Reviews of Three Books on Roman Names

DEMETRIUS J. GEORGACAS

I<small>T IS IMPORTANT</small> and imperative that the onomastic studies of the outstanding Finnish scholar Iiro Kajanto be made known to American onomatologists, classicists and linguists. The author has, along with a fourth work,[1] produced, within four years, four books of significance that deserve the attention of this journal's readers.[2]

1. CHRISTIAN ONOMASTIC STUDIES

Iiro Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions of Rome and Carthage.* Helsinki (Helsingfors), 1963. (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae, Vol. II: 1). Pp. III–X, 141.

Subject of this monograph is the peculiarities of Christian Latin nomenclature.

The structure of this book's contents is as follows:

Bibliography, V–X.

Introduction, 1–2.

The main body of the work, 3–121.

Summary, 122f.

Indices, 124–141: 1. i. of scholars, 2. i. of personal names discussed, and 3. general index.

In bibliography, the author is well equipped; he lists 20 titles of sources and 131 titles of pertinent literature, in addition to his having utilized numerous other articles in reference works and journals not listed.

---

[1] I. Kajanto, *A Study of the Greek Epitaphs of Rome* (Helsinki, 1963), (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae, II: 3).

[2] This reviewer expresses his sincere regrets and apologies to both the author and the Review Editor of *Names* for the long delay in delivering the present reviews; he has had no excuse other than the heavy burden of dictionary work and other previous commitments.

Professor Kajanto himself collected a large amount of Roman name material[3] and handled the names of 10,000 persons in section A and of 11,000 in section B. The material for Carthage now lies available in the fully published early Christian inscriptions;[4] the Carthaginian inscriptions date from a later period than the Roman ones (dated inscriptions are exceptional); the Carthaginian inscriptions, being largely brief, contain only the name of the deceased; and a great number of them are fragmentary.

The proportions of the frequencies of names are a decisive point, so the statistical method, which the author has consistently employed, makes the presentation of such a vast amount of material possible in a convenient and comprehensive manner.

Roman nomenclature is complicated, if compared with the single-name system of the ancient Greeks (with the father's name added). Kajanto offers here the information we are using to present the Roman way of naming. The *nomen* (gentilicium nomen, gentile name) or the lack of it, the *filiation* and the *tribus* indicated a person's place in society, while the *cognomen* distinguished one individual from another. A free woman bore two names, viz., as a rule no praenomen, but a free man bore three names: *praenomen* (given name), *nomen* (family name), and *cognomen* (individual name). During the Later Empire, i.e. after A.D. 200, social and political as well as cultural changes affected that system; social and political developments of the third century and then the victory of Christianity during the fourth century caused these changes: disappearance of the praenomen and its replacement by the cognomen as the individual name to serve to distinguish one person from another.

Latin nomenclature found in the early Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage, two most important centers of Western Christianity, differs from that of the Early Empire. Kajanto discusses

---

[3] The reason for Kajanto's collecting name material from published inscriptions is that out of 11 projected volumes of *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae* only three had appeared by 1963, namely in the years 1922, 1935, and 1956. The majority of the early Christian inscriptions of Rome are taken from catacombs, which were established at ca. A.D. 200. About one-tenth of the Roman inscriptions are dated. Many of them give also the names of relatives, thus facilitating the study of the transmission of personal names.

[4] *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, VIII. Berolini, 1881–1959; *Inscriptions Latines de la Tunisie*. Paris, 1944.

the features of difference. Considering the double aspect of Latin nomenclature, he treats his topic in two parts and works out the fundamental causes of the changes in Latin nomenclature:

A. Pp. 3–54. *The Latin Name System in the Christian Inscriptions*, headings I–VIII: Discussion of the alterations in the number and order of the elements of a name, and related problems. Bibliography on the history of the Latin name system is found on p. 3, note 1.

B. Pp. 55–121. 1. *On the Origin and Formation of Cognomina in Christian Inscriptions*, I–III: Discussion of the changes in the proportions of Latin and foreign cognomina and in the use of suffixes, and 2. *The Origins of a Christian Nomenclature*, I–VII: Exploration of the origins of a specific Christian nomenclature.

The author states at the beginning of his introduction (p. 1) that purely onomastic factors should be weighed, in addition to the social and political and cultural causes of change, on the ground that some of the changes may have been the logical outcome of trends inherent in the nature of the Latin name. That is correct; I take the liberty of making a slight addition to this: onomastic principles and factors should be considered as underlying any cause of change, whether social, political, or cultural. In dealing with names, i.e., in doing onomastic research, one should explore all possible causes of change in names and their use, since these constitute part of the onomastic process.

The discussion of the changes in Latin nomenclature during Later Imperial times is conducted on the basis of the material in the early inscriptions of Rome and those (still later) of Carthage, and the most radical changes prove to be the disappearance of freedmen's filiation (on account of the decline of slavery and of the Christian reluctance to make a distinction between bond and free) and the decline in using the praenomen and nomen,[5] resulting in the single name system that prevailed approximately after A.D. 300. The supernomina were nicknames (agnomina; signa proper;

[5] The decline in the use of the praenomen and nomen is the result of the loss in value of Roman citizenship and of the enormous popularity of a few imperial Roman nomina, particularly *Aurelius* (411 times) and *Flavius* (149 times), and its resulting damage to the distinctive function of the nomen. Nomina were no longer used as family names but often were used as cognomina.

or as detached signa coined with the old gentile suffix -*ius*, extemporized nicknames, and a number of them being *nomina sodaliciaria*).[6]

The *cognomen* was commonly transmitted from the parents (in proportion, three-fourths of the father and one-fourth of the mother) to the child and was mostly unchanged. While in the Christian inscriptions of Rome the percentage of cognomina of Greek origin borne by persons amounts to 43 per cent as against 56 per cent in the pagan inscriptions (there being a decline of slavery and no more Greek-speaking slaves from the East), in Carthage the Greek cognomina, being in the minority as against Latin names, declined, to be sure, but not as radically. Most cognomina in Christian inscriptions were old-established ones and they were extended with suffixes attached. Two new suffixes appear shortly before A.D. 200: the suffix -*ius* (and -*ia*), being the old gentile suffix, was more universal and the suffix -*osus* (-*osa*), e.g., *Veneriosus, -osa*, originated and prevailed in Africa.

A specifically Christian nomenclature came into existence ca. A.D. 350. Many Christian names were old pagan cognomina (saints had borne them or they acquired a Christian connotation through a semantic shift in the original word). Four very great figures of the NT (whence derive 238 names from Rome) yield very frequent names: *Iohannes, Maria, Paulus*, and *Petrus*. From the cult of martyrs (there are 184 such names from Rome; cf. also the name *Martyrius* and *Martyrus, Martyra*): *Laurentius, -ia* (110 Christian names) and *Cyprianus, -na* (six from Rome and 20 from Carthage; *Cyprianus* is a suffixed derivative from *Cyprius*) attained great popularity. Christian theophoric names (240 in number) form the most important group of Christian names, and the majority of this type of names were derived from the term *Deus*[7] and in Rome the most important Christian theophoric name was *Cyriacus* 'belonging to the Lord' (Gr. Κυριακός, "pertaining to the Kyrios").

---

[6] On the chapter on the Latin *supernomen* (pp. 31–49) see below, review no. 2, pp. 95–102.

[7] Examples from *Deus: Adeodatus, Deogratias, Deusdat, Deusdedit, Deusdona, Deushabet, Habetdeus, Vincetdeus* (sentence names). Parallels are derivatives from Gk. Θεός: *Theodulus* (from Gk. Θεόδουλος); cf. Gk. Θεόκλεια and the martyr's name *Thecla*, created by the author of the legend about *Thecla* "out of the common Greek woman's name Θεόκλεια which he used as the name of the girl's mother" (Kajanto, p. 100).

Paschasius is the most important of Christian date names (there are 87 of these); *Anastasius, -ia* (51 times from Rome) and *Agape* are the important ones among those expressing Christian ideas, i.e., dogmas and virtues (there are 208 such Christian names recorded in inscriptions from Rome): Gr. ἀγάπη [agápɛ·] "(human) love" in general and then with the special Christian meaning, acquired and ascribed to St. Paul, "loving kindness, God's love";[8] hence *Agape* in Christian times was a very popular name (66 times from Rome).

The archeological findings that the period of the greatest activity in the Roman catacombs was the fourth century is confirmed now by the study of the nomenclature in the dated inscriptions of Rome.

One of the good features of this study by Kajanto is his 28 tables that serve to give at once an excellent survey of the material handled and discussed. The figures may be altered after new material accumulates but it is hardly expected to effect drastic changes in the results.

2. SUPERNOMINA

Iiro Kajanto, *Supernomina. A Study in Latin Epigraphy.* Helsinki, 1966. (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum. Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Vol. 40, No. 1.) Pp. 114. (Printed January 1967.)

While the problem of the late Latin supernomen was discussed in 19 pages in the book reviewed above (No. 1), the present work embodies it as the central point of the study. The best treatment of the supernomen, before Kajanto's concise discussion of this problem in 1963 (*ibid.*), was the study by M. Lambertz,[9] well known also as a distinguished Albanologist, which appeared in the early second decade of this century.[10] We now have a more complete discussion of the subject in this special monograph, which is devoted exclusively to the study of the *supernomen*.

---

[8] The best treatment of ἀγάπη in the NT is found in Walter Bauer's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, A translation and adaptation... by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago, 1957), 5—6, with listing of important bibliography. Kajanto knows the German editions of this dictionary.

[9] M. Lambertz, "Zur Ausbreitung des Supernomen oder Signum im römischen Reiche," *Glotta* 4 (1913), 78—143, and 5 (1914), 99—170.

[10] I. Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies* (1963), p. 31 note 1, acknowledges Lambertz' work.

For the sake of the reader, we may state, on the basis of the author's exposition, what the s u p e r n o m e n is: a personal name apart (i.e., separated in the context) from the other names of a person mentioned, and of relatively low frequency. The supernomen may be either

(1) the *agnomen*, i.e., the name tacked on to the other names of a person later in his life, and preceded by the words *qui (quae) et* or *sive* or rarely by other means; or

(2) the *signum*, which can be either (a) the detached signum, or (b) the signum proper.

The contents of the book are as follows:

I. The *Introduction* (pp. 5–7) sets the purpose of the book and gives the classes of the supernomen;

II. *Agnomina* (7–15).

III. *Interpretation of agnomina* (15–42), including lists of "barbaric" agnomina (from languages of the Empire from Iberian in the West to the Semitic tongues in the East, i.e., Iberian, Celtic, Germanic, Venetic, Illyrian, Thracian, Semitic, Libyo-Punic, and some of uncertain origin) (26–32); Greek (32–35); and Latin (35–37), gentilicia as agnomina (37–40), etc.

IV. *Signa* (42–75) with six subdivisions; a total of 417 signa consists of 294 detached signa, 68 plural forms/club names, and 55 signa proper (see distribution of signa on p. 42).

V. *Alphabetical list of signa* (76–90), comprising 288 entries plus some cross references

VI. *Bibliography* (91–94), with subdivisions:
     1. Sources (32 items).
     2. Literature (76 items; there have been omitted from this listing brief articles in periodicals, etc.).

VII, VIII, IX, and X: *Indices* (95–115), i.e., index of scholars (95); i. of personal names discussed (95–103); subject i. (103–5), i. of references (106–15).

The author counted ca. 850 Latin supernomina, of which ca. 500 were agnomina (p. 6).

The names called *signa* were largely new formations coined and derived with the suffix *-ius*. The term *signum* designated (1) primarily "a name added on to the other names by the expression *signum, signo*," and called *signum proper*,[11] e.g. *M. Aur. Sabinus cui fuit et signum vagulus*; the signum proper includes a relatively small group of 54 examples; and (2) the detached signum, i.e. a name written detached from the other names, above or below the text; on the ways of adding these signa on to the other names, pp. 65–75.

In principle, there was not much difference between double cognomina and supernomina, as a name of one person appears now as a supernomen, now as a double cognomen (e.g., *Supestianu qui et Naucellius* Aud. 276.3 versus *Naucelliu Supestianu* 275.21, etc.). In numerous cases of double cognomina, one cognomen was inherited from the father and the other from the mother.[12] It has been suggested that the family name or *nomen gentilicium* served an aristocratic function, at least at the time of its origin and early use.[13] Now, double gentilicia too were often turned into agnomina or detached signa, as shown in inscriptions.[14] And double cognomina as well as double gentilicia were found in Latin from very early times and polyonymy became still commoner and fashionable during the Empire, especially in high circles: one was in the habit of emphasizing the grandeur of his family by combining the names of his ancestors in his own name.[15]

The *Agnomen* came into Roman nomenclature from the East (p. 15) and was of Greek origin, the petrified expression *qui et (quae et)* translating Greek ὁ καί (ἡ καί) and equivalent to *cognominatus*, and began to appear in Latin epigraphy in the first century A.D. and became commoner in the second century, the latest example dating from A.D. 570. Of a total of 502 agnomina 398 entries have *qui/quae et* and ὁ/ἡ καί, 52 *sive* (which is prevalent in Gallia) and

---

[11] Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies* (1963), p. 31.

[12] H. Thylander, *Étude sur l'épigraphie latine* (Lund, 1952), 114.

[13] E. Pulgram, "The Origin of the Latin nomen gentilicium," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 58—59 (1948), 163—87; cf. idem, "New Evidence on Indo-European Names," *Language* 36 (1960), 198f. (he likewise sees an aristocratic manner of naming in the dithematic names of Indo-European).

[14] See Kajanto, *Supernomina*, 37—40, 69.

[15] Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies*, 4; idem, *Supernomina*, 7 and 41.

55 other expressions. Latin influence has brought about Gk. ὅς καί, translating Latin *qui et* (p. 13); the petrifaction of *qui et* is witnessed in that it is used also for the feminine gender (p. 13) but this may be characteristic of African Latinity in general (p. 14). The first name of a person was the original, while the *agnomen* was the late addition to the person's nomenclature. Out of ca. 450 complete agnomina 118 or 26 per cent are "barbaric," having, in other words, something to do with the barbaric origin of persons (pp. 16, 23–32).

Agnomina are grouped in two classes:

(1) names given at birth along with other names, and

(2) names given later in life.

A subgroup of two comprises the *nicknames*, which are legion because of the innumerable occasions giving rise to them; but sometimes a nickname may have been given at birth or soon after. Nicknames *par excellence* were pet names and (not numerous) *pejorative* names, but only an insignificant number of such names has been recorded and transmitted to us. The ethnics found as agnomina denoted origin. There are three cases of an agnomen obtained from an occupational term and a few agnomina were obtained from designations of social or other position and a few refer to the position of slave or freeborn. Names of famous historical persons were often given at birth to set examples for children or were assumed through respect for those persons.

Among pejorative names, *Adigillus* (from Lat. *adig-ere* "make one swear an oath") is explained as referring to an unsavory practice of a banker. The combination of ἄρτι "just" and κακός "wicked" suggested by Kajanto to explain the pejorative name 'Αρτικά-κοναν is hardly probable to me, as far as the second member of the compound is concerned, on account of its termination; if Kajanto's suggestion were true, the expected result of the compounding would have been either 'Αρτίκακος or − from the comparative κακίων − 'Αρτικακίων. I would like to suggest a hybrid compound ἄρτι + *Caco (acc. *Cacōnem* would yield Κάκονα(ν)).

A Christian inscription from Africa[16] proves that agnomina often were genuine nicknames (e.g., *Mater* for a girl owing to her manners) and that a name, even if it were rare and a nickname, might have

---

[16] *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des Travaux Historiques* 1951/2, p. 209.

been given at birth, e.g. *Inbidiosa* = *Invidiosa*. Personal names derive also by metonymy from nouns designating animals, plants, and things, e.g., Πετροκόραξ, *Asellus*, *Tripeccio*. The explanation of the agnomen Στρωμῶσος from στρῶμα "horsecloth, horsetrappings" for a charioteer is not blameless, for the expected formation with the suff. *-osus* (cf. Σαπηδῶσος from *Sapidus*, p. 36) would have been *στρωματ-ῶσος (cf. the name Στρωματεῖς). Christian names, again, were given persons at adult baptism as a sign of their conversion to Christianity.[17] New Testament names are discussed on pp. 22f. The names *Calvario* and *Calvarius* are explained from *calvaria* "the skull of a man" and in Christian Latin "Calvary" (p. 23).

A foreigner upon becoming a Roman citizen or a slave upon manumission assumed the Roman name form, i.e., *praenomen*, *gentilicium*, and *cognomen*; of the three the cognomen, being the individual name, remained unchanged save in the case of entering service in the Roman army or navy.

A list of the barbaric agnomina according to origin (those of uncertain origin are many; see p. 29) takes seven pages (26–32) and the largest group, 30 items in all, is that of Libyan and Punic names.

There follow Greek (32–35) and Latin (35–37) agnomina, gentilicia as agnomina (37–40), cognomen or another full name separated (40f.), agnomina in *-ius*, *-ia* (41), and fragmentary cases (41f.; see also p. 90). Greek personal names were not felt as alien as the barbaric ones (p. 33).

The Latin agnomen *Sabanas* is linked by Kajanto with Gk. σάβανον "linen cloth, shroud" (equivalent to Lat. *panniculus*)[18] correctly but the termination *-as* remains unexplained; I suggest that *Sabanas* reproduces the Gk. occupational term *σαβανᾶς, m. "manufacturer and/or seller of shrouds." It is unclear to me, concerning the name Γάϊος Ἰούλιος Ἑρμᾶς ὁ καὶ Μερκούριος (*CIG* 3705), what Kajanto means by his statement that "Ἑρμᾶς is a suffixed form of Ἑρμῆς";[19] both these forms are the outcome of contraction from Ἑρμέας, one Doric Ἑρμᾶς, the other Ionic Ἑρμῆς. The name Ἑρμᾶς, τοῦ Ἑρμᾶ, etc. is Hellenistic.[19a]

---

[17] Cf. also *Onomastic Studies*, 120f.

[18] Kajanto, *Supernomina*, 32f.

[19] Kajanto, *Supernomina*, 33.

[19a] The name Ἑρμᾶς might occasionally have been a shortened form of a longer compound name with Ἑρμ- as its initial component.

There are ca. 100 Greek agnomina recorded and 60 of them derive from Rome (p. 35) and there are 67 Latin agnomina (added on to Latin individual names, i.e. cognomina) (*ibid.*).

There are 36 cases of a family name (gentilicium) borne as an agnomen (out of ca. 450 complete agnomina) (p. 37). The gentilicia, used as individual names (cognomina) during the Imperial period, are now equal to double gentilicia.

Agnomina coined with the aid of the suffix -*ius* (and fem. -*ia*) from an earlier cognomen or from a Latin or Greek appellative are 47 (to the exclusion of those attested in Christian inscriptions and late documents; 41); these are discussed on pp. 55–57.

In the alphabetical list of signa (76–90) there are given signa proper, detached signa, agnomina in -*ius*, and the relevant club names and plural forms. The etymologies Kajanto offers "are," as he states, "often mere suggestions" and his statement bears witness to his scholarly caliber, for he is very cautious. In allowing myself to mention some 30 names, I offer a hint in each case as to a closer linking and derivation:

Acacius (76) is rather from Gk. name ᾿Ακάκιος (Pape-Benseler s.v.),[20] this in turn
    from ἀκακία "goodness" or directly fr. ἄκακος, whence also name ῎Ακακος.
    Acacius is also a cognomen (*OS* 84).[21]

Aegippius is fr. Gk. *αἰγίππιος; cf. *Euhippius* and τραγέλαφος.[21a]

Aetherius fr. Gk. Αἰθέριος, man's name, this in turn fr. adj. αἰθέριος "heavenly,
    ethereal."

᾿Αλύπιος, voc. ᾿Αλύπι of ᾿Αλύπις,[22] also fem. ᾿Αλυπία, not from ᾿Αλύπος, ῎Αλυπος;
    cf. ᾿Αμέλιος, Εὐτύχιος, etc. ᾿Αλύπιος is also a cognomen (*OS* 84).

---

[20] Pape-Benseler = W. Pape — G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen.* 2 vols. Braunschweig, 1870. Nachdruck der 3. Auflage, Graz, 1959. — Kajanto knows and lists the book in the bibliography and, judging from his book, reviewed above, No. 1, he knows also the equivalent Greek names, but he does not seem to have exploited that material for the names discussed here; Pape and Benseler of course give material but their interpretations leave much to be desired. This dictionary of proper names, done one century ago, has to be done all over again by collective effort in an institute and will take the work of two generations.

[21] *OS* is the author's *Onomastic Studies.*

[21a] The latter as a parallel for the compounding of two animal designations such as αἰγ-ίππιος.

[22] On the late Greek names in -ις, voc. -ι (from -ιος, -ιε) see D. J. Georgacas, *Classical Philology* 43 (1948), 243–260.

Arcadius (77) fr. Gk. 'Αρκάδιος (Pape-Benseler s.v.), this in turn fr. 'Αρκάς; the geographic name 'Αρκαδία is fem. of the adj. 'Αρκάδιος. *Arcadius* is also cognomen (*OS* 84).

Athanasii (cognomen *Athanasius, -ia, OS* 86): cf. Gk. 'Αθανάσιος, fem. 'Αθανασία, this fr. ἀθανασία (cf. also εὐθανασία). Also *Athenasius* belongs to *Athanasius*; 'Αθήναιος is irrelevant, for the -σ- would then remain inexplicable (no connection with 'Αθήνησι).

'Ατύφιος, voc. 'Ατύφι of nomin. 'Ατύφις, fr. ἄτυφος "not puffed up" with suff. -ιος; cf. Εὐγένιος, Εὐμέλιος, Εὐσέβιος, Εὐτύχιος, etc.

Basilii (78) from *Basilius* ← Gk. Βασίλειος (Pape-Benseler s.v.), this fr. adj. βασίλειος "royal" ← βασιλεύς m. "king." *Basilius* is a cognomen (*OS* 84).

Calliepius is hardly "corrupt" for Καλλιόπιος but rather fr. Gk. *Καλλιέπιος ← adj. καλλιεπής "elegant in diction."

Castorius fr. Gk. *Καστόριος; cf. also Καστορία (λίμνη and) city name, and name Καστορίων of a poet from Soli, both fr. κάστωρ m. "castor fiber." *Castorius, -ia* are also cognomina (*OS* 84).

Daemonius (80) fr. Gk. Δαιμόνιος, adj. δαιμόνιος.

Draconius is a direct deriv. fr. *Lat. Draco*, gen. *Draconis*, for the Gk. Δράκων has the stem Δρακοντ-; cf. δρακόντειος, Δρακόνιος and Δρακονεύς recorded by Steph. Byz. However, the Latin cognomen *Dracontius* (*OS* 84) is fr. Gk. Δρακόντιος: Δράκων, gen. Δράκοντος.

Εὐάγριος (Pape-Benseler s.v.), voc. Εὐάγρι (not Εὔαγρι) of nom. sing. Εὐάγρις; fr. adj. εὔαγρος whence also man's name Εὔαγρος, or εὐαγρής "lucky in the chase; affording good sport"; cf. εὐαγρία "good sport."

Euanthius (81) from Gk. Εὐάνθιος (man's name in Liban. *ep.* 1110), cf. the fem. name Εὐανθία (in mod. Greek); fr. Gk. εὐανθής "rich in flowers, flowery," whence name Εὐάνθης.

Eugenius (also as cognomen, *OS* 83) fr. Gk. Εὐγένιος "Eugene," Gk. "well-born"; cf. Εὐσέβιος, Εὐτύχιος, Εὐάνθιος, etc.

Εὐλόγιος (also as cognomen, *OS* 83; cf. Pape-Benseler s.v.), voc. Εὐλόγι, of Εὐλόγις, and fem. Εὐλογία; fr. εὐλογία "praise, eulogy."

Eusebius (also as cognomen, *OS* 83) fr. Gk. Εὐσέβιος (Pape-Benseler s.v.), deriv. with suff. -ιος fr. εὐσεβής "pious"; cf. name Εὐσεβής.

Glaucopius (83) fr. Gk. γλαυκωπός "having gleaming eyes."

Gregorius (also as cognomen *Gregorius, -ia, OS* 86) fr. Gk. Γρηγόριος (Pape-Benseler s.v.), later Γρηγόρις and Γληγόρις; fr. γρήγορα ← ἐγρήγορα.

Harpagius fr. Gk. 'Αρπάγιος (a presbyter, Sulpic. Sever. *dial.* 3, K), this either fr. ἁρπαγή "seizure, robbery, etc." (cf. ἁρπάγιμος "ravished, stolen") or fr. ἁρπάγη 'hook', ἅρπαγος m. "hook." For the latter case cf. *Procopius* (infra).

Helladius (also as cognomen, *OS* 85) fr. Gk. Ἑλλάδιος (Pape-Benseler s.v.); cf. Ἑλλαδ-ικός "Helladic."

Heraclius fr. Gk. Ἡράκλειος, a frequent man's name; originally *Heraclĭus*, it changed into *Heraclīus* after the analogy of other names in *-īus* and specifically of the equivalent Latin *Herculīus* (← *Hercules* ← Ἡρακλῆς).

Hilarius fr. Gk. Ἱλάριος ← ἱλαρός "cheerful, merry" (from the latter also name Ἴλαρος); cf. also Ἱλαρίων.

Nemesius (86) (cf. cognomen *Nemesius, -ia, OS* 85) fr. Gk. Νεμέσιος; cf. place name Νεμέσιον neut., Νεμέσια neut. pl. "festival of Nemesis," name Νεμεσίων ← Gk. νέμεσις "retribution; cause for anger, wrath" (deity Νέμεσις); cf. Γενέσιος m. fr. γένεσις f.

Pancratius (87) fr. Gk. name Παγκράτιος, deriv. of name Παγκράτης; cf. also *Syncratius.*

Pelagius fr. Gk. Πελάγιος (cf. martyr Πελαγία) ← Gk. πέλαγος "open sea."

Procopius (88; also as cognomen, *OS* 85) fr. frequent Gk. name Προκόπιος (also fem. Προκοπία Byz.), this in turn deriv. of προκοπή "progress, advance."

Proserius is hardly of Gk. origin.

Uranius (90) fr. Gk. Οὐράνιος used as man's name; see Pape-Benseler, s.v. Οὐράνιος. Οὐράνιος is not only an adj., as the author notes.

3. COGNOMINA

Iiro Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina.* Helsinki, 1965 (Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum. XXXVI, 2). Pp. 418.

This work, largest of the three, presents all historical Latin cognomina (both the original cognomina, which were used as single names, and the surnames) in both epigraphy (the material is largely inscriptional) and literature down to ca. A.D. 600.

In addition to the foreword (9–10), bibliography (367–371) and abbreviations (372), three indices (373–417: index of scholars, subject i., and 379–417 i. of personal names discussed), and 25 additamenta (in names, 418), the work was planned and executed in two unequal parts:

Part I: ⟨*Systematic analysis*⟩ pp. 11–135, chapters 1–4

1. Introduction.
2. Analysis of the name categories in 15 §§.
3. The suffixes.
4. Chronological and social differences in nomenclature.

Part II: Name Lists, pp. 137–366; chapters 1–15: Fifteen categories of cognomina (three of these categories including subcategories).

1. C. (= cognomina) derived from gentilicia.
2. C. from praenomina.
3. Geographical c.
4. Theophoric c.
5. Calendaric c.
6. C. relating to human body and mind.
7. C. relating to circumstances.
8. C. relating to birth.
9. C. relating to age.
10. C. obtained from relationship and sex.
11. C. relating to origin.
12. C. obtained from occupations.
13. C. obtained from fauna and flora.
14. C. obtained from inanimate nature and from objects.
15. Formal groups.

The rich bibliography, including some 140 titles, is one of the strong warrants that we have before us a solid product.

To give the reader some idea of the first part of this work, I shall present a few details here.

Latin cognomina were of considerably later origin than ancient individual names. The cognomina constituted originally a privilege of the nobility, the patricians, and were so used from the fifth century B.C. and in the Republic. They became common at the end of the second century B.C. The early cognomina were largely nicknames and for a long period unofficial and the enormous majority of Latin cognomina were adjectival formations. Also their frequency was very unequal; on the average, to a cognomen correspond 23 recorded applications or instances but a tiny fraction of cognomina accounts for most of the 133,059 instances. E.g., the following names have the number of attested examples given with each:

Felix 3716.	*Fortunatus* 2516.
Secundus 2684.	*Primus* 2397.
Saturninus 2615.	*Maximus* 2362.

In this connection, I find interesting and important the 25 tables scattered in the text (though not listed or mentioned either in the contents or in the subject index for one who should like to consult all of them for a certain purpose).

Table 1 (p. 27), e.g., classifies 5783 cognomina of 133,059 persons into the 15 categories. A few of these categories, showing frequencies from greater to lesser, are as follows:

cognomina	*number of cognomina*	*percentage* (%)
derived from gentilicia	1176	20.4
geographical	643	11.1
relating to mind	539	9.4
formal groups	507	8.7
relating to body	498	8.6
relating to circumstances	488	8.4

Table 2 (p. 29) registers the distribution of the bearers of Latin cognomina: of 133,059 persons (represented by names) 72 per cent are men and 28 per cent women; in the Imperial period, 80.5 per cent were free, 7.5 per cent slaves/freedmen, and three per cent belong to the senatorial class.

Table 24 (p. 103) depicts the distribution of Latin cognomen-suffixes: of 2120 names (of 27,565 persons) 447 display the derivative suffix -*ius/ia*, 441 the suff. -*ianus/na*, 303 -*inus/na*, 245 -*illus/a*, and so forth.

Table 3 (p. 31) tabulates the cognomina derived from gentilicia with the aid of a suffix; of 1176 names so derived, 774 names (representing 7986 bearers) are derivatives with the suffix -*anus/na*.

But the rest of the tables are equally illuminating, though of course modifications in the future will be forthcoming.

From the *Name Lists* in Part II, some examples taken at random, but representative of different classes, are given here; references and remarks are omitted:

*Balbus, Balbillus/lla, Balbillianus, Balbinus/na, Balbinianus,
Balbio* (classified under: *III Physical peculiarites, pejorative
names. 1. Head*), p. 240.

Colonus/na, Colonianus, Coloniscus/ca, Colonilla (classified under:
Cognomina from occupations, farmers), p. 321.

Decianus (adopted by *gens Dacia*) (classified under: *Cognomina from gentilicia, suffix -anus/na*), p. 145.

Domnus/na, Domnianus, Dom(i)nicus/ca, Dominicellus, Domnicius, Domnicosus, Δομνίλλα, Domninus/na, Domnio/n, Domnissimus, Domnitta, Domnius, Domno, Domnulus/la, Domnellus (classified under: *Formal Groups*, 2. *nomina agentis*), p. 362.

Favor, Favorianus, Favorinus/na, Favorabilis, Favoralis (classified under: *Cognomina relating to circumstances. I. Laudatory. 2. From other people's point of view*), p. 285.

Iuvenis, Iuvenantius, Iuvenilis, Iuvenilia, Iuvenilla, Iuvenio, Iuvenior, Iuvenius (classified under: *Cognomina relating to age; youth*), p. 300.

Probus/a, Proballa, Probianus, Probicius, Probilla, Probilianus, Probillio, Probinus/a, Probissimus (classified under: *Cognomina relating to human body and mind. VI. Mental qualities. 2. Moral and social qualities; upright, honest, sincere*), p. 253.

Sapo, Saponianus, Saponius, Saposus (classified under: *Cognomina from inanimate nature and from objects. 2. Material words. Other materials*), p. 341.

Valerinus (from *Valerius*) (classified under: *Cognomina from gentilicia. 1. Common suffixes; -inus/na*).

Venerius/ia, Venerianus, Venerilla, Venerina, Veneriosus/osa (classified under *Theophoric cognomina. 1. Dedicatory; major divinities; Venus*), p. 214.

It was my intention to examine the etymologies and interpretations given to names in this book but it would take much more space than is allotted to me for these reviews.

This work has filled a considerable gap in Latin onomastic studies and, as the author is a seasoned onomatologist in Latin as a result of his three previous publications, he has mastered his material in an exemplary way and attempted to give also a brief history of each name and an idea of its distribution. The ca. 6000 Latin name entries, representing over 133,000 Roman persons named in records, are a tremendous wealth stored and ready to help onomastic investigators in their researches; such work is facilitated extremely well by the excellent indexes that conclude this precious volume.

A Conclusion on the three reviews

Concluding the foregoing reports on Kajanto's work, I will refrain from an account of typographical errors, which are not too many and, confined as they are to the English words, hardly impair the exposition or influence the understanding. In fact, the author has taken pains in, and achieved, the presentation of the Latin names in their flawless form. The paper and printing are excellent. English-speaking scholars will also be grateful to the author for making use of English as the vehicle of his publications.

The present triple review, prepared on the basis of material from these studies and the reviewer's impressions, is meant chiefly to stress, for the sake of onomatologists and classicists in the Western Hemisphere, the great importance of the author's contribution to the difficult study of Latin anthroponymy. On such conscientious scholarly work, that was needed and is original, and on the fruitful results of painstaking labors we are happy to extend our cordial congratulations and our feelings of gratitude to Research Scholar Kajanto.

The University of North Dakota