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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 C VI: 4, 2—3 (34030—36602 and 37858—39082a). I think they represent the average features of the whole pagan inscriptive 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 Stzyger, Die römischen Katakomben, p. 319, 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 Stzyger, op. cit., p. 3.
³ RO p. civii.
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. 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. 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. 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.

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.


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 inscriptions 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 *CVI* (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-

---

⁴ Doer, *Die römische Namengebung*, p. 95 f.
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 *C I: 2* 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 *C VI*, 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 *C VI*. 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 Ἀντιοχείς*. 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C VI : 4, 2—3, epitaphs</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Free</em></td>
<td>1.785</td>
<td>1.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Freedmen</em></td>
<td>733</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Slaves</em></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total</em></td>
<td>2.622</td>
<td>1.986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pagan</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Free</em></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Freedmen</em></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Slaves</em></td>
<td>276</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total</em></td>
<td>754</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: ... Zee con[pars et]conser[vae in] and SI 6337: ... forus con[serbus ben[e]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 conservus 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 libero. 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 Sabinianno 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 proper, 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: *Sozomenet alumnae / audienti / patronus fidelis*.

The insignificant percentage of slaves and freedmen in the Christian inscriptions 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. 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 inscriptions 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(lariissimae) f(eminae) — — liberti fe[cerunt]* imply the continuance of the ancient practice of manumission. One can also refer to the literary evidence of large-scale manumissions in Christian times. 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*.

Grossi Gondi 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 epitaphs, 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(erfectissimus), 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.


6 *Trattato* pp. 72 and 100.

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. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>praen. + nomen</th>
<th>C VI: 4, 2—3, epitaphs</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tria nomina</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duo nomina</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>71.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single or double cognomen</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>10.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>16.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 over-estimated; 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 consequences” (p. 156).
Table 4. The name forms in the Greek inscriptions of Rome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IG X IV Roman epitaphs</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praen. + nomen or</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only nomen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stigma nominae</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duo nominae</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>20,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single or double</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>64,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognomen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pagan</th>
<th></th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praen. + nomen or</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only nomen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stigma nominae</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,0%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duo nominae</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>57,5%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single or double</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16,0%</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>69,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognomen</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>25,5%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>31,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
stratum of the catacomb of Priscilla, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ante pacem</th>
<th>A.D. 313—410</th>
<th>A.D. 410—500</th>
<th>A.D. 500—600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>tria nomina</strong></td>
<td>18 10.5 %</td>
<td>31 9.5 %</td>
<td>98 95.5 %</td>
<td>98 95.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>duo nomina</strong></td>
<td>54 32.0 %</td>
<td>292 90.5 %</td>
<td>103 103 %</td>
<td>72 96.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognomen</td>
<td>98 57.5 %</td>
<td>292 90.5 %</td>
<td>103 103 %</td>
<td>72 96.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.D. 313—410</th>
<th>A.D. 410—500</th>
<th>A.D. 500—600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>duo nomina</strong></td>
<td>80 50.0 %</td>
<td>245 90.0 %</td>
<td>47 98.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognomen</td>
<td>79 50.0 %</td>
<td>245 90.0 %</td>
<td>47 98.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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 people, the disappearance of the nomen after the pax seems all the more thorough. Again, Greek material formed almost a third of the early inscrip-

---

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 insessional 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 insessional 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 insessional 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*:

\[
\text{Martius Alexan[der] — Martia Earine} \\
\quad \text{L. Martius L.f. Alexan[der]}
\]

or *C VI 38879*:

\[
\text{Polytimu[s] — Hermetilla} \\
\quad \text{M. Seius M.f. Secundianus}
\]

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 relatives \(^1\), e.g. *C VI 35124: Domitiae Florae | Lais soror | 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 = DEHIL 4124: Flavius Fortunius / et / Lutatia Prisca / Communioni filio, and FE 8792 = DEHIL 2278: Legitimus et Amanitia 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.
unity of the gens.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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; Rostovtzeff 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.\textsuperscript{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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomina</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aelius</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonius</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavius</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulpian</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\textsuperscript{1} Nogara, op. cit. p. 102.
\textsuperscript{2} Cp. Suet. Divus Claudius 25, 3.
\textsuperscript{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 Ulpius, 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 census⁴, 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 Dietrich, upon whose index Thylander has based his calculations, Flavius is found c. 400 times.
³ Cf. Thylander p. 97.
⁴ Cf. Lex Julia municipalis (C I: 23 593, 145—6).
of the name system. 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. A number of birth certificates found in Egypt show that boys were designated by the classical *tria nomina* and girls by *duo nomina*. 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 date, there is evidence that it was often neglected. The last reference to registration is in Justinian’s times, *Schol. Basilic.* 48, 20, 15: ἡ ἀπογραφὴ τῆς γενέσεως. πολλάκις γὰρ σημειώνται τινὲς πότε ἔτεχθησον. Notice that the registration is explicitly stated as taking place sometimes; 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. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>C VI</em>:4,2—3, epitaphs</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double nomina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single nomina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of men and women</td>
<td>3.0 %</td>
<td>5.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of the total</td>
<td>0.3 %</td>
<td>2.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 *Schulz, JRS* 1942, pp. 78—80 and 85—86.
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:

\[
\begin{align*}
C. Laelius Alexander — Tetaena Clara \\
C. Laelius Tetaenius Firmus
\end{align*}
\]
or from the Christian material, RAC 1936, p. 21:

\[
\begin{align*}
Flavius Iulianus c.v. — Insteia Cilonis c.f. \\
Flavius Insteius Cilo c.p.
\end{align*}
\]

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. Poubilia Turpilia Cn. uxor (C I: 24 42 = ILS 3234). 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. 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) Valer[i(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)aleries, as DIEHL does. The name may be connected with the name of a Corsican city, Aleria.
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:

**Ulpian Eutyches — Ulpia Secundina**

**Ulpian Secundinus, Ulpia Iulia, Ulpia Secundina, Ulpian 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 proper ¹, 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**


---

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. I. Laelius*, and 15648: *T. C. Aug. lib. Petronius* may have been called *Laelius* and *Petronius* as slaves. Cf. also NBull 1921, p. 44 = DIEHL, 766: *Aurelio Onesino, Aurelio Papirio, Aureliae Prim. vivg. Aurelius Feliciissimus / 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, Marcius.

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 3691Cd: the father is [Ju]lius Aemilius[], the sons [Ju]lius 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 interpretation 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 iunia 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 Ulpius, the mother Felicitas, and the sons Ulpius and Aelianus. Only the elder son bears the same name as his father; had Ulpius 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 Sestilius, the mother [Feli]cissima, the daughter Adeodala, or if borne by a child, is not found as the name of the parents, e.g. \( R 0 1576 = \) 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 Archemais, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomen</th>
<th>Frequency in Nomenclature</th>
<th>Frequency as Family Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius</td>
<td>16 (411)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitius</td>
<td>16 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavius</td>
<td>12 (149)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius</td>
<td>36 (94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcianus</td>
<td>16 (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronianus</td>
<td>27 (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerianus</td>
<td>32 (64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the names listed as the most popular nomina proper, p. 16, have disappeared, and three new ones have been substituted for them, Domitian, Marcius 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 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, Aprilis, nine examples, 1

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(onesta) f(eminum) 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(eminum)) — 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. CVI 38214: Caliste Clodia and 38063: Erotis Avi e(minia), or from the Christian material, SI 4826: Augena Decia and FE 9365: Volusiana A ufidia. 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 ə > ʊ 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. Thyländer, 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. 165), 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 = DIELH 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 = DIELH 3959adn: Cassus / Domninus_.

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 = DIELH 3734A: Mercuria / Laurentia / se bibas cun / pararunt_, the examples in which the context implies one person are more numerous, e.g. _SI 567 = DIELH 4000A: Clemencia / Furtunia vixit / anos III m. VIII_ (erroneously considered by Sylvagni as the epitaph of two persons in the index); _SI 2233 = DIELH 4005D: Facundo / Artemoni / q(ui) v(ixit) a. I m. I d. XIII; FE 7565: Eustasius / Trancylianus / 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 = DIELH 2279: Iucaun [d] e filiae quiesc / tes parentes posuer / uni qui vixit annis / octo. Rodopoe in pace quiesc / duleis_. Though DIELH, 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 Empire\(^3\), 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 -*ioς* may have contributed to the generalization of the new cognomina. This suffix was native in Greek in dedicatory names, e.g. Ἀπολλώνιος, Αμυττριός, Διονύσιος, 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. Betchel, p. 4, records Εὐαυγέριος, 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.
3. SCHULZE, loc. cit.
4. Ἡσύγιος 26 B.C. (*SB* 4380); Ἐφεσαῖος, the teacher of Marc Antony's and Cleopatra's children (Plut. *Ant.* 72 = *PIR III*, p. 92 n. 123); Ἐβαυγέριος, the first bishop of Antioch, first century A.D. (*Rusebius, hist. eccl.*, 3,22); Μακσδόνιος 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 supernomina 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 ethnici, e.g. SI 2444: Vernacius Carpitianus and FE 8596 = Diehl 4451: Ulpianus 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?) Constantinus pius is a similar case. In SI 3678 = Diehl 2713B: Niceforus pisinus, the last word is probably an epithet, a vulgar form for pisinus, 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 magistrates which were absent from the former, and the multiplication

---

1 E.g. 'Αλντιος, the earliest dated example I have found is A.D. 314 (Flor. I); 'Αμαζωνιας A.D. 295 (POxy I 43, verso I 22); 'Ανανδας A.D. 352 (POxy XII 1431.1); 'Επιφανιας A.D. 438 (Stud. XX); Ευδοξιος, fourth century (e.g. Flor. I 71, 307); Ευδοκιος A.D. 295 (POxy I 43 recto II 26); Ευσεβιος A.D. 295 (ibid. recto V I, 4); Τεκλας third century (e.g. Flor. II 133); Γεωργιος a popular name in Byzantine times; I have found no examples before the sixth century; Γεωργιας A.D. 316 (POxy VI 896 i 23); Γεωργιος A.D. 265? (Soc. V 465, 9).

2 In SI 1171 = Diehl 4128C: Claudia Romana Benantio (= Venantio) Flomentum contugi, the first name of the husband, considering that his wife bears seuo nominas, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>Carthage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C VI:4, 2–3</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nomen + double cogn.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double cognomina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the total</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Rome, 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.
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. 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. 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. The other cases in our material in which one cognomen is barbaric, the other Latin or Greek, may also admit of a similar interpretation.

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: Lepusclus Leo, where the first cognomen may have been given to contrast with Leo, or

---

1 Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht III: 1 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.
SI 3666 = DIEHL 3989Cadn: *Mercuria Culina*, where the second name, not instanced as a Latin cognomen\(^1\), suggests a female occupation. In SI 1284 = DIEHL 3990A: *Augustus December*\(^2\), 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. Agiius Septentrio* (C XIV 2113 and 2977). The first cognomen was presumably a nickname given to him because of his *agility*.\(^2\) 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\(^3\) 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: *Alogius Fortius* and SI 18 = DIEHL 4103: *Stercorius Aly[pius]*\(^3\), 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: *Draconius 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 Aeliodora 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. Macrobi. 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. 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 the use of surnames. On the one hand, the practice of bearing surnames, 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 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 a gnoma and s igna (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 Rhoaia sive Euresis; the term signum denotes a name cut detached from them («detached signum»), e.g. C VI 3446, the epitaph of an U<bs>pius Ursinus, with Arcadi oxa libi 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 sodaliciarum.

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 names ², 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, Graecia 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 Wullemier, Etude 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. Wullemier’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. Claudii 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pagan</th>
<th></th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>fragm.</td>
<td>-ius</td>
<td>-ius %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detached signa</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>94 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signa proper</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agnomina</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 [F]avia Satura bears [Vi]ctoria detached. 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**

- *epitaphs* ............................................. 130 or 56 %
- *honorary inscriptions* ............................. 79 or 34 %
- *votive inscriptions* .............................. 24 or 10 %

**Social origin of the bearers**

- *senatorial class* .................................. 39 or 17 %
- *equestrian class, municipal magistrates* ...... 79 or 33 %
- *others* .............................................. 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 |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| above                           | 33              | 73              | 11              | 117             |
| below                           | 68              | 4               | 7               | 76              |
| in the margins                  | 20              | 3               | 5               | 28              |
| other cases                     | 9               | 2               | 1               | 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. W o m e n'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 euromi (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 11605, 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 x* / *Heraclie compari sue beneme[renti fecit que vi]x[x]it anis XXI in palæe Liberi vivas in x*. 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 *Heraclio*. Again, in Bull 1887, p. 20, the epitaph of a certain *Klaudia Artronia Stxovnŭciva* 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 exceptions, 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. The earliest datable instance is C VI 180 = ILS 3703: *Romuli euhemer — 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, *Versobi vivas* refers to the person *pro* whose *salutes* 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, *Bettius Pius Maximilianus* (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 Aurelia* *Ceonia 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 numerous\(^2\), 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 sodaliciarum, 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), Eugrañii (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]thanasiorn C VI 7649 is obvious, but Olycrmpii 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 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 contubernales 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.
\(^4\) Cf. WUILLEUMIER, op. cit., p. 64: quis espérent habiter un jour sur l’Olympe avec les Immortels.
\(^5\) Cf. CUMONT, After life in Roman paganism, p. 155.
These club names were mostly set in the genitive plural, and examples like C VI 5174 = ILS 7945a: *aeterna domus Olymptiorum* 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 progeny, 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 Phyilles*. Professional clubs seldom had the new type of nomenclature; C VIII 11549: *Decasi vatele 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 -eiot, 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, 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. 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(u)e p(osterisque) eorum. | Eve 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 -ius, 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 Synкратиорum; and he calls himself aego Synкратиus.\(^1\) 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 infraforamum has Verzobio (dative) cut above the die of his honorary inscription. In C XI 6362 = ILS 7364, the patron of iunvenum forensium and studior(um) Apollinar(is) et Gunthar(is?) is addressed as Zwinthi.

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 Pancratii hic, has been dug up in the same place as the stone of Pancratiorum (C VI 10279, -81). Again, SI 475 we read: Dulcitiorum / depossio Dulci et vies. Because no other name is given, this is somewhat obscure. Dulcitio 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>other provinces</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>detached signa</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural forms</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Pancratii. 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 IRTv 564, 568: Heraclii, 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 Seritii (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 nomin: 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 names*. 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

---

\(^1\) *ILA* 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 *Heracl.* — *C IX 1640—41 = ILS 6494—95* two brothers bear *Verzobia* (dative) and *Navigi*, respectively. — *ILS 9093: mother Simplici*, son *Uran.* — *ILS 9442: mother Memphi*, daughter *Engami.* — *C XIV 418 = ILS 6167: mother Gaudenti*, daughter *Lampadi.*

\(^2\) *C V 2944: husband Πονιθρομ wife Ὄοθα; V 5869 = ILS 6730: husband Innocenti*, wife *Encratia* (ablative); *V 7453: husband Euphilius*, wife *Simplici; XIII 1880: husband Gaudentius*, wife *Duleci* (cf. p. 34); *XIV 2220: husband Sosifeni*, wife *Exuperi: FE 8969 = DIELI 895: husband Eustathi, wife *Amanita.*

\(^3\) 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[ter]/ soror carissima / fecit Vir[ten] / tio; 14849: Caeselitius / dulcisissimus / Narecthius; 21198: ...iciano filio / dulcissimo Cremen[i]o; ILS 283: parentes / dulcissimo filio fecerunt Byzacio*, the name of the deceased being given at the beginning: *AE 1913, 156 (Africa): P. Magnius / Paulinius / vo[tum] s[olvit] l[ibens] a[nimo] / Caelestius; C XIV 2815 = ILS 1669: Aurelius Alexander prox[imius] ab epistula[s] la[inibus] Digestius* — notice the suggestive name. *VI 10210* we read *T. Fl. Maximo*, the text then continuing vertically *Eui[pio (= 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 Dulcitius had accordingly been created at the moment of setting up the stone. There are other similar cases. The acclamation 'Agoraptai tauera, cut on the epitaph of an infant Secundilla, who rapta parentibus reliquit dolorem, ut tan dulcis crat tanquam aromata (C XII 874), was probably written to symbolize her sweet nature; VI 19611: Aeoni gregori, seems to imply a hope of immortality; XIII 2073 = ILS 841: <H>sarpagi, tibi terram leven, 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 ἀοράτω). 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: Caejalius ex[imi]ae laudis i[swe]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 νέβδις, the fawn skin worn by Dionysus. There are also cases in which the signum corresponds to an ethnic. Thus Cart[ilius] Secund[us], buried in saltus Aurasius, has Aurasi cut below (C VIII 2476). But though this is not the only similar case ², one must be cautious in regard to signa derived from geographical terms: it is not possible to consider all Dalmatii, Laodiceii, 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 Logianos, who had provided the sanctuary of the Nymphs with a water supply, is saluted as Kt[oster]³. His wife is for the same reason addressed as Πηγαία (nymphs) 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 ν(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 Fidius.
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 ἀληθεῖς χαῖρε (e.g.
IG XIV 1583; 1638) and the one in which the adjective had been replaced
by the new form, Ἡσίως σοι, ὧν ἀληθή (IG XIV 1030). Again, an exhortation
common in Greek inscriptions was γοηρόγερ (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: Aenon 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]line que et Simplicius; they are more numerous among
cognomina, e.g. FE 8748: A<étio Valentinae, the monogram found on

---

1 For the infrequency of signa in Greek inscriptions, see Wilhelm, EUTYXEI
EYΣΕΝΙ, WS 1902, p. 596 ff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>detached signa</th>
<th>signa proper</th>
<th>agnominia</th>
<th>cognominia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mascul. forms</td>
<td>feminine forms</td>
<td>mascul. forms</td>
<td>feminine forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i or fem. vocative</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. -ii or ae</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative or ablative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 sodaliciarum*, 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 sodaliciarum* 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 agnomena, the names are always put in the feminine.⁴ Moreover, we have a number of women’s

---

¹ C XIII 2070: Claudian(a) *Dulciitus soror*; 3826: *Ypsichius* — — *Archontus coniugi carissime*; Diehl 3539 (Hispania): *Rufo coniugi suo Viventius*; C XI 2894 = Diehl 226l addn: *Secunda Ama(z)ionis*; VI 31950 = Diehl 279A: *Aurelia Amazonius*; VI 37170: *Chrestina Dorcadius h(onesta) femina*; Diehl 315B (Rome): *Porfius c(ariissima) femina*; S 2463 = Diehl 2718A: *Eutolmius mater*; SICV 178: *Elavia 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. 41), 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. I. 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 Hilaris, 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 1 col. 2200). Cases of this type have been excluded from the statistics. 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.

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. 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 Apronius 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 Apronius (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, Aproiani praef. urb. fil., Asterii (ILS 706 and 729), and in an inscription dedicated by him to his wife he calls himself L. Turcius Secundus Asterii 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 cognomenHYMETIUS being also cut above the die; XIV 1000, the epitaph of one Faenia Elpidia, bears Elpidia quaeque detached.

2 C VI 31961 = ILS 8843, Betilius Perpetuus v.c. (latter half of the fourth century) bears Arzygii above the die, whereas in VI 1702 = ILS 1251 his name runs Betilius Perpetuus Arzygius v.c. — IX 1576 = ILS 1289, Clodius Celsinus insignis et c. v., prefect of Rome, A.D. 351, has Aldefi cut above, whereas in an epitaph set up by him to his wife he calls himself Clodius Adefi (VI 1712 = SI 19). Ammianus 16, 6, 2 refers to him as Adelfi.

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 Annius (or Ammius) Manius Caesonium 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: Nili, from his cognomen Nilus; 565 Nepotianii from Nepotianus; 571 [Be]nedictii from [Ben]edi[c]tus; 574 Romulii from Romulus; 588 Quintii from Quintus.

\(^2\) RE I col. 2199, 61 has erroneously considered the dative honorii, 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 anteo-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
Amanitia, FE 8969 = Diehl 895
*Aπεβληυ, FE 7166
Audenti, C VIII 20162 = Diehl 746
Caenabi Cons[i]an[i], a double signum, C VI 37231 = Diehl 1585

... io dulci Constantius suis, the wife's signum being fragmentary,
C VI 2651
Cynegi, C XI 2700 = Diehl 143
Δωσιάλη π’Αμπιγιός, FE 7251, a double signum? cf., however, Ferrua, Epigraphica 1940, p. 12 f.
Eivagio, C V 8766
Euphroni —
Euphroni, ARM p. 152
Eusebi, FE 6681
Eustathi, FE 8969 = Diehl 895
Eustorgi, FE 8974
Εὐστόγιος
Εὐστόγιος, FE 7203
Eutropi vivas, Diehl 1592
Florentio, RAC 1929, p. 217
Gregor[i], C VI 2655 = Diehl 4478
Γρηγορίου, Diehl 4037
Hesperi quiesce in pace, RAC 1931, p. 196
Heuresi —
Euresi fid[i]s maneas 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
Paludis dulcis, FE 8877
Pancratii in pace, SI 1380
Paramoni, RAC 1936, p. 215
Refrigeri vivas, SI 4704
Simplici dulcis in aeternum, FE 6769 = Diehl 896
Σωφρόνι γαίες, SI 692
Viventio dulci, RS I 31, 2 = Diehl 4644 adn.

§ 5. Signa proper and agnomina

It is likely, as Lambertz contends, 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., 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 Supernoemen, 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 o ual long before our era. During Imperial Times, the agnomena came to the West. The earliest example, C VI 975 145: C. Iulius C.I. Ephesius qui et Mascutius, is from A.D. 136, the latest, XI 941 = DIEHL 253: Gundebergia qui et Nonnica sp(ectabilis) f(eminis) 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.

---

1 LamBERTZ Supernomen, Glotta 1914, p. 99 ff.

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 Africa 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 2952Cadin:... sive Anastasia or FE 6600b: Barnabæs 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 Leoninus> and C VIII 8640 = DIEHL 3622adn: Istatlicius 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 Eavasius; XI 2535 = DIEHL 3916: Quaeius Iulianus sive Aebyrus; XII 956 = DIEHL 3540: Ennius Filerius 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.
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's nomen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's nomen</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 . . .

*Gavinia Valeria* 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 nomen. Even in cases in which mother and children bear some uncommon nomen, e.g. *Ilicus* (*SI* 1301 = DIEHL 4129), a name otherwise unknown, and *Pokleia* (*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 = DIELH 2990E, where the father is Felix, and the daughter Felicitas; SI 1885: the mother is Neikoumèða, the son Neikoumèðhês; SI 460: the mother is Elóðhy, the son Elóðhños. A connection through suffixes was also common; e.g. SI 2390 = DIELH 2698adn: the father is Salvius, the son Salvianus; an abbreviated form was less common with children, but was sometimes found, e.g. SI 606 = DIELH 2709: the father is Maximianus, the daughter Maximina; NBull 1909, p. 214 = DIELH 4503: the father is Iuslianus, 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 = DIELH 3574A, where the father is Timocrates, the son Timotheus, and RS III p. 273 = DIELH 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 Chrysomallass, the daughter Chrysi; Bull 1892, p. 105 = DIELH 4516, where the father is Xrusanthus, the daughter Xrysisis, and Bull 1892 p. 58, where the father is Ov ñ μος, the son Ov ñ οσιος, compound, and short names etymologically belong together. A similar case is once found in Latin cognomina, FE 8458 = DIELH 4515, where the father is Primus, the daughter Primigiena, 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: [Theodotus senio[r] and [Theodotus iunior.
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 *Auspicialis* and the daughter *Asergurina* have names suggesting a religious institution of the Romans. In some cases, a G r e e k cognomen had been substituted for the Latin one of the parents, e.g. *SI 57 = Diehl, 4145Cadn*, where the father is *Felicissimus*, the son *Eutychius*. Cognomina could occasionally be connected through a s s o n a n c e, as in *NBull 1902*, p. 131 = *Diehl, 3890*, where the father *Amiantus* (from Greek *ἄμιαντος*, *stony*) and the daughter *Amias* (from Greek *ἄμιας*, *stunny*) bear cognomina beginning with *Amia-*. A case of this type is scarcely a coincidence.

I shall finally give the s t a t i s t i c s of the transmission of cognomina in the Christian inscriptions of Rome. In the transmission through s e t y m o l o g y 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognomina of both parents preserved</th>
<th>frequency of transmission</th>
<th>modes of transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>transmitted</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>60 or 31 %</td>
<td>father’s 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mother’s 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognomen of father preserved</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 or 28.5 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognomen of mother preserved</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>15 or 10.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
Thyländer, 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 grandparents. 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 born 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 born 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 suggested ², account for the popularity of the transmission of the cognomen.

¹ Runes, op.cit. p. 176, fn. 1.
² Thyländer p. 121.
ON THE ORIGIN AND FORMATION OF COGNOMINA IN CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS

I. LATIN, GREEK AND BARBARIAN 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 étrangers,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, Saturnus and Siricus, though derived from words not native in Latin,⁴ 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. Eutych-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 Thyländer 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". 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*; and in the Latin group, e.g. *Dalmatius*, *Gaetulicus* and *Maurus*. 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. 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, 31; *XVII* col. 635; *IVA* col. 1549 ff.
3 *RE XIV* col. 2349, 22.
4 Some examples, *SI* 4293 = *Diehl* 1736 adn, we read the name *Addo*. This name is considered Celtic by *Holder*, as Semitic by *Wuthnow*, *Die semitischen Menschennamen. Amanus* (*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 $E\delta$- and some other word, while fragments like Res- and Cressuggest 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C VI: 4, 2—3, epitaphs</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>1.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbaric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IG XIV, Roman epitaphs</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbaric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, Iptias, 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pagan</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>77 %</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>13 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbaric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 origin ¹, 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 ff.
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. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father Latin cognomen</th>
<th>Greek cognomen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Son Latin cognomen</td>
<td>Greek cognomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, Paschiasius, 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**

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

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 C I 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 VIIA 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 C I 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 C VI: 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 C VI, 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 C VIII 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 Secundiananus, 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, Ursilianus, Ursilianus, 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. 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.

The simple suffixes found in Christian inscriptions are:
- annum - na, after vowels, - i annum - na, after consonants, the latter having developed from the former by false analogy. 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. Mercurlis SI 2340 = DIEHL 4284 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), Quintilianus, 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), Demetriana (SI 3607 = Diehl 4272A).\footnote{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 SVENNING, Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautelehre p. 17 ff.}

-ianus is usually attached to Latin cognomina, the most usual being Crescentianus, Felicianus, Maximianus, Primianus, Priscianus, Sabinius, Severianus, Victorianus, Vitalianus; it was, however, rather common in Greek cognomina too, e.g. Diocletianus (SI 2805), Eucharistianus (e.g. SI 1984 = Diehl 4758), Eutychianus (passim), [H]elvicianus (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 haplogy.

-icus-ca was in limited use in Rome, the only name of some frequency being Victorius. It was sometimes used in cognomina derived from names of animals: Asellicus-ca (passim), Leporce (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), Opilionica (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), Natalicicus (C VIII 13545; 25262; ILT 1147), Sorica (C VIII 25286), Triumfalica (C VIII 13976), Victoricus (C VIII 25300; ILT 1147), Vitalica (C VIII 1094, unless corrupt for Vitalica). Such derivatives were naturally much more numerous throughout African inscriptions.\footnote{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, Laticus (ILT 1613), Maioricus-ca, Mappalics-us-ca, Martialisus, Massuricus, Matronica, Messoricus, Moniera, Monnica, Municus, Mustelica, Musficus-ca, Natalicus-ca, Nonica, Nuptalica, Paulica, Pistoricus, Primulica, Pusinicus-ca, Salicinus, Soricus-ca, Spenica, Terticus, Triumphalica, Urbanica, Victoricus-ca, Vitalicus-ca.} There was a corresponding suffix -icos in Greek, e.g. Hermicus.
(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 language.

-i[nus -n a] 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. A similar idea on the diminutive connotation of -inus-ina is held by Olcott. 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 L a t i n cognomina, the most frequent being Albinus, Augurinus, Augustinus, Capitolina, Celerinus, Constantinus, Crescentinus, Crispinus, Faustinus, Firminus, Florentinus, Gemellinus, Iustinus, Marcellinus, Maximinus, Rufinus, Secundinus, Septimius, Severinus, Silvinus, Valentinus, Victorinus, Vitalinus. It was relatively rarer than -ianus in G r e e k 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), Ἡλεκτρείνα (FE 7244), Tryferina (SI 2984 = Diehl 2988).

Though -anus was the regular suffix in cognomina derived from n o m i n 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 Ianuarius (passim).

-i o had originated from the suffix -o -onis by false analogy, but had acquired a diminutive or hypocoristic connotation. The influence of Greek diminutives in -ων, regularly transcribed in Latin as -io, 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 \textit{C VI}, among the 4890 Latin cognomina in \textit{SI-FE} the corresponding figure is c. 50, the only forms with some frequency being \textit{Felicio} and \textit{Vitalio}.

\textit{-ius -ia}, 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, \textit{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 \textit{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.

\textit{-onis}, important during republican times, in particular in cognomina derived from parts of the body and implying an abnormal largeness\footnote{Meyer op. cit. p. 223 f.; Zimmermann, \textit{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.}, had dropped out of use, there being in Christian epigraphic material only fossilized remnants of ancient nomenclature like \textit{Capito (SI 1286 = Diehl 4067), Cicero (SI 3190 = Diehl 627), Fronto (SI 1417 = Diehl 4667).}

\textit{-osus -sa}. 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.\footnote{Cognomina Africana, Ephemera epigraphica IV p. 520 ff.} 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. \textit{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 \textit{C VIII}). \textit{Exitiosus-sa} and \textit{Gloriosus-sa}, much in favour in Africa and Carthage (in Carthage, 14 and 11 cases, respectively),
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 cognomina ¹, 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]nosus (SI 3617), Mellosus (Carthage, passim), Pretzios... = 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 cognomen, Candidosa (C VIII 13541—42), Catosus (ILT 1147), Clarosus (FE 8501), Libosus (SI 4776) from *Libonosus < Libo through haplology, Mandrosa (SI 4985), Nonnosa (RO 474), Primosus-sa (NBull 1914 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, Atherbosa = Adverbiosa, probably from adverbium (FE 6527), Agoniosus from agonia (C VIII 25194), Bonosus from bonus ² (passim), Foidosa from foedus, the adjective (NBull 1914 p. 69), Gaudiosus-sa from gauàium (passim), Micosus (FE 6825d) probably from mica (unless from *Miconosus < Micon through haplogogy). 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, Ini-
riosus were Christian «names of humility». These, and other similar names, such as Stercorius and Projectus, though used in a pejorative sense and unknown or rare in pagan documents, were completely in the ancient tradition of «uncomplimentary nicknames». Similarly, one must refute the idea that Gaudiosus (and Gaudentius) was used by the Christians to express «Christian joy».

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. -culus-la had almost dropped out of use as a suffix of cognomina in Christian inscriptions. Disregarding old appellatives used as cognomina, such as Lepuscoculus (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 3641), Quintula (FE 9079), Ursula (SI 3888). This suffix could be attached to words which normally should have had -culus, thus Adbeutus (SI 1275 = DIEHL 2799A). The forms -olus-la were used after vowels: Fabiola (SI 4175 = DIEHL 165), Ianauriola (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 -illa.5 The suffix -illus-la was mostly attached to Latin

2 Le Blant, Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule I p. 155.
3 Väänänen, p. 100 ff.
4 Ibid. p. 27.
5 Leumann, Lateinische Cognomina auf -inus und -illa, Romanica Helvetica 1943, p. 171 f.

Latin diminutive suffixes were in general rarer in cognomina of Gre ek o r b a r b a r i c origin. Examples from Greek cognomina are *Agapitilla* (SI 4858 = DIEHL 3532), *Leucadiola* (RO 177 = DIEHL 4689), *Petru[a* (RAC 1927 p. 204), *Theovilla* (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), *Sapertilla[a* (8281b) and *Suppestilla* (7487) seem to be barbaric.¹

In addition to the simple suffixes, there are a number of c o m b i n e d 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:

- *a n i l l a*, from *-anus* and the diminutive suffix *-illa*, e.g. *Flavianilla* [SI 2741], *Marcianilla* (Bull 1881 p. 89 = DIEHL 3522A), *Mucianilla* [SI 3522A] (FE 8785 = DIEHL 2726adn).

- *i c i a n u s*, in *Lupecianus* (SI 2781 = DIEHL 2610adn), combined from *-icus* and *-ianus*.

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

- *i l l i a n u s* - *n a*, usually *-ilianus* through the weakening of the gemination ², combined from *-illus* and *-ianus*, *Bassilianus* (SI 3130 = DIEHL 1258B), *Maximiliana* [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 *-ianus* through dissimilation; he explains the examples in *-ilianus* as phonetic or graphic variations.³

But I think that it is rather the reverse that is true. The forms in *-ilianus* are to be found in inscriptions in which correct language is to be expected,

---

¹ The diminutive suffix *-itta*, in our material *Galitta* (FE 8237), is usually considered to be a suffix borrowed from Etruscan (see STOIZ-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 *Galitta*, *Jutilla*, *Pollita*, *Livillita* had originated from *-illa* through dissimilation, the preceding consonants being *-l- or -ll-.

² For this phenomenon of Vulgar Latin, see VÄNÄNEN, 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 Maximilianus. 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 -ianus. 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 Lucill(i)ianus (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(emin) 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. 31), and must be excluded here. Again, in Greek, women’s names were early on derived from abstracts ending in -ua, 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 Eutychius from Eutyches, 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 orders 3, had a good chance of becoming popular in the West because of the large-scale influx and manumission of slaves. All Greek abstracts in -ua 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 -ua 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). Basilius was likewise a new formation from Basilens, 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>men</th>
<th>women</th>
<th>fragm.</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>63.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>32.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>men</th>
<th>women</th>
<th>fragm.</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>67.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Paschasia 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 inscriptions, 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, Paschadius, 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. 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 ff.; Diehl, Signum, RhM 1907 p. 408; the same theory is implicit in Lambertz Supernomen, Giotta 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. Crescentius Eugeniius; 1058 ii 59: Q. Ummbricius Nemesius 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cognomen</th>
<th>double cognomen</th>
<th>supernomen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>fragm.</td>
<td>tria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amantius-ia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asterius-ia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilus¹</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonifatius-ia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordius¹</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius-ia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescentius-ia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenius¹</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebios¹</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutychius¹</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exuperantis-ia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florentius-ia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudentius-ia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorius-ia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplicius-ia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stercorius-ia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincentius-ia</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) Florentia³; C V 6205 = DIELI 4557, where mother and daughter are Constantia⁴. 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 Aequaitis 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]uperantis> 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 \textit{-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 \textit{-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 \textit{-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 \textit{-ius} may be tabulated thus:

\textbf{Table 20. The derivation of the Latin cognomina in -ius -ia in the Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage}

\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & particles & adjectives & nouns & verbs & compounds & names \hline
names & 37 & 30 & 51 & 5 & 2 & 18 \hline
persons & 509 & 156 & 196 & 17 & 66 & 166 \hline
persons % & 45.0 \% & 15.0 \% & 17.5 \% & 1.5 \% & 6.0 \% & 15.0 \% \hline
\end{tabular}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I I Carthage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persons %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Among participles are classed words like \textit{constans} and \textit{decens}, which could be considered adjectives as well.

2 In this category are included Latin cognomina not coinciding with common words, e.g. \textit{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 Probatus 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 deverbative. 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, Hypterechius from ὑπτερεχεῖν.

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 -io. 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 24. The extended suffixes in -ius -ia in the Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-n-</th>
<th>-c-</th>
<th>-ill- diminut.</th>
<th>-n-</th>
<th>-s-</th>
<th>-l-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aur-entia</td>
<td>Fulgentilla</td>
<td>Crescent-</td>
<td>Brum-asius</td>
<td>Duls-itiu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux-entia</td>
<td></td>
<td>onius Splend-onius</td>
<td>asius</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>Marc-itiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb-entius</td>
<td>Prob-icius</td>
<td>Urs-enia</td>
<td>Gel-asius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercule-ntius</td>
<td>Procl-ocia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maur-isius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuv-entius</td>
<td>Retiect-icia</td>
<td>T&lt;chi&gt;ars-icius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pasch-iasi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maur-entia</td>
<td>S&lt;chi&gt;ol-acius</td>
<td>Urs-acius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quint-asius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max-entius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rip-asiu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nic-entius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ror-entia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secu-er-antia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with -s- on the analogy of Anastasius, Telesius etc., and those with -l- on the analogy of Mellitius, Syncretius etc. A few of the cases are not analogical formations but combinations of suffixes. Thus -illia in Fulgentilla 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 Sparicius, for Preissigke records Σαπρός and Σαπρικός from papyri. 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, Telesphorianius, Victorinia. The name Romuliesia seems to have been formed from Romuliensis, a by-form of the more usual Romulensis, the correct form accordingly being Romuliena.

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 Maxienius 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 (angeo aux-) being unknown. In Greek, there were a number of personal names derived from ση (see Pape-Benesh), and the new form may have been coined on the analogy of the Latin Augusteus.

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 *Ariemis*, and *Tychenia*, from *Tyche*, should have run *Artemidius* and *Tychia*. But in Latin *Artemis* is often declined as a stem in -m (*Thes. II* col. 681) and *Tyche* as a stem in -n², 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 *Tyχίος* (*Bechtel* p. 577), but it was derived from the verb *τυχω* (see Liddell-Scott s.v.).

2 Stolz-Schmalz, p. 263.
### Latin Cognomina

* **Derived from participles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Form</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Frequency Rome</th>
<th>Carthage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abundantius-ia</td>
<td>(abundans)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amantius-ia</td>
<td>(Amans)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augentius — Augent —</td>
<td>(augens)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILT 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aventius-ia</td>
<td>(avens)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caelantia</td>
<td>(caelans)</td>
<td>SI 1010</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius-ia</td>
<td>(Constand)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>C 13579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C]rescentinius</td>
<td>(Crescentinus)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescentius-ia</td>
<td>(Crescens)</td>
<td>SICV 258</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currentius</td>
<td>(currens)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C 25220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicentius</td>
<td>(dicens)</td>
<td>SI 411</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[D]onantius</td>
<td>(donans)</td>
<td>NBull 1901, 224</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerentius</td>
<td>(emerens)</td>
<td>SI 58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exuperantius-ia</td>
<td>(Exuperans)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25232; 25324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidentius</td>
<td>(Fidens)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florentius-ia</td>
<td>(Florens)</td>
<td>RO 354</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulgentillia</td>
<td>(fulgens, cf. p. 77)</td>
<td>SI 3518</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulgentius</td>
<td>(fulgens)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudentius-ia</td>
<td>(Gaudens)</td>
<td>SI 3610; FE 9001</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucentius</td>
<td>(luces)</td>
<td>SI 1043</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nentius</td>
<td>(nens)</td>
<td>SI 2751</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascentius-ia</td>
<td>(pascens)</td>
<td>RO 64; FE 8165</td>
<td>ILT 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverantius-ia</td>
<td>(perseverans)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentius</td>
<td>(potens)</td>
<td>SI 2751</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestantius-ia</td>
<td>(praestans)</td>
<td>RAC 1931, 224</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probantius-ia</td>
<td>(probans)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probatus-ia</td>
<td>(probatus)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providentius</td>
<td>(providens 1)</td>
<td>NBull 1902, 127</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pudentius</td>
<td>(Pudens)</td>
<td>SI 1122</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preiecticia</td>
<td>(requetus, cf. p. 77)</td>
<td>SICV 309</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repositus</td>
<td>(repositus, cf. p. 77)</td>
<td>SI 2378</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salventius</td>
<td>(salvens)</td>
<td>SI 175</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serpentius-ia</td>
<td>(serpens)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σπιγγαρία — Ispagaria</td>
<td>(sperans)</td>
<td>SI 3139</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studentius-ia</td>
<td>(students)</td>
<td>RO 104; SI 123</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbantia</td>
<td>(turbans)</td>
<td>RO 43</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentius-ia</td>
<td>(Valens)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ILT 1147, duo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venantius-ia</td>
<td>(venans)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?ILT 1147: Be-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilantius</td>
<td>(vigilans)</td>
<td>SI 2454</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincentius-ia</td>
<td>(vincens)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>C 25302; ?ILT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viventius</td>
<td>(vivens)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1147: Vive...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

2. The passage runs HICPREIEECTICIA, and the name may be, by way of an analecty, Preiecticia.
### Derived from adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abundia</td>
<td>(Abundus)</td>
<td>SI 3269</td>
<td>ILT 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alacrius</td>
<td>(Alacer)</td>
<td>RS III 26, 9</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annalius</td>
<td>(Annalis)</td>
<td>RAC 1927, 205</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casarius</td>
<td>(casarius)</td>
<td>RO 1130</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castellanius</td>
<td>(Castellanus)</td>
<td>SI 470</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementius</td>
<td>(Clemens)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Concordius    | (Concors, Concordia) | 8 | — |
| Decentius-ia  | (Decens)    | 13        | — |
| Dextria       | (Dexter)    | SI 5431   | — |
*Dulcitus-ia   | (Dulcis, cf. p. 77) | 13 | C 25098 |
*Hilarius-ia   | (Hilarus)   | 17        | 5 |
*Innocentius-ia| (Innocens)  | 28        | ILT 1147 duo |
*Liberius-ia   | (Liber)     | 5         | — |
*Mavortius     | (mavortius) | RAC 1953, 16 | — |
| Maxentius-ia  | (Maximus, cf. p. 77) | 8 | C 2525c |
| Maximasia     | (Maximus, cf. p. 77) | SI 2102 | — |
|Mellitus-ia    | (Mellitus)  | 4         | — |
| Memorius      | (Memor)     | FE 9040   | — |
| Natalius      | (Natalis)   | —         | C 25134 |
| Patricius-ia  | (patricius) | 7         | — |
| Placidia      | (Placidus)  | SI 739    | — |
*Primaeus      | (primaeus)  | SI 6295   | — |
| Primeius      | —           | —         | — |
| Probicius     | (Probus, cf. p. 77) | 7 | — |
| Proculacia    | —           | —         | — |
| Proculia      | —           | —         | — |
| Pulcheria     | —           | —         | — |
| Pulcetia      | —           | —         | — |
| Quintusius    | (Quintus, cf. p. 77) | — | ILT 1147 |
| Rusticia      | (Rusticus)  | SI 5224   | — |
| Salacius(s)   | (salax 1)   | SI 1173   | — |
| Severantia    | —           | —         | — |
| Seberantia    | (Severus, cf. p. 77) | ARM p. 290 | — |
*Simplicius-ia | (Simplex)   | 27        | 3 |
| Siricius      | (Sirica)    | FE 9162   | — |
| Urbanius      | (Urbanus)   | SI 2463   | — |
| Vitalia       | (Vitalis)   | SICY 272  | — |

### Derived from nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alboria</td>
<td>(albor)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>C 25063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboria</td>
<td>(arbor)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILT 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentia</td>
<td>(argentum 2)</td>
<td>NBull 1909, 141</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armentius</td>
<td>(armentum)</td>
<td>FE 7434</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Acupius      | (aueps, aecupium) | SI 3272 | — |
| Augurius     | (Augur)     | 8         | — |
| Aurentia     | (Aura or aurum, cf. p. 77) | — | C 24941a |
| Auricius     | (Aurum or aurum, cf. p. 76) | SI 2169 | — |
| Axungius     | (axungia)   | SI 183    | — |
| Barbentius   | (Barba, cf. p. 77) | SICY 317 | — |

1 C III 12912, 77 records Salax, but the editor is doubtful of the form of the name.

2 Cf. the old cognomen Argentea.
Latin Cognomina

Brumasius (bruma, cf. p. 77) SI 2727; 4560 —
Camasis (?camasis) SI 1478 —
*Cremenius-ia (crementum 1) SICV 312 C 13571—72
Delicius 2 (delicium, delicium) SI 5092 —
Desiderius (desiderium) RAC 1929, 204 ILT 1147
*Eventius-ia (Eventus) 5 —
Fortunius-ia (Fortuna) 18 —
*Honorius-ia (Honor) 3 C 13732; ILT 1147

Iuvenantis (Iuvenis, cf. p. 77) FE 7673 —
Kalendius (kalendae) SI 4631 —
Lauricius (Laurus, cf. p. 77) FE 8980 —
Leonius (Leo) SI 5380 —
Leporius (Lepos) 3 C 25313
*Litorius (litus) FE 7644 —
*Luxurius (luxuria) FE 7689; NBull 1902, 129

*Mensurius —
Mesurius (mensura) RS III p. 61 —

Munerius (munus) SI 3003; 4839 —
*Navigius-ia (navigium) 9 —
Nepolia (Nepos) — ILT 1147

 Nugasius (nugas) SI 593; RAC 1939, 230

Pecorius (pecus) 4 —
Peculius (peculum) 3 —
*Praesidius (Praeses) 3 —
*Principius (Princips) 3 —
Probitalia (Probitas) SI 5450 —
Processius (Processus) SI 5043 —
Provincia (Provincia) RAC 1924, 88 —

*Purpurius (purpura) Bull 1886, 113
*Refrigerius (refrigerium, refrigerare, see p. 76) 5 —

Remigia (remen, remigium, remigare) RO 478

Ripasius (ripa 4, cf. p. 77) RS III p. 293 —
Roborius (robor) RS III 17, 1 —
Rorentia (ros, cf. p. 77) RO 520 —

*Sagittius-ia (Sagitta, Sagittus) 3 —
Salutius-ia (Salus) 13 —

Scholaius —
Scolaius (scole, cf. p. 77) RS III p. 318 —
Soricius (Sorex) SI 2410 —
Stercorius-ia (stercus) 57 —

Storacius —
Istovarius (Storax) — C 25345

Studius —

*Instudius (studium 4) FE 6574 —

1 Thes. Onom. II col. 488, 36 puts Cremenius down as an incorrect form of Clemens. 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 Crenem. Thes. Onom. II col. 483, 63 certainly records two instances of Cremen, but these are the cases from C VIII given above; both are fragmentary, Cremen ... and with all probability ran Cremen[ius-ia]. The name Cremenius is similar in meaning to Crescentius and Crescensius.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ursacius-ia</td>
<td>(Ursus, cf. p. 77)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursenia</td>
<td>(Ursus, cf. p. 77)</td>
<td>FE 8970</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorina —</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bictorinia</td>
<td>(Victorinus)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ILT 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorius</td>
<td>(Victor, Victoria)</td>
<td>SI 2797</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilius</td>
<td>(Vigil)</td>
<td>SI 2793; FE 9242</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vindemius</td>
<td>(vindemia)</td>
<td>SI 3265</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Vindicius</td>
<td>(Vindex)</td>
<td>SI 613 duo</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derived from verbal stems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crescomius-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Exuperius-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reticius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splendonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Subicius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonemontius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bonifatius-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatibonia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derived from geographical and mythological names or from old cognomina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Caesarius-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthagus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dalmatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herclaniius-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herclentius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herculinus-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Laurentius-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Marsius 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurentia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neptunia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucerus 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picentius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Populonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Romulius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulienisia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 — Nucerus, Picentinus — Telesinus — Telesius.

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

4 Cf. the cognomen Nuceri.

5 Cf. Picentinus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(Genitive)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romuliesia</td>
<td>Romulus, cf. p. 77</td>
<td>SI 2027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrentius</td>
<td>Surrentus 1</td>
<td>SI 4405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telesius</td>
<td>Telesia 2</td>
<td>FE 7825b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greek Cognomina**

*Derived from compound names*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(Genitive)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apodemiaus</td>
<td>Apodemus</td>
<td>SI 2604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calipodiaius</td>
<td>Calopus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ILT 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipronia</td>
<td>Callipho</td>
<td>FE 8148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipronia</td>
<td>Calliphanes, Epiphania</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epipodiaus</td>
<td>(—, formed like Calopus)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euangeliaus</td>
<td>Euangelus,  Euboulos, Eubulus, Eubulus, Eudoxus, Euphronius, Euphroni</td>
<td>SI 2439; 5305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eubulus</td>
<td>Eubulus</td>
<td>SI 3451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucharius</td>
<td>Eucharius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucherus</td>
<td>Eucherus</td>
<td>SI 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudoxia</td>
<td>Eudoxus</td>
<td>SI 331; 4855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugamia</td>
<td>Eugamus</td>
<td>SI 1595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenius</td>
<td>Eugenes, Eugenia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ILT 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphronius</td>
<td>Euphron</td>
<td>RS III 21, 46</td>
<td>C13644; ILT 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Eusebes, Eusebia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustathius</td>
<td>Eustathus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustochius</td>
<td>Eustochus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutherius</td>
<td>Euthereus</td>
<td>RO 817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthymius</td>
<td>Euthymus, Euthymia</td>
<td>SI 4905; N Bull</td>
<td>1902, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutropius</td>
<td>Eutropus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ILT 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutychius</td>
<td>Eutychus, Eutychia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>C 25224—25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermogenius</td>
<td>Hermogenes</td>
<td>FE 8939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancharius</td>
<td>Panchares</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>C 25267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancratius</td>
<td>Pancratos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socraitis</td>
<td>Socrates</td>
<td>FE 8722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophronius</td>
<td>Sophros</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syagruis</td>
<td>Syagrus</td>
<td>SI 3339; 3818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acacius —</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacis</td>
<td>(Acacus)</td>
<td>FE 7390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Achilla</td>
<td>(Achilles)</td>
<td>SI 3978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Adelphius —</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelfius</td>
<td>(Adelphus)</td>
<td>SI 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agape</td>
<td>(Agape)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Agylos —</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agylos</td>
<td>(Agele)</td>
<td>RS II 37, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricus —</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrocus</td>
<td>(Agrocus)</td>
<td>FE 8747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alethius 1</td>
<td>(Alethes, Alethia)</td>
<td>SI 1775; FE 8748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexius</td>
<td>(Alexus)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Alypis —</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alypis 2</td>
<td>(Alypus)</td>
<td>SI 4441; RAC 1931, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Amazonius</td>
<td>(Amazon)</td>
<td>SI 839; 2946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampelius-ia</td>
<td>(Ampele etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatolius-ia</td>
<td>(Anatole)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthemius</td>
<td>(Anthimus etc.)</td>
<td>SI 5725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollinaris</td>
<td>(Apollinaris)</td>
<td>SI 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Archadius</td>
<td>(Arcas, 'Aqadía, BECHTEL)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Archontia —</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcontia 3</td>
<td>(Archo)</td>
<td>RO 710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemius-ia</td>
<td>(Artemis, see p. 78)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Astartes —</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astartes</td>
<td>(Astacos, myth., geogr.)</td>
<td>FE 7439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Asterius-ia</td>
<td>(Aster)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augenius</td>
<td>(Auge)</td>
<td>I LT 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilus</td>
<td>(Basilia; cf. Basileus)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boethius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boethius</td>
<td>(Boethus)</td>
<td>SI 4187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calchedonius-ia —</td>
<td>(Calchedon)</td>
<td>C 13533; 24901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calimius</td>
<td>(Callimus)</td>
<td>SI 6159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Castorius-ia —</td>
<td>(Castor)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celadia</td>
<td>(Celadus)</td>
<td>RAC 1933, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Celidionius —</td>
<td>(Chelido)</td>
<td>RS III p. 414; Bull 1892, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Chorasis —</td>
<td>(Xógrasoc, Pape-Bens.)</td>
<td>SI 5687—88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanis</td>
<td>(Coma, cf. p. 77)</td>
<td>FE 7502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dardania</td>
<td>(Dardanus)</td>
<td>SI 3133; 5294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuterius-ia</td>
<td>(Deuter)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Draconius</td>
<td>(Draco)</td>
<td>RAC 1925, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamius</td>
<td>(Dynamis)</td>
<td>FE 8488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dyscolus</td>
<td>(Dyscolus)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Euchomos —</td>
<td>(Euchomos)</td>
<td>SI 414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustasius</td>
<td>(Eustasia)</td>
<td>FE 7556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgius</td>
<td>(Georgus)</td>
<td>SI 4142; 6449, 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Notice that both bearers of the names are women.

2 C VI 24925 records Pretiosa Alyptia, daughter of Alypus and Meroe. Because the Greek abstract ákaptia 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 Eusbia (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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Cognomina</th>
<th>(Geron)</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>ILT 1147</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerontius-ia</td>
<td>(Geron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigonia —</td>
<td>(อำเภอ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giconia</td>
<td>(อำเภอ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glycinus —</td>
<td>(Glycinne, Πλυκίνος, BECHTEL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glycinnus —</td>
<td>(Glycinne, Πλυκίνος, BECHTEL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gorgonius-ia</td>
<td>(Γοργώνα, BECHTEL)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hellas —</td>
<td>(Hellas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Heldius —</td>
<td>(Heldas)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heresius —</td>
<td>(Αιγες, BECHTEL)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hesperius —</td>
<td>(Hesper)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hesychius —</td>
<td>(Hesychus, Hesychia)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Heuresia —</td>
<td>(Heuresis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconia —</td>
<td>(Ionia, Iкония, Iкония)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ionius —</td>
<td>(Ionia, αν. adj. Iония)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Καγεγέλα</td>
<td>(Καγεγέλα, PAP-BENIS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lamπαδής-ia</td>
<td>(Lampanas)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Limenius-ia</td>
<td>(Limen, Limene)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Macedonius-ia</td>
<td>(Macedo, Macedonia)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mandronius-ia</td>
<td>(Mandro)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Melanias —</td>
<td>(Melanus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methius —</td>
<td>(Methe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Movsia</td>
<td>(Musics)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesisus-ia</td>
<td>(Nemesis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicentius —</td>
<td>(Nice, p. 76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oenanthius —</td>
<td>(Oenanthe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Palladius-ia</td>
<td>(Pallas)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Paregorius —</td>
<td>(Paregorus)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Peristerius —</td>
<td>(Peristera)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrus —</td>
<td>(Petrus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharetrius —</td>
<td>(Φάρετροι, PAP-BENIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enertrius-ia</td>
<td>(Φάρετροι, PAP-BENIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierius —</td>
<td>(Pierus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Poemenia —</td>
<td>(Poemen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porphyrius-ia</td>
<td>(Πορφύρος, BECHTEL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Procopius —</td>
<td>(Procope)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sarcius-ia</td>
<td>(Σαρκιώς, see p. 77)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σκύλλοις —</td>
<td>(Σκύλλοις)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τηλεσφοριανος —</td>
<td>(Σκύλλοις, BECHTEL)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephanias —</td>
<td>(Telephanias)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsicius —</td>
<td>(Tharsus 8 cf. p. 77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Because the name is a stem in -ν, 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: Tarsicius, my derivation seems more probable.
### ONOMASTIC STUDIES IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thalassius-ia</td>
<td>(Thalassa, Thalassus)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tychenia</td>
<td>(Tyche, cf. p. 78)</td>
<td>SI 1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tychenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyranios</td>
<td>(Tyrannus)</td>
<td>RS I 21, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyranios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Derived from common words not instanced as names of persons in extant documents
| Acatius¹     | (ἄκατος) | SI 4413                |
| *Acholi[us]| (ἀχολός) | SI 4906                |
| Acomius²     | (ἀκόμος) | FE 6547                |
| Adolus       | (ἄδολος) | SI 1800                |
| Aerus        | (ἀέρος)  | NBull 1897, 179        |
| *Agenius     | (ἀγένιος)³ | —                     |
| Alogius      | (ἀλόγος) | FE 6547; 7415          |
| Amachius     | (ἀμαχός) | SI 81                  |
| Anagius      | (ἀναγής) | SI 4374                |
| *Anastasius-ia | (ἀναστασίς) | 51                     |
| *Aphasia     | (ἀφασία) | SI 6196                |
| *Athanasius-ia | (ἀθανασία) | 6                     |
| Auentia⁴     | (αὐεντία, see p. 77) | RS III 22, 2; SI 5255 |
| Auentia      |          |                        |
| *Balsamius   | (βάλσαμον) | SI 4151                |
| Cataphronia  | (καταφρονέω) | SI 794                |
| Citamius     | (κλίμα)  | RAC 1926, 83; 1931, 217|
| Endeleeus    | (ἐνδέλεκχης, ἐνδέλεχεω) | SI 2216                |
| Endeleeus    |          |                        |
| Euemcia      | (εὐμήκης) | NBull 1917, 118        |
| *Euphrasiea  | (εὐφρασία) | 3                     |
| Eustolius    | (εὐτόλομος)³ | SI 4166               |
| Eutolmios    | (ἐὐτολμός, ἐὐτολμία) | SI 2463, a woman. C 25238; ILT 1447 |
| Gelasius-ia  | (γελάιος, cf. p. 77) | 3                     |
| *Gregorius-ia| (γρηγόρεω) | 31                    |
| *Hyperechius-ia | (ὑπερέχω) | SI 1441; Bull 1892, 62 |
| *Martyrius-ia| (μάρτυς) | 28                    |
| *Megethius-ia| (μεγέθος) | 6                     |
| Metropios     | (μετρόπιος) | SI 1888                |
| Metrius      | (μέτριος) | RAC 1929, 210          |
| Parabasis    | (παράβασις) | SICV 22               |
| Polychronius-ia | (πολύχρονος) | 11                    |
| Probolpeus   | (προβόλης) | SICV 188              |
| Syncretia    | (συνκρέτος) | SI 2647               |
| Hebrew Cognomina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Paschasis-ia</td>
<td>(pascha)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatis-ia</td>
<td>(Sabbatis)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The stone is fragmentary: ... ACATIVS.

² Thes. 1 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 Eudaliov (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 "Apollo" and "Iovinus," testifies to the piety of the ancient man; names embodying some praiseworthy moral or physical quality, such as "Kallistos," "Euthymos," "Blandus," "Celer," were expressions of parental hopes; in a like manner, numerous popular names, such as "Eudos," "Eunechos," "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 "Kopros," "Agathos," "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: "Apodyssey," "Apollinaris," "Antemidorus," "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: "Dionysius" 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.

scriptions was c. 40,000 in CVI 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 Licinia Aeliodora Aedodata (SI 1672 = Diehl 2630 adn). For the problem, see p. 120. It should, however, be noticed that those pagan theophoric cognomina which had come into use showed a higher frequency in the Christian material than in the pagan one. Thus Iovinus-na, Iovianus-na and Iovianianus-na were found 22 times in CVI and 33 times in SI-FE; the corresponding figures for Martinus-na and Martinianus are 36 and two in CVI, 19 and five in SI-FE. Veneriosus-sa was found once in CVI 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 Cannegeüter 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, Harnack⁴, Schrijnen⁵, Ferrua⁶ and Testini⁷ 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.
³ Names (Christian), ERE IX p. 145 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 *Scrijnen*, 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 *Ελπίς* was a very important Christian notion and was counted among the three cardinal virtues of the Christian (I Cor. 13, 13). The expression ἐν εἰρήνῃ, 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).

³ These names have been counted as Christian e.g. by *Martigny, Kraus, Grossi Gondi, Scrijnen* (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 inheritance\(^1\), 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(yter)* *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 Rome, 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. 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 dea 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.
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*. Both these explanations are to be found in the writings of the Fathers. Chrysostomus and Eustathius take the rational view, whereas Theodoretus declares that parents give their children names of martyrs to assure them divine protection. 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 *momen 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** | **Rome** | **Carthage** |
| | *C VIII* and *Frey* | *Christian* | *C VIII pagans* | *Christians Carthage* |
| 'Adam | — | *SI 1899, 4* | — | — |
| Danihel | — | *SI 4199* | — | — |
| Elias-sa | *Frey, 1* | *SI 2410; 2675* | — | — |
| Moyses | — | *4* | — | — |
| Rebechecca | *Frey, 2* | *SI 6056* | — | — |
| Susanna | — | *21* | — | — |

---

1 *Hist. eccl. 7, 25, 14*: πολλοὺς δὲ ὁμονόμους Ἰωάννη τῷ ἀποστόλῳ νομίζω γεγονέναι, ὅτι διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἐκείνον ἀγάπης καὶ τῷ θανατώ καὶ ζηλοῦν ἀγάπης τῇ θυγατρίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τὴν ἐπονομασίαν τὴν αὐτῆς ἱπατίας, ὕσσερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος πολὺς καὶ ὁ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος — —

2 *Hamil. XXI in Genesim, PG 53, col. 179.* *DIELEHAYE Origines* p. 138 thinks that the passage implies the idea of intercession, but this is a minor item. Chrysostomus advises the parents to give their children the names of τῶν ἁγίων ἄνδρων τῶν ἁρετής διαλαμψάντων, τῶν πολλῶν παροιμιῶν πρὸς τῶν Θεόν ἐξηγήσαντο, but his words ὅτι διὰ γὰρ ὄνομα προσφορὰ ἁρετῆς ἐρήμωσι bring out his real meaning. Cf. further *Hom. 52 in Malth.,* 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 *Greecarum affectionum curatio* (RAEDER) VIII, p. 67.

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

6 The correct form is found only in *RS II 39, 10: Μονῆς. SI 2012 (= DIEHL 2986) the name is written Moses, 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.

### Table 23. Names derived from the New Testament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rome CVI and Frey</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Carthage CVIII pagans</th>
<th>Christians Carthage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andreas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnabas</td>
<td></td>
<td>SI 2697; FE 6600b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Bart[holomaeos]</td>
<td></td>
<td>SI 5256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iacob, Iacobus</td>
<td>Frey, 1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iohannes-na</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>5 + Frey, 9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>ILT 1129; 1146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazarius</td>
<td></td>
<td>SI 2345; RAC</td>
<td>1926, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulius-la</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60 ²</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Philemon</td>
<td></td>
<td>SI 2250; 2588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

_Iohannes-na_, 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. 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 Hebrew names, and, when found as a slave name in pagan inscriptions, may be Jewish. 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 [Τ]ακοῦ is found in _SI 5348_; in two fragmentary Greek inscriptions we have Ἰακ. . . ( _SI 4941_ and _5680_ ); Ἰακ[όβος] seems a likely supplement, simple Ἰακόβ being the Old Testament form.

² There are, moreover, two examples of _Petrus_ (see p. 85) and one of _Petrua_ ( _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. 91).

*Nazarius* 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 *Paulus* 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). 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 extrabiblical name, the pagan examples being ascribed to inheritance from Christian relatives. 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. Ananus Paulus* sets up a stone to his son, *M. Ananus 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 Christians, 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 = 24034: *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 Church, 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.

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. 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. A similar Calendarian calendar is from the following century. 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, Januarius, the martyrs chosen include Abdos and Sennes (BHL 6); Agnus (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 Agnus, 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 légends hagiographiques, p. 104; 203 f.
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 martyrlogy.\textsuperscript{1} Other early evidence, archeological, liturgical and literary, also confirms the fame of these martyrs.\textsuperscript{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 (\textit{LThK X} p. 29), have also been considered.

But if we compare the frequencies of these names in the pagan and Christian inscriptive material, the result is that most of the names recorded in the \textit{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 \textit{CVI}. 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 martyrs\textsuperscript{3}, there are no examples of these names in the Christian inscriptive 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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{1} Aigrain, \textit{L’agiographie}, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{2} For this kind of evidence, I have in general consulted Delehaye’s \textit{Comment. mart. Hieron.}
\textsuperscript{3} They had two churches bearing their name in Rome, Delehaye \textit{Comment. mart. Hieron.} p. 405.
\textsuperscript{4} Giving the frequency in \textit{CVI} first, the list runs as follows: Callistus c. 200—300 — 15; Calocaeus 17 — 2; Fabianus 20 — 2; Hyacinthus 25 — 4; Parthenius 13 — 7; Pontianus 15 — 6; Protus 55 — 3; Xystus 18 — 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>Carthage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CVI</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Agne¹</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprianus-na</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Hippolytus-ia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurentius-ia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>see p. 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Sebastianus</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanus-na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thecla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrius-ia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Martyr</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 verisimilitudes 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 verisimilari features of ancient legends ⁵ 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. Perrua, 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. Romamum, p. 412.
⁷ Sundwall, Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier; Wuthnow, Die semitischen Menschennamen.
it was probably created by the author out of the common Greek woman's name Θεόκλεα, which he used as the name of the girl's mother.

We have to discuss one more name pertaining here: *Martyrius* - *i* a. 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 *C I: 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 Mardhus* 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 *Grec*ek 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 p a g a n 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 Delehave, Sanctus, p. 74 ff.
2 Delehave *Origines*, p. 139.
3 Svennung, Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre, p. 17 ff.
4 Fick-Bechtle, p. 300 ff.; Schulze *Eigennamen* p. 464 ff. UeSener, 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 innumerabl 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. Diethelm 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 Christopherus (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 Quodiusbet, 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 Useber Götternamen p. 358; Pick-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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>Carthage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C VI</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C( christos ph ) orus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>SI 6449, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adeodatus-ta</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deogratias</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>SI 5297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deusdat</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>RS III p. 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deusdedit</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(eu)sdona</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>SI 6449, 10; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deushabet</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habedaeus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>SI 20; 5215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quodiubet</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quodvuldeus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spesindeo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>SI 6334; FE 9168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincetdeus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theodulus-le      | 1    | 21        | 1             | —                  |

Theodosius        | 1    | 21        | 1             | —                  |

Kēthis            | 9    | 113       | 1             | ILT 1147 duo       |

Damnus            |      |           |               |                    |
| Dominicus-ca     | —    | 6         | —             | 4                  |
| Domininus-na     | 1    | 19        | —             | —                  |

Quodvuldeus, 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 aegaret 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 inedible. 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 Deus-deciris as the genitive of Deusdedit; SI 3396: Cobuldeo = Quodvuldeo is the dative; SI 6305 = Diehl 3789adn and ILT 1147: Quodvuldeonia and Covuldonia are the feminine forms of the same name.
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distinctive feature of Semitic nomenclature. 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 Latin; when Christianity conquered North Africa, the Punic-speaking population was also affected. 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 century, 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, Theodorus (Θεόδοχος). Though the name is not wholly unknown in pagan documents (C VI 11762: Anninus Theodorus; other cases II 2142 and VIII 23011a), it is likely that, the idea of hierodulic being foreign to the Greeks and Romans, the pagan Θεόδοχος was due to Oriental influence. 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.

---

1 MOWAT L'élément, RA 1869 I p. 246 ff.
2 Cp. e.g. Oxf.Class.Dict. p. 18.
3 LIEITZMANN, Geschichte der alten Kirche II p. 221.
4 Ibid., p. 220 f.
5 SITITIG, 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 Κύριος 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 παῖδος, from which the name is derived, suggested "belonging to the Κύριος, i.e. the master", and so Cyriacus was an appropriate name for a slave. But for the Christians the name suggested "belonging to Κύριος, 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

---
² A sporadic masculine is found in SI 3434 = Diehl, 2809 adn: Donnus, i.e. Domnus.
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suffix -inus, Dominus, 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 Donna (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, Dominus 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 Empire 1, 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 clergy 3, there was nothing specifically Christian in this usage. The slight rise in the frequency of Donna was thus rather due to its late coming into use than to any Christian associations. One might also ascribe the popularity of Dominus in the Christian material to its being a suffixed form in favour during the Later Empire (cf. p. 64). Yet even granting this, Dominus 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«. Dominus had thus undergone a semantic shift similar to Cyriacus.

Domnicus - ca, 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 Donna 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 Schülze 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 3727 Fdn: A.D. 533/4; SI 6449, 14: seventh century.
7 Hirzel, Name p. 37 ff.
months. In Latin, the most important group was represented by the cognomina obtained from the names of months, with *Januarius* and *December* heading the list (see p. 22). A few names, such as *Kalendinus*, were derived from Roman designations of days. 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.

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 astrology, the names of the days were subjected to important changes. The ancient *dies solis* became the day of rest and was renamed *dies dominica* (ἡμέρα *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. Pagan festivals went out of use during the fourth century and were replaced by Christian ones, especially by Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Easter and Pentecost. 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>names of days</th>
<th><em>names</em></th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th></th>
<th>Carthage</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>C VI</em> and <em>Frey</em></td>
<td><em>Christian</em></td>
<td><em>C VIII</em> pagans</td>
<td>Christians Carthage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>?<em>Natalicus-ca</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphany</td>
<td>?<em>Epiphanius-ia</em></td>
<td>see p. 108</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent</td>
<td><em>Quadragesima</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td><em>Paschasius-ia</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost</td>
<td>Πενθεσία</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>RAC 1931, 194</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Fick-Bechtel p. 295 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 KUBITSCHEK, *Grundriss der antiken Zeitrechnung*, p. 31.
5 In *Codex Theod.*, the expression *dies solis* was usual during the fourth century (*II* 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 *S u n d a y* (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 *S a b b a t i u s - i a*, 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 *C h r i s t i a n* 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 inscriptive material may have been a *J e w i s h I e g a c y*. 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 derivatives\(^2\) 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 descendants. 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 *C h r i s t m a s*. The names suggested include *Natalis, Genesius, Natalicicu*, and *Natalius*.\(^4\) To decide whether or not this is so, one must first

---

\(^1\) Prohibited in *Codex Theod. II 8, 22 (A.D. 395).*

\(^2\) For the importance of these festivals, see *Codex Theod. II 8, 24 (A.D. 400).*

\(^3\) Cf J. G. CARLETON, *Festivals and Fasti (Christian)*, ERE V p. 846.


\(^1\) Cf J. G. CARLETON, *Festivals and Fasti (Christian)*, ERE V p. 846.

\(^2\) *Eβαυββανια* (379); *Σαββάνα* (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 *Namengebungen*, 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. The Greek term for Christmas being *tὰ 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 Epiphanius (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 Rome, 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 *Epiphanía* 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«, 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.
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, πέντεκοστή 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 passcha. The personal name obtained from passcha 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: Naturc Severi nomine Pascasius 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 paschales* 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 XII* 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 year\(^4\), 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*.
Table 27. Names expressive of Christian ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>names</th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>Carthage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C VI and</td>
<td>C VIII pagans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frey</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dogmas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius-ia</td>
<td>Frey, 4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redemptus-ia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerius-ia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Renatus-ia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovatus-ia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reparatus-ia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>virtues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agape</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agapius</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocentius-ia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 2. Names embodying Christian dogmas

The most important of these names is *Anastasius ius*. The name was derived with the suffix -ιος-ιας 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 Judgement 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 ἀναστασία τῆς Χριστοῦ Ἀναστάσιον, 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<e> secundum nomen credo ful[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.


\(^{3}\) 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, 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. Though the rise in the Christian frequency might be ascribed to the general popularity of cognomina derived from past participles during Imperial Times, 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 is a name generally claimed as Christian. 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, 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 and Reparatus 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 CVI belong to slaves, freedmen, peregrini and soldiers.
3 Martigny p. 513; Grossi Gondi Trattato, p. 82; Schrijnjen Namengebungen, Mn 1935, p. 275; Testini, Archeologia cristiana, p. 370.
4 Le catacombe romane, p. 120.
Africa, 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 us; 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 supporters, most modern scholars agree that ἀγάπη existed in the *koine* before the translators of the LXX appropriated it. 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. 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 extrabiblical origin of the word. 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. 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 ἀγάπη in ODCC (1957) considers it a specific biblical word, too.
5 For a good history of the word, see CERESA-CASTOLDI, 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.
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 - i a. 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: Maelia Agape (the epitaph terminates in a typical pagan formula libertis libertatusque etc.); VI 16805: Agapent (notice D.M.); VI 21527: Luceria Agape (though the members of the family are referred to as Luccei 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 comites and svinfus uuan tenens, which argue paganism); X 2565: Flavia Agape (notice D.M.); X 3674 = ILS 6335: Aemilia Agape (the brother an eques Romanus and decuria); 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 arbitris exprs 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 too 4, 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.

**Table 28. Christian names in Rome and Carthage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>Carthage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Testament names</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament names</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>names of martyrs</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theophoric names</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date names</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>names expressive of</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>21 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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, Nataleus, 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:

- Adeodatus
- Barnabas
- Christophorus
- Cyprianus
- Deogratias
- Deusdedit
- Deusdona
- Deushabet
- Dominicus
- Habetdeus
- Martyrius
- Paschasius
- Πεντηχοστή
- Quadragesima
- Quodivibet
- Quodvultdeus
- Renovatus
- Spesindeo
- Thecla
- Thomas
- Vincetdeus
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, Dominus, 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—49% 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); *Dominus* 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, Sabbatus, 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 Christian ², whereas converts received baptism at a later age. It has been contended that the assumption of a Christian name was common at adult baptism ³, 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 accepit, 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 Sanct. Aprilis II p. 483: Derivato a patre vocabulo Quintius appellabatur; nomine autem proprio, quod in baptismo gratia accepit, 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) Olimpii Iudaei solusque ex gente sua ad (Christi) meritum 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 / j o n t e r e n a s c e n t i s.*

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 n<eo>ofito potenti> 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. 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: Licinia Aeliodora Adeodata, is an obvious example, even the etymological implications being retained (Aeliodora = 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, Johannes two⁷, Nazarius one⁸, Paschasius two⁹, Petrus two¹⁰, Quadragesima one¹¹, Refrigerius one¹², Susanna one¹³, Theodulus two¹⁴

---

¹ Jeremias, Die Kindertaufe in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten, p. 102 ff.
³ Bull 1867, p. 31 = Diehl 2952Cadm: ... sive Anastasia; C III 9587 = Diehl 4484: Anastasia qui et Verula.
⁴ FE 6600b: Barnabas qui et Aseillo.
⁵ SI 5249: Aurelius Atticus Cyriacus; C V 6260 = Diehl 1368: Quirace supernomen Micines.
⁶ SI 2601 = Diehl 3959adn: Cassius Domininus.
⁷ FE 9307: 'Ioánης "Αδριαν; C V Suppl. Ital. 26 = Diehl 1878: Iohannis Romanus.
⁸ RAC 1926, p. 75: Ναζάρους 'Ippokéntiouς. 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 Paschasia.
¹⁰ SI 3859 = Diehl 2709A: Petrus Victorinus; for Petrus qui Papario, see p. 119.
¹¹ SI 1947 = Diehl 4384: Quadr[a]gensima [Ianuaria].
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 nicknames which were later attached to the original ones. The most likely moment for the assumption of a Christian name was the Christian baptism. 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 servile stigma and were for this reason avoided by free citizens. It may be of interest to see whether there was any similar class division 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 titled persons, the nobility and the clergy, viz. Agapē, Cyriacus, Martyrius, Theodulus, whereas the frequency of Adeodatus, Anastasius, Deusdedit, Iohannes, Paulus and Petrus among the upper class was above the average.

This obvious class division of Christian names is difficult to explain in terms other than simple fashion. Pagan tradition may also account for something, for, with the exception of Anastasius, the names avoided by the nobility and the clergy were Greek. Agapē 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: Φίλανδεθ Θεόδουλ(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 fos-sores, 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 Deus-dedit 0 — 2 — 9; for Iohannes 8 — 8 — 52; for Paulus 6 — 6 — 81; for Petrus 0 — 14 — 60.
SUMMARY

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 inscripational 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 gentle 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 *νυμαχος* 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.
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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
Petrus 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
Πλατονεία 64
Plotius 50
Poemenia 85
Polla 23; 96
Pollia —
  Polia 51
Pollita 68, 1
Polychronius 76; 86
Pompeius 49, 3
Pontianus 97; 98, 4
Populonius 82
Porphyrius 85
Porfirius 42, 1
Potentius 79
Poubilia 19
?Praejecticia v. Reiecticia
Praesidius 81
Praestantius —
  Prestantius 79
Pretiosa 84, 2
  Pretzio... 66
Primaeus —
  Primevius 80
Primemius 77; 80
Primianus 63
Primigenia 52
Primillus 68
Primus 66
Primulica 63, 2
Primus 52; 61
Principius 38; 81
Priscianus 63
Priscilla 68; 69
Priscillianus 69
Priscillianus 68
Priscus 61
Probantius 79
Probatus 76; 79
Probicius 77; 80
Probilianus 68
Probata 81
Probelpius 86
Processus 81
Procopius 85
Proculo... —
  Proculo 77; 80
Proficus 82
Proficius 82
Proiectus 67; 87
Protus 97; 98, 4
Providentius 79
Provinitius 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
Quodiu... 101; 102; 116
Quodvultdeus 102 bis; 116; 117; 117, 1
  Cobuldeo (dat.) 102, 1
  Covuldonia 102, 1
Quodvuldeonia 102, 1

RATIOGER 49, 5
Rebecca —
  Reveca 93
Redemptus 90; 114; 112 bis
Refrigerius 46; 47; 76; 81; 111; 113;
  120
Regulus 67
?Reiecticia 76; 77; 79 (unless
  Praejecticia)
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
Reticulus 82
Reveca v. Rebecca
Riparius 77; 81
Roborius 81
Romulien... —
  Romuliesia 77; 82
Romulus (club name) 37
Romulius 34; 37; 45, 1; 72; 82
Rorentia 77; 81
Rufillus 68
Rufinianus 61; 69
Rufinus 61; 64
Index of personal names discussed

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

SABAS 60
?Σαββάδα 107, 2
?Sabbatinus —
Sabbati 106, 8
Sabbatia 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
?Salamarius 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
Scholaciu[s] —
Scholacius 77; 78; 81
Scholasticius —
Scholasticus 50
Sebastianus 97; 98 ter; 99
Seberantia v. Severantia
Secundianus 62
Secundilla 62
Secundina 62
Secundianus 62
Secundinus 30; 62; 64
Secundio 62
Secundius 62
Secundosa 62; 66
Secundula 62
Secundus 61; 62; 65
Sennes 97; 98
Septimius 64
Serpentius 79
Sertius 38, 4; 39
Servandus 118, 4
?Servus dei 103, 6
Sestilius v. Sextilius
Severantia —
Seberantia 77; 80
Severianus 63
Severianus 63, 1
Severinus 64
Severus 65; 109; 110
Sextilius —
Sestiliu[s] 22
Sillaria 48, 2
Silvanus 61
Silvius 64
Silviola 67
Simplicius 39, 1; 39, 2; 41; 47; 73, 1; 74; 80
Simposi v. Symposium
Sinboletianus v. Symboletianus
Siricius 80
Siricosa 66
Siricus 55
Σκυλάκιος —
Σκυλάκιος 85
Socratia 83
Sof[e]nius 39, 2
Σωφρόνιος 47
Sophronius 83
Soricius 81
Soricus 63 bis; 63, 2
Soterianus 63
Spenicus 63; 63, 2
Σπηράντια —
Ισπηράντια 79
Spes 91
Spesindeo 102; 116
Splendonicus 77; 82
Stabillicius —
Istabillicius 49
Stephania 85
Stephanilla —
Στεφανίλλα 68
Stephanus 91; 98; 99
Στέφανος 91
Stercorius 29; 67; 73; 74; 81; 87
Storacius —
Στορακίος 81
Studentius 79
Studiosus 66; ?66, 1
Studios 76
Istudius 29; 81
?Subicius 82
Suppessilla 68
Surrenius 83
Susanna 60; 91; 93; 94; 118; 120
Syagrius 83
Symboletianus —
Sinboletianus 63
Symphorius 55
Symposium —
Simposium 85
Syncretii (club name) 37
Syncretius 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
Thecleia / Θεόκλεια 99; 100
Theoctistus 103
Theodorus 61; 103
Theodosius 61; 103
Theodotus 61; 103
[Τ]heodotus 52, 1
Theodulus 102; 103; 104; 117; 117, 1; 120; 121
Θεορίδα 68
Thomas 95; 116
Timocrates 52
Timoteus 52
Titiarius 63
Titicus 63, 2
Tricontii (club name) 36

Triumphalica 63, 2
Triumphalica 63
Trypherina —
Tryferina 64
Tryphonianus —
Tryfonianus 63
[T]ryphonilla 68
?Tucrosus 66
Turbantia 79
Turpilia 19
Tychenia 78
Tycenia 86
Tychicianus 27, 3
Τυχίος 78, 1
Τυχίνιος —
Τυχίνιος 86

ULPIUS 16; 17; 22; 34, 2
Uranius 39, 1
Urbanica 63, 2
Urbanius 80
Urbanus 64
Ursacus 29, 3; 62; 77; 82
Ursatius 62
Ursella 62
Ursenia 62; 77; 82
Ursianus 62
Ursicinus 62; 68
Ursicus 62
Ursiculus 62
Ursilianus 62
Usilla 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
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Veneriosus 65; 66; 88
Venerius 87 bis
Veritas 23, 1
Verzobio 34; 1; 37; 39, 1
Vicentius v. Vincentius
Victor 30; 61; 89
Victoria 28
[Vi]ctoria 32
Victorianus 63
Victoricus 63 bis; 63, 2
Victorina 77
Bictorina 82
Victorianus 69
Victorinus 64
Victorius 82
Vigilantius 79
Vigilius 82
Vincentius 33, 2; 73; 74; 79
Vincentius 73, 1
Vincetdeus 102; 116
Vindiceius 82
Vindicius 82
Virentius 39, 3
Vitalianus 63
Vitalicus 63, 2
Vitalinus 64
?Vitatica 63 (unless Vitalica)
Vitalia —
Beviala 80
Vitalio 30; 65
Vitalis 89; 118, 4
Viventi 42, 1; 47; 79; 89
Volusius —
Bolusius 49
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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
Aemilius 96
Afer (ethnic) 26
Africa 11; 22, 1; 26; 38; 48; 49; 61 f.;
63; 65 f.; 76; 94; 100; 102 f.; 104;
106; 112 f.; 114; 116
African Church, latinization of 100; 103;
104
African cognomina 35
After life 35
Aγάπη/agape 113 f.
Agnomen 30; 31; 39; 41; 42; 43; 75;
88; 109
Alaric 2; 12; 13
Alumnus 8
"Αὐων (voc.) 41
Ammius (or Amnus) Anicius Paulinus
45
Analogy 76 f.
— false 62; 64
Anapyxis 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
Ausoni 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
Caelius Saturninus 40
Caracalla 5; 17; 35
Cardinal virtues, Christian 89; 91; 113
Carpitatus (ethnic) 26
Catacombs 2; 15; 94
— St. Agnese 12
— Commodilla 101
— Priscilla 9, 5; 11; 91; 97
Catechumens 109; 119; 120
Catholics 102
Alfenius Caecilias 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
Cloidius 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
Consilbertus 6
Conservi dei 7
Conservus 7
Constantine the Great, age of 13
Converts 30; 104; 107; 118; 119
St. Cosmas 97, 2
Kyriakē ήµέγα 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
Dedictory names/cognomina 25; 100; 101
Deo gratias 102
Deo laudes 102
Depositio 11; 110
Depositio martyrium 94; 97; 98; 108; 108, 3
Dies dominica 106
— Iustrius 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
Donna 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
Ev εἰσθήνῃ 89
Ελπίς 89
Εὐφράεια 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
Fossores 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 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
Γενναγος/gregori (imper.) 41
Hadrumetum 114
Haploology 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
Junior 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
Libertas 7
— lib., l. 6
Loan-words 55
Manliri 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 sodaliiciarium 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(1,5),(999,997)
42; 45; 49
Nominative, use of in signa 34
— in women’s names in -ius, 41 f.; 43
Nymphs, sanctuary of 40
‘O ωός 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
*Pitinus (= 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
-ač 69
-calus 67
-ειος 36
-ellus 67
-enteris 62; 63
-ια 70
-ianus 62 f.
-icianus 68
-icinus 68
-ιωκ 63 f.
-icus 62 bis; 63 f.; 77; 108
-ilio 69
-ilis 62, 1
-ιλλα 67
-illianus/iliianus 68 f.
-ilus 64; 67 f.
-inianus 69
-inus 62; 64; 105
-io 64 f.; 104
A general index

-ινος 64
-ιος 25 f.; 111
-ις 69
-ίττα 68, 1
-ιυμ (⇐-ινος) 43
-ιος 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
-ιος as a deverbative 76
-ο -ονις 64; 65
-ολυς 67
-οσυς 62 bis; 65 f.; 84, 2
-ολυς 67

Superhomen 25; 26; 70; 72; 73—75; 78; 120
Symmachus 38; 45
Syncopeation 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
— δ > ι 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; 24; 22; 23; 33; 41—43; 64; 65; 70