

BIOMETRICAL  
NOTES

THE INFORMATION ON ANCIENT  
CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS  
FROM ROME CONCERNING THE DURATION  
OF LIFE AND THE DATES OF BIRTH  
AND DEATH

By  
HENRIC NORDBERG

Helsinki—Helsingfors 1963

## PREFACE

The present investigation follows closely on *Sylloge inscriptionum christianarum veterum Musei Vaticani (SICV)*, published in *Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae*, Vol. I:1,2. While doing the preparatory studies for that work, which was completed under the guidance of Professor Henrik Zilliacus, I grew interested in the particulars as to age and marriage, and other data, that appear so numerous on the ancient Christian inscriptions. The result of that interest was my paper *Biométrie et mariage* in the same series Vol. I:2, pp. 185—210. For that paper I had to collect and work through an extensive material. I could hardly treat that subject solely on the basis of some more than 300 inscriptions that were published in *SICV*, but had also to collect relevant material for comparison. Gradually the amount of material grew so that it proved to be impossible to treat the subject at all comprehensively within the framework of that part that had been reserved for the commentaries. Besides Professor Henrik Zilliacus, Professor Jaakko Suolahti, Professor Rolf Westman, Dr. Patrick Bruun, Dr. Iiro Kajanto and myself took part in that team-work. Without seriously upsetting the original plans of the editors space could not be found for a fuller biometrical study within the common work. This explains why these Biometrical Notes are published separately from the original work.

I am deeply indebted to Professor Henrik Zilliacus for the interest he has shown and also for the stimulus he has given for this separate study. Many valuable ideas have been gained through discussion with my colleagues in the team-work.

Mrs. Ruth Donner has with great kindness, and real interest, translated this work into English. For this I am very grateful to her.

Helsingfors, June 8th, 1963.

Henric Nordberg

## CONTENTS

List of Tables . . . . .	6
I. The Extent and Limitations of the Material . . . . .	7
II. The Formulae and Case Used for Recording the Age . . . . .	8
A. The Formulae Recording the Age . . . . .	8
B. An Analysis of the Different Forms of Case-ending . . . . .	14
C. The Confusing of Cases . . . . .	21
D. Case Preference . . . . .	23
III. The Exactness of the Records of Age . . . . .	25
A. The Exactness of the Records of Years . . . . .	25
a. P(lus) M(inus) . . . . .	25
b. The exactness of the years . . . . .	29
B. The Exactness of the Number of Months . . . . .	30
C. The Exactness of the Number of Days . . . . .	32
D. The Exactness in General of the Records of Age . . . . .	34
IV. Mortality and Length of Life . . . . .	38
A. Average Length of Life . . . . .	38
B. Length of Life and Age-groups in Tables . . . . .	42
V. Dates of Death and Deposition . . . . .	49
A. Death and Deposition Formulae with Dates . . . . .	49
a. Formulae of death . . . . .	49
b. Formulae of deposition . . . . .	50
c. Rest-in-peace formulae used in the same way as formulae of deposition . . . . .	51
B. The Connection between the Dates of Death and Deposition . . . . .	52
C. Dates of Deposition and Death . . . . .	54
D. Depositions and Days of the Week . . . . .	60
VI. Marriage and Age . . . . .	62
A. The Occurrence of Particulars about Marriage . . . . .	62
B. The Exactness of the Information . . . . .	63
C. The Duration of the Marriages . . . . .	64
D. Age at the Time of Marriage . . . . .	66
a. The age of women . . . . .	66
b. The age of men . . . . .	67
VII. Dates of Birth . . . . .	69
List of Inscriptions from ICVR and SICV . . . . .	73
Bibliography . . . . .	76

## LIST OF TABLES.

<i>Table 1.</i> The Extent and Limitations of the Material . . . . .	9
<i>Table 2.</i> The Total Extent of the Material . . . . .	9
<i>Table 3.</i> P(lus) M(inus) with Years . . . . .	26
<i>Table 4.</i> The Exactness of the Years . . . . .	29
<i>Table 5.</i> The Exactness of the Figures relating to Age . . . . .	35
<i>Table 6.</i> Exactness of the Age according to Sex . . . . .	36
<i>Table 7.</i> The Average Age . . . . .	37
<i>Table 8.</i> Average Length of Life . . . . .	39
<i>Table 9.</i> Length of Life and Age-groups per Century according to the Dated Tituli . . . . .	43 f.
<i>Table 10.</i> Length of Life and Age-groups according to the Undateable Tituli . . . . .	45 f.
<i>Table 11.</i> Deaths according to Age-groups and Sex . . . . .	47 f.
<i>Table 12.</i> Dates of Death and Deposition . . . . .	55 ff.
<i>Table 13.</i> The Duration of the Marriages . . . . .	65
<i>Table 14.</i> The Age of Women at the Time of Marriage . . . . .	68
<i>Table 15.</i> The Age of Men at the Time of Marriage . . . . .	69
<i>Table 16.</i> Dates of Birth . . . . .	70 f.

## I. THE EXTENT AND LIMITATIONS OF THE MATERIAL

The present study, which deals solely with inscriptions on Christian graves from Rome, is based on the following material: G. B. de Rossi in *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae I* (inscriptions 1—1374) and L. Gatti's supplement to this work (inscriptions 1375—1865; references to these works in the following pages will be made under the abbreviation *Ro I* followed by the number of the inscription). Further, the material published by A. Silvagni and A. Ferrua in *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae I* (inscriptions 1—4091), *II* (inscriptions 4092—6495) and *III* (inscriptions 6496—9366; henceforth referred to as *ICVR I, II, III* followed by the number of the inscription) and, lastly, the 325 hitherto unpublished inscriptions in the *Galleria Lapidaria*, in the Vatican Museum, which have been published by a group of Finnish scholars headed by H. Zilliacus, *Sylloge inscriptionum christianarum veterum I* (henceforth *SICV*), Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae, Vols. I:1,2. The abbreviation *ICVR* (without a following number) includes both *Ro I* and *ICVR I—III*.

On the other hand, the inscriptions from the city of Rome which are included in E. Diehl's *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae veteres I—III*, but which do not occur in *ICVR* or *SICV* are not dealt with in this study. These limits have been set because Diehl had in mind a collection of inscriptions, not an edition in the modern sense, and because he had not seen a single one of the inscriptions that are included in his collection. He took them over direct from older, and not always reliable, publications. Nor are isolated inscriptions, published elsewhere, included in the following material.

Considerable care has been taken to avoid the duplications that appear in *ICVR*. By reason of the extent of the material I can not, however, guarantee that all duplications have been excluded, but the number of them is in any case so insignificant as not to influence the results to any appreciable degree.

With these reservations this study, then, is based on more than 11,000 inscriptions. In reality the material is even greater than the numbers indicate, partly because, as is well known, an inscription can concern two or more people, and partly because Silvagni and Ferrua under one and the same number of the inscription incorporate a number of fragments of inscriptions, all of which, to the extent that the condition of the fragment makes it possible, have been noted in this study.

My aim has been to observe the greatest possible care in relation to the material. Where an inscription has been fragmentary and there has been reason to suspect incompleteness with regard to the matter under consideration in the study, the inscription has been excluded. In a number of cases the formulae for the records of age have been complete and undamaged while their dates of deposit in the Catacombs have been defective, and vice versa. This has given rise to a certain disparity in the material in the different sections, but the limits of each section have been determined on the principle of the completeness and undamaged condition of the phenomena under consideration. Only in the section on dates of deposition has an exception been taken to this line of procedure. There I have even dealt with those cases where the month but not the date has been fully preserved, but have shown where this has been done.

The dated tituli, which can be grouped together on the basis of de Rossi-Gatti and Silvagni-Ferrua, have in the cases where the exact year can not be stated in accordance with de Rossi-Gatti been taken under that year that seems the most probable according to the information.

The *tables* on p. 9 give an idea of the scope of the material under review in this study.

## II. THE FORMULAE AND CASE USED FOR RECORDING THE AGE

### *A. The Formulae Recording the Age*

Our material contains 410 different Latin formulae for recording age distributed among the whole body of 2,286 tituli, if only those cases are considered where the formulae have been preserved intact. The relative diversity is apparent from the list below p. 10. The list also presents our material and gives a number for the frequency. In this connection I have not dealt at all with the Greek formulae<sup>1</sup>. In 21 cases the age is given without any age formula.

<sup>1</sup> In the following list are the Latin formulae in Greek letters printed in italics to distinguish them from the ordinary Latin ones.

Table 1. *The Extent and Limitations of the Material*

	Tituli with only the age			Tituli with age and date of deposition <sup>2</sup>			Tituli with only date of deposition		
	M	F	?	M	F	?	M	F	?
2nd century .....	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3rd century .....	2	1	—	4	6	2	3	2	—
4th century .....	32	53	20	158	166	35	31	41	4
5th century .....	18	7	17	102	84	29	20	22	—
6th century .....	15	7	17	58	26	16	3	1	—
All the dateable tituli	67	69	54	322	282	82	57	66	4
ICVR I + Ro I									
Appendix II .....	404	396	67	217	222	62	54	70	2
ICVR II .....	124	81	29	81	78	33	36	37	2
ICVR III .....	167	144	41	119	99	57	54	63	2
All the undateable .. tituli .....	695	621	137	417	399	152	144	170	6
All the tituli in ICVR	762	690	191	739	681	234	201	236	10
SICV .....	34	55	7	13	20	7	3	7	—
Our material .....	796	745	198	752	701	241	204	243	10

<sup>1</sup> In this column are included, as in the following tables, tituli where for different reasons it has been impossible to determine whether the deceased was a man or a woman.

<sup>2</sup> Here are also included those tituli where the ages are given but are illegible.

Table 2. *The Total Extent of the Material*

	M	F	?	Total
2nd century .....	—	1	—	1
3rd century .....	9	9	2	20
4th century .....	221	260	59	540
5th century .....	140	113	46	299
6th century .....	76	34	33	143
All the dateable tituli .....	446	417	140	1.003
ICVR I + Ro I				
Appendix II .....	675	688	131	1.494
ICVR II .....	241	196	64	501
ICVR III .....	340	306	100	746
All the undateable tituli .....	1.256	1.190	295	2.741
All tituli in ICVR .....	1.702	1.607	435	3.744
SICV .....	50	82	14	145
Our material .....	1.752	1.689	449	3.890

A . . . . .	10	ANI : MENSES : DIES . . . . .	1
A : DIE . . . . .	1	ANIIS . . . . .	1
A : DIES . . . . .	1	ANIS . . . . .	26
A : M . . . . .	13	ANIS : D . . . . .	2
A : M : D . . . . .	13	ANIS : DIE . . . . .	1
A : ME . . . . .	1	ANIS : DIES . . . . .	2
A : MENS . . . . .	2	ANIS : DS . . . . .	1
A : MENS : D . . . . .	1	ANIS : M . . . . .	3
A : MESES : D . . . . .	1	ANIS : M : D . . . . .	4
A : MESIB . . . . .	1	ANIS : M : DIE . . . . .	1
s		ANIS : M : DIES . . . . .	1
A : M : D . . . . .	1	ANIS : ME . . . . .	1
AN . . . . .	144	ANIS : ME : D . . . . .	1
AN : D . . . . .	18	ANIS : MENSES . . . . .	3
AN : DI . . . . .	3	ANIS : MENSIBVS . . . . .	1
AN : DIEBVS . . . . .	1	ANIS : MENSIS . . . . .	1
AN : DIES . . . . .	7	ANIS : MESES : DIEBV . . . . .	1
AN : DIS . . . . .	1	ANIS : MESES : DIES . . . . .	5
AN : M . . . . .	39	ANIS : MESIBVS . . . . .	1
AN : M : D . . . . .	39	ANIS : MESIBVS : DIES . . . . .	1
AN : M : DI . . . . .	3	ANIS : MESIS . . . . .	1
AN : M : DIES . . . . .	2	ANN . . . . .	280
AN : M : DIIS . . . . .	1	ANN : D . . . . .	27
AN : ME . . . . .	3	ANN : DI . . . . .	3
AN : ME : D . . . . .	3	ANN : DIAES . . . . .	1
AN : ME : DI . . . . .	3	ANN : DIB . . . . .	1
AN : MEN . . . . .	4	ANN : DIE . . . . .	3
AN : MEN : D . . . . .	1	ANN : DIEB . . . . .	2
AN : MEN : DI . . . . .	1	ANN : DIEBVS . . . . .	1
AN : MEN : DIEBVS . . . . .	1	ANN : DIES . . . . .	24
AN : MEN : DIES . . . . .	1	ANN : M . . . . .	68
AN : MENS . . . . .	3	ANN : M : D . . . . .	96
AN : MENS : D . . . . .	2	ANN : M : DI . . . . .	2
AN : MENS : DIES . . . . .	2	ANN : M : DIE . . . . .	4
AN : MENSES . . . . .	1	ANN : M : DIEB . . . . .	2
AN : MENSES : DIES . . . . .	2	ANN : M : DIES . . . . .	9
AN : MENSIS : D . . . . .	1	ANN : ME : DIES . . . . .	1
AN : MENSIS : DIES . . . . .	2	ANN : MEN . . . . .	6
AN : MES . . . . .	3	ANN : MEN : D . . . . .	3
AN : MES : D . . . . .	1	ANN : MEN : DI . . . . .	1
AN : MES : DIEB . . . . .	1	ANN : MEN : DIE . . . . .	1
AN : MES : DIES . . . . .	1	ANN : MEN : DIEBVS . . . . .	1
AN : MESES : . . . . .	2	ANN : MEN : DIS . . . . .	1
AN : MESIS : DIES . . . . .	1	ANN : MENS . . . . .	11
AN : MESS . . . . .	1	ANN : MENS : D . . . . .	11
AN : MI . . . . .	1	ANN : MENS : DIE . . . . .	1
AN : MN : D . . . . .	1	ANN : MENS : DIEB . . . . .	5
ANAI : MISES . . . . .	1	ANN : MENS : DIER . . . . .	1
ANI . . . . .	1	ANN : MENS : DIES . . . . .	9
ANI : MENS : DIES . . . . .	1	ANN : MENSES . . . . .	7



ANN : MENSES : D . . . . .	2	ANNIS : ME : D . . . . .	3
ANN : MENSES : DIES . . . . .	3	ANNIS : MEN . . . . .	9
ANN : MENSIB . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MEN : D . . . . .	2
ANN : MENSIB : DIEB . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MEN : DIES . . . . .	5
ANN : MENSIBVS . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MEN : DIIB . . . . .	1
ANN : MENSIBVS : D . . . . .	3	ANNIS : MEN : ZIES . . . . .	1
ANN : MENSIBVS : DIEBVS . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENS . . . . .	5
ANN : MENSIBVS : DIES . . . . .	2	ANNIS : MENS : D . . . . .	2
ANN : MENSIS . . . . .	2	ANNIS : MENS : DIEBVS . . . . .	2
ANN : MENSIS : D . . . . .	2	ANNIS : MENS : DIES . . . . .	6
ANN : MENSIS : DIES . . . . .	2	ANNIS : MENSE : DIES . . . . .	3
ANN : MENSS . . . . .	2	ANNIS : MENSES . . . . .	20
ANN : MENSSSES . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENSES : DIE . . . . .	1
ANN : MENSVM : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENSES : DIEBVS . . . . .	3
ANN : MES . . . . .	2	ANNIS : MENSES : DIES . . . . .	13
ANN : MES : D . . . . .	2	ANNIS : MENSIB . . . . .	3
ANN : MES : DI . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENSIBVS . . . . .	2
ANN : MESES . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENSIBVS : DIEB . . . . .	1
ANN : MESES : DIES . . . . .	4	ANNIS : MENSIBVS : DIEBVS . . . . .	11
ANN : MESES : DIIS . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENSIBVS : DIES . . . . .	3
ANN : MESIS . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENSIS . . . . .	5
ANN : MESIS : DIEB . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENSIS : DIES . . . . .	2
ANN : MESIVM . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENSSSES . . . . .	2
ANN : MM : D . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENSSIBVS : DIEBVS . . . . .	1
ANN : MN : D . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MENSVM : DIEBVS . . . . .	1
ANN : MS : D . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MES . . . . .	7
ANN : M <sup>s</sup> : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MES : D . . . . .	1
ANNB : MES . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MES : DIAEBVS . . . . .	1
ANNES . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MES : DIE . . . . .	2
ANNI . . . . .	4	ANNIS : MES : DIES . . . . .	2
ANNI : MENS . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MES : DIIS . . . . .	1
ANNI : MENSES : D . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MESE : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNI : MENSORVM . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MESES . . . . .	8
ANNIS . . . . .	189	ANNIS : MESES : DIE . . . . .	1
ANNIS : D . . . . .	6	ANNIS : MESES : DIEB . . . . .	1
ANNIS : DIAEBVS . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MESES : DIES . . . . .	5
ANNIS : DIE . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MESIBVS . . . . .	1
ANNIS : DIEB . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MESIBVS : DIEBVS . . . . .	1
ANNIS : DIEBVS . . . . .	14	ANNIS : MESIS . . . . .	3
ANNIS : DIES . . . . .	27	ANNIS : MESIS : DIEBVS . . . . .	1
ANNIS : DIBVS . . . . .	2	ANNIS : MESIS : DIES . . . . .	5
ANNIS : M . . . . .	15	ANNIS : MESSIS : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNIS : M : D . . . . .	29	ANNIS : MINSES . . . . .	1
ANNIS : M : DEBVS . . . . .	1	ANNIS : MINSES : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNIS : M : DIB . . . . .	1	ANNO . . . . .	2
ANNIS : M : DIEBVS . . . . .	2	ANNO : D . . . . .	2
ANNIS : M : DIES . . . . .	7	ANNO : DI . . . . .	1
ANNIS : M : DIRVS . . . . .	1	ANNO : DIES . . . . .	2
ANNIS : ME . . . . .	2	ANNO : M . . . . .	1
		ANNO : M : D . . . . .	2

ANNO : M : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MENSBVS . . . . .	1
ANNO : MEN . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MENSE : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNO : MEN : D . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MENSES . . . . .	17
ANNO : MENSE . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MENSES : D . . . . .	2
ANNO : MENSES : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MENSES : DIES . . . . .	22
ANNO : MENSIBVS : DIBVS . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MENSES : DIIS . . . . .	1
ANNO : MENSIBVS : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MENSIS . . . . .	6
ANNO : MENSIS : D . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MENSIS : DIE . . . . .	1
ANNO : MENSIS : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MENSIS : DIES . . . . .	3
ANNO : MENSS : DIE . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MENSSIS : DIESI . . . . .	1
ANNO : MES : DI . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MES . . . . .	2
ANNOR . . . . .	5	ANNOS : MES : DIE . . . . .	1
ANNORO . . . . .	5	ANNOS : MES : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNORO : MENSES : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MESE : DES . . . . .	1
ANNORO : MENSIS . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MESES . . . . .	5
ANNORV . . . . .	6	ANNOS : MESES : D . . . . .	1
ANNORV : DIERV . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MESES : DIE . . . . .	1
ANNORV : MES . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MESES : DIEBVS . . . . .	1
ANNORV : MESORV . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MESES : DIES . . . . .	5
ANNORV : MESORV : DIERV . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MESIBVS . . . . .	1
ANNORVM . . . . .	36	ANNOS : MESIS . . . . .	4
ANNORVM : DIEBVS . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MESIS : DIAES . . . . .	1
ANNORVM : DIERV . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MESIS : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNORVM : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MESSIS . . . . .	1
ANNORVM : MENSES : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MISES : ZI . . . . .	1
ANNORVM : MENSORVM . . . . .	1	ANNOS : MS . . . . .	1
ANNORVM : MENSVM : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNOYΣ . . . . .	1
ANNORVM : MESES : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNS . . . . .	1
ANNORVM : MESIS : DIEM . . . . .	1	ANNV . . . . .	7
ANNORVM : MESORVM . . . . .	1	ANNV : DIES . . . . .	3
ANNOYΩPΩM : MHΣΩPΩN :		ANNV : M . . . . .	2
AEYPΩN . . . . .	1	ANNV : M : D . . . . .	3
ANNORVM : MS . . . . .	1	ANNV : MEN . . . . .	1
ANNORVM : MS : DIR . . . . .	1	ANNV : MENS : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNOS . . . . .	180	ANNV : MENSE . . . . .	1
ANNΩΣ . . . . .	1	ANNV : MENSES . . . . .	1
ANNOS : D . . . . .	7	ANNV : MENSIS . . . . .	2
ANNOS : DIEBVS . . . . .	1	ANNV : MENSIS : D . . . . .	1
ANNOS : DIEM . . . . .	1	ANNV : MENSIS : DIES . . . . .	2
ANNOS : DIES . . . . .	12	ANNV : MENSSE . . . . .	1
ANNOS : M . . . . .	12	ANNV : MESE : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNOS : M : D . . . . .	21	ANNV : MESES . . . . .	2
ANNOS : M : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNV : MESES : DIES . . . . .	2
ANNOS : ME . . . . .	1	ANNV : MESIS . . . . .	2
ANNOS : MEN . . . . .	2	ANNV : MESIS : DIES . . . . .	2
ANNOS : MEN : D . . . . .	1	ANNVM : D . . . . .	1
ANNOS : MEN : DIES . . . . .	1	ANNVM : DI . . . . .	1
ANNOS : MENS . . . . .	1	ANNVM : DIE . . . . .	1
ANNOS : MENS : D . . . . .	1	ANNVM : DIES . . . . .	2
ANNOS : MENS : DIES . . . . .	2	ANNVM : M . . . . .	1

ANNVM : M : D . . . . .	2	ANS : M : D . . . . .	1
ANNVM : MENS : D . . . . .	1	ANS : MES : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNVM : MENSEM : DIES . . . . .	1	ANV . . . . .	1
ANNVM : MENSES . . . . .	6	ANV : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNVM : MENSES : DIES . . . . .	3	ANV : M . . . . .	2
ANNVM : MESES . . . . .	1	ANV : M : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNVM : MESIS : DIEBVS . . . . .	1	ANV : MESES . . . . .	1
ANNVM : SES : DIES . . . . .	1	ANV : MESES : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNVS . . . . .	118		
ANNVS : D . . . . .	1	ANV : M : DS . . . . .	1
ANNVS : DIES . . . . .	7	ANVM : MENSES . . . . .	1
ANNVS : M . . . . .	7	ANVM : MENSIS . . . . .	2
ANNVS : M : D . . . . .	11	ANVM : MENSIS : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNVS : ME . . . . .	1	ANVM : MESES . . . . .	1
ANNVS : MEMES . . . . .	1	ANVM : MESI . . . . .	1
ANNVS : MEN . . . . .	2	ANVS . . . . .	7
ANNVS : MEN : D . . . . .	1	ANVS : M . . . . .	1
ANNVS : MENS : DIES . . . . .	1	ANVS : M : D . . . . .	3
ANNVS : MENSES . . . . .	2	ANVS : ME : D . . . . .	1
ANNVS : MENSIS . . . . .	1	ANVS : MENS : D . . . . .	1
ANNVS : MENSIS : DIES . . . . .	4	ANVS : MENSES . . . . .	1
ANNVS : MENSVM . . . . .	1	ANVS : MENSES : DIIS . . . . .	1
ANNVS : MESES : DIES . . . . .	1	ANVS : MES : DIES . . . . .	1
ANNVS : MESESIS : DIIS . . . . .	1	M . . . . .	8
ANNVS : MESIS . . . . .	1	M : D . . . . .	21
ANNVS : MESIS : DIES . . . . .	2	M : DI . . . . .	1
ANNVS : MINSES . . . . .	1	M : DIE . . . . .	1
ANNVS : MN . . . . .	1	M : DIER . . . . .	1
ANO . . . . .	7	ME : DI . . . . .	1
ANO : M . . . . .	2	ME : DIE . . . . .	1
ANO : ME . . . . .	1	ME : DIES . . . . .	1
ANO : ME : D . . . . .	1	MEN : D . . . . .	1
ANO : MESIS . . . . .	1	MEN : DI . . . . .	1
ANOR : M . . . . .	1	MENS : D . . . . .	2
ANORO . . . . .	4	MENS : DIES . . . . .	4
ANORO : MESE : DIES . . . . .	1	MENSENS : DIES . . . . .	1
ANORO : MESIS . . . . .	1	MENSES . . . . .	3
ANORV . . . . .	3	MENSES : DIES . . . . .	3
ANORVM . . . . .	4	MENSIB . . . . .	1
ANOS . . . . .	10	MENSIB : DIES . . . . .	1
ANOS . . . . .	1	MENSIBVS . . . . .	1
ANOS : D . . . . .	1	MENSIBVS : D . . . . .	1
ANOS : DIE . . . . .	1	MENSIBVS : DIES . . . . .	1
ANOS : M . . . . .	1	MENSIS . . . . .	1
ANOS : ME : D . . . . .	1	MENSIS : D . . . . .	1
ANOS : MENSE : DIES . . . . .	1	MENSIS : DIES . . . . .	2
ANOS : MES : DIES . . . . .	1	MENSS : D . . . . .	1
ANOS : MESSES : DIES . . . . .	1	MENSSES : DIES . . . . .	1
ANS . . . . .	1	MES . . . . .	1
ANS : M . . . . .	1	MES : DIES . . . . .	2

MES : DIO . . . . .	1	MESIS : DIES . . . . .	3
MESES . . . . .	1	MHΞIE : DIHΞ . . . . .	1
MESES : D . . . . .	1	MESS . . . . .	1
MESES : DIES . . . . .	3	MESSE : D . . . . .	1
MESI : DIEBVS . . . . .	1		
MESIBVS . . . . .	1		
MHΞIBOΞ . . . . .	1	IN ANNIS . . . . .	1
MESIS . . . . .	1	IN ANNOS . . . . .	2

### *B. An Analysis of the Different Forms of Case-ending*

The following study is concerned firstly with an analysis of the different forms in order to determine the case-ending in doubtful cases. It is not, consequently, concerned with those instances where the case is quite clear.

### *ANNVS, ANVS*

Our material shows 165 instances of ANNVS (if one excludes *ANNOYΣ Ro I 85*) and 16 of ANVS, all with or without information about months and days.

ANNVS on its own never means *one* year but has always a plural meaning in our material. Even where it is in conjunction with *menses* or *dies* it is as a rule in the plural. The only exceptions to this rule are *ICVR I 2297* (1 year 10 months) and *ICVR I 3885* (1 year, 4 months, 3 days). *ICVR III 8243* lacks a legible record of age. ANVS is plural throughout.

E. Diehl takes the forms ANNVS, ANVS as the accusative plural and explains their origins in the following way: »*vocalis u orta est ex numero singulari ad analogiam 'horam horas, diem dies, mensem menses, manum manus' potius quam ex vocali ō mutata in ū.*»<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile H. Zilliacus has brought forward the theory that these forms were petrified nominatives.<sup>2</sup> With this thesis in mind I have subjected the forms ANNVS, ANVS to a more careful inspection.

There appeared some facts to make note of. Of the 118 instances of ANNVS alone no less than 50 have the prefix P(lus) M(inus) to which is added PM to ANNVS: MENSVM (*ICVR III 8953/4*). If we consider only ANNVS, then 42,4 % are provided with the reservation PM, while of all the tituli in our material with only records of age just 28,6 % have the prefix PM (see p. 26).

<sup>1</sup> E. Diehl, *Inscr. III, Index XII*, p. 485.

<sup>2</sup> *SICV2*, p. 28 ff.

At the same time there appear 51 instances of PM with ANNOS alone in our material (and 4 instances with ANNOS and MENSES [: DIES]). Of these the absolute majority (30 instances) appear among the dated tituli. PM with AN(N)IS alone appear in 48 instances (of which only 17 are from the dated tituli). To this are added at most 4 tituli with PM and ANNIS as well as information as to the number of months and days.

From the material on the dated tituli one gets the impression that the use of ANNIS with PM gradually diminishes and falls into disuse. The last dateable PM with ANNIS is from the year 485 (*Ro I 884*). For the sake of completeness 11 instances of PM with ANNOR(VM) may be noted.

Against this background it seems very probable that ANNVS is not to be taken as an accusative plural. Looking at the dateable tituli, where this form appears most frequently, we see that it replaces not the accusative form ANNOS, but the ablative. One can indeed query whether this petrified nominative form has arisen only in connection with P(LVS) M(INVS). The whole expression could simply be taken as a solitary singular concept even though referring to a number of years. Possibly also the effort to *homoioteleuton* has contributed to the appearance of the form AN(N)VS in connection with P(LVS) M(INVS).<sup>1</sup>

Further, it is noted that of the 118 instances of ANNVS 78 are given in even multiples of 5 or 10, which means 66,1 % of all the instances of ANNVS. This is a noticeably higher percentage than is the case for all the records of age where the highest percentage noted for dated tituli is 49,0 % and for undateable ones 45,6 % (see *Table 4. The Exactness of the Years*, p. 29). Here one can see a connection between the ANNVS-forms and a lesser degree of exactness in giving the age.

Of the 165 instances of ANNVS 73 (44,2 %) are included among the dated inscriptions. Here it should be noted that barely 2.000 of the inscriptions are dated while over 9.000 are undated. The form ANNVS is thus relatively speaking far more usual in the dated than in the undated tituli. Possibly this has a connection with the somewhat lesser degree of exactness in recording age on the dated tituli (see *Table 5. The Exactness of the Figures relating to Age*, p. 35). Of the 16 instances of ANVS 3 are found among the dateable inscriptions.

The first dateable ANNVS (= ANNVS : M) is (if one excepts the form *ANNOYΣ* *Ro I 85* from the year 345) from the year 359 (*Ro I 140*). Otherwise the form ANNVS (with or without details as to months and days) is distributed among the centuries according to the following:

<sup>1</sup> Cf. below, concerning AN(N)I, p. 17.

4th century — 33

5th century — 23

6th century — 17

Bearing in mind that the number of dated tituli from the 5th and 6th centuries is considerably less than from the 4th century it can be said that the use of the form ANNVS increases. At the same time one must remember that the first dateable ANNVS, as mentioned, dates from the last half of the 4th century.

### ANNV, ANV

ANNV and ANV stand, as one could expect, for *annum*, but either form can also stand for the plural and thus marks a later stage of development of ANNVS and ANVS, where the final-s has been dropped. I am not here taking note of those cases where ANNV, ANV stands for *annum*.

ANNV and ANV occur most often in place of AN(N)VS where the age is given only in years. ANNV = ANNVS : *ICVR I 1675* (11 years), *1841* (54 years), *2147* (35 years), *2854* (11 years), *3141* (11 years); *ICVR III 8673* (30 years). Only in *ICVR III 8451* does ANNV alone stand for *annum*. Further it may be noted that ANNV = ANNVS in the following two instances: *ICVR I 1513* (6 years), *3146* (ANNV : MESIS : DIES; 12 years). In all the other instances ANNV stands for *annum*. A comparison shows that our material includes 26 cases where ANNV = *annum* and 8 where ANNVS = ANNVS.

ANV alone, which occurs only once in our material (*ICVR I 2335*), stands for ANVS (17 years). In 7 cases, then, ANV stands for *annum*.

### ANNVM, ANVM

In our material ANVM always, and ANNVM as a rule has a singular meaning. The only exceptions to this rule are *ICVR I 1776* (ANNVM : D; 2 years) and *ICVR II 4664* (ANNVM : DI; 7 years). In these two cases one can not either assume that ANNVM was in the genitive plural, and thus was a contraction of *annorum*. In either case it is construed with *vixit* (*bixit*). We may consequently assume that the singular stands for the plural.

### ANNO, ANO

In the two instances where ANNO appears on its own, *ICVR I 2662* and *2763*, both are examples of a contraction for *annorum*. Similarly there

exist examples where ANO = *annorum*. This is clearly the case in *ICVR III 8885* (ANO : MESIS) and presumably also in *ICVR I 3446*.

Otherwise both ANNO and ANO can sometimes be an ablative singular and sometimes an accusative plural, where the final -s has been dropped. In the majority of the instances ANNO stands for the ablative singular. Such is the case in *ICVR III 9106* (ANNO : D), *6548* (ANNO : DI); *ICVR I 2138* (ANNO : DIES); *SICV 274* (ANNO : M); *ICVR III 8815* (ANNO : M : D); *ICVR I 2169* (ANNO : M : DIES); *ICVR III 8891* (ANNO : MEN); *ICVR I 402* (ANNO : MEN : D), *200* (ANNO : MENSES : DIES); *Ro I 282* (ANNO : MENSIBVS : DIBVS); *ICVR III 7456* (ANNO : MENSIBVS : DIES), *9042* (ANNO : MENSIS : D), *8757* (ANNO : MENSIS : DIES), *8250* (ANNO : MENSS : DIE); *ICVR I 1756* (ANNO : MES : DI).

It is different with ANO. This form stands more often for *annos* than for *anno*. The ablative singular is noted only in the following two cases: *Ro I 1534* (ANO : M); *ICVR III 7978* (ANO : ME).

ANNO stands for the accusative plural in: *ICVR I 3959* (ANNO : D), *3773* (ANNO : DIES), *2905* (ANNO : M : D); *ICVR III 6802* (ANNO : MENSE).

ANO stands for *annos* in: *ICVR I 628, 1504, 2705, 3446; ICVR III 6721, 6775, 8789* (ANO); *ICVR I 2242* (ANO : M), *2242* (ANO : ME : D).

We can thus note that ANNO may most often be taken as the ablative singular *anno*, but that ANO mostly = *annos*, and that ANNO alone in our material always = *annorum* but that ANO alone always = *annos*.

### ANNI, ANI

ANNI is in one case the genitive singular: ANNI : MENSORVM (*ICVR II 4394*). All the other cases of ANNI and ANI are plural and must be understood as petrified nominatives, analogously with AN(N)V(S). This is clear from the fact that ANNI and ANI never stand together with MENSIBVS and/or DIEBVS but, on the other hand, with MENSES and DIES. This is so with ANNI : MENSES : D (*ICVR I 2676*); ANI : MENS : DIES (*Ro I 24*); ANI : MENSES : DIES (*ICVR I 3128*).

The only dateable ANI (*Ro I 24*) occurs in the year 298. ANNI *Ro I 1351* is undateable.

### MENSIS, MENSSIS, MESIS, MHΣIZ, MESSIS, MESESIS

All the forms of *mensis* in -is have, after inspection, been shown to be in the plural and not in a single case in the singular. Here it is impossible to decide what case is intended. One possibility is that we have here a petrified

nominative analogously with (AN(N)V(S). Equally possible, of course, is the accusative plural; nor can the ablative plural, analogously with *annis* be ruled out. One can not either ignore the possibility of a lapse on the part of the *marmorarius* or that the letter E has in a number of instances been shaped like an I. Cf. F. Grossi Gondi, *Trattato*, p. 31. Nor does it seem to be improbable that the forms in -is can have arisen as an attempt at *homoioteleuton* and consequently were formed in analogy with *annis* (and *di[i]s*).

The present material gives no indication of what has been decisive in the rise of the forms in -is. 19 instances of ANNIS and ANIS together with forms in -is of *mensis* can be noted and 12 instances of ANNOS with these -is forms. But, in addition, ME(N)SIS is combined with the ablative singular ANNO, genitive plural ANNORO, ANNORVM, ANO, ANORO, accusative singular ANNV, ANNVM, ANVM and the petrified nominative ANNV. On the other hand ME(N)SIS appears in only 4 instances together with DIEB(VS) as against 36 instances with DI(A)ES (*DIHΣ*).

#### MENSE, MENSSE, MESE, MESSE, MESI

MENSE, MENSSE, MESE and MESSE stand for *menses* in the following cases: *ICVR I 1777* (ANOS : MENSE : DIES; 10 months), *3778* (ANNV : MENSSE; 8 months); *ICVR III 9274* (ANNV : MESE : DIES; 3 months); *ICVR I 304* (MESSE : D; 9 months). It is possible that MENSSE and MESSE arose because the *marmorarius* inverted the letters E and S.

One case of MESI *ICVR I 3698* (MESI : DIEBVS; 16 months 18 days) is either a suspension for *mesibus* or *mesis* = *menses* with the dropping of the final -s.

All the other instances of ME(N)SE, MESI are intended to be singular. On the question of MENSE, MESE one can doubt if the intention was to write ME(N)SE for *mensem* or whether in fact *mense* (ablative) was intended. For the sake of the survey all the instances of ME(N)SE in the singular are given here: *Ro I 287, 447*, and *ICVR III 8780* (ANNIS : MENSE : DIES); *ICVR I 2216* (ANNOS : MENSE : DIES); *SICV 321* (ANNV : MENSE); *ICVR III 7137* (ANNIS : MESE : DIES); *ICVR I 2291* (ANORO : MESE : DIES). To this is added one case, *ICVR III 6802* (ANNO : MENSE), where the number of months is illegible.

In these cases it seems to be clear that MENSE stands for *mensem*: *ICVR I 2216* and *SICV 321*. In the remaining cases it is impossible to decide whether we are confronted with an accusative or an ablative.

Similarly it is impossible to decide what case it is in ANVM : MESI (*ICVR I 3384*; 1 year 1 month). It seems to be possible to translate MESI in this instance as a dative pro ablative, as an ablative in -i, as an accusative



singular with the final -m for *mensem* left out or even as a genitive plural MESI(um). On the other hand it seems unthinkable that MESIS should be = *mesis*, as, as has been shown above, these -is forms are always in the plural in our material.

*MENSORVM, MESORVM, MHΣΩPΩN, MESORV,  
MESIVM, MENSVM*

The genitive plural of *mensis* is as a rule (6 instances) ME(N)SORV(M). In 5 instances the type MENS(I)VM appears, of which altogether 4 instances of MENSVM occur together with the accusative or ablative of *annus* or *dies* (see below, p. 23).

ANNI : MENSORVM . . . . .	ICVR II 4394
ANNORVM : MENSORVM . . . . .	ICVR I 2784
ANNORVM : MESORVM . . . . .	ICVR III 9025
ANNOYΩPΩM : MHΣΩPΩN : ΔEYPΩN . . . . .	Ro I 11
ANNORV : MESORV . . . . .	ICVR I 2303
ANNORV : MESORV : DIERV . . . . .	ICVR I 2386
ANN : MESIVM . . . . .	SICV 318
ANN : MENSVM : DIES . . . . .	Ro I 451
ANNIS : MENSVM : DIEBVS . . . . .	ICVR I 1770
ANNORVM : MENSVM : DIES . . . . .	ICVR I 2017
ANNVS : MENSVM . . . . .	ICVR III 8953/4

*DIE, DIEM*

I here note all the instances of DIE in our material, grouped after the number of days DIE refers to:

*DIE = die or diem*

A : DIE . . . . .	Ro I 930
ANN : M : DIE . . . . .	ICVR I 2453
ANN : M : DIE . . . . .	ICVR I 3534
ANN : M : DIE . . . . .	ICVR III 7138
ANNIS : DIE . . . . .	ICVR III 8641
ANNIS : MENSES : DIE . . . . .	ICVR I 1530
ANNIS : MES : DIE . . . . .	ICVR I 3370
ANNIS : MESES : DIE . . . . .	ICVR III 8813
ANNO : MENSS : DIE . . . . .	ICVR III 8250
ANNOS : MES : DIE . . . . .	SICV 209
ANNOS : MESES : DIE (? d.) . . . . .	ICVR II 5979

*DIE = dies*

ANIS : DIE (30 days) . . . . .	ICVR I 385
ANIS : M : DIE (12 d.) . . . . .	ICVR III 9226
ANN : DIE (21 d.) . . . . .	Ro I 1536
ANN : DIE (10 d.) . . . . .	ICVR I 737
ANN : DIE (46 d.) . . . . .	ICVR I 2902
ANN : M : DIE (10 d.) . . . . .	ICVR II 4488
ANN : MEN : DIE (7 d.) . . . . .	Ro I 1014
ANN : MENS : DIE (13 d.) . . . . .	ICVR III 8892
ANNIS : MES : DIE (23 d.) . . . . .	ICVR I 3460
ANNOS : MENSIS : DIE (12 d.) . . . . .	ICVR I 3858
ANNVM : DIE (20 d.) . . . . .	ICVR I 3860
ANOS : DIE (23 d.) . . . . .	SICV 148
M : DIE (28 d.) . . . . .	SICV 8
ME : DIE (7 d.) . . . . .	ICVR III 8768

As appears from this list there are somewhat more instances where *DIE = dies* than where *DIE = die* (ablative) or *diem*. On the other hand it is impossible to decide where *DIE* is intended as an ablative singular and where one must expect a suspension for *diem*. One indication that *DIE* in a number of the instances enumerated above should be understood as an ablative is that 5 instances of *ANNIS* and 1 of *ANNO* appear in this group but only one written out *ANNOS*. No real certainty can be reached if we bear in mind the usual confusion of cases and that *MENSES* and *MESES* appear in 2 of these instances.

In our material we have only 2 instances of *DIEM*. In the first (*ANNOS : DIEM; Ro I 1581*) the accusative singular is clearly meant. The second (*ANNORVM : MESIS : DIEM; ICVR III 9008 = Diehl 3535*) is more complicated. The number of days here is 21. Diehl, *Inscr. III, Index XII*, p. 513, interprets this *DIEM* as singularis pro pluralis. In itself this interpretation is possible (see e.g. this paper, p. 16) but bearing in mind that also in Diehl's work this is the only example of it happening with *dies* it would seem to me more natural to interpret it as a contraction. Thus: *ANNORVM SEX ET NOVE MESIS, XXI DIE(ru)M*, because *DIEM* is the last word on the titulus, which indicates a lack of space.

*DIIS, DIS*

What has been said above about *ME(N)SIS* applies almost equally well to these forms. Here it is even more possible than in the question of *ME(N)SIS* that we have a *lapsus marmorarii* or an unclear reading. Only in one instance can the form *DIIS* have been chosen for harmony in *homoioteleuton*: *ANNVS : MESESIS : DIIS (Ro I 749)*.

*DIERV, ΔEYPΩN, DIERV, DIER, (DIRVS), DIR, DIO*

These forms appear in our material:

ANNORVM : DIERV	ICVR I 3527
ANNOYΩPΩM : MHΣΩPΩN : ΔEYPΩN	Ro I 11
ANNORV : DIERV	ICVR I 3115
ANNORV : MESORV : DIERV	ICVR I 2386
ANN : MENS : DIER	ICVR III 8850
ANNIS : M : DIRVS	ICVR I 2131
ANNORVM : MS : DIR	ICVR III 8848
MES : DIO	ICVR I 2961

Of the forms recorded above *DIRVS* is clearly a miswriting (or misreading) of *DIBVS*, while *DIO* is most probably, as *Diehl 3999 A* suggests, a suspension for *diorum*. Except for *DIRVS* the above are at the same time examples of the genitive plural of the different forms of *dies* in our material.

*C. The Confusing of Cases*

As is shown in the above list, pp. 10—14, a confusion of cases between the accusative and the ablative occurs in our material. This confusion is familiar also from the pagan tituli. G. Konjetzny, *De idiotismis syntacticis in titulis latinis urbanis* (CIL VI) conspicuis in *Archiv f. lat. Lexikogr. u. Gramm.* XV, p. 297 ff., has grouped together the mixed forms and given the rate of frequency for them. This grouping includes only the correctly written out forms. For the sake of comparison a similar grouping can be made on the basis of our material, in connection with which it should be noted that the number of hours has not been discussed:

	CIL VI	Our material
ANNIS : MENSES : DIES (HORAS)	120	13
ANNIS : MENSES : DIEBVS } or MENSES : DIEBVS }	17	3
ANNIS : MENSIBVS : DIES	25	3
MENSIBVS : DIES	3	1
ANNIS : DIEBVS : HORAS	1	—
MENSIBVS : DIES : HORIS	2	1
ANNOS : MENSIBVS	5	—
ANNOS : MENSIBVS : DIEBVS	2	—
ANNOS : DIEBVS	6	1
ANNOS : MENSES : DIEBVS	1	—

E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aeternae*, p. 56, makes a list on the basis of Konjetzny's figures, from which it appears easier to survey the case preference in these mixed forms. This can with advantage be compared with our material, which is still only concerned with the correctly written out forms:

<i>CIL VI</i>	ANNIS	163	MENSIBVS	37	DIEBVS	27
<i>Our material</i>	ANNIS	19	MENSIBVS	5	DIEBVS	4
<i>CIL VI</i>	ANNOS	14	MENSES	138	DIES	150
<i>Our material</i>	ANNOS	1	MENSES	16	DIES	18

The above groupings certainly give a very good idea of the actual confusion of cases in the tituli from the city of Rome but hardly a completely reliable picture of the preferred case in these mixed forms. To get the right figures in this connection even those instances of suspension and contraction, where the case can be determined, must be dealt with. With our material we get the following frequencies, in doing which it should be noted that the singular ME(N)SE and DIE have been omitted, because these can be understood as an ablative equally well as an accusative. Concerning the forms ANI, MENSIS, MESIS and MESSIS see the discussion above, pp. 17—18.

<i>ablative</i>	ANNIS	130	MENSIBVS	8	DIEBVS	7
	ANIS	17	MENSBVS	1	DIEBV	1
	AN AIS	1	MENSIB	1	DIEB	1
	ANNO	6	MESIBVS	1		
		154		11		9
<i>accusative</i>	ANNOS	4	MENSES	43	DIES	101
	ANNVM	1	MENSSES	2	ZIES	1
			MINSE	2	DIIS	1
			MESES	22	DIE (= dies)	3
			MISES	1	DS	1
		5		70		107

Thus:

	<i>years</i>	<i>months</i>	<i>days</i>
<i>ablative</i>	154	11	9
<i>accusative</i>	5	70	107

In 12 instances in our material the genitive is combined with the accusative or the ablative. One can not, naturally, talk here of a mixing of cases

in the literal sense in all the separate instances. The genitive is probably in a number of instances what is known as a partitive genitive. The frequency for the appearance of the different forms is as follows:

genitive — genitive — accusative . . . . .	1
genitive — accusative — genitive . . . . .	1
genitive — accusative . . . . .	4
genitive — accusative — accusative . . . . .	4
genitive — ablative . . . . .	1
ablative — genitive . . . . .	1

Or if we group them together:

<i>genitive</i>	annorum (+ suspensions and	10	ensorum or mensum	3	die[ru]m	1
	contractions)					
<i>accusative</i>		1	menses (and variations)	7	dies	7
<i>ablative</i>	annis		mensibus	—	diebus	2

Of altogether 2.286 tituli with records of age in Latin 164 or 7.2 % show a confusion of cases in the formulae. Of the 164 instances 152 are a mixture of the ablative and accusative and 12 a mixture of the genitive and accusative or ablative.

In fact the confusion of cases occurs more frequently than this. In the figures above I have not dealt at all with the part played by the *petrified nominative* in this connection, which is difficult, if not impossible, to determine. Assuming the instances with AN(N)VS, AN(N)I are reasonably clear it is, on the other hand, almost impossible to decide what case is intended with the *-is* forms of *mensis*. In addition to this it is even possible that DIES is itself a petrified nominative. On this point it suffices to note that the confusion of cases covers in effect the whole scale of case-endings.

#### D. Case Preference

Concerning the case preference in the mixed formulae one can easily draw the conclusion that the preferred case in the records of age is on the whole characterized according to the scheme *annis : menses : dies*. An analysis of all the formulae without considering the combinations gives this picture of the case preference:

<i>accusative</i>	ANNOS	327	MENSES	124	DIES	273
	ANNΩΣ	1	MENSSES	4	ΔΙΗΣ	1
	ANOS	17	MENSENS	1	DIAES	2
	ANNES	1	MINSES	3	ZIES	1
	ANNO	6 <sup>1</sup>	MENSEM	1	DES	1
	ANO	8 <sup>1</sup>	MENSE	7	DIESI	1
	ANNV	26	MENSSE	2	DIEM	1 <sup>5</sup>
	ANV	7	MESES	58	DIE	14 <sup>6</sup>
	ANNVM	22	MESSES	1	DIS	1
	ANVM	7	MISES	3	DIIS	5
			MESE	4 <sup>3</sup>	DS	2
			MESSE	1		
			MESESIS	1		
		422 <sup>2</sup>		209 <sup>4</sup>		302 <sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In this sum are included only forms with a plural meaning and thus *anno* with a suspension of the final -s.

<sup>2</sup> Not included in this figure are ANNVS (165), ANNV = ANNVS (8), ANVS (16) and ANV = ANNVS (2).

<sup>3</sup> Only plural forms are included in this figure.

<sup>4</sup> Not included in this total are the singular forms MENSE, MESE and MESI, which can be interpreted either as the accusative or ablative singular. There are 8 of them, including one without any information about the number of months. Also missing in this total amount are the forms MENSIS (47), MENSIS (1), MESIS (34), ΜΗΣΙΣ (1), MESSIS (2) and MESESIS (1).

<sup>5</sup> Concerning this number see the previous discussion on pp. 19 f.

<sup>6</sup> In this number only plural forms are included.

<sup>7</sup> Not included in this figure are the singular DIE, which can be accusative or ablative. There are 11 of them including one without any information as to the number of days.

<i>ablative</i>	ANNIS	450	MENSIBVS	30	DIEBVS	43
	ANIS	57	MENSIBVS	1	DIAEBVS	2
	ANIIS	1	MENSBVS	1	DIBVS	4
	ANAIS	1	MESIBVS	6	DIEBV	1
	ANNO	15	MENSIB	7	DIEB	9
	ANO	2	MESIB	1	DIB	2
			ΜΗΣΙΒΟΣ	1	DEBVS	1
		526		47 <sup>1</sup>		62 <sup>2</sup>
<i>genitive</i>	ANNORVM	47	MENSORVM	4	DIERV	1
	ANNOYΩΡΩΜ	1	ΜΗΣΩΡΩΝ	1	ΔΕΥΡΩΝ	1
	ANNORO	7	MESORVM	1	DIERV	1
	ANNORV	10	MESORV	2	DIER	1
	ANORO	6	MENSVM	3	DIRV	1
	ANNOR	5	MESIVM	1	DIR	1
	ANORVM	4			DIEM	
	ANORV	3			(= <i>dierum</i> )	1
	ANOR	1			DIO(rum)	1
	ANNI	2				
	ANNO(rum)	2				
	ANO(rum)	2				
		130		12		8

<sup>1</sup> See above, note 3.

<sup>2</sup> See above, note 6.

If we group this information together we thus get:

	years	in %	months	in %	days	in %
accusative .....	422	39,1	209	78,0	302	81,2
ablative .....	526	48,8	47	17,5	62	16,7
genitive .....	130	12,1	12	4,5	8	2,1

Thus on the basis of this study we can state that the *normal form* with *vixit* in our material was *annis : menses : dies*; that *annos* is an alternative to *annis* when considering which was preferred but that the ablative forms *mensibus, diebus* have given way in favour of the accusatives *menses, dies*. Perhaps one can venture to say that this is connected not so much with harmony in the final syllables as Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aeternae*, p. 56, maintains was the reason but rather the fact that the forms in *-ibus* and *-ebus* were too long and clumsy, especially in an epigraphic connection. The shorter forms are more usable for lapidary usage.

As against this we see a preference for the accusative with *vixit*, if we deal only with those instances where the accusative and ablative have been used constantly in the three parts, that is, for the years, months and days. Then we get 59 instances with the accusative constantly in the three parts and only 15 instances with a constant ablative.

### III. THE EXACTNESS OF THE RECORDS OF AGE

#### A. The Exactness of the Records of Years

##### a. P(lus) M(inus)

For the sake of lucidity I have brought together under this heading all the material that concerns the sign PM, consequently also all those instances where P(lus) M(inus) stands with years and months and with years, months and days.

The material for PM with records of years alone is presented most clearly in the form of a table (*Table 3*). Concerning PM and age formulae see, pp. 14—15.

Table 3. *P(lus) M(inus) with Years*

	number PM	their average age	PM in % of all records of years	number of PM's with year in 5's and 10's	in % of all PM's <sup>1</sup>
4th century ....	58	42,0	37,7	35 (10+25)	60,3 (17,2+43,1)
5th century ....	65	40,6	54,2	38 (13+25)	58,5 (20,0+38,5)
6th century ....	61	45,0	75,3	40 (14+26)	65,6 (23,0+42,6)
All the dateable tituli .....	184	42,5	51,8	113 (37+76)	61,5 (20,1+41,4)
ICVR I + Ro I Appendix II..	104	38,2	21,1	70 (24+46)	67,3 (23,1+44,2)
ICVR II ....	52	34,7	29,2	40 (12+28)	76,9 (23,1+53,8)
ICVR III ....	22	43,5	10,5	18 (8+10)	81,8 (36,4+45,4)
All the undate- able tituli in	178	37,8	20,2	128 (44+84)	71,9 (24,7+47,2)
All the tituli ICVR .....	362	40,2	29,3	241 (81+160)	66,5 (22,3+44,2)
SICV .....	5	31,2	10,4	3 (1+2)	60,0 (20,0+40,0)
Our material ..	367	40,0	28,6	244 (82+162)	66,4 (22,4+44,0)

<sup>1</sup> The first number in parentheses is given in multiples of 5, the second in 10's.

On the basis of this study we can thus state the following:

— Firstly, PM with the years does not only indicate that the number of years is approximate in this connection, but that also the number of months and days has been left out. Also the records of years have often been rounded off to multiples of 10 or 5, a number of which can probably be accounted for by shortage of space. (Less room is needed to write XX than XXV, DECEM than DVODECIM.)

— Secondly, by far the greatest number of tituli with the sign PM is found on the dated inscriptions, which in its turn should be noted bearing in mind that the dated inscriptions are distinguished by a somewhat lesser degree of exactness for records of age than is the case with the undated tituli. One can already here generalise by saying that the dated tituli are more 'date-minded' than 'age-minded' (see in this connection *Table 5*, p. 35). *ICVR III*, with tituli from, in the first place, the Domitilla Catacomb have a conspicuously small number of PM's.

— Thirdly, the use of PM increases gradually from the 4th until the 6th century so that during the 6th century, 314 of all the dated tituli with the age given in years bear the sign PM.



— To this can be added besides that the first dated PM with only years (*Ro I 30*) dates from the year 307 and is found in a Greek titulus. The first dateable PM in a Latin titulus in our material (*Ro I 38*) is from the year 330. During the latter half of the 4th century this sign begins to be more usual in our material. (Concerning the average age with PM and the year see *Table 3*, p. 26.)

Our material includes 18 instances of *PM with the years and months*. Of these 7 are dated. The earliest example is from the year 376, the latest from the year 490. Just in these three instances (*Ro I 194*, *893*, and *SICV 28*) the reservation PM indubitably refers to the number of months (ANNOS XXVII ET MENSES PLVS MINVS VIII, PM MENSES III, and ANNIS XXXVII MENSES PM IIII). Further PV MINVS, *ICVR III 6918*, manifestly refers to the number of months.

With the remaining 14 instances it is more difficult to decide if PM refers to the years or the number of months. P(lus) M(inus) stands in these cases between the year's formula and the number of years, as for example in ANN PM QVADRAGINTA MENSES SEPTE (*ICVR I 3627*).

I list here these 14 instances of *PM with years and months*:

<i>Ro I 214</i>	:	30	years ?	months
<i>Ro I 535</i>	:	26	»	6 »
<i>Ro I 1308</i>	:	26	»	? »
<i>Ro I 1645</i>	:	2	»	4 »
<i>ICVR I 988</i>	:	5	»	5 »
<i>ICVR I 1411</i>	:	31	»	? »
<i>ICVR I 2034</i>	:	18	»	? »
<i>ICVR I 2826</i>	:	32	»	2 »
<i>ICVR I 3383</i>	:	12	»	3 »
<i>ICVR I 3627</i>	:	40	»	7 »
<i>ICVR II 6063</i>	:	33	»	3 »
<i>ICVR III 8953/4</i>	:	25	»	4 »
<i>ICVR III 9029</i>	:	5	»	? »
<i>ICVR III 9347</i>	:	35	»	2 »

Of these there are thus 6 (= 42,8 %) instances where the number of years is given in multiples of 5 and 10. This percentage is appreciably smaller than the corresponding number with PM and only the years, and is not much larger than would be foreseen with a natural distribution of multiples of 5 and 10. To this is added that the distribution between multiples of 5 (4 times) and 10 (2 times) does not correspond to the percentual distribution with PM and years (see *Table 3*, p. 26). The number of instances of multiples of 5 and 10 years with PM and years and months is, relatively speaking, not so great that their occurrence can not be explained because

the comparative scantiness of the material is not entirely representative. Hence a study based on this does not give any indication whether PM in this instance should refer to the number of years.

The known number of months is, according to the above: 2 months (2 instances), 3 months (2 instances), 4 months (2 instances), 5 months (1 instance), 6 months (1 instance) and 7 months (1 instance).

Thus we can establish that PM with years and months, even in those instances where the sign PM stands in immediate connection with the number of years, is not intended to indicate that the age is approximate in any other connection than that the exact number of years is accompanied by a more or less approximate number of months.

The average age for those 14 instances of PM with years and months is 23, 1 years, and thus noticeably lower than with PM and only the years (see *Table 3*, p. 26).

I note here the 16 instances of *PM with the age in years, months and days* that occur in our material:

<i>Ro I 229</i>	:	4	years	7	months	5	days
<i>Ro I 239</i>	:	25	»	1	»	5	»
<i>Ro I 250</i>	:	8	»	?	»	15	»
<i>Ro I 356</i>	:	28	»	5	»	15	»
<i>Ro I 683</i>	:	20	»	0	»	19	»
<i>Ro I 835</i>	:	11	»	0	»	?	»
<i>Ro I 900</i>	:	54	»	6	»	13	»
<i>Ro I 903</i>	:	48	»	0	»	20	»
<i>Ro I 1591</i>	:	25	»	0	»	27	»
<i>ICVR I 606</i>	:	4	»	11	»	16	»
<i>ICVR I 1706</i>	:	50	»	5	»	7	»
<i>ICVR I 1713</i>	:	41	»	3	»	5	»
<i>ICVR I 2793</i>	:	50	»	?	»	8	»
<i>ICVR I 3422</i>	:	25	»	2	»	4	»
<i>ICVR I 3536</i>	:	30	»	5	»	1	»
<i>ICVR II 6125</i>	:	9	»	0	»	63	»

Here it is very clear that the approximation — where such is intended — alludes to the number of days and not to the years and months. This is apparent if one deals with the number of days specified. In 6 (= 37,5 %) of these 16 tituli the number of days has been given in multiples of 5 and 10. This is also normal when giving the age in years, months and days, without the sign PM (see p. 36).

We can thus summarize the use of the sign PM in this way:

— Firstly, PM with the years alone refers to an approximate age, most usually given to the nearest 5 and 10 years.

— Secondly, PM with years and months and with years, months and days is as a rule redundant, while the number of years with which the sign

stands can most often be taken as given exactly. Where an approximation is intended it concerns the last item in the formula of age.

*b. The exactness of the years*

The material is presented most clearly in the form of a table. It should be especially pointed out that in this material are also included the ages with the prefix PM:

Table 4. *The Exactness of the Years*

	number	average age in years	age in multiples of 5 and 10	in % of all ages <sup>1</sup>
4th century.....	154	35,8	80 (35+45)	51,9 (22,7+29,2)
5th century.....	120	35,8	45 (17+28)	37,5 (14,2+23,3)
6th century.....	81	43,7	49 (18+31)	60,5 (22,2+38,3)
All the dateable tituli	355	37,6	174 (70+104)	49,0 (19,7+29,3)
ICVR I + Ro I				
Appendix II .....	493	31,3	230 (90+140)	46,7 (18,3+28,4)
ICVR II .....	178	28,9	89 (35+54)	50,0 (19,7+30,3)
ICVR III .....	209	28,2	82 (43+39)	39,2 (20,6+18,6)
All the undateable tituli .....	880	30,1	401 (168+233)	45,6 (19,1+26,5)
All the tituli in ICVR.....	1.235	32,2	575 (238+337)	46,6 (19,3+27,3)
SICV .....	48	26,9	21 (9+12)	43,8 (18,8+25,0)
Our material .....	1,283	32,1	596 (247+349)	46,5 (19,3+27,2)

<sup>1</sup> The first figure in parentheses is in multiples of 5, the second in multiples of 10.

From this we can thus state the following:

— Firstly, ages without PM are more exact than the years and a PM. The rounding off to the nearest multiple of 5 or 10 also occurs where the age is given without PM, but to a lesser extent than where it is with the sign PM.

— Secondly, there is a strikingly large number of ages without PM in the nearest multiple of 10 in the 4th century. This suggests the development: firstly the ages were rounded off to the nearest multiple of 5 and 10 without the reservation PM during the first half of the 4th century. From the beginning of the 350's practically all numbers rounded off in this way were supplied with a PM (cf. p. 14).

— Thirdly, *ICVR III*, in which the material is mainly taken from the Domitilla Catacomb, also deviates somewhat here from the prevailing pattern, as was the case with the PM (see *Table 3* and p. 26 f.). Relatively speaking, the number of ages given in 5's and 10's is least frequent here, and the multiples of 5 predominate.

— Fourthly, nearly half of all the ages are given in 5's and 10's, which shows that ages were generally rounded off. (Concerning the average age for the ages given see *Table 4*, p. 29.)

The figures in *Table 4* above should be compared with those given by H. Armini, *Sepulcralia* on the Italian tituli in *CIL* among which are included 858 Christian ones (152 Christian ones from Rome).<sup>1</sup> Armini does not mention what percent of all the tituli with only information as to age have the age given in multiples of 5 and 10 years, but this can be worked out on the basis of the figures he has given.

If we now list these and compare them with our material, we get the following arrangement:

	years in multiples of 5 and 10 in % of all the records of age
<i>CIL</i> (Italy) . . . . .	46,7 (20,0+26,7)
<i>Our material</i> . . . . .	46,3 (19,2+27,1)

Armini has also shown<sup>2</sup> that the tituli in his material from the city of Rome are more exact in this connection than tituli from the rest of Italy. On the basis of our study we can thus now establish that the Christian tituli from the city of Rome are less exact on the question of ages than are the pagan tituli from the city of Rome, and that the Roman Christian tituli in this respect do on the whole follow the custom of pagan tituli from the rest of Italy.

#### *B. The Exactness of the Number of Months*

If we deal only with the tituli where the age is given in years and months (or only in months) we get the following sequence for the number of months:

number of months	number of tituli	number of months	number of tituli
1	10	7	51
2	54	8	44
3	41	9	26
4	57	10	32
5	53	11	30
6	52		

<sup>1</sup> See H. Armini, *Sepulcralia*, p. 120 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 13.

These numbers should be compared with those given by H. Armini, *Conlectanea*, p. 14, for the pagan tituli from the city of Rome in *CIL*. Armini gives the highest figure for 6 months, 152 instances, which amounts to 14,1 % of all the figures for months. The corresponding figure for our material (*ICVR* + *SICV*) is 11,5 %, which suggests that the Christian tituli to a lesser extent than the pagan considered half a year as a unit of time. This should not necessarily imply that the Christian tituli are more exact than the pagan ones on the question of the number of months. The number 1—5 months amounts in our material to 47,8 % of all these figures for the months. Armini gives the corresponding figure for the pagan tituli as 43,1 %. The number 7—11 months amounts in our material to 40,7 %, in the pagan material from the city of Rome the corresponding figure is 42,8 %. The tendency is thus in this case the same both in the pagan and the Christian tituli but more noticeable in the latter. Especially noteworthy compared with the pagan material is the comparatively large number of Christian tituli that give the number of months as 1 or 2. Armini has only 16 tituli with 1 month and 98 tituli with 2 months. Presumably the pagan tituli in this case gave the number of days while the Christians were content to give the number of months.

To sum up it can thus be noted that with the Christian tituli from the city of Rome we see a slight and yet noticeable shift to a lesser degree of exactness on the question of the number of months as compared with the pagan tituli from the city of Rome.

Lastly, it should be noted in this connection that the Christian tituli, like the pagan, gave the number of months up to 12 or more. This happened, as Armini, *Sepulcralia*, p. 7, points out, for reasons of space. Examples of this occur in our material according to the following:

13 months . . . . .	<i>ICVR I 1571</i>
15 months . . . . .	<i>Ro I 1076</i>
17 months . . . . .	<i>ICVR I 268</i>
18 months . . . . .	<i>ICVR I 2720</i>
32 months . . . . .	<i>ICVR I 2978</i>
34 months . . . . .	<i>ICVR II 4336</i>

In all these 6 instances the number of years is not given. Armini makes note of 8 Italian tituli of this type from *CIL*. Bearing in mind that our material is considerably smaller we can thus say that this way of writing increased among the Christian tituli.

Besides this there appears in our material 1 instance where this way of giving the number of months is combined with a figure for the number of years:

*ICVR I 980* : 11 years 17 months

Out of the whole of his material (*CIL*, Italian tituli) Armini quotes only 3 instances of this type, of which, in addition, two are from Rome.

### *C. The Exactness of the Number of Days*

In the same way as Armini, *Conlectanea*, p. 12, I have grouped together the number of days given, and from our material I have got the following grouping:

<i>number of days</i>	<i>number of tituli</i>	<i>number of days</i>	<i>number of tituli</i>
1	22	16	24
2	33	17	17
3	34	18	23
4	39	19	18
5	52	20	45
6	37	21	23
7	45	22	20
8	46	23	28
9	33	24	12
10	45	25	29
11	25	26	21
12	35	27	20
13	37	28	10
14	17	29	7
15	38		

We note that from 1—14 days accounts for 59,9 % and 16—29 days accounts for 35,5 % of the whole number, while the number 15 days is written on 4,6 % of all the tituli with a given (and legible) number of days. The corresponding figures for the pagan tituli from the city of Rome are according to Armini: 53,6 %, 40,1 % and 6,3 %.

The number 15 days is that which appears most often in Armini's material (195 tituli). From this he drew the following conclusion: *Potest fieri, ut Romanis imperatorum aetate viventibus 'quindecim dies' idem fere significaverit quod nunc Italis 'quindici giorni' vel Francogallis 'quinze jours'*. Our study gives no support to this theory. If this were the case it should also be reflected in our material. On the contrary the percentage for *quinze jours* is lower on the Christian inscriptions than on the pagan. Further, a gradual increase in the number of tituli with this number of days among the dated tituli is not observable. From the 4th century we have 7 cases

of this type, but not one example from the 5th and 6th centuries. It seems to me most probable that here also we have the influence of the Roman liking for multiples of 5 and 10 with the days as is clearly reflected in both the pagan and the Christian material, a phenomenon with which we are already familiar from the discussion of the number of years (see *Table 4*, p. 29).

As with the pagan tituli our material also shows that the number 26—29 days is used more seldom. As Armini points out, this figure could with ease be rounded off to 1 month.

Armini has also discussed whether *nundinae* (9 days, 17 days and 25 days) has any significance as a unit of time, and came to the conclusion on the basis of his material that it did not. Possibly one can in fact see in our material some connection between the market days and the fact that the number 9 and 17 days are, compared with the numbers nearest to them, used somewhat less. The number 25 days is a special case in that that number is also a multiple of 5. In any case one can raise the question as to whether the market days, *nundinae*, had such a pagan stamp that they were to some extent avoided by the Christians as a unit of time?

From Armini's figures one can without any doubt draw the conclusion that the pagan Roman tituli to a certain extent treated the seven day week as a unit of time. From our material we do not know if this was the case with the Christian tituli. If only the dated Christian tituli are taken into account it appears to be the reverse, that such a unit of time was avoided. Among all the dated tituli in our material there is only one with the number 7 days, 4 with 14 days and 3 with 21 days, while the numbers, close to these occur more numerously. Did the Christians even avoid the 7 day week as a unit of time?

We can thus establish that the information on the Christian inscriptions as to the number of days was possibly somewhat less exact than that of the corresponding pagan ones. Also that the number of days, where they have been rounded off, have been so to the nearest multiple of 5 or 10, and that other units of time seem to have been more or less avoided.

Finally those tituli will be quoted where the age has been given in figures of 30 days or over. This list can be compared with the corresponding one for *CIL* (Italian tituli) in Armini, *Sepulcralia*, p. 7. Also here (cf. what has been said above, p. 31, on months) this phenomenon appears, relatively speaking, more often on Christian than on pagan tituli:

30 : ICVR I 385, 405, 1601, 1829, 2155, 2625, 2897, 3323, 3694, 3702;

ICVR II 4582, 5947

31 : ICVR I 1301, 4087; ICVR II 4335



- 32 : *ICVR I* 24, 1614; *ICVR III* 6968, 9133  
 34 : *ICVR I* 844  
 35 : *Ro I* 509; *ICVR I* 3538; *ICVR II* 5312  
 36 : *ICVR I* 838; *ICVR III* 8901  
 37 : *ICVR II* 5633; *ICVR III* 8766  
 38 : *ICVR I* 2355  
 39 : *ICVR I* 3556  
 40 : *Ro I* 1085; *ICVR I* 2138, 2330, 2437, 2791; *SICV* 284  
 41 : *Ro I* 731; *ICVR I* 296, 2013, 3571  
 43 : *ICVR I* 1636; *SICV* 265  
 44 : *ICVR I* 2686; *ICVR III* 7697  
 45 : *ICVR III* 9129; *SICV* 195  
 46 : *ICVR I* 2902  
 48 : *ICVR II* 4307  
 49 : *ICVR I* 2581; *ICVR II* 4545; *ICVR III* 8883, 9239  
 50 : *ICVR I* 2703  
 54 : *Ro I* 1494  
 55 : *Ro I* 41; *ICVR III* 7803  
 56 : *ICVR I* 3737  
 59 : *Ro I* 219  
 61 : *SICV* 95  
 63 : *ICVR I* 4018; *ICVR II* 6125  
 87 : *ICVR III* 7703  
 93 : *Ro I* 1457  
 108 : *ICVR I* 3675  
 343 : *ICVR I* 866

#### *D. The Exactness in General of the Records of Age*

Of greater interest than the exactness of the separate figures for years, months and days is the study of what principles apply when the Roman Christian tituli give the age in years, years and months, and years, months and days. *Table 5* illustrates the frequency of these formulae as to age in percentage.

We can on the basis of these figures note (cf. p. 26) afresh that the dated tituli are less exact on the question of age than are the undateable. Further, there is a not unmeaningful divergence between the different Catacombs in this connection (cf. *ICVR II* with *ICVR III*). These circumstances seem to indicate that *marmorarii* and not only the deceased's relations had an influence on how exactly the age was given, and that in the different Catacombs they had developed their own usages in this connection.

These figures set forth here ought now to be compared with those left by Armini on the basis of the material in *CIL*. I on p. 35 list Armini's figures in *Sepulcralia*, pp. 10, 12 and 13, with the final figures in our material.



Table 5. The Exactness of the Figures relating to Age

	years		years, months		years, months, days		total no. of tituli
	number	in % of all tituli	number	in % of all tituli	number	in % of all tituli	
2nd century	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
3rd century	1	—	—	—	9	—	10
4th century	155	41,5	70	18,7	149	39,8	374
5th century	120	67,2	22	12,4	36	20,1	178
6th century	81	75,7	5	4,7	21	19,6	107
All the date- able tituli...	358	53,5	97	14,3	215	32,1	670
ICVR I + Ro I Appen- dix II ....	493	40,9	255	21,1	459	38,0	1.207
ICVR II...	178	53,0	61	18,1	97	28,9	336
ICVR III	209	39,8	120	22,9	196	37,3	525
All the un- dateable tit.	880	42,5	436	21,1	752	36,4	2.068
All the tituli in ICVR...	1.238	45,2	533	19,4	967	35,3	2.738
SICV ....	48	37,5	28	21,9	51	41,6	127
Our mat. ...	1.286	44,9	561	19,6	1.018	35,6	2.865

	years	years, months	years, months, days
CIL (the whole of Italy) . . . . .	53 %	12 %	33 %
CIL (Rome) . . . . .	50 %	12 %	36 %
CIL (Christians, the whole of Italy) . . . . .	57 %	13 %	28 %
Our material . . . . .	44,9 %	19,6 %	35,6 %

On the basis of his material Armini arrives at the following conclusion: *Christianorum aetates paulo neglegentius quam ceterorum scribi*. It is clear that Armini's material, which includes 858 Christian tituli (*op. cit.* p. 121), was rather too limited for this conclusion. On the contrary, our study shows that the Roman Christian tituli are more exact about ages than are the pagan, both the Italian and the Roman pagan ones.

As regards the exactness of the information about age Armini notes (*op. cit.* p. [11 and] 13), without mentioning any figures, that there is no noteworthy difference between the sexes: *Constat igitur feminarum aetates, si quidem adscribuntur, eadem vel maiore diligentia ac virorum notari*.

The figures from our material are as follows:

Table 6. *Exactness of the Age according to Sex*

	years					years, months					years, months, days				
	M	%	F	%	?	M	%	F	%	?	M	%	F	%	?
2nd century	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3rd century	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	7	—	—
4th century	74	43,0	68	39,6	13	28	16,3	30	17,8	12	70	40,7	72	42,6	7
5th century	56	62,5	44	69,8	20	15	17,0	5	8,0	2	19	20,5	14	22,2	3
6th century	42	77,8	22	73,3	17	2	3,7	—	—	3	10	18,5	8	26,7	3
All the date- able tituli . .	172	54,1	136	49,8	50	45	14,2	35	12,9	17	101	31,8	101	37,6	13
ICVR I + Ro I															
Appendix II	230	40,5	225	40,2	38	119	20,9	114	20,3	22	219	38,6	221	39,5	19
ICVR II . .	80	48,5	70	51,9	28	39	23,6	18	13,3	4	46	27,8	47	34,8	4
ICVR III. .	95	36,7	84	38,9	30	63	24,3	49	22,6	8	101	39,0	83	38,4	12
All the undateable tituli . . . . .	405	40,8	379	41,6	96	221	22,3	181	19,9	34	366	36,9	351	38,5	35
All the tituli in ICVR	577	44,1	515	43,5	146	266	20,3	216	18,3	51	467	35,6	452	38,2	48
SICV. . . . .	11	22,9	33	47,1	4	15	31,3	11	16,2	2	22	47,8	27	38,2	2
Our material	588	43,3	548	43,8	150	281	20,8	227	18,2	53	489	36,0	479	38,0	50

We can thus establish that there does not appear to be in this connection any difference between the pagan and the Christian material. The ages of the males and the females are mentioned with an almost equal degree of exactness; the exactness is only slightly greater for the females than for the males.

Lastly the question of how far the age itself has influenced the exactness of the particulars as to age should be dealt with. A measuring stick for this is the average age for the different forms of giving the age (years; years, months; years, months, days). This is shown in *table 7*.

We note that the average age gradually decreases from *PM and year* until *years and months*. On the other hand it is again in general somewhat higher with *years, months and days* than with only *years and months*. This in its turn is because the more exact particular as to age in years, months and days was not only reserved for younger people but was used also for those

Table 7. *The Average Age*<sup>1</sup>

	<i>with PM and years</i>	<i>with years<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>with years, months<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>with years, months, days<sup>4</sup></i>
<i>4th century . . . .</i>	42,0	35,8	20,9	19,7
<i>5th century . . . .</i>	40,6	35,8	22,3	25,5
<i>6th century . . . .</i>	44,9	43,7	37,2	18,1
<i>All the dateable tituli . . . . .</i>	42,5	37,6	22,1	20,6
<i>ICVR I + Ro I Appendix II . . . .</i>	38,2	31,3	14,3	16,7
<i>ICVR II . . . . .</i>	34,7	28,9	16,9	18,7
<i>ICVR III . . . . .</i>	43,5	28,2	14,3	14,8
<i>All the undateable tituli . . . . .</i>	37,8	30,1	14,7	16,5
<i>All the tituli in ICVR . . . . .</i>	40,2	32,2	16,0	17,4
<i>SICV . . . . .</i>	31,2	26,9	13,9	13,1
<i>Our material . . . .</i>	40,0	32,1	15,9	17,2

<sup>1</sup> This is the actual average age (not the calculated median), where the most extreme values have been included.

<sup>2</sup> In these figures are included also PM with years.

<sup>3</sup> In these figures are also included PM with years and months.

<sup>4</sup> In these figures are also included PM with years, months and days.

of advanced age: for children but also for old people the age was given in years, months and days.

This was not the case with the pagan tituli, as Armini (*op. cit.* p. 11) has shown. He has dealt with the particulars as to age where the age of the deceased was more than 50 years. If we compare our figures with those of Armini we get the following:

	<i>years</i>	<i>years, months</i>	<i>years, months, days</i>
<i>CIL (Italy) . . . . .</i>	80 %	5 %	14 %
<i>Our material . . . . .</i>	68,7 %	9,2 %	22,1 %

We can accordingly note that the Christian tituli are more exact in giving particulars as to age where it is an advanced age than are the corresponding pagan ones. Why is this? Is it because our material covers the

tituli from the city of Rome while Armini's figures refer to the whole of Italy, or in other words that the divergence is due to the different areas studied? We have already noted (p. 47) that Armini found, on the basis of his material, that the pagan tituli from the city of Rome were more exact in their particulars than tituli from the rest of Italy. Or is this divergence due to the fact that Armini's material was predominantly pagan, ours Christian? This last would seem to me the most probable. We have already (p. 55) noted that the Christian particulars as to age from the city of Rome are more exact than the pagan, if we consider the percentaged distribution for the particulars in years, years and months, and years, months and days.<sup>1</sup> We can thus reasonably suppose that this phenomenon can quite simply be an expression of the Christians' greater concern than the pagans' for age. It cannot be denied that a greater degree of exactness seems to denote a greater interest. This so much more in those cases where an older person's age is given with the same exactness as a little child's. One cannot naturally entirely dismiss the possibility that the larger Christian grave plaques compared with the smaller pagan ones can have contributed to this development.

#### IV. MORTALITY AND LENGTH OF LIFE

##### A. Average Length of Life

The average length of life that can be calculated on the basis of the records of age on the inscriptions has occasioned some considerable interest. This interest has in the main concerned the pagan tituli from different geographical areas including Rome: The average length of life has not previously been worked out from the records of age on the Christian tituli from the city of Rome. This is shown for the sexes and with the total in Table 8, arrived at on the basis of our material.

The particulars as to age on the tituli from the city of Rome have been studied by A. de Marchi in 1903<sup>2</sup>, W. R. Macdonell in 1913<sup>3</sup>, H. Armini in 1916<sup>4</sup> and L. Moretti in 1959.<sup>5</sup> De Marchi's information is based on 8193

<sup>1</sup> On the other hand the Christian particulars as to age in Rome are somewhat less exact than the corresponding pagan ones from the city of Rome. See p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> A. de Marchi, Cifre di mortalità nelle iscrizioni romane in *Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere* 36 (1903), pp. 1025—1034.

<sup>3</sup> W. R. Macdonell, On the Expectation of Life in Ancient Rome, and in the Provinces of Hispania and Lusitania, and Africa in *Biometrika* 9 (1913), pp. 366—380.

<sup>4</sup> H. Armini, *Sepulcralia Latina* (doctoral thesis). Göteborg, 1916.

<sup>5</sup> L. Moretti, Statistica demografia ed epigrafia: Durata media della vita in Roma Imperiale in *Epigrafica* 21 (1959), pp. 60—78.

Table 8. *Average Length of Life*

	<i>Male</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>?</i>	<i>Total</i>	
	<i>number</i>	<i>average no. of years</i>	<i>number</i>	<i>average no. of years</i>	<i>number</i>	<i>number</i>	<i>average no. of years</i>
<i>2nd century ..</i>	—	—	1	—	—	1	—
<i>3rd century ..</i>	2	—	8	—	—	10	—
<i>4th century ..</i>	172	29,1	170	24,3	32	374	26,7
<i>5th century ..</i>	90	31,2	63	30,8	25	178	31,5
<i>6th century ..</i>	54	39,1	30	34,4	23	107	38,3
<i>all the date- able tituli ....</i>	318	31,3	272	26,6	80	670	29,6
<i>ICVRI + Ro I</i>							
<i>Appendix II</i>	568	22,0	560	20,9	79	1.207	22,0
<i>ICVR II ....</i>	165	22,6	135	24,7	36	336	23,7
<i>ICVR III ..</i>	259	20,4	216	18,7	50	525	19,8
<i>All the undate- able tituli ....</i>	992	21,7	911	20,9	165	2.068	21,6
<i>All the tituli in ICVR ....</i>	1.310	24,1	1.183	22,1	245	2.738	23,6
<i>SICV .....</i>	48	17,6	71	19,4	8	127	19,1
<i>Our material</i>	1.358	23,4	1.254	22,0	253	2.865	23,4

tituli with records of age. Though unable to trace de Marchi's paper, Macdonell gave an account of the records of age on 8065 (of which 4575 were for males and 3490 for females) pagan tituli from the city of Rome. Armini, whose work seems in a striking way to have completely eluded the other scholars in this field, based his very extensive study on, among other things, 9496 pagan tituli from the city of Rome. Finally, de Marchi's and Macdonell's studies have been supplemented by Moretti's study of a further 1174 pagan tituli from the city of Rome (of which 722 were for males and 452 for females).

Of these only Moretti has calculated the average length of life both for the sexes separately and for the total number. Macdonell gives only the total average length of life, but fails to give them for males and females separately. On the basis of the figures he gives one can, however, in a fairly simple way calculate the average length of life for the different sexes. Armini has not given the average length of life and this cannot either, with any claim to precision, be calculated on the basis of the figures he gives. In spite of the fact that Macdonell's and Moretti's figures are somewhat less exact than those that are given in the above table, as Macdonell and Moretti

have rounded off those particulars given with the months and days to only years, which has not been done with the above, their figures can be compared with mine. We get then the following result:

	<i>the average length of life for males</i>	<i>the average length of life for females</i>	<i>the average length of life total</i>
<i>according to Macdonell . . . . .</i>	21,8 years	20,8 years	21,65 years
<i>according to Moretti . . . . .</i>	22,07 »	19,72 »	21,16 »
<i>the whole of our material . . . . .</i>	23,8 »	22,0 »	23,4 »

The conformity of these three studies is, as is seen, striking, even though our study on the whole gives a somewhat higher average length of life. This does not necessarily have to be interpreted as showing that the average length of life, as known from the tituli, is somewhat higher for the Christians than for the pagans in Rome.<sup>1</sup> That which raises the average age in our material are above all the particulars on the dated tituli, where the average length of life is exceptionally high. If we consider only the average length of life as shown in the undateable tituli we get a series that is practically identical with the figures which can be calculated from Macdonell's material, that is to say 21,7 years for males, 20,9 for females and 21,6 years for both the sexes together.

Now we come to the problem as to whether the figures calculated in this way really give the average length of life or if they only give the average age for those whose age was given on the tituli and are thus of purely academic interest. In other words: Is our material representative or not from a demographic point of view? The most weighty arguments in this much discussed field have been put forward by W. F. Willcox<sup>2</sup>, A. R.

<sup>1</sup> I would like just in this connection to draw attention to what A. R. Burn, *Hic brevis vivitur*, p. 6 ff., shows on the basis of his studies of Christian tituli: »We have collected two sizeable groups of Christian ages at death — those, namely, recorded for Africa and for North Italy; and it is interesting to find that among those who could afford tombstones the expectation of life, reckoned from the age of 15, does show an increase. (It is, of course, important to remember that under the late empire the proportion of those who could not or did not afford tombstones was very much larger.) Reckoning from age 10 as a base-line, as I have done in compiling the graphs, this position is masked by the fact that the Christians appear to have set up proportionately more tombstones to children between 10 and 15; an interesting if not surprising variation in social practice. Only when we come to the very old does the Christian population show either less longevity, or, as one may suspect, less of a propensity to exaggeration.»

<sup>2</sup> W. F. Willcox, *The Length of Life in the Roman Empire. A Methodological Note in Congrès international de la population* (Paris, 1937) 2 (Démographie historique), pp. 14—22.

Burn<sup>1</sup>, R. Etienne<sup>2</sup> and Moretti, this last in the paper already referred to.

It has been repeatedly stressed by these writers that the death-rate among babies and children is not fully apparent in our material. This is without doubt right and there here exists indisputably a source of errors in calculating the average length of life. But it has also been pointed out, quite rightly, that neither is the mortality among older people correctly expressed in the non-Christian inscription material.<sup>3</sup>

On the basis of the tables concerning the length of life, below, pp. 43—48, we can perhaps venture to state that both the infant mortality and the mortality among older people can be seen more clearly in the Christian material than in the non-Christian, though also here we find these two great sources of error represented.

Moretti, referring to W. Lexis' curve, has succeeded, in my view, in making it very plausible that these sources of error do on the whole cancel each other out. In other words we may count on the fact that the average length of life in Imperial Rome was less than 25 years.<sup>4</sup> It can hardly be a coincidence that the Christian and the non-Christian material agree so markedly on this point. Rather, I contend that my study strongly supports this thesis of Moretti's.

An argument against this thesis, to a certain extent, is the fact that other geographical areas show a noticeably higher average length of life.<sup>5</sup> R. Etienne lists the following figures for the average length of life in different places in this way:

	for males	for females	total
<i>Hispania</i> . . . . .	37,7 years	34 years	36,2 years
<i>Africa</i> . . . . .	47,4 »	44,1 »	45,2 »
<i>Burdigala</i> . . . . .	37,24 »	34,59 »	35,7 »

I do not intend here to discuss in any detail these interesting differences. I will only point out that the disparities in climate do not alone explain the differences. One must also notice how the social levels of the different geographical regions can be a salient cause of the differences in the average length of life in different places. A higher position in the social scale can conceivably be accompanied by a higher average length of life.

<sup>1</sup> A. R. Burn, *Hic breve vivitur, A Study of the Expectation of Life in the Roman Empire in Past & Present* 4 (1953), pp. 1—31.

<sup>2</sup> R. Etienne, *Démographie et épigraphie in Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina* (Roma, 1957), pp. 415—424.

<sup>3</sup> First by de Marchi, *op. cit.* p. 1032.

<sup>4</sup> L. Moretti, *op. cit.* p. 77: «Io credo pertanto che sia ancora opportuno — malgrado i dinieghi dell' Etienne — tener fermo al dato della communis opinio sulla durata della vita nell' antichità: Sotto i 25 anni.»

<sup>5</sup> This fact was not unimportant in leading W. F. Willcox to throw doubt on earlier calculations as to the average length of life.

It is profitable to study the dated tituli in our material from this stand-point. The dated Christian tituli do, in my view, represent a higher social status than the undated ones. I concede that this is only an hypothesis based on a general impression, and that this question is worth a closer investigation. But there seem to be so many arguments that point to this supposition, that it is worth mentioning in this connection. Then we can observe at the same time that the dated tituli show proof of a considerably higher average length of life, which raises the query: Is this an example of a higher average length of life being bound up with a higher social standard? And further: Is the higher average length of life in Hispania, Africa and Burdigala connected at least to some extent with the higher social standard in general?

### *B. Length of Life and Age-groups in Tables*

The particulars as to age on the non-Christian tituli within the different geographical areas have, as already mentioned, been the subject of intensive study. I have above on p. 38 referred to the investigations that have been concerned with the non-Christian tituli from the city of Rome. On the other hand the Christian tituli from different places have been only scantily studied on their own. Armini in *Sepulcralia* — a work that is worth closer attention than it has been given — treats the Christian tituli he found in *CIL* (Italian tituli) as a group on its own. According to Armini's figures these consisted of altogether 858 tituli with particulars as to age, of which only 158 tituli were from Rome (112 for males and 40 for females).<sup>1</sup> Burn has investigated 356 Christian tituli from Africa on the basis of *CIL VIII* and *L'Année Epigraphique*, 1914—1949, as well as 191 Christian tituli from Cisalpine Gaul (*CILV*).<sup>2</sup>

In the tables below I have grouped together the material from the whole of *ICVR* and *SICV*. Here I have mainly, in agreement with the practice of modern statistics, divided the material according to age-groups. This has the drawback that one cannot calculate the expectation of life for each separate age-group. I have, however, chosen this method not only because, with Burn, I believe that calculations of this sort are »less useful to the historian than to insurance companies»<sup>3</sup>, but more especially because a division of the age-groups with the mortality calculated for each group separately, according to the sex and the total, is the method that makes possible a direct comparison with the corresponding figures Armini has calculated for the non-Christian tituli from the city of Rome. In this way Armini's 9496 tituli from the city of Rome can be compared with the 2865 tituli in our material, even though the extent of the material is so different.

<sup>1</sup> H. Armini, *op. cit.* pp. 120—121.

<sup>2</sup> A. R. Burn, *op. cit.* pp. 20—21; cf. also p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 18.



Table 9 a. *Length of Life and Age-groups per Century according to the Dated Tituli*

		2nd c.	3rd c.	4th c.		5th c.		6th c.	
		no.	no.	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
0—5 months	M			1	0,6	1	1,1		
	F			1	0,6	1	1,6		
	?				0,5				
6—11 months	M			4	2,3				
	F		1	1	0,6				
	?			1					
1—4 years	M			14	8,2	8	8,9	1	1,9
	F		1	24	14,1	5	7,9	4	13,3
	?			4		2		2	
5—9 years	M		1	18	10,5	9	10,0	4	7,4
	F			23	13,5	5	7,9	2	6,7
	?			2		1		1	
10—14 years	M			11	6,4	7	7,8	5	9,3
	F	1	4	9	5,3	7	11,1	1	3,3
	?			5		4		2	
15—19 years	M			17	9,9	3	3,3	4	7,4
	F		1	15	8,8	2	3,2	1	3,3
	?			3		1		1	
20—24 years	M			21	11,7	8	8,9	3	5,6
	F			18	10,6	8	12,7	1	3,3
	?			3		2		1	
25—29 years	M			15	8,8	3	3,3	3	5,6
	F			24	14,1	5	7,9	3	10,0
	?			1		2		3	
30—34 years	M		1	7	4,1	12	13,3	2	3,7
	F			14	8,2	8	12,7	5	16,7
	?			2		3			
35—39 years	M			11	6,4	9	10,0	2	3,7
	F			11	6,5	6	9,5	2	6,7
	?			3				2	
40—44 years	M			7	4,1	6	6,7	6	11,1
	F			9	5,3	2	3,2	1	6,7
	?			1		1		1	
45—49 years	M			10	5,9	2	2,2	4	7,4
	F			5	2,9	2	3,2	1	3,3
	?			2				3	
50—54 years	M			5	2,9	2	2,2	5	9,3
	F			5	2,9	1	1,6	2	6,7
	?			3		4		2	
55—59 years	M			6	3,5	3	3,3	3	5,6
	F		1	2	1,2	3	4,8	1	3,3
	?				2,1	1			

Table 9 b. *Length of Life and Age-groups per Century according to the Dated Tituli*

	2nd c.		3rd c.		4th c.		5th c.		6th c.	
	no.		no.		no.    %		no.    %		no.    %	
60—64 years	M				5    2,9	3,2	9    10,0	7,9	2    3,7	2,8
	F				5    2,9		3    4,8		1	
	?				2		2			
65—69 years	M				8    4,7	2,1	2    2,2	2,3	5    9,3	6,5
	F						2    3,2		1    3,3	
	?								1	
70—74 years	M				6    3,5	1,6	4    4,5	5,1	2    3,7	3,7
	F						3    4,8		2    6,7	
	?						2			
75—79 years	M				3    1,8	1,1	2    2,2	1,1	1    1,9	1,9
	F				1    0,6				1    3,3	
	?									
80—84 years	M				2    1,2	1,1			1    1,9	1,9
	F				2    1,2					
	?								1	
85—89 years	M									
	F									
	?									
90—94 years	M				1    0,6	0,5			1    1,9	1,9
	F				1    0,6				1    3,3	
	?									
95—99 years	M									
	F									
	?									
100—104 years	M									0,9
	F									
	?								1	
105—109 years	M									1,9
	F									
	?								2	

Table 10 a. *Length of Life and Age-groups according to the Undateable Tituli*

		ICVR I + Ro I App. II		ICVR II		ICVR III		SICV									
		no.	%														
0—5 months	M	5	0,9	1,2			5	1,9	1,7								
	F	8	1,4									4	1,8				
	?	1															
6—11 months	M	9	1,6	2,0	4	2,4	9	3,5	2,8	2	4,2						
	F	15	2,7									6	4,5	6	2,8	2	2,8
	?																
1—4 years	M	126	22,2	20,8	29	17,6	47	18,1	19,6	11	22,9						
	F	115	20,5									15	11,1	46	21,3	15	21,1
	?	10	9														
5—9 years	M	79	13,9	11,8	22	13,3	44	17,0	18,7	8	16,7						
	F	57	10,2									13	9,6	40	18,5	13	18,3
	?	7	3														
10—14 years	M	45	7,9	7,7	17	10,3	18	7,0	8,0	3	6,2						
	F	48	8,6									9	6,7	19	8,8	4	5,7
	?		2														
15—19 years	M	41	7,2	7,7	8	4,9	18	7,0	8,0	4	8,4						
	F	45	8,0									14	10,6	21	9,7	9	12,7
	?	7	2														
20—24 years	M	51	9,0	9,7	15	9,1	26	10,0	7,8	6	12,5						
	F	59	10,5									15	11,1	13	6,0	1	1,4
	?	7	2														
25—29 years	M	37	6,5	7,7	17	10,3	14	5,4	5,7	3	6,2						
	F	47	8,4									13	9,6	14	6,5	7	9,7
	?	9	4														
30—34 years	M	43	7,6	7,9	15	9,1	23	8,9	7,0	2	4,2						
	F	43	7,7									16	11,9	12	5,6	7	9,7
	?	10	6														
35—39 years	M	26	4,6	5,8	7	4,3	17	6,6	6,7	3	6,2						
	F	38	6,8									7	5,2	14	6,5	4	5,7
	?	7	1														
40—44 years	M	17	3,0	4,0	7	4,3	6	2,3	2,5	1	2,1						
	F	27	4,8									6	4,5	5	2,3	4	5,7
	?	4															
45—49 years	M	17	3,0	3,0	4	2,4	7	2,7	2,3	1	2,1						
	F	14	2,5									4	3,0	3	1,4	1	
	?	5	1														
50—54 years	M	19	3,3	2,5	6	3,6	7	2,7	2,7	2	4,2						
	F	9	1,6									6	4,5	4	1,8	4	5,7
	?	3	2														

Table 10 b. *Length of Life and Age-groups according to the Undateable Tituli*

	ICVR I + Ro I App. II			ICVR II			ICVR III			SICV	
	no.	%		no.	%		no.	%		no.	%
55—59 years	M 10 F 4 ? 3	1,7 0,7 }	1,4	2 1,2 1 0,7 2 }	1,5		6 2,3 4 1,8 }	1,9			
60—64 years	M 19 F 14 ? 1	3,3 2,5 }	2,8	5 3,0 6 4,5 }	3,3		3 1,1 3 1,4 1 }	1,3			
65—69 years	M 3 F 3 ? 1	0,5 0,5 }	0,6	2 1,2 1 0,7 }	0,9		3 1,1 1 0,5 }	0,8	1 2,1 }	0,8	
70—74 years	M 8 F 8 ? 2	1,4 1,4 }	1,5	2 1,2 1 0,5 2 }	1,5		2 0,8 4 1,8 2 }	1,1			
75—79 years	M 4 F 3 ?	0,7 0,5 }	0,6	2 1,2 }	0,5						
80—84 years	M 6 F ? 2	1,0 }	0,6				1 0,5 }	0,2	1 2,1 }	0,8	
85—89 years	M 1 F ?	0,2 }	0,1	1 0,6 1 0,7 }	0,5		1 0,4 2 0,9 }	0,6			
90—94 years	M F ?						1 0,4 }	0,2			
95—99 years	M 2 F 1 ?	0,3 0,2 }	0,2								
100—104 years	M F 2 ?		0,4	1 0,7 }	0,3				1 1,4 }	0,8	
115—119 years	M F 1 ?		0,2								

Table 11 a. Deaths according to Age-groups and Sex

		Our material			CIL VI according to Armini		In Rome 1954	
		no.	in %	MF <sup>2</sup>	in %	MF	MF in %	
0—5 months	M	12	0,9	} 0,9	}		}	
	F	14	1,1					
	?	1						
6—11 months	M	27	2,0	} 2,1	} 16,7 <sup>1</sup>	} 15,1	} 16,1	} 9,10 <sup>2</sup>
	F	31	2,5					
	?	2						
1—4 years	M	237	17,5	} 17,4	}		}	
	F	222	17,8					
	?	40						
5—9 years	M	184	13,6	} 12,8	} 14,3	} 13,2	} 13,9	} 0,67
	F	155	12,4					
	?	28						
10—14 years	M	106	7,8	} 7,9	} 7,9	} 9,4	} 8,5	} 0,63
	F	102	8,2					
	?	18						
15—19 years	M	95	7,0	} 7,8	} 10,6	} 14,4	} 7,8	} 0,99
	F	108	8,6					
	?	20						
20—24 years	M	130	9,6	} 9,2	} 9,5	} 13,5	} 11,2	} 1,90
	F	116	9,3					
	?	17						
25—29 years	M	92	6,8	} 8,0	} 8,1	} 11,2	} 9,3	} 1,92
	F	113	9,0					
	?	23						
30—34 years	M	105	7,7	} 8,1	} 7,4	} 7,0	} 8,1	} 2,04
	F	104	8,3					
	?	23						
35—39 years	M	75	5,5	} 6,1	} 6,3	} 4,8	} 6,1	} 2,07
	F	81	6,5					
	?	17						
40—44 years	M	50	3,7	} 4,0	} 5,2	} 2,9	} 4,3	} 3,05
	F	55	4,4					
	?	10						
45—49 years	M	44	3,2	} 3,0	} 2,8	} 2,3	} 3,0	} 4,57
	F	29	2,3					
	?	14						

<sup>1</sup> Armini gives other age-groups for 0 to 4 years. The figures given here are his figures added up. These, in their turn, should thus be compared with the total for these groups in our material, viz. M 20,4 %, F 21,4 %, total 20,4 %.

<sup>2</sup> *Annuario Statistico* has other age-groups. This figure was an adding up obtained by the figures given there. The figure 9,10 % should thus be compared with 20,4 % in note 1 above.

Table 11 b. Deaths according to Age-groups and Sex

		Our material			CIL VI according to Armini			In Rome 1954
		no.	MF in %		in %	MF		MF in %
50—54 years	M	46	3,4	3,2	2,3	2,0		6,12
	F	30	2,4		1,4			
	?	17						
55—59 years	M	30	2,2	1,9	1,2	1,0		8,20
	F	16	1,3		0,8			
	?	6						
60—64 years	M	43	3,2	2,8	2,3	1,9		9,35
	F	31	2,5		1,2			
	?	7						
65—69 years	M	24	1,8	1,2	0,9	0,7		10,77
	F	8	0,6		0,5			
	?	2						
70—74 years	M	24	1,8	1,7	1,4	1,5		11,46
	F	18	1,4		1,4			
	?	6						
75—79 years	M	14	1,0	0,7	0,7	0,6		10,65
	F	5	0,4		0,5			
	?							
80—84 years	M	10	0,7	0,5	1,1	0,8		9,32
	F	3	0,2		0,5			
	?	2						
85—89 years	M	3	0,2	0,2	0,4	0,3		4,87
	F	3	0,2		0,2			
	?							
90—94 years	M	3	0,2	0,2	0,5	0,2		1,87
	F	2	0,2		0,1			
	?							
95—99 years	M	2	0,1	0,1	0,3	0,2		0,37
	F	1	0,1		0,1			
	?							
100—104 years	M			0,1				0,02
	F	4	0,3					
	?	1						
105—109 years	M			0,1	0,1	0,1		
	F				0,1			
	?	2						
115—119 years	M	1	0,1	0,03				
	F							
	?							

## V. DATES OF DEATH AND DEPOSITION

*A. Death and Deposition Formulae with Dates*

In immediate connection with the date there appear in our material three kinds of formula: a) the death formula, that gives the deceased's date of death; b) the deposition formula, that gives the date of deposition; c) what I have called the rest-in-peace formula and which in fact corresponds to the formulae Grossi Gondi, *Trattato*, p. 192 ff., includes under the heading *Il riposo nella tomba*. In a number of cases it is not completely clear within the last mentioned group whether the date given refers to the date of death or deposition. This last seems to me to be the most likely, and they have been regarded as dates of deposition in the following. Nor is it in fact of any great importance what they refer to when the difference between the dates of death and deposition can be at most just a few days, if they do not simply coincide.<sup>1</sup> In not less than 99 cases there is no formula of any kind with the date. In the following these dates have also been treated as dates of deposition. Rather different are the 24 cases where a proper formula of deposition is missing but the date is immediately preceded by IN P(ACE). It seems to me not impossible that this should be treated as an elliptical deposition or rest-in-peace formula, where the verb form has been left out.<sup>2</sup> In the following these cases have also been treated as dates of deposition.

In the following list the formulae have been taken up in strict alphabetical order with the verb as leading word. Where the verb is missing the formula's nominative has taken its place as the leading word.

It ought further to be pointed out that the list below includes only those formulae which are immediately connected with the date. The numerous cases of death, deposition or rest-in-peace formulae without a date have thus not been dealt with at all in this connection. For a general survey of the formulae of this kind see Grossi Gondi, *loc. cit.*

*a. Formulae of death*

ABSO[lutus] DE CORPORE . . . . .	1	DECES . . . . .	2
ACCEPTA APVT DEVM . . . . .	1	DECESIT . . . . .	5
ACCERSITVS AB ANGELIS . . . . .	1	DECESS . . . . .	1
DEC (IN PACE) . . . . .	13	DECESSET DE SECVLVM . . . . .	1
DECE . . . . .	2	DECESSIT (IN PACE) . . . . .	63

<sup>1</sup> See below, pp. 69 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The question of IN PACE's structural meaning is in general an intricate and difficult problem that merits a detailed study.

DECESSIT DE CORPORE . . . . .	1	VITA FVNCTA EST . . . . .	1
OBITU DECESSIT . . . . .	1	FVNCTVS . . . . .	1
DECIDENS IN BONIS . . . . .	1	HOBITA . . . . .	1
DECS . . . . .	1	IBET IN PACE . . . . .	1
DEF . . . . .	8	IBIT IN PACE . . . . .	6
DEFVCTA . . . . .	1	IIT AD DEVM . . . . .	1
DEFVCTA ES . . . . .	1	IVIT IN PACE . . . . .	1
DEFVNCTA . . . . .	7	MOR . . . . .	1
DEFVNCTA EST . . . . .	5	MORITVR . . . . .	4
DEFVNCTE . . . . .	1	MORTVA EST . . . . .	1
DEFVNCTVS . . . . .	14	OBIIT . . . . .	1
DEFVNCTVS ES . . . . .	1	OBITA . . . . .	1
DEFVNCTVS EST . . . . .	1	OBITVS . . . . .	1
DEFVNGITVR . . . . .	4	PERIT . . . . .	2
DEFVNTA . . . . .	1	PERTI . . . . .	1
DEFVNTA EST . . . . .	1	PETITVS IN PACE . . . . .	1
ΔΗΚΕ[σέρ] . . . . .	1	R . . . . .	3
DF . . . . .	4	REC (IN PACE) . . . . .	2
DICESSIT . . . . .	2	RECEDIT . . . . .	1
DIFVNCTA . . . . .	1	RECEPTA IN PACE . . . . .	1
DIFVNTA . . . . .	3	RECESSIT (IN PACE) . . . . .	20
DIFVNTVS EST . . . . .	2	RECESSIT DE HAC LVCE . . . . .	1
DISCES . . . . .	2	RECESSIT DE SAECVLO . . . . .	1
DISCESSIT . . . . .	11	RECESSIT DE SECVLO . . . . .	1
DISCESSIT DE SAECVLVM . . . . .	1	DE SECVLO RECESSIT . . . . .	1
DISESSIT . . . . .	1	RED . . . . .	4
EREPTVS EST REBV HVMA-		REDDIDIT . . . . .	2
NIS . . . . .	1	REDDIT . . . . .	2
ESCESSIT . . . . .	1	SECESSIT IN PACE . . . . .	1
ESSIBE DE CORPORE . . . . .	1	CVIVS SPIRITVS IN LVCE	
EX . . . . .	2	DOMINI SVSCEPTVS EST . . . . .	1
EXIBIT DE SAECVLO . . . . .	1	VENISTI IN PACE . . . . .	1
EXIIT . . . . .	1		
EXIT DE SECVLO . . . . .	1	ΑΠΕΘΑΝΕΝ . . . . .	4
EXIVI DE SECVLV . . . . .	1	ΑΠΕΛΩΚΕΝ . . . . .	1
EXIVIT . . . . .	1	ΑΠΟ . . . . .	1
EXIVIT IN PACIS . . . . .	1	ΕΞΕΛΘΩΝ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΒΙΟΥ . . . . .	1
EXVIT . . . . .	1	ΕΤΕΛΕΥΘΗΣΕΝ . . . . .	1
EXXIVT . . . . .	1	ΤΕΛΕΥΤΑ . . . . .	5
OBITVM FECIT . . . . .	2	[τελευτή]ΣΑΣ . . . . .	1
VITA FVNCTA . . . . .	1		

## b. Formulae of deposition

ABET DEPOSTION . . . . .	1	D IN PC . . . . .	1
ANIMA BENE IN CIMITERO . . . . .	1	D IN PE . . . . .	1
D . . . . .	97	DE . . . . .	9
D IM PACEM . . . . .	1	DEP . . . . .	286
IN PACE D . . . . .	3	DEP EST . . . . .	5
IN PACE D EST . . . . .	1	DEP EST IN PAC . . . . .	1



DEP IN P . . . . .	6	DPST . . . . .	2
DEP IN PACE . . . . .	6	DIP . . . . .	1
IN PACE DEP . . . . .	8	DIPOSIT . . . . .	1
DEPO . . . . .	5	DIPOSITA . . . . .	4
DEPOS . . . . .	12	DIPOSITA EST . . . . .	1
ΔΗΠΟΣΕΙΤΟΥΣ . . . . .	1	DIPOSITOS IN PACE . . . . .	1
DEPOSETA . . . . .	1	DIPOSITVS . . . . .	11
DEPOSITO . . . . .	4	DIPOSITVS EST . . . . .	3
DEPOSITO EIVS . . . . .	1	DIPOSSIO . . . . .	1
DEPOSIT . . . . .	12	DP . . . . .	189
DEPOSIT IN PACE . . . . .	1	IM P DP . . . . .	2
DEPOSITA . . . . .	155	DP IN PACE . . . . .	4
DEPOSITA EST . . . . .	14	IN PACE DP . . . . .	4
DEPOSITA EST IN PACE . . . . .	1	DP IN PC . . . . .	2
DEPOSITA IN AC . . . . .	1	DPO . . . . .	1
DEPOSITA IN PACE . . . . .	19	DPOSITA . . . . .	1
IN PACE DEPOSITA . . . . .	9	DPS . . . . .	4
DEPOSITAE . . . . .	1	DPS IN PACE . . . . .	1
DEPOSITAS . . . . .	2	DPSIT . . . . .	1
DEPOSITI . . . . .	5	DPST . . . . .	2
DEPOSITIO . . . . .	9	DPT . . . . .	2
DEPOSITIO EIVS . . . . .	3	ELATVS EST . . . . .	1
DEPOSITO . . . . .	2	HABE DEPOVSIONE . . . . .	1
DEPOSITOS . . . . .	1	IMPOSVIT . . . . .	1
DEPOSITV . . . . .	3	INCLVSA EST . . . . .	1
DEPOSITVS . . . . .	148	PES . . . . .	1
DEPOSITVS EST . . . . .	13	POS . . . . .	1
DEPOSITVS IN PACE . . . . .	18	POSITA . . . . .	1
IN PACE DEPOSITVS . . . . .	7	HIC POSITA EST . . . . .	1
IN PACEM DEPOSITVS . . . . .	1	POSITVS EST . . . . .	1
DEPOSO . . . . .	1	POSVERVNT . . . . .	2
DEPOSSIO . . . . .	12	POSVETE . . . . .	1
DEPOSSIO EIVS . . . . .	1	VITAM POSVIT . . . . .	1
DEPOSSIONE . . . . .	2	PT . . . . .	1
DEPOSSO . . . . .	3		
DEPOSSO EIVS . . . . .	1		
DEPOSSONE . . . . .	2	ΕΤΑΦΗ . . . . .	1
DEPOSTA . . . . .	1	ΚΑ . . . . .	1
DEPOSTE . . . . .	1	ΚΑΤΘ . . . . .	8
DEPOTVS . . . . .	1	ΚΑΤΑΘ . . . . .	1
DEPP DVO . . . . .	1	ΚΑΤΑΘΕΣΙΣ . . . . .	5
DEST . . . . .	1	κατετέθη . . . . .	1
DFP . . . . .	1	ΚΑΤΘ . . . . .	1
DPS . . . . .	1	ΚΑΤΤ . . . . .	1

c. *Rest-in-peace formulae used in the same way as formulae of deposition*

CESQVENTI IN PACE . . . . .	1	DORM IN PACE . . . . .	1
CESQVET IN PACE . . . . .	2	DORMET IN PACE . . . . .	1
DOMI . . . . .	1	DORMIT . . . . .	1

DORMIT IN PACE . . . . .	2	QVIESCET IN PACE . . . . .	1
DORMITIO . . . . .	3	QVIESCIT IN PACE . . . . .	1
REQVEBIT . . . . .	1	QVIESVET . . . . .	1
REQVEVIT . . . . .	3	QVIEVIT . . . . .	1
REQVIEVIT . . . . .	1	QVIEVIT IN PACE . . . . .	1
REQVIEVIT IN P . . . . .	1	IN PACE QVIEVIT . . . . .	1
IN PACE REQVIEVIT . . . . .	1	QVIEVIT . . . . .	1
RIPAVSAVT . . . . .	1		
Q IN PACE . . . . .	1	ΑΝΕΠΑΗ . . . . .	3
QVEBIT IN PACE . . . . .	1	ΑΝΕΠΑΥΣΑΤΟ . . . . .	4
QVESQVET IN PACE . . . . .	1	EK . . . . .	1
QVEVIT . . . . .	1	EKOIMHΘH . . . . .	5
QVIEBIT IN PACE . . . . .	1	KOIMATAI . . . . .	1

### *B. The Connection between the Dates of Death and Deposition*

From the above list the fact clearly appears that the deposition formulae with a date clearly outnumber the death and rest-in-peace formulae. Nevertheless our material shows that the death formula in this position represents the oldest usage, and though the deposition formulae increase at the cost of the death formulae, this last evidently does not fall completely into disuse during the whole period covered by our material. The oldest death formula (DEC) with the date is from the year 234 (*Ro I 6*) and the youngest (DEFVNCTVS EST) from the year 522 (*Ro I 980*). The oldest deposition formula (DP) with the date is, if one excepts POSVETE from the year 269 (*Ro I 11*), from the year 290 (*Ro I 15*); the youngest deposition formula (DIPOSITVS EST) is from the year 584 (*Ro I 1125*). The oldest case of a rest-in-peace formula (CESQVET IN PACE) with the date stems from the year 345 (*Ro I 84*) and the youngest (REQVIEVIT) from the year 438 (*Ro I 699*). In addition the relative frequency on the dated tituli of the different groups of formulae appears from the following:

	<i>death formula with the date</i>	<i>deposition formula with the date</i>	<i>rest-in-peace formula with the date</i>
3rd century . . . . .	5	3	—
4th century . . . . .	55	244	12
5th century . . . . .	17	153	2
6th century . . . . .	1	66	—

There exist 14 tituli in our material where the date of death as well as of deposition has been given. The difference between these two dates appears from the following list:

	<i>day of death</i>	<i>day of deposition</i>	<i>difference</i>
<i>Ro I 282</i>	15 July (Sunday)	16 July (Monday)	1 day
<i>Ro I 754</i>	14 May (Wednesday)	15 May (Thursday)	1 day
<i>ICVR I 962</i>	12 September	13 September	1 day
<i>ICVR I 3575</i>	8 August	9 August	1 day
<i>ICVR II 6451</i>	22 March	23 March	1 day
<i>Ro I 193</i>	7 June (Thursday)	9 June (Saturday)	2 days
<i>ICVR I 368</i>	26 December	28 December	2 days
<i>ICVR I 3872</i>	7 June	9 June	2 days
<i>ICVR II 5176</i>	17 March	19 March	2 days
<i>ICVR III 8079</i>	12 October	14 October	2 days
<i>ICVR III 8440</i>	2 October	4 October	2 days
<i>ICVR III 8815</i>	12 January	14 January	2 days
<i>ICVR III 9117</i>	7 September	10 September	3 days
<i>ICVR I 1315</i>	16 June	20 June	4 days

It seems probable that the day of death and the day of deposition usually coincided. Such is still the case in the countries round the Mediterranean. Their climate does not permit of any delay. So, in my view, the sign DFP *ICVR I 1276*, which has been interpreted as *defuncta puella*, ought to be treated as an amalgamation of DF = *defuncta* and DP = *deposita* with the date following to show that the date of death and date of deposition coincided.

It is impossible to decide what was the cause for delaying the deposition for a few days. That the deposition was put off until the day after the death hardly needs any explanation. Almost any practical reason could have caused it. The case *Ro I 193*, from the year 367, where the death occurred on Thursday the 7th of June and the deposition was put off until the 9th of June can of course have an equally simple and practical explanation. Nevertheless one can question whether astrological calculations, which are of no inconsiderable importance in the Christian tituli<sup>1</sup>, can have had any influence on the delaying of the deposition. The choice of week-day, however, seems not to be dependent on these calculations. Considering these views the day of Saturn was treated as *noxius*.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand *luna XXVI*, that in the year 367 fell on the 8th June, was treated as a not particularly favourable day, while *luna XXVII* (the 9th

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. F. Grossi Gondi, *Trattato*, p. 200.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. E. Svenberg, *De latinska lunaria*, p. 159. — On the question of the connection between the day of deposition and the week-day see also below, pp. 93—94.

of June) was a more favourable day.<sup>1</sup> It is of course impossible on the basis of one single example to draw any conclusions, and what is said here is only to draw attention to a point that deserves closer study. For natural causes these astrological calculations — if they do in general have any significance in this connection — can to a very limited extent have influenced the choice of the day of deposition. The climate was certainly the primary consideration.

In the same way the case *ICVR III 8815*, where the death occurred on the 12th of January but the deposition was put off until the 14th, can have some connection with the fact that the 13th of January was of old treated as a *dies vitiosus*.<sup>2</sup>

### *C. Dates of Deposition and Death*

In the following list the number of depositions for every date is recorded according to sex (M and F; ? indicates that the sex of the deceased could not, for various reasons, be determined). Where a figure stands in parentheses it means that only the date of death is given. An item of the type '3(1)' means that this date (in the example 7th January under M) is recorded as the date of death or deposition on 3 tituli and that of these 3 tituli 1 has expressly given this day as the date of death, while in 2 cases the 7th of January can be treated as the date of deposition. What has been summarized under the designation *date of deposition* appears from the discussion above on p. 74. In the 14 cases where two different dates have been given (see above, p. 53) only the date of deposition has been included in this list. At the foot of every column those cases have been noted where the month but not the date was legible on the titulus, and also the total number of depositions per month.

I group together the total number of depositions per month in accordance with the above and also note for the sake of comparison the number of deaths per month in percentages from modern Rome. These last mentioned figures from 1954 are taken from *Annuario statistico della città di Roma*, anni 1952—1954, *Table 34*, p. 192. It ought to be made quite clear that for modern conditions the year 1954 was a representative one.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E. Svenberg, *op. cit.* p. 74 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, V. 4), p. 433.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. e.g. with the corresponding figures for the years 1952 and 1953 in the same table. See also *Bollettino Statistico* e.g. no. 5 1960, *Table 6*, p. 8.

Table 12 a. Dates of Death and Deposition

Date	January			February			March			April		
	M	F	?	M	F	?	M	F	?	M	F	?
1.	4	1		2	5	3	2	9		1	3	2
2.		1		2	3					1	2	
3.	1		2	1	1		1	1		2	2	
4.	1	1		2(1)				1		2	1	
5.	2		(2)	2(1)			3		1	1	1	
6.		2			1	1	2				1	
7.	3(1)	2		5(2)	3		2					1
8.	2	4(2)		1	2	2	2	1		1	2	
9.	3(1)	1	1	3			2	(2)		1	1	1
10.	2(1)	3	1	1			2	3(1)			2	1
11.	4(3)	2	1	4(1)	2(1)		3(1)	6(1)		3	3	1
12.	2(1)		1	2(1)	2		(1)	3		1		1
13.	4	3	1	2	1		2			3	1	
14.	1			2(1)			1	1		2	3	
15.	1	1		5			1	2				
16.	1	1		3	1		1	1	1	(1)	1	1
17.		3			1		(1)			3(1)	1	
18.	2	1		3	2		1	2(1)		1	4	
19.	2(1)	1			3		4	1	1	3	3(1)	
20.	1	2	1	2			1	1		2(1)	4	
21.	2	1		2	3	2		1	1	3(1)	1	
22.	3	2(1)		2	7(1)		1	(1)		5(2)	2(1)	
23.	2	1			3(1)		5(1)	2	1	1	3	
24.	3	5		3	(1)		4(1)		1	2	5(3)	
25.		2		1	2(1)	1				2	1	
26.	5(1)				3	1	1	5(1)	1	1	1	
27.	4(1)	3	1	1	5	3(1)	3(1)	1	1	3	3(1)	2(1)
28.	2			3	3	1	4	2(1)	1	3(2)	4	1
29.	2		1				1				3	
30.	3	2	1					4(1)		4	2	(1)
31.		1					2	4				
where the date is missing	2	4	7	4(1)		5	4		5	2		5
depositions TOTAL	64	50	20	58	54	19	57	54	14	54	60	17
		134			131			125			131	

Table 12 b. *Dates of Death and Deposition*

Date	May			June			July			August		
	M	F	?	M	F	?	M	F	?	M	F	?
1.	1	1	1	4	2		5	1	1	3(1)	3(2)	1
2.				(1)	(1)		(1)			3(1)	2	
3.	2	1		2(1)			3(1)	1		3	2	
4.		1		2(1)	2(1)		2	1		3	5	1
5.	3	5	2	2(1)	3		2(1)	2		2	2(1)	
6.	2	3(1)		(1)			3	5	1	5(1)	1	
7.		4(1)	1	3(1)	1		1	3(2)	(1)	2	2(1)	1
8.	2	5(1)		3	2			1		(3)	2	2
9.	4	2(1)	1	2	3(1)		7(1)			4	(1)	
10.	(1)	2(1)		1	2(1)		1	4(2)		2(1)	4	
11.	2	3		2	1	1		7		6(1)	4	
12.	2(1)	2(1)		3	1		3(1)			2(1)	2	1
13.	5	3		4(1)	1	1	1	1	1	3(1)	10(1)	1
14.	1	3(1)					1	3	1	2	5(2)	
15.	1	6(1)	1				3(1)	4(1)		1	3	
16.	4				(2)		1	4		3	6(1)	
17.	1	1	1	2	4(1)	2	1	4		7(1)		
18.	1	2(1)			2(1)		1	4	2	6(1)	7(2)	
19.	1	2		2(1)	1	1	(2)	1	1	3	4(1)	
20.	5	4	1	3	2	1		1	1	3	4	3(1)
21.	2	4		4		2	1	2	1	1	3	1
22.	1	2	2(1)	2(1)	4		2	2	1	2	2	
23.	4(1)	3(2)		3(1)	4		7(1)	7(1)	1	8	6	2
24.	7(1)	3	3		4		1	5		4(1)	8	1
25.	2(1)	1		3(1)	2		3	5		2(1)	7(3)	2(1)
26.	(1)	3		3(1)	1		3(1)	6(3)	3	5(1)	8	1
27.	2	1	1	(1)	3			2		5(1)	1	
28.	4	2		7(3)	1		4(1)	6(1)		6(1)	2(1)	
29.	3	3	1	2(1)		1	2	1	2	2	1	(1)
30.		1		2	1	1	2(1)	2		3	6	2
31.	1						2(1)	1	1	3	3(1)	1
where the date is missing	6	4	5	2	3	4	5	6	7	8(1)	10	6
depositions	71	77	20	66	53	14	70	92	25	115	126	27
TOTAL		168			133			187			268	

Table 12 c. *Dates of Death and Deposition*

Date	September			October			November			December		
	M	F	?	M	F	?	M	F	?	M	F	?
1.	7(1)	5	2(1)	8	5		3	3		4	1	
2.	4(2)	2(1)			(1)			2		4	1	
3.	4	3(1)	1	3	5(1)		2	1		2(1)	(1)	
4.	1	7	1	2	3		(1)	2		4		
5.	3	6(4)	1	5	4(1)		5(1)	2	1	2		(1)
6.	5	1	1	6	1		1	2(1)			4(2)	
7.	7(2)	3		2(1)	4		2			1	2(1)	
8.	4	3		2	5(1)	1				3		
9.	7	3	2	4(1)	4		2	3(1)		1	5	
10.	5(1)	1		3	2	2	1	1		1	3(1)	
11.	2(1)	2	1	4	(1)		4	2	1		5	
12.	11(2)	5	1	4(1)	5(1)		1				1	
13.	7	5		1	6	1	3	1	1	5	1	2
14.	2(1)	5		2	1	1	2	2(1)				
15.	6	6		4(1)	3(1)		3			2	2(1)	
16.	4	2(1)	2	1	1			3	1	1	1	2
17.	2	6(2)	2	2	1			5			1	1
18.	3	3		2	4	1	3	6	1	4	1	
19.	5(1)	2(1)	2	3		1		4(1)		3(1)	3	
20.	7(2)	7(1)	1	4	3(1)		3	3(1)			6	
21.	6(2)	7(1)	2	2(1)	5(1)		2(1)	3	1	2	3	
22.	2	3		3(1)	1		8	2		1		1
23.	6(1)	5(1)	1	2(1)	3	2(1)	3(2)	2		4(1)	7	
24.	1	5	1	2	2	1	6(1)	4(1)	1		2	
25.	7	1		5(1)	2	1	2	3		3(1)	1	
26.	5	3	2	2	2		2(1)	3		2(1)	3(1)	
27.	3	5		5(1)	3			3	3	2	4	1
28.	8(2)	3		4(2)	4		2	1		1	4(2)	1
29.	3(1)	6(1)		4	1	1	4(1)	2(1)	1	3		
30.	5(1)	4(1)	3	2	4	2	4(1)	5(1)		3	2	
31.				3(1)	1					3(1)	2	
where the date is missing	10(1)	7(1)	11	4	3	12	8(1)	4	6	4	5(1)	4
depositions TOTAL	152	126	37	100	90	26	77	74	17	65	71	13
		315			216			168			149	

	<i>the number of depositions in our material</i>	<i>the number of deaths in % in Rome 1954</i>
January . . . . .	134	10,49
February . . . . .	131	9,06
March . . . . .	125	8,79
April . . . . .	131	8,43
May . . . . .	168	7,78
June . . . . .	133	7,76
July . . . . .	187	7,28
August . . . . .	268	7,33
September . . . . .	315	6,94
October . . . . .	216	7,92
November . . . . .	168	8,62
December . . . . .	149	9,60

A comparison seems to prove that the time from July-October was the most fatal in Rome during the first centuries A.D., while the period December-March shows the highest death-rate in modern Rome. However, this gives only a partially correct picture of the development. Firstly, one must note that our material in this connection embraces altogether only 2.125 depositions while the statistics for the year 1954 give an account for 13.799 cases of death. Secondly, our figures are not directly comparable with the modern ones because, for example, the infant rate of mortality is fully expressed in the latter but is very poorly represented in the former.

But even with these reservations it appears clear that a decrease from the peak of the mortality rate has appeared. In the statistics for births from modern Rome July and August represent a very high number <sup>1</sup> with a corresponding increase in infant mortality for these months and the months immediately following. On the other hand during the first centuries of the Christian era in Rome the greatest number of births occurred during the period December-March, according to what our material shows.<sup>2</sup> Our study seems thus to imply that the infant mortality rate in any case can not be the only cause for this divergence.

Further, a divergence is noticeable between the early Christian mortality rate as it appears in our material and the death-rate in present-day Rome. In the early Christian times the maximum death-rate coincided quite clearly with the hottest months of the year (June-September). It is true that on this point I have had to stick entirely to modern statistical information <sup>3</sup>, but the climate in Rome has probably not in this connection changed to any appreciable degree in the last 1600 years. On the other hand the highest death-rate in modern Rome coincides entirely with the months that show the lowest average temperature. It is perhaps not too bold to assume

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* Table 11, p. 140.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 107.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 70.



that infectious diseases accounted for a higher proportion of the death-rate in ancient Rome than in Rome today.

Nowadays the death-rate is divided fairly evenly among the months of the year while the tituli in our material show that then death took its greatest toll during the autumn, with an appreciably lower rate of mortality during the other months of the year.

Of the 2,125 depositions 949 concerned men and 927 women, while 249 are cases where it was found impossible, for various reasons, to determine the sex. Only during four months, that is to say April, May, July and August, is the number for the women greater than for the men. However, the material is too limited and the differences too small for any conclusions to be drawn from this.

The individual dates of deposition in the table above are also of some interest. None of the more important Christian holidays, with the possible exception of *Whit-Sunday*, seem to have been excluded as a day of deposition. A deposition occurred on *Christmas Day* in the year 393 (*Ro I 414*). *ICVR I 3703* and *3705* with depositions on the 25th of December are undateable. On the day of *Epiphany*, the 6th of January, there occurred a deposition, according to the undateable *ICVR II 4393* and *ICVR III 7731*. There was a deposition on *Easter Saturday* according to *Ro I 8* (A.D. 238) and *Ro I 745* (A.D. 449). *Easter Day* is the deposition day according to *Ro I 471* (A.D. 399) and *Ro I 743* (A.D. 448). On the other hand I have not found an example in our material of *Whit-Sunday* being used as a day of deposition. According to *ICVR I 292* (A.D. 496) the deposition occurred two days before *Whitsun* and according to *Ro I 862* (A.D. 476) the day before *Whitsun*. Further, the deposition occurred the day after *Whit-Sunday* according to *Ro I 685* (A.D. 435). The material is too limited to allow a definite conclusion to be drawn, but it seems as if *Whit-Sunday* was avoided as a day of deposition. A comparison between the dates of deposition in the above list and the dates in the oldest martyrologies<sup>1</sup> give no indication of a relationship one way or another.

Nevertheless it seems as if certain dates were avoided as days of deposition. This concerns above all the second day in certain months. If we deal only with depositions (I exclude in this connection dates of death) the second day of the month is recorded as a day of deposition in only 23 cases, and for March, May, June, July and October no deposition was recorded for that day while a number of depositions can be shown for the first and third days of those months. In addition no depositions occur in our material on the following days: 17th of March, 25th of March, 15th of April, 6th of June, 14th and 15th of June, 8th of November and 14th of December.

<sup>1</sup> H. Lietzmann, *Die drei ältesten Martyrologien*. Kleine Texte 2. Bonn, 1911.

Probably this is due mostly to the scantiness of the material. Perhaps it would, however, be worth studying a greater amount of material with this point in mind, asking whether certain dates were favoured while others were avoided. It can hardly be by chance that the second day in the month is so seldom recorded as a day of deposition. Did astrological calculations in general play any part in this?

#### *D. Depositions and Days of the Week*

In a few cases the day of the week when the death or deposition took place is expressly given in connection with the dates of the death and deposition. In the following cases the day of the week is given with the date of death:

*Sunday:* ICVR III 8058  
*Monday:* ICVR III 8164,2 (A.D. 395)  
*Tuesday:* Ro I 68 (A.D. 343)  
*Wednesday:* Ro I 443 (A.D. 397), 754 (A.D. 452), 1430 (A.D. 338)  
*Thursday:* Ro I 638 (A.D. 423?)  
*Friday:* Ro I 597 (A.D. 411?); ICVR III 8883  
*Saturday:* ICVR III 8164,1 (A.D. 395)

On the whole it is thus the dated tituli that give the day of the week with the date of death. It is given on only 2 of the undateable tituli. *Ro I 754* gives the day of the week with the date of death as well as the date of deposition. The material is too scanty to allow any surmises as to whether, for example, astrological calculations have been taken into account in giving the day of the week.

Of greater interest are those cases where the day of the week has been given with the date of deposition:

*Sunday* (11 examples): *Ro I* 529 (A.D. 404), 601 (A.D. 415), 711 (A.D. 443), 798 (A.D. 457), 855 (A.D. 473), 1371 (A.D. ?); *ICVR I* 486, 2481; *ICVR II* 5222, 6078 (A.D. 428/29); *ICR III* 8058  
*Monday* (5 examples): *Ro I* 235 (A.D. 373), 355 (A.D. 385), 1340 (A.D. ?); *ICVR I* 3741, 3978  
*Tuesday* (4 examples): *Ro I* 208 (A.D. 368); *ICVR I* 2223, 3455; *ICVR III* 8146 (A.D. 367)  
*Wednesday* (4 examples): *Ro I* 475 (A.D. 399), 645 (A.D. 425); *ICVR I* 635, 2028  
*Thursday* (5 examples): *Ro I* 275 (A.D. 378), 754 (A.D. 452); *ICVR II* 4394, 6221; *ICVR III* 7021  
*Friday* (13 examples): *Ro I* 11 (A.D. 269), 473 (A.D. 399), 558 (A.D. 406), 695 (A.D. 425?), 730 (A.D. 445), 851 (A.D. 473?), 1240 (A.D. ?), 1438 (A.D. 340), 1825 (A.D. 391); *ICVR I* 1518, 2922; *ICVR II* 5218; *ICVR III* 8147 (A.D. 368)  
*Saturday* (5 examples): *Ro I* 596 (A.D. 411), 745 (A.D. 449), 1098 (A.D. 565), 1474 (A.D. 368); *ICVR I* 3682

In these cases also the day of the week is given mainly on the dateable tituli (30 examples) but on the undateable as well (17 examples).

To the above list can be added *ICVR I 1071*, where the name of the week-day is not fully legible, it being possibly either a Tuesday (*dies M[ar-tis]*) or a Wednesday (*dies M[ercurii]*), and *Ro I 926* (A.D. 502), where according to a relatively certain replacement Monday was probably given as the day of deposition.

Thus of the days of the week Friday and Sunday are given by far the most often. This fact certainly has more to do with Christian than with pagan-astrological views and should be placed in connection with the death of Christ (day of deposition) and day of resurrection. Certainly the planet Venus and as a result of this Friday is counted among the 'good ones' (*boni*) but the planet Jupiter and Thursday were according to astrology in the same class, which should have expressed itself on the day given if this point of view had prevailed. Bad (*noxii*) were Saturn and Mars and their days.

One can not draw the conclusion from the above list that Friday and Sunday were the main days of deposition. That such was not the case is apparent if one studies the dateable tituli, and on the basis of the information they give calculates the day of the week for the deposition. Thus in the list below the week-day for the deposition has been calculated while all those cases where the date of death has been given are left out. In the figures below those 47 cases have also been included where the day of the week has been given directly:

<i>Sunday</i>	. . . . .	81 cases
<i>Monday</i>	. . . . .	70 cases
<i>Tuesday</i>	. . . . .	63 cases
<i>Wednesday</i>	. . . . .	70 cases
<i>Thursday</i>	. . . . .	70 cases
<i>Friday</i>	. . . . .	66 cases
<i>Saturday</i>	. . . . .	84 cases

Thus depositions occurred during all the days of the week: the climate made a speedy deposition necessary without consideration to the day of the week. Nevertheless where it was possible the deposition seems to have been put off until a Saturday or Sunday, and this was presumably more for practical reasons than others.

## VI. MARRIAGE AND AGE

*A. The Occurrence of Particulars about Marriage*

A striking feature of the Christian tituli is the comparative plentifulness of the information about the length of a marriage either with or instead of particulars as to age. For natural reasons information about marriage is more often given for women than for men. I have noted 286 cases in our material where the duration of the marriage has been given. In fact the number is somewhat larger, for I have dealt only with those cases where these particulars have been preserved intact, or nearly intact. On the other hand I have not in this connection specially noted in how many cases the deceased is designated as married without any information as to the duration of the marriage. It is clear that information as to civil status is considerably more common in the Christian than in the pagan tituli. Macdonell has noted only 897 cases out of a total of 3,490 females from the city of Rome in *CIL VI* where the deceased is designated as a wife or a mother.<sup>1</sup> It is true that I can not make any comparison in exact figures with the Christian tituli from Rome, but it is obvious that in this connection the figures would be greater for the Christian tituli.

Only in exceptional cases is the age given with the commencement of the marriage in our material. It can, however, be calculated for those cases where both the age and information about the duration of the marriage has been left. In our material the age at the commencement of the marriage can in this way be calculated for 125 out of the total of 1,689 women (1,253 cases with legible particulars as to age and 193 cases with illegible particulars as to age but legible particulars as to the deposition as well as 243 cases with only the date of deposition.) In the pagan material from the city of Rome Macdonell noted only 59 cases (out of a total of 3,490 women), where the woman's age at the time of her marriage can be calculated.<sup>2</sup> In the same way the age at the time of marriage can be calculated for 53 men in our material, while the total number of men is 1,752 (1,358 cases with legible particulars as to age and 190 cases with illegible particulars as to age but legible particulars as to deposition, and also 204 cases with only the date of deposition). The corresponding figures given by Macdonell are 29 cases out of a total of 4,575 men.<sup>3</sup>

The oldest legible piece of information on the length of a marriage to be found in our material is from the year 279 (*Ro I 14*). From the 4th

<sup>1</sup> W. R. Macdonell, On the Expectation of Life in Ancient Rome. *Biometrika* 9 (1913), p. 369.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 371 and 379.

century we have 44 cases, of which only 9 are from the first half of the century. From the 5th century we have 4 cases and from the 6th century 6 cases. Of all the dateable tituli with information as to the duration of a marriage 37 concern women, 12 men and in 6 cases the sex is unknown.

### B. The Exactness of the Information

In the same way as with the age the duration of a marriage is given with different degrees of exactness, either in years alone, or in years and months, or years, months and days. Out of 286 cases where the duration of the marriage is given, in 141 (49,6 %) it is given in years, in 62 (21,8 %) in years and months and in 83 (29,3 %) in years, months and days. If we compare this with *Table 4*, p. 45, we can thus show that the duration of a marriage is given with less exactness than the information as to age.

There is a considerably greater degree of exactness for the females than for the males, as appears from the following chart where the age of the individual at the time of marriage has been calculated:

	years	years, months	years, months, days
the number of men . . . . .	49	1	3
the number of women . . . . .	98	6	21

One can, in addition, observe the same phenomena with the giving of the duration of a marriage as with the information as to age. Out of 141 cases where the duration of a marriage is given *in years alone* it is given in 54 cases (38,3 %) in even multiples of 5 or 10, of which 24 cases (17,0 %) are in multiples of 5 and 30 cases (21,3 %) in multiples of 10. If we compare this with *Table 4*, p. 29 we thus find that information about the number of years a marriage had lasted is given with a somewhat greater degree of exactness than is generally so with the particulars as to age given only in years.

Where the information as to the duration of a marriage is given in *years and months* (62 cases), the number of months is divided according to the following:

number of months	number of tituli	number of months	number of tituli
1	—	7	7
2	7	8	10
3	11	9	2
4	3	10	7
5	4	11	5
6	6		

These figures ought to be compared with what above (p. 30) has been said about the exactness for the number of months given with the age. In our material the number 1—5 months composes 40,3 % of all the particulars as to months, and the number 7—11 months composes 50 % of all the particulars as to months. Thus it seems clear that where the duration of a marriage is given in years and months it is given more precisely than, in general, where the age is given in years and months.

Where the length of a marriage is given in *years, months and days* (80 cases, of which 77 have a completely legible number of days) the number of days is divided according to the following:

<i>number of days</i>	<i>number of tituli</i>	<i>number of days</i>	<i>number of tituli</i>
1	1	16	3
2	1	17	3
3	2	18	2
4	3	19	1
5	6	20	—
6	1	21	1
7	2	22	2
8	4	23	—
9	3	24	2
10	7	25	5
11	—	26	1
12	8	27	2
13	4	28	2
14	3	29	3
15	5		

We may note that 1—14 days accounts for 57,1 % and 16—29 days for 33,7 % of the whole material. If we compare this with the corresponding figures for the exactness of the number of days with the age (p. 32) we observe that the number of days in each case has been given with an almost equal degree of exactitude. In each case a five-day period clearly composed the prevalent unit of calculation.

### *C. The Duration of the Marriages*

The average duration<sup>1</sup> for 286 marriages is 14,8 years. The shortest-lived came to an end with the death of the husband after 2 months and the longest lasted for the whole of 80 years. The following table gives a picture

<sup>1</sup> This refers to the actual average duration.

of the duration of a marriage. Except for where it concerns a very short-lived marriage its duration has been given to the nearest number of years. Where the duration of the marriage has been given on the titulus as, for example 1 year and 6 or more months, the marriage has been included in the group for 2 years but where the given number of months is less than half a year it has been added to the nearest previous group, that is to say in our example to the group for 1 year.

Table 13. *The Duration of the Marriages*

<i>duration</i>	<i>number of marriages</i>	<i>duration</i>	<i>number of marriages</i>
1 month . . . . .	—	18 years . . . . .	8
2 months . . . . .	1	19 years . . . . .	6
3 months . . . . .	2	20 years . . . . .	15
4 months . . . . .	—	21 years . . . . .	5
5 months . . . . .	1	22 years . . . . .	3
6 months . . . . .	—	23 years . . . . .	6
7 months . . . . .	1	24 years . . . . .	2
8 months . . . . .	1	25 years . . . . .	6
9 months . . . . .	2	26 years . . . . .	4
10 months . . . . .	4	27 years . . . . .	7
11 months . . . . .	—	28 years . . . . .	1
1 year . . . . .	8	29 years . . . . .	2
2 years . . . . .	9	30 years . . . . .	10
3 years . . . . .	14	31 years . . . . .	—
4 years . . . . .	12	32 years . . . . .	2
5 years . . . . .	15	33 years . . . . .	1
6 years . . . . .	7	34 years . . . . .	1
7 years . . . . .	13	35 years . . . . .	3
8 years . . . . .	13	37 years . . . . .	2
9 years . . . . .	11	38 years . . . . .	1
10 years . . . . .	15	40 years . . . . .	1
11 years . . . . .	6	41 years . . . . .	1
12 years . . . . .	8	45 years . . . . .	3
13 years . . . . .	11	50 years . . . . .	1
14 years . . . . .	6	52 years . . . . .	1
15 years . . . . .	15	55 years . . . . .	1
16 years . . . . .	7	69 years . . . . .	1
17 years . . . . .	9	80 years . . . . .	1

It is evident that the calculated average duration gives as inadequate a picture as the above table of the actual circumstances. Certainly the length of a marriage was noticeably shorter than the given average duration of 14.8 years. The cases where a marriage had lasted longer than usual was

more likely to be mentioned than those where the marriage had lasted for only a short time. This can be assumed as a consequence of the greater importance laid on marriage by the Christians.

The table above also gives some indication of the influence of pregnancy and childbirth on the mortality rate among women. The largest group is composed of 18 persons who died during or shortly after the first few years of marriage. Of these there is 1 man, 1 whose sex cannot be determined, and for the rest 16 women. It would surely not be too much to assume that most of these died from some sort of illness connected with or resulting from pregnancy. For 14 of these 16 women we can calculate the age at the time of marriage. This is shown in the following:

<i>age at the time of marriage</i>	<i>number of women</i>
16 years . . . . .	1
17 years . . . . .	2
18 years . . . . .	3
19 years . . . . .	1
20 years . . . . .	1
22 years . . . . .	3
24 years . . . . .	1
25 years . . . . .	1
30 years . . . . .	1

Most (8) of these women were thus 20 or younger at the time of their marriage. Can one possibly see here a connection between the youthful age at marriage and the mortality rate for women? A connection between age and death due to a women's illness can very likely also be seen in *Ro I 261*, the titulus for a young wife who died after 2 years of marriage, which began when she was 13 years, and also in *ICVR I 1959*, the titulus for a wife who died after 1 year and 7 months of marriage, which began when she was 44 years old.

#### *D. Age at the Time of Marriage*

##### *a. The age of women*

We can calculate the age at the time of marriage for 125 women in our material. The (actual) average age of these 125 women at the time of marriage was 20,4 years. However, this is certainly not the age at which as a rule Christian women in Rome got married. Rather, on the basis of the material in *Table 14* below, p. 68, one can maintain that the most usual age at which women married was between 15 and 18 years. This fits well with



Cavedoni's figures, which were also derived from the information on the Christian tituli.<sup>1</sup> They are reproduced in the table below. The too high average age of 20,4 years in our material is due to those extreme cases where a woman's age at the time of marriage was given just because she was unusually old at the time. From Macdonell's figures<sup>2</sup> the average age for non-Christian women at the time of marriage can be calculated as 17,1 years, but compare below, p. 104. Bang has given more detailed and recent information from Italy<sup>3</sup>, which I have not, however, analysed more closely and brought into line with that given here. Bang's figures are supplemented by Moretti's information from *IG* (7 tituli).<sup>4</sup> They are here not dealt with. The youngest age at which a woman married in our material was 11 years, 9 months and 17 days, and the oldest was 45 years.

The material is somewhat too limited to allow a comparison between the ages of the Christian and the pagan women at the time of marriage. The information listed above argues for an earlier age among the pagan than the Christian women at the time of marriage. Bang calculates with consideration to Epictetus' *Enchir.* 40 an average age of 14 years.<sup>5</sup>

Of course, one should not, in this case differentiate only between the pagan and Christian. We must also remember that in general the pagan tituli represent older pre-Constantine practice while the Christian tituli are to a considerable extent younger and represent post-Constantine usage. If one looks at this phenomenon from this point of view one finds a trend from a younger to an older age at the time of marriage. Perhaps it ought to be pointed out here that those instances of a particularly old age in our material can well be cases of widows who remarried.<sup>6</sup>

In any case we can say that among the non-Christians in Rome it was considered better for a woman to marry young while among the Christians in Rome it was not considered dishonourable but, rather, a virtue for a woman to marry at a considerably more mature age.

#### *b. The age of men*

We can calculate the age at the time of marriage for 53 of the males in our material. For these the actual average age at the time of marriage is 26,5 years. In this case as well it would seem that the calculated average

<sup>1</sup> Cavedoni, *Dell' età consueta nelle nozze degli antichi Cristiani* according to M. Bang, *Das Gewöhnliche Alter der Mädchen bei der Verlobung und Verheiratung* in L. Friedlaender, *Sittengeschichte Roms* (1921).

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 380.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 133.

<sup>4</sup> L. Moretti, *op. cit.* p. 74.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 134.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. M. Bang, *op. cit.* p. 136 and L. Moretti, *op. cit.* p. 76.

Table 14. *The Age of Women at the Time of Marriage*

age	number			
	in our material	after Cavedoni	in CIL	
			after Macdonell	after Bang <sup>1</sup>
7 years <sup>2</sup> . . . . .			1	
10 years <sup>2</sup> . . . . .			3	
12 years . . . . .	6	8	7	11
13 years . . . . .	3	9	6	14
14 years . . . . .	3	11	6	13
15 years . . . . .	12	16	8	8
16 years . . . . .	16	13	5	8
17 years . . . . .	14	11	1	4
18 years . . . . .	13	9	4	3
19 years . . . . .	7	8	2	5
20 years . . . . .	7	9	6	4
21 years . . . . .	6	6	2	4
22 years . . . . .	6	5		1
23 years . . . . .	3			1
24 years . . . . .	3		1	1
25 years . . . . .	3		2	4
26 years . . . . .	2			2
27 years . . . . .	3			
28 years . . . . .	1		1	1
29 years . . . . .	0			
30 years . . . . .	2		1	
31 years . . . . .	4		1	
32 years . . . . .	1		1	1
33 years . . . . .	1			
34 years . . . . .	1			
36 years . . . . .	2			
37 years . . . . .	1			
40 years . . . . .	1			
44 years . . . . .	1			
45 years . . . . .	2			
56 years . . . . .			1	

age is too high. As is shown in *Table 15* below the customary age for men to marry probably lay between 18 and 25. Macdonell notes 29 cases in *CIL* where a man's age at marriage can be calculated. Of these 11 cases lie between 17 and 20.<sup>3</sup> L. Friedlaender for his part points out:<sup>4</sup> *Nach den bisher*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. M. Bang, *op. cit.* p. 136 ff. and L. Moretti, *op. cit.* p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> On the question of these low ages compare, besides Bang's Work, M. Durry, *Le mariage des filles impubères dans la Rome antique* in *Compt. Rend. Acad. Inscr.*, 1955, p. 85.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 371.

<sup>4</sup> L. Friedlaender I, p. 272 ff.

*bekannten, allerdings nicht zahlreichen Angaben scheinen selbst in den mittlern und untern Ständen Ehen von Männern unter 18 (vielleicht sogar unter 20) Jahren Ausnahmen gewesen sein.* Thus it seems that also for the Christian men in Rome the age at marriage was somewhat higher than for the non-Christian men. In our material the youngest age at which a man married was 15 years, the oldest 50 years.

Table 15. *The Age of the Men at the Time of Marriage*

<i>age</i>	<i>number</i>	<i>age</i>	<i>number</i>
15	3	29	3
16	1	30	4
17	1	31	1
18	3	33	1
19	2	35	2
20	4	36	1
21	3	37	1
22	2	38	1
23	2	40	1
24	3	41	1
25	5	42	1
26	1	45	1
27	1	50	1
28	3		

## VII. DATES OF BIRTH

Only in exceptional cases in our material is the year of birth or date of birth given with the age and date of deposition. I have noted 21 cases in all with a formula of birth. Of these 2 (*Ro I 36; SICV 219*) are such that the date of birth is illegible. In 3 cases (*Ro I 32, 362 and 1487*) only the year of birth is given. I have naturally excluded votive tablets which give the heavenly day of birth of a saint as for instance *ICVR I 93*. The other cases are:

<i>Ro I 810</i>	4th April	<i>ICVR I 2686</i>	13th January
<i>Ro I 1404</i>	9th September	<i>ICVR I 2864</i>	27th November
<i>Ro I 1457</i>	15th June	<i>ICVR I 3452</i>	24th April
<i>Ro I 1474</i>	11th August	<i>ICVR I 3698</i>	24th September
<i>Ro I 1494</i>	18th August	<i>ICVR III 7451</i>	11th February
<i>ICVR I 79</i>	15th July	<i>ICVR III 7880</i>	9th January
<i>ICVR I 1643</i>	26th July	<i>ICVR III 9046</i>	9th February
<i>ICVR I 1978</i>	25th March	<i>ICVR III 9060</i>	11th January

Table 16 a. *Dates of Birth*

<i>Date</i>	<i>Jan.</i>	<i>Feb.</i>	<i>March</i>	<i>April</i>	<i>May</i>	<i>June</i>
1.	3	2	1	4	1	1
2.	4	2	1		1	2
3.	3	1	1		1	
4.	1	1	1	1	3	3
5.	2		2	3		1
6.			4	1	1	1
7.	2		2		2	
8.	1	2	1		1	1
9.	1	3	3		1	1
10.	3	1	1		1	1
11.	4	1			3	2
12.	1		2		2	
13.	2	1				
14.	1	1	1	3	1	3
15.	1		1		1	1
16.			1	1		
17.			1			1
18.	1	2		1		1
19.		1	1			
20.	1	2				1
21.	4	1		1	1	
22.		1	1		1	1
23.		1			1	
24.		1	1	3		
25.		2	2	3	1	
26.		1	2		1	
27.		2		1	1	
28.	1	2	1		2	1
29.	1			1	1	1
30.						1
31.			1			
cases where only the months can be calcul.	19	26	16	10	16	15
TOTAL	56	57	48	33	44	39

To these cases can be added those where the date of birth can be calculated on the basis of the information on the titulus. There are those cases where the age has been given in years, months and days or in years and months at the same time as the date of deposition or date of death has been given. Exact dates of birth cannot be obtained in this way. Where the age has been given in years and months only the month of birth can be

Table 16 b. *Dates of Birth*

<i>Date</i>	<i>July</i>	<i>Aug.</i>	<i>Sept.</i>	<i>Oct.</i>	<i>Nov.</i>	<i>Dec.</i>
1.	2	3	2	1	1	2
2.		1	3	2	4	2
3.		2		2		2
4.		2	1	1		
5.		1		1	2	1
6.	1	2	1	1	1	1
7.	1	3	2	1		
8.			1	3	1	2
9.		1	2			
10.	2	1	1	3		2
11.	1	4			1	4
12.	1	3		1		2
13.	1	1	2			2
14.	1	1	1	1		
15.	3	1		1	1	
16.	2		1		2	1
17.	1				1	
18.	2	1		2	2	1
19.						1
20.	3			1		1
21.			2	3	1	1
22.	2	2		1		1
23.	2	2		4	1	
24.	3	2	1			
25.		1	4		1	
26.	2		2	1		
27.	1		1		1	3
28.	1	2				2
29.				1	1	
30.			1			1
31.	2			1		
cases where only the months can be calcul.	7	12	8	9	11	17
TOTAL	41	48	36	41	32	49

calculated. Also where the age has been given in days the date of birth is only approximate even if the difference between the calculated and actual day of birth is only a few days. The reason for this difference is partly the already mentioned fact that the number of days were not always given exactly and partly that, as already pointed out, one can reckon on an interval of one or more days between the date of death and date of deposi-

tion. The numbers in the following table hold with these reservations. In the same table are also included the tituli with a given date of birth. Lowermost in each column for the months are taken those cases where the month of birth and not the date of birth could be calculated.

As a result of this study embracing a total of 524 dates of birth one can conclude that the period from December to March was the time when the majority of births took place.

# LIST OF INSCRIPTIONS FROM ICVR AND SICV

mentioned or discussed in this study

<i>Ro I</i>	597 p. 60	1534 p. 17
6 p. 52	601 p. 60	1536 p. 20
8 p. 59	638 p. 60	1581 p. 20
11 p. 19, p. 21, p. 52,	645 p. 60	1591 p. 28
p. 60	683 p. 28	1645 p. 27
14 p. 62	685 p. 59	1825 p. 60
15 p. 52	695 p. 60	
24 p. 17 (bis)	699 p. 52	<i>ICVR I</i>
30 p. 27	711 p. 60	24 p. 34
32 p. 69	730 p. 60	79 p. 69
36 p. 69	731 p. 34	93 p. 69
38 p. 27	743 p. 59	200 p. 17
41 p. 34	745 p. 59, p. 60	268 p. 31
68 p. 60	749 p. 20	292 p. 59
84 p. 52	754 p. 53, p. 60	296 p. 34
85 p. 14, p. 15	(ter)	304 p. 18
140 p. 15	798 p. 60	368 p. 53
193 p. 53 (bis)	810 p. 69	385 p. 20, p. 33
194 p. 27	835 p. 28	402 p. 17
208 p. 60	851 p. 60	405 p. 33
214 p. 27	855 p. 60	486 p. 60
219 p. 34	862 p. 59	606 p. 28
229 p. 28	884 p. 15	628 p. 17
235 p. 60	893 p. 27	635 p. 60
239 p. 28	900 p. 28	737 p. 20
250 p. 28	903 p. 28	838 p. 34
261 p. 66	926 p. 61	844 p. 34
275 p. 60	930 p. 19	866 p. 34
282 p. 17, p. 53	980 p. 52	962 p. 53
287 p. 18	1014 p. 20	980 p. 31
355 p. 60	1076 p. 31	988 p. 27
356 p. 28	1085 p. 34	1071 p. 61
362 p. 69	1098 p. 60	1276 p. 53
414 p. 59	1125 p. 52	1301 p. 33
443 p. 60	1240 p. 60	1315 p. 53
447 p. 18	1308 p. 27	1411 p. 27
451 p. 19	1340 p. 60	1504 p. 17
471 p. 59	1351 p. 17	1513 p. 16
473 p. 60	1371 p. 60	1518 p. 60
475 p. 60	1404 p. 69	1530 p. 19
509 p. 34	1430 p. 60	1571 p. 31
529 p. 60	1438 p. 60	1601 p. 33
535 p. 27	1457 p. 34, p. 69	1614 p. 34
553 p. 60	1474 p. 60, p. 69	1636 p. 34
596 p. 60	1487 p. 69	1643 p. 69
	1494 p. 34, p. 69	1675 p. 16





8813	p. 19	9029	p. 27	<i>SICV</i>	
8815	p. 17, p. 53, p. 54	9042	p. 17	8	p. 20
8848	p. 21	9046	p. 69	28	p. 27
8850	p. 21	9060	p. 69	95	p. 34
8883	p. 34, p. 60	9106	p. 17	148	p. 20
8885	p. 17	9117	p. 53	195	p. 34
8891	p. 17	9129	p. 35	209	p. 19
8892	p. 20	9133	p. 34	219	p. 69
8901	p. 34	9226	p. 20	265	p. 34
8953/4	p. 14, p. 19, p. 27	9239	p. 34	274	p. 17
9008	p. 20	9274	p. 18	284	p. 34
9025	p. 19	9347	p. 27	318	p. 19
				321	p. 18 (bis)

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Annuario statistico della città di Roma*, anni 1952—1954. Roma, 1957.
- ARMINI, H., *Sepulcralia Latina* (doctoral thesis). Göteborg, 1916.
- »— Conlectanea epigraphica in *Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift*, Vol. 29 (1923):4. Göteborg, 1923.
- »— Kring romersk livslängdsstatistik in *Eranos*, Vol. 25 (1927), pp. 193—205.
- BALIL, A., Le edad de vida media en Tarragona Romana-visigoda in *Boletín de la Biblioteca-Museo Balaguer*, Vol. 2 (1954) pp. 113—116.
- BANG, M., *Das Gewöhnliche Alter der Mädchen bei der Verlobung und Verheirathung* in L. Friedlaender, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, Vol. 4, 9th and 10th ed., pp. 133—141. Leipzig, 1921.
- BELOCH, J., *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*. Leipzig. 1886.
- Bolletino Statistico* N. 5, maggio 1960. Rom 1960.
- BURN, A. R., Hic breve vivitur. A Study of the Expectation of Life in the Roman Empire in *Past & Present*, Vol. 4 (1953), pp. 1—31.
- DIEHL, E., *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae veteres*, Vols. I—III. Berlin, 1924/31.
- DURRY, M., Le mariage des filles impubères à Rome in *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belle-Lettres*. 1955, pp. 84—90.
- ETIENNE, R., Démographie et épigraphie in *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina*, pp. 415—424. Rome, 1957.
- FRIEDLAENDER, L., *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang der Antonine*, Vol. 1, 9th ed. Leipzig, 1919.
- GAGNÉR, A., Epigraphica Latina in *Eranos*, Vol. 24 (1926), pp. 1—20.
- GROSSI GONDI, F., *Trattato di Epigrafia cristiana latina e greca del mondo Romano occidentale*, Roma, 1920.
- HOMBERT, H., and PREAUX, CL., Note sur la durée de la vie dans l'Egypte greco-romaine in *Chronique d'Egypte*, Vol. 20, 39—40 (1945), pp. 139—146.
- »— A propos des chances de survie dans l'Empire Romain in *Latomus* 5 (1940—1945), pp. 91—97.
- KONJETZNY, G., De idiotismis syntacticis in titulis latinis urbanis (CIL VI) conspicuis in *Archiv für lat. Lexikogr. und Gramm.*, Vol. 15, pp. 297 ff.
- LATTE, K., *Römische Religionsgeschichte* in *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 5, 4. München, 1960.
- LIETZMANN, H., *Die drei ältesten Martyrologien*. Kleine Texte, Vol. 2. Bonn, 1911.
- LÖFSTEDT, E., *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. Uppsala, 1911.
- »— *Syntactica*. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins II. Acta Reg. Societatis Hum. Lundensis, Vol. 10, 2. Lund, 1933.
- MACDONELL, W. R., On the Expectation of Life in Ancient Rome, and in the Provinces of Hispania and Lusitania, and Africa in *Biometrika*, Vol. 9 (1913), pp. 366—380.
- DE MARCHI, A., Cifre di mortalità nelle iscrozioni romane in *Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere*, Vol. 36 (1903), pp. 1025—1034.
- MORETTI, L., Statistica demografia ed epigrafia: Durata media della vita in Roma Imperiale in *Epigrafica*, Vol. 21 (1959), pp. 60—78.
- PEARSON, K., On the Change in Expectation of Life in Man during a Period of circa 2,000 years in *Biometrika*, Vol. 1 (1901/02), pp. 261—264.
- SVENBERG, E., *De latinska lunaria* (doctoral thesis). Göteborg, 1936.
- WILCOX, W. F., The Length of Life in the Roman Empire. A Methodological Note in *Congrès international de la population*, Vol. 2 (Démographie historique), pp. 14—22. Paris, 1937.