coinages in -ius were a distinctive feature of early Christian nomenclature. Whereas the new cognomina were rare in the pagan material of Rome and Carthage — in the Roman material, 16 cases or 0,3 %, in the Carthaginian material ten cases or 0,6 % — the frequencies were vastly greater in the Christian material, as is revealed by the following tables:

Table 17. *The new cognomina in -ius-ia in the Christian inscriptions of Rome*

	men	women	fragm.	total	%
Latin	647	381	82	1.110	63,5 %
Greek	396	142	21	559	32,0 %
Hebrew	40	26	10	76	4,5 %
total	1.083	549	113	1.745	

Table 18. *The new cognomina in -ius-ia in the Christian inscriptions of Carthage*

	men	women	fragm.	total	%
Latin	63	37	43	143	67,0 %
Greek	27	6	7	40	18,0 %
Hebrew	11	6	16	33	15,0 %
total	101	49	66	216	

The fact that men bearing new cognomina in -ius considerably outnumber women, in particular in the Greek group, was due to the exclusion of a few women's names from the statistics (see p. 70). The Hebrew cognomina of the new type are represented by *Paschasius* and *Sabbatius*. Because the former was very popular in Carthage (see p. 106), the percentage of Hebrew cognomina became very high there.

Because in the Christian material of Rome 11.000 persons had a cognomen, in that of Carthage 1.505, the percentage of the new cognomina in -ius was 16 % in Rome and 14 % in Carthage. The frequency of the new

¹ *Thes. Onom. II* col. 558, 58.

cognomina, however, was considerably lower before the *pax*: out of the 343 cognomina belonging to the first period of Christian Rome (see p. 60) only 13 or 3,5 % were new coinages.

Though it has been maintained that it was the meaning of the new formations which accounts for their popularity in the Christian inscriptions¹, it is unlikely to be so, most of these cognomina having been derived from older names or else having a meaning similar to ancient Greek and Latin cognomina. I have earlier (p. 67) disposed of *Gaudentius*, a name often put down as »Christian». There are actually few coinages in *-ius-ia* which can be argued to be »Christian». *Anastasius*, *Paschasius*, *Sabbatius* and probably *Innocentius* are derived from words which had special Christian meanings or implications, whereas the immense popularity of *Laurentius* was due to quite other factors than the meaning suggested by the name (see p. 99). Purely onomastic factors suffice to account for the spread of the new formations in Christian times. The main factor was the preference for the suffixed forms during the Later Empire. The popularity of the new formations may at first have been impeded by the fact that while the nomen was still an indispensable part of the Latin name, the cognomen in *-ius-ia*, especially if used as a single name, always ran the risk of being confused with another element of nomenclature. After the almost total disappearance of the nomen, the last obstacles to the spread of the formations were removed. It is significant that the final disappearance of the nomen and the victory of the new formations were simultaneous, both occurring in the fourth century A.D. The large-scale use of nomina as cognomina may also have furthered the spread of the new coinages in *-ius-ia*.

§ 2. *The origin of the new cognomina in -ius-ia*

It is in general held that the supernomina in *-ius-ia* were the primary, and the cognomina the secondary phenomenon: the cognomina were not only later in appearing, but they were first used as double cognomina or as single names, only later replacing regular cognomina.² This theory is, however, invalidated by a number of facts.

First, available chronological data prove that the cognomina in *-ius-ia* came into use if not prior to, at least contemporary with the corresponding supernomina. The earliest dated example of a cognomen in *-ius* which I have found is *T. Iuni(us) Laurenti(us)*, A.D. 205 (C VI 1056 iv 93), the earliest dated supernomen being *Romulius*, A.D. 202 (see p. 34).

¹ DIEHL *Signum*, RhM 1907, p. 417.

² SCHULZE, *Graeca Latina* p. 5; MOMMSEN *Signum*, Hermes 1902 p. 453 f.; DIEHL *Signum*, RhM 1907 p. 408; the same theory is implicit in LAMBERTZ *Supernomen*, Glotta 1913 p. 87.

There is a number of other undoubted cognomina in *-ius* from the beginning of the third century A.D.¹ In all the cases the names in *-ius* are genuine cognomina, preceded by a praenomen and a nomen.

Again, a large number of cognomina in *-ius-ia* have not been instanced as *supernomina*. In our material from the Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage there are 303 new cognomina in *-ius-ia* (see the list on p. 79), but only 97, or a third, of them have been found as supernomina or club names in the Latin inscriptions and *IG XIV*. It can of course be argued that since the preservation of epigraphic material depends upon chance, a large number of supernomina must have been lost. But it is doubtful whether this argument carries weight, for a corresponding number of cognomina in *-ius* must also have been lost.

Other arguments to refute the current theory of the origin of the new cognomina in *-ius-ia* spring from a comparison of the frequencies of cognomina and supernomina in *-ius*. Table 19 (next page) gives the frequencies of the 17 most popular cognomina in *-ius* in the pagan epigraphic material (see bibliography, sources III), which, on the whole, represents an earlier period than the Christian material and where the original use of the new cognomina can accordingly be examined. The cognomina are classified according to the *name forms*, and the frequencies of each name as double cognomina and supernomina are given in other columns.

The table shows that even in the pagan material the frequency of cognomina in *-ius* greatly surpassed that of the corresponding double cognomina and supernomina, the proportion being about 3.5:1. There was also a considerable lack of correlation between the frequencies of a new coinage as a cognomen and as a supernomen. *Bonifatius*, *Crescentius* and *Stercorius* were not found as double cognomina or supernomina, and the most frequent cognomen, *Vincentius*, not as often as might have been expected. Conversely, the most popular double cognomen and supernomen in *-ius-ia*, the Greek *Eusebius*, is not among the most popular new cognomina. Again, in regard to the *name system*, the new cognomina observed the same pattern as ordinary cognomina. Deducting the fragmentary cases, there are 250 pagans bearing a cognomen of the new type. Out of them 142, or 56 %, bear a nomen. Most pagan examples must date from the third century A.D., a minority from later times. By the third century, the Latin name system had begun to break up, and the nomen was then considerably less frequent than in the ordinary pagan material,

¹ *C VI 1058 iii 118: C. Ligurius Argentius; 1057 ii 80: L. Grescentius Eugenius; 1058 ii 59: Q. Umbric(ius) Nemestius* are from A.D. 210; *T. Florius Florentius (C XIII 11787)* is from the same year, and *L. Aurelius Simplicius* and *P. Bellicius Vincentius (III D XCV 22; 27)* from A.D. 254.

Table 19. *The most frequent new cognomina in -ius-ia in the pagan inscriptions*

	cognomen					double cog- nomen	supernomen			
	total	fragm.	tria nomina	duo nomina	single		plur.	detach- ed	signa proper	agnom.
<i>Amantius-ia</i>	12	2	1	4	5	—	—	1	1	—
<i>Asterius-ia</i>	8	—	—	4	4	1	—	2	1	2
<i>Basilius</i> ¹	14	4	2	2	6	2	—	—	—	—
<i>Bonifatius-ia</i>	16	2	1	8	5	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Concordius</i> ¹	15	3	2	6	4	1	—	—	1	—
<i>Constantius-ia</i>	28	4	1	13	10	1	3	2	—	2
<i>Crescentius-ia</i>	22	1	—	14	7	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Eugenius</i> ¹	9	2	1	4	2	—	1	1	—	—
<i>Eusebius</i> ¹	12	2	2	3	5	3	3	6	1	2
<i>Eutychius</i> ¹	14	—	1	7	6	—	1	—	—	—
<i>Exuperan- tius-ia</i>	8	4	—	2	2	1	—	1	—	—
<i>Florentius-ia</i>	27	3	3	14	7	1	1	1	2	1
<i>Gaudentius-ia</i>	14	1	—	4	9	2	2	4	—	—
<i>Gregorius-ia</i>	9	4	—	3	2	4	—	5	—	—
<i>Simplicius-ia</i>	22	6	6	4	6	4	2	2	1	2
<i>Stercorius-ia</i>	15	—	1	8	6	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Vincentius-ia</i>	43	—	3	18	22	1	—	1	—	4
total	288	38	24	118	108	21	13	26	7	13

which is largely from the two first centuries A.D. The percentage of the nomen — 56 % — among the new cognomina must accordingly fairly well correspond to that for other cognomina in the same period.

The new cognomina also observed the same pattern of transmission as other cognomina: many of the cognomina were the suffixed forms of parental cognomina or had been taken over unchanged (cf. p. 52); *C XIII* 11787: *T. Florius Florentius* bears a cognomen obviously derived from his father's nomen²; *XI* 5772, where the father is called *Aur(elius) Florinus*, the daughter *Aur(elia) Florentia*³; *C V* 6205 = *DIEHL* 4557, where mother and daughter are *Constantia*.⁴ If the names had been supernomina, they could not have been derived from parental cognomina or nomina.

¹ Only the masculine form is registered here for reasons given on p. 70.

² A similar case *C XIII* 1945 = *ILS* 7591, where the son of a certain *Constantinius Aequalis* is called *Constantinius Constantius*.

³ Notice the names of the brothers in *C VI* 38952: *Iulii Florentius et Flosculus*.

⁴ Cf. *C V* 7584: mother *Eusebia*, son *Eusebius*; *FE* 7569: father [*Ex*]uperantiu<s> daughter *Exuperantia*. The examples could be multiplied.

All these facts — the chronology, the majority of the new cognomina not being found as supernomina, the lack of correlation between the frequencies of particular new coinages as cognomina and supernomina, the ordinary pattern of the name system and of the transmission observed by these cognomina — strongly suggest that the new cognomina in *-ius-ia* could not have originated as supernomina. On the contrary, they were genuine cognomina from the very beginning. This of course does not make it impossible that a number of them had first been used as supernomina.

To sum up the discussion on the new coinages in *-ius-ia*: after the gentile suffix had been freed for other uses towards the end of the second century A.D., it was exploited as a suffix of cognomina. Names of that type, being new and expressive and often approximating to adjectives in meaning, were also much used as nicknames, either more or less permanent (double cognomina, agnomina and signa proper) or temporary (detached signa).

§ 3. *The new cognomina from a linguistic point of view*

Attention has been called above (p. 65) to the fact that the suffix *-ius-ia* was in general tacked on to older cognomina which were not among the most frequent, or put to use to derive new cognomina from common words not before used as personal names. This tendency is most obvious in the Latin group, but the Greek cognomina showed similar features. If we disregard whether or not the common words had been used as older cognomina, the derivation of the Latin cognomina in *-ius* may be tabulated thus:

Table 20. *The derivation of the Latin cognomina in -ius -ia in the Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage*

I R o m e							
	parti- ciples ¹	adjec- tives	nouns	verbs	com- pounds	names ²	total
names	37	30	51	5	2	18	143
persons	509	156	196	17	66	166	1.110
persons %	45,0 %	15,0 %	17,5 %	1,5 %	6,0 %	15,0 %	
I I C a r t h a g e							
names	13	10	10	2	2	4	41
persons	43	18	12	23	39	8	143
persons %	30,0 %	12,5 %	8,5 %	16,0 %	27,5 %	5,5 %	

¹ Among »participles» are classed words like *constans* and *decens*, which could be considered adjectives as well.

² In this category are included Latin cognomina not coinciding with common words, e.g. *Caesar*, and geographical and mythological names.

The compound names were three: *Bonifatius*, very frequent, *Fatibonia* and *Bonemontius*, one example of each (see p. 82). *Bonifatius* is of African origin, and it is claimed to be a translation of some native Punic name of »good omen». ¹ The participles were almost invariably present ones. Only *Probatius* and, presumably, *Reiecticia* and *Reposius* were derived from past participles.

Though *-ius* was normally a denominative suffix, cases like *Studius* and *Refrigerius*, which could be considered to have been derived from *studere* and *refrigerare* as well as from the corresponding nouns *studium* and *refrigerium*, make it seem *deverbativum*. Hence it was turned to account to form names from verbal stems: *Cresconius*, *Exuperius*, etc. (see list, p. 82). There are similar instances in the Greek group, e.g. *Gregorius* from *γρηγορεῖν*, *Hyperechius* from *ὑπερεχεῖν*.

Despite the limited number of examples from Carthage, the differences between Rome and Carthage are too noticeable to be accidental. In Rome, the high percentage of names derived from proper names was solely due to the popularity of *Laurentius*. Conversely, the high percentage of compound names in Carthage was due to the popularity of *Bonifatius*, the frequency of names derived from verbal stems to *Cresconius*, a type of name favoured in Africa (in *C VIII* *Crescentius* has 29, *Cresconius* 22 instances).

Technically the names in *-ius-ia* were formed by tacking the suffix to the stem of the original word or name. There are exceptions, however. A few of the names are derived from corresponding adjectives not before used as personal names, e.g. *Patricius* from *patricius* and *Polychronius* from *πολυχρόνιος*. In a number of cases the suffix is extended, e.g. the name *Nicentius* must be derived from the Greek cognomen *Nice*, but the suffix is extended in *-entius*, probably by analogy with *Vincentius*, with which the Greek name agrees in meaning. Again, *Auricius* is derived from *Aura* or *aurum*, but the suffix is augmented by »c». The consonants forming the extended suffixes, and the names derived with them, are tabulated in table 21 (next page).

Most of the cases are formations *ex analogia*. Thus the suffixes with *-nt-* were formed on the analogy of names derived from present participles: *Constantius*, *Vincentius*, those with *-c-* on the analogy of names like *Salacius*, *Simplicius*, those with *-n-* on the analogy of *Eugenius*, *Leonius* etc., those

¹ See MOWAT *L'élément*, RA 1869 I p. 240 f. On the other hand, the fact that most pagan examples of *Bonifatius* are women (six pagan men and ten women bear this name, all of them Africans) and that many of the names were preceded by nomina, which argues a relatively early date, suggests that there may have been an abstract *bonifatia* not preserved in literary sources, which had been first used as a woman's name, the masculine derivative being secondary.

Table 21. The extended suffixes in -ius -ia in the Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage

-nt-	-c-	-ill- diminut.	-n-	-s-	-t-
<i>Aur-entia</i>	<i>Aur-icius</i>	<i>Fulgent-</i>	<i>Cresc-onius</i>	<i>Brum-asius</i>	<i>Dulc-itus</i>
<i>Auxx>-entia</i> ¹	<i>Laur-icius</i>	<i>illia</i>	<i>Splend-onius</i>	<i>Com-asius</i>	<i>Marc-etius</i>
<i>Barb-entius</i>	<i>Prob-icius</i>		<i>Urs-enia</i>	<i>Gel-asius</i>	
<i>Hercul-</i>	<i>Procl-ocia</i>			<i>Maur-isius</i>	
<i>entius</i>	<i>Reiect-icia</i>			<i>Maxim-asia</i>	
<i>Iuven-antius</i>	<i>Sc<h>ol-</i>			<i>Pasch-asius</i>	
<i>Maur-entia</i>	<i>acius</i>			<i>Quint-asius</i>	
<i>Max-entius</i>	<i>T<h>ars-</i>			<i>Rip-asius</i>	
<i>Nic-entius</i>	<i>icius</i>				
<i>Ror-entia</i>	<i>Urs-acius</i>				
<i>Sex>er-</i>					
<i>antia</i>					

with -s- on the analogy of *Anastasius*, *Telesius* etc., and those with -t- on the analogy of *Mellitius*, *Syncretius* etc. A few of the cases are not analogical formations but combinations of suffixes. Thus -illia in *Fulgentillia* is a suffix combined from the diminutive suffix and -ia. In some of the instances of the extended suffix -icius, one might also consider the possibility of a suffix combined from -icus and -ius. Such a case seems to be *Sapricius*, for PREISIGKE records Σαπρός and Σαπριζός from papyri.² There are a few other names, not included in the table, in which the suffix -ius is attached to cognomina previously furnished with other suffixes: *Crescentinius*, *Glycinnius*, *Primenius*, *Telesphorianus*, *Victorinia*. The name *Romuliesia* seems to have been formed from *Romuliensis*, a by-form of the more usual *Romulensis*, the correct form accordingly being *Romuliensia*.

In a few cases, the original stem is abbreviated. The clearest example is *Maxentius*. The name can only be derived from *Maximus*, the suffix being -entius. This derivation is corroborated by the fact that the etymological connection was often observed in the transmission of the name, e.g. the father of the Emperor *Maxentius* was *Maximianus* (RE XIV col. 2419, 23). Another example is *Reposius* (SI 2378), corrected by DIEHL 3904B to *Repostus*. But the original name seems certain when another example has been found (C VIII 7932). There was also a Latin poet called *Reposianus* (RE IA col. 611), with a name derived from the same stem.

¹ DIEHL, *Signum* RhM 1907, p. 409 includes *Auxentius* in the Latin group, but this is unlikely, the derivation of names from perfect stems (*augeo aux-*) being unknown. In Greek, there were a number of personal names derived from αὐξή (see PAPE-BENSELER), and the new form may have been coined on the analogy of the Latin *Augentius*.

² DIEHL, *Signum*, RhM 1907, p. 396, erroneously considered *Sapricius* as a barbaric name.

This stem may have been the abbreviated supine of the verb *reponere*. The name *Carthagius* is also an example of an abbreviated stem, for the regular form should have been **Carthaginius*.

Some forms are only apparently abbreviated or extended, the irregularities being due to Vulgar forms. Thus *Artemius*, from *Artemis*, and *Tychenia*, from *Tyche*, should have run **Artemidius* and **Tychia*.¹ But in Latin *Artemis* is often declined as a stem in *-m* (*Thes. II* col. 681) and *Tyche* as a stem in *-n*,² and the new forms were derived from these stems.

§ 4. *A list of the new cognomina in -ius found in the Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage*

The material has been divided into Latin, Greek and Hebrew groups. The Latin cognomina have been subdivided in accordance with their origin (see p. 75); in the column which gives the probable etymology, the initials of the words previously used as cognomina have been written in capitals. In a similar way, the Greek cognomina have been subdivided into those derived from compound names, those derived from short names, and those derived from common words not previously used as names of persons. The last group, as well as similar cases in the Latin material, are of limited value, the lack of instances of personal names often depending upon chance. In any event, such words cannot have been very frequent as names of persons. Conversely, if a word is rarely instanced as a cognomen, it is not certain that the new form was obtained from it instead of from the original word. Thus *Schole* is found as a cognomen only in *C I: 2² 1274* and *C VI 9544*, so that *Scholacius* may have been formed directly from *schola*.

In the Greek group, I have consistently given the name from which the new form had been obtained in its Latin form, if it is found in Latin documents. Only if the corresponding name is not found there, have Greek lexicons of personal names been consulted. This is done because the new cognomina in use in the West had primarily been coined by a Latin-speaking population. However, the considerable number of Greek names in *-ius* which were derived from words not previously used as names of persons shows that the Greeks also contributed to the coining of these names. One can refer to the papyrological evidence for the popularity of similar names in late Greek (see p. 26).

In the following lists, references to DIEHL have been omitted to save space. An asteric denotes a name also found as a supernomen in Latin epigraphy. Simple *C* stands for *C VIII*. Passages are given if the name is found once or twice; after that, only the frequencies are mentioned.

¹ In Greek, there was a name *Τυχίος* (BECHTEL p. 577), but it was derived from the verb *τεύχω* (see LIDDELL-SCOTT s.v.).

² STOLZ-SCHMALZ, p. 263.

Latin Cognomina

Derived from participles

		frequency	
		Rome	Carthage
* <i>Abundantius-ia</i>	(abundans)	17	—
* <i>Amantius-ia</i>	(Amans)	19	3
* <i>Augentius</i> —			
<i>Augent</i> . . .	(augens)	—	<i>ILT</i> 1147
<i>Aventius-ia</i>	(avens)	8	—
<i>Caelantia</i>	(caelans)	<i>SI</i> 1010	—
* <i>Constantius-ia</i>	(Constans)	103	10
[C]rescentiniu[s]	(Crescentinus)	—	<i>C</i> 13579
<i>Crescentius-ia</i>	(Crescens)	27	3
<i>Currentius</i>	(currens)	<i>SICV</i> 258	—
<i>Dicentius</i>	(dicens)	—	<i>C</i> 25220
[D]onantius	(donans)	<i>SI</i> 411	—
<i>Emerentius</i>	(emerens)	<i>NBull</i> 1901, 224	—
* <i>Exuperantius-ia</i>	(Exuperans)	58	—
* <i>Fidentius</i>	(Fidens)	3	—
* <i>Florentius-ia</i>	(Florens)	74	<i>C</i> 25232; 25324
<i>Fulgentillia</i>	(fulgens, cf. p. 77)	<i>RO</i> 354	—
<i>Fulgentius</i>	(fulgens)	<i>SI</i> 3518	—
* <i>Gaudentius-ia</i>	(Gaudens)	79	4
<i>Lucentius</i>	(lucens)	<i>SI</i> 3610; <i>FE</i> 9001	—
<i>Nentius</i>	(nens)	<i>SI</i> 1043	—
* <i>Pascentius-ia</i>	(pascens)	<i>RO</i> 64; <i>FE</i> 8165	<i>ILT</i> 1147
<i>Perseverantius-ia</i>	(perseverans)	4	—
<i>Potentius</i>	(potens)	<i>SI</i> 2751	—
<i>Praestantius-</i>			
<i>Prestantius</i>	(praestans)	<i>RAC</i> 1931, 224	—
* <i>Probantius-ia</i>	(probens)	5	—
* <i>Probatus-ia</i>	(Probatas)	7	—
<i>Providentius</i>	(providens ¹)	<i>NBull</i> 1902, 127	—
<i>Pudentius</i>	(Pudens)	<i>SI</i> 1122	—
? <i>Reiecticia</i> ²	(reiectus, cf. p. 77)	<i>SICV</i> 309	—
<i>Repositus</i>	(repositus, cf. p. 77)	<i>SI</i> 2378	—
<i>Salventius</i>	(salvens)	<i>SI</i> 175	—
<i>Serpentius-ia</i>	(serpens)	4	—
Σπηραιτια —			
Ισπηραιτια	(sperans)	<i>SI</i> 3139	—
<i>Studentius-ia</i>	(studens)	<i>RO</i> 104; <i>SI</i> 123	—
<i>Turbantia</i>	(turbans)	<i>RO</i> 43	—
* <i>Valentius-ia</i>	(Valens)	7	<i>ILT</i> 1147, duo
<i>Venantius-ia</i>	(venans)	4	? <i>ILT</i> 1147: <i>Benatius</i>
<i>Vigilantius</i>	(vigilans)	<i>SI</i> 2454	—
* <i>Vincetius-ia</i>	(vincens)	61	13
* <i>Viventius</i>	(vivens)	5	<i>C</i> 25302; ? <i>ILT</i> 1147: <i>Vive...</i>

¹ The index of *C XIII* 7272 records *Providens*, but the name is fragmentary, *Provide* . . ., and probably ran *Provide[ntius]*.

² The passage runs *HICPOREIECTICIA*, and the name may be, by way of an anaptyxis, *Preiecticia*.

Derived from adjectives

<i>Abundia</i>	(Abundus)	SI 3269	ILT 1147
<i>Alacrius</i>	(Alacer)	RS III 26, 9	—
<i>Annalius</i>	(Annalis)	RAC 1927, 205	—
<i>Casarius</i>	(casarius)	RO 1130	—
<i>Castellanius</i> —			
<i>Castelanius</i>	(Castellanus)	SI 470	—
<i>Clementius</i>	(Clemens)	—	ILT 928
* <i>Concordius</i>	(Concors, Concordia)	8	—
<i>Decentius-ia</i>	(Decens)	13	—
<i>Dextria</i>	(Dexter)	SI 5431	—
* <i>Dulcitius-ia</i>	(Dulcis, cf. p. 77)	13	C 25098
* <i>Hilarius-ia</i>	(Hilarus)	17	5
* <i>Innocentius-ia</i>	(Innocens)	28	ILT 1147 duo
* <i>Liberius-ia</i>	(Liber)	5	—
* <i>Mavortius</i>	(mavortius)	RAC 1953, 16	—
<i>Maxentius-ia</i>	(Maximus, cf. p. 77)	8	C 25259
<i>Maximasia</i>	(Maximus, cf. p. 77)	SI 2102	—
<i>Mellitius-ia</i>	(Mellitus)	4	—
<i>Memorius</i>	(Memor)	FE 9040	—
<i>Natalius</i>	(Natalis)	—	C 25134
<i>Patricius-ia</i>	(patricius)	7	—
* <i>Placidia</i>	(Placidus)	SI 739	—
<i>Primaevius</i> —			
<i>Primevius</i>	(primaevus)	SI 6295	—
<i>Primenius-ia</i>	(Primenus, cf. p. 77)	7	—
<i>Probicius</i>	(Probus, cf. p. 77)	FE 7766	—
<i>Proculocia</i> —			
<i>Proclodia</i>	(Proculus, cf. p. 77)	SICV 220	—
<i>Pulcheria</i> —			
<i>Pulceria</i>	(Pulcher)	—	C 13866—67
<i>Quintasius</i>	(Quintus, cf. p. 77)	—	ILT 1147
<i>Rusticia</i>	(Rusticus)	SI 5224	—
<i>Salaciu[s]</i> ¹	(salax ¹)	SI 1173	—
<i>Severantia</i> —			
<i>Seberantia</i>	(Severus, cf. p. 77)	ARM p. 290	—
* <i>Simplicius-ia</i>	(Simplex)	27	3
<i>Siricius</i>	(Sirica)	FE 9162	—
<i>Urbanus</i>	(Urbanus)	SI 2463	—
<i>Beitalia</i>	(Vitalis)	SICV 272	—

Derived from nouns

<i>Alboria</i>	(albor)	—	C 25063
<i>Arboria</i>	(arbor)	—	ILT 1147
<i>Argentia</i>	(argentum ²)	NBull 1909, 141	—
<i>Armentius</i>	(armentum)	FE 7434	—
<i>Aucupius</i> —			
<i>Acupius</i>	(auceps, aucupium)	SI 3272	—
* <i>Augurius</i>	(Augur)	8	—
<i>Aurentia</i>	(Aura or aurum, cf. p. 77)	—	C 24941a
<i>Auricius</i>	(Aura or aurum, cf. p. 76)	SI 2169	—
<i>Axungius</i>	(axungia)	SI 183	—
<i>Barbentius</i>	(Barba, cf. p. 77)	SICV 317	—

¹ C III 12012, 77 records *Salax*, but the editor is doubtful of the form of the name.

² Cf. the old cognomen *Argentea*.

<i>Brumasius</i>	(bruma, cf. p. 77)	SI 2727; 4560	—
<i>Camasius</i>	(?camasis)	SI 1478	—
* <i>Crementius-ia</i>	(crementum ¹)	SICV 312	C 13571—72
<i>Delicius</i> ²	(delicius, delicum)	SI 5092	—
? <i>Desiderius</i>	(desiderium)	RAC 1929, 204	ILT 1147
* <i>Eventius-ia</i>	(Eventus)	5	—
<i>Fortunius-ia</i>	(Fortuna)	18	—
* <i>Honorius-ia</i>	(Honor)	3	C 13732; ILT 1147
<i>Iuvenantius</i>	(Iuvenis, cf. p. 77)	FE 7673	—
<i>Kalendius</i>	(kalendae)	SI 4631	—
<i>Lauricius</i>	(Laurus, cf. p. 77)	FE 8980	—
<i>Leonius</i>	(Leo)	SI 5380	—
<i>Leporius</i>	(Lepos)	3	C 25313
* <i>Litorius</i>	(litus)	FE 7644	—
* <i>Luxurius</i>	(luxuria)	FE 7689; NBull 1902, 129	—
* <i>Mensurius</i> —			
<i>Mesurius</i>	(mensura)	RS III p. 61	—
<i>Munerius</i>	(munus)	SI 3003; 4839	—
* <i>Navigius-ia</i>	(navigium)	9	—
<i>Nepotia</i>	(Nepos)	—	ILT 1147
<i>Nugasius</i>	(nugas)	SI 593; RAC 1939, 230	—
<i>Pecorius</i>	(pecus)	4	—
<i>Peculius</i>	(peculium)	3	—
* <i>Praesidius</i>	(Praeses)	3	—
* <i>Principius</i>	(Princeps)	3	—
<i>Probitatia</i>	(Probitas)	SI 5450	—
<i>Processius</i>	(Processus)	SI 5043	—
<i>Provincius</i>	(Provincia)	RAC 1924, 88	—
* <i>Purpurius</i>	(purpura)	Bull 1886, 113	—
* <i>Refrigerius</i>	(refrigerium, refrigerare, see p. 76)	5	—
<i>Remigia</i>	(remex, remigium, remigare)	RO 478	—
<i>Ripasius</i>	(ripa ³ , cf. p. 77)	RS III p. 293	—
<i>Roborius</i>	(robor)	RS III 17, 1	—
<i>Rorentia</i>	(ros, cf. p. 77)	RO 520	—
* <i>Sagittius-ia</i>	(Sagitta, Sagittus)	3	—
<i>Salutius-ia</i>	(Salus)	13	—
<i>Scholacius</i> —			
<i>Scolacius</i>	(Schole, cf. p. 77)	RS III p. 318	—
<i>Soricus</i>	(Sorex)	SI 2410	—
<i>Stercorius-ia</i>	(stercus)	57	—
<i>Storacius</i> —			
<i>Isttoracius</i>	(Storax)	—	C 25345
<i>Studius</i> —			
<i>Istudius</i>	(studium ⁴)	FE 6574	—

¹ *Thes. Onom. II* col. 488, 36 puts *Crementius* down as an incorrect form of *Clementius*. This is unlikely, however, the change *l* > *r* being rare in Vulgar Latin (SOMMER p. 168). It is also significant that there are no examples of *Clemens* written *Cremens*. *Thes. Onom. II* col. 483, 63 certainly records two instances of *Cremens*, but these are the cases from *C VIII* given above; both are fragmentary, *Crement* . . ., and with all probability ran *Crement[ius-ia]*. The name *Crementius* is similar in meaning to *Crescentius* and *Cresconius*.

² *Delicius* may here be a common word as well.

³ Cf. the old cognomen *Ripanus*.

⁴ The name may, however, be derived from the corresponding verbal stem as well.

<i>Ursacius-ia</i>	(Ursus, cf. p. 77)	14	—
<i>Ursenia</i>	(Ursus, cf. p. 77)	FE 8970	—
<i>Victorinia</i> —			
<i>Bictorinia</i>	(Victorinus)	—	ILT 1147
<i>Victorius</i>	(Victor, Victoria)	SI 2797	—
<i>Vigilius</i>	(Vigil)	SI 2793; FE 9242	—
<i>Vindemius</i>	(vindemia)	SI 3265	—
* <i>Vindicius</i>	(Vindex)	SI 613 duo	—

[Derived from verbal stems

<i>Cresconius-ia</i>	(crescere, cf. p. 77)	—	22
* <i>Exuperius-ia</i>	(exuperare)	13	—
<i>Proficius</i>	(proficere)	FE 7765	ILT 1129
<i>Reticus</i>	(reticere)	SI 2786	—
<i>Splendoni</i>	(splendere)	SI 2323	—
? <i>Subicius</i> ¹	(subicere)	SI 3819	—

Compound names

<i>Bonemontius</i>	(bonus, mons)	SI 6155	—
* <i>Bonifatius-ia</i>	(bonum, fatum)	65	38
<i>Fatibonia</i>	(fatum, bonum)	—	C 25321

Derived from geographical and mythological names or from old cognomina

* <i>Caesarius-ia</i>	(Caesar)	7	—
<i>Carthagius</i>	(Carthago, cf. p. 78)	FE 7399	—
* <i>Dalmatius</i>	(Dalmatia)	9	C 13603; 14144
<i>Herculanus</i> —			
<i>Herclanius-ia</i>	(Herculanus)	11	C 25243
<i>Herculentius</i>	(Hercules, cf. p. 77)	SI 2218; RO 726	—
<i>Herculius-ia</i>	(Hercules)	15	—
* <i>Laurentius-ia</i>	(Laurens, Laurentum ²)	110	4
<i>Marcelius</i>	(Marcus, cf. p. 77)	FE 9016	—
? <i>Marsius</i> ³	(Marsus)	RS III p. 362	—
<i>Mauventia</i>	(Maurus, cf. p. 77)	FE 8592	—
<i>Maurisius</i>	(Maurus, see p. 77)	SI 5401	—
<i>Neptunia</i>	(Neptunus)	SI 2163	—
<i>Nucerius</i>	(Nuceria ⁴)	—	C 13499
<i>Picentius</i>	(Picens ⁵)	RO 275	—
* <i>Populoni</i>	(Populonia)	FE 9084	—
* <i>Romulius</i>	(Romulus)	SI 3752	—
<i>Romuliensia</i> —			

¹ The stone is fragmentary: ...SVBICIVS, and the name accordingly not certain.

² Though DIEHL *Signum*, RhM 1907 p. 416, and SCHRIJNEN, *Namengebung*, Mn 1935, p. 277, by considering the name as coming from a gymnastic or artists' club, imply an etymology from *laureus* (as a token of victory), the use of the cognate form *Laurentinus*, originally the name of the inhabitant of Laurentum, as a popular cognomen corroborates my derivation. Cf. similar cases *Nucerinus* — *Nucerius*, *Picentinus* — *Picentius*, *Telesinus* — *Telesius*.

³ Only the genitive *Marsi* is found on the stone, the ending of the nominative thus being uncertain.

⁴ Cf. the cognomen *Nucerinus*.

⁵ Cf. *Picentinus*.

<i>Romuliesia</i>	(Romulus, cf. p. 77)	SI 2027	—
<i>Surrentius</i>	(Surrentus ¹)	SI 4405	—
<i>Telesius</i>	(Telesia ²)	FE 7825b	—

Greek Cognomina

Derived from compound names

<i>Apodemius</i>	(Apodemus)	SI 2604	—
<i>Calipodius-ia</i>	(Calopus)	5	ILT 1147
<i>Calliphronia</i> —	(Calliphro)	FE 8148	—
Ca[ll]ifronia	(Epiphanes,		
<i>Epiphanius</i>	Epiphania)	3	3
<i>Epipodius</i>	(—, formed like		
	Calopus		
	> Calipodius)	6	—
<i>Euangelius-ia</i>	(Euangelus)	SI 2439; 5305	—
<i>Eubulius</i> —			
<i>Eubolius</i>	(Eubulus, Εὐβουλία,		
	BECHTEL)	SI 3451	—
* <i>Eucharius</i>	(Eucharus)	4	—
* <i>Eucheries</i> —			
<i>Hcherius</i>	(Eucherus)	SI 63	—
* <i>Eudoxia</i>	(Eudoxus)	SI 331; 4855	—
* <i>Eugami[a]</i>	(Eugamus)	SI 1595	—
* <i>Eugenius</i>	(Eugenes, Eugenia)	16	ILT 1147
* <i>Eugraphius</i> —			
<i>Eugrafius</i>	(Eugraphus)	SI 2222; FE 7470	—
<i>Euhippius</i> ³	(Εὐῖππος, BECHTEL)	RS III p. 390	—
<i>Eulalius-ia</i>	(Eulalus)	3	ILT 1147
* <i>[E]ulogius</i>	(Eulogus)	RO 817	—
Εὐνάπιος —			
<i>Εὐνάπις</i>	(—, cf. Προνάπης,	FE 7201	—
	PAPE-BENS.)		
* <i>Euodius</i>	(Euodus, Euodia)	5	—
* <i>Euphronius</i> —			
<i>Eufronius</i>	(Euphron)	RS III 21, 46	—
* <i>Eusebius</i>	(Eusebes, Eusebia)	23	C 13644; ILT 1147
* <i>Eustathius-ia</i>	(Eustathus)	6	—
* <i>Eustochius-ia</i>	(Eustochus)	3	—
<i>Eutheries</i>	(Εὐθέρως,		
	BECHTEL)	SI 4099	—
<i>Euthymius</i>	(Euthymus,	SI 4905; NBull	
	Euthymia)	1902, 225	—
* <i>Eutropius-ia</i>	(Eutropus)	6	ILT 1147
* <i>Euty chius</i>	(Eutychus,		
	Eutychia)	20	C 25224—25
<i>Hermogenius</i>	(Hermogenes)	FE 8939	—
* <i>Pancharius</i>	(Παγχάρης,		
	PAPE-BENS.)	6	C 25267
* <i>Pancratius</i>	(Pancrates)	5	—
<i>Socratia</i>	(Socrates)	FE 8722	—
* <i>Sophronius-ia</i>	(Sophro)	9	—
<i>Syagrius</i>	(Syagrus)	SI 3339; 3818	—

¹ Cf. *Surrentum*, the town name, and *Surrentinus*.² Cf. *Telesinus*.³ Because the stone gives only the genitive *Euhippi*, the ending of the nominative is uncertain.

Derived from short names

<i>Acacius</i> —			
<i>Acacis</i>	(Acacus)	FE 7390	—
¹ <i>Ἀχιλλία</i>	(Achilles)	SI 3978	—
* <i>Adelphius</i> —			
<i>Adelfius</i>	(Adelphus)	SI 19	—
<i>Agapius</i>	(Agape)	3	—
¹ <i>Ἀγέλιος</i> —			
¹ <i>Ἀγέλις</i>	(Agele)	RS II 37, 5	—
<i>Agroecius</i> —			
<i>Agricius</i>	(Agroecus)	FE 8747	—
<i>Alethius</i> ¹	(Alethes, Alethia)	SI 1775; FE 8748	—
<i>Alexius</i>	(Alexus)	5	—
* ¹ <i>Ἀλύπιος</i>	(Alypus ²)	SI 4441; RAC 1931, 226	—
* <i>Amazonius</i>	(Amazon)	SI 839; 2946	—
<i>Ampelius-ia</i>	(Ampele etc.)	5	—
<i>Anatolius-ia</i>	(Anatole)	11	—
<i>Anthemius</i>	(Anthimus etc.)	SI 5725	—
<i>Apollinaria</i>	(Apollinaris)	SI 98	—
* <i>Arcadius</i>	(Arcas, ¹ <i>Ἀρκαδία</i> , BECHTEL)	3	—
? <i>Archontia</i> —			
<i>Arcontia</i> ³	(Archo)	RO 710	—
<i>Artemius-ia</i>	(Artemis, see p. 78)	4	—
¹ <i>Ἀστακίος</i> —			
¹ <i>Ἀστακίς</i>	(Astacos, myth., geogr.)	FE 7439	—
* <i>Asterius-ia</i>	(Aster)	10	—
<i>Augenius</i>	(Auge)	—	ILT 1147
<i>Basilus</i>	(Basilia; cf. Basileus)	14	—
<i>Boethius</i> —			
<i>Boetius</i>	(Boethus)	SI 4187	—
<i>Calchedonius-ia</i>	(Calchedon)	7	C 13533; 24901
[C]allinius	(Callinus)	SI 6159	—
* <i>Castorius-ia</i>	(Castor)	8	—
<i>Celadia</i>	(Celadus)	RAC 1933, 198	—
<i>Chelidonius</i> —			
<i>Celidonius</i>	(Chelido)	RS III p. 414; Bull 1892, 100	—
¹ <i>Χορτάσιος</i>	(¹ <i>Χόρτασος</i> , PAPE-BENS.)	SI 5687—88	—
<i>Comasius</i>	(Coma, cf. p. 77)	FE 7502	—
* <i>Dardania</i>	(Dardanus)	SI 3133; 5294	—
<i>Deuterius-ia</i>	(Deuter)	3	C 13620; ILT 1147
* <i>Dracontius</i>	(Draco)	RAC 1925, 24	—
<i>Dynamius</i>	(Dynamis)	FE 8488	ILT 1147
* <i>Dyscolius</i>	(Dyscolus)	10	—
¹ <i>Ἐπανόδιος</i>	(Epanhodus)	SI 414	—
<i>Eustasius</i>	(Eustasia)	FE 7565	—
<i>Georgius</i>	(Georgus)	SI 4142; 6449, 20	—

¹ Notice that both bearers of the names are women.

² C VI 24925 records *Pretiosa Alypia*, daughter of *Alypus* and *Meroe*. Because the Greek abstract *ἀλυσία* is not instanced as a women's name in BECHTEL, it remains uncertain whether the name can be put down as an old example, similar to *Eugenia* and *Eusebia* (see p. 70), or whether it belongs to the era of the new formations in *-ius-ia*. The first cognomen in *-osa*, however, argues the latter alternative, the names in *osus-sa* being in general late (see p. 65).

³ SCHULZE *Eigennamen* p. 126 and *Thes. II* col. 469, 7 consider *Archontius* as a nomen, but it hardly can be, considering the Greek etymology.

<i>Gerontius-ia</i>	(Geron)	19	<i>ILT</i> 1147
<i>Gigontia</i> —			
<i>Gicontia</i>	(?Γίγονν ¹ BECHTEL)	<i>FE</i> 8242	—
<i>Glycinnius</i> —			
<i>Glicinnius</i>	(Glycinna, Γλυκίνος, BECHTEL)	RAC 1940, 18	—
* <i>Gorgonius-ia</i>	(Γοργόνα, BECHTEL)	20	—
* <i>Helladius</i>	(Hellas)	4	—
* <i>Helpidius-ia</i>	(Helpis)	10	<i>ILT</i> 1147
<i>Heresius</i>	(Αἰρεσις, BECHTEL)	<i>SI</i> 1225	—
* <i>Hesperius</i>	(Hesper)	<i>SI</i> 1426	—
* <i>Hesychius</i>	(Hesychus, Hesychia)	3	—
* <i>Heuresia</i> —			
<i>Euresia</i>	(Heuresis)	<i>FE</i> 7637	—
<i>Iconia</i>	(Icone, Iconium, Iconio)	<i>RS III</i> p. 316	—
* <i>Ionius</i>	(Ionia, cf. <i>adj.</i> Ionius)	<i>SI</i> 4947	—
* <i>Κατερία</i>	(Κατερός, PAPE-BENS.)	<i>SI</i> 4435	—
* <i>Lampadius-ia</i>	(Lampas)	3	4
<i>Limenius-ia</i>	(Limen, Limene)	5	—
<i>Macedonius</i>	(Macedo, Macedonia)	3	—
<i>Mandronius-ia</i>	(Mandro)	<i>SI</i> 1480	<i>ILT</i> 1147
? <i>Melanius</i> ²	(Melanus)	<i>SI</i> 2960	—
<i>Methius</i>	(Methe)	Bull 1886, 42	—
<i>Μουσεία</i>	(Musicus)	3	—
<i>Nemesius-ia</i>	(Nemesis)	8	—
<i>Nicentius</i>	(Nice, cf. p. 76)	<i>RO</i> 375; <i>SI</i> 296	<i>ILT</i> 1147
<i>Oenanthius</i> —			
<i>Hoinanthius</i>	(Oenanthe)	<i>SI</i> 2273	—
* <i>Palladius-ia</i>	(Pallas)	5	<i>C</i> 13816
* <i>Paregorius</i>	(Paregorus)	3	—
* <i>Peristerius</i>	(Peristera)	<i>SICV</i> 178, a woman	—
<i>Petrius</i>	(Petrus)	<i>FE</i> 8421; <i>SICV</i> 117	—
<i>Phaetorius</i> —			
<i>Faetorius-ia</i>	(Φάετρα, PAPE-BENS.)	<i>RS II</i> 55, 2; <i>ARM</i> 276	—
<i>Pierius</i>	(Pierus)	<i>FE</i> 7750; <i>SICV</i> 200	—
* <i>Poemenia</i>	(Poemen)	<i>SI</i> 4679; <i>FE</i> 9080	—
<i>Porphyrius-ia</i>	(Πόρφυρος, BECHTEL)	3	<i>ILT</i> 1147 <i>duo</i>
* <i>Procopius</i>	(Procope)	<i>RS III</i> p. 49	—
* <i>Sapricius-ia</i>	(Σαπρικός, see p. 77)	9	—
<i>Σκυλάκιος</i> —			
<i>Ἰσχυλλάκις</i>	(Scylace)	<i>FE</i> 9328	—
<i>Stephania</i>	(Stephanus)	3	—
<i>Symposium</i> —			
<i>Σίμπος</i>	(Σύμπος, BECHTEL)	<i>SI</i> 907	—
<i>Telesphorianius</i> —			
<i>Telesporianius</i>	(Telesphorianus)	<i>SICV</i> 222	—
<i>Tharsicius</i> —			
<i>Tarsicius</i>	(Tharsus ³ cf. p. 77)	<i>SI</i> 2419	—

¹ Because the name is a stem in -v, the etymology is uncertain.

² The case is uncertain, for the stone gives only the genitive *Melani*.

³ DE ROSSI, Bull 1886, p. 98 derives *Tarsicius* from the name of the native city of St. Paul, *Tarsus*, but since the aspirated form is found in *C VIII* 13328: *Tharsicius*, my derivation seems more probable.

<i>Thalassius-ia</i>	(Thalassa, Thalassus)	4	—
<i>Tychenia</i> —			
<i>Tycenia</i>	(Tyche, cf. p. 78)	SI 1674	—
<i>Τυράννιος</i> —			
<i>Τυράνιος</i>	(Tyrannus)	RS I 21, 8	—
<i>Derived from common words not instanced as names of persons in extant documents</i>			
† <i>Acatus</i> ¹	(ἄκατος)	SI 4143	—
* <i>Acholi</i> [us]	(ἄχολος)	SI 4906	—
<i>Acomius</i> ²	(ἄκομος)	FE 6497	—
<i>Adolius</i>	(ἄδολος)	SI 1800	—
<i>Aerius</i>	(ἄεριος)	NBull 1897, 179	—
<i>Agenius</i>	(ἀγένειος) ³	—	ILT 1147
* <i>Alogius</i>	(ἄλογος)	FE 6547; 7415	? C 13452
<i>Amachius</i>	(ἄμαχος)	SI 81	—
<i>Anagius</i>	(ἀναγής)	SI 4374	—
* <i>Anastasius-ia</i>	(ἀνάστασις)	51	4
† <i>Ἀφασία</i>	(ἀφασία)	SI 6196	—
* <i>Athanasius-ia</i>	(ἀθανασία)	6	C 13469; 13680
<i>Auxentia</i> ⁴ —			
<i>Ausentia</i>	(αὐξή, see p. 77)	RS III 22, 2; SI 5255	—
* <i>Balsamius</i>	(βάλσαμον)	SI 6151	—
<i>Cataphronia</i> —			
<i>Cat[a]fronia</i>	(καταφρονέω)	SI 794	—
<i>Climatius</i>	(κλίμα)	RAC 1926, 83; 1931, 217	—
<i>Endelechius</i> —			
<i>Endelecius</i>	(ἐνδελεχής, ἐνδελέχεια)	SI 2216	—
<i>Eumecia</i>	(εὐμήκης)	NBull 1917, 118	—
* <i>Euphrasia</i>	(εὐφρασία)	3	—
<i>Eustolius</i>	(εὐστολος) ⁵	SI 4166	—
<i>Eutolmius</i>	(εὐτολμος, εὐτολμία)	SI 2463, a woman.	—
<i>Gelasius-ia</i>	(γελάω, cf. p. 77)	3	C 25238; ILT 1147
* <i>Gregorius-ia</i>	(γροηγορέω)	31	ILT 1147
* <i>Hyperechius-ia</i>	(ὑπερέχω)	SI 1441; Bull 1892, 62	—
* <i>Martyrius-ia</i>	(μάρτυς)	28	—
* <i>Megethius-ia</i>	(μέγεθος)	6	—
<i>Μετρίκιος</i> —			
<i>Μετρίκις</i>	(μετρικός)	SI 1883	—
<i>Metrius</i>	(μέτριος)	RAC 1929, 210	—
<i>Parabasis</i>	(παράβασις)	SICV 22	—
<i>Polychronius-ia</i>	(πολυχρόνιος)	11	—
<i>Problepius</i>	(προβλέπω)	SICV 188	—
<i>Syncretia</i>	(συνκρίτος)	SI 2647	—
Hebrew Cognomina			
* <i>Paschasius-ia</i>	(pascha)	36	33
<i>Sabbatius-ia</i>	(Sabbatis)	40	—

¹ The stone is fragmentary: ... ACATIVS.

² *Thes.* I col. 419, 54 records *Acomius Tertullius* from C III 633, 3, 10, considering it a nomen. I think, however, that the name is rather an instance of a double cognomen.

³ Cf., however, the geographical name *Agennum*.

⁴ SILVAGNI suggests the reading *Augentia*, but this is unlikely, the writing of *s* pro *x* being frequent in Vulgar Latin (VÄÄNÄNEN p. 65).

⁵ Cf. the late *Εὐστολίον* (PAPE-BENS.).

THE ORIGINS OF A CHRISTIAN NOMENCLATURE

I. THE CRITERIA OF A »CHRISTIAN» NAME

In the classical period, the meaning of a personal name — in Latin, that of the individual cognomen — was a matter of more importance than it is nowadays.¹ To cite a few examples, the vast group of theophoric names, such as *Ἀπολλώνιος* and *Iovinus*, testifies to the piety of the ancient man; names embodying some praiseworthy moral or physical quality, such as *Κάλλιστος*, *Εὖνους*, *Blandus*, *Celer*, were expressions of parental hopes; in a like manner, numerous popular names, such as *Εὐδοος*, *Εὐτυχος*, *Faustus*, *Felix*, implied the hope that the bearer of the names would enjoy good luck in life. On the other hand, popular humour coined large numbers of uncomplimentary names, such as *Κόπρος*, *Ἄγριος*, *Balbus*, *Proiectus*, *Stercorius*.²

Because Christianity was a force that affected almost every aspect of ancient life and thought, it is a priori likely that it also left traces upon nomenclature. The influence of Christianity was seen both in aversion to pagan theophoric cognomina and in the creation of a specific Christian nomenclature. The elimination of pagan theophoric nomenclature was not so early and thorough as might have been expected. As late as A.D. 268, a pope was called *Dionysius*, and in the Christian epigraphic material there are a large number of theophoric cognomina: *Aphrodisius*, *Apollinaris*, *Artemidorus*, *Cerialis*, *Dionysius*, *Eros*, *Heliodorus*, *Hermes*, *Iovinus*, *Martinus*, *Mercurius*, *Saturninus*, *Venerius*, *Zeno* etc. Still in the fifth and sixth centuries, such cognomina could be borne by the Christians: *Dionisius* A.D. 498 (RO 1050) and *Apollo* A.D. 527 (DIEHL 344). Nevertheless it is a fact that the frequency of pagan theophoric cognomina was lower in the Christian material than in the pagan one. I shall give as examples the pagan and Christian frequencies of the most important Latin theophoric cognomina: *Apollinaris*, C VI 65—SI-FE five; *Cerialis*, C VI c. 65—SI-FE two; *Martialis*, C VI c. 170—SI-FE four; *Mercurius-ia*, C VI 75—SI-FE 35; *Saturninus-na*, C VI c. 500—SI-FE 27; *Venerius-ia*, C VI c. 160—SI-FE 32. Considering that the number of in-

¹ Cf. in general HIRZEL *Name*, passim.

² See HUG, *Spitznamen*, RE IIIA col. 1821 ff.; cf. p. 67 above.

scriptions was c. 40,000 in *C VI* and c. 9400 in *SI-FE*, it will be seen that, with the exception of *Mercurius*, the frequency of these cognomina had greatly fallen in Christian inscriptions. As another example of the aversion to pagan theophoric cognomina we may refer to the cases in which a name of Christian origin was used to replace a pagan theophoric name, e.g. *Ioannes iunior qui et Mercurius*, pope A.D. 532—535 (*Liber pontificalis* p. 141), or *Licina Aeliadora Adeodata* (*SI* 1672 = *DIEHL* 2630 adn). For the problem, see p. 120. It should, however, be noticed that those pagan theophoric cognomina which had come late in use showed a higher frequency in the Christian material than in the pagan one. Thus *Iovinus-na*, *Iovianus-na* and *Iovinianus-na* were found 22 times in *C VI* and 33 times in *SI-FE*; the corresponding figures for *Martinus-na* and *Martinianus* are 36 and two in *C VI*, 19 and five in *SI-FE*. *Veneriosus-sa* was found once in *C VI* and 24 times in *SI-FE*. The names had been formed with suffixes and were thus coinages popular during the Later Empire (see p. 61).

The partial survival of pagan theophoric cognomina was due to the fact that the legacy of pagan nomenclature was too large to be reshaped in a short time; it will be remembered that most of the cognomina found in Christian inscriptions were an ancient inheritance (see p. 61). Moreover, the meaning of a personal name was never of the same importance as that of an appellative, and the pagan world of gods could live on in nomenclature long after the final victory of Christianity.

The problem of a specific Christian nomenclature has often been treated. As early as the eighteenth century CANNegiETER drew attention to the fact that numerous personal names of the Later Empire expressed ideas peculiar to Christianity.¹ During the following century the problem was often discussed in works upon Christian epigraphy and Christian antiquities.² During the present century the problem has been dealt with by MOFFAT³, HARNACK,⁴ SCHRIJNEN,⁵ FERRUA,⁶ and TESTINI,⁷ for instance.

There has been no systematic discussion of the problem, however. When reading the lists of Christian names in previous studies, one has the impression that numerous names have been declared Christian without sufficient reason. I shall quote a few examples. MARTIGNY, KRAUS and SCHRIJNEN give a long list of presumably Christian names, among

¹ *De mutata Romanorum nominum sub principibus ratione*, p. 75 ff.

² LE BLANT, *L'épigraphie chrétienne en Gaule et dans l'Afrique romaine*, p. 90 ff.; RO p. cxiii; MARTIGNY p. 513 ff.; KRAUS, *Real-Encyclopädie der christlichen Alterthümer II* p. 481 f.; GROSSI GONDI *Trattato*, p. 80 ff.

³ *Names (Christian)*, *ERE IX* p. 145 ff.

⁴ *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums I*, p. 436 ff.

⁵ *Namengebung*, Mn 1935, p. 271 ff.

⁶ *Epigrafia sicula pagana e cristiana*, RAC 1941, p. 229.

⁷ *Archeologia cristiana*, p. 369 f.

them e.g. *Felix*, *Victor*, *Vitalis*, *Viventius*. According to MARTIGNY, the first name implies »spiritual joy», the second »the victory of a Christian over sin», the last two »spiritual life»¹; SCHRIJNEN, on the other hand, considers the first two as »christlich umgedeutete Wunschnamen», the last two as baptismal names.² But since *Felix*, *Victor* and *Vitalis* are extremely common in pagan inscriptions, and *Viventius* rare both in pagan and Christian epigraphic material, it is ill-advised to count the names as Christian. The cases in which a personal name is derived from a word which had become a Christian term are more insidious. There seem to be good reasons to think that *Elpis* and *Irene*, two popular cognomina, are names with Christian implications.³ *Ἐλπίς* was a very important Christian notion and was counted among the three cardinal virtues of the Christian (I Cor. 13, 13). The expression *ἐν ειρήνῃ*, and its Latin equivalent, *in pace*, were a standard feature of Christian epitaphs and were derived from a similar Hebrew expression; it was a wish concerning the well-being of the departed in the other world.⁴ Though *Elpis* and *Irene* were frequent cognomina in Christian inscriptions (19 and 73 instances in *SI-FE*, respectively), this does not entitle us to conclude that the Christians had assumed the names because of their Christian suggestiveness. If names of that type are frequent in the pagan world, it is more likely that the Christians had inherited them from the pagans without attaching any great importance to them. This is the case with *Elpis* and *Irene*. In *C VI* the names are very frequent (about 400 and 150 instances, respectively). *Elpis* had in fact become rarer in Christian times, whereas the frequency of *Irene*, considering the relative sizes of *C VI* and *SI-FE* (40.000 and 9.400 inscriptions) had remained fairly constant.

In the above cases, a presumably Christian name has been found not to be one because it was quite as common in the pagan material. But even if a name which has been considered Christian is rare or not found at all in pagan inscriptions, it is not certain that the name had Christian implications. To have them, a name should have a meaning unequivocally calling up Christian associations. This is in particular true in regard to the new names which had come into use during the Later Empire. I have earlier drawn attention to names like *Gaudentius* and *Gaudiosus*, which, in spite of the fact that they were rare or unknown in pagan documents, cannot be counted as Christian, there being nothing specifically Christian in the meaning conveyed by them (see p. 67).

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 513.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 275.

³ These names have been counted as Christian e.g. by MARTIGNY, KRAUS, GROSSI GONDI, SCHRIJNEN (only *Irene*) in the works cited.

⁴ FREY I, p. cxxxii f.

The above demonstrates the absolute necessity of reliable criteria to decide whether or not a name is Christian. The cases discussed above have shown that two requirements had to be met: a name must call up Christian associations because of its meaning, and it must be of much rarer occurrence or not occur at all in the pagan material. The first requirement must be clarified by remarking that not only the names which suggest Christian ideas belong here, but also the names which had become »sacred» because famous saints and martyrs had borne them. As to the second requirement, a problem at once arises: it is a fact that many names which we shall claim as Christian (e.g. *Agape*, *Cyriacus* and *Redemptus*) were also found in the pagan material, though with a frequency insignificant in comparison with that in the Christian inscriptions. It might be argued that the names cannot have implied Christian ideas and that the frequency of the names in the Christian inscriptions must have been due to some other factor. The objection can be refuted. During the last decades, Christian Latin has been eagerly discussed, in particular by Dutch scholars, of whom SCHRIJNEN and his pupil MOHRMANN are among the most famous.¹ The school of SCHRIJNEN argues that the early Christians were a closely knit social group held together by a set of ideas sharply in contrast with the outlook of the pagan world. As is always the case, from a linguistic aspect the result was differentiation and the development of Christian Latin as a special language. Leaving aside the other aspects of the problem, what mostly interests us here is the means resorted to in order to express things Christian. Besides borrowing Greek terms and coining new Latin ones, the meaning of numerous Latin words was twisted so as to express Christian ideas.² It is these semantic shifts that are important from our point of view, for personal names derived from words subject to semantic shifts may also have acquired new Christian associations. Extreme caution is of course advisable. A personal name is never the same thing as a common word, which always stands for a thing or idea. The »meaning» of a name is not usually thought of unless special circumstances draw attention to it. It is accordingly only in cases in which a name popular in Christian inscriptions is derived from an important Christian term, which had undergone a semantic shift, that we are entitled to conclude that the name had been deliberately chosen, at least originally, because of its associations.

It is particularly important to bear in mind that the great majority of Christian inscriptions, in particular in Rome, are from the fourth century

¹ SCHRIJNEN, *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein*, passim; MOHRMANN, *Altchristliches Latein*, in *Études*, p. 3 ff.

² See the general discussion in TEEUWEN, *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian*, p. 11 ff.

and from the period anterior to the *pax*, a minority from the fifth and sixth centuries. The present study, largely based upon a comparison of pagan and Christian frequencies, exhibits the Christian names which had come into use before the last two centuries. But because Christian names did not come into use until the middle of the fourth century (see p. 117), the later material, though limited in amount, is richer in Christian nomenclature. Not only are the names which had come into use earlier much more frequent, but some names which in the great mass of Christian inscriptions do not show any rise in frequency were apparently used in a Christian sense in the late period. Such a name is *Stephanus*, so usual in the pagan material that the relative frequency actually falls (in *C VI* 1—11.307 I have counted 44 examples, but only 28 in the fairly equal number of the Christian inscriptions of Rome). But examples are particularly numerous during the latest period, for ten of them are from the fifth and sixth centuries. Moreover, an example like *SI* 5087 = *DIEHL* 3819, from A.D. 544, where a brother and sister are called *Stefanus* and *Thecla*, the latter an unmistakable Christian name (see p. 99), illustrate the Christian character of *Stephanus* during the latest period of Christian Rome, the cognomina current in a family often belonging together through their meaning or associations (cf. p. 52 f.).

The chronological period must also be taken into account in considering the names which had become Christian through a semantic shift. It is unlikely that the names were used in a Christian sense in very early inscriptions. *Agape* is found in the most ancient stratum of Priscilla (Bull 1886, p. 96 = *DIEHL* 2194; NBull 1900, p. 339 = *DIEHL* 2392), but may have been a pagan inheritance. It is the same in regard to some names of saints. *Paulus* and *Susanna* were also borne by pagans and Jews, and in some of the earliest Christian examples the names may have been a pagan or Jewish inheritance¹, whereas in the examples from the latest period, the Christian implications seem incontestable.²

Occasional uses of a name in a Christian sense cannot be taken into account in the present study. *Pistis* is rare both in pagan and Christian material, and *Spes* shows a fall in frequency (in *C VI* there are nearly a hundred examples, in *SI-FE* less than twenty), but in *RS I* p. 262 = *DIEHL* 4104D, where two sisters are called *Piste* and *Spes*, the Christian flavour is patent. The parents had named their daughters with a clear reference to the Christian cardinal virtues, *Piste* being sufficiently rare to exclude the possibility of a coincidence.

¹ *Paula*, A.D. 234 (*RO* 6 = *DIEHL* 2807); *Susanna*, early Priscilla (Bull 1886, p. 103).

² E.g. *pr(es)b(yster)* *Paulus*, A.D. 528 (*SI* 6088 = *DIEHL* 3768); *Susanna*, A.D. 408 (*RO* 587 = *DIEHL* 808B).

In accordance with the general principles laid down above, I shall compare the frequencies of each name in the Christian and pagan inscriptions of Rome and Carthage. To eliminate the influence of »statistical chance«, always present when names with a relatively low frequency are considered, the pagan frequencies have been counted throughout *C VI* and *C VIII*. Because the number of persons recorded in *C VI* is about four times larger than that in the Christian material, and that in *C VIII* vast in comparison with the Christian material from Carthage, any absolute rise in the Christian frequency implies a still larger relative rise, and thus our first criterion of a Christian name is met.

When comparing the use of a name in Christian and pagan inscriptions, it is important to consider the Jewish inscriptions too. Though limited in number (FREY gives about 530 Jewish inscriptions from Rome), the numerous links between Christianity and Judaism make them important to us. The Jewish element was considerable in the first Christian communities, in particular in Rome¹, and the Jewish legacy in nomenclature must accordingly be taken into account. This is of particular importance in studying the biblical names of Hebrew origin. Though the Jews of Rome had largely adopted pagan nomenclature, Hebrew names were an important element, for about a seventh of Roman Jews bore a cognomen of Hebrew origin, *Iuda*, *Maria* and *Sabbatis* heading the list.² The doctrinal links between Jews and Christians must also be taken into account in considering the origin of names expressing Christian ideas.

I have divided the Christian names into four classes. The first comprises the names of saints, whether biblical figures or martyrs, the second Christian theophoric names, in which the name of Christ or God is the divine element, the third date names of Christian origin, the fourth class containing names expressive of Christian ideas. In the tables, passages from Christian material will be given if a name is found once or twice.

II. NAMES OF SAINTS

§ 1. *The ideas of the Fathers on the adoption of the names of saints*

The names of saints used as personal names with Christian implications are the only class of Christian names upon which we have the comments of the ancients themselves. The earliest mention is found in Eusebius, who quotes the remark of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria (who died A.D. 265)

¹ See BARDY, *La question des langues dans l'Église ancienne*, p. 81 ff.; MOHRMANN, *Les origines de la latinité chrétienne à Rome*, VChr 1949, p. 67 f.

² LEON, *The names of the Jews of ancient Rome*, TAPhA 1928, p. 205 ff.; FREY p. lxvi ff.

on the adoption by the early Christians of the names of apostles. The bishop gave two main reasons for the adoption of the names, one rational, the other what may be called mystic: the names were borne either because of simple veneration or because they were thought to assure divine protection.¹ Both these explanations are to be found in the writings of the Fathers. Chrysosthomus² and Eustathius³ take the rational view, whereas Theodoretus declares that parents give their children names of martyrs to assure them divine protection.⁴ It is likely that both these ideas determined the choice of »sacred» names, and the idea of divine protection or intercession is not to be minimized. Mystical ideas, in a time of religious fermentation, certainly affected nomenclature, and the ancients had always been conscious of the principle »nomen est omen».⁵

§ 2. Biblical names

Personal names of Hebrew origin which were derived from the Old Testament were uncommon in early Christian nomenclature. The cases are listed below:

Table 22. Names derived from the Old Testament

names	R o m e		C a r t h a g e	
	C VI and FREY	Christian	C VIII pagans	Christians Carthage
᾽Αδάμ	—	SI 1899, 4	—	—
Daniel	—	SI 4199	—	—
Elias-sa	FREY, 1	SI 2410; 2675	—	—
Moyses	—	4 ⁶	—	—
Rebecca	FREY, 2	SI 6056	—	—
Susanna	—	21	—	—

¹ *Hist. eccl.* 7, 25, 14: πολλοὺς δὲ ὁμωνύμους Ἰωάννη τῷ ἀποστόλῳ νομίζω γεγονέναι, οἱ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἐκείνον ἀγάπην καὶ τῷ θαυμάζειν καὶ ζηλοῦν ἀγαπήθῃν αὐτὸν τε ὁμοίως βούλεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τὴν αὐτὴν ἡσπάσαντο, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος πολὺς καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος — —

² *Homil. XXI in Genesim*, PG 53, col. 179. DELEHAYE *Origines* p. 138 thinks that the passage implies the idea of intercession, but this is a minor item. Chrysosthomus advises the parents to give their children the names of τῶν ἀγίων ἀνδρῶν τῶν ἀρετῇ διαλαμπάντων, τῶν πολλὴν παροχήσαν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐσχηκότων, but his words οὐδὲ γὰρ δύνῃσι τι προσηγορία ἀρετῆς ἐρημος bring out his real meaning. Cf. further *Hom. 52 in Matth.*, PG 60, col. 365: there are people who bear great names like *Paulus*, *Petrus*, and *Ioannes* without having anything whatsoever to do with the persons whose names they bear.

³ *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* II: 4, p. 61: a name has no power to make anyone virtuous.

⁴ *Graecarum affectionum curatio* (RAEDER) VIII, p. 67.

⁵ Cp. KROLL, *Alte Taufgebräuche*, Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 1905, Beiheft, p. 50.

⁶ The correct form is found only in *RS II* 39, 10: *Μουσῆς*. *SI* 2012 (= DIEHL, 2986) the name is written *Mosses*, *RS II* 40, 11 *Muses*.

The only name of some frequency is thus *Susanna*. Though the Jewish legacy may have contributed to its spread, it is unlikely that a mere transmittance of a Jewish name, which was never very popular among the Jews (two Italian examples in FREY, none from Rome), suffices to account for its frequency in Christian epigraphic material. A Roman martyr certainly bore the name *Susanna* (BHL 7937). But though the martyrdom of *Susanna* may be historical¹, she cannot have been one of the most famous ones, as her name does not appear in the *depositio martyrum* (see p. 97). Since only a few of the martyrs recorded in that very ancient document of the cult of the martyrs of Rome were of sufficient fame to have their names in current use among the believers, it is unlikely that the frequency of the name *Susanna* was due to the martyr. The right explanation is to be found in the Bible. The name is found in the New Testament in Luc. 8, 3, where a certain *Susanna* is mentioned as one of the followers of Christ, but such a casual passage cannot be of any significance. It was in the Old Testament that the name was important, *Susanna* being the heroine of the famous story concerning a false accusation of adultery, which in the Vulgate preceded or followed the Book of Daniel. The story came to have considerable significance to the Ancient Church as a symbol of a soul saved from the machinations of Satan, and the story is illustrated in numerous paintings in the catacombs as well as in other works of art². It was obviously for the very same reason that the name was borne by a number of Christian women.

*

Names derived from the New Testament were naturally of much greater importance in early Christian nomenclature. The cases are listed in table 23 (next page).

The list reveals that only three or four biblical figures were of importance in early Christian nomenclature. The others provide sporadic examples or, like *Andreas*, are also found in the pagan material, though less frequently. It is remarkable that though Christian nomenclature was in general much more conspicuous in Carthage than in Rome (see p. 116), biblical names, with the exception of *Iohannes*, were not very frequent there. That this was not an African peculiarity is shown by the fact that *Paulus* and *Petrus*, for instance, were popular Christian names elsewhere in Africa (12 examples of each). The only explanation we can give is the one often to be resorted to in an onomastic study: a regional peculiarity.

¹ DELEHAYE, *Comment. mart. Hieron.* p. 435.

² See LECLERCQ, *DACL* XV: 2, p. 1742 ff.; WILPERT, *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms I*, p. 363 f.

Table 23. Names derived from the New Testament

names	R o m e		C a r t h a g e	
	C VI and FREY	Christian	C VIII pagans	Christians Carthage
<i>Andreas</i>	7	10	—	—
<i>Barnabas</i>	—	SI 2697; FE 6600b	—	—
? <i>Bart[holomaeus]</i>	—	SI 5256	—	—
<i>Iacob, Iacobus</i>	FREY, 1	3 ¹	—	—
<i>Iohannes-na</i>	—	52	—	12
<i>Maria</i>	5 + FREY, 9	22	—	ILT 1129; 1146
<i>Nazarius</i>	—	SI 2345; RAC 1926, 75	—	—
<i>Paulus-la</i>	51	81	38	8
<i>Petrus</i>	1	60 ²	—	4
< <i>Ph</i> > <i>ilemon</i>	—	SI 2250; 2588	—	—
<i>Thomas</i>	—	3	—	—

I shall discuss the most important New Testament names in detail in what follows.

I o h a n n e s - n a, a name of Hebrew origin, was one of the most obvious Christian names and an almost infallible proof of the faith of its bearer. But because it is of Hebrew origin, it is occasionally borne by Jews; FREY 717 gives an example from Achaia.

The name *Maria* is in fact two names of totally different etymology: the female of the Latin nomen *Marius*, and a Hebrew name, transcribed in Latin *Maria*. The cases in which *Maria* is a nomen must naturally be excluded. Such a case is SI 3268 = DIEHL 104: *Accia Maria Tulliana*; because the woman's grandfather was called *Marius Victorinus* (RE VIIA col. 794, 21), it is certain that she bore *Maria* as a nomen.³ But excluding cases of that type, it is not at all certain that the cognomen *Maria* should be considered biblical. For one thing, nomina were often used as cognomina during the Later Empire; for another, *Maria* was also one of the most common Jewish names, and, when found as a slave name in pagan inscriptions, may be Jewish.⁴ Nevertheless *Maria* is far too common in the Christian material for the explanations suggested to appear exhaustive. *Maria* being a major figure of Christianity, it would have been strange if

¹ The form [*I*]acobus is found in SI 5348; in two fragmentary Greek inscriptions we have 'Iax... (SI 4941 and 5680); 'Iax[ωβος] seems a likely supplement, simple 'Iaxōβ being the Old Testament form.

² There are, moreover, two examples of *Petrius* (see p. 85) and one of *Petrula* (RAC 1927, p. 204). For *Petronius* as a derivation of *Petrus*, see p. 23.

³ Another similar case is SI 1040 = DIEHL 172adn: *Maria Sicula* c.f.

⁴ E.g. C VI 14025: *Caesonia P. et C. l. Maria*; 27948: *Valeria L. C. l. Maria*.

her name had not been borne by Christian women at least as often as *Iohanna* and *Paula*. Most Christian examples of *Maria* must accordingly be put down as biblical, and the later the material, the more likely is this interpretation (cf. p. 94).

Nazarinus is derived from the name of the town *Nazareth*; it must have had implications similar to the adjective *Nazarenus*, indicating its bearer as an adherent of the doctrine of the Man from *Nazareth*.

Paulus-la, in older times *Paullus* and *Paulla* or *Polla*, the name by which the apostle of the Gentiles was generally known, was originally a hereditary cognomen in the gens *Aemilia* (*RE XVIII* col. 2362). During the Empire the name was much used as an individual cognomen by common people, as is revealed by our list (from which the senatorial class is excluded).¹ The frequency of *Paulus* in the pagan material makes it difficult to decide in a particular case whether the name had been given in honour of the apostle or used as a pagan inheritance. The considerable rise in the Christian frequency, however, suggests the latter alternative.

It is in general argued that *Petrus*, a common Greek word used to translate the Aramean *Κηφᾶς* (John 1, 42), does not occur as an extra-biblical name², the pagan examples being ascribed to inheritance from Christian relatives.³ I do not think, however, that the pagan instances can be explained away. It is doubtful whether *M. Aurelius Petrus*, a governor of Arabia (*PIR I* p. 321, 1570), could have borne his cognomen in A.D. 278, before the official recognition of Christianity, if the name had really been exclusively Christian. It is also likely that we must consider as pagan a famous epitaph found at Ostia, where a father called *M. Anneus Paulus* sets up a stone to his son, *M. Anneus Paulus Petrus* (*C XIV* 566 = *DIEHL*, 3910). Though *DE ROSSI* argues that the name of the son was an unmistakable reference to the two apostles and father and son were thus Christians⁴, the stone is more likely to be pagan — the letters *D.M.* are revealing — and the double cognomen *Paulus Petrus* a coincidence. The son had inherited his father's cognomen, but bore another cognomen, too, which may have been a nickname, *πέτρος* perhaps implying »hard and reliable as a stone«. Another similar case is *C VI* 10882 = 21034: *Acilius Primigenius Petrus*.

Though we must give up the idea that *Petrus* was exclusively Christian, the pagan examples were few, whereas in the Christian epigraphic material

¹ Though most bearers of the name were free-born, there were five examples from the freedman class; *Paulus* was particularly common among the military (14 examples).

² *BAUER*, s. v.

³ *DE ROSSI*, *Bull* 1884—5, p. 77 ff.

⁴ *Bull* 1867, p. 6.

Petrus was one of the most popular cognomina. There is evidence that the name had come into use earlier than the specific Christian nomenclature in general, for in the most ancient stratum of Priscilla there are four examples of the name (Bull 1885, pp. 77; 78 *duo*; 1886, p. 103). Though it may be argued that in some of the early cases *Petrus* was not a biblical name but the pagan cognomen which has been discussed, the frequency of the cases seems to make that interpretation unlikely.

§ 3. Names of martyrs

Because the devotion to, and the cult of martyrs was a significant feature in the life of the ancient Church¹, it is important to investigate to what extent the names of the martyrs became popular among the early Christians. As far as I know, similar studies are few.²

The point of departure is the names of popular martyrs. Special caution is certainly advisable. It is not possible to draw conclusions from later legends as to the popularity of a martyr in early times, most hagiographical legends being devoid of historical truth.³ As to Rome, we fortunately possess an early and genuine document of the veneration of Roman martyrs, the local calendar of martyrs, *depositio martyrum*, published together with some other historical documents in A.D. 354, but in existence since 336 A.D.⁴ A similar Carthaginian calendar is from the following century.⁵ The martyrs recorded in the Roman calendar, some fifty in all, were thus the objects of a cult and venerated during the fourth century. If names of martyrs were assumed by the early Christians, we should find a rise in the frequency of the names recorded in the calendar.

I have chosen a number of the Roman martyrs for this study. Leaving aside the martyrs buried in the neighbourhood of Rome, as well as martyrs having some very common name, such as *Felicitas*, *Felix*, *Hermes*, *Ianuaris*, the martyrs chosen include *Abdos* and *Sennes* (BHL 6); *Agne* (BHL 156); *Callistus*, a pope (BHL 1523); *Fabianus*, a pope (BHL p. 423); *Hippolytus* (BHL 3960); *Laurentius* (BHL 4752); *Parthenius* and *Calocaerus* (BHL 1534); *Pontianus*, a pope (BHL p. 1002); *Protus* and *Hyacinthus* (BHL 6975); *Sebastianus* (BHL 7543); *Xystus*, a pope (BHL 7801). The most famous of the martyrs were *Agne*, *Hippolytus* — the schismatic anti-pope —

¹ See DOERFLER, *Die Anfänge der Heiligenverehrung*, and DELEHAYE *Origines*, passim.

² Cf. DELEHAYE *Origines*, p. 139, where a few studies on Sts. Cosmas and Damias are cited.

³ DELEHAYE, *Les légendes hagiographiques*, p. 104; 203 f.

⁴ AIGRAIN, *L'hagiographie*, p. 253.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20 f.

Laurentius, *Sebastianus* and *Xystus*, as the fact that their names had also been included in the Carthaginian calendar witnesses; *Xystus*, moreover, was the only Roman martyr to figure in the *breviarium Syriacum*, the first universal martyrology.¹ Other early evidence, archeological, liturgical and literary, also confirms the fame of these martyrs.² I have included in the study two famous Carthaginian martyrs, *Cyprianus* (BHL 2037) and *Perpetua* (BHL 6633), registered in the Roman calendar and so venerated in Rome. Moreover, two martyrs not mentioned in the calendar but who enjoyed very great popularity, *Stephanus*, the protomartyr, and *Thecla*, the heroine of a famous apocryphal story (LThK X p. 29), have also been considered.

But if we compare the frequencies of these names in the pagan and Christian inscriptional material, the result is that most of the names recorded in the *depositio martyrum* do not appear to have become popular among the Roman Christians. Thus the names of *Abdos* and *Sennes*, being Persian, were unknown in C VI. If the names were found in the Christian inscriptions of Rome, they had probably been adopted in honour of the martyrs. But though *Abdos* and *Sennes* were by no means unknown martyrs³, there are no examples of these names in the Christian inscriptional material. It is the same in regard to most other names: there is no considerable rise in the frequency, in a few cases actually a fall.⁴

Excluding these cases, the names of martyrs which show a rise in their relative frequency are listed in table 24, next page (I include *Martyrius*, to be discussed later).

Only the most famous martyrs, irrespective of whether or not they were local, thus attracted the popular imagination sufficiently for their names to become popular. Moreover, the rise in the relative frequency of *Agne*, *Hippolytus* and *Sebastianus* was so small that were it not for the general fall in the popularity of Greek cognomina (see p. 57), no rise in their frequency could be established. We may further notice that those martyrs who had held official positions in the Church had more of a chance of becoming popular in nomenclature than simple martyrs; a comparison of *Cyprianus* and *Laurentius* with *Agne* and *Sebastianus* is revealing.

¹ AIGRAIN, *L'hagiographie*, p. 25.

² For this kind of evidence, I have in general consulted DELEHAYE's *Comment. mart. Hieron.*

³ They had two churches bearing their name in Rome, DELEHAYE *Comment. mart. Hieron.* p. 405.

⁴ Giving the frequency in C VI first, the list runs as follows: *Callistus* c. 200—300 — 15; *Calocaerus* 17 — 2; *Fabianus* 20 — 2; *Hyacinthus* 25 — 4; *Parthenius* 13 — 7; *Pontianus* 15—6; *Protus* 55—3; *Xystus* 18—8.

Table 24. Names of martyrs

names	R o m e		C a r t h a g e	
	C VI	Christian	C VIII pagans	Christians Carthage
? <i>Agne</i> ¹	20	13	—	—
<i>Cyprianus-na</i>	—	6	—	20
? <i>Hippolytus-ta</i>	15	12	—	—
<i>Laurentius-ia</i>	5	110	4	4
<i>Perpetua</i>	3	3	—	7
? <i>Sebastianus</i>	1	SI 269; 1411	—	—
<i>Stephanus-na</i>	see	p. 91	9	10
<i>Thecla</i>	—	7	—	4
<i>Martyrius-ia</i>	—	28	—	—
? <i>Martyr</i>	—	3 ²	—	—

A few of the names need onomastic comment. *Laurentius* was a new formation in *-ius-ia* (see p. 82), and this may have contributed to its popularity, but not decisively; the name in itself does not suggest a clear etymology, as most of the popular cognomina in *-ius* do. *Cyprianus* and *Thecla* are only found in the Christian material. The former is the suffixed form of *Cyprius*, a name which itself is rare in Latin.³ The origin of the name *Thecla* is somewhat enigmatic, and seems to be bound up with the problem of the authenticity of the legend. Earlier scholars, like Sir William RAMSAY, thought most of the legend was true, and following LE BLANT's method of »verisimilitude» tried to work out the original story.⁴ RAMSAY contended that the name *Thecla* was barbaric, and her mother's name *Theocleia* a Grecized form of the name. Modern hagiographical criticism, however, has recognized the futility of the efforts to discover historical truth in the »verisimilar» features of ancient legends⁵, and I think one must, with DELEHAYE, dismiss the legend of *Thecla* as a »fabula».⁶ Because the story is not authentic, the name cannot be historical. It is of course possible that the writer of the legend had given his heroine a name current in Asia Minor, but no onomastic dictionary covering the area records *Thecla* or a similar name.⁷ The name seems to be wholly fictitious, and

¹ The name was, however, most often written *Hagne*. For the form of the name, cf. FERRUA, *Civiltà Cattolica* 1939 I p. 122.

² The cases recording the form *Martyr*, FE 7700; 8539; 8597 are all uncertain, however.

³ *Thes. Onom.* II col. 800, 23 records two bearers of that name.

⁴ *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, p. 375 ff.

⁵ See DELEHAYE, *Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique*, p. 20 ff.

⁶ *Comment. mart. Romanum*, p. 412.

⁷ SUNDWALL, *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier*; WUTHNOW, *Die semitischen Menschnennamen*.

it was probably created by the author out of the common Greek woman's name *Θεόκληα*, which he used as the name of the girl's mother.

We have to discuss one more name pertaining here: *Martyrius - ia*. The name was coined from the common Greek word *μάρτυς*, which later became a specific Christian term for those who had given testimony of their faith by preferring death to apostasy. The much-debated problem of how this word came to have this specific Christian meaning is not of interest to us here.¹ The name *Martyrius* is an expression of the veneration of all the martyrs.²

There are eight cases in our material of *Martyra*, *Martyrus*, but these are unlikely to be independent formations; they are rather to be considered as Vulgar forms, the disappearance of *i* in *-ri-* being very common.³ There is certainly an early example of *Martura* in *CI: 2 1110*, but it is doubtful whether this is a Greek name derived from *μάρτυς*. It seems to be of Celtic origin; cf. the frequent Celtic name *Martus* or *Marthus* in HOLDER. The similarity to the late form *Martura* — the change *y* > *u* was of course wide-spread — was thus accidental.

Though *Martyrius* is a name with an undoubted Christian flavour and though it was fairly popular in Rome, it is almost unknown in Carthage and Africa. Similar cases will come up in what follows (see pp. 104 and 114). This was probably due to the fact that *Martyrius* and other similar names which were derived from Greek stems had less chance of becoming popular in Africa where Greek cognomina had always been relatively rare (see p. 58). Moreover, the African Church underwent latinization at an earlier date than the Roman Church, and this may also have handicapped the spread of Christian names of Greek origin (see p. 103).

III. CHRISTIAN THEOPHORIC NAMES

§ 1. *The classification of theophoric names*

Theophoric names were one of the earliest and most important categories of *pagan* nomenclature. The names were of two types; they were either »dedicatory names», such as *Apollonius* and *Saturninus*, derived from the name of a deity with a suffix and bringing out the idea of a human being belonging to, or supposed to enjoy the protection of the deity.⁴ On

¹ Cf. the discussion in DELEHAYE, *Sanctus*, p. 74 ff.

² DELEHAYE *Origines*, p. 139.

³ SVENNUNG, *Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre*, p. 17 ff.

⁴ FICK-BECHTEL p. 300 ff.; SCHULZE *Eigennamen* p. 464 ff. USENER, *Götternamen* p. 349 ff. seems to exaggerate the importance of the theophoric element in ancient nomenclature.

the other hand, divine names as such began to be borne by human beings about the beginning of our era, e.g. *Hermes* and *Mercurius*, though mostly by humble people; it is likely, as has been suggested, that divine names could not be used as personal names until the period of religious decay.¹

Because theophoric names were such a distinctive feature of ancient nomenclature and because the Christians were the inheritors of pagan onomastic traditions, it is reasonable to expect theophoric names to be a significant element in Christian nomenclature. Theophoric names are in fact the largest category of specific Christian names and their importance is enhanced by the fact that most of the names were unknown to the pagans. Yet there is a great difference between pagan and Christian theophoric names. Because the Christians naturally could not use divine names as such as personal names, it is only the first, the »dedicatory» group, which is represented here. Again, whereas pagan divinities were innumerable and the number of different theophoric names consequently very great, the Christians had not many to choose from. Christ was called *Christus*, the name *Jesus* being rare (cf. DIEHL III p. 195). God was naturally called *Deus* and *Θεός*. Moreover, there were the Greek and Latin equivalents of »the Lord», *Κύριος* and *Dominus*.

No personal name was derived from *Jesus*. The only name in which *Christus* is an element is *Christophorus* (see table 25, next page). But because the name is found in a late graffito in Commodilla, it is possible that it refers to the famous Christian martyr of the same name (*BHL* 1764).² The word *Χριστόφορος* was originally an appellative, implying »das wahre Christsein des Christus in sich tragenden»³, and it was also a frequent proper name of Christians, especially in Egypt (cf. PREISIGKE *Namenbuch*). Some other Christian and not the martyr may thus have been meant in the graffito. In any case, the example is too late and too rare to be of any importance. All the other terms were used in deriving Christian theophoric names, in particular *Deus*, see next page.

§ 2. Names derived from *Deus* and *Θεός*

The word *Deus* is contained in all the other names except the rare *Quodiubet*, where it is implied as the subject, however. The idea conveyed by the names is either that of a child as a gift of God — *Adeodatus*, *Deusdedit*, *Deusdona* — or that of the power of God in human affairs — *Deushabet*,

¹ USENER *Götternamen* p. 358; FICK-BECHTEL p. 304; MEYERSAHM, *Deorum nomina hominibus imposita* p. 30.

² This martyr seems, however, to be a creation of hagiographical imagination, see DELEHAYE *Comment. mart. Hieron.* p. 396.

³ A. HERMANN, *RAntChrist II* col. 1243.

Table 25. *Christian theophoric names*

names	R o m e		C a r t h a g e	
	C VI	Christian	C VIII pagans	Christians Carthage
<i>Christus</i>				
<i>C<h>risto<ph>orus</i>	—	SI 6449, 7	—	—
<i>Deus</i>				
<i>Adeodatus-ta</i>	—	45	—	17
<i>Deogratias</i>	—	SI 5297	—	20
<i>Deusdat</i>	—	RS III p. 141	—	—
<i>Deusdedit</i>	—	9	—	12
<i>D(eu)s dona</i>	—	SI 6449, 10; 11	—	—
<i>Deushabet</i>	—	—	—	3
<i>Habetdeus</i>	—	SI 20; 5215	—	3
<i>Quodiubet</i>	—	—	—	ILT 1147
<i>Quodvultdeus</i>	—	18	—	30
<i>Spesindeo</i>	—	SI 6334; FE 9168	—	ILT 1147 duo
<i>Vincetdeus</i>	—	—	—	ILT 1147
<i>Θεός</i>				
<i>Theodulus-le</i>	1	21	1	—
<i>Κύριος</i>				
<i>Cyriacus-ce</i>	9	113	1	ILT 1147 duo
<i>Dominus</i>				
<i>Dominicus-ca</i>	—	6	—	4
<i>Domninus-na</i>	1	19	—	—

Quodvultdeus, etc. A few inscriptions in which the meaning of the names is referred to, though not quite in the original sense, bring out their Christian character; SI 4926 = DIEHL 1196, on a levite: *A Deo sic datus altaris fuit ille minister / nomen ut aequaret vita decora viri*; the priest was called *Adeodatus*; in DIEHL 1195 we read about another levite: *ecce Deusdedit nomen qui forte gerebas, / ecce Deus dedit regna beata tibi*. Again, *Deogratias* has a very specific Christian flavour, *Deo gratias* being the watchword of the Catholics in opposition to the *Deo laudes* of the Donatists (see the comment on ILT 1202).

These names have an alien look at first sight. With the exception of *Adeodatus-ta*, they are in principle *indeclinable*.¹ Moreover, most of them are *sentence-names* foreign to Greek and Latin nomenclature. It has been argued that the names originated in North Africa as translations of current Punic (Semitic) names: »sentence-names» were a

¹ There were, however, some attempts at declination; SI 5744 we have *Deusdedxitis* as the genitive of *Deusdedit*; SI 3396: *Cobuldeo* = *Quodvultdeo* is the dative; SI 6305 = DIEHL 3789adn and ILT 1147: *Quodvuldeonia* and *Covuldonia* are the feminine forms of the same name.

distinctive feature of Semitic nomenclature.¹ *Adeodatus* and *Deusdona* may, however, be translations of Greek personal names *Θεόδοτος* and *Θεόδωρος* as well. The other names, in which a subject and a predicate are expressed or implied, are probably of Semitic origin. The names came into being in Africa and in particular in Carthage, as may be seen from a comparison of Roman and Carthaginian frequencies. The coining of the names may be explained as follows. In North Africa, especially in Carthage, the Punic language persisted alongside the official Latin²; when Christianity conquered North Africa, the Punic-speaking population was also affected.³ Because Latin early became the language of the African Church, Greek being the language of the Roman Church down to the middle of the third century⁴, it is possible that a need was felt in Africa to venerate God even by the names borne by the Christians, and this need was met by translating current Semitic (or Greek) names familiar to a population in which the native element was strong.

There are a large number of personal names derived from *Θεός*, *Theodotus*, *Theodosius*, *Theodorus*, etc., many of them in use from the earliest times (see p. 61). Though it might be contended that the *θεός* of the names was now the God of the Christians and that the names had accordingly acquired a new, «Christian» sense, the names were so extremely common in pagan times that it is questionable whether the Christians were able to create anything fresh out of them (for the pagan interpretation of the rare *Theoctistus* see *SICV* 152 *idem* 204).

One Christian theophoric name is derived from *Θεός*, *Theodulus* (*Θεόδουλος*). Though the name is not wholly unknown in pagan documents (*C VI* 11762: *Annius Theodulus*; other cases *II* 2142 and *VIII* 23011a), it is likely that, the idea of *hierodulia* being foreign to the Greeks and Romans, the pagan *Θεόδουλος* was due to Oriental influence⁵. Yet it was only in Christian times, as our list reveals, that the name became really frequent. The idea of a human being as the slave of God was popular in early Christianity; one need only recall the numerous inscriptions in which the epithets *servus Dei* and *ancilla Dei* are included (examples in *DIEHL* 1454—57 and 1465—68). The name *Theodulus* became popular among the early Christians because it corresponded to this Christian idea.⁶

¹ MOWAT *L'élément*, RA 1869 I p. 246 ff.

² Cp. e.g. *Oxf. Class. Dict.* p. 18.

³ LIETZMANN, *Geschichte der alten Kirche II* p. 221.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 220 f.

⁵ SITTIG, *De Graecorum nominibus theophoris*, p. 164; REINACH, *Sur une classe de noms grecs théophores*, RA 1924, p. 154.

⁶ There are no incontestable cases of the corresponding Latin expressions, *servus Dei* and *ancilla Dei*, used as personal names. SILVAGNI certainly inserted in his index of personal names a few *Servi dei* (3798; 6324; 6325). All the cases are, how-

§ 3. Names derived from *Kύριος* and *Dominus*

Cyriacus-ce (less correctly *Quiriacus-ce*) is one of the most common cognomina in the Christian inscriptions of Rome. Though the name is found in the pagan material, too, its frequency in the Christian material is many times larger. The significance of this rise in frequency is all the greater considering the general decline of Greek nomenclature in Rome (see p. 57). Some special circumstances must account for the rise. I think we have here a very clear example of a semantic shift in a personal name. For the pagans the Greek adjective *κυριακός*, from which the name is derived, suggested »belonging to the *Kύριος*, i.e. the master», and so *Cyriacus* was an appropriate name for a slave. But for the Christians the name suggested »belonging to *Kύριος*, i.e. the Lord» (see LIDDELL-SCOTT), and it was no doubt this new connotation, which so well corresponds to the idea of man as the slave of God, that explains the popularity of the name in Christian times. We have, moreover, an unequivocal example that *Cyriacus* was considered a Christian name in the ancient Church: in the legend of *Iudas qui et Cyriacus*, written about the turn of the fifth and sixth centuries, *Iudas*, a Jew, was said to have assumed the name of *Cyriacus* at baptism, that is to say, as a mark of his conversion to Christianity.¹

Though theophoric names were numerous in the Christian material from Carthage, *Cyriacus* is not found; the name is also rare elsewhere in Africa (two examples in *C VIII*). It is the same in regard to *Theodulus* (see the table). The phenomenon is to be explained along the lines suggested on p. 100: the general paucity of Greek nomenclature in Africa, and the early latinization of the African Church.

The number of Latin cognomina which were derived from *dominus* is considerable. The very word was used as a women's name, though mostly in the syncopated form, *Domna*.² Other derivatives, all of them syncopated forms, were that formed with the suffix *-io*, *Domnio*, and that with the

ever, fragmentary, and it is more than likely that *servus dei* was an epithet preceded by the real name. Moreover, SILVAGNI's supplements do not always look correct: in 6325 he has supplemented *Serbu[sdei]*, but *Serbu[s]* and *Serbu[lus]* seem more likely supplements. DIEHL has also included one *Servus dei* in his index, but given it a question mark; in this example (1454) a copper collar of a slave bears the inscription *servus dei fugitivus*. It is probable that *Fugitivus* was the proper name and *servus dei* an epithet. In *SI* 3194 = DIEHL, 1464 we certainly have *ancilla dei* in place of the name, the epitaph being undamaged, but the real name had probably been suppressed, there being examples of epitaphs in which the name of the deceased is lacking (GROSSI GONDI *Trattato* p. 77 f.).

¹ *Liber pontificalis* (ed. MOMMSEN) p. 45: . . . *et baptizatus est Iudas qui et Quiriacus*; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* I 34 (PL 71, col. 179): . . . *prodente Iuda Hebraeo, qui post baptismum Quiriacus est vocitatus*. Cf. p. 119 below.

² A sporadic masculine is found in *SI* 3434 = DIEHL, 2809adn: *Donnus*, i.e. *Domnus*.

suffix *-inus*, *Domninus*, and the diminutive *Domnula*. There is also a name derived from the corresponding adjective, *Dominicus*. The last name is found only in Christian inscriptions, whereas the others figure in the pagan ones, too. There was a slight rise in the frequency of *Domna* (five examples both in *C VI* and in *SI-FE*), the relative frequency of *Domnio* remaining fairly constant (seven examples in *C VI* and two in *SI-FE*); *Domnula* is rare (the only example is *FE* 8849). On the other hand, *Domninus* was so rare in the pagan material that both it and *Dominicus* must be considered Christian (see table 25 p. 102).

The derivations of *dominus* seem to have come into use late in the Empire¹, the point of departure perhaps being the extensive use of *dominus* as a title.² Though the Christians, too, made use of the title in addressing the saints and the clergy³, there was nothing specifically Christian in this usage. The slight rise in the frequency of *Domna* was thus rather due to its late coming into use than to any Christian associations. One might also ascribe the popularity of *Domninus* in the Christian material to its being a suffixed form in favour during the Later Empire (cf. p. 64). Yet even granting this, *Domninus* is far too frequent in the Christian material for this interpretation to appear acceptable. Considering examples like *Iov-inus* and *Saturn-inus*⁴, it is more likely that the name had come to possess a Christian connotation: »belonging to *Dominus*», that is to say, to »the Lord». *Domninus* had thus undergone a semantic shift similar to *Cyriacus*.

D o m i n i c u s - c a, derived from the adjective *dominicus*, »belonging to the Lord»⁵, came into use late.⁶ It may also have originated as the Latin translation of *Cyriacus*. For another interpretation of the name, see p. 107.

IV. DATE NAMES OF CHRISTIAN ORIGIN

§ 1. *The Christian reshaping of the Roman calendar*

Among the Greeks and Romans, it was a general practice to give a child a name recalling his or her time of birth.⁷ In Greek, it was the names of festivals that were most often used, but also the names of days and

¹ The earliest bearer of the simple form *Domna* is Caracalla's mother, see *Thes. Suppl. Onom. III* col. 215, 69.

² *Thes. V* col. 1924, 77.

³ *Ibid.*, col. 1929, 61; 1930, 66.

⁴ SCHULZE *Eigennamen*, p. 467.

⁵ *Thes. V* col. 1888, 83.

⁶ Three of the Roman examples are very late, *SI* 4949: A.D. 465; *RO* 1068 = *DIEHL* 3727Fadn: A.D. 533/44; *SI* 6449, 14: seventh century.

⁷ *HIRZEL Name* p. 37 ff.

months.¹ In Latin, the most important group was represented by the cognomina obtained from the names of months, with *Ianuarius* and *December* heading the list (see p. 22). A few names, such as *Kalendinus*, were derived from Roman designations of days.² Matters are a little more complicated in regard to cognomina recalling Roman festivals, for most of them, e.g. *Neptunalis*, *Saturnalis*, etc., could be considered theophoric as well.³

With the coming of Christianity, a number of changes took place in the calendar, and it is natural to expect a corresponding reshaping in nomenclature. Though the seven-day week had become common property through the medium of astrology⁴, the names of the days were subjected to important changes. The ancient *dies solis* became the day of rest and was renamed *dies dominica* (κυριακή ἡμέρα). The Jewish Sabbath, largely observed during the Empire by non-Jews as well, became the last day of the week, partly replacing the earlier name of the day, *dies Saturni*. Both innovations were late in appearing.⁵ Pagan festivals went out of use during the fourth century⁶ and were replaced by Christian ones, especially by Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Easter and Pentecost.⁷ The names which by our criteria may be considered as Christian date names are included in the following statistical table:

Table 26. *Christian date names*

names	R o m e		C a r t h a g e	
	C VI and FREY	Christian	C VIII pagans	Christians Carthage
<i>names of days</i>	19 + FREY, 17	—	1	—
<i>Sabbatis</i>		—		—
<i>Sabbatius-ia</i>		40 ⁸	—	—
<i>Christmas</i>	—	SI 3675	4	3
<i>Epiphany</i>	—	5	—	3
<i>Lent</i>	—	4	—	—
<i>Easter</i>	—	36	—	33
<i>Pentecost</i>	—	RAC 1931, 191	—	—

¹ FICK-BECHTEL p. 295 ff.

² GOTTANKA, *Epigraphische Beiträge*, p. 33 ff.

³ GOTTANKA, *op. cit.* p. 57 ff., though admitting the theophoric interpretation, considers a derivation from names of festivals as more likely, whereas SCHULZE *Eigennamen*, p. 486 f., regards cognomina derived with the suffix *-alis* and *-aris* as theophoric; cf. p. 62 fn. 1 above.

⁴ See KUBITSCHKE, *Grundriss der antiken Zeitrechnung*, p. 31.

⁵ In *Codex Theod.*, the expression *dies solis* was usual during the fourth century (II 8, 1a; 8, 18; 8, 19; 8, 20); *dies dominica* is first referred to in A.D. 386 (II 8, 18), but begins only to dominate after A.D. 399 (II 8, 23). In DIEHL, there are 13 examples of *dies solis*, the latest of them in A.D. 608 (1148); *dies dominica* is found ten times,

§ 2. Names derived from names of days

Though *Cyriacus* and *Dominicus* are derived from adjectives used as Greek and Latin terms for Sunday (see above), it is unlikely that, apart from exceptions, the names could be considered as date names. Were it so, *Dominicus*, the Latin term, should outnumber *Cyriacus*. Moreover, both names came into use considerably earlier than the Christian terms for Sunday.

The name *Sabbatius-ia*, common in Christian Rome, was a new form, obtained through the suffix *-ius-ia*, of the woman's name *Sabbatis*, which was frequent in Jewish and pagan inscriptions. *Sabbatis* is in turn derived from *sabbatum* or *sabbata*, the Hebrew word for the day of rest. It is problematic whether *Sabbatius-ia* was a name of distinctive Christian character. The Christians did not observe the Sabbath as a festal day, on the contrary, celebrating the Sabbath was considered judaizing and condemned.¹ The frequency of the name in the Christian inscriptional material may have been a Jewish legacy. The Sabbath was a distinctive Jewish institution, and the personal name commemorating it, *Sabbatis*, is characteristically Jewish; considering the limited number of Jewish inscriptions from Rome (five hundred odd), the frequency of the name and its derivatives² is considerable. As to the examples in the pagan epigraphic material, it has been suggested that these bearers of the name *Sabbatis* were non-Jewish semi-proselytes.³ However, not a few of them must have been Jewish slaves and freedmen or their descendents. It is possible, then, that the Christians had inherited the name *Sabbatius* from the Jews, continuing to use it with little regard for its religious significance.

§ 3. Names commemorating Christmas and Epiphany

Numerous scholars argue that there were Christian names commemorating Christmas. The names suggested include *Natalis*, *Genesius*, *Natalilicus*, and *Natalius*.⁴ To decide whether or not this is so, one must first

the earliest in A.D. 404 (659adn). In DIEHL there are also 11 examples of *dies Saturni* and nine of *dies Sabbati*, the earliest of them dated A.D. 449 (1706).

⁶ Prohibited in *Codex Theod.* II 8, 22 (A.D. 395).

⁷ For the importance of these festivals, see *Codex Theod.* II 8, 24 (A.D. 400).

⁸ *SI* 5470: *Sabatian* ... may be a form coined with the suffix *-anus*, *Sabbatianus*.

¹ Cf J. G. CARLETON, *Festivals and Fasts (Christian)*, *ERE* V p. 844.

² *Εὐσαββᾶτις* (379); *Σαββᾶσα* (396). The new form *Sabbatius* is also found (153; 263 etc.).

³ GOTTANKA, *Epigraphische Beiträge*, p. 81 f.

⁴ *Natalis* is considered Christian by MARTIGNY p. 513, the other names by SCHRIJNEN *Namengebung*, Mn 1935, p. 275; *Genesius* is also counted as Christian by HIRZEL *Name*, p. 42.

consider the institution of the festival and the terms denoting it. Christmas seems to have originated in Rome, and the earliest mention of it is found in the *depositio martyrum* of A.D. 354. The Latin term for the festival was *natalis* or *natale*, a term probably taken over from the *natalis Solis Invicti* which was replaced by Christmas.¹ The Greek term for Christmas being τὰ γενέθλια, the Greek cognomen commemorating Christmas should be *Genethlius* and not *Genesius*. But though there are a few examples of *Genethlius* in the pagan material, it is unknown in Christian inscriptions. *Natalis* must also be dismissed: the name is frequent in pagan inscriptions (*C VIII* alone gives 47 examples) and not very common in the Christian ones (two cases in *SI-FE*, one in Carthage). Only *Natalius* and *Natalicus* are left. *Natalius* is not a common name, the only example coming from Christian Carthage (*C VIII* 25134). It is unlikely to be anything but a late derivative of *Natalis* (see p. 80). A better case could be made out for *Natalicus*, which, though without significance elsewhere in the Roman Empire, is sometimes found in Africa and shows a rise in relative frequency in Christian Carthage (see table 26, p. 106). But though one could argue that the pagan name *Natalicus* had been appropriated by the Christians because it suggested their great festival, it is also possible to consider the name as a variety of *Natalis*, coined with the suffix *-icus* popular in Africa (cf. p. 63), the rise in Christian frequency being due to the lateness of the formation. The Christian character of *Natalicus* is therefore not incontestable.

It is also consistently held that *Epiphanius-ia* was a Christian name commemorating *Epiphany*² (lat. *Epiphania*, Greek Ἐπιφάνεια). But because the feast, which originated in the East and only spread to the West during the fourth century, was still fairly unknown in contemporary Rome³, its influence upon Roman nomenclature must have been still less than that of Christmas. There are certainly examples of *Epiphanius* (see table 26, p. 106), but the name was a derivative in *-ius* of the ancient Greek cognomina *Epiphania* and *Epiphanes* (in *C VI* there are ten and two examples, respectively). Because the pagan name implied «fame» and «famous», whereas the name of the Christian festival developed from quite another meaning of the word Ἐπιφάνεια, «divine manifestations»⁴, it is unlikely that the new form *Epiphanius* suggested the Christian festival, least of all in Rome. In Carthage, considering that the pagan names are not found in *C VIII* at all, the three instances of *Epiphanius* may attest Christian influence.

¹ MOHRMANN *Études*, p. 267.

² MARTIGNY p. 513; MOFFAT, *ERE IX* p. 147; SCHRIJNEN *Namengebung*, Mn 1935, p. 275.

³ The *depositio martyrum* of A.D. 354 records Christmas but not Epiphany.

⁴ MOHRMANN *Études*, pp. 250 and 261.

§ 4. Names commemorating Lent, Pentecost and Easter

Only when we approach the most important festival of the ancient Church, Easter, do we find unequivocal examples of Christian names obtained from the Calendar. The period of fasting before Easter, *Lent*, originated in the East and was first mentioned in A.D. 325.¹ In the Western Church the Latin equivalent, *Quadragesima*, was substituted for the Greek name of the festival, *τεσσαρακοστή*.² The four Roman women bearing the name were certainly so named in regard to the festival — they had probably been born during Lent — for so high a number was unlikely to be used as a cognomen without special reasons. It is the same with the sporadic *Πεντηκοστή*, derived from the Greek term for the festival of *Pentecost*, *πεντηκοστή ἡμέρα*.

In the ancient Church, fifteen days, seven after and seven before Easter Sunday, were included in the *Easter* period.³ The importance of the feast was increased by the fact that catechumens were generally baptized on Easter Day.⁴ The Greek and Latin name of the feast was derived from the corresponding Hebrew name, in Greek transcription *πάσχα*, in Latin *pascha*. The personal name obtained from *pascha* was *Paschasius-ia*, clearly a new formation in *-ius-ia* (see p. 86).

Considering the double significance of Easter to the ancient Church — as a religious festival and as a time of the baptism of catechumens — it is possible to explain the name *Paschasius* in two ways. Either it was, as SCHRIJNEN argues,⁵ a baptismal name given to catechumens, or it was the name of *Easter children*. There is little evidence to support the first contention. The only example that might be adduced is *C XII* 956 = *DIEHL* 3540: *Optatina Reticia sive Pascasia*, where the agnomen may have been assumed at baptism. *SI* 3722: *Paschasia Veneranda*, might be quoted as another similar case. But since we lack examples in which *Paschasius* is explicitly stated to have been given at baptism as the new, Christian name, the problem must remain unsolved (see p. 119).

On the other hand, there are a few epitaphs which show that *Easter children* were often called by the name *Paschasius*. The most important of them is *RO* 810 = *DIEHL* 1541: *Natu<s> Severi nomine Paschasius dies pascales prid. no[n] April[es]* — — —. The child had been born on the 4th of April, 457 and died on the 28th of April, 463, eight days after receiving baptism on Easter Day, the 21st of April. In 457 Easter was celebrated

¹ *ODCC* p. 797.

² *MOHRMANN Études*, p. 43.

³ *Codex Theod.* II 8, 19 (A.D. 389).

⁴ *ODCC* p. 432.

⁵ *Namengebung*, Mn 1935, p. 274.

on the 30th of March, so that the 4th of April falls within the *dies paschales*.¹ In the inscription, *dies pascales* stands for the ablative of time of classical Latin, and the text may be interpreted: an Easter child (*Pascasius*), with the (real) name *Severus*, had been born during the Easter days — — —.

Further, if we find epitaphs in which both the exact age and the *dies depositionis* are given, it is easy for us, supposing that the *dies mortis* and *dies depositionis* coincide,² to reckon the time of birth. If it falls within the period of *dies paschales*, the conclusion that the child bore the name to commemorate his time of birth seems justified. There are a few such cases. In *SI* 5791 = *DIEHL* 4146Cb, a *Pascasius* was buried on the 4th of December, 382 at the age of four years, eight months and four days. The child had thus been born on the first of April, 378, which was the Easter Day of that year.³ Another case is *C XIII* 2353 = *DIEHL* 2901: a *Pascasia* was buried on the 29th of July, 422 at the age of two years, three months and ten days, with the time of birth consequently about the 19th of April, 420. Because Easter was celebrated on the 18th of April that year⁴, the time of birth falls within the period of the fifteen *dies paschales*.

Since in all the cases in which we possess clear indications of time, the time of the birth of persons bearing the name *Paschasius-ia* falls within the *dies paschales*, or even on Easter Day itself, it is legitimate to assume that the name was primarily given to children born during Easter time.

V. NAMES EXPRESSIVE OF CHRISTIAN IDEAS

§ 1. *A general note*

We have so far had reliable criteria in deciding the Christian character of a personal name: the names of saints and the Christian terms for God and Christ as well as for Christian festivals could be used as the point of departure. Matters are much more complicated if we look for names expressing Christian ideas. Whereas names embodying Christian dogmas are somewhat easier to lay hold of, names expressive of Christian virtues are quite misleading, the virtues of »piety», »faith», »hope», etc. being known to the pagans also. This is why I have been cautious in regard to names of the latter type. Names which, by the criteria of connotation and frequency, can be argued to express Christian ideas are listed below:

¹ For the comments, see *RO* and *DIEHL*, *ad loc.*

² This was usually the case, see *H. NORDBERG*, *Biometrical Notes*, p. 53.

³ See *SCHWARTZ*, *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln*.

⁴ *Ibid.*

Table 27. Names expressive of Christian ideas

	names	R o m e		C a r t h a g e	
		C VI and FREY	Christian	C VIII pagans	Christians Carthage
dogmas	<i>Anastasius-ia</i>	FREY, 4	51	—	4
	<i>Redemptus-ta</i>	15	31	6	10
	<i>Refrigerius-ia</i>	2	6	—	C 25349b
	? <i>Renatus-ta</i>	12	19	9	C 14195—96
	<i>Renovatus-ta</i>	—	—	—	4
	<i>Reparatus-ta</i>	1	4	—	4
virtues	<i>Agape</i>	4	66 ¹	1	—
	<i>Agapius</i>	—	3	—	—
	<i>Innocentius-ia</i>	2	28	3	ILT 1147 duo

§ 2. Names embodying Christian dogmas

The most important of these names is *Anastasius-ia*. The name was derived with the suffix *-ιος-ius* from the Greek term for the resurrection from the dead, *ἀνάστασις* (see p. 86). Though the term had occasionally the same meaning in older Greek, it first became important in the New Testament, especially in the meaning of »the future resurrection on Judgment Day» (BAUER *s.v.*). The Christian character of the name is further proved by a few epitaphs in which the meaning of the name is alluded to; IG IV 412: 'Ἀναστασία ἀνασταθῖσα τῇ καὶ 'Απριλίον, where, however, it is not the exact theological meaning of the name to which allusion is made; in SI 6130 = DIEHL 3341, it is the exact meaning of the name which is referred to: *Anastasia*<m> *secundum nomen credo fut[uram]*.

Nevertheless, one must disclaim that the Christians had priority in the use of the name. Though there were no examples in the pagan material, the name was not at all uncommon among the Jews (see table 27). The popularity of the name which was derived from the term *ἀνάστασις* in Jewish epigraphic material was due to the fact that about the beginning of our era the Jews, with the exception of the Saducees, believed in the resurrection, and after the Fall of Jerusalem this belief further grew in importance.² The significance of this article of faith to the Jews explains the coining of the corresponding personal name.³ It is likely that the

¹ The diminutive *Agapetilla* is found SI 4858 = DIEHL 3532 and ARM p. 16 = DIEHL 1465.

² See e.g. FREY, *Les Juifs avaient-ils des dogmes?* Gregorianum 1927, p. 497 ff.

³ Cp. FREY 211: [*Anas*]*tasius*; »il constitue une belle profession de foi en la résurrection des corps». FREY's supplement is, however, uncertain, [*Eus*]*tasius* being also possible.

Christians took over the name from the Jews, which, because of a similar belief, became a very important Christian name.

The four names beginning with *Re-*, *Redemptus*, *Renatus*, *Renovatus*, *Reparatus*, all imply the idea of redemption. The first of them, *Redemptus-ta*, belongs to those cognomina which were frequent in pagan documents and which should accordingly be treated with caution. *Redemptus*, as well as the other three names, is a cognomen derived from a past participle, and like other similar names seems to have been borne primarily by humble people.¹ Though the rise in the Christian frequency might be ascribed to the general popularity of cognomina derived from past participles during Imperial Times ², it is more likely that, the verb *redimere* having undergone a semantic shift and expressing the idea of redemption (BLAISE s.v.; cf. DIEHL III p. 396), the personal name obtained from the verb had acquired a new, Christian connotation.

Renatus-ta is a name generally claimed as Christian.³ It is derived from the past participle of the verb *renascor*, and it is the importance of this verb in Christian Latin that has made *Renatus* seem a Christian name. In Christian terminology the verb denoted »to be reborn, scil. through baptism» (BLAISE s.v.; cf. DIEHL III, p. 397, for epigraphic material). One might therefore expect *Renatus* to be a distinctive baptismal name. There are few examples to prove this, however. A neophyte of five years certainly bears the name *Renata* in SI 6100 = DIEHL 1489B. But though MARUCCHI argues that the girl had been given the name at baptism ⁴, it remains uncertain, as no other name is given, whether the girl had been called so from her birth or whether her original name had been replaced by the Christian one at baptism. In addition to the fact that there is little evidence that *Renatus* was a baptismal name, the rise in the Christian frequency is not as high as that of *Redemptus*, for instance (see table 27). The Christian character of *Renatus* is therefore somewhat open to doubt.

Two other similar names, *Renovatus-ta* and *Reparatus-ta* have better claims to be considered Christian. Both are derived from verbs which had acquired new, Christian meanings similar to *renascor* (BLAISE s.v.; for *renovare* in inscriptions, cf. DIEHL III p. 397). Both names seem to have originated, or at least acquired a Christian connotation in Africa. *Renovatus* is only Christian; besides being found in Carthage, it is twice found in CX; *Reparatus* is borne by nine other Christians in

¹ Six of the cases in C VI belong to slaves, freedmen, *peregrini* and soldiers.

² Cf. OTTO, *Nomina propria Latina oriunda a participiis perfecti*, Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie, Suppl. XXIV, 1898, p. 743 ff.

³ MARTIGNY p. 513; GROSSI GONDI *Trattato*, p. 82; SCHRIJNEN *Namengebung*, Mn 1935, p. 275; TESTINI, *Archeologia cristiana*, p. 370.

⁴ *Le catacombe romane*, p. 120.

Africa¹, and in other volumes of *C* it is borne by three Christians and three pagans.

There is one more name which may be taken as expressing a Christian article of belief, *Refrigerius*. The name is derived with the suffix *-ius* from the noun *refrigerium* or the verb *refrigerare* (see p. 81). In *C VI* 22028 the name is found as a detached signum. Though these facts suggest that the slight rise in the Christian frequency was due to *Refrigerius* being a new formation, some special circumstances seem to argue in favour of the Christianity of the name. Both *refrigerium* and *refrigerare* had acquired new connotations in Christian Latin: »eternal bliss» and »to enjoy heavenly joy» (see BLAISE s.v.). The name *Refrigerius* may have been given as an embodiment of the parental hopes that their child would in time enjoy celestial bliss.

§ 3. Names suggestive of Christian virtues

I am certain of only two names expressive of Christian virtues, *Agape* and *Innocentius*.

The name *Agape* is derived from the Greek word ἀγάπη, which, according to St. Paul, was the highest Christian virtue (I Cor. 13, 1 ff.). Here it is not the much-discussed meaning of the Christian *agape* that is of interest to us²; we have only to find out whether, and to what extent, the Christians utilized *Agape* as a personal name. Though the idea that ἀγάπη was a specific biblical word first coined by the translators of the *Septuaginta* still finds supporters³, most modern scholars agree that ἀγάπη existed in the *koiné* before the translators of the *LXX* appropriated it.⁴ In profane Greek, however, ἀγάπη stood for »love» in general, whereas the special Christian meaning of the word, though foreshadowed by the *LXX* and subsequent Jewish writing, is to be ascribed to St. Paul.⁵ This discussion of the origin of the word ἀγάπη has special significance for us because the use of *Agape* as a pagan name has been cited as evidence for the extra-biblical origin of the word.⁶ PETERSEN has tried to refute this argument by contending that a few of the instances were Christian and that in the others the name *Agape* was not certain.⁷ PETERSEN's attempt to prove ἀγάπη

¹ In addition to the examples in *C VIII*, AE 1946, 27 and 35 record two members of the clergy bearing the name *Reparatus*.

² See e.g. LIETZMANN, *Handbuch zum neuen Testament IX*, p. 66 f.

³ PETERSEN, ἀγάπη, *Biblische Zeitschrift* 1932, p. 378 ff. The writer of the article »agape» in *ODCC* (1957) considers it a specific biblical word, too.

⁴ DEISSMANN, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 57 ff.; LIETZMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 68; BAUER s.v.

⁵ For a good history of the word, see CERESA-CASTOLDO, ἀγάπη nei documenti anteriori al Nuovo Testamento, *Aegyptus* 1951, p. 269 ff., continued in *RFIC* 1953, p. 347 ff.

⁶ LIETZMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁷ *Op. cit.*

a biblical word has misled him, however. In all the volumes of *C* there are ten cases of the name *Agape* which are considered pagan by the editors, but in none of them can the bearer of the name be considered Christian or the form of the name be questioned.¹ It is not difficult to understand why *Agape* was used as a pagan personal name. As a Greek abstract, ἀγάπη found its way into pagan nomenclature (cf. p. 70), but because the noun was not very common, *Agape* was not as frequent a personal name as *Elpis* and *Irene*, for instance.

In Christian times *Agape* was a very popular name (see table 27 p. 111). This enormous rise in its frequency can only be due to the fact that ἀγάπη had become an important Christian notion. Whereas ἀγάπη for the pagans denoted ordinary human love, for the Christians it suggested »loving-kindness», »love of God» and »God's love». Numerous inscriptions in which the expression *in agape* is found attest the familiarity of the term in early Christian times (DIEHL 2723 ff.). A similar change of meaning must have taken place in the personal name, and *Agape* acquired a strong Christian connotation.

It may be seen from list 27, p. 111, that whereas *Anastasius* and *Agape* are frequent in Christian Rome, they are rare or unknown in Carthage. While in regard to *Anastasius* the same is true as in regard to *Martyrius* and other similar names (see p. 100): as a Greek cognomen it had less chance of becoming popular in Latin Africa, *Agape* seems to be rare outside Rome, the only non-Roman examples coming from Latium and from Ostia (*C XIV* 1897 and 4810). There are, moreover, two cases in Hadrumetum (*ILT* 201). The popularity of *Agape* thus seems to have been a Roman peculiarity.

The slight rise in the frequency of the cognate name *Agapetus* (in *C VI* there are 12 and in the Christian material 17 cases) may have been due to the fact that when *Agape* became a very popular Christian name, *Agapetus* also acquired greater popularity because of the etymological connection.

Apart from *Agape*, I can only vouch for the Christianity of one name expressive of »virtue», *Innocentius* - *ia*. The name is rare in pagan inscriptions.² Though it may be objected that *Innocentius* belongs to the

¹ The cases are *C III* 2104: *Vettia Agape* (the husband an *Augustalis*); *V* 1260 *Iulia Agapae* (the *domus aeterna* figuring in the inscription is not a specific Christian feature); *VI* 3491: *Cosconia Agape* (notice *D.M.S.*); *VI* 13785: *Manlia Agape* (the epitaph terminates in a typical pagan formula *libertis libertabusque* etc.); *VI* 16805: *Agapeni* (notice *D.M.*); *VI* 21527: *Luceia Agape* (though the members of the family are referred to as *Luceii* and *filii*, it is impossible to argue that the bearer of the name was a man and the name *Agapetus*); *VIII* 20956: *Claudia Agape* (notice the figures of »*canis*» and »*infans uvam tenens*», which argue paganism); *X* 2505: *Flavia Agape* (notice *D.M.*); *X* 3674 = *ILS* 6335: *Aemil(ia) Agape* (the brother an *eques Romanus* and *decurio*); *XIV* 1064: . . . *inia Agape* (a sarcophagus).

² Both examples, *C VI* 1663 and 19941 = 22628, are very late and may have been Christian.

new formations which did not become popular until the Later Empire, some facts seem to prove the Christianity of the name. First, the simple form *Innocens* was also rare in pagan documents (in *C VI* only 9285 and probably 38467a). Again, *innocens* was a term popular among the early Christians, referring to *infantia quae arbitrii expers peccare nescit*¹, whereas in pagan use it had the more general meaning of »innocent», referring to children and adults alike.² The idea that *innocens* for the Christians suggested the specific notion quoted is strengthened by the fact that though *innocens* is a popular epithet in Christian inscriptions according to DIEHL, III p. 539, out of the twenty odd examples cited by him only one pertains to an adult.³ Though *innocentissimus*, the superlative, is a term occasionally found in pagan epitaphs too⁴, and though in accordance with this pagan use it is applied to children and adults alike in Christian inscriptions (half the cases recorded by DIEHL, III p. 539 belong to adults), in less stereotyped passages the new, Christian meaning of the term leaps out, e.g. *SI 2615* = DIEHL 4662: *innocentissimae aetatis dulcissimae filiae Marciae*. It is likely, then, that Christian parents called their children *Innocentius-ia* with reference to the current Christian connotation of the term *innocens*.

VI. SUMMARY OF CHRISTIAN NOMENCLATURE IN ROME AND CARTHAGE

The total number of the examples, as well as the percentage, of different categories of Christian names in Rome and Carthage are listed below.

T a b l e 28. *Christian names in Rome and Carthage*

	R o m e		C a r t h a g e	
Old Testament names	30	3 %	—	—
New Testament names	238	24 %	26	12 %
names of martyrs	184	19 %	45	21 %
theophoric names	240	24 %	95	42 %
date names	87	9 %	39	14 %
names expressive of ideas	208	21 %	27	11 %
total	987		232	

¹ *Thes. VII: I* col. 1703, 7.

² *Thes. VII: I* col. 1701, 51.

³ In 4141 the parents put up a stone for a *iubeni innocenti* of 28; parental affection may account for the inaccurate use.

⁴ *Thes. VII: I* col. 1702, 8.

Though the Christianity of a few of the names is uncertain — *Agne*, *Hippolytus*, *Epiphanius*, *Natalicus*, *Renatus* — this does not materially affect the statistics.

The table once again emphasizes the points commented upon in the previous chapters: in Rome, names derived from the Bible were twice as numerous as in Carthage, whereas theophoric names dominated in Carthage. Names expressive of Christian ideas were much more popular in Rome, but this was largely due to the popularity of *Agape*.

The above differences in the frequencies of the various categories do not entitle us to draw conclusions about differences between Roman and Carthaginian Christianity, purely onomastic factors largely accounting for the differences in nomenclature. The relative paucity of Greek cognomina in Africa accounts for much. Again, Latin theophoric names, being of African origin, were naturally more numerous in Carthage. The infrequency of biblical names in Carthage may have been a regional peculiarity, biblical names being found elsewhere in Africa.

On the other hand, Christian nomenclature was much more significant in Carthage, for about 15 % of the persons having cognomina bore Christian names, the corresponding figure for Rome being about 9 %. Moreover, most of the Christian names popular in Carthage were exclusively or almost exclusively Christian, whereas not a few of the Christian names frequent in Rome were also found in pagan inscriptions. This difference in frequency and significance may have been due to the fact that the Carthaginian material is on the average from a later period than the Roman one (see p. 2), but it also testifies to the firm hold of Christianity on the Carthaginian population.

I shall finally give a list of the names which were unknown in pagan or Jewish documents and which accordingly prove the Christianity of their bearers:

<i>Adeodatus</i>	<i>Martyrius</i>
<i>Barnabas</i>	<i>Paschasius</i>
<i>Christophorus</i>	<i>Πεντηκοστή</i>
<i>Cyprianus</i>	<i>Quadragesima</i>
<i>Deogratias</i>	<i>Quodiubet</i>
<i>Deusdedit</i>	<i>Quodvultdeus</i>
<i>Deusdona</i>	<i>Renovatus</i>
<i>Deushabet</i>	<i>Spesindeo</i>
<i>Dominicus</i>	<i>Thecla</i>
<i>Habetdeus</i>	<i>Thomas</i>
	<i>Vincetdeus</i>

Moreover, *Iohannes* and *Petrus* are so very rare in pagan or Jewish inscriptions that they are practically of exclusive Christianity. *Anastasius* is relatively as frequent in Jewish material but is unknown in pagan documents.

VII. SPECIAL PROBLEMS

After this survey of Christian nomenclature, a number of special problems must still be discussed. First of all, we should determine the time at which specific Christian names came into use; further, the important problem of a baptismal change of name should be tackled; and the social aspect of Christian nomenclature is also worth attention.

§ 1. *The chronology of Christian names*

In defining the time when specific Christian nomenclature came into use, we should disregard those names which, though frequency and semantic development argue them Christian, were used by the pagans and the Jews. What we need are names which were exclusively or almost exclusively Christian and which were moreover found in sufficient numbers to make reliable conclusions possible. Such names are *Adeodatus*, *Anastasius*, *Domninus*, *Iohannes*, *Martyrius*, *Paschasius*, *Petrus*, *Quodvultdeus*, *Theodulus*. Owing to the brevity of the Carthaginian epigraphic material, the following study is based solely upon Roman inscriptions.

The most reliable criterion in defining the chronology is of course the dated epitaphs. Moreover, the frequency of nomina is a chronological criterion, for nomina were found in almost half the cases before the *pax*, all but disappearing during the fourth century (see p. 12). If we apply these criteria to our material, we find that the first dated epitaphs in general go back to the middle of the fourth century.¹ The second criterion also establishes a late date. Whereas in all the Christian material of Rome, nomina were found in 17—19 % of the cases (see p. 9), the specific Christian names are preceded by a nomen in 8 % of the cases and the nine exclusively Christian names in only 3 %. In the light of the above we may conclude that, though there are a few sporadic examples of incontestable Christian names before the *pax* (see p. 97), in Rome specific Christian nomenclature did not come into

¹ *Adeodatus* A.D. 366—80 (SI 1934); *Anastasius* A.D. 355 (FE 8420 = DIEHL 2451); *Iohannes* A.D. 383 (SI 4818 = DIEHL 3499); *Domninus* A.D. 502—18 (SI 3247); *Paschasius* A.D. 348 (SI 887); *Petrus* A.D. 348 (RO 97 = DIEHL 1267), but cf. p. 97; *Quodvultdeus* A.D. 367 (SI 1401); *Theodulus* A.D. 398 (SI 4834 = DIEHL 4164); *Martyrius* gives no dated example.

use until about the middle of the fourth century A.D. It is also likely that those names which were used by Jews or pagans — *Agape, Cyriacus, Laurentius, Maria, Paulus, Sabbatius, Susanna* — came to possess Christian associations or implications at the same time (cf. p. 91).

The late development of a specific Christian nomenclature was no doubt due to the fact that before the *pax* the Christians, living in a hostile world, had no reason to attract attention by bearing names which might expose them to danger.¹ It was only after the *pax*, when specific Christian features of religious and social life began fully to develop, that nomenclature, too, was partially renewed in a Christian spirit.

§ 2. *The problem of a baptismal change of name*

In the ancient Church, infant baptism was general from the third century onwards if the parents were Christian², whereas converts received baptism at a later age. It has been contended that the assumption of a Christian name was common at adult baptism³, and some scholars even make lists of specific »baptismal names».⁴ Roman Law allowed a change of name (*Digesta IX 25*, A.D. 293), and this made it possible to replace the old pagan name by a Christian one at baptism as an outward token of the new faith. However, the evidence must be carefully considered before deciding upon this important point.

First, there does not seem to be any early evidence of a change of name at baptism. There is certainly a passage in hagiographical literature which is often cited, the legend of *Petrus Balsamus* (RUINART, *Acta sincera*, p. 501 f.). When asked his name, he is alleged to have said: *nomine paterno Balsamus dicor; spirituali vero nomine, quod in baptismo accepi, Petrus dicor*, but according to modern hagiographical criticism the legend of *Petrus Balsamus* belongs to the category of »historical novels» devoid of truth.⁵ Such passages in hagiographical legends reflect the practice of the Middle

¹ Cf. MOFFAT, *Names (Christian)* ERE IX p. 145.

² ODCC p. 689.

³ E.g. KROLL, *Alte Taufgebräuche*, Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 1905, Beiheft, p. 47; SCHRIJNEN, *Namengebung*, Mn 1935, p. 273 f. Both adduce as testimony the passages from hagiographical legends which I have discussed above.

⁴ SCHRIJNEN *Namengebung*, p. 275, gives a long list of »baptismal names», among them such incontestable pagan cognomina as *Athanasius, Restitutus, Servandus, Vitalis*.

⁵ DELEHAYE, *Les légendes hagiographiques*, p. 114; cf. p. 108. — Still less can any historical truth be attached to *Acta Sancti Aprilis II* p. 483: *Derivato a patre vocabulo Quintius appellabatur; nomine autem proprio, quod in baptismi gratia acceperat, Innocentius dicebatur*, for the passage is found in a legend which had never been classed as »genuine».

Ages, for in the Middle Ages the old name was often replaced by a Christian one at baptism or confirmation.¹

Though no early instances of a change of name at baptism can be cited, some evidence is to be had from a later period. The earliest example is perhaps the legend of *Iudas qui et Cyriacus* written about the turn of the fifth and sixth centuries (see p. 104). Though the legend is fictitious, the man could not have been represented as assuming a new, Christian name at baptism unless this was a contemporary practice. There is also some epigraphic evidence. AE 1951, 172 (Aquileia) records *Petrus qui <et> Papario fil(ius) Olimp(i)i Iudaei solusque ex gente sua ad (Christi) meruit gratiam pervenire*. The man was a Jew converted to Christianity, and had doubtless assumed the venerable name of *Petrus* together with the new religion. Because the epitaph is dated by the method of «indictiones»: *ind(ictione) quarta*, it is probably late.² The first explicit statement of the assumption of a Christian name at baptism goes back to the seventh century. DIEHL 55 reproduces an epitaph of *Cedual qui et Petrus, rex Saxonum*, A.D. 689. His new name was given at baptism (lines 10—13): *barbaricam rabiem nomen et inde suum | conversus convertit ovans, Petrumq(ue) vocari | Sergius antistes iussit ut ipse pater | fonte renascentis*.

The above does not mean that the assumption of a Christian name at baptism was only customary in later times; early documents may simply have been lost. To decide the question, indirect evidence must also be considered.

First, the names of neophytes should be examined to find out whether they attest a baptismal assumption of a Christian name. There are certain names which, if a baptismal change of name was general, should often be borne by neophytes. Such names are above all *Paschasius*, catechumens usually receiving baptism on Easter Day, and *Renatus*, which suggests the idea of «rebirth» at baptism. It has, however, been proved that *Paschasius* was a name given to Easter children (see p. 110 f.) and that *Renatus* was scarcely a Christian name at all (see p. 112). Further, Christian names in general were rare amongst neophytes. Among the considerable number of neophytes recorded by DIEHL 1477—1507, only *Anastasius* (1507), *Cyriace* (1489D), *Innocentius* (1484 = SI 3552), and *Paulus* (1504) bear Christian names. *Paulus* must be dismissed, for it was also a common pagan cognomen. The first example, *Anastasio innocenti <re>ofito petent<i> in Cristo*, cannot be used as proof of a baptismal change of name. *Anastasius*

¹ KROLL, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

² RO p. xcvi f.: epitaphs dated by *indictiones* without the accompanying consular date are from the sixth century. — A case similar to the one discussed may be Bull 1890, p. 15 = DIEHL 4993A [*Pascha?*] *sii* / . . . *qui nomen habuit Iuda*. The name *Iuda* was popular among the Jews, but naturally looked at askance by the Christians.

was obviously a child (*innocens*, cf. p. 115), probably borne to Christian parents, and may have had the name from the very beginning. This view seems to find support in the fact that *Anastasius* was only a *petens*, i.e. a catechumen, and may have been called a neophyte only by way of anticipation (see DIEHL *ad loc.*). *Cyriace* and *Innocentius* were adults (20 and 23, respectively). Though the names may be Christian ones assumed at baptism, one might expect that the old name would also have been given, especially as the death took place so soon after their baptism. Even in later times the old name was retained, as the examples discussed show (see below). But as the old name is not given, the real origin of the names remains a mystery. *Cyriace* and *Innocentius* may have had Christian parents and received their names at birth, infant baptism not always being practiced.¹ Again, the names were not exclusively Christian (see pp. 104 and 114), and may have been given by pagan parents as well.

The only indirect evidence we thus have of a possible assumption of a Christian name at baptism are the double cognomina and supernomina in which one name is pagan, the other Christian. The examples to be gathered from the whole of Latin epigraphy are numerous. Cases in which a Christian name is substituted for a mythological one are particularly important. SI 1672 = DIEHL 2630adn: *Licina Aeliadora Adeodata*, is an obvious example, even the etymological implications being retained (*Aeliadora* = gift of *Helius*), but NBull 1903, p. 21 = DIEHL 3979G: *Alfenia Narc[issa] sig(no) Martyri*, and SI 3698: *Paulus Asclepius*, belong to the same group. In the other cases a Christian name is tacked on to ordinary Latin and Greek cognomina. The Christian names represent every category: *Agape* three cases², *Anastasius* two³, *Barnabas* one⁴, *Cyriacus* two⁵, *Domninus* one⁶, *Iohannes* two⁷, *Nazarius* one⁸, *Paschasius* two⁹, *Petrus* two¹⁰, *Quadragesima* one¹¹, *Refrigerius* one¹², *Susanna* one¹³, *Theodulus* two.¹⁴

¹ JEREMIAS, *Die Kindertaufe in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten*, p. 102 ff.

² SI 2603 = DIEHL 4535: *Vitalis Agape*; SI 4346: *Irene Agape*; RAC 1931, p. 227: *Creste quae et Agape*.

³ Bull 1867, p. 31 = DIEHL 2952Cadn: . . . *sive Anastasia*; C III 9587 = DIEHL 4484: *Anastasia qui et Verula*.

⁴ FE 6600b: *Barnab[as] qui et Ase[llus]*.

⁵ SI 5249: *Aurelius Atticus Cyriacus*; C V 6260 = DIEHL 1368: *Quirace supernomen Micines*.

⁶ SI 2601 = DIEHL 3959adn: *Cassus Domninus*.

⁷ FE 9307: Ἰωάννης Ἀκδοῦν; C V Suppl. Ital. 26 = DIEHL 1878: *Iohannis Romeus*.

⁸ RAC 1926, p. 75: *Ναζάριος Ἰννοκέντιος*. The names may, however, have been given at birth by Christian parents.

⁹ C V 1692 = DIEHL 2687B: *Felix Paschasius*; XII 956 = DIEHL 3540: *Optatina Reticia sive Pascasia*.

¹⁰ SI 3859 = DIEHL 2709A: *Petrus Victorinus*; for *Petrus qui Papario*, see p. 119.

¹¹ SI 1947 = DIEHL 4384: [*Quadr*]agensima [*Ianu*]²aria.

While a few of the double names may have been given by parents at birth (see p. 30), there can be no doubt that most of them were *n i c k n a m e s* which were later attached to the original ones. The most likely moment for the assumption of a Christian name was the Christian *b a p t i s m*. Though nothing certain can be said about the chronology of baptismal names, the appearance of a *nomen* in a few of the examples quoted argues not too late a date.

One must concede, then, that in the early Christian Church the assumption at baptism of a new, Christian name was actually practiced. The names represented every class of Christian nomenclature, no preference being given to names which recalled baptismal ideas. There is no evidence that the new name entirely supplanted the old one; on the contrary, the old name seems in general to have been retained, the new name being added as a second cognomen or as a supernomen.

§ 3. *The social aspect of Christian nomenclature*

In pagan Roman nomenclature, certain names, e.g. *Felix*, *Hilarus* and *Salvius*, as well as Greek cognomina in general, being often borne by slaves and freedmen, had a *s e r v i l e* stigma and were for this reason avoided by free citizens.¹ It may be of interest to see whether there was any similar *c l a s s d i v i s i o n* in Christian nomenclature. Though our evidence, which is solely derived from Roman inscriptions, cannot be conclusive, some facts of interest nevertheless emerge. There were certain names which were never or extremely seldom borne by *t i t l e d* persons, the nobility and the clergy, viz. *Agape*, *Cyriacus*, *Martyrius*, *Theodulus*, whereas the frequency of *Adeodatus*, *Anastasius*, *Deusdedit*, *Iohannes*, *Paulus* and *Petrus* among the upper class was above the average.²

This obvious class division of Christian names is difficult to explain in terms other than simple *f a s h i o n*. Pagan tradition may also account for something, for, with the exception of *Anastasius*, the names avoided by the nobility and the clergy were Greek. *Agape* and *Cyriacus* had been cognomina of humble people (see pp. 114 and 104) and continued to be such in Christian times. *Anastasius*, on the other hand, was a new coinage; moreover, it suggested a very noble and important Christian idea.

¹² *SI* 4704: *Bitalio*, with *Refrigeri vivas* cut below.

¹³ *DIEHL* 2514h (Africa): *Sussanna que et Lolliana*.

¹⁴ *RAC* 1926, p. 74: *Φίλανδρος Θεόδουλος*(ος); 1929, p. 214: *Theodulus sive Leontius*.

¹ *FRANK*, *Race mixture in the Roman Empire*, *AHR* 1915/16, p. 692.

² Including in the upper class all the higher magistrates and in the clergy *fossors*, *virgines* and the like, the material may be tabulated as follows: *Adeodatus* is borne by two members of the aristocracy and six members of the clergy out of a total of 45; the corresponding figures for *Anastasius* are 5 — 2 — 51; for *Deusdedit* 0 — 2 — 9; for *Iohannes* 8 — 8 — 52; for *Paulus* 6 — 6 — 81; for *Petrus* 0 — 14 — 60.

S U M M A R Y

Of the changes suffered by Latin nomenclature during the Later Empire such as they appear in the early Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage, the most radical were the disappearance of freedmen's filiation and the decline in the use of the praenomen and nomen, the result being a single name system prevalent from the beginning of the fourth century. The disappearance of freedmen's filiation was primarily due to the decline of slavery and to the Christian reluctance to make a distinction between bond and free, the decline in the use of the nomen to the loss in value of Roman citizenship, formerly symbolized by the right to bear Roman nomina, and to the enormous popularity of a few Imperial nomina, in particular *Aurelius* and *Flavius*, which damaged the distinctive function of the nomen. Because nomina did not function as family names as much as before, they were often used as cognomina. The popularity of double cognomina was again partly due to an imitation of the practice of the aristocracy of inheriting cognomina from both parents or other relatives, partly to the growing liking for nicknames. Nicknames, however, were most often added to the original name as supernomina, either as agnomina connected with *qui et*, as signa proper connected with *signo*, or as detached signa cut apart from the text of the inscription. The detached signa, which were almost invariably new names coined with the old gentile suffix *-ius*, were usually set in the vocative or genitive, women also having the masculine form of the name; they were largely extemporized nicknames, much resembling epithets, but a number of them were *nomina sodaliciaria*, indicating membership of a funeral club with a collective name of the same type. Finally, the transmission of cognomina was rather common, a third of the parental cognomina being transmitted to children, that of the father three times as often as that of the mother. Cognomina were most often transmitted unchanged, but parental and children's cognomina were sometimes suffixed forms of each other or corresponded to each other through meaning or assonance.

Whereas in the pagan inscriptions of Rome cognomina of Greek origin were borne by 56 % of the persons, in the Christian inscriptions the percentage had diminished to 43 %. This was due to the decline of slavery, Greek cognomina being primarily imported by Greek-speaking slaves from the East. In Carthage, where slaves, being drawn from native stocks, largely bore Latin names, Greek cognomina were in a minority

in the pagan inscriptional material too, and the decline of their number in the Christian inscriptions was not as radical as in Rome. Most of the cognomina found in Christian inscriptions were old-established, but they were extended with suffixes much more often than in the pagan material. Moreover, two new suffixes had come into use towards the end of the second century A.D., — *osus-sa* and *-ius-ia*, the former, with a more restricted use, originating and prevailing in Africa, the latter, the old gentile suffix, being more common and more universal. About a sixth of the persons in the Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage had new coinages in *-ius-ia*, a considerable number of which were derived from words not before used as cognomina.

About the middle of the fourth century, a specific Christian nomenclature came into being. Many Christian names were either old pagan cognomina which had become sacred because famous saints had borne them or which had acquired a new, Christian connotation through a semantic shift in the original word. Names derived from the Old Testament were exceptional; New Testament names were more popular, but only the names of the four greatest figures, *Iohannes*, *Maria*, *Paulus* and *Petrus* were really frequent. Biblical names were more popular in Rome than in Carthage, where they were exceptional. The cult of martyrs also influenced nomenclature, but even here only the very greatest names, in particular *Cyprianus* and *Laurentius*, attained real popularity. The most important group of Christian names were represented by Christian theophoric names. Most of the names of this type were derived from the word *Deus* and were indeclinable sentence-names which originated in Carthage probably as translations of native Punic names. In Rome, the most important Christian theophoric name was *Cyriacus*, the Christian sense of which was due to a semantic shift in the original word *κυριακός* from »belonging to the master» to »belonging to the Lord». Christian date names were not many, *Paschasius* being the most important of them. There were a number of names expressing Christian dogmas and virtues, too, in particular *Anastasius* and *Agape*.

In regard to the chronology, a study of the nomenclature in the dated inscriptions of Rome confirms the archeological findings that the period of the greatest activity in the Roman catacombs was the fourth century. The Christian inscriptions of Rome which are derived from the period before the *pax*, present some striking differences from the above picture of early Christian nomenclature: a nomen was found in half the cases, and 10 % of the men had, moreover, a praenomen; Greek cognomina were as frequent as Latin ones; the new coinages in *-ius-ia* were borne by only 3,5 % of all the persons who had cognomina; there were only a few sporadic examples of specific Christian names.

INDEX OF SCHOLARS

(A number after a comma denotes a footnote)

- Aigrain 97, 4, 5; 98, 1
 Bardy 92, 1
 Barrow 55, 1
 Bechtel 70, 1, 3
 Le Blant 67, 2; 88, 2; 99
 Blumenthal 3, 1
 Borghesi 4, 3
 Buck 64, 1
 Bury 8, 2
 Cagnat 3, 1; 5, 1
 Cannegieter 88
 Carleton 107, 1
 Ceresa-Castoldo 113, 5
 Chase 3, 3
 Cumont 35, 5
 Deissmann 113, 4
 Delattre 26, 3
 Delehaye 93, 2; 94, 1; 97, 1, 2, 3; 98, 2, 3; 99; 99, 5; 100, 1, 2; 101, 2; 118, 5
 Diehl 31, 1; 33, 3; 34, 34, 2; 35, 3; 36; 38; 42; 72, 1, 2; 77, 1, 2; 82, 2
 Doer 3, 1; 4, 4, 5
 Doerfler 97, 1
 Duff 28, 1
 Ernout 62, 2
 Ferrua 47; 88; 99, 1
 Fick-Bechtel 100, 4; 101, 1; 106, 1
 Fraenkel 3, 1; 4, 1; 26
 Frank 55, 1; 58; 59; 60; 121, 1
 Frey 89, 4; 92, 2; 111, 2, 3
 Gardthausen 18, 1, 6
 Gordon 58
 Gottanka 106, 2, 3; 107, 3
 Grossi Gondi 8; 11, 2; 15; 15, 3; 69; 88, 1; 89, 3; 103, 6; 112, 3
 Harnack 88
 Hermann 101, 3
 Hirzel 87, 1; 105, 7; 107, 4
 Hug 87, 2
 Jeremias 120, 1
 Kraus 88; 88, 2; 89, 3
 Kretschmer 42
 Kroll 93, 5; 118, 3; 119, 1
 Kubitschek 106, 4
 Lambert 31, 1; 42, 4; 43; 47; 48, 1; 49, 4; 72, 2
 Leclercq 94, 2
 Lemonnier 27, 2; 28, 2; 29, 2
 Leon 92, 2
 Leumann 64; 67, 5
 Lietzmann 103, 3, 4; 113, 2, 4, 6
 Marouzeau 55
 Marquardt 17, 2
 Martigny 88; 88, 2; 89; 89, 3; 107, 4; 108, 2; 112, 3
 Marucchi 112
 Meyer 64, 5; 65, 1
 Meyersahm 101, 1
 Moffat 88; 108, 2; 118, 1
 Mohrmann 90; 92, 1; 108, 1, 4; 109, 2
 Mommsen 3, 1; 4, 2; 7, 1; 11; 27, 2; 28, 1; 31, 1; 34; 34, 2; 35, 3; 36; 38; 42; 44; 49; 65; 68, 1; 72, 2
 Mowat 22, 1; 76, 1; 103, 1
 Muratori 34
 Niedermann 68
 Nogara 15; 16, 1
 Nordberg 110, 2
 Olcott 64
 Otto 112, 2
 Petersen 40, 4; 113; 113, 3
 Ramsay 99
 Reinach 103, 5
 De Rossi 2, 1, 3; 12; 12, 1; 15, 1; 24; 25, 1; 31, 1; 34; 35, 3; 37, 1; 85, 3; 88, 2; 96; 96, 3; 119, 2
 Rostovtzeff 16
 Ruinart 118
 Runes 52, 2; 54, 1
 Schneider 2, 1
 Schnorr 62, 3
 Schrijnen 82, 2; 88 *bis*; 89; 89, 3; 90; 107, 4; 108, 2; 109; 112, 3; 118, 3, 4
 Schulz 18, 2, 3
 Schulze 3, 1, 2; 14, 1; 19, 1; 25, 2, 3; 31, 1; 35, 3; 36; 72, 2; 84, 3; 100, 4; 105, 4; 106, 3
 Schwartz 110, 3, 4
 Sittig 103, 5
 Solmsen 3, 1
 Sommer 81, 1
 Stolz-Schmalz 64, 4, 6; 68, 1; 78, 2

- Styger 2, 1, 2
 Sundwall 12, 2
 Svennung 63, 1; 100, 3
 Teeuwen 90, 2
 Testini 1, 1; 88; 112, 3
 Thylander 3, 4; 17, 1, 3; 23, 2; 30, 1;
 50; 54; 54; 54, 2; 55, 2; 56, 4; 58; 59
 Toutain 11, 1
 Usener 100, 4; 101, 1
 Väänänen 23, 1; 67, 3, 4; 68, 2; 86, 4
 Wallon 9, 1
 Westermann 9, 1; 58
 Wilhelm 41, 1
 Wilpert 94, 2
 Wuilleumier 31, 1; 35, 4
 Zimmermann 65, 1; 69, 1

INDEX OF PERSONAL NAMES DISCUSSED

- ABDOS* 97; 98
Abundantius 79
Abundia 80
Acacius —
 Acacis 84
 ?*Acatius* 86
 Ἀχιλλία 84
Acholi[us] 86
Acomius 86
Acupius v. Aucupius
Acutula 67
Acutus 49
 Ἀδάμ 93
 Ἀδᾶς 28, 4
Adbentulus v. Adventulus
Addo 56, 4
Adelphius —
 Adelfius 44, 2; 84
Adeodatus 30; 88; 101; 102 *ter*; 103;
 116; 117; 117, 1; 120; 121
Adolius 86
 Ἀδων —
 Ἀδων 120, 7
Adventulus —
 Adbentulus 67
 ?*Adverbiosa* —
 Atverbosa 66
Aeburius 49, 3
Aelianus 63
Aeliadora v. Heliodora
Aelius 16
Aemilianus 63
Aemiliu[s] 21
Aeonius 33; 40; 41
Aerius 86
Aetherius 33
 Aeterius 46
Afra 49
Africa 49
Africana 49
Agape 60; 90; 91; 111; 113 f.; 116; 118;
 120; 121 *bis*
Agapetilla 111, 1
 Agapitilla 68
Agapetus 114
Agapius 84; 111
 Ἀγέλιος —
 Ἀγέλις 84
Agenius 86
Agilius 29
Agne 97; 98 *bis*; 99; 116
 Hagne 99, 1
Agnellus 67
Agoniosus 66
 Ἀγριος 87
Agrippianum (collegium) 36
Agroecius —
 Agricius 84
Agurina v. Augurina
Alacrius 80
Albinus 64
Alboria 80
Alerius 19, 2
Alethius 41 f.; 84
Alexander 61
Alexius 84
Allinus 64
Allius 64
Alogius 29; 86
 Ἀλόπιος 26, 1; 84
Amachius 86
Amannus 56, 4
Amantius 39; 39, 2; 43; 46; 74; 79
 Ἀμαζονία 26, 1
Amazonius 42, 1 *bis*; 84
Amevania 28, 4

- Amiantus 53
 Amias 53
 Amnius (*or* Ammius) 45
 Ampelius 84
 Anagius 86
 Anastasius 23; 49; 60; 72; 86; 111 *bis*;
 114; 117 *bis*; 117, 1; 119 f.; 120;
 121 *bis*.
 Anatolius 84
 Andreas 94; 95
 Annalius 80
 Anthemius 84
 Antoninus 64
 Antonius 16; 17
 Ἀφασία 86
 Aphrodisius 87
 Apodemius 83
 Apollinaria 84
 Apollinaris 37 (*club name*); 62, 1; 87
 bis
 Apollo 87
 Ἀπολλώνιος 25; 87
 Apollonius 100
 Aprilis 22
 Apronianus 63
 Arboria 80
 Arcadius 31; 84
 Archontia —
 Arcontia 84
 Argentius 33, 2; 73, 1; 80
 Armentius 80
 Ἀρωμάτιος 40
 Artemidorus 87
 Artemius 78; 84
 Arzygius 44, 2
 Asclepius 120
 Asellicus 63
 Asellus 49
 Asiaticus 56
 Assyrius 56
 Αστακιος —
 Αστακις 84
 Ἀστέριος 46
 Ἀ[στί]γε (*voc.*) 47
 Asterius 38, 2; 44; 74; 84
 [A]thanasi (*club name*) 35
 Ἀθανάσιος 26, 1
 Athanasius 86; 118, 4
 Atticilla 69
 Atticillianus 69
 Atticus 56; 61; 120, 5
 Auchenius 44
 Auctus 61
 Aucupius —
 Acupius 80
 Audentius 33, 2; 46
 Augenius 84
 Augustus —
 August... 79
 Augurii (*club name*) 36
 Augurinus 64
 Agurina 53
 Auguris 69
 Augurius 80
 Augustinus 64
 Augustus 29
 Aurasius 40
 Aurelianus 63
 Aurelius 16 *bis*; 17 *ter*; 22 *bis*; 51
 Aurentia 77; 80
 Auricius 76; 77; 80
 Auspicalis 53
 Auxentia —
 Ausentia 77; 86
 Aventius 79
 Axungius 80

 BALBUS 87
 Balsamius 86
 Balsamus 118
 Barbentius 77; 80
 Barnabas 95; 116; 120
 Barnab[as] 49
 ?Bart[holomaeus] 95
 Basilia 70
 Basilius 70; 74; 84
 Bassilianus 68
 Bassus 44; 61
 ?Baumassa 57, 1
 Βεϊταλία *v.* Vitalia
 Benantius *v.* Venantius
 ?Benatius *v.* Venantius
 [Be]nedictius 45, 1
 Bictorinia *v.* Victorinia
 Bitatio *v.* Vitalio
 Blandus 87
 Boethius —
 Boetius 84
 Bolusius *v.* Volusius
 Bonemontius 76; 82

Bonica 63, 2
 Bonifatius 73; 74; 76 *bis*; 82
 Bonosus 66
 Bonus 66, 2
 Brechetii (*club name*) 35
 Brumasius 77; 81
 Brybys 28, 4
 Bubalus 48
 Byzacius 39, 3

CAELANTIA 79

Caenabius 46
 Caelestius 39, 3
 Caephalus —
 Caefalius 40
 Caesar 75, 2
 Caesarius 82
 Calchedonius 84
 Calipodius 83
 [C]allinius 84
 Calliphronia —
 Ca[l]ifronia 83
Κάλλιστος 87
 Callistus 97; 98, 4
 Calocaerus 97; 98, 4
 Calumniosus 66 *bis*
 Calvaro 48, 2
 Camasius 81
 Camenius / Kamenius 44
 Candidosa 66
 Capito 65
 Capitolina 64
 Carthagius 78; 82
 Casarius 80
 Cassianus 63
 Cassica 63, 2
 Cassius 50
 Cassus 30; 120, 6
 Castellanius —
 Castelanius 80
 Castorinus 64
 Castorius 84
 Ca[.]anius 34, 2
 Cataphronia —
 Cat[a]fronia 86
 Catellus 67
 Catosus 66
 Cedual 119
 Celadia 84
 Celer 61; 87

Celerinus 64
 Celidonium *v.* Chelidonium
 Cerialis 62, 1; 87 *bis*
 Charitosa 66
 Chelidonium —
 Celidonium 84
Χορτάσιος 84
 Chrestinus 64
Χριστόφορος 101
 Christophorus 101; 116
 Cristoforus 102
 Chrysanthus —
 Xrusanthus 52
 Chrysis 52
 Xrysis 52
 Chrysomallus 52
 Cicadula 67
 Cicero 65
 Clarosus 66
 Claudianus 63
 Claudius 16
 Clemens 50
 Clemes 50
 Clementius 80
 Climatius 86
 Cobuldeo *v.* Quodvultdeus
 Comasius 77; 84
 Concordia 71
 Concordius 39; 74; 80
 Constantii (*club name*) 36
 Constantinius 74, 2
 Constantinus 64
 Constantius 29; 33; 46 *bis*; 71; 74 *bis*;
 74, 2; 79
 Copiosus 66, 1
Κόπος 87
 Cornelia 19
 Covuldonia *v.* Quodvultdeus
 Crementius 39, 3; 81
 Cres- 57
 Crescens 57; 61
 Crescentianus 63
 [C]rescentiniu[s] 77; 79
 Crescentinus 64
 Crescentius 73; 74; 76; 79; 81, 1
 Cresconius 76 *bis*; 77; 81, 1; 82
 Cristoforus *v.* Christophorus
 Crispinus 64
Κρίστιος 40
 Culina 29

Culinus 29, 1
 Currentius 79
 Cynegius 47
 Cyprianus 63; 98 *bis*; 99 *bis*; 116
 Cyprin(a) 64
 Cyriacus 60; 90; 102; 104; 105; 107;
 118; 119 *bis*; 120 *bis*; 121 *bis*
 Quiriacus 104

 DALMATIUS 40; 56; 82
 Danihel 93
 Dardania 84
 Decasi(i) (*club name*) 36
 December 23; 106
 Decentius 80
 Decimilla 68
 ?Decorensis —
 Decoresis 63 (*unless* Decorianensis)
 Delicius 81
 Demetrianus 63
 Δημήτριος 25
 Deogratias 102 *bis*; 116
 Desiderius 81
 Deusdat 102
 Deusdedit 101; 102 *bis*; 116; 121
 Deusderitis (*gen.*) 102, 1
 Deusdona 101; 102; 103; 116
 Deushabet 101; 102; 116
 Deuterius 84
 Dextria 80
 Dicientius 79
 Digitius 39, 3
 Diocleti[anus] 63
 Διονύσιος 25
 Dionysius 61; 87 *bis*
 Dionisius 87
 Dogmatius 40
 Dominicus 102; 105 *ter*; 107; 116
 Domitianus 63
 Domitilla 68
 Domitius 22; 23
 Domna 23, 3; 104; 105 *bis*
 Domninus 64; 102; 105 *ter*; 117; 117, 1;
 120
 Domnio 104; 105
 Domnula 67; 105 *bis*
 Domnus —
 Donnus 104, 2
 [D]onantius 79
 Donatus 49; 62

Donnus *v.* Domnus
 Doradius 42, 1
 Dracontius 29, 3; 84
 Dudda 28, 4; 35
 Duddasi(i) (*club name*) 35
 Dulcitii (*club name*) 37
 Dulcitus 34; 37; 39, 2; 40; 42, 1; 77;
 80
 Dynamius 84
 Δυσκόλιος 47
 Dyscolius 84

 Εἰνάρχιος *v.* Ἰνάρχιος
 Εἰρηναῖος —
 Εἰρηνέος 51
 Εἰρήνη 52
 Elias 93
 Ἑλπίδια 44, 1
 Elpis 89; 114
 Emerentius 79
 Encratius 39, 2
 Endelechius —
 Endelecius 86
 Ἐπανόδιος 84
 Ephesius 48
 Ἐπιφάνιος 26, 1
 Epiphanius 83; 106; 108; 116
 Epipodius 83
 Eros 87
 Etelia 28, 4
 Eu- 56
 Εὐ — 57
 Εὐαμέριος *v.* Εὐημέριος
 Euangelius 83
 Εὐβούλιος 25
 Eubulius —
 Eubolius 83
 Εὐβουλος 25
 Eucharistianus 63
 Eucharis 83
 Eucherii (*club name*) 35
 Eucherius —
 Hcherius 83
 Εὐδόξιος 26, 1
 Eudoxius 33; 70; 83
 Εὐημέριος —
 Εὐαμέριος 25
 Εὐήμερος 25
 Eufronius *v.* Euphronius
 Eugamius 39; 1; 83

- Eugenia 70
Εὐγένιος 26, 1
 Eugenius 70; 73, 1; 74; 83
 Eugrafii (*club name*) 35
 Eugraphius —
 Eugrafius 83
 ?Euhippus 83 (*unless* Euhippus)
 Euvipius 39, 3
 Euhodius *v.* Euodius
 Eulalius 83
 [E]ulogius 83
 Eumecia 86
Εὐμέκια —
 Εὐμέκας 83
Εὐνους 87
 Euodia 70
Εὐόδιος 25, 4
 Euodius 70; 83
 Euhodius 34, 2
Εὐόδος 87
 Euodus 70
 Euphilius 39, 2
 Euphrasia 86
Εὐφροῖνιος 25, 4
 Euphronius —
 Eufronius 47; 83
 Eupsychius —
 Ypsichius 42, 1
 Euresis *v.* Heuresis
 Euresius *v.* Heuresius
Εὐρεσσιβάνης 107, 2
 Eusebia 70; 74, 4
 Eusebii (*club name*) 35
Εὐσεβίος 26, 1
 Eusebius 33; 38; 45; 47; 70; 73; 74;
 74, 4; 83
 Eustasius 25; 84
 Eustathius 39, 2; 47; 83
 Eustochius 83
 Eustolius 86
Εὐστόργιος —
 Εὐστόργης 47
 Eustorgius 46; 47
 Eutherius 83
 Euthymius 83
 Eutolmius 42, 1; 86
 Eutropius 47; 83
 Eutyches 61; 70
 Eutychia 70
 Eutychianus 55; 63
 Eutychie (*club name*) 35
Εὐτύχιος 25
 Eutychieus 25, 4; 53; 70; 74; 83
Εὐτύχος 25; 87
 Euvipius *v.* Euhippus
 Evasius 49, 3
 Eventii (*club name*) 36, 1
 Eventius 81
 Exitiosus 65; 66 *bis*
 Exuperantius 74; 74, 4; 79
 [Ex]uperantiu[s] 74, 4
 Exuperius 39, 2; 76; 82

FABIANUS 97; 98, 4
 Fabiola 67
 Faretrius *v.* Pharetrius
 Fatibonia 76; 82
 Faustinianus 68; 69
 Faustinus 64; 68
 Faustus 22, 1; 61; 68; 87
 Felicianus 63
 Felicio 65
 Felicissimus 53
 Felicitas 52; 53; 97
 Felicula —
 Felicla 53
 Felicus 63, 2
 Felix 22, 1; 52; 61; 87; 89; 97; 121
 Festianus 27, 3
 Fi- *v.* Phi-
 Fidentius 40, 1; 79
 Filemon *v.* Philemon
 Firmilla 68
 Firminus 64
 Firmus 55
 Flavianill[a] 68
 Flavianius 45, 1
 Flavianus 22
 Flavius 12, 2; 16; 17 *bis*; 17, 1; 22 *bis*
 Florentinus 64
 Florentius 31; 47; 71; 73, 1; 74 *ter*;
 74, 3; 79
 Florinus 74
 Florius 74
 Florus 61
 Flosculus 74, 3
Φοιδωσα 66
 Formicula 67
 Fortunatus 53; 61
 Furtunatus 53

Fortunius 81
 Fortunula 67
 Fronto 65
 Fructuosus 66 *ter*; 66, 1
 ?Fugitivus 103, 6
 Fulgentillia 77 *bis*; 79
 Fulgentius 79
 Furtunatus *v.* Fortunatus
 Fuscus 61

GAETULICUS 56

Gallitta —
 Gallita 68, 1
 Gallus 61
 Ganga 56
 Gaudentii (*club name*) 35; 36
 Gaudentius 34; 39, 1, 2; 67; 72; 74; 79;
 89
 Gaudiosus 66; 67; 89
 Gavinia 50
 Γελάσιος 26, 1
 Gelasius 77; 86
 Gemellinus 64
 Gemellus 67
 Generosus 66
 Genesius 107; 108
 Genethlius 108
 Gentianis 69
 Gentianus 63
 Γεώργιος 26, 1
 Georgius 84
 Γερώντιος 26, 1
 Gerontius 85
 Gigontia —
 Gicontia 85
 Gilventius 40, 2
 ?Gismeia 28, 4
 Gloriosus 65; 66; 66, 1
 Glycinnus 77
 Glicinnus 85
 Gorgonius 85
 Gratosus 66
 Gregarius 46
 Γρηγόριος 26, 1; 39, 2
 Gregorius 29; 33, 2; 34, 2; 41; 47; 74;
 76; 86
 Γρωμά[τιος] 47
 Gulosus 66
 Gundeburga 48
 ?Gunthar (*club name*) 37

HABETDEUS 102; 116
 Hagne *v.* Agne
 Harpagius 40
 Hcherius *v.* Eucherius
 Heliodorus 87
 Aeliadora 30; 88; 120
 Helladius 34; 38, 3; 85
 Helpidius 85
 [He]raclianus 63
 Heraclius 31; 38, 1; 39, 1; 70
 Herculanus —
 Herclanius 82
 Herculentius 77; 82
 Herculus 82
 Heresius 85
 Hermes 87; 97; 101
 Hermicus 63
 Hermogenius 83
 Hesperius 47; 85
 Hesychium —
 Hesuchium 43
 'Ησύχιος 25, 4
 Hesychius 85
 Heuresis —
 Euresis 31
 Heuresius —
 Euresius 47; 85
 Hilarianus —
 Hilaranus 63, 1
 Hilarius 34; 43, 2; 47; 80
 Hilarus 55; 61; 67; 121
 Hippolytus 97; 98; 99; 116
 Hispartara 28, 4
 Hoinanthius *v.* Oenanthius
 Honoratianus 45
 Honorius 40, 1; 45, 2; 81
 Hyacinthus 97; 98, 4
 Hylocharius 33, 2
 Hymetius 44, 1
 Hyperechius 76; 86

IACOB 95

Ιακώβ 95, 1
 Iacobus 95
 Iambaria 48, 2
 Ianuarinus 64
 Ianuariola 67
 Ianuarius 22; 22, 1; 97; 106
 Iconia 85
 Ilicus 51

- Imperiosus 66, 1
 Ἰνδάχιος —
 Εἰνδάχιος 47
 Iniuriosus 66
 Innocens 115
 Ἰννοκέντιος 120, 8
 Innocentius 39, 2; 72; 80; 111; 113;
 114 f.; 118, 5; 119; 120
 Insteius 19
 Iohanna 96
 Iohannes / Ioannes 23; 58; 60; 88; 94;
 95 *bis*; 117 *bis*; 117, 1; 120; 121
 Ionius 38, 1; 85
 Iovianus 88
 Iovinianus 88
 Iovinus 64; 87 *bis*; 88; 105
 ?Ipitias 57, 1
 Irenaeus 61
 Irene 61; 89; 114
 Irenicus 64
 Ἰσχυλλάκις *v.* Σκυλλάκιος
 Ἰσπηραντία *v.* Σπηραντία
 Istablicius *v.* Stabilicius
 Isstoracius *v.* Storacius
 Istudius *v.* Studius
 Iuda / Iudas 92; 104; 119; 119, 2
 Iugas 69
 Iulianus 63
 Iulinus 64
 Iulitta 68, 1
 Iulius 16; 20; 21, 1; 22 *ter*; 24; 51
 Iullica 63, 2
 Iustianus 52
 Iustinus 64
 Iustus 52
 Iuvenantius 77; 81
 Iuvenil[ia] 68
 Iuventius 39, 1

 KALENDINUS 106
 Kalendius 81
 Kamenius *v.* Camenius
 Καρτερία 85
 Κηφᾶς 96

 LABROSA 66
 Laelius 20, 1
 Lampadius 34; 39, 1; 47; 85
 Laodicius 40
 Laricia 49, 5

 Laurentius 72 *bis*; 76; 82; 97; 98 *bis*;
 99 *bis*; 118
 Lauricius 77; 81
 Lauris 69
 Lauticus 63, 2
 Leo 28; 54; 55
 Leoninu <s> 49
 Leonius 81
 Leontius 31; 34; 36; 47; 54; 55; 70
 Leporica —
 Leporice 63
 Leporius 81
 Lepusculus —
 Lepusculus 28; 67
 Leucadiola 68
 Liberalis 61
 Liberius 34; 47; 80
 Libosu <s> 66
 Licin[ia]nus 21
 Licinius 21
 Limenius 85
 Litorius 38; 81
 Livilitta 68, 1
 Lucentius 79
 Lucil[ia]nus 69
 Lucillus 68; 69
 Lucretius 51
 Lucrosa 66
 [Lum]inosus 66
 Lupercilla 68
 Lupicianus —
 Lupecianus 68
 Lupicinus 68
 Lupicus 63
 Lupus 31
 Luxurius 81

 MACCAL 48, 2
 Macedo 56
 Macedonia 70
 Μακεδόνης 25, 4
 Macedonius 70; 85
 Maioricus 63; 63, 2
 Malchus —
 Malcus 60
 Mandronius 85
 Mandrosa 66
 Mappalicus 63, 2
 Marcellinus 64
 Marcellus 61; 67

- Marcetius 77; 82
 Marcianilla 68
 Marcianus 63
 ?Marciulus 67 (*unless* Marciolus)
 Marcus 20 f.; 22; 23
 Marculus 67
 Marcus 21; 23
 Maria 60; 92; 95 f.; 118
 Marius 95
 ?Marsius 82 (*unless* Marsus)
 Marta 28, 4
 Martenses (*club name*) 37
 Martialicus 63, 2
 Martialis 62, 1; 87
 Martinianus 69; 88
 Martinus 87; 88
 ?Martyr 99
 Martyrius 86; 98; 99; 100; 114; 116;
 117; 117, 1; 120; 121
 Martura 100
 Martyrus 100
 Mascutius 48
 Massuricus 63; 63, 2
 Matronata 29
 Matronica 63, 2
 Maurentia 77; 82
 Mauricius 47
 Maurilio 69
 Maurisius 77; 82
 Maurus 56
 Mavortius 38, 1; 45; 80
 Maxentius 25; 77 *bis*; 80
 Maximasia 77; 80
 Maximianus 52; 63; 77
 Maximilla 68; 69
 Maximillianus 69 *bis*
 Maximili[ana] 68
 Maximilianus 69
 Maximinus 52; 64
 Maximus 52; 61 *bis*; 65
 Megethius 86
 ?Melanius 85 (*unless* Melanus)
 Mellitius 80
 Mellosus 66
 Memorius 80
 Memphis 39, 1
 Mensurius —
 Mesurius 81
 Mercurialis 62, 1
 Mercuriana 63
 ?Mercurilis 62, 1
 Mercurius 87 *bis*; 88 *bis*; 101
 Meropius 34; 38, 3
 Merulicus 63
 Messoricus 63, 2
 Mesurius *v.* Mensurius
 Meter 49, 5
 Methius 85
 Μετρίκιος —
 Μετρίκις 86
 Metrius 86
 Micosus 66
 Minorica 63, 2
 Modestina 30
 Modius 51
 Moflontius 48, 2
 Monnica 63, 2
 Monica 63
 Montanis 69
 Montanus 61
 Μονσεϊκία 85
 Moyses 93
 Μουσῆς 93, 6
 Mosses 93, 6
 Muses 93, 6
 Mucianilla 68
 Mundicus 63, 2
 Munerius 81
 Muses *v.* Moyses
 Mustelica 63, 2
 Musticus 63, 2

 NARC[ISSA] 120
 Narcithius 39, 3
 Nars[alu?]s 28, 4
 Natalicus 63 *bis*; 63, 2; 106; 107; 108;
 116
 Natalis 107; 108
 Natalius 80; 107; 108
 Navigius 39, 1; 81
 Naucellii (*club name*) 35
 Nazarius 95; 120
 Nebrius 40
 Nebulius 37
 Νεικομήδης *v.* Νικομήδης
 Νεικομηδία *v.* Νικομήδεια
 Nemesius 73, 1; 85
 Nentius 79
 Nepotianus 45, 1; 81
 Nepotilla 69

- Nepotillianus 69
 Neptunalis 106
 Neptunia 82
 Nice 28
 Nicentius 76; 77; 85
 Νικομήδης 52
 Νεικομήδης —
 Νικομήδεια —
 Νεικομηδία 52
 Nilius 45, 1
 Nina 32, 1
 Ninus 56
 Nonnica 48; 63, 2
 Nonnosa 66
 Nucerus 82
 Nugasius 81
 Numisius 49, 5
 Nuptialica 63, 2

 OENANTHIUS —
 Hoinanthius 85
 Officiosus 66, 1
 Olympii —
 Olypii (*club name*) 35; 36
 Olympinus 55; 64
 Olympius 31; 36; 70
 Ὀνηφόρος 52
 Ὀνήσιμος 52
 Opilionica 63
 Optantius 38, 1
 Optatus 61; 62
 Ὀρέσιος 39, 2
 Ovius 49, 5

 PACCIIUS 20
 Palladianum (*studium*) 37
 Palladium 43
 Palladius 25; 29, 3; 85
 Paludius 47
 Panacrius 33, 1
 Pancharius 83
 Pancratii (*club name*) 35; 37
 Pancratius 37; 38; 42; 47; 83
 Papario 119; 120, 10
 Papirius 20, 1
 Parabasius 86
 Paramonius 47
 Pardinus 64
 Paregorius 85
 Parthenius 97; 98, 4

 Pascentius 79
 Paschasius 58; 60; 71; 72; 77; 86; 106;
 116; 117; 117, 1; 119; 120
 Pascasius 109 f.
 Paternus 30
 Patricius 76; 80
 Pattiso 48, 2
 Paula 96
 Paulica 63, 2
 Paulinianus 69
 Paullus 96
 Paulus 49; 5; 91; 94; 95; 96 *bis*; 118;
 119; 120; 121
 Pecorius 81
 Peculius 81
 Πηγάσις 40
 Pelagii (*club name*) 35
 Pelagius 29, 3; 31; 70
 Πεντηκοστή 106; 109; 116
 Peregrinus 26
 Peristerius 42, 1; 85
 Perpetua 98; 99
 Perseverantius 79
 Pervincius 25
 Pesidii (*club name*) 35
 Petrius 85; 95, 2
 Petronilla 68
 Petronius 20, 1; 22; 23; 24; 95, 2
 Petrunia 23; 23, 1
 Petrula 68; 95, 2
 Petrus 23; 24; 60; 94; 95; 96 f.; 117
 bis; 117, 1; 118; 119 *bis*; 120; 121
 Pharetrius —
 Faretrius 85
 Philemon —
 Filemon 95
 Philomella —
 Filomella 52
 Philomenes —
 Filomenes 52
 Phosphorius 38; 45
 Phylletianii (*club name*) 36
 Picentius 82
 Pierius 85
 Pisonis 69
 Piste 91
 Pistis 91
 Pistoricus 63, 2
 Placidia 80
 Πλατωνεῖνα 64

- Plotius 50
 Poemenia 85
 Polla 23; 96
 Pollia —
 Polia 51
 Pollitta 68, 1
 Polychronius 76; 86
 Pompeius 49, 3
 Pontianus 97; 98, 4
 Populonium 82
 Porphyrius 85
 Porfirius 42, 1
 Potentius 79
 Poubillia 19
 ?Praiecticia *v.* Reiecticia
 Praesidius 81
 Praestantius —
 Prestantius 79
 Pretiosa 84, 2
 Pretzios . . . 66
 Primaevius —
 Primevius 80
 Primenius 77; 80
 Primianus 63
 Primigenia 52
 Primillus 68
 Primosus 66
 Primulica 63, 2
 Primus 52; 61
 Principius 38; 81
 Priscianus 63
 Priscilla 68; 69
 Priscillianus 69
 Priscilianus 68
 Priscus 61
 Probantius 79
 Probatius 76; 79
 Probicius 77; 80
 Probilianus 68
 Probitatia 81
 Problepius 86
 Processius 81
 Procopius 85
 Proculocia —
 Proclodia 77; 80
 Proficius 82
 Proiectus 67; 87
 Protus 97; 98, 4
 Providentius 79
 Provincius 81
 Pudentius 79
 Pulcheria —
 Pulceria 80
 Purpurius 81
 Pusinnicus 63, 2

QUADRAGESIMA 106; 109; 116; 120
 Quinctilianus 63
 Quinta 23
 Quintasius 77; 80
 Quintilla 68
 Quintiola 67
 Quintius 45, 1; 118, 5
 Quintula 67
 Quiriacus *v.* Cyriacus
 Quodiubet 101; 102; 116
 Quodvultdeus 102 *bis*; 116; 117; 117, 1
 Cobuldeo (*dat.*) 102, 1
 Covuldonia 102, 1
 Quodvuldeonia 102, 1

RATIAGER 49, 5
 Rebecca —
 Revecca 93
 Redemptus 90; 111; 112 *bis*
 Refrigerius 46; 47; 76; 81; 111; 113;
 120
 Regulus 67
 ?Reiecticia 76; 77; 79 (*unless*
 Praiecticia)
 Remigia 81
 Renatus 111; 112 *bis*; 116; 119
 Renovatus 111; 112 *bis*; 116
 Reparatus 111; 112 *bis*; 113
 Reposianus 77
 Reposius 76; 77; 79
 Res- 57
 Restitutus 57; 62; 118, 4
 Reticius 82
 Revecca *v.* Rebecca
 Ripasius 77; 81
 Roborius 81
 Romuliensia —
 Romuliesia 77; 82
 Romulii (*club name*) 37
 Romulius 34; 37; 45, 1; 72; 82
 Rorentia 77; 81
 Rufillus 68
 Rufinianus 61; 69
 Rufinus 61; 64

- Rufus 61 *bis*; 65
 Rupilius 51
 Rusticia 80
 Rusticulus 32, 1

SABAS 60
 ?*Σαββάσα* 107, 2
 ?Sabbatianus —
 Sabatian ... 106, 8
 Sabbatis 92; 106; 107
 Sabbatius 60; 71; 72; 86; 106; 107; 107,
 2; 118
 Sabinianus 63
 Sabinus 61
 Sabras 28, 4
 Saburtilla 68
 Sagittius 81
 Salaciu[s] 80
 ?Salcamarius 28, 4
 Salutius 81
 Salventius 79
 Salvianus 52
 Salvicus 63, 2
 Salvius 52; 121
 Samso 60
 Sapertill[a] 68
 Sapricius 77; 85
 Sarama ... 48, 2
 Saturnalis 62, 1; 106
 Saturninus 61; 64; 87 *bis*; 100; 105
 Saturus 55
 Scholacius —
 Scolacius 77; 78; 81
 Scholasticus —
 Scolasticus 50
 Sebastianus 97; 98 *ter*; 99
 Seberantia *v.* Severantia
 Secundianus 62
 Secundilla 62
 Secundinia 62
 Secundinianus 62
 Secundinus 30; 62; 64
 Secundo 62
 Secundius 62
 Secundosa 62; 66
 Secundula 62
 Secundus 61; 62; 65
 Sennes 97; 98
 Septiminus 64
 Serpentius 79

 Sertius 38, 4; 39
 Servandus 118, 4
 ?Servus dei 103, 6
 Sestilius *v.* Sextilius
 Severantia —
 Seberantia 77; 80
 Severianus 63
 Severanus 63, 1
 Severinus 64
 Severus 65; 109; 110
 Sextilius —
 Sestiliu[s] 22
 Sillaria 48, 2
 Silvanus 61
 Silvinus 64
 Silviola 67
 Simplicius 39, 1; 39, 2; 41; 47; 73, 1;
 74; 80
 Simposius *v.* Symposius
 Sinboletianus *v.* Symboletianus
 Siricius 80
 Siricosa 66
 Siricus 55
Σκυλάκιος —
 'Ισκυλλάκις 85
 Socratia 83
 Sof[e]nius 39, 2
Σωφρόνιος 47
 Sophronius 83
 Soricus 81
 Soricus 63 *bis*; 63, 2
 Soterianus 63
 Spenicus 63; 63, 2
Σπηραντία —
 Ισπηραντία 79
 Spes 91
 Spesindeo 102; 116
 Splendonius 77; 82
 Stabilicius —
 Istablicius 49
 Stephanía 85
 Stephanilla —
 Stefanilla 68
 Stephanus 91; 98; 99
 Stefanus 91
 Stercorius 29; 67; 73; 74; 81; 87
 Storacius —
 Isstoracius 81
 Studentius 79

- Studiosus 66; ?66, 1
 Studius 76
 Istudius 29; 81
 ?Subicius 82
 Suppestilla 68
 Surrentius 83
 Susanna 60; 91; 93; 94; 118; 120
 Syagrius 83
 Symboletianus —
 Sinboletianus 63
 Symphorus 55
 Symposius —
 Simposius 85
 Syncratii (*club name*) 37
 Syncratiis 37
 Syncretia 86
 Syrus 56
- TAELEGENII* (*club name*) 36
 Tarsicius v. Tharsicius
 Tarvius —
 Tarbius 28
 Taurilio 69
 Taurus 48
 Telesius 83
 Telesphorianus 77
 Telesporianus 85
 Terticus 63, 2
 Tertius 61
 Tetiaena / Tetiaenius 19
 Thalassius 86
 ?Thalassus 42,1 (*unless* Thalassius)
 Tharsicius —
 Tarsicius 77; 85
 Thecla 91; 98; 99 *bis*; 116
 Theocleia / Θεόκληια 99; 100
 Theoctistus 103
 Theodorus 61; 103
 Theodosius 61; 103
 Theodotus 61; 103
 [T]heodotus 52, 1
 Theodulus 102; 103; 104; 117; 117, 1;
 120; 121
 Θεοπίλλα 68
 Thomas 95; 116
 Timocrates 52
 Timotheus 52
 Titianus 63
 Titicus 63, 2
 Tricontii (*club name*) 36
- Triumphalica 63, 2
 Triumfalica 63
 Trypherina —
 Tryferina 64
 Tryphonianus —
 Tryfonianus 63
 [T]ryphonilla 68
 ?Tucrosus 66
 Turbantia 79
 Turpilia 19
 Tychenia 78
 Tydenia 86
 Tychicianus 27, 3
 Τυχίος 78, 1
 Τυράννιος —
 Τυράννιος 86
- ULPIUS* 16; 17; 22; 34, 2
 Uranius 39, 1
 Urbanica 63, 2
 Urbanus 80
 Urbanus 61
 Ursacius 29, 3; 62; 77; 82
 Ursatius 62
 Ursella 62
 Ursenia 62; 77; 82
 Ursianus 62
 Ursicinus 62; 68
 Ursicius 62
 Ursiculus 62
 Ursilianus 62
 Ursilla 62; 68
 Ursinianus 62
 Ursinula 62
 Ursinus 62
 Ursio 62
 Ursulianus 62
 Ursulus 62; 67
 Ursus 62
- VALENS* 23; 28
 Valentinianus 69
 Valentinus 64
 Valentius 79
 Valerianus 63
 Valerius 16; 17; 19, 2; 20; 22; 23; 50
 Venantius 79
 Benantius 26, 2
 ?Benatius 79
 Venerianus 63

- Veneriosus 65; 66; 88
 Venerius 87 *bis*
 Veritas 23, 1
 Verzobius 34, 1; 37; 39, 1
 Vicentius *v.* Vincentius
 Victor 30; 61; 89
 Victoria 28
 [Vi]ctoria 32
 Victorianus 63
 Victoricus 63 *bis*; 63, 2
 Victorinia 77
 Bictorinia 82
 Victorinianus 69
 Victorinus 64
 Victorius 82
 Vigilantius 79
 Vigilius 82
 Vincentius 33, 2; 73; 74; 79
 Vicentius 73, 1
 Vincetdeus 102; 116
 Vindemius 82
 Vindicius 82
 Virentius 39, 3
 Vitalianus 63
 Vitalicus 63, 2
 Vitalinus 64
 ?Vitatice 63 (*unless* Vitalica)
 Vitalia —
 Βευταλία 80
 Vitalio 30; 65
 Vitalis 89; 118, 4
 Viventius 42, 1; 47; 79; 89
 Volusius —
 Bolusius 49
 XYSTUS 97; 98; 98, 4
 Zeno 87
 Zminthius 37
 Xr- *v.* Chr-
 Ypsichius *v.* Eupsychius

A GENERAL INDEX

- Abstracts, names derived from 36; 70;
 76, 1; 84, 2; 114
 Acclamation 25; 33; 33, 2; 34; 37; 40;
 41; 43; 45
 Achaia 95
 Adjectives 37; 95
 — names derived from 62, 1; 66; 70;
 75, 1; 76; 105; 107
 Adoption 4; 28
 Aemilii 96
Afer (ethnic) 26
 Africa 11; 22, 1; 26; 38; 48; 49; 61 f.;
 63; 65 f.; 76; 94; 100; 102 f.; 104;
 108; 112 f.; 114; 116
 African Church, latinization of 100; 103;
 104
 African cognomina 35
 After life 35
Αγάπη/agape 113 f.
 Agnomen 30; 31; 39; 41; 42; 43; 75;
 88; 109
 Alaric 2; 12; 13
 Alumnus 8
Ἀλυπε (voc.) 41
 Ammius (*or* Amnius) Anicius Paulinus
 45
 Analogy 76 f.
 — false 62; 64
 Anaptyxis 79, 2
Ancilla dei 7; 103; 103, 6
 Anicii 44
 Anicius Auchenius Bassus 43 f.
 Animals, names of 63; 68
 Antoninian Constitution 16
 Antony, Marc 25, 4
 Apostasy 100
 Aramean names 96
 Asia Minor 40; 99
 Assonance 53
 Augustalis 114, 1
 Marcus Aurelius 25, 4
 M. Aurelius Petrus 96
 Ausonius 43, 2
 Baptism 30; 104; 109
 Baptismal names 89; 109; 112
 Barbaric names/cognomina 28; 29, 1;
 35; 48; 63, 2; 66; 68; 77, 2; 99
 Betitius Perpetuus Arzygius 44, 2
 Betitius Pius Maximillianus 34, 2
 Birth, names given at 27; 30; 37; 43;
 49 *bis*; 112; 120; 120, 8; 121
 Births, registration of 18

- Boatmen 36
 ?*Bonifatia* (noun) 76, 1
 Breviarium Syriacum 98
 Bryonianos Lollianos 40
 C. Caelius Saturninus 40
 Caracalla 5; 17; 35
 Cardinal virtues, Christian 89; 91; 113
Carpitanus (ethnic) 26
 Catacombs 2; 15; 94
 — St. Agnese 12
 — Commodilla 101
 — Priscilla 9, 5; 11; 91; 97
 Catechumens 109; 119; 120
 Catholics 102
 Alfenius Caeionius Iulianus Kamenius 44
 Celtic names/cognomina 28; 28, 4; 56, 4; 100
 Cemeteries, etiquette in 9; 14
 Census 17
 Children, illegitimate 50
 Christ 94; 101; 110
 Christian Latin 90
 Christian nomenclature 23; 30; 35; 46; 49; 58; 60 f.; 66 f.; 72
Christus 101
 Citizenship, Roman 4; 5; 16; 17; 51
 Cleopatra 25, 4
 Clergy 9; 12; 105; 113, 1; 121
 Clodius Celsinus Adelphius 44, 2
 Clubs, burial 35—39
 — Greek 36
 — names of 35 f.; 73
 — professional 36; 82, 2
 Cognomen, double 23; 24; 32; 48; 49; 57; 70; 72; 73; 75; 86, 2; 88; 96; 120
 — hereditary 44; 52; 96
 — transmission of 4; 20—22; 29; 30; 39; 59 f.; 62; 69; 74; 77; 91; 96
 Collegia domestica 36
 — tenuiorum 38
 Commodus 34, 2
 Compound names, Greek 52; 78
 — Latin 52; 76 *bis*
 Confirmation 119
Conlibertus 6
Conservi dei 7
Conservus 7
 Constantine the Great, age of 13
 Converts 30; 104; 107; 118; 119
 St. Cosmas 97, 2
Κυριακή ἡμέρα 106
 St. Damias 97, 2
 Dated inscriptions 2; 11 f.; 29; 35; 46; 48; 60; 72 f.; 117; 119
 Dating of inscriptions 13
 Dative, use of in signa 33; 34, 2; 37; 39, 1
 Days, names of 105; 106
 Decurio 114, 1
 Dedicator, signum of 33, 1; 34
 Dedicatory names/cognomina 25; 100; 101
Deo gratias 102
Deo laudes 102
 Depositio 11; 110
 Depositio martyrum 94; 97; 98; 108; 108, 3
Dies dominica 106
 — *lustricus* 30
 — *Sabbati* 106, 5
 — *Saturni* 106
 — *solis* 106
 Diminutives 62; 64 *bis*; 67 f.; 77; 105
 Dionysus 40
 Dissimilation 68; 68, 1; 69
 Divine names 70; 101
D.M. 96; 114, 1 *bis*
D.M.S. 114, 1
Dominus (title) 105
 Domna 105, 1
 Domus aeterna 114, 1
 Donatists 102
Duo nomina 3; 11; 12; 13; 18; 24; 26, 2; 46
 Easter Day 119
 Ecclesia triumphans 15
 Egypt 18; 48; 101
Ἐν εἰρήνῃ 89
Ἑλπίς 89
Ἐπιφάνεια 108
 Epitaphic style, Christian 24; 46; 54; 89
 — in Carthage 2; 13
 — in Rome 15
 Epitaphs 32 f.
 — nameless 103, 6
 — pagan formulas in 114, 1
 Epithets 26; 40; 103, 6

- Equality, Christian ideal of 8; 15
 Eques Romanus 114, 1
 Ethnics 5; 26; 40; 56
 Etruria 4
 Etruscan 68, 1
 Etymology, of club names 35; 37
 — of cognomina 20; 22 f.; 29; 52; 53; 99; 114; 120
 — of nomina 22 f.; 37
 Fashion 4; 5; 30; 46; 121
 Fathers, the 9
 Festivals, names of 105; 106; 110
 — pagan 106
 Filiation 1; 6
 Q. Flavius Maesius Egnatius Lollianus 45
 Fossore 121, 2
 Freedmen 3; 4; 16; 17; 20, 1; 27; 28; 36; 37; 38; 58 f.; 96, 1; 107; 121
 — Imperial 7; 27 f.; 34, 2
 Gaul 20; 25
 Γενέθλια 108
 Genitive, use of in club names 36
 — in signa 33; 43
 Gens 16; 36; 39
 Geographical terms, names derived from 40; 56; 63; 70; 75, 2
 Geta 35
 Gladiators 36
 »Good omen«, names of 22, 1; 76; 87
 Grandparents 50; 54
 Greek inscriptions 5; 9; 10; 11; 12 f.; 31; 40; 41; 41, 1; 57; 58; 95, 1
 — name form 1; 5; 10; 13; 17; 46
 — names/cognomina 25 f.; 28; 31; 36; 42; 43; 48; 52; 53; 54; 61; 63 *bis*; 64; 65, 1; 67; 68; 70; 75; 76; 77, 1; 98; 100; 103; 104 *bis*; 114; 116; 121
 Γρηγόρι/gregori (imper.) 41
 Hadrumetum 114
 Haplogy 63; 66 *bis*
 Hebrew names/cognomina 58; 71; 92; 93; 95
 Hierodulia 103
 Honorary inscriptions 32 f.; 34; 37; 38; 40; 43; 44; 45; 46
Honori (dat.) 45, 2
 Humility, Christian names of 67
 Hunters 36
 Hypocoristic forms 64; 65
 Indeclinable names 102
 Indictio 119
Innocens/innocentissimus 115; 120
 Intercession 93; 93, 2
Iunior 52
Jesus 101
 Jewish inscriptions 92; 107; 117
 Jews 91; 92; 94; 95; 106; 107; 111 f.; 113; 117; 118; 119; 119, 2
 Joy, Christian 67; 89
 Judaism 92
 Koine 113
 Language, of inscriptions 56; 68 f.
 Latium 114
 Legends, hagiographical 97; 99; 118 f.
 Lex Iulia municipalis 17, 4
Libertus 7
 — *lib.*, *l.* 6
 Loan-words 55
 Manlii Capitolini 66, 1
 Manumission 8; 17; 27; 51 *bis*; 70
 Martyrology, Carthaginian 97; 98
 Masculine, use of in women's nomenclature 41—43
 Maxentius 77
 Months, names of 22 f.; 29; 105 f.
 Musulmans 2
 Mythological cognomina, *see* theophoric cognomina
Natalis/natale 108
Natalis Solis Invicti 108
Nazarenus (adj.) 96
 Neophytes 112; 119 f.
 Nicknames 28—30; 31; 39 f.; 43; 45; 48; 49; 67; 70; 75; 96; 121
 — preceding the original names 29
 Nobility 3; 4; 8; 12; 12, 2; 15; 17; 26 f.; 28; 30; 32 f.; 38; 43; 52; 60; 69; 121
 Nomen sodalicium 31; 35; 37; 38; 39; 42; 44; 46
 Nomen 1; 4; 5; 23; 27; 30; 36 f.; 42; 62; 64; 68; 70; 72; 73 *bis*; 74; 75; 84, 3; 86, 2; 117; 121
 — double 19—21; 48; 49; 50
 — Imperial 16 f.; 34, 2
 — new 25; 26; 37
 — transmission of 4; 19; 20; 21; 34, 2; 39,

- use of as a cognomen 24; 25; 53; 72; 95
- use of as a supernomen 31; 42; 45; 49
- Nominative, use of in signa 34
- in women's names in *-ius*, 41 f.; 43
- Nymphs, sanctuary of 40
- 'O *καί* 48
- Ostia 96; 114
- In pace* 89
- Papyri 25; 77; 78
- Participles, names derived from 61 *bis*; 62; 70; 75, 1; 76; 112
- Patrons, of colleges 37
- Patronus* 6; 7 f.
- Patronymics 64
- St. Paul 85, 3; 113
- People, common 8; 12; 13; 30; 32; 60; 61; 70; 96; 101; 112; 121
- Peregrini 10; 16; 17; 28; 57; 58
- Peregrinus* 26
- Persian names 98
- Phrygian names 56, 4
- Pitinnus* (= *pisinnus*) 26
- Pius* 26
- Polyonymy 4; 26 f.; 30; 43
- Pompey 66, 1
- Post-Constantinian inscriptions 8; 12 f.; 15; 58; 60; 91; 117
- Praenomen 3; 4; 5; 6; 11; 13 *bis*; 14; 15; 16; 17; 21; 23; 73
- Pre-Constantinian inscriptions 8; 10; 11; 12 f.; 15; 46; 57 f.; 60; 69; 71 f.; 91; 97; 117
- Punic names/cognomina 76; 102 f.
- Qui et* 31; 35; 43; 47; 48; 49
- Race mixture 17; 55
- Redemption 112
- Relatives, names of 2; 14
- signa of 37—39
- Republican nomenclature 4; 5; 19; 61; 62; 65; 66, 1; 100
- Resurrection 111
- Saducees 111
- Saints 60; 90; 91; 105; 110
- Satan 94
- Semantic shift 90; 91; 104; 105; 112; 113; 114; 115; 117
- Semitic names/cognomina 56, 4; 60; 102 f.
- Senior* 52
- Sentence-names 102
- Septimius Severus 34 f.
- Septuaginta 113
- Servus* 4; 7; 11
- Servus dei* 7; 103; 103, 6
- »Short» names, Greek 52; 78
- Latin 52
- Signo* 31; 35; 43; 47; 48
- Signum 31; 75; 113
- double 34; 46; 47 *ter*
- Sive* 31
- Slave-dealers 58; 59
- Slavery 4; 8; 9; 15; 28; 59; 60
- Slaves 4; 9; 11; 14 *bis*; 15; 16; 20; 28; 34, 2; 51; 58 f.; 70; 104; 107; 121
- Imperial 7; 11; 27 f.
- Social differences, recording of in Christian epitaphs 8 f.; 15
- Soldiers' nomenclature 25; 26; 96, 1
- Statistical chance 73; 78; 92
- Stems, abbreviation of 77 f.
- Stone-cutters 56
- Suffixes 52; 53; 55; 72; 88; 100
- combined 62; 68 f.; 77
- extended 62; 76 f.
- *-alis* 62, 1
- *-alis/-aris* 106, 3
- *-anilla* 68
- *-anus* 4; 21; 27; 28; 36; 62 f.; 99; 106, 8
- *-as* 69
- *-culus* 67
- *-ετοι* 36
- *-ellus* 67
- *-ensis* 62; 63
- *-ia* 70
- *-ianus* 62 f.
- *-icianus* 68
- *-icinus* 68
- *-ικος* 63 f.
- *-icus* 62 *bis*; 63 f.; 77; 108
- *-ilio* 69
- *-ilis* 62, 1
- *-ιλλα* 67
- *-illianus/ilianus* 68 f.
- *-illus* 64; 67 f.
- *-inianus* 69
- *-inus* 62; 64; 105
- *-io* 64 f.; 104

- ior* 64
- ios* 25 f.; 111
- is* 69
- itta* 68, 1
- ium* (= -*ior*) 43
- ius* 25 f.; 29; 31 f.; 35; 36 f.; 39; 41—43; 44 f.; 47 f.; 62 *bis*; 65; 69; 99; 107; 108; 109; 111; 113; 115
- ius* as a deverbative 76
- o -onis* 64; 65
- olus* 67
- osus* 62 *bis*; 65 f.; 84, 2
- ulus* 67
- Supernomen 25; 26; 70; 72; 73—75; 78; 120
- Symmachus 38; 45
- Syncopation 104 f.
- Theophoric cognomina 62, 1; 75, 2; 87; 106; 120
- survival of in Christian epigraphy 87 f.
- Trajan 17; 34, 2
- Translation of personal names 28; 48; 76; 102 f.; 105
- Tria nomina* 3; 4; 11; 12; 13; 16; 18; 21, 1; 46
- Tribus 1; 6
- Tripolitania 45
- Turcii 44
- L. Turcius Apronianus Asterius 44
- Uncomplimentary names 29; 67; 87
- Vandals 2
- Venus 69
- Verna* 4; 11
- Virgines 121, 2
- Vocative, use of in signa 33; 33, 2; 34; 41; 43; 46
- L. Volusius Saturninus 19
- Votive inscriptions 32 f.; 34
- Vulgar Latin 78; 81, 1
- accusative *pro* ablative of time 110
- weakening of gemination 68; 69
- $\bar{o} > \bar{u}$ 23, 1
- $o > u$ 67
- *-ri-* > *-r-* 63, 1; 100
- $y > u$ 100
- $x > s$ 86, 4
- Week, seven-day 106
- Western provinces 42
- Women's nomenclature 3; 5; 9; 19; 21; 22; 23; 33; 41—43; 64; 65; 70