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## INTRODUCTION

What was the popular religion of the Early Church, as developed in a typical, historically important province of the Western Empire, in so far as this can be gathered from its Christian Inscriptions? That is the question to which an answer is sought in the following pages. Dilettanti and controversialists, to be sure, have long been aware of the charm and usefuiness of Christian Epigraphy; but an earnest grappling with the problem is still wanted, whose aim shall be neither amusement nor propaganda but genuine knowledge, and therefore more nearly worthy of the expert work already accomplished, to wit the excavation, critical examination, and accurate publication of Early Church remains.
(a) Problem

Our purpose is thus broady similar to that ofpr. Alexis Schwarze, Who in the year 1892, under the title: "Untersuchungen tuber die Hussere Entwicklung der afrikanischen Kirche mit besonderer Verwertung der arch ${ }^{\text {alologischen }}$ Funde" (Gbttingen, Vandenhoekk und Ruprecht) issued a history of the African Church, in which speeial use was made of local Christian Inscriptions, about 300 items in all being examined by this industrious investigator, his source being the parts then in print of CIL VIII. We differ from him radically however, (1) in neglecting the "outward" development of the African Church, i.e. its history considered as a chronicle of specific events, in favour of a description of the metamorphosis of its piety brought about in the course of time, that is to say, what no doubt Schwarze
himself would term its "inward" development; and (2) in raising the Christian Inscriptions of the country from the status of auxiliary to that of principal sources. Each of these two fundamental modifications involves the other; for although the African stones are so numerous that the history of the Church there can be traced through them, alone they could not for a monent supply the data for a continuous chronicle: on the contrayy, their function, as is the function of inscriptions generally, can only be to fill out with flesh and blood the skeleton of the past left us by the old chroniclers?) In a sense this is precisely what we wish to do here: namely to supplement Schwarze's "Bussere Entwicklung" by means of an "innere Entwicklung", which shall restore something of the freshness of immediate experience to the bald details of what the African Church did and suffered.

And in truth its achievements and its sufferings were alike extraordinary. Whence Africa received the Gospel is not known: on general grounds, probably Rone; in any case the African Chúrch could boast of martyrs before the end of the second century, not in one spot only, but from every quarter of the country? Very soon it was flourishing as the Church from which Western Christendom was glad to learn its Theology, owing to its outstanding personalities, notably Tertullian, Cyprian, and above all Augustine, to whom Harnack ascribes a degree of influence equal only to that exerted by Paul beiore him and Luther after him. On the other hand no church was more grievously mutilated by schism, intensively or extensively; and of all the Western Churches that of Africa alone was utterly

1) Le Blant, ECGA 108
2) Dessau,Lateinische Epigraphik 36
3) Harnack, Mission iv 3/18 4) Lietzmann, Gesch. d. alten Kirche 2/219
annihilated without remainder, never to rise again, ere the
Mediaeval Transition: for in 644 the Arabs gained a footing on Tripoli, in 698 they subdued Carthage, and by 714 they had overrun the whole land westwara as far as Tingi itself.) Apparently the expulsion of the Romans meant also the extinction of the Church in Africa, since its last dated monument, namely the epitaph of one Julius recently discovered at Volubilis, in Morocco, belongs to the year 679. It is with astonishment, however, that we learn a further fact, namely that in spite of this revolution, a Christian remnant survived down to the sixteenth century, albeit on an insignificant scale, since it left no monumental traces, and therefore is of no account for our present purpose. In order to explain bo th phenomena, the extinction of a once vigorous Church as a whole on the one hand, and the long survival of a numerically contemptible remnant of it on the other, our informant offers the hypothesis: Catholicism affected the natives superficially, being essentially a development of Christianity controlled by the Roman spirit; in so far as they were Christianized at all, the natives developed a radically different conception of the foith (Donatism!), which, had it prevailed, might well have secured Africa for Christianity; as it was, the victory of the Catholics, and therewith the political reduction of the faith, which henceforth became for the Africans merely the religion of alien overlords, rendered the extinction of the Church in Africa inevitable on the withdrawal of the Roman political domination therefrom: and the l6th-century remnant survived simply because it was not Catholic. ${ }^{4}$ )

We have no occasion to comment on this solytion of the

1) Wilmanns,CIL $8 /$ Preface p. xix
2) CRAIBL 1933 p. 62 no. 2
4)Holme, The Extinction of the Christian Churches in N.Africa ibid. pp.253-255
problem in the mean time; we only wish to justify our interest in the Church of North Africa, whose unique destiny invites a scrutiny of its religious quality.
(b) Material

From the very beginning of the modern interest in Christian Archaeology considered as a science, the Christian Inscriptions of Africa have attracted attention: G. B. De Rossi himself wrote a work "De christianis titulis Carthaginiensibus"(Paris,1858). But it was only after the early parts of the CIL volume 8 appeared, (1881), that the first Affican collection of Christian texts could be brought together; and this pioneer work was undertaken without delay by Kunstle, who isolated therefrom 408 items. ${ }^{\text {l }}$ But soon the CII 8 Supplements of 1891,1894 , and above all of 1916(containing fresh texts up to 1907) offered new matter in such richness as to render Kunstle's collection antiquated. By this time, moreover, the Christian Inscriptions of the West generally had been brought together in local collections, those of Rome by De Rossi, those of Gaul by Le Blant, those of Spain and Britain by Hubner: Africa alone lacked a collection of its own. In 1903, therefore, Monceaux took up the challenge, and announced an ambitious programme, ${ }^{3}$ ) issuing 119 Greek texts immediately, 33 Jewish texts in 1904, and 75 metrical inscriptions in 1906, all in the Revue Archeologique; and a fourth series, consisting of hagiographic texts, he published through the French Institute in 1907. Since then nothing has been heard of the plan: to date, therefore, of the 2000 texts he said he possessed, Monceaux has furnished us with but 304 ,his Jewish texts apart.

[^0]It has therefore been necessary to start afresh upon the task of assembling the Christian inscriptions of North Africa. For this purpose the eighth volume of the CIL and its Supplements have naturally been taken as the basis, with Monceaux's Enquête alongside. For texts emerging since, Gsell's admirable re-editing of the Latin inscriptions of Algeria, so far as that has been published, has been drawn upon. Cagnat-Merlin-Chatelain's collection supplementing the CIL for Tripolitania, Tunisia, and Moroceo? from which unfortunately all Christian matter has been excluded on the ground $k$ that "Christianity is so much a world apart that the epigraphical documents of Christendom are lost in a general Corpus, and would be more conveniently brought together in a special collection, which will be done for Africa sone day", has however been consulted for state tituli. Further material has also been supplied by the French Society of Antiqueries' Bulletin (BSNAF) and the Transadions of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres(CRAIBL). For texts not communicated to these bodies grateful use has been made of the Revue des Publications Epigraphiques issued annually in connection with the Revue Archeologique, and edited by Cagnat, Besnier, Merlin, and Gagé in turn. Finally the collection was revised, checked, and where necessary further supplemented by means of Diehl's splendid sylloge ${ }^{3}$ ) the 5000 texts of which include most of the material originally accessible to Monceaux, and much that is fresh besides. It is known that some inscriptions have not yet been seen, those namely found only in local African journals, at present out of reach, which have not

1) Inscriptions latines de l'Algerie t.I (Paris 1922)
2) Inscriptions latines d'Afrique (Paris 1923)
3) Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres (Berlin,3vols,1925-31)
been reproduced by the editors of the Revue des Publications Epigraphiques. They are few in number, and when again available are not likely to affect the results obtained without them. It is impossible, moreover, to calculate the number of whole inscriptions represented by the prodigious mass of debris recovered by Delattre from the cemeteries of Carthage, numbering to date in the region of 30000 small fragments ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) which Leclereq, following De Rossi's "canaglia degli iscrizioni", has aptly termed "poussidre épigraphique", Some hundreds of pieces, those namely selected by the editors of CIL 8 as leaving less to the imagination than the majority, have been copied out; but apart from these, the names and phrases which Delattre himself was able to trace, and which he was in the habit of submitting, in liaa of the fragments themselves, when reporting his discoveries to the bodies interested, have been noted. In all, our collection contains over 3000 items.

## (c) Method

Obviously the most convenient way of dealing with this material is first to catalogue the texts according to provenance and date: only when this is done can a fruitful examination begin. Such a procedure will moreover simplify subsequent reference, as each text will then have a serial number, in letters and figures, which will not only prove far less cumbrous than an original quotation, but in addition will at once show its topographico-chronological situation.

Part I of the present investigation consists in just

[^1]such a catalogue, in the introduction to which, called Methodological Prolegomena to distinguish it from this general Introduction, the principles controlling the selection of the material and its subsequent arrangement will be set forth.

It remains to determine the structure of Part II, i.e., the investigation proper. The main divisions into which the exposition will have to fall are indicated from two directions. On the side of the Problem, it is methodologically necessary to distinguish the life of the Christian commenty insofar as it is the centre of action and reflection respectively. Behind its overt behaviour we are justified in assuming the existence of beliefs, convictions, and theories of all kinds which ultimately control what they do, and Which therefore may be inferred from what they do. Our exposition will consequently contain two parts, the former devoted to the PRAXIS, the latter to the IDEOLOGY of the African Christians, the latter being inferred directly from the former.

But on the side of the Material also a methodological distinction must be made. We may alternatively approach the texts from below upwards, a posteriori, enpirically, following up each element until we trace it in isolation to its origin; or from above downwards, a priori, formally, with preconceived attitudes and prearranged, specific questions, wishing to reduce all diversities to the maximum degree of unity. The former procedure is ANALYTIC, the latter SYNTHETIC.

Both systems may be combined by positing a correspondence between Christian Praxis and the analytical use of the texts on the
one hand, andfchristian Ideology and the synthetic use of the texts on the other. This is done by distinguishing within the material a variety of categories, types, etc., and tracing the situation, experience, etc.determining them, thereby reaching analytically the Praxis of the community; and by formulating specific questions covering all possible Ideology, and reviewing the entire material once again from this synthetic standpoint.

A further plastic factor lies implicit in the predicates we wish to establish respecting the particular community in question, namely, "Christian", "African". It is a Christian community; we must discover how far it resembles, and how far it differs from, the non-Christian communties which surrouna it. And it is an Affican community; we must distinguish the elements it shares with the other Christian communities throughout the Empire, and those features of its Christianity which are peculiar to itself. Only so, that is, by establishing the African Christian community's identity with and difference from its immediate environment, can a clear picture of its piety be secured.

The detailed discussion of the plan outlined above is reserved for the appropriate section on Methodological Prolegomena, whth which Part II, like Part I, will be furnished. That, finally, a concluding section, offering a systematic summary of the results, will be necessary, is self-evident.

## PART ONE : THE INSCRIPTIONS

Methodological Prolegomena

The tables which follow are the result of two distinct operations: first the Christian inscriptions of Africa were isolated from the general mass of extant epigraphical matexial, then they were reduced to order according to date and provenance. The principles underlying the former of these operations may conveniently be set forth under the general heading of TERMINOLOGY, while those controlling the latter may likewise be subsumed under the heads of CHRONOLOGY and TOPOGRAPHY respectively.

## (a) Terminology

What is an inscription? And when is it a Christian inscription? These are the general questions to be handled here.
(A)An inscription is a writing carved on stone, metal, and other hard and durable surfaces, fashioned in mosaic, painted (dipinto) or scratched on wolls (graffito): such appears to be the extent of the conception underlying e.g. the CIL. It is therefore an element in the monumentil precipitate of human culture, and the science elaborated for its understanding, namely Epigraphy, is a division of the general science of cultural remains, namely Archeology? As consisting in unities of ariculate

[^2]language, it stands in contrast to the other divisions of Archaeology, whose subject-matter includes only symbols or perfunctory, conventional formulae, $2 s$ in the case of Glyptics or Numismatics, ${ }^{l}$ ) or exclude language altogether, as in the case of painting, sculpture, architecture, and the other subdivisions of Art. On the other hand, epigraphical categories are always in essence non-literary: one recalls Mornmsen's ditum cited over the Preface to Kaufmann's Handbuch der altchristlichen Epigraphik: "Die Inschriften gehbren nicht der Literatur $z u$, sondern dem Leben!"(The Inscriptions belong not to literature, but to life!) In this respect Epigraphy lies on the periphery of Archaeology, dividing it from the study of Fine Literature. We will therefore to justice to the generally accepted viewpoint by requiring of an inscription that it be an original writing, executed on a durable surface, and that it express some thought-content in articulate language, without however belonging to literature proper. Such a discription is intended, not to constitute an inscription as an archaeological category absolutely and without contradiction or inconsistency, but only to secure a serviceable principle for the selection of the material.
(B) Less simple is the problem of delimiting the concept "Christian" as applied to inscriptions.

To begin with, it is assumed from the objective point of view that all inscriptions produced by Christians are to be reckoned Christian Inscriptions. How, then, are Christian inscriptions, in this sense, to be recognised? Here we must beware of

[^3]the circular fallacy. We approach the inscriptions with a view to extracting information from them about Christianity, but we must know in advance enough already about Christianity to distinguish Christian inscriptions from inscriptions in general. Care taken not to accept as constituting new knowledge in Part II what was assumed in Part I as diagnostic in the selection of the 电exts will of course provide an adequate safeguard; in the mean time we can reduce the extent of our presuppositions by seeking a minimum apparatus for the identification of Christian inscriptions. With this proviso before us we are free to proceed.

Evidences for the Christian origin of an inscription fall naturally into two classes, internal and external. Both classes again subdivide into negative and positive.

Internal negative evidence consists in the absence of positive pagan stigmata in an inscription. The absolute use of Pós or Deus ( $=$ God), that is without the name of any god in apposition, is of course the most obvious instance. A particular example of this is the common pagan dedication to the infernal gods on tombstones, "Dis Manibus Sacrum"1) which in the form of various abbreviations, DM,DMS,DIM,DMI, ) was current in pagan inseriptions from the time of Augustus onwards?) The omission of deprecatory formulae on tombs originating in ancient Roman piety, and the common STTL $=$ sit tibi terra levis $=$ the earth lie light apon you, ${ }^{4}$ ) to which, curiously enough, Arabic epitaphic idiom offers a parallel: ${ }^{5}$ ) together with the peculiarly Roman epithet "pius",
1)Dessau,Lat.Epigr.I7
2) Cagnat, Cours d'Epigr.lat. 254
3) Sandys,Lat. Epigr. 62
4) Cagnat,Cours a'Epigr. Iat. 257
5) RCEA 361 (A.D. 853) 307 (A.D. 844) 296 (A.D.843)
which occurs commonly in the fixed phrase PVA = pius vixit annis... practically, "he lived for so many years, and did his duty!") Similarly, the abbreviation $H S E=$ hic situs est $=$ here is placed, ${ }^{2}$ ) is so regular a feature of pagan epitaphs of the Empire, occurring frequently in association with the legend DMS noted above, that its Omission is generally to be reckoned negative evidence in favour of Christianity. The mere omission, however, of these elements in an inscription does nothing more than put us on our guard.

Positive internal evidence may be classed in two categories. First come explicit Christian stigmata: the name of Christ on an inscription, whether in adjectival or substantival form, is quite sufficient, on self-evident grounds, to establish its Christian origin. On this principle, however, we should be able to isolate very few texts indeed; our African material so identified would need only a sheet of notepaper for its reproduction entire. But our list of indisputably authentic Christian texts swells a hundredfold When we recognize the name of Christ concealed under the monogram手 produced by the fusion of the Greek letters Chi and Rho, and thereby constituting a suspension for CHRistus readily intelligible to antiquity, as may be seen from $A \neq A R C H o n t o s$ on one of the coins of Decius3) $\&$ on the coins of the Ptolemies ${ }^{4}$ ) and elsewhere also to represent CHRuson, CHRonos and the like when these could not be written in full. ( This monogram was

1) Cagnat,Cours d'Epigr.lat. 255
2) Sandys,Lat,Epigr. 63
3) Kraus, RE ii 434 fig. 270
4) King, Numismatics 13
5) Kaufimann, Handbuch der christlichen Arch
current from Constantine's official use of it onwards? but does not owe its existence to his original suggestion, as is shown by its appearance on a stone dated 298.) We might do justice to the evidence by saying that before Constantine's time its employment was sporadic, but that afterwards it spread like wilafire: the Emperor had once for all set the fashion. For the period of the Church's minority, although we do not have the monogram to any useful extent, we have a highly curious forerunner which serves the same purpose for us, namely the fish, either spelt out in letters (IX $\mathcal{Y} \mathrm{YC}$ ) or represented pictoriฮlly. Two contemporary inscriptions from opposite extremities of the aneient world, namely the Epitaph of Pectorius in Gaul, and the Epitaph of Abercius, Bishop of Hierapolis, in Asia Minor, ${ }^{4}$ ) combine to remove all doubt as to the meaning of this device: for the Christians of the time, it meant Jesus Christ. We have no occasion here to settle the obscure question of the primary reference of this odd symbol, but will simply recall the acrostic ingeniously found by the ancients in the word IXOYC, namely Incous Xpiotos $\theta \in 0 \cup$ Yioc (wTnp = Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour, ${ }^{5}$ ) thought by Kaufmann to conceal a reference to the Imperial titles, ${ }^{6}$ ) together with Augustine's explicit statement:"...horum autem Graecorum quinque verborum, quae sunt Inoaus XpleTosetc., quod est Latine Iesus Christus Dei Filius Salvator, si primas litteras iungas, erit $\mid x \theta r C$, id est piscis, in quo nomine mystice intelligitur
6) Euseb. vit. Const.I/3I
2)De Rossi vol.Ino. 26
3)Marucchi pp.125-126
7) Marucchi pp.129-130
5)Oracula Sibyllina viii/217-250 ed.Geffcken(Leipzig 1902)pp.153-5
8) Kaufmann, Handbuch d. chr. Arch Hologie p. 294
9) De Civitate Dei xviii 23

Christus."(..!the joining of the initial letters of these five Greek words, viz., Inoous XplótaSetc, in Latin, Ifesus Christus Dei Filius Salvator(Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour) produces $1 \times$ OrC, that is, fish, by which name Christ is mystically to be understood.") As for the other early Christian symbols, the anchor, dove, palmbranch, ${ }^{1}$ Etc., together with the cross in all its forms, including the so-called monogramatic cross $(f)$, which, all evidence as to its extra-Christian distribution and fundamentally non-Christian otigin notwithstanding, must in practice, and in want of evidence to the contrary, be regarded, for the purposes of this study, as an 3) authentic Christian stigma: their discussion belongs to Archaeology rather than to Epigraphy, as here understood.

We pass now to consider Internal positive evidences of the Christian origin of inscriptions belonging to our second class.In contrast to those discussed above, which constitute direct stigmata and their recognisable transformations, these latter might be denominated indirect stigmata, whose interpretation we derive from our knowledge of Church History in general. The reference here is to all these elements in inscriptions which show obvious relation to actual Christian tradition, e.g. Biblical citations, references to events which can be identified, for example persecutions or schisms, references to the constitution, doctrine, worship, or discipline of the Church, above all the mention of Church offices - bishops, presbyters, deacons, lectors, and the like. Whenever these or similar officials are mentioned, we may be tolerably certain that we are dealing with a Christian inscription. The solitary

1) Marucchi pp.58-70
2)King,op.cit.p.13sq
3)Kraus RE ii 225
occurrence of EPISCOPUS as the title of a municipal official in Gaul ${ }^{1)}$ does not affect the validity of this general conclusion; one must rather marvel, that the title "overseer" was not more widely used outside Christian circles. So long as nothing else in an inscription containing explicit references to the Christian tradition(as we know it from other sources)contradicts the inference, we are at liberty to treat all such references as diagnostic of Christianity.

Inscriptions, therefore, which contain explicit stigmata, in names or symbols, or which exhibit clear relationship with the Christian tradition as above explained, have absolute validity as Christian inscriptions. But not every stone originating from Christians are or need be adorned with stigmata such as these; frequently we shall have to deal with stones parts of which have been broken off, carrying away with them such stigmata; and not all Christians bear office in the Church. How are the stones of such Christians to be identified? Were we pursuing this question for its own sake, that is in order to issue a complete treatise on the diagnosis of Christian inscription, we should have to carry out a thorough examination of all inscriptions bearing direct or indirect stigmata of absolute validity as above described (henceforward to be denominated PRIMARY STIGMATA) in order to discover whether they also bore other marks rarely or not at all found upon authentic pagan, if possible pre-Christian, inscriptions of the same class. If so, we would consiaer them relatively diagnostic 1)ORELLI 4024; for eastern examples see Deissmann NB 60-62
of the Christian origin of those inscriptions on which they occurred in the absence of more certain marks, and should therefore call them SECONDARY STIGMATA; they would then suffice, in the absence of positive evidence to the contrary, to indicate that the stone in question is Christian in origin. But this is too large a task for mere Prolegomena.

What is meantime impossible on a large scale can be done however on a small scale, valid criteria being available from a limited collection of texts, provided they are representative. Diehl's admirable anthology, "Lateinische altchristliche Inschriften" published as Nr. 26-28 of Lietzmann's "Kleine Texte" by Marcus \& Weber of Bonn (2te Aufl. 1913), which contains 350 items, provides the desired basis; for the first 117 of these bear the names of familiar Church officials, together, in many cases, with well-known Christian devices and sacred names (God, Christ). They are all of them therefore indisputably Christian texts. Selecting then the first fifty epitaphs from among them, we at once notice two elements frequently recurring, which are scarcely or not at all found among well-authenticated pagan texts of the same order. (A) The phrase IN PACE = in peace, which occurs only twice in the 2000 odd "exempla" of Wilmanns!) occurs here in the ratio $31 / 50$, that is to say $62 \%$. Hence in the absence of primary stigmata, and of contrary evidence, an inscription containing the phrase IN PACE, "in peace", is a Christian inscription. (B) In 44 cases out of 50 in Diehl, the
date of death is mentioned, and in three cases where the exact date is not specified, there is nevertheless a reference of a more or less explicit kind to the death of the deceased; only in three cases is there no mention whatever of the subject. This fact stands in marked contrast to the situation in pagan sepułchral epigraphy, Where the date of death is very rarely mentioned. In Wilmanns the fact of the death, apart from notices of the deceased having fallen in battle, does not occur oftener than a score of times; the exact day of death is not mentioned more than four times, or five times, if an inscription, whose pagan origin admits of doubt, be included? ) Here again, therefore, we have a right to say: In the absence of primary stigmata, and of evidence to the contrary, a text containing reference to the death of the deceased, especially to the exact day of his death, is a Christian inscription. The degree of probability inherent in each of these secondary stigmata considered in isolation is naturally heightened when both coincide on a stone otherwise devoid of diagnostic marks: so combined, they carry an approach to certainty practically equal to that of one of the primary stigmata. It is by the application of this canon that much the larger part of our African material of lay origin has been isolated.

Only when internal evidences are not forthcoming ought we to resort to external evidences, whose diagnostic probability is of low degree. These latter evidences are of two kinds, corresponding to the dimensions of time and space which

1) Dessau, Lat. Ep. 26
2)Wilmanns nos. $206,234,257,1999,(? 1285)$
for us mediate the transition from inner to outer reality, namely, evidence derived from the mere chronological or topographical situation of an inscription. From non-epigraphical sources we know in advance, that the Roman Empire, at first pagan, finished Christian: that result has never once been disputed. It therefore follows, that the more recent an inscription is, the more likely is it to be Christian, other things being equal. This is the same criterion as that assumed by Monceaux, when in different words he lays it down, that an inscription belonging to the early Empire is Christian if it bears special Christian marks, and that one belonging to the later Empire is Christian if devoid of special pagan marks! ${ }^{\text {l }}$ But however expressed, the rule is merely a general one indicating probability; it can never be decisive. The corresponding rule derived from the topography of an inscription is likewise only to be applied as a last resort, namely, that an inscription, itself devoid of internal stigmata, but occurring in the imnediate neighbourhood of others of the same class which do possess internal stigmata showing unmistakable Christian origin, it is to be reckoned a Christian inscription, other things being equal. On this principle many of the texts excavated from catacombs, e.g. those at Hadrumetum, are accepted, even al though they contain only names in no way distinctively Christian. The same remark applies on an even larger scale to the debris of Christian cenetaries such as those at Carthage associated with the work of Delattre already meantioned.
[^4]The principles underlying the objective delimitation of the material may therefore be summarised as follows. Evidence as to the Christian origin of epigraphical texts are either INTERNAL or EXTERNAL. Internal evidence either directly, by explicit words or signs, or indifectly, by reference to the Church tradition, or in both ways simultaneously, constitutes an inscription as Christian. The identity of texts bearing such unequivocal marks (primary stigmata) is certain. Primary stigmata, in a very large proportion of cases, are accompanied by secondary stigmata, namely the pax-formula and the death-clause. Either of these occurring in isolation would in itself be sufficient to indicate the origin of its vehicle as Christian, provided evidence to the contrary were lacking; together they would form a strong justification scarcely less cogent than that belonging to a primary stigma. External evidence, on the other hand, namely that forthcoming from the chronology of any given text, whereby the probability of its Christian origin is in proportion to its distance from the origin in time of the Christian religion, and that supplied by its topography, whereby the probability of its Christian origin is controlled by the origin of similar texts in its immediate neighbourhood, naturally carried much less weight, and should only be invoked as a last resort, namely when all internal evidence is lacking.

So much for the objective principles governing the identification of Christian inscriptions in general, those namely which are universal, valid for all undertakings with Christian inscrip-
tions as material. Each fresh investigator, however, has his own individual purpose in working up such material, whence arise subjective criteria conditioned by his particular viewpoint and in turn conditioning his final selection of texts. It is of these presuppositions in the present case that it is now proposed in a few words to treat.

Naturally the first aim $\not x$ here has been, to bring together all texts of genuine Christian origin, and the principles adopted to that end have just been set forth. The object of the investigation however being an understanding of Christian piety, any evidence is welcome which offers enlightenment thereon. In principle, therefore, an ideal collection would contain pagan inscriptions also, as on account of their interest for the understanding of Christianity the
many pagan inscriptions resemble/Priene stone announcing the introduction of the Julian Calendar into the Province of Asia in the time of Augustus ${ }^{I}$ ) of which Harnack saia:"In very truth, this inscription is incomparably more significant for the history of Christianity than the majority of Christian inscriptions! ${ }^{2)}$ But in practice limits must be set, however arbitrary. It has therefore been decided to include among our Christian inscriptions all dedications to Christian Emperors from Constantine onwards, and other similar documents on which their names occur. With the exception of Julian, they were all officially Christian, and, on the other hand, such documents were drawn up in the name of the

[^5]general community, so that it must be assumed, with the acquiescence of the Christians also. Among the state inscriptions we include the inscriptions in verse affixed to public works built by the Vandal Kings, who were Arians, and therefore, like all heretics, earnestly Christian in intention. In this connection it should perhaps be stated that dogmatic considerations play no part in the choice of our material; in any case scruples on this point cannot apparently be upheld in dealing with Christian inscriptions, if the case of Gaul, where Catholic and Arian remains cannot be distinguished, ${ }^{l}$ be typical. But the numerous mile-stones belonging to the Christian Empire, because of their want of originality and the need for some limit, have been excluded. They lie on the periphery of our collection, and are merely enumerated.

The similar exclusion of mere chrisms, whether of the form $\mathbb{F}_{\text {or }} f$, with or without the apocalyptic letters $d \omega$, has its ground in the distinction between Epigraphy and Archaeology already mentioned. Their relegation to the periphery of our collection cannot be justified on principle, but only as an attempt to set reasonable limits to the material.

Pinally it has been decided, albeit with regret, to exclude Gnostic texts.It is quite true that the Gnostics considered themselves Christians: in the Epistl of Ptolemy (School of Valentinus) to Flora, for example, the exposition is permeated with New Testament commonplaces, especially from Matthew, John, and Paul, and it is

[^6]to Basilides the Gnostic that the Church owes its first Gospel Commentary, and that with an impeccably orthodox text as basis. ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) Nevertheless the recognisably Gnostic pieces we have examined of African origin are devoid of specifically Christian stigmata, and type belong altogether to the Abraxas/, which, in so far as it admits of any classification at all in terms of organised religion, shows as much affincty with Judaism as with Christianity, if not indeed more? ) They are therefore relegated to the periphery, as in fact becomes their syncretistic character. With this last explanation our remarks on the subject of Terminology reach their close.
(b) Chronology.

State tituli reckoned apart, no more than 192 items belonging to our collection can be exactly dated to the year. These texts we propose to reproduce in extenso as an appendix, on account of their importance, as they constitute the basis of the chronology of our African material. As the appendix will furnish full details as to their source and position in the catalogue, it will be convenient here to cite them according to their serial number,i.e. I-192.

The great majority come from Mauretania, and are dated A. D. in terms of Provincial Era, which was reckoned from the year/ 39 , when, by overcoming the local prince, Ptolemaeus, son of Juba II, qaius Caligula reduced the kingdom to submission and incorporated it as a Province into the Roman Empire. 3) The reigns of the Vanal

1) Lietzmann, Geschichte der alten Kirche $I / 307$ (Berlin 1932)
2) Kraus RE I/8-9 fg.6-9, esp.fg. 8: $1 A \Omega \subset A B A \Omega / M O Y C H$
3) Schwarze,Untersuchungen 5

Emperors provide references in the case of four stones, two from Byzacena (no. 131 Genseric;no. 172 Hilderic) and two from Numidia (no. 169 Trasamund; no. $177^{4}$ Gelimir). Genseric's capture of Carthage in 439 is thought to have supplied the point of departure from which one inscription excavated at Cap Bon appears to date; and the re-capture of the same city in the year 533 by Justinian's general Belisar, whereby Africa was placed under Byzantine rule, ${ }^{2}$ ) supplies the reference of texts belonging not only to Zeugitana (no.175), but also to Byzacena (no.175) and Numidia(nos.177-179). Only five pieces bear reference to consulates, elsewhere and especially at Rome the prevailing method ${ }^{3}$ ) two in Byzacena(nos. 101 and 104), two in Numidia (nos.ll2 and 189) and one in Mauretania, which curiously enough combines therewith the same date reckoned in terms of the Provintial Era. (no.126). No.l28, from Byzacena, would probably refer to the Justinian Era, were it not for its proximity to No. 101 already mentioned, dated 427 by consulates. Mommsen's conjecture, namely that the reference here is to the 28th year of the reign of Valentinian III, is indeed without positive grounds, and lacks analogies; yet it provides a date compatible with the fact that the two inscriptions were found together, and so must stand until a better explanation is forthcoming.

The transition from direct internal evidence as to the date of the African inscriptions to indirect evidence, upon which all the others outside the 192 must be placed in order, is found

1) RPE $1937 \mathrm{no}$.
2) Schwarze, Untersuchungen 173
3) Kaufmann, Handbuch d. altchr. Epigr.43-47
4)Schwarze,op.cit. 56
by an examination of those features in the dated inscriptions which recur frequently enough to show a definite relation to the chronological position of the stones on which they appear.

The most obvious feature of this kind is the name, since whatever else it possesses or lacks, every inscription may be assumed at one time at least to have borne a name. Here, then, the following facts emerge: (1) In 238(no.3) and from 302(no.4) to 577(no.185), perhaps also 583(no.186), that is, through申ut the 4 th, 5 th, and 6 th centuries generally, the double name is current. It occurs 53 times in the 4 th, 65 times in the 5 th, and 8 times in the 6 th century. The corresponding figures for the triple name are $10,5,0 .(310,323$, 324,342(2 examples),344,352,353,377,391,394,400+,408,414,454,470 = nos. $6,10,12,22,25,37,40,49,56,63,69,80,83,130,146$.$) The single$ name, on the other hand, is more evenly distributed than either, being found in the 3rd century thrice (225twice,226once=nos.1,2) 43 times in the 4 th century, 50 times in the 5 th century, 13 times in the 6 th century, and 9 times in the 7 th century $(605,637,655,679=$ nos. 188-192), in which last it is to be noted that names of both double and triple formation are entirely wanting. Hence the general rule: triple names indicate a date,in practice, not lower than the first quarter of the 5 th century, much more probably the 4 th century; double names, almost any date higher than the 7 th; single names, any time at all. Further, in view of the numerical predominance of all three categories between 400 and 500 , doubtful cases should be placed in the 5 th century. Beyond this it is impossible to particularise on the chronological value of names without encountering numerous exceptions and anomalies.

The chronological distribution of chrisms, crosses, and the like corresponds very much to that already observed in the cases of Rome and Gaul. It will be observed from the table below, however, that so far as three items are concerned, namely $P_{1}$ their African incidence stands uniformly between those of the other two areas, thus:-


Here follow the details:-
D 318 (no.8)
329(no.14) 349(no.29) 352(no.38) 359(no.43) 377(no.49) 379-382(no.52) 383(no.51) 450-1,452-3(no.124)

(ث) $394(\mathrm{no} .62) 452(\mathrm{no.128)} 557(\underset{182)}{\text { no. }}$
(t)

398(no.66)
dW, AW $405($ nos. 74 \& 75)
406 (no.78)
十 379-382(m 52) 406(no.77)
$\xrightarrow{f^{637(\text { no. 189) }}} \begin{aligned} & 379-382(\text { no. } 52) 456(\text { no.131 }) \\ & 543(\text { no. } 181) \\ & 637(\text { no.189 })\end{aligned}$
aKw 408(no.80) 480(no.156)
\&A(1) 415 (no.85)
He 419 (no.88) 440 (no.115)
${ }_{\text {WPX }}^{\text {W19(no.89) }}$
迷 425 (no.99)
$\Leftrightarrow 430($ no.106 (10) 432(no.107) 450(no.123)
Alw 454 (no.105) 170510 (no.170) 526 (no.172)

1)Le Blant, Manuel d'epigr.chret. p. 29

Here again only the most general inferences are possible: $\frac{0}{1}$ is an indication of 4 th-century origin; the addition of the apocalyptic letters $A\left(W\right.$ point to the transition to the 5 th, in which $\frac{p}{}$ is the dominant form; equal-limbed crosses, more or less ornate, carry us still lower: these are the general guiding-principles adopted from the preceding examination of symbolic marks.

Those morphological elements in the inscriptions which have already been noted as diagnostically important are also to a certain extent of chronological value, on account of their frequency. On the whole the pax-formula is not decisive, as it is current throughout; but its position in relation to the verb VIXIT with which it is often syntactically combined is to be noted. The earlier order is IN PACE VIXIT, which is predominantly 4 th century: of the three instances noted in our dated material, one occurs in 360 (no. 44), one in 377 (no.49), and one in 471(no.147). Probably we should not generalise on such slender evidence. But the alternative order VIXIT IN PACE is distinctly later: in our African material it occurs in 454 (no.130),508(no.169), and 531(no.174), and is thus exclusive to the 5 th and following centuries, exactly as in Rome (from 404) ${ }^{\text {l }}$ and in Gaul, where its upper terminus lies even later, namely 486. ( Similarly the other primary diagnostic stigman, namely mention of the death of the deceased, is by itself of small value from our present viewpoint, since the current verbs are fairly evenly distributed, namely discedere from 302(no.4) to 679(no.192), decedere from $225($ no.l $)$ to $577($ no.185) and precedere from 352(no.37) to 519(no.171). To the fifth and following
I)De Rossi vol.I no. 533
2) Le Blant, Manuel pp.50-51
centuries, however, are confined the verbs QUIESCERE, which occurs thrice, namely in 406(no.77),510(no.170), and 526(no.172), and its compound REQUIESCERE, which occurs six times between 422(no.95) and 508(no.169). This is considerably later than the incidence of the same verb in Rome, the upper limit in the case of QUIESCERE being 339, in the case of REQUIESCERE being 345 , ${ }^{2}$ ) from which time both become common. More remarkable still is the late currency in Africa of the verb RECEDERE which occurs as often as ten times, but only between 440 (no.l15) and 557(no.182). In Gaul this verb dates from the midale of the 4 th century, namely between 347 and 489, ${ }^{3}$, while in Rome it can be traced to the 3rd, namely to the year 235. Whatever be the explanation it is a striking feture of African chronology.

Passing to other frequently-recurring elements in our dated material, we notice as characteristic of the earlier epitaphic style the epithets of endearment CARISSIMUS, which occurs 9 times between 318(no.8) and 416(no.86), AMANTISSIMUS twice,i.e.in 335 (no.19) and $350($ no. 32), and DULCISSIMUS, of which we count six examples between $323($ no. 10) and 392(no.58), together with two of the $3 r$ century, namely nos. 1 \& 2 , belonging to the years 225 and 226 respectively. Somewhat later occur INNOX and its variants, namely from 392(no.59) to 419(no.89). Of the term FIDELIS applied to the baptized, ${ }^{5}$ ) which is extremely frequent in Africa, we have only five dated examples, and these lie between $360(n 0.44)$ and 557(no.182): the expression is accordingly to be regarded as $\varepsilon$ mark of the 5 th and 6 th centuries rather than of the 4 th.
1)De Rossi I/52
2) ibid. 81
3) Le Blant, Manuel
p. 24
4) Marucchi, Le catacombe romane(Rome 1902)p. 94
5) Marucchi,Christian Epigraphy p. 105

Two other common elements whose diagnostic value as stigmata indicating a later origin of the stones on which they occur is well authenticated fall to be mentioned here, namely the qualification PLUS MINUS interposed before the number of years the deceased has to his credit, and the word HIC when it occurs at the head of an inscription. PLUS MINUS, written in full or variously abbreviated, occurs in Africa ten times in the 5th century, namely from 405(no.74) to 460 (no.134), is entirely lacking during the 6 th, but reappears $t_{\text {wice }}$ in the 7 th century, namely in 605(no.188) and 679(no.192). This is almost a century behind the occurrence of the expression in Rome, where it can be traced to the year 3301) on the other hand however fully a century in advance of its appearance in Gaul, where it occurs for the first time in the year 5ll, falling out of use after 643.) HIC appears commonly at the head of epitaphs of the fifth century, in such combinations as HIC JACET four times in 405 (nos.73-76), once in 415(no.85), once in 440(no.115), and again in 531(no.174); HIC REQUIESEIT in 444(no.118),467(no.139), and 508(no. 168) ; HIC REQUIESCIT SANCTAE MEMORIAE in 475(no.153); and HIC EST in 491(no.164). In connection with relics the phrase is above all Common: IN HOC LOCO (=HIC)DEPOSITAE SUNT RELIQUIAE...as in 452 (no. 126) and $474($ no.150 ). This use prevails in the 6 th century, when the current formula.is HIC MEMORIA...in 543(no.180) and HIC ABENTUR RELiquie...as in 568(no.184). This use of HIC is common at Rome, where however it may be traced weil up into the fourth century: HIC QUIESCIT for example occurs there five times between

365 and 399. In Gaul, on the other hand, it appears slightly later,
1)De Rossi I/38
2)LeBl,Manuel 24
3)De Rossi I/84 101185207
namely from 469 onwards.)
Finally the name of the monument itself is sometimes an indication of its date. The current term, MEMORIA, is of slight use in this respect, since it is found throughout the period for which we possess dated texts: it appears in the first (a.225) and in the last (a.679).MENSA, however, is predominantly 4th-century:five times only does it occur, namely in 324(no.12), 342(no.92), 352(no.38), 360(no.44), and in 419(no.88), of which the last is the only 5thcentury example. On ten pieces ranging from 344 (no.25) to 440 (no. ll6) we find the elsewhere totally unknown legend DOMUS ROMULA; and from the midale of the 5 th century to the end of the namely from 536(no.176) to 679(no.192) the tomb is regularly entitled DOMUS ETERNALIS. As for the altogether pagan D.M.S. and its numerous variants, we find it very frequently indeed throughout the 4 th and 5 th centuries, namely from 302(no.4) to 493(no.165), after which it does not appear again on well-authenticated Christian stones.

Palaeographical considerations have been invoked only on a very slight scale in the dating of our African material, owing to the almost complete lack of a basis in the form of accurate facsimiles and photographs, without which a connected history of lapidary script is impossible. Here and there isolated observations reveal a frequent, but by no means universal, displacement of the Roman $D$ by the Greek Delta ( $\Delta$ ) from the fifth century, namely in a series of stones dating from a year posterior to $400($ no.69 ) to 1)Le Blant, Manuel p. 23

655(no.191), the uncial $M(m)$ on a stone dated 419(no.91), and the uncial $s(r)$ on one of $462(n o .136)$. So far as they go these modifications of the traditional Roman script coincide With those observed on the later pieces in Gaul, where Le Blant, with the advantage of a personal examination of much of his material, has given an excellent account of the local script, showing beyond doubt that the occurence of all such modifications is a certain index of work dating from the fifth or subsequent centuries.) The kindrea study of the Orthography is even less fruitful in this respect, but for different reasons. Illiterate forms, together with contractions and suspensions, are of little chronological significance so far as our African dated material is concerned, as irregularities of this kind are confined to no particular epoch, and seem to be controlled by the condition of the vehicle, e.g. the space available, or the social standing of the stonecutter, rather than by the cultural tendency of the community. At the same time, however, one notes the relative frequency of abbreviations on documents of later date, e.g. the occurence of $\operatorname{sps}=$ spiritus, sci $=$ sancti, rlqe srm mrm $=$ reliquiae sanctorum martyrum, a vro betmo $=$ a viro beatissimo, in 585(no.187), and of the ellipse of the final -m in genitive plurals such as ...confessorū per manus beatissimorū episcoporū in $537($ no. 189), in which latter case at least literary convention and not practical necessity must be the controlling factor, since accommodation to scanty space would have been much more readily

1) Le Blant, Manuel pp.41-42
secured by the ellipse of medial vowels as in the former examples. On the whole therefore abbreviations indicate a late date; but only in a document of some length, where the frequency and nature of the abbreviations can be adequately examined, can this rule be decisive. In two directions the above criteria are subject to
limitation. In the first place it will be observed that owing to the overwhelming preponderance of Mauretanian material in our dated texts, the results cannot $\begin{aligned} & \text { be applied altogether without reserve }\end{aligned}$ to inscriptions from the rest of Africa, in particular from the populous region of Zeugitans. No special difficulty attends formulae common to all African inscriptions, but elements peculiar to areas outwith mauretania, and of which no dated examples are forthcoming, cannot apparently be dealt with except with the help of analogies outwith Africa itself. Thus for example numerous texts in this sparsely-dated region are dated according to the INDICTION, i.e. a period of 15 years, a method which,on account of the variety of cycles underlying its reckoning, is practically useless when employed, as is usually done, alone. In this case resort must be made to extra-African examples of the Indiction system in which this form of dating is reinforced by another more nearly precise reference. The earliest examples of Indiction-dating, so determined, we find to be in 491 in Gaul, and in 570 and 571 in Rome. 3) Hence we conclude for Africa that a stone bearing an indiction is of the 6 th century or later. A similar method is invoked in the case of other chronologically significant stigmata dated examples of which are

[^7]entirely wanting among our African material. In particular the valuable generalisations invited by the copious Roman collection respecting the characteristic form of names from the 4 th dentury, viz. that gentilida become more and more rare with the exception of Flavius, which is common in centuries 5 and 6 , and that names ending in -anus, -antius, -entius, -ontius, and -osus, together with names inspired by Christian piety, e.g. Quodvultdeus, Thomas, Anastasius, and the like, have the 4 th century as their upper limit, of of constitute the sole criteria applicable to stones bearing names but otherwise devoid of significant marks.

The second defect inherent in our collection of dated texts is its poverty in material previous to the 4 th century: only two items belong to this period, and from them we learn next to nothing of the characteristic features in stones of this period. That the fish and anchor are the most ancient of all sepulchral symbols we know from a stone of the year 234 in Rome; to Rome likewise we must resort in order to discover the earliest precise date of the 2) ancient acclamation Refrigera, namely 291. But the evidence whereby we recognise the early date of similar acclamations, e.g. AVE VALE, VIVAS IN DEO, PAX TECIJM, lies beyond Epigraphy proper, in the realm rather of Archaeology and Primitive-Christian Literature. These disciplines, moreover, furnish us with the reason for this: Wilpert's reproductions from the Roman Catacombs show us the Christian depicted, not as a member of the world, busied with earthly tasks, but as a candidate for Paradise, in the attitude
1)De Rossi I/pp.cxii-cxiii
2) De Rossi,I/6,17
3) Le Blant, Manuel p. 45
of prayer, ${ }^{1)}$ while the Christian literature contemporaneous therewith was dominated by eschatological expectations which at first ignored the world, being forced to acknowledge it only by degrees because as a matter of fact it did not perish, but continued from generation to generation, thus leaving no choice?) In these circumstances it may be readily understood that the earliest Christians of all had no occasion to use dates on their sepulchral texts calculated in reference to a regime destined in their view to share the general destruction. Ultimately, therefore, the lack of chronological data on our material prior to the 4 th century is to be traced beyond the texts themselves to the otherworldly piety of the primitive community, and is amenable to no remedy.

So much for internal evidence as to the date of the inscriptions. External evidence is similar to that already considered in connection with the problem of identification. Proximity to pieces whose date is known, the average date of neighbouring texts, manifest relation to historically ascertained events, persons, or situations: these are the criteria here relevant. That such evidences, however, are of slight weight, and are to be employed only when internal evidence is ambiguous or altogether wanting, is self-evident.

## (c) Topography

Since modern editors are careful always to report the provenance of every piece they bring forward, the topography of our African texts constitutes no problem in the scientific sense. What falls

1) Wilpert, Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms(Freiburg i. Br. 1903) 2) Dibelius, Urchr.u.Kultur
[Tafelband 4369727588 etc. (Heidelberg 1928)23-28
of prayer, ${ }^{1)}$ while the Christian literature contemporaneous therewith was dominated by eschatological expectations which at first ignored the world, being forced to acknowledge it only by degrees because as a matter of fact it did not perish, but continued from generation to generation, thus leaving no choice?) In these circumstances it may be readily understood that the earliest Christians of all had no occasion to use dates on their sepulchral texts calculated in reference to a regime destined in their view to share the general destruction. Ultimately, therefore, the lack of chronological data on our material prior to the 4 th century is to be traced beyond the texts themselves to the otherworldy piety of the primitive community, and is amenable to no remedy.

So much for internal evidence as to the date of the inscriptions. External evidence is similar to that already considered in connection with the problem of identification. Proximity to pieces whose date is known, the average date of neighbouring texts, manifest relation to historically ascertained events, persons, or situations: these are the criteria here relevant. That such evidences, however, are of slight weight, and are to be employed only when internal evidence is ambiguous or altogether wanting, is self-evident.
(c) Topography

Since modern editors are careful always to report the provenance of every piece they bring Iorward, the topography of our African texts constitutes no problem in the scientific sense. What falls
1)Wilpert, Die Walereien der Katakomben Roms(Freiburg i. Br. 1903)
2) Dibelius, Urchr.u.Kultur

Tafelband 4369727588 etc.
(Heidelberg 1928)23-28
to be considered here is rather the regional grouping of the texts in the catalogue which follows.

Obviously the most appropriate division of the country to adopt for a study of the Early Church in Africa is the division into Provinces settled by Diocletian, ${ }^{\text {l }}$, with which coincided for all practical purposes the Ecclesiastical Provinces. Kiepert's map appended to the 8 th volume of the CIL has naturally been taken as the basis; but the region including Theveste, Calama, and Hippo Regius, there called ${ }^{\text {TMmidia Proconsularis, has been reckoned part }}$ of Numidia, and the term Proconsularis, applied to the Carthage sector, has been set aside $\not 2 h$ on account of its ambiguity in favour of the alternative term Zeugitana, and the modern French frontier has been adopted, vhich divides Tunisie and Algérie. Owing partly to the habit of modern editors of citing localities under French political divisions without reference to the old Roman provincial divisions, and partly to the multiple nomenclature whereby individual settlements usually have at least two names apart from the original Latin name, namely in Arabi and French, corresponding to the political destinies of the country from time to time, it has not always been easy to locate exactly every inscription forthcoming since the CIL. The new Government Archaeological Atlas of Algeria would of course have provided a ready solution for all these perplexities, had it been available for this study; but with the aid of the magnificent maps and indices supplied by Mesnage, ${ }^{3)}$ all but a very few items have been accounted for. In this connection a map

1) Schwarze, Untersuchungen p. 11
2) ibid.p. 28
3) Mesnage, L'Afrique chrétienne (Paris 1912)
has been prepared on the basis of those supplied by Holme ${ }^{\text {l }}$ and by Julien, ${ }^{2}$ chiefly on account of their suitable dimensions, and has been scored in both directions so that the whole country is covered by about 40 small rectangles, reference to which by means of letters of the alphabet has been deemed sufficient for the location of the numerous insignificant villages and ruins containing ehristian texts which could not be marked with names without overcrowding the map.

Such are the principles underlying the following catalogue. This consists of three distinct tables, all of which are necessary in view of the twofold classification corresponding to chronology and topography.

The first table results from taking the chronological order of the texts as basis, and superimposing thereon the topographical classification. A priori the unit of chronological grouping is the century, but two objections militate against this otherwise convenient method. Grouping by centuries is external add artificial, since it follows no inward principle of significance to the matter in hand; moreover it results in too many divisions emerging. Therefore an alternative principle of division has been adopted which is free from these defects, namely a division suggested by the stages whereby Christianity achieved its final synthesis with the world. The points of division are two only, namely the Edict of Milan of the year 313, whereby Constantine and Licinius permitted Christianity to flourish within a general situation in

1) Holme, The Extinction of the Christian Churches in N. Africa(London 2) Julien, Histoire de I'Afrique du Nord (Paris 1931)
which all religions whatsoever enjoyed toleration and respecton terms of absolute equality, and the enactment of the Emperor Honorius of the year 408 prohibiting paganism in the west, which shows us Christianity in its full dominance, possessing power to establish itself by law to the absolute exclusion of all other religions whatsoever? ${ }^{2}$ (t is obviously of much more significanee whether a text occurs (a) wen Christianity was a "religio illicita" or (b)when it was a "religio licita" or (c) when it alone was "licita", all others being now "illicitae", than whether it occurs in the first quarter of this, or the last third of that century. We shall use the century as a convenient unit to the extent of treating the period 313-408 as the fourth century; otherwise we shall group together in our catalogue those inscriptions previous to the fourth, and those posterior to the fourth century. This arrangement yields a threefold division convenient in its simplicity:-
(a) saec i-iii
(b) saec iv
(c) saec v-vii

Grouping now the African Provinces from East to West according to Roman numerals, thus: I Tripolitania II Byzacena III Zeugitana IV Numidia $V$ Mauretania, and subsuming them under each of the time-divisions above, we reach the following schema for our first table: 7

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a I \text { aII aIII aIV aV } \\
& \mathrm{bI} \text { bII bIII bIV bV } \\
& c I \text { cII cIII cIV cV }
\end{aligned}
$$

Fragments defying chronological classification or so completely devoid of individuality or continuity as to defy interpretation
I) Lactantius De mort.pers. XIviii6
2) Cod Theod XVI $\times 19$
by themselves, but whose Christian origin is reasonably well authenticated, and which when examined in the mass or alongside other texts might yield substantial information, we relegate to a section of Chronologically unclassifiable material, marking them with the letter $x$, retaining however the distinction of provinces:-

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
x I & x I I & x I I I & x I V & x V
\end{array}
$$

This table, being the original one employed in the grouping of the inscriptions, will constitute the catalogue proper, and will therefore contain the fundamental references. Although in many cases the tradition of an inscription has been traced through several different periodicals and collections, and although the most recent readings have always been taken into account in the actual investigation, only one reference will be given for each item, namely the first occasion on which it was published, whether or not it has since been reedited. This principle accounts for the preponderance of references to the CIL vol. 8 , which in this connection has for obvious reasons been adopted as the ultimate source of sources.

The second table, in which the fundamental relations are reversed, so that the topographical grouping is taken as basis, and the chronological classification superimposed thereon, presupposes the first, in this respect, namely, that each item, instead of being traced to its ultimate source, is merely cited according to its twofold division-inaex and serial number assigned it in the catalogue. This method of citation permits of compact presentation. Naturally the larger unit of the Province will be employed, but within this unt $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}$ the smalier one of exact locality
lement will in addition bear an index NEh CoLL. LSS m the map according to the aforementioned the whole will be grouped in geographical ; precedence over the North-South axis. :xcluded from this table, on account of ty and general want of individual dex-groups the order of place-names will .ptive praenomina (egg. in Latin, castra, יabic,henschir, ain, etc.) not being taken use.
pps, however, no order will be evident ions themselves, as they appear in either lave been incorporated as they have been ing, or as they have come to be placed in
the course of aualuıur, ueletion, transposition, and general revision. The pari passu compilation of the Onomasticon to be used later forbade more minute classification, for which there is at this stage in any case no need, in view of the structure of part II. If and when the texts come to be published in extenso, it will be easy for whoever is concerned to arrange them as he pleases within the general outline already provided in the second table.

The one-sidedness of each of the aforementioned tables in contrast to the other is transcended in the third table, were we renounce individual citation and resort to statistics. In it is shown at a glance the present condition of our African material.

These three tables now follow in order.
will be subsumed. Each settlement will in addition bear an index referring to its position om the map according to the aforementioned network of parallels, while the whole will be grouped in geographical order, the East-West taking precedence over the North-South axis. The fragments(x-) will be excluded from this table, on account of their chronological ambiguity and general want of individual significance. Within the index-groups the order of place-names will be alphabetical, the descriptive praenomina (e.g. in Latin, castra, castellum, municipium,in Arabic,henschir, ain, etc.) not being taken into account for this purpose.

Within these groups, however, no order will be evident among the individual citations themselves, as they appear in either of these two tables. They have been incorporated as they have been from time to time forthcoming, or as they have come to be placed in the course of addition, deletion, transposition, and general revision. The pari passu compilation of the Onomasticon to be used later forbade more minute classification, for which there is at this stage in any case no need, in view of the structure of part II. If and when the texts come to be published in extenso, it will be easy for whoever is concerned to arrange them as he pleases within the general outline already provided in the second table. The one-sidedness of each of the aforementioned tables in contrast to the other is transcended in the third table, where we renounce individual citation and resort to statistics. In it is shown at a glance the present condition of our African material.

These three tables now follow in order.

## FIRST TABLE: CHRONOLOGICO - TOPOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION (Catalogue)

(a) Saec I - III
(I) TRIPOLITANA
none
(II) BYZACENA
aII

| $1=$ | CIL8 2 | 23012 | $17=$ | CRAIBI | 7/436:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2=$ | 12 | 23013 | $18=$ | " | 7/439:1 |
| $3=$ | 12 | 23019 | $19=$ | 11 | 7/439:2 |
| $4=$ | 12 | 23020 | $20=$ | " | $7 / 439: 3$ |
| $5=$ | 12 | 23049/L | $21=$ | " | 9/282:1 |
| $6=$ | 11 | 23051/A | $22=$ | " | 9/283:2 |
| $7=$ | 12 | 23051/B | $23=$ | " | 9/283:3 |
| $8=$ | CRAIBI | L 11/514 | $24=$ | " | 9/283:4 |
| $9=$ | " | 11/469:2 | $25=$ | " | 9/284:5 |
| $10=$ | " | $7 / 433$ | $26=$ | " | 9/284:6 |
| $11=$ | " | $7 / 434$ | $27=$ | 17 | 9/286:7 |
| $12=$ | " | 7/432:1 | $28=$ | " | 9/286:8 |
| $13=$ | " | 7/432:2 | $29=$ | " | 9/286:9 |
| $14=$ | " | 7/432: 3 | $30=$ | 11 | 9/286:10 |
| $15=$ | " | 7/432: 4 | $31=$ | 11 | 9/286:11 |
| $16=$ | " | 7/436:5 | $32=$ | " | 9/287:12 |

$$
33=\text { CRAIBL } 10 / 277
$$

## (III) ZEUGITANA

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { aIII } \quad I=\text { Monceaux } 5 \\
& 2=\text { CIL8 } 23014 \\
& 3=\text { Monceaux } 6 \\
& 4=\text { CIL8 } 25230 \\
& 5=124008 \\
& 6=" 24325 \\
& 7=1124326 \\
& 8=" 943 \\
& 9=11090 \\
& 10=11094 \\
& 11=" 1095 \\
& 12=11096 \\
& 13=" 1097 \\
& 14=" 1098 \\
& 15=11099 \\
& 16=" 10550 \\
& 17=" 25242 \\
& 18=1 \quad 25243 \\
& 19=1 \quad 25247 \\
& 20=1 \quad 25248 \\
& 21=1125249 \\
& 22=1125257 \\
& 23=1125263 \\
& 24=1125264 \\
& 25=1125265 \\
& 26=1125267 \\
& 28=" 13550 \\
& 29=1125309 \\
& 30=\text { CRAIBL 24/368 } \\
& 31=\text { CIL8 25312/A } \\
& 32=" 25349 / B \\
& 33=1113731 \\
& 34=1 " 13733 \\
& 35=1113737 \\
& 36=113789 \\
& 37=113798 \\
& 38=1113799 \\
& 39=1 \text { 13821 } \\
& 40=\text { " } 25279 \\
& 41=\text { CRATBL 7/123:7 } \\
& 42=115 / 497 \\
& 43=\text { CIL8 } 13961 \\
& 44=1113985 \\
& 45=\text { CRAIBL 24/369:1 } \\
& 46=\text { CIL } 813987 \\
& 47=1113992 \\
& 48=" 13994 \\
& 49=\text { Monceaux } 88 \\
& 50=\text { CIL8 } 14005 \\
& 51=\quad " 14011 \\
& 52=1125224
\end{aligned}
$$

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued
aIII

(IV) NUMIDIA
aIV

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I=\text { CIL8 } 17753 \\
& 2=118191 \\
& (\mathrm{~V}) \text { MAURETAIIAA }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
3=\operatorname{CIT} 810711
$$

$$
4=(\text { Diehl } 3085 \mathrm{~A}) \mathrm{CIL} 88189
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { aV } \quad I=\text { CIL8 } 20483 \\
& 4=9289 \text { CIL8 } \\
& 2=118645 \\
& 5=\text { CIL8 8501/A } \\
& 3=1120892 \\
& 6=118501 / B \\
& 7=\text { CRAIBL 32/84: I }
\end{aligned}
$$

(b) saec IV
(I) TRIPOLITANA
bI

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
1=\text { CIL8 } 22671 \\
2= & 11025 \\
3= & 111024
\end{array}
$$

$$
4=\operatorname{RPE} 29 / 5
$$

$$
5=1129 / 6
$$

$$
6=" 34 / 172
$$

$7=$ Monceaux 75
(II) BYZACIENA

| bII | $1=$ | CIL8 | 12198 | $19=$ | CIL8 | 23046 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2=$ | 11 | 22836 | $20=$ | " | 23047 |
|  | $3=$ | 11 | 748 | $21=$ | " | 23048 |
|  | $4=$ | " | 22840 | $22=$ | " | 23049 |
|  | $5=$ | " | 22841 | $23=$ | " | 23049/A |
|  | $6=$ | " | 22842 | $24=$ | " | 23049/B |
|  | $7=$ | " | 23012/D | $25=$ | " | 23049/C |
|  | $8=$ | " | 23014 | $26=$ | 11 | 23049/E |
|  | $9=$ | " | 23015 | $27=$ | 11 | 23049/G |
|  | $10=$ | " | 23018 | $28=$ | " | 23049/H |
|  | $11=$ | " | 23072 | $29=$ | " | 23051 |
|  | $12=$ | 1 | 23124 | $30=$ | " | 23052 |
|  | $13=$ | " | 23415 | $31=$ | " | 63 |
|  | $14=$ | 1 | 231186 | $32=$ | " | 23053/A |
|  | $15=$ | " | 27992 | $33=$ | " | 210 |
|  | $16=$ | Diehl | 12751 | $34=$ | 11 | 23053/C |
|  | $17=$ | 1 | 3998/A | $35=$ | " | $23053 / \mathrm{L}$ |
|  | $18=$ | CIL8 | 23044/A | $36=$ | 11 | 23053/0 |

(II) BYZACENA - continued
bII

| $37=$ | CIL8 | 23053/Q | $63=$ | CIL8 | 11149 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $38=$ | " | 23053/U | $64=$ | " | 11157 |
| $39=$ | Diehl | 4737 | $65=$ | 11 | 55 |
| $40=$ | CIL8 | 23053/Y | $66=$ | " | 23130 |
| $41=$ | " | 11077 | $67=$ | " | 23142 |
| $42=$ | " | 11079 | $68=$ | " | 23144 |
| $43=$ | " | 11082 | $69=$ | " | 23233*23233/A-B |
| $44=$ | " | 11089 | $70=$ | " | 23233/C |
| $45=$ | " | 11090 | $71=$ | 11 | 23249 |
| $46=$ | " | 11096 | $72=$ | " | 23323 |
| $47=$ | 1 | 11099 | $73=$ | 1 | 23570 |
| $48=$ | " | 11111 | $74=$ | 1 | 23573 |
| $49=$ | 1 | 11112 | $75=$ | 11 | 252 |
| $50=$ | " | 11113 | $76=$ | 11 | 23580 |
| $51=$ | " | 11117 | $77=$ | " | 177-179 |
| $52=$ | " | 22883 | $78=$ | " | 181 |
| $53=$ | " | 11120 | $79=$ | 11 | 11269 |
| $54=$ | " | 11121 | $80=$ | " | 11270 |
| $55=$ | " | 11122 | $81=$ | " | 11273 |
| $56=$ | " | 11123 | $82=$ | 1 | 17647 253 |
| $57=$ | " | 11124 | $83=$ | " | 11647 |
| $58=$ | " | 11125 | $84=$ | 1 | 11726 |
| $59=$ | " | 23344 | $85=$ | 11 | 11416 |
| $60=$ | Diehl | 12678 | $86=$ | " | 23772 |
| $61=$ | " | 3230/A | $87=$ | " | 11727 |
| $62=$ | CIH8 | 10509 | $88=$ | 11 | 586 |

(II) BYZACRNA - continued
bII

| $89=$ | CIL8 11805 | 111 = Diehl 331 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $90=$ | " 11806 | $112=\operatorname{RPE} 34 / 37$ |
| $91=$ | " 11807 | $113=" 38 / 47$ |
| $92=$ | 111808 | $114=$ CII8 $23012 / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $93=$ | " 11893 | $115=123016$ |
| $94=$ | " 11894 | $116=$ CRAIBL $11 / 469: 1$ |
| $95=$ | " 11896 | $117=$ CIL8 24044 |
| $96=$ | " 11898 | $118=\mathrm{RPE} 27 / 27$ |
| $97=$ | " 11902 | $119=$ " $36 / 29$ |
| $98=$ | " 11083 | $120=$ CIL8 22855 |
| $99=$ | 111904 | $121=111080$ |
| $100=$ | " 67 | $122=$ CRATBL 7/434 |
| $101=$ | " 23579 | $123=119 / 597-605$ |
| $102=$ | 11 673 | $124=113 / 432: 1$ |
| $103=$ | " 23578 | $125=113 / 433: 2$ |
| $104=$ | BSNAF 12/357:1 | $126=$ BSNAF 10/403 |
| $105=$ | CIL8 12196 | $127=$ MMCh 11 |
| $106=$ | " 11084 | $128=1$ " 69 |
| $107=$ | Monceaux 335 | 129 = CIL8 1I088 |
| $108=$ | BSNAF 12/357:2 | $130=$ Diehl 2525 |
| $109=$ | RPE 1I/19 | $131=$ CRAIBL 13/433:3 |
| $110=$ | " $13 / 31$ | $132=113 / 434: 4$ |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued
bIII

|  | $=$ | CIL8 | 24067 | $29=$ | CIL8 | 12260 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | $=$ | " | 24074 | $30=$ | Diehl | 3402/B |
| 5 | $=$ | " | 25036 | $31=$ | CIL8 | 779 |
| 6 | $=$ | " | 25037 | $32=$ | " | 780 |
|  | $=$ | " | 25046 | $33=$ | " | 782 |
| 8 | $=$ | " | 25047 | $34=$ | " | 791 |
|  | $=$ | " | 25048 | $35=$ | " | 12272 |
| 10 | $=$ | " | 25049 | $36=$ | BSNAF | 13/95:1 |
| 11 | $=$ | " | 25050 | $37=$ | CIL8 | 870 |
| 12 | $=$ | " | 25051 | $38=$ | " | 957 |
| 13 | $=$ | " | 25052 | $39=$ | " | 1085 |
| 14 | $=$ | " | 25053 | $40=$ | " | 25339 |
| 15 | $=$ | " | 25054 | $41=$ | " | 12527 |
| 16 | $=$ | " | 25055 | $42=$ | " | 1092 |
| 17 | $=$ | " | 25057 | $43=$ | " | 1100 |
| 18 | = | " | 25058 | $44=$ | " | 1106 |
| 19 | $=$ | " | 25059 | $45=$ | " | 10542 |
| 20 | = | " | 25060 | $46=$ | " | 10546 |
| 21 | $=$ | " | 12455 | $47=$ | " | 25135 |
| 22 | = | " | 22657/2 | $48=$ | " | 25221 |
| 23 | $=$ | " | 23897 | $49=$ | " | 24561 |
| 24 | $=$ | " | 23942 | $50=$ | " | 25275 |
| 25 | = | " | 23946 | $51=$ | " | 25845 |
|  | = | " | 26218 | $52=$ | " | 13403 |
|  | $=$ | CMCh | 362 | $53=$ | " | 13404 |
|  | = | CIL8 | 15243 | $54=$ | " | 13405 |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued
bIII

| $55=$ | L8 | 13407 | $82=$ | CIL8 | 25334 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $56=$ | " | 13408 | $83=$ | 1 | 25336 |
| $57=$ | " | 13409 | $84=$ | " | 15639 |
| $58=$ | " | 13415 | $85=$ | 11 | 25341 |
| $59=$ | " | 13416 | $86=$ | " | 25342 |
| $60=$ | " | 13417 | $87=$ | " | 25349/A |
| $61=$ | " | 25284 | $88=$ | 1 | 25351 |
| $62=$ | " | 13442 | $89=$ | " | 25352 |
| $63=$ | 11 | 13443 | $90=$ | " | 13608 |
| $64=$ | " | 13463 | $91=$ | " | 13610 |
| $65=$ | " | 13469 | $92=$ | " | \$3617 |
| $66=$ | " | 13473 | $93=$ | " | 13629 |
| $67=$ | " | 13521 | $94=$ | " | 13632 |
| $68=$ | " | 13543 | $95=$ | " | 13633 |
| $69=$ | y | 13548 | $96=$ | 11 | 13661 |
| $70=$ | 1 | 13549 | $97=$ | " | 13662 |
| $71=$ | " | 13580 | $98=$ | 11 | 13759 |
| $72=$ | " | 25294 | $99=$ | " | 13761 |
| $73=$ | 1 | 25298 | $100=$ | 11 | 13781 |
| $74=$ | " | 25300 | $101=$ | " | 13803 |
| $75=$ | " | 25302 | $102=$ | BSNAF | 13/95:2 |
| $76=$ | " | 26166 | $103=$ | CIL8 | 13826 |
| $77=$ | " | 25306 | $104=$ | " | 13876 |
| $78=$ | " | 27695 | $105=$ | 11 | 13887 |
| $79=$ | " | 25314 | $106=$ | 11 | 13915 |
| $80=$ | " | 25320 | $107=$ | " | 13946 |
| $81=$ | 11 | 25329 | $108=$ | " | 13956 |

$82=$ CIL8 25334
$83=1125336$
$84=\quad$ " 15639
$85=1125341$
$86=1 \quad 25342$
$87=1125349 / A$
$88=1125351$
$89=" 25352$
$90=1113608$
$91=$ " 13610
$92=133617$
$93=113629$
$94=113632$
$95=113633$
$96=" 13661$
$97=\quad$ " 13662
$98=1113759$
$99=$ " 13761
$100=113781$
$101=\quad " 13803$
102 = BSNAF 13/95:2
$103=$ CIL8 13826
$104=113876$
$105=1113887$
$106=\quad " 13915$
$107=\quad " 13946$
$108=\quad " 13956$
(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

| bIII | $109=$ CIL8 13986 | $135=$ CIL 8 | 14207 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $110=$ CMCh $273 / \mathrm{B}$ | $136=0$ | 14215 |
|  | $111=$ CIL8 14033 | $137=1$ | 14216 |
|  | $112=$ " 14034 | $138=$ | 14217 |
|  | $113=$ " 14035 | $139=\quad "$ | 14218 |
|  | $114=$ " 14036 | $140=*$ | 14225 |
|  | $115=$ " 14053 | $141=1$ | 14228 |
|  | $116=$ " 14058 | $142=$ " | 26569 |
|  | $117=$ Di*hl 4461/D | $143=0$ | Oiche 1582 |
|  | $118=$ CIL 814060 | $144=$ " | 14231 |
|  | $119=114068$ | $145=1$ | 25453 |
|  | $120=$ " 14069 | $146=\quad "$ | 25483/A |
|  | $121=$ " 14071 | $147=\quad "$ | 25669 |
|  | $122=$ " 14117 | $148=$ | 25817 |
|  | $123=$ " 14119 | $149=1$ | 25826/A |
|  | $124=$ " 14121 | $150="$ | 25930 |
|  | $125=$ " 14128 | $151="$ | 26394 |
|  | $125=$ " 14129 | $152=\quad "$ | 27332 |
|  | $127=$ " 14156 | $153="$ | 2733.3 |
|  | $128=$ " 14161 | $154="$ | 27336 |
|  | $129=$ " 14165 | $155=$ CRAIBL | L 14/100 |
|  | $130=114196$ | 153 = CIL 8 | 1409 |
|  | $131=114198$ | $157=\quad "$ | 28045 |
|  | $132=$ " 14199 | $158="$ | 14328 |
|  | $133=$ " 14202 | $159="$ | 14329 |
|  | $134=$ " 14203 | $160=$ " | 14346 |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

| bIII | $161=$ | CIL8 | 14355 | $186=$ | CIL8 | 17386 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $162=$ | " | 14398 | $187=$ | CRAIB | BL 14/104 |
|  | $163=$ | " | 14436 | $188=$ | CIL8 | 23863 |
|  | $164=$ | 11 | 14600 | $189=$ | " | 24093 |
|  | $165=$ | " | 14728 | $190=$ | 11 | 25443 |
|  | $166=$ | " | 14752 | $191=$ | Di*h工 | 2671 |
|  | $167=$ | " | 14902 | $192=$ | CIL8 | 13904 |
|  | $168=$ | " | 1393 | $193=$ | " | 17388 |
|  | $169=$ | 11 | 1408 | $194=$ | " | 13968 |
|  | $170=$ | " | 16281 | $195=$ | 1 | 16841 |
|  | $171=$ | " | 1767 | $196=$ | RPE 1 | 12/178 |
|  | $172=$ | " | 16251 | $197=$ | CII8 | 928 |
|  | $173=$ | 11 | 16400 | $198=$ | 11 | 879 |
|  | $174=$ | Mohee | aux 153 | $199=$ | " | 880 |
|  | $175=$ | CMCh | 393 | $200=$ | " | 1125 |
|  | $176=$ | CIL8 | 27582 | $201=$ | 11 | 1163 |
|  | $177=$ | 11 | 13395 | $202=$ | 11 | 1214 |
|  | $178=$ | It | 25149 | $203=$ | " | 15451 |
|  | $179=$ | 11 | 25270 | $204=$ | 11 | 15452 |
|  | $180=$ | 1 | 25360 | $205=$ | 11 | 16281 |
|  | $181=$ | Diehl | 12660 | $206=$ | 11 | 24029 |
|  | $182=$ | " | 2661 | $207=$ | 11 | 24039 |
|  | $183=$ | CIL8 | 16840 | $208=$ | 11 | 24070 |
|  | $184=$ | " | 16842 | $209=$ | 1 | 24107 |
|  | $185=$ | " | 17384 | $210=$ | " | 24901 |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued
bIII

$236=$ CIL8 26267
237 ㅍ " 26568
$238=127817$
$239=116351$
$240=$ Diehl 2549
$241=$ CRATBL $22 / 304$
$242=$ Monceaux 249
$243=$ RPE $8 / 19$
$244=" 8 / 75$
$245=$ CIL8 23909
$246=$ CRAIBL $22 / 305$

$$
247=\text { CIL8 } 13850
$$

$$
248=\operatorname{RPE} 11 / 115
$$

$$
249=" 11 / 116
$$

$$
250=" 12 / 166
$$

$$
251=\text { Diehl } 2722 / \mathrm{A}
$$

$$
252=\text { CRAIBL } 22 / 306: 1
$$

$$
253=\operatorname{RPE} 14 / 37
$$

$$
254=\text { CMCh } 314
$$

$$
255=\operatorname{RPE} 14 / 57
$$

$$
256=" 14 / 58
$$

$$
257=" 14 / 59
$$

$$
258=1116 / 99
$$

$$
259=1117-18 / 99
$$

$$
260=" 17-18 / 25
$$

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

| bIII | $261=\operatorname{RPE} 19 / 32$ | 276 | RPE 3 | 38/39 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $262=$ " $20 / 84$ | 277 | CIL8 | 23918 |
|  | $263=1125 / 72$ | 278 | " | 13881 |
|  | $264=125 / 31$ | 279 | " | 13882 |
|  | $265=$ CRALBL $22 / 306: 2$ | 280 | " | 13995 |
|  | $266=\operatorname{RPE} 29 / 60$ | 281 | " | 14020 |
|  | $267=$ " 29/62 | 282 | Diehl | 331/A |
|  | $268=" 30 / 44$ | 283 | " | 2033 |
|  | $269=$ " 32/14 | 284 | " | 2514/A-H |
|  | $270=" 33 / 105$ | 285 | * | 2519 |
|  | $271=134 / 133$ | 286 | " | 2548 |
|  | $272=$ CRAIBL $22 / 307:$ a | 287 | " | 2552/E |
|  | $273=\operatorname{RPE} 36 / 117$ | 288 | " | 2648 |
|  | $274=" 37 / 21$ | 289 | " | 2658 |
|  | $275=137 / 22$ | 290 | " | 2659 |
| $291=$ Diehl 2477/A |  |  |  |  |
| (IV) NUMIDIA |  |  |  |  |

bIV

| $\mathbf{1}=$ BSNAF $9 / 212: 3$ | $5=$ CIL8 $224 I$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2=$ CIL 816740 | $6="$ |
| $3=" 2216$ | $7="$ |
| $4=" 2218$ | $8=" 2243$ |

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued
bIV

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued

| bIV | $113=$ CIL8 8354 | $139=\operatorname{RPE} 9 / 229$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $114=$ " 17653 | $140=19 / 122$ |
|  | $115=17753$ | $141=10 \mathrm{~W}$ 9/223 |
|  | $116=118552$ | $142=119 / 169$ |
|  | $117=$ Gsell 3688 | $143=19 / 231$ |
|  | $118=$ CIL8 19102 | $144=$ " 9/170 |
|  | $119=191921$ | $145=$ " $35 / 120$ |
|  | $120=110840$ | $146=" 11 / 217$ |
|  | $121=42721$ | $147=\\| 11 / 218$ |
|  | $122=\quad " 17715$ | $148=1113 / 25$ |
|  | $123=$ " 27921 | $149=1113 / 36$ |
|  | $124=119414$ | $150=$ Diehl 855 |
|  | $125=129643$ | $151=\operatorname{RPE} 14 / 64$ |
|  | $126=$ Monceaux 298 | $152=\\|$ " 1465 |
|  | $127=$ CIL8 2722 | $153=1114 / 82$ |
|  | $128=$ Monceaux 314 | $154=" 16 / 96$ |
|  | 129 = Diehl 2422 | $155=" 17-18 / 83$ |
|  | $130=$ CIL8 22657/13 | $156=$ BSNAF 9/214:5 |
|  | $131=127930$ | $157=R P E 17-18 / 66$ |
|  | $132=119852$ | $158=$ BSNAF 9/337:1 |
|  | $133=1120157$ | $159=\mathrm{RPE} \mathrm{21/44}$ |
|  | $134=127920$ | $160=1124 / 39$ |
|  | $135=$ Monceaux 275 | $161=$ CIL8 17614 |
|  | $136=\mathrm{RPE} 8 / 68$ | $162=\operatorname{RPE} 28 / 104$ |
|  | $137=119 / 119$ | $163=1126 / 134$ |
|  | $138=119 / 171$ | $164=$ " 30/56 |

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued

```
bIV 165 = RPE 37/154
    I66 = " 37/115
    167 = " 37/155
    168=" 38/129
    169 = CIL8 17460
    170 = " 16655
    171 = " 16738
    172 = " 16739
    173 = " 16743
    174 = " 16755
    175 = " 16756
    176 = " 16757
    177 = " 17579
    (v) MAURETANIA
bV I = CIL8 2021I
    2= " 20299
    3 = " 20300
    4=" 20301
    5 = " 20302
    6 = " 20303
    7= " 20304
8= RPE 17-18/100
        9 = BSNAF 8/291
    10 = CRAIBL 14/211
    II=" 32/85
    12= RPE 14/86
    13 = CIL8 9789
    14=" 20412
```

(V) MAURETANIA - continued
bV

$$
42=C I L 88712
$$

$$
43=\quad \text { " } 26490
$$

$$
44=\quad " 8766
$$

$$
45=\quad " 8769
$$

$$
46=\quad " 8932
$$

$$
4^{r}=\text { CRATBL } 32 / 86: 2
$$

$$
48=\text { CIL8 } 21421
$$

$$
49=\text { CRAIBL } 32 / 87: 1
$$

$$
50=\text { CIL8 } 21422 / A
$$

$$
51=1121423
$$

$$
52=" 21425
$$

$$
53=\text { CRAIBL } 32 / 87: 2
$$

$$
54=\text { CIL8 } 21427
$$

$$
55=\quad " 21428
$$

$$
56=\quad 1121432
$$

$$
57=\quad " 21433
$$

$$
58=\quad " 21434
$$

$$
59=\quad " 21476
$$

$$
60=C R A I B L 32 / 87: 3
$$

$$
61=\text { CIL8 } 21478
$$

$$
62=\quad " 21479
$$

$$
63=\quad " 21496
$$

$$
64=\quad \text { " } 21498
$$

$$
65=\quad " 21517
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 15=\text { CIL8 } 21519 \\
& 16=18431 \\
& 17=1120471 \\
& 18=1120472 \\
& 19=\quad \text { " } 20473 \\
& 20=\text { CRAIBL 32/84:2 } \\
& 21=\text { Monceaux } 318 \\
& 22=\text { CIL8 } 20476 \\
& 23=\text { CRAIBL 32/86:1 } \\
& 24=\text { CIL8 } 20478 \\
& 25=1120566 \\
& 26=1120573 \\
& 27=1120600 \\
& 28=\quad \text { " } 8407 \\
& 29=" 8427 \\
& 30=" 8429 \\
& 31=\quad \text { " } 10905 \\
& 32=" 8633 \\
& 33=118643 \\
& 34=\operatorname{RPE} 9 / 117 \\
& 35=\text { CIL8 } 8647 \\
& 39=1120647 \\
& 40=118608 \\
& 41=\quad " 8607
\end{aligned}
$$

(v) MAURETANIA - continued

| bV | $69=$ | CIL8 | 9586 | $95=$ | CIL8 | 9975 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $70=$ | " | 9587 | $96=$ | " | 9977 |
|  | $71=$ | " | 9589 | $97=$ | RPE 3 | 35/86 |
|  | $72=$ | " | 9692 | $98=$ | " 2 | 29/91 |
|  | $73=$ | " | 8480 | $99=$ | CIL8 | 8412 |
|  | $74=$ | 11 | 8477 | $100=$ | " | 22653/8 |
|  | $75=$ | " | 21727 | $101=$ | " | 21805 |
|  | $76=$ | 11 | 21728 | $102=$ | " | 21806 |
|  | $77=$ | " | 21735 | $103=$ | " | 21816 |
|  | $78=$ | 1 | 21736 | $104=$ | 11 | 9588 |
|  | $79=$ | " | 21767 | 105 플 | 11 | 20589 |
|  | $80=$ | RPE | 21/37 | $106=$ | Diehl | 12729 |
|  | $81=$ | CIL8 | 9708 | $107=$ | CIL8 | 20266 |
|  | $82=$ | 11 | 9714 | $108=$ | 1 | 9862 |
|  | $83=$ | " | 9716 | $109=$ | 11 | 9885 |
|  | $84=$ | " | 9717 | $110=$ | 1 | 21734 |
|  | $85=$ | " | 9793 | $111=$ | 1 | 20780 |
|  | $86=$ | " | 9794 | $112=$ | " | 9855 |
|  | $87=$ | " | 9821 | $113=$ | 1 | 9861 |
|  | $88=$ | " | 9823 | $114=$ | " | 9856 |
|  | $89=$ | ' | 9848 | $115=$ | " | 21772 |
|  | $90=$ | " | 9849 | $116=$ | 11 | 21753 |
|  | $91=$ | " | 9850 | $117=$ | 11 | 21686 |
|  | $92=$ | ' | 9878 | $118=$ | 11 | 21769 |
|  | $93=$ | " | 9890 | $119=$ | " | 9968 |
|  | $94=$ | " | 20604 | $120=$ | 11 | 21645 |

(v) MAURETANIA - continued

(II) BYZACENA
cII

| $1=$ | CIL8. | 22795 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2=$ | " | 22833 |
| $3=$ | 11 | 22837 |
| $4=$ | Monce | aux 81 |
| $5=$ | CIL8 | 11119 |
| $6=$ | " | 22884 |
| $7=$ | " | 22885 |
| $8 \neq$ | 11 | 22897 |
| $9=$ | \% | 23011/A |
| $10=$ | " | 23035 |
| $11=$ | 11 | 23040 |
| $12=$ | 11 | 23040/A-B |
| $13=$ | 11 | 23041 |
| $14=$ | " | 22653/11 |
| $15=$ | 11 | 259 |
| $16=$ | 11 | 301 |
| $17=$ | 11 | 483 |
| $18=$ | " | 618 |
| $19=$ | " | 11081 |
| $20=$ | 11 | 11104 |
| $21=$ | 11 | 11133 |
| $22=$ | " | 11140 |
| $23=$ | 11 | 11372 |
| $24=$ | " | 11414 |
| $25=$ | " | 1574 |

$27=$ CRAIBL 18/4I
$28=$ CIL8 23042
$29=1123043$
$30=1123044$
$31=1123045$
$32=1123045 / \mathrm{A}$
$33=1123047 / \mathrm{A}$
$34=1123049 / D$
$35=1123049 / F$
$36=1123049 / I$
$37=1123049 / K$
$38=1123050$
$39=1123053$
$40=123053 / B$
$41=1123053 / D$
$42=123053 / E$
$43=1123053 / F$
$44=\quad " 23053 / G$
$45=1123053 / \mathrm{H}$
$46=1123053 / I$
$47=1123053 / \mathrm{K}$
$48=1123053 / \mathrm{M}$
$49=1123053 / N$
$50=1123053 / P$
$51=1123053 / R$
(II) BYZACENA - continued

(II) BYZACENA - continued
cII

| $105=$ | CIL8 | 23581 | 131=CIL8 11523 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $106=$ | " | 23582 | $132=$ | CIL8 | 11650 |
| $107=$ | " | 23583 | $133=$ | " | 11655 |
| $108=$ | " | 23584 | $134=$ | " | 453 |
| 109 | " | 23585 | $135=$ | " | 11525 |
| $110=$ | " | 23586 | $136=$ | " | 11648 |
| $111=$ | " | 23587 | $137=$ | 11 | 456 |
| $112=$ | 11 | 23588 | $138=$ | " | 457 |
| $113=$ | 11 | 23589 | $139=$ | " | 458 |
| $114=$ | 1 | 23590 | $140=$ | " | 11526 |
| 115 | " | 23591 | $141=$ | " | 460 |
| 116 | " | 23592 | $142=$ | " | 461 |
| 117 | " | 23593 | $143=$ | " | 11644 |
| $118=$ | " | 23594 | $144=$ | " | 463 |
| $119=$ | " | 23673 | $145=$ | " | 464 |
| $120=$ | " | 23695 | $146=$ | " | 23279 |
| $121=$ | " | 23703 | $147=$ | " | 10516 |
| $122=$ | " | 101(=102) | $148=$ | " | 10517 |
| 123 | " | 150 | $149=$ | " | 10518 |
| 124 | 11 | 11268 | $150=$ | " | 10518/A |
| 125 | " | 11271 | $151=$ | " | 11643 |
| 126 | 1 | 11272 | $152=$ | " | 11644 |
| 127 | " | 241 | $153=$ | " | 11645 |
| 128 | 11 | 11447 | $154=$ | " | 11646 |
| 129 | " | 11482 | $155=$ | RPE | $9 / 17$ |
| 130 | " | 449 | $1.56=$ | CIL8 | 11649 |

(II) BYZACENA - continued

| cII | $157=$ | RPE 1 | 12/296 | $183=$ | CIL8 | 12197 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $158=$ | CIL8 | 23037 | 1.84 $=$ | " | 22835 |
|  | $159=$ | 1 | 11651 | $185=$ | 19 | 12200 |
|  | $160=$ | v | 11652 | $186=$ | " | 22838 |
|  | $161=$ | " | 11653 | $187=$ | " | 749 |
|  | $162=$ | " | 11654 | $188=$ | " | 23010 |
|  | $163=$ | RPE 1 | 12/295 | $189=$ | " | 23036 |
|  | $164=$ | CIL8 | 11656 | $190=$ | 1 | 23012/C |
|  | $165=$ | " | 11657 | $191=$ | RPE | 12/298 |
|  | $166=$ | Monce | eaux 247 | $192=$ | 1 | 14/52 |
|  | $167=$ | CIL8 | 11725 | $193=$ | " | 14/53 |
|  | $168=$ | " | 603 | $194=$ | " | 14/54 |
|  | $169=$ | " | 11895 | $195=$ | " | 15/38 |
|  | $170=$ | 11 | 11897 | $196=$ | " | 17-18/65 |
|  | $171=$ | 1 | 11899 | $197=$ | " | 35/95 |
|  | $172=$ | " | 11900 | $198=$ | " | $37 / 23$ |
|  | $173=$ | 1 | 11901 | $199=$ | CIL8 | 11905 |
|  | $174=$ | " | 11906 | $200=$ | " | 670 |
|  | $175=$ | 11 | 11907 | $201=$ | " | 706 |
|  | $176=$ | " | 11794 | $202=$ | " | 12130 |
|  | $177=$ | " 67 | 672 | $203=$ | BSNA | AF $10 / 402$ |
|  | $178=$ | " | 674 | $204=$ | " | 10/404:7 |
|  | $179=$ | " | 675 | $205=$ | " | 10/404:10 |
|  | $180=$ | " | 684 | $206=$ | CIL8 | $822655 / 19$ |
|  | $181=$ | " | 707 | $207=$ | " | 23038/F |
|  | $182=$ | " | 12035 | $208=$ | Dieh | hl $2297 / \mathrm{K}$ |

(II) BYZACENA - continued

cII | 209 | $=$ CIL8 $23053 / \mathrm{V}$ | 213 | $=\mathrm{CIL} 823038 / \mathrm{A}$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 210 | $=" 11131$ | 214 | $=" 123038 / \mathrm{B}$ |
| 211 | $=" 11130$ | 215 | $=" 23038 / \mathrm{C}$ |
| 212 | $=" 23038$ | 216 | $=" 23038 / \mathrm{D}$ |

$217=$ CIL8 $23038 / E$
(III) ZEUGITANA

| $1=$ CIL8 23921 |  |  | $21=$ | L8 | 25038/A-I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2=$ | CRAIB | SL 17/517 | $22=$ | " | 22656/22 |
| $3=$ | CIL8 | 24075 | $23=$ | H | 25040 |
| $4=$ | " | 24075/A | $24=$ | 11 | 22634/1 |
| $5=$ | 1 | 24068 | $25=$ | " | 25042 |
| $6=$ | " | 24078 | $26=$ | " | 25043 |
| $7=$ | 11 | 24097 | $27=$ | " | 25044 |
| $8=$ | " | 24331 | $28=$ | 11 | 25045 |
| $9=$ | 1 | 24332 | $29=$ | 11 | 25056 |
| $10=$ | 11 | 24332/A | $30=$ | 1 | 25061 |
| $11=$ | " | 24332/B | $31=$ | " | 25062 |
| $12=$ | 11 | 24506 | $32=$ | 1 | 25063 |
| $13=$ | " | 24507 | $33=$ | " | 25064 |
| $14=$ | 11 | 24508 | $34=$ | " | 25068 |
| $15=$ | 11 | 24509 | $35=$ | " | 25070 |
| $16=$ | " | 24510 | $36=$ | " | 25072 |
| $17=$ | " | 24511 | $37=$ | " | 25073 |
| $18=$ | " | 24511/A | $38 \cong$ | 1 | 25079 |
| $19=$ | " | 24513 | $39=$ | " | 25080 |
| $20=$ | 11 | 25038 | $40=$ | 11 | 25081 |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued
cIII

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

| cIII | $93=$ CRAIBL $8 / 67$ |  |  | $119=$ | $=$ | L8 | 10541 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $94=$ | CIL8 | 25356 | 120 | $=$ | " | 10543 |
|  | $95=$ | 11 | 25132 | 121 |  | 17 | 10548 |
|  | $96=$ | " | 1125 | 122 |  | y | 25140 |
|  | $97=$ | " | 25134 | 123 |  | 1 | 25141 |
|  | $98=$ | " | 10549 | 124 |  | " | 25146 |
|  | $99=$ | " | 1001 | 125 |  | 4 | 25152 |
|  | $100=$ | " | 12460 | 126 |  | 11 | 25159 |
|  | $101=$ | " | 12410 | 127 | $=$ | " | 25160 |
|  | $102=$ | 11 | 983 | 128 | $=$ | " | 25161 |
|  | $103=$ | " | 984 | 129 | $=$ | " | 25162 |
|  | $104=$ | " | 992 | 130 | $=$ | " | 25165 |
|  | $105=$ | " | 1083 | 131 |  | " | 25166 |
|  | $106=$ | 1 | 1084 | 132 |  | 11 | 25168 |
|  | $107=$ | " | 1087 | 133 |  | 11 | 25169 |
|  | $108=$ | 11 | 1088 | 134 |  | " | 25172 |
|  | $109=$ | " | 1089 | 135 | $=$ | " | 25173 |
|  | $110=$ | " | 1093 | 136 |  | 1 | 25174 |
|  | $111=$ | " | 1101 | 137 |  | " | 25175 |
|  | $112=$ | " | 1102 | 138 |  | 11 | 25.176 |
|  | $113=$ | " | 1103 | 139 |  | 1 | 25182 |
|  | $114=$ | " | 1104 | 140 |  | " | 25183 |
|  | $115=$ | " | 1105 | 141 |  | 1 | 25184 |
|  | $116=$ | " | 1113 | 142 |  | 1 | 25185 |
|  | $117=$ | 11 | 10529 | 143 |  | 1 | 25186 |
|  | $118=$ | " | 10540 | 144 |  | " | 25187 |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

| cIII | $145=$ | CIL8 | 25188 | $171=$ | CIL8 2 | 25219 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $146=$ | 11 | 25191 | $172=$ | " 2 | 25220 |
|  | $147=$ | 12 | 25192 | $173=$ | 12 | 25223 |
|  | $148=$ | " 2 | 25193 | $174=$ CRAIBL $17 / 522: 4$ |  |  |
|  | $149=$ | " 2 | 25194 | $175=$ | CIL8 2 | 25225 |
|  | $150=$ | 12 | 25195 | $176=$ | 12 | 25226 |
|  | $151=$ | 1 | 25197 | $177=$ | 12 | 25228 |
|  | $152=$ | 11 | 25198 | $178=$ CRAIBL $17 / 522: 7$ |  |  |
|  | $153=$ | 112 | 25200 | 179 CIL8 25231 |  |  |
|  | $154=$ | 11 | 25202 | $180=$ | 12 | 25232 |
|  | $155=$ | 11 | 25203 | $181=$ | 12 | 25233 |
|  | $156=$ | " | 25204 | $182=$ | 12 | 25234 |
|  | $157=$ | " | 25205 | $183=$ | 12 | 25235 |
|  | $158=$ | " | 25206 | $184=$ | 12 | 25236 |
|  | $159=$ | 1 | 25207 | $185=$ | 12 | 25238 |
|  | $160=$ | " | 25208 | $186=$ | 12 | 25239 |
|  | $161=$ | " | 25209 | $187=$ | 112 | 25240 |
|  | $162=$ | 1 | 25211 | $188=$ | 12 | 25241 |
|  | $163=$ | " | 25212 | $189=$ | " 2 | 25244 |
|  | $164=$ | " | 25213 | 1907 | 12 | 25245 |
|  | $165=$ | CRAIB | [ 17/525:15 | $191=$ | 12 | 25246 |
|  | $166=$ | CIL8 | 25214 | $192=$ | " | 25250 |
|  | $167=$ | 1 | $25215+25215 / \mathrm{A}$ | $193=$ | 11 | 25251 |
|  | $168=$ | " | 25216 | $194=$ | " | 25252 |
|  | $169=$ | " | 25217 | $195=$ | " | 25253 |
|  | $170=$ | " | 25218 | $196=$ | " | 25254 |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

| cIII | $197=$ | CIL8 | 25255 | $224=$ | CIL8 | 25287 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $198=$ | " | 25256 | $225=$ | 1 | 25288 |
|  | $199=$ | 11 | 25258 | $226=$ | " | 25289 |
|  | $200=$ | " | 25259 | $227=$ | 1 | 25290 |
|  | $201=$ | " | 25260 | $228=$ | " | 25291 |
|  | $202=$ | " | 25261 | $229=$ | 1 | 25292 |
|  | $203=$ | " | 25262 | $230=$ | 11 | 25293 |
|  | $204=$ | " | 25268 | $231=$ | 11 | 25293/A |
|  | $205=$ | " | 25269 | $232=$ | " | 15428 |
|  | $206=$ | " | 25273 | $233=$ | 11 | 13429 |
|  | $207=$ | " | 252774 | $234=$ | 11 | 13430 |
|  | $208=$ | " | 25277 | $235=$ | 1 | 13431 |
|  | $209=$ | " | 25278 | $236=$ | " | 13432 |
|  | $210=$ | " | \$3410 | $237=$ | 11 | 13436 |
|  | $211=$ | 1 | 13418 | $238=$ | " | 13437 |
|  | $212=$ | 1 | 13420 | $239=$ | 11 | 13439 |
|  | $213=$ | " | 13422 | $240=$ | 11 | 13440 |
|  | $214=$ | " | 13423 | $241=$ | " | 13454 |
|  | $215=$ | " | 13424 | $242=$ | 11 | 13462 |
|  | $216=$ | " | \$.3426 | $243=$ | " | 13468 |
|  | $217=$ | " | 1.3427 | $244=$ | " | 13470 |
|  | $218=$ | CRAIB | BL 17/522:8 | $245=$ | " | 13481 |
|  | $219=$ | CIL8 | 25280 | $246=$ | 11 | 13482 |
|  | $220=$ | 11 | 25281 | $247=$ | 11 | 13488 |
|  | $221=$ | " | 25282 | $248=$ | 11 | 13489 |
|  | $222=$ | " | 25283 | $249=$ | " | 13495 |
|  | $223=$ | 1 | 25286 | $250=$ | " | 13496 |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued
cIII

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued
cIII

| $305=$ | CIL8 | 25335 | $331=$ | CIL8 | 13652 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $306=$ | 1 | 25337 | $332=$ | " | 13654 |
| $307=$ | 11 | 25338 | $333=$ | " | 13656 |
| $308=$ | " | 25339/A | $334=$ | " | 13669 |
| $308=$ | 1 | 25340 | $335=$ | " | 13670 |
| $310=$ | 11 | 25340 / A | $336=$ | " | 13672 |
| $311=$ | " | 25344 | $337=$ | " | 13676 |
| $312=$ | 11 | 25344/A | $338=$ | " | 13677 |
| $313=$ | 11 | 25345 | $339=$ | " | 13681 |
| $314=$ | " | 25346 | $340=$ | " | 13696 |
| $315=$ | 11 | 25347 | $341=$ | 11 | 13698 |
| $316=$ | 11 | 25349 | $342=$ | " | 13699 |
| $317=$ | " | 25354 | $343=$ | " | 13700 |
| $318=$ | 11 | 25355 | $344=$ | " | 13704 |
| $319=$ | 1 | 25357 | $345=$ | " | 13710 |
| $320=$ | 19 | 25358 | $346=$ | 11 | 13716 |
| $321=$ | 11 | 14547 | $347=$ | 1 | 13717 |
| $322=$ | 11 | 13603 | $348=$ | 11 | 13722 |
| $323=$ | " | 13606 | $349=$ | 1 | 13736 |
| $324=$ | 11 | 13607 | $350=$ | " | 13740 |
| $325=$ | " | 13614 | $351=$ | 1 | 13742 |
| $326=$ | " | 13623 | $352=$ | " | 13748 |
| $327=$ | 11 | 13627 | $353=$ | " | 13750 |
| $328=$ | " | 13634 | $354=$ | " | 13751 |
| $329=$ | " | 13637 | $355=$ | " | 13752 |
| $330=$ | " | 13647 | $356=$ | " | 13755 |


(III) ZEUGITANA - continued
cIII

| $411=$ | CIL8 14013 | $438=$ | CIL8 | 14138 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $412=$ | " 14015 | $439=$ | " | 14141 |
| $413=$ | " 14017 | $440=$ | " | 14144 |
| $414=$ | " 14018 | $441=$ | " | 14145 |
| $415=$ | " 14025 | $442=$ | 1 | 14147 |
| $416=$ | 114027 | $443=$ | " | 14150 |
| $417=$ | 114031 | $444=$ | " | 14151 |
| $418=$ | " 14039 | $445=$ | " | 14152 |
| $419=$ | " 14046 | $446=$ | 1 | 14154 |
| $420=$ | " 14054 | $447=$ | " | 14158 |
| $421=$ | " 14056 | $448=$ | " | 14167 |
| $422=$ | " 14064 | $449=$ | " | 14168 |
| $423=$ | " 14067 | $450=$ | 1 | 14176 |
| $424=$ | " 14073 | $451=$ | " | 14177 |
| $425=$ | 1) 2494/A | $452=$ | " | 14178 |
| $425=$ | " 14076 | $453=$ | 1 | 14179 |
| $427=$ | " 14081 | $454=$ | " | 14180 |
| $428=$ | " 14082 | $455=$ | 1 | 14181 |
| $429=$ | " 14086 | $45.6=$ | " | 14187 |
| $430=$ | " 14090 | $457=$ | " | 14188 |
| $431=$ | 114115 | $458=$ | " | 14190 |
| $432=$ | " 14120 | $459=$ | " | 14192 |
| $433=$ | CRAIBI 17/525:13 | $460=$ | 11 | 14193 |
| $434=$ | CIL8 14124 | $461=$ | " | 14194 |
| $435=$ | 114130 | $462=$ | 1 | 14195 |
| $4.36=$ | " 14136 | $463=$ | 1 | 14208 |
| $437=$ | " 14137 | $464=$ | " | 14211 |

(III) ZEUGDTANA - continued

| cIII | $465=$ | CIL8 | 14213 | $492=$ | CIL8 | 25814 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $406=$ | Y | 14219 | $493=$ | " | 25815 |
|  | $467=$ | " | 14222 | $494=$ | 1 | 25818 |
|  | $468=$ | " | 14226 | $495=$ | " | 25825 |
|  | $469=$ | " | 14229 | $496=$ | " | 25892/A |
|  | $470=$ | " | 14232 | $497=$ | " | 25929 |
|  | $471=$ | " | 14234 | $498=$ | 1 | 26393 |
|  | $472=$ | " | 14035 | $499=$ | " | 26395 |
|  | $473=$ | " | 14236 | $500=$ | " | 27338 |
|  | $474=$ | " | 14238 | $501=$ | " | 27690 |
|  | $475=$ | " | 14239 | $502=$ | 11 | 27691 |
|  | $476=$ | " | 14240 | $503=$ | 1 | 27692 |
|  | $477=$ | " | 14243 | $504=$ | " | 27693 |
|  | $478=$ | " | 14251 | $505=$ | 1 | 27694 |
|  | $479=$ | " | 14252 | $506=$ | " | 25310 |
|  | $480=$ | " | 14253 | $507=$ | " | 27696 |
|  | $481=$ | " | 14255 | $508=$ | " | 27767/B |
|  | $482=$ | 1 | 14256 | $509=$ | " | $27767 / \mathrm{D}$ |
|  | $483=$ | " | 14257 | $510=$ | " | 27767/E |
|  | $484=$ | " | 25409 | $511=$ | 1 | 27767/F |
|  | $485=$ | " | 25410 | $512=$ | "1 | 27813/A |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 486= \\ & 487= \end{aligned}$ | " | $\begin{aligned} & 25411 \\ & 22655 / 7 a \\ & 054 \end{aligned}$ | $513=$ $514=$ | " | 27814 27825 |
|  | $488=$ | " | 25810 | $515=$ | Monce | eaux 155 |
|  | $489=$ | " | 25811 | $516=$ | " | 156 |
|  | $490=$ | " | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 2580 \end{array}$ | $517=$ | 1 | 157 |
|  | $491=$ | " | 25813 | $518=$ | " | 158 |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued
cIII

$600=\operatorname{RPE} 19 / 164$
601 ㅍ " 12/201
$602=$ CRAIBL $17 / 514$
$603=\operatorname{RPE} 17-18 / 13$
$604=117-18 / 14$
$605=11$ 17-18/101
$606=" 19 / 35$
$607=4 \quad 24 / 60$
$608=1127 / 23$
$609=1129 / 59$
$610=1 \quad 29 / 63$
$611=" 31 / 47$
$612=" 31 / 33$
$613=1133 / 62$
$614=\| 34 / 134$
$615=$ CIL 813397
$616=\operatorname{RPE} 36 / 26$
$617=1137 / 40$
$618=" 37 / 20$
$619=" 37 / 177$
$620=$ CRAIBL $8 / 63$
$621=11 \quad 11 / 568: c$
$622=11 \quad 11 / 569: a$
$623=$ Wonceaux 44
$624=\quad 11 \quad 47$
$625=$ CRAIBL 14/102
$626=$ Monceaux 50
(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

| cIII | 627 = Monceaux |  |  | $654=$ CRAIBL $14 / 698$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $628=$ CIL8 14089 |  |  | $655=$ Monceaux 164 |  |  |
|  | $629=$ | " 226 | 65/46 | $656=$ | CRAIBL | 22/306: a |
|  | $630=$ Monceaux 64 |  |  | $657=$ | " | 22/306:0 |
|  | $631=$ | " | 65 | $658=$ | " | 15/127 |
|  | $632=$ | 1 | 66 | $659=$ CIL8 22655/8,10 |  |  |
|  | $633=$ | " | 68 | $660=$ CRAIBL $24 / 351: c$ |  |  |
|  | $634=$ | " | 69 | $661=$ | " | 29/29 |
|  | $635=$ | " | 70 | 662 = Monceaux 19 |  |  |
|  | $636=$ | " | 71 | $663=$ | " | 24 |
|  | $637=$ | 11 | 72 | $664=$ | " | 25 |
|  | $638=$ | 1 | 73 | $665=$ | 11 | 26 |
|  | $639=$ | " | 74 | $666=$ | 11 | 27 |
|  | $640=$ CIL8 13478 |  |  | $667=$ | 11 | 28 |
|  | $641=$ CRAIBL $16 / 434=17 / 520$ |  |  |  | 1130 |  |
|  | $642=$ | " | 17/536:16 |  | " | 31 |
|  | $643=$ | 11 | 17/536:17 | $670=$ | 11 | 32 |
|  | $644=$ | 12 | 20/193 | $671=$ | 1 | 33 |
|  | $645=$ | 12 | 20/194 | $672=$ | " | 34 |
|  | $646=$ | " 20 | 20/195:2 | $673=$ | " | 35 |
|  | $647=$ | 12 | 20/196:3 | $674=$ | " | 39 |
|  | $648=$ | 12 | 20/196:4 | $675=$ BSNAF $47 / 98: 1$ |  |  |
|  | $649=$ | 12 | 20/196:5 | $676=$ | 1 | 7/98:2 |
|  | $650=$ | 12 | 20/197:6 | $6777=$ | " | 7/98:4 |
|  | $651=$ | " 2 | 20/197:7 | $678=$ | " | $7 / 109-111: 1$ |
|  | $652=$ | " 1 | 14/585 | $679=$ | " | 7/109-111:2 |
|  | $653=$ | " 1 | 14/586 | $680=$ | 11 | 7/109-111:4 |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

| cIII | $681=$ BSNAF $7 / 109-111: 5$ |  |  | 708 | $=$ | BSINAF | 8/262-264 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $682=$ | $=1$ | 7/159-160 | 709 | $=$ | " | 8/288 |
|  | $683=$ | $=1$ | 7/254:1 | 710 | = | " | 8/299:1 |
|  | $684=$ | $=1$ | 7/246:2 | 711 | $=$ | " | 8/299:2 |
|  | $685=$ | = " | 7/246:3 | 712 | $=$ | " | 8/307:1 |
|  | $686=$ | $=1$ | 7/312:1 | 713 | $=$ | " | 8/307:2 |
|  | $687=$ | $=1$ | 7/312:2 | 714 | $=$ | " | 8/307:3 |
|  | $688=$ | $=1$ | 7/312:3 | 715 | $=$ | " | 8/330 |
|  | $689=$ | $=1$ | 7/312:4 | 716 | $=$ | " | 8/363-365:1 |
|  | $690=$ | $=1$ | 7/326:1 | 717 | $=$ | " | 8/363-365:2 |
|  | $691=$ | $=\quad "$ | 7/326:2 | 718 | $=$ | " | 8/363-365:3 |
|  | $692=$ | $=1$ | 7/326:3 | 719 | $=$ | " | 8/363-365:4 |
|  | $693=$ | $=$ | 7/326:4 | 720 | $=$ | " | 9/152 |
|  | $694=$ | $="$ | 8/94-95:2 | 721 | = | " | 9/163:1 |
|  | $694=$ | $=$ | 8/120-122:1 | 722 | $=$ | " | 9/163:2 |
|  | 696 | = " | 8/120-122:2 | 723 | $=$ | " | 91/339:1 |
|  | 697 | $=\quad "$ | 8/120-122:3 | 724 | $=$ | " | 9/339:2a |
|  | 698 | $=\quad "$ | 8/120-122:4 | 725 | $=$ | " | 9/339:2b |
|  | 699 | $=\quad "$ | 8/162 | 726 | $=$ | " | 9/339:3 |
|  | 700 | $=\quad "$ | 8/177:1 | 727 | $=$ | " | 9/342-343:1 |
|  | 701 | $=\quad "$ | 8/177:2 | 728 | $=$ | " | 9/342-343:2 |
|  | 702 | $=\quad "$ | 8/177:3 | 729 | $=$ | " | 9/342-343:3 |
|  | 703 | $=$ | 8/219:1 | 730 | $=$ | " | 9/387-388:1 |
|  | 704 | $=\quad "$ | 8/219:2 | 731 | $=$ | " | 9/387-388:2 |
|  | 705 | $=\quad "$ | 8/222 | 732 | $=$ | " | 10/209 |
|  | 706 | $=\quad "$ | 8/242:1 | 733 | $=$ | " | 10/227:1 |
|  | 707 | $=1$ | 8/242:2 | 734 |  | " | 10/227:2 |

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued
cIII $\quad 735=$ BSNAF $10 / 227: 4$
$736=\quad " 10 / 242: 1$
$737=\quad " \quad 11 / 107-108: 1$
$738=" 11 / 107-108: 2$
$739=11 \quad 11 / 164-165: 1$
$740=" \quad 11 / 164-165: 2$
$741=\quad " \quad 11 / 164-165: 3$

| $742=$ | $"$ | $11 / 187: 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $743=$ | $"$ | $11 / 187: 2$ |


| 743 | $=$ | $11 / 187: 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 744 |  | $11 / 237-238: 1$ |
| 745 | $=$ | $"$ | $11 / 237-238: 2$

$746=$ " $11 / 237-238: 3$

| $747=$ | $"$ | $11 / 311 / 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 748 | $=$ | $"$ |$\quad 12 / 198 \cdot 1$


| 748 | $=$ | $12 / 198: 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 749 | $=$ | $" 12 / 198: 2$ |
| 750 | $=$ | $\prime \prime$ |
|  | $12 / 208: 1$ |  |

$751=" 12 / 208: 2$
$752=" 12 / 218-219: 1$
$753=" 12 / 218-219: 2$
$754=" 12 / 218-219: 3$
$755=11 \quad 12 / 332-333: 2$
$756=1112 / 332-333: 3$

| 757 | $=$ | $\prime \prime$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 758 | $=$ | $12 / 332-333: 4$ |
|  | $\prime 12 / 354-355: 1$ |  |

$759=\quad$ "
$760=12 / 354-355: 2$
$761=$
7
$762=\operatorname{BSNAF} 12 / 394-395: 1$

| $763=$ | 1 | 12/394-395:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $764=$ | 1 | 12/430-431:1 |
| $765=$ | " | 12/430-431:2 |
| $766=$ | " | 12/430-431:4 |
| $767=$ | 1 | 12/4 |

$768=11$ 12/430-431:6
$769=1$ 13/81-82:1
$770=11$ 13/81-82:2
$771=" 13 / 81-82: 3$
$772=\quad " \quad 13 / 81-82: 4$
$773=11 \quad 13 / 84: 1$
$774=" 13 / 84: 3$
$775=1 \quad 13 / 89-90: 1$
$776=11$ 13/89-90:2
$777=11 \quad 13 / 89-90: 3$
$778=11 \quad 13 / 89-90: 4$
$779=11$ 13/94-95:1
$780=713 / 94-95: 2$
$781=" \quad 13 / 94-95: 3$
$782=11$ 13/94-95:4
$783=11$ 13/165-165:2
$784=11$ 13/165-166:3
$785=1113 / 180-181: 1$
$786=11$ 13/180-181:2
$787=11$ 13/180-181:3
$788=11 \quad 13 / 190: 2$

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

| cIII | $843=$ | BSNAF | 14/129:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $844=$ | " | 14/129:3 |
|  | $845=$ | " | 14/147:2 |
|  | $846=$ | 11 | 14/147:3 |
|  | $847=$ | " | 14/147: 4 |
|  | $848=$ | " | 14/169-170:2 |
|  | $849=$ | 11 | 14/169-170:4 |
|  | $850=$ | * | 14/169-170:5 |
|  | $851=$ | 11 | 14/202-203:1 |
|  | $852=$ | 1 | 24/202-203:2 |
|  | $853=$ | " | 14/202-203:3 |
|  | $854=$ | 1 | 14/222-223:1 |
|  | $855=$ | 1 | 14/222-223:2 |
|  | $856=$ | 11 | 14/222-223:3 |
|  | $857=$ | " | 14/222-223:4 |
|  | $858=$ | " | 14/225-226:1 |
|  | $859=$ | 1 | 14/225-226:2 |
|  | $860=$ | 1 | 14/225-226:3 |
|  | $861=$ | " | 14/225-226:4 |
|  | $862=$ | 11 | 14/284-285:1 |
|  | $863=$ | " | 14/284-285:3 |
|  | $864=$ | " | 14/287-288:1 |
|  | $865=$ | " | 14/287-288:2 |

(IV) NUMIDIA

| cIV | $1=$ CIL8 16507 |  |  | $28=$ | L8 | 19913 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2=$ | " | 2046 | $29=$ | " | 19914 |
|  | $3=$ | " | 2051 | $30=$ | 11 | 2292 |
|  | $4=$ | " | 16684 | $31=$ | 11 | 2308 |
|  | $5=$ | " | 2095 | $32=$ | " | 16659 |
|  | $6=$ | " | 3357 | $33=$ | " | 2334 |
|  | $7=$ | 1 | 2219 | $34=$ | 1 | 2494 |
|  | $8=$ | " | $7018$ 0000 | $35=$ | " | 4353 |
|  | $9=$ | " | 2223 | $36=$ | " | 4354 |
|  | $10=$ | " | 2245 | $37=$ | 11 | 4671 |
|  | $11=$ | 11 | 16647 | $38=$ | " | 4762 |
|  | $12=$ | " | 17714 | $39=$ | " | 4770 |
|  | $13=$ | " | 17607 | $40=$ | 1 | 27915 |
|  | $14=$ | " | 17717 | $41=$ | " | 4799 |
|  | $15=$ | " | 17718 | $42=$ | " | 4807 |
|  | $16=$ | " | 17732 | $43=$ | " | 5176 |
|  | $17=$ | 11 | 17758 | $44=$ | 11 | 5229 |
|  | $18=$ | " | 17759 | $45=$ | 11 | 5262 |
|  | $19=$ | BSNAF | 9/194 | $46=$ | 1 | 5263 |
|  | $20=$ | CIL8 | 17768 | $47=$ | 1 | 5264 |
|  | $21=$ | CIL8 | 17801 | $48=$ | 11 | 5352 |
|  | $22=$ | " | 18002 | $49=$ | " | 5488 |
|  | $23=$ | " | 18705 | $50=$ | 11 | 5489 |
|  | $24=$ | 11 | 18656 | $51=$ | 1 | 5490 |
|  | $25=$ | " | 18683 | $52=$ | 11 | 5491 |
|  | $26=$ | " | 19742 | $53=$ | " | 5492 |
|  | $27=$ | " | 19671 | $54=$ | " | 5493 |

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued

| cIV | $109=$ CIL8 18668 | $136=\operatorname{RPE} 9 / 120$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $110=\quad 18669$ | $137=$ CIL 828045 |
|  | $111=\operatorname{RPE} 28 / 81$ | $138=\mathrm{RPE} 16 / 111$ |
|  | $112=$ CIL8 4677 | 139 CIL8 27916 |
|  | $113=$ " 16727 | $140=" 5341$ |
|  | $114=$ " 17617 | $141=$ CRAIBL 24/80 |
|  | $115=110706$ | $142=$ BSNAF 9/226:4 |
|  | $116=10904$ | $143=\operatorname{RPE} 22 / 25$ |
|  | $117=$ BSNAF 9/200:3 | $144=1124 / 58$ |
|  | $118=1$ 9/218:2 | $745=1124 / 37$ |
|  | $119=$ CIL8 2119 | $146=" 28 / 105$ |
|  | $120=$ Diehl 2080 | $147=" 28 / 35$ |
|  | $121=$ Monceaux 336 | $148=131 / 112$ |
|  | $122=$ CIL8 16851 | $149=133 / 232$ |
|  | 123 = Monceaux 278 | $150=" 35 / 94$ |
|  | $124=1279$ | $151=" 351 / 62$ |
|  | $125=11280$ | $152=$ " $35 / 59$ |
|  | $126=1281$ | $153=$ " $37 / 147$ |
|  | $127=11282$ | $154=" 37 / 148$ |
|  | $128=1083$ | $155=$ Diehl 801 |
|  | $129=1284$ | $156=\operatorname{RPE} 37 / 149$ |
|  | $130=285$ | $157=137 / 150$ |
|  | $131=1286$ | $158=$ CIL8 27914 |
|  | $132=1287$ | $159=\quad " 27917$ |
|  | $133=\mathrm{RPE} 8 / 238$ | $160=1127918$ |
|  | $134=19 / 118$ | $161=127919$ |
|  | $135=19 / 121$ | $162=$ BSNAF 9/225:2 |


(IV) NUMIDIA - continued.

$$
\text { cIV } \begin{aligned}
& 217=\text { Gsell } \\
& 2763 \\
& 218=" \\
& 219=" \\
& 2764 \\
& 220=" \\
& 2765 \\
& 2768 \\
& 222=" \\
& 227 \text { " }
\end{aligned}
$$

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued

cIV | $271=$ | CIL8 2492 | $273=$ CIL8 $5394 / A$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| $272=$ | Diehl 2117 | $274=128044$ |

cV

| $1=$ | CIL8 | 20410 | $20=$ | CIL8 | 8635 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2=$ | 1 | 20411 | $21=$ | " | 8636 |
| $3=$ | " | 20414 | $22=$ | 11 | 8817 |
| $4=$ | 1 | 20415 | $23=$ | " | 8838 |
| $5=$ | " | 20480 | $24=$ | " | 8639 |
| $6=$ | " | 20482 | $25=$ | BSNAF | 12/247 |
| $7=$ | 11 | 20572 | $26=$ | CIL8 | 8641 |
| $8=$ | " | 20590 | $27=$ | 11 | 8642 |
| $9=$ | 1 | 8630 | $28=$ | 11 | 8644 |
| $10=$ | " | 8631 | $29=$ | " | 8649 |
| $11=$ | $y$ | 8632 | $30=$ | " | 8650 |
| $12=$ | " | 8520 | $31=$ | t | 8651 |
| $13=$ | " | 8621 | $32=$ | 11 | 8653 |
| $14=$ | \# | 8622 | $33=$ | " | 8655 |
| $15=$ | " | 8623 | $34=$ | " | 20643 |
| $16=$ | " | 8624 | $35=$ | " | 20644 |
| $17=$ | 1 | 8625 | $36=$ | " | 20489 |
| $18=$ | " | 8628 | $37=$ | " | 8708 |
| $19=$ | " | 8634 | $38=$ | 1 | 8805 |

cV $\quad 39=$ CIL8 20903
$40=1120904$
$41=1120905$
$42=1120906$
$43=1120907$
$44=1120908$
$45=1120909$
$46=1120910$
$47=\quad " \quad 20911$
$48=1 \quad 20912$
$49=1120913$
$50=" 20914$
$51=1120915$
$52=120916$
$53=1120918$
$54=1120920$
$55=1 \quad 20921$
$56=$ CRAIBL $14 / 125$
$57=$ CIL8 20923
$58=" 20928$
$59=1121424$
$60=1121431$
$61=\quad " 21539$
$62=1121540$
$63=1121543$
$64=1121544$
$65=$ " 21549
$66=$ CIL8 21550
$67=\quad$ " 9248
$68=\quad$ " 9286
$69=1120958$
$70=" 9590$
$71=119591$
$72=\quad$ " 9592
$73=18629$
$74=119594$
$75=\quad$ " 9595
$76=\operatorname{RPE} 36 / 65$
$77=$ CIL8 9694
$78=1121551$
$79=1121553$
$80=1121554$
$81=" 21555$
$82=\quad$ " 21570
$83=\quad$ " 21571
$84=1121572$
$85=" 21573$
$86=1121574$
$87=1121655$
$88=1121675$
$89=1121676$
$90=1$ 21680
$91=\quad " 21681$
$92=\quad " 21682$
(v) MAURETANIA - continued

| cV | $93=$ | CIL8 | 21686 | $120=$ | CIL8 9 | 9712 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $94=$ | 1 | 21688 | $121=$ | " | 9713 |
|  | $95=$ | " | 21689 | $122=$ | 1 | 9715 |
|  | $96=$ | " | 21694 | $123=$ | " | 9718 |
|  | $97=$ | " | 21698 | $124=$ | " 9 | 9731 |
|  | $98=$ | 11 | 21701 | $125=$ | 19 | 9732 |
|  | $99=$ | " | 21726 | $126=$ | " 97 | 9733 |
|  | $100=$ | " | 21729 | $127=$ | CRATBI | L 33/62:1 |
|  | $101=$ | 1 | 21733 | $128=$ | 1 | $33 / 62: 2$ |
|  | $102=$ | 1 | 21737 | $129=$ | CIL8 9 | 9746 |
|  | $103=$ | " | 21738 | $130=$ | 119 | 9751 |
|  | $104=$ | " | 21740 | $131=$ | 19 | 9752 |
|  | $105=$ | " | 21742 | $132=$ | Diehl | 234/A |
|  | $106=$ | " | 21744 | $133=$ | CIL8 9 | 9859 |
|  | $107=$ | 11 | 21745 | $134=$ | 19 | 9865 |
|  | $108=$ | " | 21746 | $135=$ | " 9 | 9866 |
|  | $109=$ | " | 21747 | $736=$ | 19 | 9867 |
|  | $110=$ | " | 21753 | $137=$ | 19 | 9869 |
|  | $111=$ | " | 21768 | $138=$ | " 9 | 9870 |
|  | $112=$ | 1 | 21773 | $139=$ | " 8 | 8483 |
|  | $113=$ | " | 21774 | $140=$ | " 9 | 9876 |
|  | $114=$ | " | RPE 31/57 | $141=$ | 19 | 9877 |
|  | $115=$ | " | 21497 | $142=$ | 119 | 9887 |
|  | $116=$ | RPE | 32/37 | $143=$ | 119 | 9898 |
|  | $177=$ | CIL8 | 9709 | $144=$ | " 98 | 9899 |
|  | $118=$ | " | 9710 | $145=$ | Diehl | 234/B |
|  | $119=$ | " | 9711 | $146=$ | " | 234/C |

(v) MAURETANIA - continued

| cV | 147 = Diehl 1111 | $174=$ CRAIBL 32/82:2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $148=$ CIL8 21511 | $175=$ | = Monce | eaux 21 |
|  | $149=$ " 20619 | $176=$ | = CIL8 | 9285 |
|  | $150=$ Diehl 2423 | $177=$ | $=\mathrm{RPE}$ | 25/42 |
|  | $151=$ CIL8 21337/A | $178=$ | $=$ Monc | eaux 297 |
|  | $152=$ " 21719 | 179 | = CIL8 | 9593 |
|  | $153=18847$ | $180=$ | $=\quad "$ | 9703 |
|  | $154=" 20288$ | 181 | $=1$ | 9804 |
|  | $155=18481$ | 182 | $="$ | 9815 |
|  | $156=$ " 9011 | 183 | $=1$ | 9835 |
|  | 157 = Moñceaux 333 | 184 | $=1$ | 9852 |
|  | $158=1117$ | 185 | $=\mathrm{RPE}$ | 36/80 |
|  | 159 C CIL8 21589 | 186 | = CIL8 | 21530 |
|  | $160=$ " 9966 | 187 | $=1$ | 21546 |
|  | $161=09982$ | 188 | $=1$ | 21547 |
|  | $162=19984$ | 189 | $=$ | 21582 |
|  | $163=$ " 21904 8825 | 190 | $=1$ | 21584 |
|  | $164=$ RPE 25/60 | 191 | $="$ | 21585 |
|  | 165 = CIL8 21799 | 192 | $=\quad "$ | 21588 |
|  | $166=$ " 21801 | 193 | $="$ | 21591 |
|  | 167 = Frend, JRS $\mathrm{xxx} / 1: 49$ | 194 | $=1$ | 21593 |
|  | $168=\operatorname{RPE} 29 / 115$ | 195 | $="$ | 21594 |
|  | 169 = CIL8 $22642 / 17$ | 196 | $="$ | 21595 |
|  | $170=122657 / 6$ | 197 | $="$ | 21597 |
|  | $171=110932$ | 198 | $=\quad "$ | 21599 |
|  | $172=$ " 8771 | 199 | $="$ | 21600 |
|  | $173=$ CRAIBL 32/82:1 | 200 | $=1$ | 21601 |

(v) MAURETANIA - continued


[^8]$55=13486$
$56=13487$
$58=13490$
$58=13491$
$59=13492$
$60=13493$
$61=13494$
$62=13497$
$63=13501$
$64=13502$ $\phi \neq$
$65=13503$
$66=1350 \not{ }^{\prime} 4$
$67=13505$
$68=13506$
$69=13507$
$70=13508$
$71=13509$
$72=13510$
$73=13511$
$74=13512$
$75=13513$
$76=13514$
$77=13515$
$78=13524$
$79=13525$
$80=13526$
$81=13527$
$82=13528$
$83=25166$
$84=25107$
$85=25112$
$86=25118$
$87=25120$
$88=25122$
$89=25124$
$90=25128$
$91=25130$
$92=25131$
$93=25133$
$94=25136$
$95=25137$
$96=25086$
$97=25088$
$98=25089$
$99=25090$
$100=25091$
$101=25095$
$102=25098$
$103=25099$
$104=25101$
$105=25103$
$106=25065$
$107=25066$
$108=25067$
$109=25069$
$110=25071$
$111=25074$
$112=25075$
$113=25076$
$114=25077$
$115=25078$
$116=25041$
$117=781$
$118=12411$
$119=10544+12483$
$120=10545$
$121=10547$
$122=25138$
$123=25139$
$124=25142$
$125=25143$
$126=25144$
$127=25145$
$128=25147$
$129=25148$
$130=25149$
$131=25150$
$132=25151$
$133=25153$
$134=25155$
$135=25157$
$136=25158$
$137=25163$
$138=25164$
$139=25167$
$140=25170$
$141=25171$
$142=25174 / \mathrm{A}$
$143=25177$
$144=25178$
$145=25179$
$146=25180$
$147=25181$
$148=25189$
$149=25190$
$150=25196$
$151=25199$
$152=25201$
$153=25210$
$154=25215 / \mathrm{A}$
$155=25222$
$156=25229$
$157=25237$
$158=25266$
$159=27271$
$160=25276$
$161=13530$
$162=13531$
$163=13532$
$164=13534+$ CRAIBL
11/571: a-e
$165=13536$
$166=13537$
$167=13538$
$168=13546$
$169=13547$
$170=13551$
$171=13553$
$172=13554$
$173=13555$
$174=13556$
$175=13557$
$176=13559$
$177=13560$
$178=13561$
$179=13562$
$180=13563$
$181=13565$
$182=13566$
$183=13568$
$184=13569 \quad$ F
$185=13571$
$186=13573$
$187=13570$
$188=13574$
$189=13575$
$190=13577$
191=13578
$192=13579$
$193=13581$
$194=1358^{7}$
$195=13588$
$196=13592$
$197=13593$
$198=13594,13595$
$199=13596$
$200=13597$
$201=13598$
$202=13599$
$203=13600$
$204=13601$
$205=13602$
$206=25297$
$207=25299$
$208=25301$
$209=25303$
$210=25312$
$211=25318$

FRAGMENTS - continued

XIII
$212=25322$
$213=25326$
$214=25333$
$215=25343$
$216=25348$
$217=25350$
$218=25353$
219225356
$220=25359$
$221=25361$
222=\$3604
$223=13605$
$224=13609$
$225=13611$
$225=13612$
$227=13613$
$228=13615$
$229=13616$
$230=13618$
231=13619
$232=13620$
$233=13621$
$234=13622$
$235=13624$
$236=13625$
$2,3 \%=13626$
$2,38=1.3628$
$239=1.3530$
$2,4 \theta=13631$
$241=13635$
$242=13636$
$243=13638$
$24=13639$
$245=1.3640$
$2 \mathbf{4}=13641$
$247=13642$
$248=1.364 .3$
$249=13644$
$250=13645$
$251=13646$
$252=13648$
$253=13649$
$254=13650$
$25.5=13651$
$256=13653$
$257=13655$
$2,58=13657$
$259=13658$
$260=13659$
$261=13660$
$252=13663$
$263=13664$
$264=13665$
$265=13666$
$266=13667$
$267=13668$
$268=13671$
$269=13673$
$270=13674$
$271=13675$
$272=13678$
$273=13679$
$274=13680$
$275=13682$
$276=13683$
$277=13684$
$278=13685$
$279=13686$
$280=13687$
$281=13688$
$282=13689$
$283=13690$
$284=13691$
285=13692,13693
$286=13694$
$287=13695$
$288=13697$
$289=13701$
$290=13702$
$291=13703$
$292=13705$
$293=13706,13707$
$294=13708$
$295=13709$
$296=13711$
$297=13712$
$298=13713$
$299=13714$
$300=13715$
$301=13718$
$302=13719$
$303=13720$
$304=13721$
$305=13723$
$306=13724$
$307=13725$
$308=13726$
$309=13727$
$310=13728$
$311=13729$
$312=137.30$
$313=13732$
$314=13734$
$315=13735$
$316=13738$
$317=13739$
$318=1.3741$
$319=13743$
$320=13744$
$321=13745$
$322=13746$
$323=13747$
$324=13749$
$325=13753$
$326=137.54$
$327=13753$
$328=13757$
$329=13758$
$330=13760$
$331=13762$
$332=13763$
$333=13764$
$3: 34=13765$
$335=1.3766$
$336=13767$
$337=13768$
$338=1.3769$
$339=13771$
$340=1.3772$
$341=13773,13774$
$342=13775$
$343=1.3776$
$344=13777$
$345=1.3778$
$346=13779$
$347=13780$
$348=13782$
$349=13783$
$350=13785$
$351=13790$
$352=13791$
$353=13792$
$354=13793$
$355=13794$
$356=13795$
$357=13801$
$358=13802$
$359=13805$
$360=1.3809$
$361=13810$
$362=13811$
$363=13812$
$354=13814$
$365=13815$
$366=13816$
$367=13817$
$368=13818$
$369=13819$
$370=13820$

## xIII

$371=13822$ $372=13823$ $373=13824$ $374=13825$ $375=13827$ $376=13828$ $377=13830$ $378=13831$ $379=13833$ $380=13834$ $381=13835$ $382=13838$
$383=13839$
384=13840
$385=13841$
$386=13842$
$387=13843$
$388=13844$
$389=13845$
$390=13846$
$391=13847$
$392=13849$
$393=13851$
$394=13852$
$395=1385.3$
$396=13854$
$397=13855$
$398=13856$
$399=13857$
$400=13859$
$401=13860,13861$
$402=13863$
$403=13864$
$404=13867$
$405=13868$
$406=13869$
$407=13870$
$408=13871$
$409=13872$
$410=13873$
$411=13877$
$412=13884$
$413=13885$
$414=1.3886$
$415=13888$
$416=13889$
$417=13890-13892$
$418=13893$
$419=13894$
$420=13895,13896$
$421=13897$
$422=13899$
$423=13900$
424=13901,13902
$425=13904$
$426=13905$
$427=13907$
$428=13908$
$429=13910$
$430=13911$
$431=13912$
4 ( $3=13916$
$433=13918$
$434=13919$
$435=13921,13922$
$436=13924$
$437 \neq 13925$
$438=13926$
$439=13928$
$440=13929$
$441=13832$
$442=13934$
$443=1.3935$
$444=13936$
$445=13937$
$446=13938$
$447=13939$
$448=13941$
$449=13942$
$450=13943$
$451=13944$
$452=13947$
$453=13948$
$454=13949$
$455=13950$
$456=13951$
$457=13953$
$458=13954$
$459=13955$
$460=13958$
$461=13959$
$462=13960$
$463=13962$
$464=13963$
$465=13964$
$466=13965$
$467=13966$
$468=13967$
$46=13970$
$470=13971$
$471=13973$
$472=13974$
$473=13975$
$474=13978$
$475=13979$
$476=13980$
$477=13981$
$478=13982$
$479=13983$ $480=13984$ $481=13988$ $482=13989$ $483=13991$ $484=13996$ $485=13997$ $486=13999$ $487=14000$ $488=14001$ $489=14002$ $490=14003$ $491=14006$ $492=1400 \not{ }^{\prime} 7$ $493=14008$ $494=14012$ $495=14014$ $496=14016$ $497=14019$ 498714021 $499=14022$ $500=14023$ $501=14024$ $502=14026$ $503=14028$ $504=14029$ $505=14030$ $506=14032$ $507=14037$ $508=14038$ 509=14040 51-914041 $511=14042$
$512=14044$
$513=14045$
$514=14048$
$515=14048$
$516=14049$
$517=14050$
$518=14051$
$519=14052$
$520=14055$
$521=14057$
$522=14061$
$523=14062$
$524=14063$
$595=14065$
$596=14066$
$587=14070$
528=14072
$529=14074$
$530=14075$
$531=14077$
$532=14078$

FRAGMENTS - continued

| XIII | $533=14079$ | $586=14221$ | $639=24562 / A$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $534=14080$ | $587=14223$ | $640=24563$ |
|  | $535=14083$ | $588=14224$ | $641=24564$ |
|  | $536=14084$ | $589=14227$ | $642=25632$ |
|  | $537=14087$ | $580=14233$ | $643=22632 / 58 a$ |
|  | $538=14088$ | $591=14237$ | $644=22644 / 225$ |
|  | $539=14091$ | $592=14241$ | $645=22644 / 226$ |
|  | $540=14092$ | $593=14242$ | $646=22645 / 490$ |
|  | $541=14093$ | $594=14244$ | $647=22696 / 20$ |
|  | $542=14094$ | $595=14245$ | $648=22649 / 3$ |
|  | $543=14095$ | $596=14246$ | $649=2020$ |
|  | $544=14096$ | $597=14247$ | $650=27922$ |
|  | $545=14116$ | $598=14248$ | $651=16666$ |
|  | $546=14118$ | $599=14249$ | $552=1114 / \mathrm{C}$ |
|  | $547=14126$ | $600=14250$ | $653=1115$ |
|  | $548=14127$ | $601=14254$ | $654=16284$ |
|  | $549=14131$ | $602=14258$ | $655=24998$ |
|  | $550=14132$ | $603=14259$ | $656=25010 / \mathrm{A}$ |
|  | $551=14135$ | $604=14260$ | $657=10538$ |
|  | $552=14139$ | $605=14261$ | $658=13995$ |
|  | $553=14140$ | $606=14263$ | $659=13968$ |
|  | $554=14142$ | $607=14265$ | $660=10613$ |
|  | $555=14143$ | $608=14268$ | $661=25458$ |
|  | $556=14146$ | $609=14269$ | 662=CRAIBL |
|  | $557=14148$ | $610=25414$ | 11/568: a-b |
|  | $558=14153$ | $611=25816$ | $663=$ CRAIBI |
|  | $559=14155$ | $612=27334$ | 11/571-572 |
|  | $560=14157$ | $613=27335$ | $664=C R A I B L$ |
|  | $561=14159$ | $614=27337$ | 12/467-471 |
|  | $562=14160$ | $615=27339$ | $665=$ CRAIBL |
|  | $563=14163$ | $616=27340$ | 17/518 |
|  | $564=14164$ | $617=27697$ | $666=C R A I B L$ |
|  | $565=14166$ | $618=27815$ | 17/517 |
|  | $566=14169$ | $619=27820$ | $667=$ CAIA BJ, |
|  | $567=14171$ | $620=27922$ | 17/526 |
|  | $568=14172$ | $621=27925$ | $668=$ CRAIBI $(2)$ |
|  | $569=14173$ | $622=27964$ | 22/307:b |
|  | $570=14174$ | 623=27981 | $669=$ CRAIBL |
|  | $571=14176$ | 624=27982/A | 15/497 |
|  | $572=14183$ | 625=27999 | $670=$ Monceaux |
|  | $573=14184$ | $626=15245$ | 82 |
|  | $574=14185$ | $627=16254$ | $671=\mathrm{CMCh} 74$ |
|  | $575=14186$ | $628=16257$ | $672=$ Diehl |
|  | $576=14189$ | $629=16841$ | 4740 |
|  | $577=14197$ | $630=16843$ | $673=1654$ |
|  | $578=14200$ | $631=16908$ | $674=22644 / 140$ |
|  | $579=14201$ | $632=22544 / 256$ |  |
|  | $580=14204$ | $633=22645 / 372$ |  |
|  | $581=14205$ | $634=22646 / 15$ | * * |
|  | $582=14206$ | $635=22656 / 28$ |  |
|  | $583=14212$ | $636=22656 / 29$ | * |
|  | $584=14214$ | $637=24078$ |  |
|  | $585=14220$ | $638=24562$ |  |

FRAGMENTS - continued (NUMIDIA).

$$
\text { XIV } \begin{aligned}
\quad 1 & =2274 \\
2 & =17605 \\
3 & =17716 \\
4 & =17729 \\
5 & =17782 \\
6 & =2293 \\
7 & =2294 \\
8 & =2448 \\
9 & =5494 \\
10 & =7016 \\
11 & =10688 \\
12 & =10710
\end{aligned}
$$

$13=10715$
$14=2051$
$15=22646 / 19$
16=Gsell 2777
17=Gsell 2778
18=Gsell 2780
19=Gsell 2784
20=Gsell 2812
2l=Gsell 2814
22=Gsell 2839
23=Gsell 3427
24=Gsell 3437

25=Gsell 3464
26=Gsell 3580
27=Gsell 3702
$28 \neq 16651$
$29=2412$
$30=2474$
$31=10933$
$32=$ CRAIBL $22 / 399$
33=CRAIBL 22/405
34=5359
$35=2305$
36=Gsell 2273

Fragments - continued (MAURETANIA)

| $x V$ | $1=20310$ | $14=20925$ | $27=9270$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2=20311$ | $15=20926$ | $28=9287$ |
|  | $3=20312$ | $16=20927$ | 29=9695 |
|  | $4=20314$ | $17=20929$ | $30=10485 / 4$ |
|  | $5=8627$ | $18=20930$ | $31=8771$ |
|  | $6=8770$ | $19=20931$ | $32=8771 / \mathrm{A}$ |
|  | 7 Diehl 1528 | $20=21419$ | $33=21418$ |
|  | $8=8707$ | 21=21429 | $34=21771$ |
|  | $9=8731$ | $22=21430$ | 35=20490 |
|  | $10=8757$ | $23=21435$ | 36=CRAIBL 14/213 |
|  | $11=20917$ | $24=21436$ | $37=$ Monceaux 204 |
|  | $12=20919$ | $25=21437$ | 38=Monceaux 205 |
|  | $13=20924$ | $26=21438$ |  |

(I) TRIPOLITANA

| Secto | Locality saec I-III | saec IV | saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KP | LEPTIS MAGNA <br> (Lebda) | bI 1,4-6 |  |
| " | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OEA } \\ & \text { (Tripoli) } \end{aligned}$ | bI 7 |  |
| " | Rumie |  | cI 4 |
| " (?) | Ain Zara |  | cJ 3 |
| JO | GIGTHIS <br> (Si.bu Ghrara) | bI 2,3 | cI 2 |
| " | GIRBA <br> (Djerba) |  | CI 1 |

(II) BYZACENA

| Sec | tor Locality | ec I-III | saec IV | saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JM | APHRODISIUM (Si.Khalifa) |  | bII 118 | cII 56 |
| 1 | Bu Fischa |  |  | cII 57-59 |
| " | Si.Habich |  |  | CII 10 |
| 11 | SEGERMES |  | bII 128 |  |
|  | UPPENTJA <br> (Hr. Chigarnia) | $\text { aII } 5-7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bII 18-30,32, } \\ & 34-38,40,64, \\ & 107 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CII 11-13,28-55, } \\ & 209 \end{aligned}$ |
| JN | Hadjeb el Aiun |  | bII 67-68 |  |
| " | HADRUVETUM (Sousse) | $\begin{aligned} & 2 I I ~ I-4 \\ & 8-33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bII } 7-10,16-17, \\ & 31,62-63,69,100 \\ & 114-116,122,124 \\ & -125,130-132 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CII 4,9,22,87,61, } \\ & 66,104,158,188- \\ & 189,206-208,212- \\ & 217 \end{aligned}$ |

(II) BYZACENA - continued

(II) BYZACENA - continued

| Sec | tor Locality saec I-III | saec IV | saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IN | Kairouan | bII 66 | CII 81-82 |
| " | Hr.Machđjuba |  | CII 168 |
| " | MACTARIS <br> (Maktar) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bII 13,73-74,76, } \\ & 89-97,99,101,102 \\ & 103,126 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cII 26,67,89-98, } \\ & 100-102,105-121, \\ & 1690180,199-200, \\ & 203-205 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11 | SALTUS <br> MASSIPIANUS | bII 88 |  |
| 11 | Mididi |  | CII 18,88 |
| 11 | Hr. Naja |  | CII 103 |
| " | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SUFES } \\ & (\text { Hr.Sbiba) } \end{aligned}$ |  | CII 15,128 |
| 11 | SUFETULA (Sbeitla) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bII 69-70,75, } \\ & 82,85,110 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CII } 23-24,68,73, \\ & 83-84,127,155,157, \\ & 163,207 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { THALA } \\ & (\text { Thala }) \end{aligned}$ | bII 59,72,84 | CII 85-86,167 |
| " | THELEPTE <br> (Medinet el Kedima) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bII 15,77-81, } \\ & 123 \end{aligned}$ | CII 124-126 |
| IO | CAPSA <br> (Gafsa) |  | CII 122-123 |
| " | La Feriana |  | CII 14 |
| " | Ksar Koutine |  | cII 62 |
| 1 | MACOMADES MINORES |  | CII 60 |
| 11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TACAPAE } \\ & \text { (Gabes) } \end{aligned}$ |  | cII 1 |
| 1 | THUSURUS (Tozeur) |  | CII 27 |
| HN | AMVAEDARA <br> (Haidra) | bII 83,112 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CII } 17,25,130-154, \\ & 156,159-165 \end{aligned}$ |


|  | tor Locality saec I-III | saec IV | saec V-VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JM | MUN. AEL. SUA | bIII 197 |  |
| " | ALTHIBUROS <br> (Hr.Medeina) |  | cIII 508-513 |
| " | Beled Beli | bIII 38 |  |
| 11 | Cap Bon | bIII 274-275 | CIII 618 |
| 11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CARPIS } \\ & \text { (Mraissa) } \end{aligned}$ | bIII 27,209 |  |
| " | $\begin{gathered} \text { CLUPEA } \\ \text { (Kelibia) } \end{gathered}$ |  | cIII 102-103 |
| 11 | CURUBIS <br> (Kourba) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WIII 155,187, } \\ & 213,224-225 \end{aligned}$ | CIII 625 |
| 1 | Hr.el Favar | bIII 163 |  |
| " | MIZIGITA <br> (Douela) |  | CIII 104 |
| " | NEFERIS <br> (Bu Beker) | bIII 207 | CIII 101 |
| " | PUPPUT <br> (Souk el Abiod) | bIII 189,196, | CIII 7 |
| 11 | Tubernuk = <br> Ain Tebornok |  | cIII 614 |
| HL | HIPPO DIARRHYTUS <br> (Bizerta) |  | CIII 87,91 |
| " | Mater | BIII 202 |  |
| MM | Hr.el Aluain | bIII 25 |  |
|  | Bordj el Amri |  | CIII 495 |
| " | Ainjel Ansarine | bIII 220,243 |  |
| 11 | APISA NAJUS <br> (Tarf ech Chena) | bIII 31-34 |  |
| 11 | Hr.bu Arada | bIII 188 |  |
|  | Aubuzza = Hr.Djezza |  | CIII 562 |


| Sector Locality saec I-III | Saec IV | saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | bIII 35 |  |
| $" \underset{(\mathrm{Hr} \cdot \text { Behaia) }}{\mathrm{BAHIA}}$ aIII 68 | bIII 190 |  |
| " Choua el Batel | bIII 51 | cIII 600 |
| " CASTELLUM BIRACSACCARENSIUM | bIII 221 |  |
| $" \begin{gathered}\text { BISICA } \\ \text { (Hr.Bijga) }\end{gathered}$ aIII 72 | bIII 167-168 | CIII 545-546,581 |
| " bulla Regia <br> (Hammam Derradj) | bIII 259 | cIII 543,654,658 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { CARTHAGO } & \text { aIII } 1,3-4,4, \\ \text { (Carthage) } & 9-48,50-67, \\ & 73-81 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIII 5-20,22,27, } \\ & 30,39-50,52-75, \\ & 77,79-83,85-101, \\ & 103-109,111-116, \\ & 118-141,144,174, \\ & 177-180,192,194, \\ & 201,210,217,223, \\ & 226-234,240-241, \\ & 244,246-247,252- \\ & 253,258,265,272, \\ & 278-281 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cIII 2,20-62,64-69, } \\ & 77-74,76-80,82-86, \\ & 88-90,92-99,105-265, \\ & 267-290,292-320,322- \\ & 483,506,515-539,547, \\ & 550,561,563-570,572- \\ & 573,576,579-580,585- \\ & 5877,594-599,503-607, \\ & 609,613,615,620-624, \\ & 626-653,655-657, \\ & 659-887 \end{aligned}$ |
| " MUN.CINCARITANUM (Bordj Tum) | bIII 149 |  |
| " Ain Djal |  | CIII 593 |
| " Djebel Djellua |  | cIII 12-18 |
| " Hr.Fallus |  | cIII 1 |
| $\text { " FURNOS } \begin{aligned} & \text { (Ain Fourna) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIII 148,I65, } \\ & \text { 268,. } \end{aligned}$ | cIII 488-494,608 |
| " Galian |  | CIII 592 |
| " Gbardimau | bIII 165 |  |
| " El Ghorfa | bIII 173 |  |
| " MUN. GIUFITANUM (Giufi) | bIII 37 |  |

## (III) BEUGITANA - continued


(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

(III) ZEUGITANA - continued

| Sector Locality saec I-III | saec IV | Saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IM VAGA(Beja) aIII 71 | bIII 167 | CIII 540-542 |
| n VALLIS <br> (Si.Median) |  | cIII 544,612 |
| " Zaghuan | DIII 3 |  |
| " ZAMA MAJOR |  | CIII 584 |
| " Zawiet el Laala | bIII 4 | cIII 3-4,6 |
| IN Sidi Achmed el Hacheni | OIII 238 |  |
| " Hr.Si.Ali ben Ahmar |  | CIII 514 |
| " VARTANA (Sra Wartan) | bIII 239 |  |

Unlocated:- Hr.Bir el Achmin, bIII 29; MUNICIPIUM SEPTIMIUM LIBERUM AULODES (Hr.Si.Reiss), bIII 161; Hr.Certouta, bIII 242; Djalta, cIII 610; Dra ben Djouder, bIII 250; Fauche, cIII 6II; Ain Gueliane, bIII 269; Hr.Haouli, bIII 27I; Pavillier, cIII 619; Bu Rebia, bIII 266; Hr.Rhiria, cIII 601; PAGUS THAE...?(Ain Teki), bIII 175; Tlelsa, bIII 267; Bordj Yonga, cIII 617; Koutiad Zateur, bIII li7.
(IV) NUMIDIA

| Sector Locality saec I-III | Saec IV | saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HM Berteaux |  | cIV ヨ |
| 1 CALAMA <br> (Guelma) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIV 31,34,54- } \\ & 55,58-59,65, \\ & 177 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cIV } 48-55,85-91,93, \\ & 103,140,186,273 \end{aligned}$ |
| " Chabot Medalouch | bIV 124 |  |
| " La Cheffia | bIV 64 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { CIRTA } \\ \text { (Constantine) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIV } 36-46,107, \\ & 125,130,163 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cIV 8,27,56 } \frac{3}{4} 57,199- \\ & 210,261-265,275 \end{aligned}$ |


| Sector Locality saec I-III | Saec IV | Saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HM Bir Fradj | bIV 20,118 |  |
| " GADIAUFALA <br> (Ksar Bebi) |  | cIV 41-42 |
| " HIPPO REGIUS ( B ôn ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIV 120,149, } \\ & 169,178 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cIV 44-47,132,145, } \\ & 147-148,183-185, \\ & 193-194,196,245 \end{aligned}$ |
| " <br> MADAURA <br> (Mdaourouch = Montesquieu) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIV 28,72-89, } \\ & 90-93,136,155 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cIV } 38,60,92,97-99, \\ & \text { l12,182,187,214- } \\ & 244,277 \end{aligned}$ |
| " Mastar | bIV 35 |  |
| " NATTABUTES <br> (Oum Guerriguech) | bIV 106 |  |
| " Ain Nechma | bIV 60 |  |
| " CIV. POPTHENSIS <br> (Ksiba M'Raou) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIV 70,158,168, } \\ & 189,190 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $" \underset{(\text { Philippeville) }}{\text { RUSICADE }} \text { aIV 2,4 }$ | bIV 132 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CIV 28-29,58-59, } \\ & 212 \end{aligned}$ |
| ```" Saddar = Ain el Bey``` |  | cIV 104 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { " SILA } \\ & \text { (Bordj el Ksar) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cIV } 97,108,153-154, \\ & 156-157 \end{aligned}$ |
| " <br> THAGASTE <br> (Souk Ahras) |  | cIV 43,195 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { THAGORA } \\ \text { (Taoura) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIV 67-69, } \\ & 179,185 \end{aligned}$ | cIV 37,94-95,122 |
| THIBILIS <br> (Announa) | bIV 33 |  |
| " THIBURSICUM NUMIDARUM <br> (Khamissa) | bIV 62,71,154 | cIV 96 |

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued

| Sector Locality saec I-III | saec IV | Saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HM $\quad \begin{gathered}\text { TIPASA } \\ \text { (Tifech) }\end{gathered}$ | bIV 182 |  |
| Truchet | bIV 150 |  |
| " zattara <br> (Kef bu Zioun) | bIV 61 | cIV 100-101 |
| HiN Abd el Nin |  | cIV 105-106 |
| " Umm el Aber | bIV 16-17 |  |
| " Hr.el Abtine |  | cIV 250 |
| " Hr.adjidj |  | cIV 114 |
| " Hr.el Aghuat |  | cIV 119 |
| " Bir Umm Ali | bIV 11 | cIV 13,83-84 |
| " Hr.el Atrom |  | cIV 249 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { BAGAIA } \\ & \text { (Bagai) } \end{aligned}$ |  | cIV 16,30 |
| " Umm el Bawaghi |  | cIV 25 |
| " Aioun Beajen | bIV 129 |  |
| " Hr.el Begueur | bIV 10,142 | cIV 19 |
| " Hr.Bekkouche | bIV 57 |  |
| " <br> AQUAE CAESARIS <br> (Youks = El Hanmam) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIV } 94,157, \\ & 186 \end{aligned}$ | cIV 138,274 |
| $" \underset{\text { (Hr.Umm Kif) }}{\text { CEDIAE }}$ |  | cIV 133 |
| " Djebel Chelia | bIV 47 |  |
| " Cheria | bIV 158 |  |
| " Dalaa = Ain Beida | bIV 135 |  |
| " Ain Fakrun |  | cIV 26 |

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued

|  | ctor Locality | c I-III | saec IV | saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hr. Foam-Metleg-Guebli |  | bIV 117 |  |
| " | Fumm el Amba |  |  | cIV 23 |
| " | Hr. Gabel <br> Hamimet Beida |  |  | cIV 248 |
| " | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GERMANI } \\ & \text { (Ksar el Kelb) } \end{aligned}$ |  | bIV 32,145,188 | cIV 213 |
| " | Ain Ghorab | aIV 3 | bIV 165 | cIV 62-64,134 |
| " | Hr.el Hamar |  | bIV 66 |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { JUSTI } \\ \text { (Scheragrag) } \end{gathered}$ | aIV 1 | bIV 115 |  |
| " | Kemellel |  |  | cIV 65-66,136 |
| " | Hr.Koreiba |  | bIV 119 | cIV 198 |
|  | MACOMADES <br> (Merkeb TaIpa) |  | bIV 30 | cIV 39 |
| 1 | Hr.Magrun |  | bIV 51-52 | cIV 251 |
|  | Hr.Makluf |  |  | cIV 109 |
| 1 | MASCULA (Kenchela) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIV } 5-9,13-14, \\ & 122,146-147, \\ & 161 \end{aligned}$ | cIV 10,12,14Ө15 |
| " | Medfun |  |  | CIV 1 IO |
| 1 | Hr.Meksem |  |  | cIV 253 |
| " | Hr.Mertoum |  |  | cIV 115 |
|  | Hr.Metkides |  | bIV 3-4,12 |  |
|  | Hr.m'Rata |  |  | cIV 246 |
| 1 | Ain Mtirschu |  |  | CIV 20 |

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued

|  | tor Locality saec I-III | Saec IV | saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HN | Ngaus |  | CIV 85 |
| " | Hr.el Ogla |  | cIV 247 |
| " | Hr. Rouis |  | cIV 135 |
| " | Hr.bu Said | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BIV 1,63,101,103, } \\ & 137-140,156 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| " | SALTUS SOROTHENSIS <br> (Ksar el Ahmaar) | bIV 19 |  |
| " | Ain Tazurgut $=$ Tazougart |  | CIV 107 |
| " | Ksar Tebinet | bIV 131 |  |
| " | THEVESTE <br> (Tebessa) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIV 2,29,53,48- } \\ & 50,95-102,104- \\ & 105,133-134,164, \\ & 170-176,180-181, \\ & 187 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cIV 1-5,11,32,40, } \\ & 61,67,82,113,121, \\ & 139,152,158-161, \\ & 163-181,189,191-192, \\ & 197,252,260,266,269 \end{aligned}$ |
| " | Vazaivi $=$ <br> Ain Zoui | bIV 114 |  |
| " | VEGESELA <br> (Hr.el Abiodh) | bIV 141 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cIV 102,142,162-163, } \\ & 276 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Ain Zaga |  | cIV 188 |
|  | Hr. Zaira |  | cIV 118 |
|  | Ksar Ouled Zid | bIV 20,144 | cIV 1 I\% |
| HO | CASAE NIGRENSES (Negrine) |  | cIV 149 |
| GM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CUICUL } \\ & \text { (Djemila) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bIV 22-23,108-113, } \\ & 133,151-152,159- \\ & 160 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CIV 116,143-144, } \\ & 254-255,257,272 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | La Ferdjioua |  | cIV 267 |
| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MILEVUM } \\ & \text { (Mila) } \end{aligned}$ | bIV 21 |  |
| GN | Hr.Akhrib |  | cIV 120,124-132 |

(IV) NUMIDIA - continued


## (v) MAURETANIA

| Sector Locality saec I-III | Saec IV | saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GM Kherbet Achiv |  | cV 22,153 |
| " Kherbet el Ma-Ahưid |  | cV 178 |
| " Bourkiker | bV 80 |  |
| " $\begin{gathered}\text { HORREA } \\ \text { (Ain Roua) }\end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bV } 16,29-31, \\ & 99 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $" \quad \begin{gathered} \text { IGILGILI } \\ \text { (Djidjelli) } \end{gathered}$ | bV 1 |  |
| " Mesloug |  | cV 211 |
| " M'Lakou |  | cV 175 |
| " Kherbet ben Mokbenech |  | cV 149 |
| " Kherbet Madjuba aV I =Sillegue (NOVAR) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bv } 17-19,22, \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | cV 5-6,17I |
| $\text { " } \begin{gathered} \text { SALDAE } \\ \text { (Bougie) } \end{gathered}$ | bV 46 |  |
| $" \begin{gathered} \text { SATAFIS } \\ \text { (Perigotville) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bV 2-r, } 28, \\ & 107 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\text { " } \begin{gathered} \text { SERTEI } \\ \text { (Kherbet Guidra) } \end{gathered}$ | bV 148 | cV 34-35 |
| $\prime \underset{\substack{\text { SImIFIS } \\(\text { setif) }}}{\sin 2,5-6}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bv } 8,14,32-33, \\ & 35-36,40,73-74, \\ & 125,133,155 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & c V 1-4,9-21,23-33, \\ & 73,134,139,153,755, \\ & 157 \end{aligned}$ |
| " Tessamert | bV 38-39 |  |
| " Tixter = Umm el Adham | bV 27 |  |
| " Mechta $\operatorname{Lin}$ Zeraba | bV 34 |  |
| GN CAST. DIANESE | bV 41 | cV 37 |
| " Bir Hadada | bV 42943 |  |
| " Kh.el Kebira | bV 44-45 | cV 172 |
| " Ain Kebira |  | cV 154 |

(V) MAURETANIA - continued

| Sector Locality saec I-III | saec IV | saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GN Ain el Ksar | bV 26 | cV 7 |
| " Lemellef = <br> Bordj Rdir | bV 21,37,94 |  |
| " Ain Mellone | bV 158 | cV 36 |
| " Bu Taleb | bV 25 |  |
| " Hr.Tarlist |  | cV 167 |
| " ThamaLLa(-ULA) <br> (Tocqueville) | bV 105,123 | cV 8,213-215 |
| " Zabi = Bechilga |  | cV 38 |
| $\begin{aligned} \text { FM } & \text { Aumale = Auzia } \\ & =\text { Sour Khozlan } \end{aligned}$ | bV 111 |  |
| " Sidi Feredj | bV 68 |  |
| " Menerville |  | cV 156 |
| " RUSGUNIAE | bV 67 | $\mathrm{cV} \mathrm{67,132,145-147}$ |
| " RUSUCCURU <br> (Tigzirt) | bV 138 | cV 114 |
| $\text { " } \begin{aligned} & \text { TANARAMUSA CASTRA } \\ = & \text { El Hadjeb } \\ = & \text { Mouraiaville } \end{aligned}$ |  | cV 68 |

" Thanar = Berrouaghia

" | TIPASA |
| :---: |
| (Tefessad) |

EM Ammi Musa
" CAESAREA
(Cherchel)
" CARTENNA (Tenes)
aV $3-4,7$
bV 10-11,20,23, 47,49,53,60,98, 127
bV 66
bV 48,50-52,54- cV 25,59-60,69-72, $59,61-62,69-71, \quad 74-75,150-151,158$, 100,104,149,159
bV 72,122
cV 77,148
bV 12
cV 56
(v) MAURETANIA - continued

| Sector Locality saec I-III | saec IV | saee V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EM Renault | bV 65 |  |
| " Ain Tekria |  | cV 186 |
| " TIGAVA <br> (El Kherba) | bV 64,137 | cV 115 |
| " CAST. TINGITANUM (El Esnam, = Orléansville) | bV 9,15,81-84 | cV 117-126 |
| EN Djebel Ladjdar |  | cV 188 |
| " Hr.Si.Mansour | bV 106 |  |
| " Mechera-Sfa | bV 132 | cV 78-81 |
| " Mina $=$ Relizane |  | cV 61-62 |
| " OPPIDUM NOVUM (Duperré) | bV 63 | cV 212 |
| " Tiaret |  | cV 63-66,187 |
| DM Quiza = <br> Pont du Chelif |  | cV 180 |
| BN ALA NILIARIA (Bénian) |  | cV 82-86,157 |
| " ALBULAE <br> (Ain Temouchent) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bV } 117,150- \\ & 151 \end{aligned}$ | cV 88-98 |
| " ALTAVA <br> (Lamoricière) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bV 75-79,89-93, } \\ & 97,108-110,112- \\ & 116,118,124,126, \\ & 129-131,133-135, \\ & 140-141,152-154 \\ & 160-166 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & c v 76,99-113,133-138 \\ & 140-144,152,183-184 \\ & 207-209,210 \end{aligned}$ |
| " Oued el Hamman = Dublineau |  | cV 159,189-201 |
| " PORTUS MAGNUS (Arzew) | bV 13 |  |
| " CASTRA PUERORUM <br> (Las Andalouses) | bV 121 |  |

(v) MAURETANIA - continued

| Sector Locality saec I-III | saec IV | saec V-VII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DN $\begin{gathered}\text { REGIAE } \\ \text { (Arbal) }\end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bV } 85-86,120, \\ & 128 \end{aligned}$ | cV 87,169,202-206 |
| " $\begin{gathered}\text { AQUAE SIRENSES } \\ \text { (Hammam bel Hanefia) }\end{gathered}$ |  | cV 129-131 |
| CN $\begin{gathered}\text { NUMERUS SRRORUM } \\ (\text { Lalla Marina) }\end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bV 95-96,101- } \\ & 102,119,142-147, \\ & 153,156 \end{aligned}$ | cV 160-162,165-166 |
| BO VOLUBILIS |  | cV 127-128,168,185 |
| $\text { AM } \begin{gathered} \text { TINGI }(S) \\ (\text { Tanger }) \end{gathered}$ | bV 103,157 |  |
| Unlocated: AQUAE CALIDAE, unknown; style | $\begin{aligned} & 139(\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{F} / \mathrm{M}: N)(?) \\ & \text { esembles that of } \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ | 177: provenance retanian tituli. |

THIRD TABLE : STATISTICAL SYNOPSIS OF THE TWO FOREGOING TABLES


## PART TWO: THE INVESTIGATION

Methodological Prolegomena

The Inscriptions having now been reduced to order and thereby rendered serviceable, it is necessary here to exoound in detail the twofold technique to be employed towards their interpretation already indicated in the general Introduction, namely the analytic and synthetic processes to which they must now be subjected. This we do by discussing in turn what it is convenient to call the CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS and the MOMENTS OF SYNTHESIS respectively.

## (a) Categories of Analysis.

In the purely empirical consideration of inscriptions, the analytic function of the mind is at once set in motion, exactly as in the case of other collective objects of large extent, as otherwise it would be altogether impossible ever to pass from mere perception to understanding. Thus we may group the texts in a variety of ways, according to ifferent standpoints. One very natural way is to divide them into classes corresponding to their content, for example into those concerning the hierarchy, theology, worship, etc; or we might ask which were metrical, and which a-metrical;or which dating previous to, and which dating since the "peace of the Church"; or which were found before, and which after 1900; or we might divide them according as they were found in the pavernents of basilicas, on the keystones of arches, on the lintels or posts of doors; or according as they were scratched, engraved, painted or
stamped upon stone, wood, plaster, wax, or metal; and so on in endless variety, gaining fresh prophtions every time. It is obvious that the controlling factor throughout is the viewpoint selected in the first place, and that consequently every individual system of division would have one purpose to which it was apprin riate, countless others for which it was of greater or less usefulness, and finally some for which it had no significance whatsoever. Hence our duty is to select the most directly relevant classification to be found, corresponding to general orientation adopted; and this, as has been explained already, is nothing other than a wish to penetrate to an understanding of the religious quality of the Christian community in Africa, as this developed from its beginning to its extinction. From this point of view it is at once clear, that the fact of a text having been executed in a certain manner, on a certain material, or in a certain place, is of relatively small significance for us, since such features are to be traced to the often quite accidental circumstances of the lapicide, craftsman, or other responsible, rather than to the specific religious quality of his life. We therefore propose to neglect all other considerations for the moment, and divide our material into LIMERARY categories.

The grounds for the choice of this type of category
are transparently obvious. Literary forms are immediate creations of the human spirit in the course of ins inifold transformations. One may always reason with certainty from a given specimen, once it has been identified, backwards alike to the motive and the situation, of course in the sense of typical origins; in particular, one may thereby gain valuable sociological conclusions. a merit of considerable importance from our present point of view.

Moreover variations of style within any one category, like the incidence of categories in general, is of infinitely greater significance from our point of view than either the vehicle of any given text, or its situation, or the technique employed in its execution, although these features may always be usefully considered once the literary question has been settled; and occasionally in cases of ambiguity they may be invoked to settle the literary question itself. In general, however, distinctions made on the basis of literary form lead directly to the centre of the problem.

So analysed, therefore, our material falls naturally into the following eight classes, which we may conveniently arrange according to their typical situations, starting from those belonging to public life, and descending to those belonging to the private life of the African community:-

$$
\begin{array}{cr}
\text { I) Inperial tituli } & \text { V) Charms } \\
\text { II) Church memorials } & \text { VI) Invocations } \\
\text { III) Biblical citations } & \text { VII) Deadications } \\
\text { IV) Acclamations } & \text { VIII) Epitaphs }
\end{array}
$$

Like all schemata of the kind, however, this list does less than justice to the texts for whose clarification it is primarily devised, in the sense that it is constructed on a purely pragmatic principle, in order namely to provide us with units of suitable magnitude with which to operate, since an empirical investigation like the present, being discursive in method and not intuitive, demands in advance such equipment. But the material so treated, like the life of the community which produced it, is an organic whole which in the last resort resists dissection: it includes several
items which eannot be made to coincide with any category, and not a few which, from the point of view of these categories, must be denomanated compound, mixed, transitional, or otherwise anomalous or a-typical. For the consideration of all such highlytindividual pieces we must therefore provide a ninth division, viz.:-
IX) Indeteminate
after which there will naturally follow a provisional summary of the results gained from this particular approach.

## (b) Moments of Synthesis

As already indicated in the general Introduction, the exposition is contrived so as to pass from an examination of the Praxis of the African Church, based on the (empirical) analysis of our material for this burpose divided into convenient categories, to a (formal) synthesis of the naterial under the aspect of (Weltanschaung or) Ideology. Primarily this is to be achieved by mere inspection; but very largely it will have to be done by means of an inference from the Praxis as already established in the first section. In either case the distinction of literary category there adopted as the basis of the exposition will fall away as being irrelevant from our fresh viewpoint. In its stead will be erected an almogether new system of reference, derived this time not from the condition of the naterial itself as it lies before us, but from our own ideological presuppositions. This new franework therefore lacks the objective validity enjoyed by the other; lize the other, however, it claims no right to be constitutive, but has meaning only as a pragmatic device, whose usefulness is exhausted when we thereby master and reduce to order a subject-matter which owing to its
scope would otherwise elude our grasp altogether.
We seek the broadest possible basis for the desired scheme of subdivision by formulating the problen of religion in terms so general as to claim universal acceptance, as concerned, namely, with the mutual relations of God and Man. When van der Leeuw speaks in this connection of God as the Object of Religion, and Man as the Subject of Religion, (hat is essentially the same distinction. In both cases it is possible to treat each aspect of the problem separately, that is to say, GOD in so far as no reference is required to Man, and MAN on the contrary in so far as no reference is required to God. Such a procedure is abstract or static, and serves to establish the individuality of each element as against that of the other. But the antithesis may be removed, and the situation observed in the concrete, by means of a realistic (Dynamic) viewpoint. That the former method is preparatory to the latter, which alone reflects the problem as it actually confronts the observer, is sufficiently obvious. By combining both approaches in correct order, therefore, we will in this section seek to embrace all relevant questions under three main heads, according as whether:-
(i) GOD is considered apart from Man,
(2) MAIJ is considered apart from God,
(3) God and Man are considered as involved TOGETHER.

1) G. van der Leeuw, PhHnomenologie der Religion (TUbingen 1933), 3

It will be convenient to use single words, if necessary in a special sense, to distinguish these stages of the exposition. Of these the first and most obvious is THEOLOGY, under which fall questions dealing with Deity in all its aspects, in so far as no reference to Man is essentially involved. It is somewhat harder to find a suitable term to cover all references, similar in scope and limitation, to Man as such; but ANTHROPOLOGY is perhaps as good as any other single word, the usual provisos being taken into account. While a certain precedent is forthcoming from common usage for both foregoing expressions in the sense here intended, we have no word ready to hand which without drastic modification can be made to express the subject-matter of the thir heading. In these circumstances we resort to ESCHATOLOGY, understanding by this term not only the doctrine of Last Things and the Future Life as regularly in theological literature, but in addition, the discussion of all that is common to God and Man in the sense of associating them in the unity of religious experience: in short, the dynamics of the religious problem in general. In this sense and in this sense alone we propose to deal in the second section with Theology, Anthropology, and Eschatology in turn.

We pass therefore immediately to Part II itself, which Will contain two Sections as announced, namely an analytic and synthetic, devoted to the investigation of Early African Christian Praxis and Ideology respectively.

## SECTION ONE : PRAXIS

I - Imperial Tituli: Church and State
(a) Morphology

Whatever the manifest structure of the texts brought under this head, in every case a threefold nucleus is presupposed as constituting their literary character, viz.; -
I) Name of Emperor
2) Name of individual or body responsible
3) Copula, implicit or explicit.

To the name of the Emperor are generally superadded his official titles, honorific epithets, and the like; frequently whole phrases serve as introduction. Each text moreover is drawn up on behalf of someone, usually the particular community concerned, through the local official, whose official decription is therefore regularly given along with his name. Sometimes, however, no official is named, the community itself alone being mentioned. The copula is fundamentally the verb setting forth the precise relation between ruler and ruled underlying the monument: from it we learn whether it is the erection of an arch to commemorate a victory, the restoration of a ruinous building, the building of a public edifice,e.g. baths, or simply a dedication, and therefore a mere token of loyalty, that is in question. So understood, the copula may be of any length, and contain any number of clauses; on the other hand, there may be little or no syntactical elaboration. An ellipse of the verb, the Emperor's name being in the dative, indicates a plain dedication.

It is obvious that texts of this category tend to differ among themselves in the extent to which they are stereotyped, conventional, and rigid on the one hand, andi individual, anomalous, and original on the other. It is therefore convenient to distinguish between those features which constantly recur, and those more nearly unique elements which recur rarely or not at all, but make isolated appearances, and are therefore of special interest. The former we shall treat statistically, thereby showing the general development in structure to be observed in this category; the latter will then be dealt with in reference to particular Enperors in order.

## (b) Typica子 Features.

(1) The commonest desfgnation of the Emperor is undoubtedly DOMINUS NOSTER ( $=$ our lord), generally represented by the suspension $D N$, Written DD NN, DDD NNN, and DDDD NNNN when two or more rulers are mentioned: from a stone erected in 313 or thereby to Constantine I and Licinius ${ }^{1}$ ) to one raised to the Byzantine ruler Phocas ${ }^{2}$ ) (602 610) we count over a hundrea examples of its use. It is not peculiar to Christian Emperers, however, since it can be traced to the time of Severus ${ }^{3}$ ) nor is its use confined to Africa, since it is current in Italy from Constantine $I^{4}$ ) to Theoderic.

Next in frequency comes AUGUSTUS (AUG, AUGG, etc.), of which we have at least seventy clear examples from Constantine $I^{6)}$ to the reign of the Byzantines Justin II and Sophia ${ }^{7}$ ) $(565-578)$. This designation is current from the time of the famous Augustus, and continues in use outwith Africa, e.g. at Rome, through Constantine $I^{9}$ ) down to the time of Phocas. ${ }^{10}$ )

1) 6 II 33
2) CIIIII7
3) De 429
4) De 692
5) Di35 6)bII64
6) CIII549
7) De 83
8) Di 2
10)Di 30

Descending now to titles occurring less than fifty times, we notice first of all PRINCEPS, which occurs chiefly in the fourth century, where it runs to about twenty examples, beginning with Constantine II) although it occurs also later, sporadically, its final appearance being in the reigns of Justinian and Theodora?) It is one of the earliest of all Imperial titles ${ }^{3)}$ and is current during Christian reigns elsewhere in the Empire outside of Africa4)

The same holds good for two other titles dating from the earliest days of the Empire, and so frequently combined as to deserve to be treated together, namely IMPERATOR and CAESAR. The former occurs about eighteen times, the latter about sixteen times, from Constantine $I^{5)}$ to the 7 th-century Byzantines; 6) both titles date from the great dictator C.Julius Caesar ${ }^{7}$ ) and both are to be found applied to Christian Emperors outwith Africa8)

REX is applied only to Vandal Emperors, ( just as it is applied elsewhere in the West only to non-Roman rulers ${ }^{70}$ ) and once to the Moorish king Masuna, on a stone dated 469 of the Mauretanian $\operatorname{Era}$, that is to say A.D. 508.1)

Although they are not official titles, the expressions TRIUMPHATOR and VICTOR, being nominatives, call for remark before we pass to laudatary epithets proper. Neither of them is found before the time of Constantine $I$, from which both date; ${ }^{12 \text { ) the former }}$ occurs about thirteen times, ceasing at the triple reign of Valens, Gratian, and Valentinian II (375-378); ${ }^{13}$ ) the latter occurs about tyenty-three times, ceasing in the double reign of Arcadius and

1) bV 74
2) CIII 542
3) De 159
4) De 697
5)bII 64
5) cIV 10,268
6) De 70
7) De 682
8) CIII 517-523, cIV 183
11)cV 183
12)bIII 163,203
13)bV 25

Honorius ${ }^{\text {l }}$ (395-402). Both expressions are found on fourth-century dedications elsewhere in the West. ${ }^{2}$ )

Of the epithets commonly interposed before these titles, whether singly or in combination, the following are current from the time of Constantine $I$ : PIUS, which dates from Hadrian, and occurs about twenty five times in our African material, usually in combination with FELIX, which is likewise pre-Christian ${ }^{4}$ (Commodus) and of similar frequency. It is together that they emerge in Africa in the reign of Constantine 1 , ${ }^{5}$ ) and it is together that they disappe ar therefrom, namely in the time of Theodosius II. With then is frequently combined the superlative MAXIMUS, of which about sixteen examples occur until the joint reign of Valentinian II and Theodosius I, and Which is likewise to be traced to a terminus higher than the Peace of the Church, in this case the reign of Hadrian?) All three expressions coincide on one of our earliest stones, as well as on similar pieces outside Africa, e.g. the celebrated Arch of Constantine I in Rome, ${ }^{10)}$ while for MAXImUS in particular further texts contemporary therewith can be adduced from Vicetia ${ }^{\text {II) }}$ and Ravennal2) Other epithets current from the time of Constantine I onwards include INVICTUS (-ISSIMUS), ${ }^{13)}$ a pre-Christian expression, attested also in non-African Christian material ${ }^{14}$ ) of which about sixteen examples are to be counted down to Justin II and Sophia; ${ }^{15)}$ NOBILISSIMUS, ${ }^{16)}$ which can be traced to the second century, ${ }^{17}$ ) is attested also beyond Africa in Christian reigns ${ }^{18}$ ) ceasing in Africa itself in the course of the fourth century, namely in the joint reign of Constantius II
1)bIII255
2)De 698
Di 35: De 697,700
3) De 338
4) De 400
5)bII64
6) CIII56
7)bIII236
8)De 341 9)bII64 10)Di 2
11)De 697
12)De 699

and Julian, afterwards the Apostatel); and PERPETUUS, ) employed from the time of Vitellius, ${ }^{3}$ ) current until the joint reign of Honorius and Theodosius $\operatorname{II}{ }^{4}$ ) and attested beyond Africa in contemporary texts. ${ }^{5}$ ) FORTISSIMUS, an epithet borne first by Pertinax, ${ }^{6}$ ) appears thrice in our African material, being applied to Constantine I's sometime co-regent Licinius? ( ) Constantine II, ( and to Vamentinian II ${ }^{9}$; its use outside Africa is illustrated by a stone raised to Constantine II in Rome. ${ }^{10}$ )

In the epignic reigns three further superlatives are added, namely florentissimus, ${ }^{11)}$ which appears for the last time in the joint reign of Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius $I^{12)}$ is nowhere found before the Peace of the Church, but which is attested in contemporary Roman material; ${ }^{13}$ ) FELICISSIMUS, ${ }^{14)}$ an expression first found in the secona century ${ }^{15}$ ) whose African incidence extends to the reigns of the 7 th century Byzantines, ${ }^{16)}$ extra-African material also furnishing examples of its use in Christian reigns; ${ }^{17 \text { ) and }}$ BEATISSIMUS, an epithet wholly unknown previously, of which only two examples are forthcoming, both referring to Constantius II, ${ }^{18}$ ) Rome supplying evidence of its extra-African employment on a scale sirilarly restricted. ${ }^{19)}$ Rather more frequent, but within the same narrow chronological limits, is the epigonic adjectival phrase BONO REIPUBLICAE NATUS, ${ }^{20}$ ) whose application outwith Africa is however slightly more extendea, namely from Constantine $I$ as well as his sons on the one hand, ${ }^{21)}$ to Theoderic on the other22)

| 1) bIIIIIO | 2)bIII203 | 3) De |  | 4) CIIITO | 5) De | 764,Di 31 | 6) De 409 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7)bIIII89 | 8) bIV27 | 9)bII |  | e 722 11) | bIV41 | 12)bIIII65 | 13) De 70 |
| 14)bV46 | 5) De 397 | 16) cI | 13 | 17) De 794 | 18) | V185,bV46 | 19) De 709, |
| 711 20) | 7-39,bIII | 8,1 |  | De 697,712 |  | i 35 |  |

Once in the reign of Gratian, () and twice in that of Arcadius? ${ }^{2}$ ) occurs an epithet wholly wanting previously, namely INCLYTUS, which however is atte sted alsewhere at a later period.3)

The adjective SALVUS is used absolutely in apposition to ruler' names (salvis dd nn etc.) no fewer than seven times from the joint reign of Valens, Gratian, and Valentinian $I I^{4}$ ) to that of the Byzantines Justin II and Sophia5) Its use can be traced far up into the early (pagan) Empire, ${ }^{6}$ ) and, on the other hand, is richly attested elsewhere from the third quarter of the fourth century onwards,
 of the seventh century, namely in Baeticall)

Last in time of all our typical African epithets in this connection is PIISIMUS, of which six examples are forthcoming, including its Greek equivalent $\in \mathscr{V} \sigma \in \beta \in \sigma$ TOS, but only in the joint reign of the Byzantines Justinian $I$ and Theodoral2) Its use can be traced to the reign of the pagan Emperor Geta, curiously enough, in Africa itself; ${ }^{13)}$ it occurs also at Rome in the time of Constantius I; 14) outside Africa it is current from Constantine $I^{\text {l5) }}$ to Justinian IG)

The transition from adjectives to miscellaneous phrases currently employed in the section of the dedication devoted to the ruler is supplied by the solitary adverb of time SEMPER, which, generally in the combination SEMPER AUGUSTUS is found about thirty seven times from Constantine $I^{17)}$ to Honorius and Theodosius $I^{18)}$ in our texts. Its first appearance in general occurs in the time of Licinius, ${ }^{19)}$ and Christian Emperors continue its use elsewhere also in the West ${ }^{2} \theta$ )
I)bIII21
2)bIIII96,254
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4)bIV25
5) CIII549
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7) $D e 805$
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12) cIII5, cIVI,5, 13) De 439 14)De 648 15) De 701 16)Di 25 (41,112,122
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A few more or less stereotyped phrases of limited currency referring to the Emperor and his happy reign fall to be noticed. Of these the oldest appears to be PRO SALUTE ET INCOLUMITATE, of which we have four examples from Constans and Constantius II ${ }^{I}$ ) to the native ruler Masuna) an expression which can be traced back to Tiberius? ( A similar expression, PRO FELICITATE TEMPORUM, is confined to the closing years of the fourth century, namely from Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius $I^{4)}$ to Valentinian II, Theodosius I, and Arcadius, ${ }^{5}$ ) and may be compared with "felicitati perpetui temporis" on a stone of Valentinian I in Rome on the one hand, and with the expression "felicissimo saeculo" on one belonging to the pagan rulers Diocletian and Maximian on the other? ') to which however FELICI SAECULO on a stone of Valens, Gratian, and Valentinian II (\%) found in our African material, more closely corresponds. The epithet "beatissimus", however, is predominantly a Christian term, so fat as the chronological situation of the expressions containing it is concerned: thus the phrase BEATISSIMO SAECULO, which we find in Africa in the reigns of Constantine $I^{9)}$ and Constantine II, ${ }^{10)}$ has parallels only in contemporary stones elsewhere, e.g. at Tiburll) Yet BEATISSIMIS TEMPORIBUS, of which four examples occur from Constantine $I^{12)}$ to Honorius and Theodosius ${ }^{7}{ }^{3}$ ) is found at the extreme end of the pagan period, under Diocletian and his three co-regents. ${ }^{\text {14) }}$ Analogues to the phrase PRO BEATITUDINE (TEMPORUM) of which we count six African examples from Constantine I \& Licinius ${ }^{15)}$

1) bV 97
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to Theodosius I, Valentinian II, and Arcadius ${ }^{\text {I }}$ ) appear to be wanting in both directions: we have thus reached the bounds of the typical in dedicatory references to the ruler.
(b) There is nothing distinctive in the names of the officials concerned in the erection of Inperial tituli. Frequently indeed no official at all is mentioned, the name of the community alone being given, usually $\operatorname{COL}(\theta N I A)$, from Constantine $I^{2}$, according to long-established pagan usage, or RES P(UBIICA), also from the time of Constantine $I^{4}$ ) continuing a practice dating from Trajan; ${ }^{5}$ ) on occasion these two expressions are combined on one stone, as in an example from the reign of Valentinian $I^{6)}$ for which likewise we are able to cite pre-Constantinian precedent, namely a stone raised to Gallienus?

When a single individual is actually mentioned, as is uniformly the case with later tituli, his official designation is invariably given, whether he be a PROCONSUL, (upper limit, Tiberius) ${ }^{\text {9) }}$ a proconsul's LEGATUS, ${ }^{10}$ (a title as old as the Empire itself) ${ }^{\text {ll })}$ a PATRONUS CIVITATIS, a CURATOR REIPUBLICAE, ${ }^{13)}$ as alpeady in the early Enpire ${ }^{74}$ ) a Praetorian PPAEFECIUS, ${ }^{\text {I5 }}$ ) as under Maximian, elsewhere also in the Christian Empire, ${ }^{17 \text { ) }}$ a PRAESES PROVINCIAB, ${ }^{(8)}$ as in the time of Diocletian, ${ }^{\text {19 }}$ ) and elsewhere under Christian rule, ${ }^{20}$ ) or a COMES AFRICAE? ${ }^{2}$ )

To these titles anterior to the Vandal Invasion the Byzantine Empire added four more : EXCONSUL ${ }^{22}$ ) and PATRICIUS, ${ }^{23)}$ both of which
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are attested outwith Africa, namely at Rome in the reign of Theoderic. ${ }^{\text {I }}$; MAGISTER MILITUM ${ }^{2}$ ) which in the Danube region appears much earlier, namely in the time of Valentinian $I$ and Valens; ${ }^{3)}$ and EXARCHUS ${ }^{4}$ ) ${ }^{2}$ title which occurs at Rome in connection with the same ruler as in Africa, namely Phocas. ${ }^{5}$ ) The courtesy titles $V(I R)$
 which are current from Constantine I onvaras, and universal on State inscriptions, call for no special remark.

The epithets likewise are of small interest, on account of their perfunctory character. With monotonous regularity the same formulae recur again and again : DEVOTUS, ${ }^{9}$ ) DICATISSIMUS, ${ }^{10}$ ) and the adjectival
 confined to Africa in Christian times. ${ }^{13)}$

In spite of the general want of colour characteristic of the mention of officials, our African material offers by way of compensation afew titles of more than ordinary interest from the Doint of view of the religion of the early Church: offices, namely, originating in the old Roman pagan cultus. Thus for example the dedicant is termed sAcerdotalts on two of our pieces, namely one raised to Gratian, and on one belonging to Theodosius, I, Valentinian II, and Arcadian. ${ }^{14)}$ We can find no analogue to this expression elsewhere in the West, but note the phrase "sacerdos Provinciae" in Moesia under Antoninus Pius, ${ }^{\left.\frac{7}{5}\right)}$. Similarly the title AUGUR occurs twice under Valentinian I, ${ }^{I 6}$ ) a phenomenon apparently exclusive to Christian Africa. Further, we hear several times of an official
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2) CIVI37
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known as JUDEX SACRARUM COGNITIONUM，who figures twice in the joint reign of Valentinian $I$ and Valens， ）and whom we should no doubt recognize in the VICE SACRA COGNOSCENS on a piece belonging to Vabens？${ }_{9}^{2}$ ）probably also in the PROCOS SACRO JUDICIO appearing in the time of Constantine $I^{3}$ ）We are unable to adduce any example of this expression from the pagan Empire，but notice＂judex sacrarum cognitionum＂at Rome in the reign of Crispus ${ }^{4}$ ）and again in that of Magnentius；${ }^{5)}$ otherwise the regular phrase is＂vice sacra judicans＂， namely at Rome under Constantine $I^{6}$ ）twice under Arcadius？）under Arcadius，Honorius，and Theodosius II，and under constantius the consort of Placiaia in 420 ${ }^{9}$ ）and at Tralles under Constantius II IO） But by far the most extraordinary feature of this section of the African Imperial titulus is the frequent incidence within narrow chronological limits of a well－known priestly title connected with ancient pagam worship：FLAMEN PERPETUUS，which is occasional⿱亠⿻⿰丨丨八又土 $\begin{aligned} & \text { found }\end{aligned}$ on stones of the Early Empire from the time of Antoninus Pius ${ }^{11}$ ） figures no fewer than twenty－two times in our African material from Valentinian $I^{12)}$ to Arcadius，${ }^{13)}$ and，so far as we are aware，nowhere else in Western Christendom．
（c）In much the larger part of our African material，those pieces namely which represent mere deaications，in contrast to inscriptions placed on public works of utility，the copula，narrowly interpreted， does not come to expression at all，but lies implicit in the syntactical structure of the dedication．In the simplest cases，
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the ellipse of the verb results in the juxtaposition of the Emperor's name, together of course with all its adjuncts, in the dative, and the dedicant's in the nominative, the sense of the whole being readily understood, as in the Lambaesis titulus to Constantine I, CIL8 2721.) This style is fundamentally identical with that of the Early Empire, as is shown by one of its earliest texts, a dedication to C. Julius Caesar, whose laconic simplicity is at once obvious from the four words of which it consists, namely: "divo Julio civit. Zmyrnaeorum! ${ }^{2)}$ This severe style is encountered likewise beyond Affica in Christion reigns from Constantine $I^{3}$ ) onwards.

Such bare juxtapositions are however of occasional occurrence. Usually the ellipse of the copula is accompanied by the formula NUMINI MAJESTATTQUE EJUS (DEVOTUS,DEVOTISSIMUS,DICATISSIMUS, etc.) of which in the neighbourhood of thirty examples can be counted in our African material from Constantine $I^{4)}$ to Phocas. ${ }^{5}$ ) This expression dates from the pagan Empire, (where "numen" is plainly shown to be the earlier element?) Its extra-African currency in Christian reigns is exemplified by its use at Ravenna under Constantine $I^{8}$ ) and at Rome under Constantine $I^{9)}$ and Crispus. 10 )

When an explicit verb was required, as afways in the case of a building, bridge, or other like structure, and frequently in other less urgent cases, the word used corresponded to the work undertaken, FACEREI 1) PERFICEREI2) PONERE, 13) CONSTRUERE, 14) REFORMARE 15)
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of which are normal, and of no special significance.
As in the pagan Empire, ${ }^{\text {I }}$ ) and elsewhere in Christian times, ${ }^{2)}$ the vows observed at the decades by which the Roman Emperors reckoned their reigns are occasionally recorded in our African material,four examples being noted fom Constantine $I^{3)}$ to Theodosius II. ${ }^{4)}$ The stereotyped formula, VOT(IS) - MUL(TIS), i.e."the vows having been discharged," stands outwith the syntax of the copula, the figures denoting both the number of decades already passed, and that number together with the forthcoming decade, so that the whole expression signifies thanksgiving for the safety of the ruler so far, and an earnest wish for his safety in the future: as one vow is fulfilled, another is undertaken. ${ }^{5}$ )

We pass now to those features of our African material which cannot conveniently be organised according to the above schema on account of their strongly individual or otherwise anomalous and original character.
(c) Non-typical Features.

Constantine I Four pieces belonging to this reign ${ }^{6}$ ) are unique in this respect, namely, that they alone of all our African imperial tituli record the details of the Emperor's "cursus honorum", together with specific mention of the provinces covered by his dominion. A briage in Rome is so inscribed to the honour of Valentinian $I$, Valens, and Gratian', otherwise this procedure is not found in Christian times, except on miliary comums. ${ }^{8)}$ On the other hand

1) De 644
2) De 694,766
3) BV 160
4) CIII56
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7)De 771
8)De 732
this style is the original nucleus of the later more florid style of dedication to which we are accustomed. C.Julius Caesar is already termed CONSUL, ${ }^{1}$ ) PONTIFEX MAXIMUS ${ }^{2}$ ) and PATER PATRIAE; ${ }^{3)}$ Augustus Caesar is accorded the TRIBUNICIA POTESTAS; ${ }^{4)}$ the title PROCONSUL appears first applied to Septimius Severus. Foreign conquests standing to the credit of the Emperor are denoted adjectivally, e.g. Germanicus, Dacicus, fromjthe time of Trajan; ${ }^{\text {) }}$ the addition of MAXIMUS to this type of epithet becomes part of the title from the time of M. Aurelius Antoninus ${ }^{7}{ }^{7}$ ) by the time of Diocletian these titles accumulate as hereditary honours.) In these special pieces of Constantine, therefore it is the result of a long development that we see before us. One example will illustrate the peculiarities of this well-defined style (bV99): IMP CAES FLAVIO CONSTANTINO MAXImO PIO FELICI INVICTO AUG PONT MAX GER MAX III SARM MAX BRIT MAX CAPP MAX ARAB MAX MED MAX ARMEN MAX GOTH MAX TRIB POTEST XIIII IMP XIII CONSUL IIII PATER PATRIAE PROCONSULI FLAVIUS TERENTIANUS V P PRAESES PROVINCIAE MAURETANIAE SITIF NUMINI MAJESTATIQUE EJUS SEMPER DICATISSIMUS.

In the less rigid dedications which form the majority of Constantinian state tituli, however, a variety of special features are forthcoming. Thus the Emperor is called variously RESTITUTOR INVICTIS LABORIBUS SUIS PRIVATORUM ET PUBLICAE SALUTIS (the restorer by his own invincible labours of both public and private safety), ${ }^{9}$, the restorer and concerver of liberty RESTITUTOR LIBERTATIS
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ET CONSERVATOR, ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) the author of perpetual security and liberty PERPETUAE SECURITATIS AC LIBERTATIS AUGTOR?) and TRIUMPHATORI OMNIUM GENTIUM AC DOMITKORI UNIVERSARU(II TERRARUM???) ${ }^{3)}$ on an inscription which is unfortunately in bad repair, in which a further phrase occurs, to the effect, it would seem, that he brought light to a society stifled by the darkness of servitude (...TENEBRIS SERVITUTIS OPPRESSAV SUA FEIICI VI...LUCE ILLUMINAVIT...); but the stone is in such a poor condition that a certain reading is no longer possible. He is likewise praised again as the restorer of liberty REDDITA LIEERTATE ${ }^{4)}$; the erection of a statue is described in the following enthisiastic terms: ...AD SEMPITERNAM MEMORIAM STATUAM MARMOREAM 5)

SUO MUMINE RADIANTEM DOMINO NOSTRO COS... ; while in one piece the dedicant promis\&es him eternal devotion : ...NUMINI NAJESTATIQUE EJUS IN AETERNUM ${ }^{-1}$ ) From the nature of the case all these phrases are highly individual; yet similar examples can be culled from pagan reigns, e.g. when Alexander is praised as "restitutor publicae libertatis', ${ }^{7}$ ) Tiberius ${ }^{8)}$ and Vespasian ${ }^{9}$ ) as preservers of ancient and revered institutions, and Diocletian as "ruler and master of the world, founder of eternal peace"(RECTORI\& ORBIS AC DOMINO, FUNDATORI PACIS AETERITAE). ${ }^{10}$ ) Outwith Africa Constantine I is praised in similar language, as at Rome : restitutori publicae libertatis ${ }^{\text {lI }}$ ) and restitutori humani generis, propagatori imperii condicionisque Romanae, fundatoris etiam securitatis aeternae; ${ }^{12)}$ añ $\lambda^{\text {者 }}$ Rheims : on account of his world-wide conquests forever to be congratulated (toto orbe victoriis suis semper ac feliciter celebrandus) ${ }^{\text {l3 }}$; while
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an Italian deaication to Theoderic praises that ruler still in like manner: d $n$ glrsmus adq inclyt rex Theodericus vict ac triumf semper aug bono rp natus custos libertatia et propagator rom nom domitor gentium, i.e."our most glorious and celebrated lord king Theoderic triumphant victor forever to be honourea born for the good of the republic guardian of liberty propagator of the Roman name master of races! ${ }^{\text {I) }}$

A titulus of Constantine I and Licinius, referring to their combined defeat of Maxentius in 312, begins with the unusual phrase: CLEMENTIA TEMPORIS ET VIRTUTE DIVINA?

A titulus in the time of Crispus begina as a dedication to the victory of the Emperor, VICTORIAE... 3) thereby reproducing a formula first encountered in the reign of Cominodus.4)

Constantine II is "to be remembered as surpassing all in valour, clemency, and sense of duty"(VIRTUTE CLEVENTIA MENORAMDO PIETATE OMNES Antecénti), and is further praised as being most generous in judgment, IMDULGENTISSIMUS. ${ }^{6}$ )

One notes in connection with the above similar extra-African expressions such as "virtute domini nostri Constantini Maximi",') and "clementissimus", also applied to Constantine I; while among preөconstantinian Emperors Gallienus is called "clementissimus".)

Two expressions belonging to stones raised to constans and Constantius II call for remark:"by the venerable cominand of our Iords"JUSSIONE VENERABILI DD NN, ${ }^{10}$ ) with which we may compare on the one hand "jubente divina majestate"lI) (Diocletian) and "jubente
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sanctissimo Gallieno", and, on the other,for the mention of the command, "jussu dd nn Constantii..et Juliani", and for the application of the word "venerabilis" to the soveriegn, the reference to Constantine I on a Roman inscription: "...venerabili principi Constantino". " ; and EX INDULGENTIA SACRA DD NN...4) (as a result of the sacred generosity of our lords), which lacks an exact parallel.

On a stone of Constantius II occurs an hapax legomenon, namely DN DO ${ }^{4 a}$, which seems to suggest as its resolution "domino deo"; but whereas "divus" is common enough as applied to pagan Enperors, 5) and is even found applied to Constantine I on the stone noted above, "deus" is never so used. Perhaps we have here to do with an error.

Valentinian I is called preserver of the whole world CONSERVATOR TOTIUS ORBIS TERRARUM, according to a thought already familiar to us from earlier stones.

In the joint reign of Valentinian I and Valens we find an expression for which we can discover no parallel, namely COMPELLENTE RELIGIONE SANCTAE P.... ${ }^{7}$ ) where the interpretation is made more difficult than usual by the large lacuna interrupting it. Familiar variations of thoughts already well known conffiknt us in the expressions DOMINORUM ORBIS, ${ }^{8}$ ) and PRO INAGNIFICENTIA(c. gen) of which we have two examples in this reign9) together withUUSTITIA PARITER AC PIETATE CAELESTIBUS ADQ ROMANAE FELICITATIS PERPFTUIS FUNDATORIBUS!O) We note also here the expression AUREIS UBIQUE TEUPORIBUS, ${ }^{1 /}$ ) connecting therewith another reference to a "golden age" in the jaint reign of $\frac{\text { Valentinian } I_{2}}{12)}$ Valens, and Gratian, namely AUREO SAECULO DDD NNN ${ }^{12}$ (c.gen.)
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to which analogues are lacking. We note also EX INDULGENTIA
 expression "ex indulgentia sacra dd $n n$ " already fortheoming in the reign of Constans and Constantius II (bIIII), and with which we may compare the unique phrase characteristic of the reign of Valentinian II, DIVINA STIRPE PROGENITUS.' In this connection, and as a commentary on all three expressions, we may adace the current use of "divus" throughout the pagan Empire as applied to rulers, together with "divus" as applied to Constantine I at Sirmium, 3) and the Verona dedication "da nn Fl Valentinian열 et Valenti divinis fratribus"4) with perhaps the phrase "ad divini nominis propagationem" inscribed on the public baths at spoleturn in the reign of Constantius II and Julian, (although the application here is somewhat doubtful.

In the reign of Valens we note the artistic expression BELIIS STRENUO OPTIFOQUE CONSILIIS,"in war most vigorous, best of diplomats" ${ }^{6}$ ) and in the reign of Gratian, VIRTUTE INCIYTO, PIETATE PACIFICO,"famed for his valour, peaceable in the discharge of his duty" ${ }^{\text {² }}$ ) with which latter we may compare the description of Comnodus as the pacifier of the world,PACATOR ORBIS. ${ }^{8)}$

By a curious coincidence two stones, one of Gratian, Vakentinian II ana Theodosius, $I^{9}$, and one of Arcadius, Honorius, and Theodosius
II, $^{\text {0 }}{ }^{(0)}$ begin with an elsewhere unknown expression, in both cases cat short by a lacuna at exactly the same place, viz.: EXCELLENS GLOR... The same general period provides us with a variety of similar
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expressions denoting the Emperors as victors, namely TOTO ORBE VINTIBUS, ${ }^{1}$ ) IN OMNE ORBE VINCENTIBUS? (2) UBIQ VINCENTIUM? ) all of which belong to the type already familiar. In the same category we may place AETERNORUM PRINCTPUM used of Theodosius I, Valentinian II, and ARCADIUS, ${ }^{4}$ ) and two expressions of the time of Arcadius and Honorius, namely GLORIOBISSIMUS, ${ }^{5}$ ) which occurs on an extra-African stone already noticed in another connection, (Dieml 35) and the ablative absolute construction with the genitive,FLORENTE GLORIA.6)

Passing over for the moment the state tituli belonging to the Vandal epoch, which for morphological reasons cannot be subsumed under the category of state tituli as here understood, but are reservea for the future (pp.497-499), we may discuss the Byzantine Period as a whole. Here we observe an entirely novel epithet within the conventional framework in a dedication to Justin II and Sophia, who are hailed in the following terms: SALVIS DOMINIS NOSTRIS XRISTIANISSIMIS?) Further novelties of very great importance from our point of view are found in the expressions for "house of God", namely DOMUS DIBINE (gen.) in the reign of Justinian I and Theodoraị) and DOMUS DEI in the reign of Heraclius $I ;^{9}$ ) together with the verbal phrases DEO FABENTE, ${ }^{10}$ ) PROPITIO DEOI ${ }^{(1)}$ DEO JUBANTE, ${ }^{12}$ ) NUTU DIVINO, ${ }^{13 \text { ) }}$ with which we naturally compare the famous "instinctu. divinitatis" at Rome, 4) and AUXILIANTE DOI5)

With this consideration of non-typical formulae peculiar to our Byzantine material the lower criticism of this category closes.
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## (d) Interpretation

We have established the incidence of typical and non-typical morphological features in the state tituli. We proceed now to an understanding of them, with the question namely, What value did such features have for those who devised them, and for those who perused them as they stood there on the public highway? In particular, What real light to they throw on the piety of the average Christian of those times, considered in his public character as a member of the Roman Empire?

Firstly it is obvious from the morphology of state inscripttons in the time of Constantine $I$, whom we regard as the first Christian ruler, that whatever the effect of the change-over, it found no expression in these documents at all. All the old pagan formulae lived on, and nothing that can be branded as specifically Christian appeared alongside then or displaced then. Even in the case of formulae unattestea before Constantine, which become curpent irom or subsequent to his reign, nothing emerges which is not in rectilineal continuity with pagan custom: trimphator, victor, (p.ll9) florentissimus, beatissimus(p.121), inclytus, piisimus,(p.122), pro bestitudine temporum, (p.123), even if not literally identical with pre-constantinian elenents of the sane category, are yet of the same spirit exactly: they celebrate the praises of the ruler, only in more variety of phrase than formerly. Bono reipublicae natus, an epigonic phrase, is perhaps the only recurring element Which might at first sight refer to the toleration policy of the Constantinian aynasty: but it night quite well refer only to the
general thankfulness of the Empire at the cessation of civil strife; in any case, that it has no specifically Christian reference is once for all plain from the fact, that it occurs on a dedication later on to Julian the Apostate, who was assuredly no Christianl) The same holds good for the numerous florid compliments ( p . 130) with which Constantinian pieces swarm: not one of them calls for a specifically Christian exegesis: they all redound to the glory of Constantine himself and his sons, and without doubt are to be accepted as the expression on the part of the whole Empire of its sincere gladness that once again at last trouble and unrest have given place to peace and security. Like the others, the Christians must of course have rejoiced in the general policy of toleration, and it is not to be doubted that they acquiesced cheerfully in the praise accorded the new Emperor; they may even have read a Christian sense into these formulae. Indeed signs of Christian enthusiasm are positively forthcoming in a few of our pieces belonging to this period, which bear the Constantinian monogram, and that in various forms. None of these authentic Christian symbols appear within the reign of Constantine $I$ himself on dedications, just as none appe ar on milestones erected in his reign; but in the reign of his sons they appear occasionally? ) exactly as on the milestones3) This is the only evidence, however, on out State tituli, of a vital Christian faith in official circles. Our general impression rather is, that ander Condantine the official recognition of the new religion was a tentative undertaking, which came to free expression only in the
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reign of his immediate successors. So far as it goes this impression coincides with the results Lietzmann reached on the basis of a study of Constantinian Numismatics, namely that with one exception only, the celebrated Constantinople small bronze showing the serpent transfixed by the labarum, Constantine issued no coins with an unambiguous confession of Christity symbolized thereon, any Christian symbols found on his coins being demonstrated as originating in the piety of individual craftsmen.) Symbols being altogether exceptionaz on state tituli, we may perhaps regard such monograms as do actually occur on epigonic material as owing their existence to the erstwhile enthusiasm of the individual stonecutter rather than to the imprimatur of the sta申e. However that may be, dedications of the Constantinian period betray scarcely any trace of Christianity, none indeed at all apart from the chrisms just mentioned.

Secondy, Imperial dedications show on the other hand traces of positive paganism not only in the time of Constantine $I$ and his imediate successots, but even down to the Vandal period. The reference here is chiefly to the divinity of the Emperor there extolled, particularly in the frequently recurring phrase "numini majestatique ejus" $p .127$ ), where "numen" certainly carries with it a notion of divinity, as appears from its history in the language: first used in connection with gods, in the time of Cicero transferred to the Senate and People of Rome, finally applied to men, especially Emperors, it denoted an impersonal power or force, inherent in divinity, capable of transmission to people and things, and having

[^9]the property of endowing its sometime vehicle with irreststibility and invincibility.) Other phrases already noted as applied to the Emperors, such as sacra indulgentia (p.132) divini principes(p.133) and expecially the defscription of Valentinian II, divina stirpe progenttus,"sprung from divine stock" $(\mathrm{p} .133)$ all accord with this fundamental conception of the ruler's divinity. Moreover the titles of the dedicant continued to reproduce traditional pagan offices, or at least pagan names, in particular, flamen peppetuus, whose occurrence so late as the time of Arcadius is astonishing. (p.126)

Thirdly, however, we must not conclude from the historical origin of these and like expressions, that they possessed all that richness and deriniteness of meaning which we attach to them, that for the Christians of the time they meant all that they contain in their history as we now know it. For example, the word "dominus", in the phrase "dominus noster" applied to practically every Emperor from first to last, almost always under a suspension, ( $\mathrm{a} n$ ), cannot possibly have the solemnity and profundity of a term used only occasionally, and when written, written in full. It is indeed quite probable that the Christians of the time saw their faith as little compromised in calling the reigning Emperor "dominus noster" as does many a present-day scotch preacher in using the much stronger expression "our Sovereign Lord King George" while praying? Similarly "perpetuus" (p.121)"in aeternum" p .130 , of the devotedness of the dedicant) and similar expressions appear so frequently, and must therefore have been used so casually, that it would be pedantic to

[^10]see in them anything more than fashionable hyperbole. The same holds good in regard to the traditional pagan offices still in use down to the time of Arcadius. As will be seen when we discuss epitaphs, there are at least two absolutely certain instances of Christians holding the office of Flamen Berpetuus. This would have been quite impossible, if at that time the Flamen Perpetuus had really been concerned with pagan rites. On the other hand, there is nothing we know of the pagan flamen perpetuus ${ }^{1}$ to suggest the duties of any Christian priest or other functionary, who because of what he did might assume the title. We are therefore bound to conclude that by the time flamenes perpetui officiated in the erection of Christian dedications and confessed the Christian faith while still in office, the original religious significance of the title had fallen away, the flamen perpetuus being thereupon a local official, one perhaps specially detailed to act as an intermediary between the comnunity and the ruler, somewhat indeed like the madern provost or mayor, and nothigg mare. Above all we must keep in mind the conventional and rigid literary chaferer of the State titulus as a category, remembering how apt such documents are to perpetuate in their structure from generation to generation features which once significant become in the course of mechanical repetition meaningless, colourless, and entirely wanting in real significance. In view of this special quality of our material, it is never a matter of certainty whether any given word or phrase refers to a specifically historic occasion, or whether it is to be accounted for on the ground $f$ of convention : if unique, the former may be the case; if comnon, the latter.

1) ThLL vi/1,849-859, PW vi 2484-2492

Fourthly it is, in spite of the conventional character of the Imperial titulus as a literary category abundantly plain, that in Byzantine times the state had no longer any difficulty in openly witnessing to the Christran faith. It is true that the old formulae survive for a very large part, and that for instance the title "dominus" continues to be applied to the ruler; but no divine quality is therewith any longer to be associated. On the contrary, the rulers themselves, as we have seen, ase called "most Christian" (p.134). The mere incidence of this renarkable expression determines the sense in which "deus" is to be interpreted, occurring as it does in syntactical connection with verbs like "to favour," "to command", "to help", with epithets like "propitious", and in adjectival form, as in "Domus dibina $=$ house of God", and "Nutu divino, almost = by divine decree": the reference is certainly not to any pagan deity, nor yet is it a neutral expression, as in the celebrated "promptings of divinity" on the Constantine Arch in Rone, already adduced on $p$. 134 where such expressions are discussed, but on the contrary, to the One God of the Christian faith. With this interpretation agree the items of Christian symbolism which, so long absent from state tituli, re-appear now as permanent features, namely fl)y (2) p 3) $\frac{p 4}{4} 4$. In private teyts, to be sure, such sparse vestiges would be of slight significance; in view of the exceptionally strong conservative tendencies which control the morphology of these public texts, however, they mean a great deal. Nothing less than a revolution in the relations of Church and State can account for such phenomena.

1) cIVI37,IO, cIIIII7, cIVVeł 274
2) CIVII2
3) cIV3 6
4) CIII549, CIV4I

## (e) Results

On the basis of the material examined in this section, the relation between Church and Stace is found to develop in the following manner : -

From Constantine I to Julian the Apostate, spotadic traces of the Christian religion find their way into official documents, which otherwise preserve traditional features. Christians undoubtedy regarded Constantine and his sons as champions of the new religion, but there is nothing in the inscriptions themselves to show that Christianity was not more than one of many religions all enjoying toleration on equal terms. There must certainly have been a fairly substantial pagan element in society.

From the death of Julian to the Vandal Invasion nothing decisive is to be inferred from Gtate tituli, where no positive Christian marks are forthcoming (unless we interpret the florid praises of the Valentinian dynasty as expressing to some extent the Church's relief at the overthrow of the anti-Christian Julian), pagan stigmata at the same tirne, when they occur, also lacking positive significance.

During the Byzantine period, pagan marks of the grosser and more obvious kind are lacking; the fundamental elements supplied by the tradition of the category persist, apparently having conventional value only; and fairly numerous formulae and symbols which we are obliged to interpret as Christian point to a more or less complete penetration of Court circles by the Christian religion, and therewith to a reversal of the original position.

## II. Martyrs' Memorials : The Cult or the Saint

(a) Distribution

The Imperial tituli witness to the slow but thorough christianizing of ancient society. That those chiefly responsible for this fine achievement should have been held in honour by the Church as the pioneers of the faith, is readily to be understood. Their monuments, therefore, are numerous. In Africa we count 117 of them, distributed as follows: -
$\left.\begin{array}{rlc} & b \mathrm{~b} & \mathrm{x} \\ \text { II } & 2+12=14 \\ \text { LIL } & 7+17=24+1 \\ \text { IV } & 7+24+1 \\ V & \underline{7}+24=51+14=26\end{array}\right\}$
$=\quad \underline{\underline{17}}$

Comparing these proportions with those of the THIRD TABLE (p.llo) we observe (l)chronologically, a manifest incline,being a real decline; anā (2) topographically, a large manifest, and still larger real maximum in $I a v o u r$ of Numidia. Hence we can formulate as preliminary results: the cult had reached its maximum already before the end of the fourth century, and was at all periods preponderant in Numidia.
(b) Morphology

While a few of the texts in this section give no specific nemes, merely speaking of ${ }^{\text {memoria martyrum" etc., end still fewer contain }}$ names only, e.g. Petrus, Paulus, without specifying the type of monument, or even the hero's designation, by far the larger part of them consists of texts compounded of all three elements, namely a description of the monument in question, the designation of the hero, and, together with various adjuncts, his
name. Occasionally further information is given, with interesting details. Thus the literary form of these monuments provides us with convenient headings under which to divide the analysis, namely (I) hero's name, (2) hero's designation, (3) dezeription of monument, (4) sundry particulars.
(c) Hero's Name.

The nucleus of our hagiographic Onomasticon consists of Panchristian names, those namely already known in Africa and throughout the rest of Christendom. From them we distinguish on the one hand names known elsewhere, but not hitherto encountered in Africa, and on the other, names already known in Africa, but not forthcoming outwith it. Finally we will notice that interesting group, viz. the nanes wholly unattestdd before, either in Africa or elsewhere, the veritable hapax legomena of our collection, of which the texts now considered remain the sole extant evidence.

## (i) Panchristian

ANAPGAC (i.e. Andrew) once, (cV I7O), presumably identical with the apostle, as is explicitly mentioned in entries in the Calendar of Carthage ${ }^{I}$ (saec VI) and in the Coptic Calendar of Alexandria? (saec VI)

BIOTOR thrice (cIII 562, cIV 57,III); doubtless the Victor of the Carthage Calendar and other African sources3) al though how many shared this name is not certain. BIKTWfoccurs in the Calendar of Oxyrhynchus.) (saec V-VI)
I) Ca $8 / 1: 645$
2)ib. 655
3) Mon HIAC $3 / 550$
4) $\mathrm{Ca} 8 / 1: 652$

CASSIANUS once (cIV 120), unless of course Casianus(cIV 132) is the same, as is probable; found in African literary sources? and in Roman inscriptions.

CLEAENS once, (CIV 38), and in the Carthage Calendar, ${ }^{3}$ ) also in the Feriale Ecclesiae Romanae ${ }^{4)}$ (saec IV), later in the Neapolitan Calendar ${ }^{5}$ (saec IX).

CYPRIANUS, ( cII 197) also spelt Ciprianus (bV 27), Without doubt the famous "bishop and martyr" of the Carthage Calendar, already celebrated in the Feriale Ecclesiae Romanae?) and the object of a Spanish dedication. (:Sciprianus)

FELICITAS twice (bII 112, CIII 20) also attested in non-epigraphical material in Africa ${ }^{9}$ mentioned in the Feriale Ecclesiae Romanae, ${ }^{\text {IO }}$ ) also in the Merovingian MS Reichenau 3011)

FELIX Very frequently (cII 89, cIII 562, bIV 49,114,124,142, cIV 93, 128, cV 2ll), richly attested in Inscriptions of Rome, ${ }^{12)}$ Gaul, ${ }^{13)}$ and Spain; ${ }^{\text {14) }}$ also in the Feriale Ecclesiae Romana. ${ }^{\text {15 }}$ ) and doubtless the Felix of Nola figuring in the Calendars of Carthage ${ }^{\text {16 }}$ ) and Naples. ${ }^{17 \text { ) }}$

JACOBUS once (cIV 57); once also in Gaul. ${ }^{18 \text { ) This name is especially }}$ popular in Spain, where dedications to it abound; and in Britain it appears twice. ${ }^{19)}$ It is found also in the Carthage Calendar. P P Probaby the apostle, son of Alpheus, is meant; 21) one Spanish text refers to the "brother of the Lord"?2)

1) MOn HLAC $3 / 537$
2) Di 2015 3) Ca $8 / 1: 645$
3) $\mathrm{Ca} 8 / 1: 635$
4) Ca 2/2:1591
5) Mon HLAC $3 / 538$
6) Ca 8/1:635 8) Hu Sp IO8 9)Mon HLAC 3/540
7) $\mathrm{Ca} 8 / 1: 635$ 11) $\mathrm{Ca} 8 / 1: 663$ 12) Di 1982,1983,1989,1999a,2002
8) LeBl 182,198 14) $\mathrm{Hu} \mathrm{Sp} 80,85,89,111$ 15) Ca 8/1:635 16)Mon HLAC 3/54C
9) $\mathrm{Ca} 2 / 2: 1591$ 18) LeBl 175 19) $\mathrm{Hu} \mathrm{Sp} 246,252,255,272,284,353,465$,
488; $\mathrm{Hu} \mathrm{Br} 186,229$ 20)Mon HLAC 3/542 21) Hu Sp 353,488; Hu Br 229
10) Hu Sp 284

The Coptic Calendar of Alexandria has the name, adding,"son of Alpheus, priest of Jerusalem" ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) while the Reichenau MS, under X kal jul",Jacobi Alfei apostoli" ${ }^{2}$ ) The entry under VI kal Jan, "...Jacobi Alfei fratris Domini" must be a mistake?)
JANUARIUS once (cIV 135); occurs on Roman inscriptions, 4) as well as in the Feriale Ecclesiae Romanae ${ }^{5)}$ and the Carthage Calendar. ${ }^{6}$ ) JOHANNES $(c V 167)=$ IOANNHC (cIV 202) is mach more richly attested outside Africa than within it, on Christian Inscriptions, namely at Rome, (n Gaul ${ }^{8}$ ) and in Spain and Britain. ${ }^{\text {² }}$ ) Whether the Baptist or the Apostle is meant, is not clear: both figure in the Carthage Calendar, ${ }^{\text {Il }}$ ) and both mingle in the texts already adduced, and in non-epigraphical texts such as the coptic Calendar at Alexandria ${ }^{12)}$ and the Reichenau MS. ${ }^{13)}$ On the whole statistics suggest the apostie as against the baptist.
IPPOLYTUS once ( cV 178) obviously an illiterate version of Fippolytus found in the Carthage Calendar. ${ }^{14 \text { ) This is a Roman saint, being }}$ round in Roman inscriptions, ${ }^{15}$ as well as in the Feriale Ecclesiae Romanae, ${ }^{16)}$ in the extraordinary form Ypolitus. It occurs also in the inscriptions of Gaul. ${ }^{17}$ )
JULIANUS very frequently (cII 146, cIV 119,124,129,130,150, cV 1I,167) Already known in Africal ${ }^{18)}$ found twice in the monuments of Gaul ${ }^{19)}$ this name occurs likewise in the Calendar of Oxyrhynchus, and, with the designation "martyr", in the Reichenau MSOI) JUSTUS once, ( CV l0) is already known, 2) has dedications in Spain, 23) (martyr), and figures in the Oxyrhynchus Calenader.4)


LAURENTIUS several times (cIV 123,124,127, XIV 5, cV 11, 2,178); already in the Carthage Calenarar, celebrated in Rome both on stone ${ }^{2)}$ and in the Feriale, and found on a Spanish inscription.4)

LUCCATIS (bIV II4) is perhaps the genitive of Lucas, representing therefore the evangelist Luke. If so, already known in the Carthage Calendar, ${ }^{5)}$ encountered on inscriptions in Spain ${ }^{6}$ ) and Britinin, and entered in the Calendar of Naples. ${ }^{\text {P }}$ ) (cIV 154), already known, ${ }^{8}$ ) and found in inscriptions of Gaul, ${ }^{9}$ Britain, 0 ) and Spain, 11 in which latter instance, and in the Coptic Calendar of Alexandrial2) the reference is to the evangerist.
MARTINUS (cIV 86), already known, ${ }^{13}$ ) and attested likewise on stones of Rome ${ }^{14}$ ) and Spain.5) The Reichenau MS remark, "in Galifs" supplied the reference, namely to the fampus monk and missionary. As we might expect, therefore, the dedications to Martin in Gaul are far more numerous than elsewhere: no fewer than twenty are extanti7)

PAULUS Very frequent (cII 13, bIV 29,51,128, cIV 24,62, xIV 5, bV 27,53,82,83), found also in the Carthage Calendar, 8) and in the inscriptions of Rome, ${ }^{19)}$ Gaul, 20) Spain, 21) and Britain.2) Presumably the reference, made explicit sporadically, ${ }^{23}$ ) the apostle, holas good in all these instances, as in the sase of the Roman Feriale, ${ }^{24}$ ) the Calendar of Oxyrhynchus, 25 ) and the Reichenau MS; ${ }^{26)}$ but the Coptic


LAURENTIUS several times (cIV 123,124,127, XIV 5, cV 11, 24, I78); already in the Carthage Calendarl) celebratea in Rome both on stone ${ }^{2)}$ and in the Feriale, and found on a Spanish inscription.)

LUCCATIS (bIV 114) is perhaps the genitive of Lucas, representing therefore the evangelist Iuke. If so, already known in the Carthage Calendar, ${ }^{5}$ ) encountered on inscriptions in Spain ${ }^{6}$ ) and Britain?, and entered in the Calendar of Naples. ${ }^{\text {P }}$ ) (cIV 154), already known, ${ }^{8}$ ) and found in inscriptions of Gaul, ${ }^{9}$ Britain, 0 ) and Spain, ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ ) in which latter instance, and in the Coptic Calendar of Alexandrial2) the reference is to the evangelist.
MARTINUS (cIV 86), already known, ${ }^{13}$ ) and attested likewise on stones of Rone ${ }^{\text {I4 }}$ ) and Spain!5) The Reichenau MS renark, "in Gallis' supplied the reference, namely to the fampus monk and missionary. As we might expect, therefore, the deaications to Nartin in Gaul are far more numerous than elsewhere: no fewer than twenty are extant.7)

PAULIJS very frequent (cII 13, bIV 29,51,128, cIV 24,62, XIV 5, DV 27,53,82,83), found also in the Carthage Calendar, 8) and in tre inscriptions of Rone, 19) (Gaul, 20) Spain, 21) and Britain? Presurably the reference, made explicit sporadically, to the apostle, holas good in all these instances, as in the sase of the Roman Feriale, 24) the Calendar of Oxyrnynchus, 25) and the Reichenau MS; ?5) but the coptic

| 1) Mon HLAC $3 / 543$ 2)Di 1992 3) Ca B/1:635 4) Hu 3p 374 5) Mon HLAC I.c. 6) Hu Sp 260 7) Hu Br 229 a 8) $\mathrm{Ca} 2 / 2: 1591$ 9) Mon $\mathrm{HLAC} 3 / 544$ 9a) LeBl542 10) Hu Br 229 a 11) Hu Sp 260 12) $\mathrm{Ca} 8 / 1: 656$ 13) Mon HLAC $3 / 544$ 14) Di 2015 15) Hu Sp 85, 275 etc 16) Ca 653 17) LeB1 ind 18) Mon HL $3 / 545$ 23) Di 1984,2000 20)LeBI 651 21) Hu Sp ind 22) Hu Br 198,229a, b 23)Hu So 46 6. Hu Br 229 24)Ca 635 25)ib. 652 26)ib. 663 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Calendar of Alexandria, while like the rest including the apostle, speaks in addition of one Paul, "chief of eremites", ) presumably the same as the "monachos" figuring besides the apostle in the Reichenau MS. ${ }^{2}$ )
PERPETUA (cIII 20), the famous martyr, and companion of Felicitas, 3) is celebrated in the Roman Feriale, ${ }^{4}$ ) and in the Reichenau MS. ${ }^{5}$ )

PETRUS extremely gopular, (cII 13, cIII 501,502,562, XIII 144, bIV 29,51,107, cIV 24,62,93,141, XIV 5, bV 27,53,82,83), known as apostle in the Carthage Calendar, $\left.{ }^{( }\right)$the Roman Feriale, ${ }^{7}$ the Calendar of Oxyrhynchus, 8 ) the Coptic Calendar of Alexandria and the Reichenau MS, as well $\phi \neq$ as on inscriptions of Gaul, 10) Spain, ${ }^{11}$ and Britain, ${ }^{12)}$ generally coupled with Paul, sothat the identity of both is without doubt.
ROGATUS (cIII 562 twice), known from the Carthage Calendar, ${ }^{13}$ ) figures al so on a Spanish inscription. ${ }^{14)}$
RUSTICUS (CIV 57) mentioned as a subdeacon in the Martyrology of Jerome, has four dedications in Gaul.6) Probably different men.

SATURNINUS at least five times (cII 12,13, bIII 6, cIII 20, bIV 29) already known, ${ }^{17}$ ) mentioned in the Roman Periale, ${ }^{18 \phi}$ in the Cal endar of Naples,9) and in the inscriptions of Spain 20) and Britain: ${ }^{2 l}$
SEBASTIANUS (bIII 1), known botir from the Carthage Calendar and from the Roman Feriale, ${ }^{23)}$ also the Reichenau ins,24) together wi th inscriptions in Rome ${ }^{25)}$ and Spain. ${ }^{26)}$ Variously spelt.

1) $\mathrm{Ca} 8 / 1: 65$
2) ib. 662
3) HOn HLAC 545 4) Ca 8/1:635
4) ib. 661
5) ib. 644
6) ib. 635 8)ib. 652
7) ib. 656 10) LeBI 174,389,651
11)Hu Sp index
8) Hu Br 208,229b 13) Ca 8/1:644 14) Hu Sp 178 15)MOn HTAC $3 / 547$
9) LeBl 21, 609, 617,618 17 MOn HIAC 3/547-8 18) C8 8/1:635 199
10) 23) ib. $235^{2 / 24) \text { ib. } 663}$ 25) Di 2015 26) Hu Sp 57,90,221

SECUNDU日 once (bIV 49), already known, mentioned in the Roman Feriale. STEPHANUS very frequent (cII 81,89, bIII 6, XIII 144, cIV III, XIV 5, bV 16, cV ll twice, variously spelt; found in an inscription in Gaul, 3 , and no fewer than eighteen times in the inscriptions of Spain, ${ }^{4}$ ) where we meet the designation "primus martyr"5) and "prothomartyr"6). We know the name also from the Carthage Calendar,') the Coptic Calendar of Alexandria, ${ }^{8}$ ) and the Reichenau MS, (primus martyr).
VICTORINUS (6bV 27) already known, 10 ) and attested in Rone on stonell) and in the Periale Ecclesiae Romanael2)

VINCENTIUS (bII 112, cIV 38,93, bV 123) = Bincentius (cIII 527, cV 211,214), already in the Carthage Calendar, popular in the inscriptions of Gaul 14 ) and still more so in those of Spain! ${ }^{5}$ )

## (iif Extra-African

ABUNDIUS (cIII 562) is a Roman saint? ${ }^{\text {6 }}$ )
ANASTASIA (cIII588) occurs also in the Naples Calendar!7)
CARITAS (cIV I56) appears to be parallelled in Spain. ${ }^{\text {P }}$ )
CRESCENTIANUS (bIV 49) figures in the Roman Feriale. ${ }^{\text {I9 }}$ ) CRISPUS (cIV 57) is attestea in Rome. ${ }^{\text {20 }}$ )

CRISTOFORUS (CV 167)(=Christophorus) occurs four times in the stones of Spaingl) and is mentioned in the Calendar of Noples?2) ESIAORUS $(c I I I 610)=$ HESIDORUS $(c I V ~ 86)$ is found in the Reichenau MS.3)

1) Mon HLAC $3 / 548$
2) Ca $8 / 1: 635$
3) LeBI 65
4) Hu Sp ind
5) ib. 115
6) ib. 283
7) Ca 8/1:645
8) ib. 655
9) ib. 661 10)Mon HLAC $3 / 551$
11)Di 2016 12) Ca 8/1:635 13)ib. 645 14)LeBl 492,593,610 15)HuSp ind 16) Di 2012 17) $\mathrm{Ca} 2 / 2: 1591$ 18) Hu Sp 126 19) Ca 8/1:635 20) Di 1999b 21) Hu Sp 175,359,382,475 22) Ca 2/2:1591 23) Ca 8/1:661
rewprlac (cIV 201) occurs on stones in Gaul, and in the Calendars of Alexandria(Coptic) ${ }^{2)}$ and Naples. ${ }^{3}$ )
GREGORIUS (cDII 562) is celebrated in GruI, ${ }^{4}$ ) in the Neapolitan Calendar5, and in the Reichenau Ms, , where he is called the pope of Rome, $i, e$, Gregory thefreat.
KOCMAC (cV 170)is found only in oriental sources, namely the Coptic Calendar of Alexandria, ${ }^{7}$, and the Calendar of Oxyrhynchus, ${ }^{8}$ ) apart from the late Naples Calendar9)

MARCIA
MENAS

NKAS

PANTALEON
PASTOR

QUIRIACUS

ROMATIUS ( cV 212 ) is entered in the Naples Calendar? ) (cIII I) occurs in the Calendars of Oxyrhynchus ${ }^{10 \text { ) and }}$ Alexandria (Coptic)? ${ }^{\text {I }}$ )
(=Nikolas)(cIV 204,205) is mentioned in a British stone, sanctus Nicholaus episcopus; ${ }^{12)}$ but we prefer to think of Nicolas of Myra in this connection, as celebrated in the Coptic Calendar of Alexanäria! ${ }^{\text {B }}$ ) (cII 146) is found in the Naples Calendar. ${ }^{\text {4 }}$ ) (cIV 125,126) is presumebly the Pastor of two Spanish deaications ${ }^{\text {² }}$ )
(cIII 619) may be identical with the Quiricus venerated in Spain, ${ }^{16)}$ and is presumably the person found in the Roman Feriale ${ }^{\text {17) }}$ and Reichenau MS ${ }^{\text {18) }}$ ( viz.Cyriacus, and in the Coptic Calendar of Alexandrial9) (cIII 562, CIV 86) is attested in Spain, 20) where the designati-on is martyr in one instance?, 1) and monachus in

| I)LeBI 196,341 | 2) $\mathrm{Ca} 8 / 1: 655$ | 3)ib. $2 / 2: 159140$ | 86,194,195 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5) $\mathrm{Ca} 2 / 2: 1591$ | 6) ib. $8 / 1: 663$ | 7) ib. 655 8)ib. 652 9) Ca | 2/2:1591 |
| 10) Ca 8/1:651 | 11)ib. 655 12) | Hu Br 210 13) Ca 8/1:655 | 14) $\mathrm{Ca} \mathrm{2/2:1591}$ |
| 15) Hu Sp 85,255 | 16)Hu Sp 85 | 17) $\mathrm{Ca} \mathrm{8/1:635} \mathrm{18)} \mathrm{ib}$. | 19)ib. 656 |
| 20) $\mathrm{Hu} \mathrm{Sp} 85,495$ | 21)Hu Sp 19 |  |  |

another.) The name also occurs in the Naples Calendar?)
SABINUS (?) (cIII 588), if that is the correct reading, is reproduced in the Naples Calendar.

TEODORUS, variously spelt, thrice (cII 103, cIV III, cV 167) occurs in the Oxyrhynchus Calendar, ) the Coptic Calendar of Alexandria and in the Naples Calendar?)

## (iii) Intra-African

BASSUS XIII 144, bIV 11 (M)*
BICTRIAN (= Vietorianus) cIII 562 (M)
CALENDIO bIII 177 (M)
CECILIUS CIIZ 13 (C) **
CITIMUS bV 27 (M)
CLAUDIUS CIV 272 (C)
CRISPINA CIII 527 twice ( $C$ )
DONATIANUS CIII 562, bIV 20, cIV 108, bV 27 (M)
DONATILLA bIII 167, cIII 527, cIV $\mathbb{2} 56$ (M)
EMERITUS bIV 16I, CIV 12 (M)
EMILIUS ( $=$ Aemilius) cII 13 (C)
FELICIANUS bIV 135 (C)
JANUARIA bII 112 twice (M)
JUCUNDUS CII 155 (M)
JULIA bII 112 (M)
LUCILLA CII 13 (C)

1) Hu Sp 140
2) $\mathrm{Ca} 2 / 2: 1591$
3) $\mathrm{Ca} 8 / 1: 653$
4) ib. 656
*M=MOnceaux HLAC iii 536-551 (Appendix II)
**C=Carthage Calendar, in Cabrol 8/1:644-545

| MARIANUS CIV 57 (M) | SALVIUS bIV 33,34 (c) |
| :---: | :---: |
| MATRONA bIV 33,34 (M) | SATURUS bIII 6, CIII 20 (M) |
| MIGGIN bIV 49, cIV 24 (M) | SECUNDA bIII 167, cIV 156 (M) |
| OPTATUS dIV 154 ( M ) | SECUNDIANUS bII 112 (c) |
| PRIMUS bIV II4 (M) | SECUNDULUS CIII 594 (M) |
| QUINTASIUS bIV ll (c) | SEVERIANUS CV 69 ( M ) |
| REBOCATUS (= Revocatus) cIII 20 (M) | SILVANUS bIV 114, cIV 57 (M) |
| ROgATIANUS bV 34 (M) | SPERATUS bIII 6 (M) |
| SALSA CV 50 (M) | TIPASIUS cV 212 (M) |
| VICTORIA $\mathrm{bV} 27, \mathrm{cV}$ | 211 (c) |
| The following occur also in the Naples | Calendarl):- |
| BONIFATIUS CIII 562 (M) | LUCIANUS cV 167 ( C ) |
| DONATUS <br> cII 13, cIII 56?, <br> bIV 49,114,138, <br> cIV 24,157 (M) | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { MONTANUS } \\ \text { MUNTANUS } \end{array}\right\} \text { (identical) }\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { cIV } 13 \\ \text { (C) } 17 \end{array}\right.$ |

but are to be reckoned, like Perpetua and Felicitas in (ii), as
African figures. The same holds good for MAXIMA bIII 167, cIII 527, cIV 150, bV 65 (M) which occurs once only outside Africa, namely in Spain. () Both Spanish and Neapolitan witnesses are here more recent than the African material in question. EUFIMIA cV 178 ( $C$ ) occurs in the Oxyrhynchus Calendar, ${ }^{3}$ ) and is thus anolmalous from the viewpoint of the classification here adopted.
(iv) Hapax Legomena

ABORUS CV 11
BARIC bIV 49, cIV 24,108

1) $\mathrm{Ca} 2 / 2: 1591$
2) Hu Sp 57
3) Ca $8 / 1: 652$

| BENENATUS CIII 562 | FUZON CITI 562 |
| :---: | :---: |
| BINDEMIUS $(=\mathrm{V}-) \mathrm{cII} 13$ | GEMINIANUS CIV 156 |
| KADIZON CIII 562 | GERMANILLA CIV 171 |
| CASTA CIV 134 | GETULA bV 84 |
| CELSUS CIV 108 | GRAZIOSUS CIII 562 |
| CESELIA BV 83, cV 212 | GUDUDA cII 12,13 |
| CINVANUS CIII 532 | JADER cII 12, $33, \mathrm{bIV} 49$ |
| CLARA CII 13 | JAHINIS bIV 114 |
| COMIT(US?) bII 112 | JAPIN CIV 57 |
| CORTANTIUS cV 211 | INNOC(ENTIUS? ) bIV 35 |
| CRENENTIA (?) DIV 125 | INULUS CITI 562 |
| DATTANUS bV 27 | AEWNTIOC CIV 203 |
| DATUS CIV 57 | LIBERALIS CIV 102 |
| DECURIUS cV 10 | LIBOSUS bII 112 |
| DONATIANA 㭏产 CV 121 | LICINIUS bII 112 |
| DOVITIANUS bII 122 | MATENNUS bV 65 |
| EGIPTIUS CIV 57 | MAXIMIN(US?) bII 112 |
| EGUSA SAT...? bV 72 | MAXULES CITI 562 |
| ENTAGIUS bV 65 | MEGGENI bIV 99 |
| EUSEBIUS CV 114 | MENGRVUS CIII 592 |
| FELICULUS CIII 562 | MERDULUS bIV 145 |
| FIDES CIV 156 | MEROBAUDES bIII 242 |
| FLORA cV 212 | METYUN(US?) bIV 49, cIV 57 |
| FLORUS bIV 107 | WLNNA cV 178 |
| FOCIUS cIV 111 | MINUCIUS bIV 49 |
| FORTUNIUS bII ll2,bIII 242 | NASSEUS bV 65 |
| FORTUNUS cII 12,13 | NATALICUS cIII 562 twice |


(A) By reducing the above lists to statistical form we are able to supplement the results already obtained by the similar treatment of the hagiographic texts in general(p.142).
(I) Examination of the chronology of these names shows in the first place, that whereas classes i,iii, and iv are fairly evenly distributed, of the nineteen items comprising class ii, only one can be referred to the fourth century (Crescentianus); the other eighteen
lie wholly within centuries V-VII. In fact most of the figures concerned are oriental. We have therefore evidence here of the influence of the Eastern Church, presumably during the reigns of the Byzantines. On the other hand, only in the case of class iii (indigenous class) do fourth-century representatives exceed in number those of later centuries. Confessedly the margin is small (22/21) but in view of the general tendency to the decrease of extant texts proportionately to their antiquity already observed on a large sale in the Third Table (p.110) it is substantial enough to justify the conclusion: indigenous dedications as a whole are earlier than other types.
(2) A similar examination of the topography of the different classes reveals, as might be expected from the distribution of the texts in general, (p.142) a decisive predominance of Numidian material throughout. There is but one exception to this rule, namely in the class of exogenous dedications,(ii) where Zeugitana's total is exactly equal to that of Numidia. This confirms our conclusions of the foregoing paragraph in reference to exogenous material, viz. that it entered Africa from the East in Byzantine times, Carthage being the centre of government. Otherwise nothing of significance emerges from the topography of the classes.
(B) The relation of the various classes to each other introduces nothing radically new into our knowledge of African Church History, apart of course from the hitherto unknown names of the fourth section, a number of which coincide on a novel document which falls to be discussed later on, as a valuable relic of the Persecution of Diocletian. It is of interest, however, to note the
small group of indigenous heroes (Saturninus, Felicitas, Perpetua, Cyprian, and possibly a few others) listed as belonging to class i, Which otherwise consists of martyrs of the primitive period (Stephen, Peter, Paul, etc.) and Roman (Hippolytus, Clement) and other local figures whose cult transcended the immediate area of their labours (e.g. Martin): such an extension of the cult of the indigenous heroes is profoundly significant from the point of view of the fame and influence of the African Church. On the other hand the cult within Africa of exogenous martyrs and saints shows plainly the solidarity of that Church with the Churches in the other provinces of the Roman Empire.

In connection with the names of class iii, the incidence of Donatus ana Montanus as names of saints raises the whole question of Donatism and its relation to Catholicism, together with such subsidiary questions as its relation to Montanism, and the worship or cult of saints on both sides; there is also the question: can we distinguish Donatist from Catholic dedications, and if so, to what extent? How many, for example, of the hapax legomena in class iv are Donatist, and how many are Catholic? It must be confessed that no direct answer to these questions is as yet possible. At most, it will be observed with regard to the names, that (I) Montanus and Donatus both occur in Numidia, only two examples of the latter name being found outwith that region; (2) several names occur, which are plainly not Latin, but presumably Berber or Punjc (*), e.g. Citinus, Miggin, Aborus, *Baric, Kadizon, Cinnanus, Fuzon, Gududa, Jader, (?*) Jahinis (?*), Japin (?*), Matennus, Stidain, Tatus, Tinus,
and Tunninus, which therefore may perhaps indicate Donatist origin, though of course such an inference is by no means necessary; and (3), that the majority of such names are found among the hapax legomena, which may mean that the hapax legomena as a whole are Donatist, since it is easily conceivable that the Donatists might pay homage to numerous local martyrs whose names would naturally not be placed on Catholic Calendars, and indeed would not even be known in circles beyond the immediate scene of their sufferings. Finally, in general, the fact that the documents in question preponderate in Numidia, the region notorious as the hotbed of the schismatic movement, raises quite clearly the problem of which texts are Donatist, and which Catholic. A similar problem presses to the foreground in relation to the Vandal persecution of the Catholics. But from the mere names nothing decisive is at this stage forthcoming: we must content ourselves with having formulated these questions, and postpone answering them until the texts as a whole have been examined.
(d) Hero's Designation

Three terms fall to be considered undar this head, namely:-
MARTYR bII 107,112; bIII 5,152,172,242; bIV 118,33,34,49,126,161; bV 8,65,27,80,82-84; cII 12-13; cIII 527,588; cIV 33,156;cD114.
SANCTUS bIII 6; bIV 10-11,20,114,124,140,142; bV 16,34,63; cII 103,155; cIII 21,527,587,594,562; cIV, 13,24,86,93, 102,108,120-121,123-130,132,150,153-154,156-159; <́ү $\operatorname{los} 201-205 ;$ cV 11, 115,167,211。

DOMINUS bIV 9,51,145; cIII 501; cIV 134,272(twice).

Our first step towards interpretation must be the statistical representation of these proportions, thus:II III IV V


## Observations

(1) "Martyr" is characteristic of the 4 th century, and "Sanctus" of the 5 th and following centuries. The one title gave place to the other gradually, although not to its absolute exclusion.
(2) "Martyr", during its dominant period, was much more frequent in Numidia and Mauretania, particularly in the latter, than in the eastern portion of the country.
(3) "Sanctus" is overwhelmingly dominant in Numidia. Even when the well-known pre-eminence of this province as against the rest of Africa in the extreme rechness of its hagiographic material (p.142) is taken into account, this example of onesiaedness in the distribution of technical terms must be reckoned exceptional.
(4) "Dominus" is altogether of secondary importance, and presents nothing remarkable in its distribution, so far as it is attested at all. It is natural that it should occur only in the most populous regions, in view of its rarity.

A mixed form of title should be noticed in this connection, namely "SANCTUS MARTYR" (bII 106;bIII 153;bIV 35; bV 123; cII 81; cIII 592,610; cIV III; cV 10,128) whose distribution, viz.:-

| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

presents no striking feature, but on the contrary exhibits all the want of character natural to an expression without inner cohesion and constituting simply the transition between two well-defined and vigorous terms.

There is nothing peculiarly African in the occurence of any of these titles. MARTYR occurs in Romel) Gaul, 2) and Spain. 3) The same holds good in the case of SANCTUS.4) As one might expect, DOMINUS is not so common as the two foregoing current titles, outwith Africa as within it; but examples have been found in Rome, and are especially common in Spain. (') The expression is known in Gaul? The transitional form SANCTUS MARTYR (occasionally "martyr sanctus") is likewise attested in the centres already remarkable for their richness in this type of material, namely Rome ${ }^{8)}$ and Spain. ${ }^{9}$ )

Passing to the etymology of these terms, we notice that in Hellenistic Greek "martyr", $\mu$ ब́p Tus meant simply witness, one who personally guaranteed matters of fact, Luke ${ }^{10}$ ) being the first to employ the

3)Di 2030a,2105; Hu Sp ind p. 149 4)Di 1991,2003,2014(*!),2015(t!);
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7) LeB1 20́2 8) Di 1998B,1999B, 2010,2012,2114A; An Boll 28/180-181
9) Di 2106,2111(t:)-2112 10) Strathmann in Kittel IV 495-498
the word in the sense thereafter characteristically Christian, namely as denoting one who is willing to die rather than abjure the faith. At all events this was the accepted current usage of the word long before we meet it on our epigraphical texts, where its use nowhere suggests any other interpretation.

The position is less patent in the case of "sanctus". In the first place, its syntax fluctuates between that of an adjective and that of a noun. In the frequently-occurring transitional phrase already noticed, viz."sanctus martyr/martyr sanctus" (p.158) it is clearly an adjective, capable of a superlative degree, both in Africal) and elsewhere. Even when, as is usual, it occurs absolutely, except for the proper name following, it is possible to regard it still as an adjective (s.Julian $=$ holy Julian, ó ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha}, 105$ MHNAC = the holy Menas, etc). But where in the last resort we have at least to postulate an ellipse of the noun, as in the phrases SEDES SANCT(orun) (cIV 114) (also cIV 247) (SANCTORUM SEDES) it is much more natural, and certainly much more in accordance with the tendency of those who wrote and read these inscriptions, to disregard the subtleties of theoretical grammar, and in all such cases to regard SANCTUS as a virtual noun ="saint!" With this interpretation moreover the large-scale transition agrees, already aiscussed, whereby "sanctus" gradually displaces "martyr" without disintegrating the syntax, which means from our present point of view that where it appears without qualification, "sanctus" is the syntactical equivalent of "rnartyr", that is, a noun.

As for the value of the title, we naturally recall the $\mathbb{N} . T$. use
I)bIV 99
2) $D \not d$
2004
(Rome)
of C'Yylos, which, like its Hebrew prototype VTP (qdsh), expressed the idea of separateness, hence when applied to God, of otherness or transcendence, when applied to the Jews, and from them transferred to the primitive Church as the spiritual Isreal, of exclusiveness as against the world at large, as a result of having been set apart from it, or chosen out of it, by God! But whereas in the primitive period hagios was applied to a collective subject, namely the community of the faithful, its epigraphical application is individual, namely as the predicate of singly heroic personalities, who were thereby Iifted above the common throng, and set apart as sancti,i.e.saints.

From another tradition, however, this tendency was further reinforced. "Sanctus" had long been applied, often in the superlative, to Emperors ${ }^{2)}$ and familiars, ${ }^{3)}$ in the former case as an epithet of general excellence, in the latter as a term of intimate endearment or admiration. But it is not to such sporadic instances of the use of the epithet $\not \forall \not \chi \not \chi$ that the reference is here made: a much more significant use of it was prevalent in Roman epigraphy than that. The Bollandist $H$. Delehaye has collected the names of no fewer than 76 pagan deities to whom the word "sanctus" is found to be applied, the typical formula of dedication being "deo sancto $-\ldots$...") His list covers all parts of the Roman Empire, a large proportion of the hundreds of texts aduced coming naturally from Rome itself, and the deities in question, while they include several of the well-known figures of Greek and Roman myth, consist mainly of local gods concerning whose cult we have otherwise little or no information.

[^11]Of these names 24 are found in North Africa, viz. Abadair, Aescupapius, Aeternus, Attis, Aulisva, Badiddir, Caelestes, Caelestis, Deus Aeternis, Frugifer Deus, Genii, Hercules, Hygia, Jupiter, Liber, Malgbelus, Mater Deum, Mercurius, Minerva, Pluto, Saturnus, Silvanus, Venus, and victoria. Several of these have more than one dedication.

Classifying these African texts according to province, thus:-

| II | III | IV | V |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 15 | 14 |

we make the remarkable discovery of the overwhelning predominance of Numidia and Mauretania, and especially of Numidia, in the production of this particular formula, as against the Eastern portion of Africa. The only figures we can compare with these are the proportions already tabulated on p. 157 for the Mauretanian incidence of MARTYR in the 4 th century, and for the Numidian incidence of SANCTUS in the 5 th and following centuries, in respect to our Christian material.

Without resorting to any hypothesis which could raise matters of opinion, we are justified in concluding on the basis of these tables our African Christians that in balling the heroes of the faith SANCII or saints, $/$ were applying to thern a title already rich in religious associations, one indeed which had already been applied to the gods themselves. The remarkable coincidence of the tern SANCTUS in the same area, first applied to pagan deities, then applied to Christian heroes, invites however yet a further inference, namely that the old local godiets lived on in the person of the Christian saints. It is of course true that the conclusion cannot be demonstrated in detail: we must remember that at this late date the texts concerned represent a mere
fraction of the material once in existence, so that to trace the history of individual dedications is no longer a possible task. Moreover it is frankly to be confessed that if this theory were correct, we should expect to find more instances of the Christian use of the term SANGTUS in Mauretania than we actually do, although the restraining influence of the strong tradition of the term MARTYR may doubtless be responsible, in which case we are to suppose that the tendency to transfer the title SANCTUS from pagan deities to Christian martyrs was inhibited to a degree in Mauretania far in excess of that of traditional influence in Numidia. Nevertheless the hypothesis appears sound, that here we have positive evidence of one methof at least whereby the Early Church subdued polytheism: namely by continuing to worship the old gods in the persons of Christian heroes whom in turn the homage and admiration of the faithful had equipped with the sanctity necessary for this purpose. Thus were the gods metamorphosed into champions of Christ and for ever more rendered harmless.

Lastly, the term DOMINUS has a straightforward etymology. It represents in the first place the Greek KUplos which is applied to human superiors in the New Testament?) just as the Hebre ${ }^{\text {W }}$ ADHONAI is employed in the Old Testament?) being used in both as a current designation of God (=Lord, Master). The modern titles Lord, Seigneur, Herr, have a similar portnanteau function, as is well known. The popular Latin use in reference to familiars ${ }^{3}$ ) seems

1) Matt. xviii 26 , Lk xix 20
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without influence on its meaning in Christion epigraphy. It will be recalled, on the other hand, that DOMINUS is the prevailing title bestowed on the Roman Emperor throughout the Christian period. (p.118) Hence we conclude that as applied to martyrs and saints, it expresses profound respect. Among those honoured with this rare title we note the names of Montanus, Peter and Paul?) and Peter alone. ${ }^{3}$ )

We may close this account of titles with reference to the epithets frequently used in connection with them, narnely BEATUS (BEATISSIMUS) 4) which we already know as an epithet applied to the Emperors, (p.12I) and which is applied to martyrs and saints elsewhere in the West, ${ }^{5}$ ) and GLORIOSISSIMUS, which occurs twice.' These epithets present nothing remarkable, merely elaborating as they do the expression of homage and veneration which we have already learned from the titles themselves to have been accorded to the heroes of the Church.

## (e) Description of Monument.

Under this head we discuss the four words with which memorials to the saints, etc. are usually introduced, viz.:MENSA bV 80; cII 89; cIII 1. MEMORIA BIV $10,11,51,114,122,124,135,145,161 ;$ bV 16,63,65,82,123;
cII 146,167; cIV 12,13,24,120,123,124,126-130,132,150;
CV 11, 157,211.
NOMEN bIII 177,242; bIV 33,34,49; bV 8,27; cII 13; cIV 33.

[^12]```
RELIQUIAE cII 197; cIII 1,559,610; cIV 93,111,153,154; cV 214. distributed thus:-
```



## Observations

(I) The current term is MEMORIA; NOMEN and RELIQUIAE come second; MENSA is the term least often employed.
(2) No striking topographical fact emerges. The preponderance of Numidia is once again noticeable, but does not exceed expectations in view of the general preponderance of Numidian material in texts of this category.
(3) On the other hand, definite chronological distinctions are possible. Whereas MENSA and MEMORIA are normally distributed throughout, at least so far as one can observe from such meagre data, NOMEN is on the whole characteristic of the 4 th century, while on the contrary RELIQUIAE is confined to the 5 th and following centuries.

Comparing these terms with the corresponding expressions in documents of the same class elsewhere belonging to the same epoch, we note with interest that Reliquiae is the only one in general use: it is found in Rome ${ }^{1)}$ and is specially frequent in Spain?) Memoria occurs in Britain3) and Mensa has been traced in Rome; 4) both are rare outside Africa, however. Nomen is found nowhere at all except in Africa, to which it is exclusive.

Prima facie the meaning of these terms is obvious enough: mensa $=$ table; memoria $=$ memorial; nomen $=$ name; reliquiae $=$ remains. It is clear, however, from a stone on which two of them coincide, (cIII I : MESA MT IC BENERANDE RELIQUIE.... = martyrs' table: Here are the venerable remains...) that NENSA is not an alternative to any one of the others, but an independent word signifying the vehicle of the inscription, namely a table. What kind of a table is meant, is not at all clear from the epigraphical use of the term alone: it is used simply in conjunction with a genitive, either of a proper name or of the word "martyr(s)" as above (cIII l), compare bV 80 MESA MARTURU and CII 89 MENSA MARTURUM. In discussing chronology we found MENSA common on 4th-century epitaphs, namely in Mauretania (p.29). But from the history of the word in Latin and Greek literature we know that in antiquity a table ( $T p \not \subset \pi \in \mathcal{Y}$ ) was placed alongside the altar of a temple for the receipt of offerings such as bread, wine, and fruit not destined to be burnt, and that in the Roman world the sacrificial furnishings of a temple included a table or MENSA used for the libations and ceremonial feasts; the term Tpfrt\}人 being
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also applied to a rectangular slab covering tombs, hollowed out in the middle for the accommodation of offerings, presumably in connection with the cult of the dead.) It is therefore of great interest to be told by those who have personally examined them, that the stones now in question, which bear the name Mensa, and others also devoid of inscriptions, correspond in shape exactly to this description. ${ }^{2}$. The full discussion of this problem belongs to Archaeology rather than to Epigraphy; but on the strength of the word Mensa alone, which occasioned these excursions in the first place, and whose interpretation demanded thern, we have a right to say: our inscriptions of this class witness to the celebration of feasts in honour of the martyrs, and held in proximity to their remains, or at least at spots consecrated by their inemory.

We have further to distinguish the three terms "nomen","memoria", and "reliquiae". We have a right to doubt, in advance, that they all mean exactly the same thing, otherwise there would not be three of them. Our question regarding them therefore is, what does each mean, and in what respect does each of them differ from the others?

The mere distribution of these terms provides us with our first clue: the contrast, namely, between NOMEN on the one hand, which preponderates in the 4 th century, and REIIQUIAE on the other, which is exclusively 5 th century or later. When we further examine the texts concerned, we discover that to this chronological contrast there corresponds a syntactical one. The table overleaf, which brings together the data in question, sets it forth without ambiguity:-

[^13]
## NOMEN

bIII 177: nomen marturis | Calendionis.ajutes |
| :---: |
| qui... |

bIII 242:...nomina beates.. qui passi sunt...
bIV 33:nomina marturum...
bIV 34: nomina marturou...
bIV 49:..nomina m..tiru..
bV 27:..nomina marturu..
bV 8: nomina marturum qui..
cII 13:hec sunt nomina martirun....
cIV 33:signu crist//// et nomina marturu

## RELIQUIAE

cII 197:hic abent(ur) reliquie beat(i) martiris...
cIII l:benerande reliquie beat martrm Men...et Sebastiani dpst in pace sub die...
cIII 559:..de..v..o scri requiescunt reliquie
cIII 610:ic abentur relicuie scs martiris Esidori posits sub..
cIV 93:hic reliquiae beati Petri...
cIV lll:..in oc benera(li) locum deposite sunt reliquie sactoru martiru id est sacti
cIV 153:ic abentur rlque scrum...
cIV 154:.. deposite sunt rlque srm mm..
cV 214:hic abetur reliquias martiris..

It is at once apparent, that whereas NOMEN stands in an absolute position, merely drawing attention to the names which follow it, teven the "hec sunt" of cII 13 having no more significance than that of rendering this relationship explicit), RELIQUIAE are capable of being "contained"(habentur)"set down",(depositae)"Laid to rest"(requiescunt), and are therefore palpable and concrete. Only in one instance (cIV 93) is there no verb of motion or transfer involved. That is to say: NOMEN is nothing else than the name of the hero, RELIQUIAE definite sorid remains, residue, relics. In the case of Cyprian (cII 197) and African martyrs, "reliquiae" probably signifies the corpse itself; but in the case of Peter (cIV 93) and other Oriental figures, whose bodily remains they cannot be, (Menas, Sebastian, cIII I; Stephen, Theodorus cIV lll) "reliquiae" must certainly signify relics in the sense of
small objects once owned or worn by the hero, pieces of his clothing, or even odd bones, although the texts nowebre give us the slightest hint of what the "reliquiae" really were.

Further syntactical details point to the substantial correctness of this view. Whereas "reliquiae" regularly takes the genitive, and "nomen" frequently does, we have two examples where "nomen" is followed by the nominative of the proper name, BIII 242 and CII 13.

Only two cases admit of doubt. In bV 8, "nomina" occurs, but no names follow; and in bII 112, not hitherto adduced, but given in extenso on p. 194, "nomina" is related to a verb of motion, being ooupled with "corpora" Since "nomen" has been found on a pagan African stone as the object of the verb "instituere" (= to set up) , we ought probably to admit that in both the above cases, in the latter if not in the former, "nomen" has the value of"relics". We regard this use of it as exceptional however, and maintain our opinion that "nomen" means name in this context, and is not simply an alternative to "reliquiae", as is held by Monceaux.' As for the enigmatic fragment cIV 33 SIGNU CRISTavii(?) ET NOMINA MARTURU, which we must apparently translate "the sign of Christ(CRISTI..?)"(or,Christian sign "CRISTIANUM??"), etc., we can say little further than point simply to the curious juxtaposition of the"sign", which must mean $\& f x$ etc., and the "name" of the martyrs, as if they were accorded equal validity when inscribed on monuments. If any hing, therefore, cIV 33 favours our view.

Lastly, (with the exception of bII ll2, see p.193) far fewer names coincide with "reliquiae" than with "nomina" (R,I thrice,2 twice, 3,$4 ;$ $\mathrm{N}, 6,10,16$. ) There is naturally a narrower limit to the number of relics one may assemble than to the number of names one may write off.

We have here, therefore, evidence of a self-consistent and readily intelligible development in the cult of the martyrs: in the early days of the movement, the Christian community, presumably from a desire to secure the presence of the martyrs in its midst, began to reproduce their names in large quantity on surfaces where it most wished their influence to energize. As the decades passed, and the heroic age, with its imposing figures, smbsided farther and farther from view, the need was felt for more drastic methods: the mere names of the martyrs no longer satisfied the faithful, and tangible remains (relics) were sought which provided a less tenuous and abstract intermediary between the heroic figures of the now distant past and the world of the present, which was conscious of its own lack of vitality and need of inspiration from the memory of a more vigorous age.

So much for NOMINA and RELIQUIAE; what now of MEMORIA (-AE) ?
As we have already seen, MEMORIA is the current term, being used more frequently than both NOMEN and RELIQUIAE taken together. Our first step therefore is to segregate the numerous texts containing it according to centuries. At once we find that the 4 th-century examples form a homogeneous group presenting exactly the same syntactical structure as the texts containing the word NOMEN: that is to say, the regular sequence "MENORIA" c.gen. of martyr or proper name. Three of the texts have HIC prefixed: bIV II HIC EST MEMORIA SANCTORUM. . .bIV 114 HIC MEM SANCT...bIV 161 HC MENORIA BEATI MARTIRIS...just as in the case of NOMEN (p.167). Parenthetically we note that the MEMORIAE ENNAGI ET SEXTI KLAS of bV 65 is a later interpolation into an otherwise typical 4 th-century text.)

1) von Soden, Urkunden p. 53 no. 34 note

Passing to texts of the 5 th and following centuries, we distinguish from the point of view of syntax no fewer than four subdivisions, viz.:-
(1) Seven instances of MEMORIA used exactly as in the texts of the 4 th century, with this slight difference, that only two of them (cIVI3 cV 157) give "Memoria" alone, the other five (cIV 12,120,127,128,132) including the prefixed "hic" with or without "est".
(2) Two texts in which MEMORIA is the subject of the verb "ponere" in the passive (cII 167 hic memoria...posita a Faustiniano epco, cV ll hic mm scor...pos sub XII kl april...)
(3) Three texts in which MEMORIAE (pl:) occurs, once with the ellipse of the verb (cIV 24 ,hic memorie sanctoru..), once with the verb "habentur" (cII 146), and once with the verb "sunt"(cIV 123).
(4) Six texts (cIV $124,126,129,130,150$; cV 211) in which MEMORIAE (again plural!) is the subject of the verb (de)ponere.

What we already know of NOMEN and RELIQUIAE with their syntactical peculiarities, however, enables us to bring order into this seemingly confused state of affairs. We resort nanely to one more table:-

## Syntax of MEMORIA

(A) saec IV: sing., ellipse $\underset{\text { verb }}{\text { "esse" }}$
(B) saec V-VII:
I. (a) sing. ,verb "esse"

2. " verb "ponere"
3. (a)plur. , verb "esse", "habere"

4. " verb "(de)ponere"...........=Syntax of RELIQUIAE!

From this table we derive the meaning of MEMORIA, or rather the meanings which it successively bore in its long history. First of all it meant simply memory or recollection in general. Then by degrees it acquired a specific content, ceasea being abstract, and cane to mean memorial, we might almost say, "souvenir" Finally it became synonymous with relics, being then regularly used in the plural. Thus throughout it represents the neutral expressiong corresponding to the strongly-contrasted terms NOMEN and REIIQUIAE, and thus constituting the vehicle of their transition. It has no independence apart from them, and teaches us nothing we do not already know from our encounter with them.
(f) Sundry non-typical features

Hither to we have considered the type of data amenable to the method of statistics, the interpretation of which indeed demanded such a method. Now we pass to those features of our hagiographic texts which cannot be treated in the mass, owing to their strong individuality. Proceeding on the basis of what we already know, we propose to deal in turn with (1)Variations from the typical, or sypplementary; (2) miscellaneous features not already considered at all owing to their slight inctdence, and therefore lack of statistical significance (occasional); (3) special items, impossible to classify; (4) texts of particulsr interest from the point of view of history in the sense of chronicle (historical); and finally (5) transitional, i.e. texts lying wholly outwith the special literary eategory bere in question, but having reference to saints or martyrs of such a kind as to require treatment at this stage in the investigation.

## I. Supplementary

In this section we follow the structure of the statistical part, treating in turn (a) names (b) designations (c) miscellaneous matter.
(a) Under the heading of names, we notice here certain items excluded from the list already drawn up on account of their irregularity, Biblical figures namely, themselves legendary or imaginary, and associated with well-known saints or otherwise regarded somewhat as holy characters. The texts in question are the following:-
cIII 45 scs DANIEL
bIV 107 bfm ofm (?) Petrus Florus et SUSANNA.....ionri...(?)
bIV 128 MICAEL Paulus
cIV 86 + sub hec sacroseo belamine altaris sunt memorie scor massae candidae sci Hesidori scor TRIU PUERORU sci Martini sei Romani
cIV 141 BB gaudete Petrus et LAZARUS rogo te domine suveni Criste tu solus medicus sanctis et penitentibus mare manib et pedibus de.

As will be seen, we have here Michael, presumably the Archangel; Daniel, Susanna, and the Three Youths; and Lazarus. Of these only Daniel and the Three Youths are directly called saints (or, holy). It is easy to see the reason for this: they provide excellent propotypes of the Christian martyrs themselves, since in all essentials their destiny was identical. It is natural to suppose that the main reason for their cult was the encouragement which the Christians Would derive from them, placed as they were before the same problem: as they are said to have triumphed in their time, so the Christians
trusted that they also would triumph, present afflictions and sufferings notwithstanding. With the implication of this hypothesis, namely that the cult of these O.T. figures must date from before the Peace of the Church, archaeological data agree: the catacombs abound in representations of Daniel flanked by lions, ${ }^{\frac{1}{)}}$ and of the Three Youths amid the flames of the furnace? ${ }^{2}$ Inscriptions mentioning Daniel are found in Podgoritz ${ }^{3}$ and Britain. ${ }^{4}$ ) The hymn of the Three Youths (Daniel iii $51-90$ ) is part of the Gallican Liturgy, ${ }^{5}$ ) and may be connected with the persecutions at Lugdunum and Vienna with which the history of the Church in these regions opens. ${ }^{6}$ )

It is less easy to account for the selection of the other figures. Lazarus must be the hero of the miraculous restoration to life, according to the tale current in the Johannine circle of the primitive Church ${ }^{7}$, ) of which numerous representations are to be found in the catacombs. 8) Presumably the reference is to the renewal of life in an eschatological sense; but see the discussion of the text in question from another point of view below (pp.190-191).

Susanna figures occasionally in the catacombs, between the two Elders; ${ }^{9}$ ) but the reference is not immendiately plain. Hippolytus however speaks of Susanna as typifying the Church, and the two Elders as the Jews and Pagans respectively, together therefore the whole nonChristian world ${ }^{l 0}$ Ggainst whose false calumnies we know the Early Church was obliged to defend itself. ${ }^{l l}$ We prefer this explanation to that of Wilpert, who sees in Susanna the Soul rescued from Satan ${ }^{12 \text { 2) }}$

[^14]Even more difficult in this respect is the case of Michael. One recalls however the tradition embodied in the much later prayer of the Roman Mass, to the effect that the Archangel Michael stands at the right hand of the altar of incense ( per intercessionem beati Michaelis Archangeli stantis a dextris altaris incensi,etc.), () so that Michael might conceivably be connectea with the thought of the sacrifice of the martyrs; but it is impossible to speak with anything like confidence here, evidence being entirely lacking. Michael figures along with Gabriel on another text, viz. cIII 527c : arcangelus Mikael et Gabriel s...c.e Crispinae martiris. Gabriel is known as the angel of the Annunciation. (Luke i 26-38)
(b) Passing now to designations, we find the word APOSTOLUS frequently used. We do not propose to reproduce the texts concerned, as they have all been mast satisfactorily examined already in a recent study, oneof the very few devoted to this type of problem? ) The conclusions reached in this paper, namely that the cult of the apostles preponderated in Numieia, and is to be referred chiefly to the Donatists' zeal for a spiritual as against on official or hierarchical principle, ${ }^{3 /}$ does but confirm our own results already obtained from the study of hagiographic texts in general on a large scale. Nothing essentially new emerges.

We note, however, the occurrence of the term INN"OCENS in the text CIV 17l: menoria sanctae Germanillae innocentis arw and are tempted to infer from ik the youthfulness of the martyr concerned. We note also one called a SANCTUS DEI, CIV 57.

1) Lietzmann kl T 19/11
2) W.H.Frend, The Memoriae Apostolorum in Roman North Africa (Journal of Roman Studies XXX i pp. 34-49) (1940)
3)ib.pp. 47-48

Quite the most interesting designation we encounter, however, is that found in bIV 138, namely Donatus mile(s) $X\left(p_{1}\right)$. We do not know who this Donatus is, whether the great Donatus, or simply an admirer who assumed his name; but apart from all such questions, this text is of great importance. It shows in a word the source whence the early Church derived its power to withstond persecution, namely the fierce instinct of pugnacity which was enlisted in the cause. The martyrs regarded themselves, not as unfortunates, or a mishandled minority, but as soldiers of Christ. A reference in Augustine (Enarr.in Psl32/2: milites Christi Agonistici appellantur. Utinam milites Christi essent, et non milites Diaboli, a quibus plus timetur DEO LAUDES quam fremitus leonis = The "Agonistics" call themselves soldiers of Christ. I wish they were soldiers of Christ, instead of soldiers of the Devil, a "praise be to God!" from whom is more to be feared than the roar of a lion.) has been responsible for the suggestion, that our Donatus is indeed a Donatist.) No doubt such is the case. Nevertheless the N.T. use of athleo, athlesis in connection with the idea of Christian service as a struggle demanding the discipline, alertness, and staying power of athletes, obviously a kinared conception, as well as its specialized application in the phrase of Lgnatius, vipye ws $\theta \in 0 \hat{u} \dot{\alpha} \theta \lambda \eta T \eta \eta^{\prime}\left(b e\right.$ sober as God's athlete) ${ }^{3)}$ serve to remind us that such a mode of thought was not confined to the schismatics. Moreover it vas by no means confinea to Africa. The Damasine epitaphs in Rome abound in military metaphors: of the martyrs Mereus and Achilles, it is there said that "having made their confession, they rejoiced to

1) $\operatorname{BSNAF}(1909) \mathrm{P} \cdot 213$
2) Souter, Lexicon 8 $k^{\prime} \gamma$
3) pros Polykarpon ii 3
carry the triumphs of Christ"(confessi gaudent Christi portare triumphos) ${ }^{1)}$; another stone mentions "the comrades of Xystus, who bear off the trophies from the enemy" (hic comites Xysti, portant qui ex hoste tropaea) ${ }^{2)}$; while Stephen is praised for bearing off the trophies from the enemy, being stoned by the Jews (Judaicus populus Stephanum meliora monentem perculerat saxis, tulerat qui ex hoste tropaeum) 3) Finally the famous epitaph of Pope Gregory the Great depicts the Christian mission as a military expedition, and speaks of Gregory's part in it (the conversion of the Angles) in these terms: "hisque Dei consul factus latare triumphis" (consul of God, made to rejoice in these triumphs) 4) Here in this laconic inscription (bIV 138) therefore, we have an authentic glimpse of the warlike spirit of the Early Church in general, and therewith one at least of the internal conditions of its ultimate supremacy in the ancient world.
(c) To our conclusions on the subject of memorial nomenclature we have occasion to add a few remarks on certain expressions.

We have seen that MENORIA may mean almost anything, from the most abstract to the most concrete, according to the extent to which it is interchangeable with NOMEN on the one hand, and RELIQUIAE on the other, i.e. syntactically (p.17l). We are able now to cite two examples of its use where MENSA would be in order, viz.:-
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { (1) bV } 65 & \text { _..MENORIA BEATISSIMORUM MARTYRUM... QUEM } \\ \text { (2) bRIMOSUS CAMBUS GENITORES DEDICAVERUNT.. } \\ \text { (2) MENORIA SANCTI STEFANI FACTA V IDUS DECEMBRES }\end{array}$
It is obvious that in order to be the object of such verbs as

1) Marucchi 431
2) Kaufmann,Handbuch 341
3) Kaufinann, Handiuch 344
4) Marucchi 458
"facere" and "dedicare", MEMORIA must be a solid structure, so that here we have, $4 f$ not a "mensa", then at least some kind of stone, to which MEMORIA is applied. Hence this is a case where MENORIA is to be translated simply by the word "memorial". These two inscriptions, therefore, although they introduce no essential novelty, serve to fill out the picture already sketched with the aid of our statistics.

Two inscriptions:-
bII 112 ... NOMINA EORUM VENERANDAQUE CORPORA...
bIV 125 CORPORA SUCCESSEANI ET CREMENTIAI......
inform us that the bodies of the heroes lie beneath the stones: to be sure, an effective stimulus to piety.

The use of the abstract noun DEPOSITIO,"deposition", from DEPONERE (see p. 182), leads to the discussion of a type of remains still more potent:-


First of all, DEPOSITIO itself calls for remark. How are we to render it in English? The syntax of cII 155 requires that we resort to some such circumlocution as "the place where Jucundus was buried.' In this case DEPOSITIO, formally abstract, must be materially concrete: it indicates the place of burial. bIV 35 on the contrary mentions the date and therewith suggests the formula: DEPOSITIO $=$ act of setting-down, so that in this instance DEPOSITIO is plainly abstract. Hence this particular problem does not admit of a decision.

But bIV 35 has something much more important to tell us: it speaks of the "blood of the holy martyrs" as having been set down in this particular spot: Moreover it will be observed that the word chosen is not the prosaic SANGUIS, but the poetic CROOR, which we must presume to have had a more noble ring, a wish for solemnity thus coming to expression as the controlling factor in the redaction of this type of text. SANGUIS does in fact occur however, together with the phrase DEPOSITIO CRUORIS, namely at Rome (venrbl sanguis beat Bonfatii), where moreover phials showing red stains, thought to represent blood, have been known to exist in the catacombs since the sixteenth century? This must be the meaning of our African text: the blood must have been collected in a eapsule of some kind, although there is no longer any trace of any such article to confirm this theory. However that may be, we can well understand the religious pleasure to be derived from the possession of what Tertullian, in an aphorism now sufficiently celebrated to be frequently misquoted, once called "seed! 2) But of all blood, without doubt Christ's was the most precious; and its presence in Africa (!!!) is attested plainly enough by cV 114 HSXII CRUOR E EUSEBI MARTYRIS, "here is placed (?) the blood of Christ (Xti) and (that) of the martyr Eusebius". To be sure, the reading is somewhat doubtful; but none other seems at all possible. Moreover our material contains further texts the consideration of which may help us to reconcile ourselves to such an interpretation; for no fewer than three items can be cited, two of them flurth century, which claim to guard fragments of the Cross of Christ! They read:-

1) Kraus RE ii 260-261
2) Tert.Apol. 50: semen est sanguis Christianorum


That is to say: here in Africa are to be found, according to the inscriptions, not only the relics of the martyrs, including the very blood they shed, but even relics of Our Lor d Himself, His cross namely and his blood. It must be confessed that this is most extraordinary! The question is forced to the suriace: can we be sure that the claims have a historic foundation?

Quite apart from our reluctance, on general groundsise the so, topographical distribution of the texts concerned yields a decisive answer in the negative. It is to be observed that they are confined wholly to the Western part of the country. No examples occur where we should naturally expect intercourse with the Eastern Mediterranean to be liveliest, nanely in Zeugitana. Instead, they are found only in ITumidia and Mauretania, that is, precisely where we know the martyrs to have been most zealously venerated. The conclusion is obvious: we have here to deal with pious $\operatorname{Irauds}$, the dernand for religious stimulus creating the supply.

## 2. Occasional

Features of this class we propose dividing into (a) those connected with the passion, (b) those with the deposition, (c) those with the personal life of the hero, to which groups we will append a short treatment of (d) miscellaneous rare itens.
(a) Several inscriptions make quite explicit reference to the passion of the martyr, for which the current verb is naturally PATIOR, found in the participial form PASSUS or PASSI, in apposition to the noun or proper name (cII 13; cIII 20; bIV 135; bV 65,82,84) $\frac{1}{2}$ In every case where the text is entire, the date is given. One inscription mentions the "passion of the martyrs", III NON SEPT PASSIONE MARTURORUM...(CIV 57) although the accidence of the word is not at all clear; and twice the indicative mood of the verb occurs, namely in bII ll2 QUI PASSI SUNT, and bIV 35 QUI SUNT PASSI, i.e., "who suffered" Only one text (cIV 86) details the mode of suffering(p.172): the heroes in question suftered martyrdom in the limestone quarry at Utical)

CONFITEOR, the verb "to make confession" appears twice in this connection: bV 8, CONFESSUS EST JUSTUS = Justus made confession, and cV 10 QUI BENE CONFESSI VICERUNT ARMA MALIGNA = who by a good confession vanquished the forces of evil. In the text cIV 135, LABORAVIT CA JULIA DI//A/TUR JANUARIUS = on the kalends of July Januarius, martyr of God, dia labour, the verb laborare signifies the act of suffering martyrdom. Finally, the common expression SPIRITUM REDDERE = to yield up the Spirit is used of Robba (cV 157). It has already been observed ( p .175 ) that far from pitying themselves, the martyrs exulted in their fate, because they viewed

[^15]it as a moral achievement. Our texts give further evidenca of this feeling. The Robba just mentioned is said to have "deserved the dignity of martyrdom"(cV 157:... MERUIT DIGNITATE MARTIRI). Martyrdom was reckoned an honour, because it was envisaged as a battle waged against the powers of wickedness, the martyrs on that account being thereby made worthy of military decoration at the hand of Christ. (cv 10:... QUI BENE CONFESSI VICERUNT ARMA MAJIGNA PRAEMIA VICTOES CRISTI MERUERE CORONAM $=$ who by a good confession vanquished the arms of wickedness: as victors they were deserving of Christ's crown, their prize.) (the grammatical question, whether Cristi is to be construed with victores or with corona, not affecting the meaning to any extent). Hence the generalization bIV 153:DIGNIS DIGNA: MERENTIBUS CORONAM:... ( $=$ to the worthy, worthy things; to those who deserve it, a crown....) with which we may compare the inscription found at Milan,"..et a Domino coronati sunt beati confessores comites martyrum", i.e., and the blessed confessors, the comrades of the martyrs, were crowned by the Lord. ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) But to fight for the Lord, and to obtain the victor's crown from Him, is also to win a place in his Kingdom; and therefore the famous saint of Tipasa, St. Salsa, "deserved to dwell blessed in heaven for ever" (MERUIT CAELO SEMPER HABITARE BEATA, CV 50). All such passages reveal to us a further ground for the heroic behaviour of the persecuted Church, namely the thorough-going eschatological orientation of the early faith. Pre-occupied with the contemplation of heavenly joys, the faithful could afford to scorn earthly comfort. This entire complex of ideas is already found in the apocalyptically-conditioned thinking of the primitive period. (Romans viii 18, First Peter i 6-7 etc., compare remarks above on the subject of the athletic metaphor, p.175).
(b) POSITUS or DEPOSITUS is the regular word used of the setting-down of relics or remains. The agent is indicated usually by means of A with the ablative, as in cII 167,197; cIV 150; cIII 527; cV 211. Alternatively the phrase PER MANUS c. gen., ( = by the hands of...) is uded, as in cIII l, cIV lll,124. In a few instances the relics are said to have been deposited IN PACE, (in peace,) viz., cIII l, cIV l26. In two cases they are deposited in the name of the Trinity. (cIV 124, IN NOMINE PATRI ET FILI ET SP SCI, cIV 154,IN NOMINE PATRIS ET FILI ET SPS SCI). It will be noticed that this development is late. The wealth of detail, for instance the recording of the names of those who were responsible for the"deposition", indicates the importance attached to the ceremony. Otherwise it is difficult to attach much significance to these variations from the typical forms, where as here such a small number of texts is concerned.
(c) Frequently a group of martyrs is disposed of collectively on the inscriptions. This is most often done by mentioning one of them, probably the most outstanding of them, by name, and adding the parase ¢...and his companions". This may be represented either by ET COMITES EJUS(cIII 586,bIV 140) or by CUM SOCIIS SUIS (cIV 124). The group may be called after the scene of suffering, as in bV 123:-

Memoria scorum martyrum Vincenti et Centumarbor -Ensium

The memorial of the holy martyrs
$=$ Vincent and the Centumarborensians
in which we are right in taking CENTUMARBORENSIUM as meaning "men of Centum Arbores", rather than " a hundred men from Arbores", as is seen from another stone erected to the same group, viz. bV 8:-

Nomina marturum qui ad CENTUM ARBORES (sc confessi sunt,) XXX $y$ (inter quibus) $\not \subset \not \subset \not \subset$ confessus est Justus
$=\ldots$ who confessed at Centum Arbores to the number of 36 , including

Justus. Similarly another inscription reads IC ABENTUR RLQUE SCRUM C ET VIII, i.e. here we have the relics of the 108 saints (cIV 153). It is obvious that in such cases we have to deal with mass executions, the victims being known only locally, and even then, not by name. The custom of collective citation thus affords us a terrible picture of the indiscriminate butchery of Christian by the score perpetrated by the Imperial government, and witnesses to the desperate ferocity of the struggle fought out between Christianity and the State. Mass executions of this kind were of course known outside Africa, as inscriptions show.)

The word NATALE is used of saints, not only in Africa (DIV 140, cIV 272) but elsewhere also, for example in Rome. ${ }^{2}$ ) Our African texts illustrate the use of this expression very plainly:-

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { cIV } \begin{array}{c}
272 \text { natale domni } \\
\text { Pascenti die.. } \\
\text {. karl J....... } \\
\text { hIV } 140
\end{array} \begin{array}{l}
\text { *II idus Juntas } \\
\text { natale sc Varagi et } \\
\text { comit.......jus }
\end{array}=
\end{gathered}
$$

Pascentius on the...
day of J. . . . . . . . . . .

* 3 days before the Ides of
June, the "natale" of saint Varagius and his companions

It is clear that however we may be at liberty to translate the word in cIV 272 , it is exceedingly improbable that it can mean "birthday" in the case of DIV 140, where a number of martyrs are celebrated in the same "natale". We find a clue to its meaning in the ancient "Martyrdom of Polycarp":-(xviii 2-3)


Thus we at last took up his bones,... and put them where it was meet. There the Lord will permit us to come together,... and celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom.
(tr.Kirsopp Lake)(ii 337)
1)
Di 2003
2) $D i$
2114A,2115,2121

From this instance it is obvious that, if we equate NATALE with $\gamma \in V^{\prime} \in \lambda$ iok as we presumably should, the resultant meaning is, not the birthday of the saint, but the anniversary of his martyrdom. The passage quoted explains moreover the purpose of noting this date, namely the subsequent celebration or rather observance of the martyrdom year by year, much as one notes the date of a person's bifth for the same purpose. On the evidence it seems better to regard NATALE as generalized in this manner, than to see in it a mystical reference to the new life begun in heaven, ${ }^{1}$ ) although it is not of course thereby denied, that such an interpretation would readily suggest itself to the pious of that age, namely as a second thought.
(d) Under the heading of miscellaneous features we wish to draw attention in the first place to a small but interesting group of inseriptions which speak of God and Hie saints in one and the same breath. The following text will illustrate this juxtaposition:bIV 161
he dornus di nos.... here is the house of (our?) God...
he avitatio sps sci p... = here dwells the Holy Spirit.....
he memoria beati martibis $=$ here is the memory of the blessed martyr, advocate of God,...mer
Now if, following the editors (CIL8 17614, Monceaux 267, Diehl 1830), we regard $P$ at the end of line 2 as the first letter of $P(A R A C L E T I)$, and thereby connect the thought with the N.T. doctrine of the Spirit's intercession before God on behalf of men ${ }^{2}$ ) we see at once in this text the assimilation fer of the role of the martyr to that of the Third Person of the Godhead: the saint, in other words, functions as an intermediary, being less indeed than God, but greater than Man.

1) Kraus $R E$ ii 483
2) Romans viii $26-27$

Such an text cIV ll4, of whose literal meaning we cannot even be sure:-

IC SEDES SANCT
IC RECISIO CAUSE
IC IN CRISTO FLORIAT
here is the seat of the saints (?) here the lawsuit(?) is reversed(?) here may (one) prosper(?) in Christ
while it may also provide the underlying assumption of another curious text found inscribed on a reliquary, viz. cIV 146:-
+ECCE LOCUS INQUIRENDI DNM behold the place for inquiring of the $+\frac{\text { EX TOTO CORDE AMEN XPE }+}{+ \text { IN ISTO VASO SCO CONGREG- }}=\frac{\text { Lord with all the heart. Amen. } 0 \text { Christ }}{\text { In this sacred vessel were gathered }}$
ABANTUR MEMBRA XI + together the limbs of Christ.
where the interpretation turns on the sense we assign to the enigmatic phease MENBRA XI. Excluding in advance the possibility of the remains of Christ Himself, for which we can adauce no parallel, and which would agree ill with the tradition of the Ascension, ${ }^{\frac{1}{l}}$ ) we naturally think first of all of the Church generally as the Body of Christ (the Head) of which believers are members.) But before our inscription can make sense we must see our way to recognize in the phrase Membra Christi a circumlocution for "saints! By means of a quotation from Gennadius (saec V) Gage enables us to do this.) The passage in question runs:-4)

| sanctorum corpora, et praecipue (We believe that) the bodies of the |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| beatorum martyrum reliquias, ac saints, especially the remains of |  |
| si CHRISTI MEMBRA sincerissime | the blessed martyrs, are to be most |
| honoranda, et basilicas erum | sincerely venerated, as if they were |
| nominibus appellandas......... | the limbs of Christ, and that |
| Eredimus] | basilicas should be called after |
| their names. |  |

The MEMBRA XI of our text are therefore martyrs' relics, representing the saints themselves as providing media by which to approach God Himself (ecce lacus inquirendi dnm etc.). Otherwise there is no very obvious connection between the two parts of ths double inscrip境n.
1)Acts i 9
2) Cor $I / x i 112$
3RA xxix (1929/1)p.140
4)De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticie(PL Iviii 42/1219)

This hypothesis would account also for the juxtapositions encountered in the following three Byzantine seals:t

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { cIV } 203 \\
& \text { " } 204 \\
& \text { " } 205 \\
& =J(\text { esus }) \operatorname{Ch}(\text { rist }) / \text { Saint Leontius } \\
& \mathrm{M} \theta / \mathrm{ANK}=\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{Mother} \text { of God/Saint Nikolas } \\
& .0 / \text { ATNI.. }=\text { do. } / \text { do. }
\end{aligned}
$$

In our view the implication is the same in all three: the Deity, whether represented by Christ or the Virgin Mary (to whom there are numerous dedications in this period, as will later be shown) is to be approached by way of the saint whose name is given.

Quite the most remarkable of all the texts of interest in this connection remains however to be mentioned, namely a dedication (bIV 9) made
I NOMINE PATRIS $\quad=\quad$ in the name of the Father
ET FILII DONI $\quad$ Son, and Saint Montanus. (:!:)

MUNTANI
in which the place of the Holy Spirit is taken by St. Montanus. In other words, St. Montanus is assimilated to the Holy Spirit, the Third Person of the Godhead, and enjoys apotheosis within the bounds of Christian Theology. (compare pp.161-162!) And if we further ask, as is natural, in what section of the Church this process could be carried to such a length, there can scarcely be any doubt in view of the saint's name: dominus Muntanus can here be no other than the notorious Montanus himself. It is not difficult to recognize the Montanist tendency operating here: namely, the ideal of the charismatic apostolate of the primitive community, whereby the Christians of the first generation spoke, not as mere men, but as inspired by the Holy Spirit, as indeed merely its vehicles, through which the Spirit spoke; so that, in the last resort, what they said was not of themselves, but of God, God thereby speaking through their mouths of Himself. (Acts ii l-13 etc.)

Hence the enthusiastic language of the Montanist prophets which so much shocked the Catholics of the day. Thus for example Maximilla is credited by contemporary controversialists with sayings like these:-


 and Power

- Eusebius HE v 16/171)


while to Montanus himself the following utterances are ascribed:-



- Epiphanies ib. ${ }^{3}$

Eyio Kúplos óbzios on


$=I$ the Lord God Omnipotent have come down in (the shape of) a man

- Epiphanies ib 4 )
$=I$ am the Father and the Son and the Paraclete
- Didymus De Trin.iii 41. ${ }^{\text {5 }}$

It is clear that our inscription springs from this selfsame tradition, as it is the only one in which such language was possible. The presence however of the apocalyptic letters Alpha and Omega flanking the Chi-Rho monogram which the stone bears suggests the close of the 4 th century: have we any right to speak of Montanism at so late a date? If nat, we can only ascribe the text to a Donatist, for the possibility of a Catholic source seems out of the question.

[^16]Proceeding further with our miscellaneous texts, we notice two cruciform monograms of the type familiar on Byzantine seals (see below) both from Zeugitana:-


cIII 587

(Petros?)
(Sanctus?)
which are however of archaedlogical rather than of epigraphical interest, witnessing as they do to the use of the cross in ancient art.

The Hebrew word of affirmation ANEN occurs twice (cIV 146, cV 211). Finally we notice a solitary example of wit, namely the dedication bIV 142:-

FE/ICI SA(ncto) To Saint Felix.
VITA FELI (X) $=$ A happy life (vita felix)
IN DEO
and a N.T. quotation,(cII 13):-
. .GLORIA IN
ESCELSIS DEO $=$ in the highest
ET IN TERRA

$$
=\quad \text { and on earth }
$$

PACS OMINIBUS
in God.
(c)
200

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { and on eartn } \\
& \text { peace to men (Luke ii } 14 \text { ) }
\end{aligned}
$$

in which the famous arux, namely the double (Eastern-Western) tradition of the underlying Greek $\epsilon \mathcal{\nu} \delta$ ok' $\alpha$ (s)is suppressed. (souter ad loc.)

## 3. Special

We are now well out of the region of typical, recurring features, and require to treat individually such texts as have not hither to been considered, or at most incompletely considered in other connections and not for their own sake.

We begin with two inseriptions which have this in common, namely that they speak of the "seat" of the saints, and contain short and
pithy sayings, namely cIV 62 and cIV 247:-

| cIV 62 | .. HAEC PETRI PAULIQUE SEDES CRISTO JUBENTE RESURGIT | ; ; this is the seat of Peter and $=$ Paul. At the command of Christ he rises. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cIV 247 | SANCTORUM SEDES DOMU DOMINI A $(f) w$ QUI PURE PETIT ACCIPIT | the seat of the saints the house of the Lord <br> $=$ who purely seeks receives |

The application of cIV 62 is not at once plain. We recall, however, the miracles attributed to both the apostles mentioned, namely by Peter ${ }^{\text {land }}$ by Paul.) In both cases the apostle cures a cripple, who then rises and walks. The instance of Peter is especially $\not \subset$ interesting because of the closeness of the parallel with the words of our inscription:-


And Peter said to him: "O Aeneas, Jesus Christ is curing you. Stand up = and make your bed yourself." And immediately he stood up.

Here we have the healing virtually ascribed to Christ (Cristo jubente:) In the light of this inscription, therefore, ( if this is its right interpretation) we venture to infer that the cripples frequented the spots consecrated to the memory of the two apostles (sedes = seat; almost, headquarters) in the hope of being cured of their complaint. Otherwise it would be hard to account for such an inscription as this. The aphorism of cIV 247 , on the other hand, does not appear to rest on any Biblical reminiscence. On the contrary, its rigorism in the insertion of the qualifying adverb "pure" is quite foreign to the well-known "ask,..seek,..knock,..." invitation of the primitive tradition of God's free grace. (Mt vii 7-8), although it may have been suggested by the later Johannine condition,"in my name"(John xv 16).

1) Acts ix 34
2) Acts xiv 8-10

Doubtless we should trace this inscription to the quarter where such perfectionism was the rule, namely the Donatist party.

Peter and Paul figure in another text, which opens with the following curious (ablative absolute?) construction:-

bV 63 \begin{tabular}{l}
POSTULANTIBUS A <br>
CREATORE DEO ${ }^{2}$.

$=$

seeking of (Christ?), <br>
God the Creator......
\end{tabular}

which might be interpreted in the sense of cIV 62 (p.189), that is, as an appeal for healing, Peter and Paul, MEMORIA SANGTORUM PETRI ET PAULI) being invoked in this connection. This would likewise explain the use of "creator", if we read into this title the thought, that God, Who created man, can likewise heal him. It is of comparatively little moment whether we see in ${ }^{p}$ a mere ornament, ork genuine suspension for CHRistus. Either way, the significance of the inscription is plain enough: the apostles are here regarded as the mediators of God's healing power.

Such may be the context of a baffling text half of which was found in 1921, (he other half in 1924, ${ }^{2}$ ) namely the Timgad stone cIV 14I, which for the moment it is wise to leave untranslated:-

> BB /GAUDETE PETRUS ET LAZARUS ROGO TE DOMINE SUVENI CRISTE TU SOLUS MEDICUS SANCTIS ET PENITENTIBUS MARE MANIB ET PEDIBUS DE. . . . .

Here first of all $B B$ is the familiar Donatist acclamation BONIS BENE, which falls to be discussed on p,225 (which see). The text is therefore a Donatist production. GAUDETE is prima facie plain enough: "rejoice ye!" The apostle Peter and one Lazarus follow in

[^17]the nominative, and not the vocative: hence the exhortation cannot be addressed to them, but to the passers-by. ROGO TE DOMINE is quite straightforward: "I beseech Thee O Lord!" So is SUVENI CRISTE TU SOLUS MEDICUS: "Help, O Christ, Thou only Healer:" But now comes the crux: what are we to do with SANCTIS ET PENITENTIBUS MARE MANI RUS ET PEDIBUS DE... ? How are we to relate "saints and penitents" and "hands and feet"? What does MARE mean? And what follo=ws DE...? Monceaus reads "matrem manibus et pedibus defendentibus" and Albertini "amare manibus et pedibus Deum", two totally different meanings thereby resulting!) Where the experts fall out, we are thrown on our own resources. Neglecting therefore the lacuna DE....which is too slenđer to support any conjecture, recalling that the saints are spoken of elsewhere (p. I85!) as the "limbs of Christ", this then being the explanation of the parallelism: "saints \& penitents" "hands \& feet", and bringing the entire phrase into connection with the verb SUVENI, we gain the following sense:-

Rejoice ye! Peter and Lazarus. I beseech Thee, O Lord: O Christ, Thou only Healer, come to the aid of Thy saints and penitents, whose Head Thou art?

Here, to be sure, MARE is not accounted for; but a broad understanding becomes possible. "Medicus" as a title of Christ recalls Apollo's epithet "medicinalis!" Lazarus, as we know, was raised from the dead by Christ ${ }^{3)}$ : without doubt an emphatic example of Christ's healing power: Peter moreover wrought miracles of healing in Christ's name 4 ) Here therfore is the cult of Christ the Healer, CHRISTUS MEDICUS. Passing now to another topic, we note cIV 57:-

1) CRAIBL 1924 p. 80
2) Richter,Lat. Sacralinschr. 38
3)John xi 1-46
3) p. 189 hereof

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { MEMORAMINI IN CONSPECTU } \\
& \text { DNI CUARUM NOMINA SCIT }=\frac{\text { We call to mind in the sight }}{\text { of the Lord those whose names }} \\
& \text { IS QUI FECIT......... }
\end{aligned}
$$

The suggestion, that the mere names of the saints possessed a mysterious potency, and were solemnly repeated by the faithful, almost it would seem as a kind af charm, appears to be implied here. Another document, cIV 119:-

HIC LOCUS LUCET SEMPER = this spot shines forever (with the?) MEMORIA JULIANI SCI DI - memory of Julian, a saint of God
is of special interest, since whether the first line be taken as syntactically depended on or independent of the second, the meaning is one and the same: the merits of St. Julian bestow quite literally a "lustre" to his very tomb, which possesses a quality of phosphorescence for all ages to come, exactly like the Baraka which adheres to the tomb of a Marabout in Moslem Africa to-day (pp. 588-9).

The last inscription we propose to quote in this somewhat diffuse section is a metrical tribute to Saint Salsa ( cV 50 ). Unfortunately the stone is in fragments, and for the greater part of its length makes scarcely any sense, owing to the numerous lacunae. The tenor, however, of the following sequence, the kernel of the document, is Dlain enough:-

| HIC EST SALSA DULCIOR |  | here is Salsa, sweeter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NECTARE SEMPER QUAE |  | than nectar at all times, |
| MERUIT CAELO SEMPER |  | who deserved to dwell forever |
| HABITARE BEATA. |  | blessed in heaven |

It is unusual, on martyrs' memorials, to find such an emphatic impression retained of the martyr's personal qualities. At the same time, this particular example has definitely literary pretensions, so that too serioms a view of its language is out of place. Its eschatology has already been discussed (p.181).

## 4. Historical

Schwarme having already related the Christian inscriptions to the chronicaf of the African Church, (see Introduction) we chose on principle to disregard this aspect of our material. Yet the martyrs' memorials include a few items of special interest from this point of view, and these we now propose to examine.

Our first text of this kind, which provides a link with the Decian Persecution, is cII 197:-

| HIC ABENTur RELIQUIE |  | cs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEATi MARTIRIS ET |  | of the blessed martyr and overseer |
| ANTISTITIS CYPRIANI | $=$ | Cyprian. (They were) set down by |
| DPS A BEAT MELLEO EPCO |  | the blessed bishop Melleus in the |
| AN IIII DMNIJUSTINI IMPS |  | fourth year of our Lord Emperor |
| (a.568-569) |  | Justin (i.e.,Justin II) |

In view of the title martyr, and especially of the title antistes (lit. a president, or overseer) which, especially in poetry, recurs from time to time as a more magnificent alternative to episcopus as the designation of specially revered bishops, (his Cyprian can only be the great Cyprian of Carthage. Here, then, we have a text which tells of the deposition of relics of this famous man. Prespumably the bones are meant, and the remains must have been exhumed in order to make the transfer possible. The Melleus concerned is unknown.

From the same region, and curiously enough also within the last decade, comes a text of more than ordinary interest, viz. bII Il2. It is a mosaic from basilica pavement in Ammaedara, commemorating, more than thirty local victims, (by name, of the persecution of Diocletian, which is likewise specified therein. There is no other inscription like it in all the Archaeology of the Early Church.

Here follows the text of it:-1)

GLORIOSISSIMIS BEATISSIMISQUE MARTYRIBUS QUI PERSECUTIONEM DIOCLETIANI ET MAXIMINIANI DIVINIS LEGIBUS PASSI SUNT QUORUM CORPORA HOC LOCO DEPOSITA APUD DEUM IN AETERNUM MANENT〈H〉IS CUI DIVINITUS INSPIRARE HOC IN ANIMO DIGNAT US EST NOMINA EORUM BENERANDAQUE CORPORA ANACLITIS LAPIDEIS
CUM ERMULIS ADQUE MENSA CONCLUSIT
UNDE DIVINE CLEMENTIE CUM SUIS
OMNIBUS MARCELLUS ILLUSTRIS
GRATIAS AGIT QUI MEMORIAE
MARTYRUM MERITA EXOPTATA VOTA COMPLEVIT FELIX SEMPER VIVAT QUI INTENTISSIME LEGERIT FELICIOR QUI DEO OMNIPOTENTI PER CHRISTUM EJUS TOTA FIDE CREDIDERIT +

To the most glorious and blessed martyrs who suffered the persecution of Diocletian and Miximian for the divine laws, whose bodies, deposited in this place, remain with god forever, one reckoned worthy of this inspiration(???) covered in their relics and venerable bodies with slanting stones, pillars, and a tablet: wherefor the illustrious Marcellus together with all his household rendere thanks to the divine mercy, and fulfilis to the memory of the martyrs his vows, which are their boon and due. Happy may he always live who reads with close attention: happier he who trusts Almighty God through His Christ with all his confidence.+ cumpecto
(Here follow the names of the martyrs,
written on two columns, to left \& right):-
(Left)
JANUARIE DOVITIAN
APR.....
...TO...
.......NI
MAXIMIN.
VIC.....
SECUNDIAN
SUCESSI
. ROCESSI
COMITI
PURPURI
PULENTI
POMPONI
.....TI
.....DIIS
.......DI
(Right)
D..........
S.........
B. ........
M. .........

BOI.......
PRIMAB
PRIMOSE
VAIENDI
...VARIE
VINCENT.
JULIAE
FELICITATIS
PROBULI
LIBOSI
LICINI
SATURNIE
FORTUNI

This inscription, which appears to belong to the end of the 4 th century, is in parts obscure on account of its peculiar literary character; but

[^18]as a whole its meaning is plain. Among the names, one notes a few already known, including the famous Felicitas: for the rest, they are hitherto unknown, presumably local heroes? () Apart from its historical interest, the inscription confirms the results already forthcoming; from the literary viewpoint, however, it belongs to a mixed category, being fundamentally a dedication ex-voto, and as such falls to be considered along with hother texts of this type in the next section. Historically it is quite a valuable adaition to our knowledge of the persecutions, in that it witnesses to the vast number of heroes who suffered at that time, but whose fame was confined to their own locality.

As might be expected, the Persecution of Diocletian is the occasion for more than one document of this kind. In fact, it is natural to ascribe the bulk of martyrdoms commemorated to this final and most desperate persecution. ${ }^{2}$ ) of particular interest however is the following text, already considered in another connection (bIV 35):-

TERTIU IDUS $\boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ JUNIAS
DEPOSITIO CRUORIS SANCTORUM MARTURUM QUI SUNT PASSI SUB PRESIDE FLORO IN CIVITATE MILEVITANA IN DIEBUS TURIFICATIONIS INTER QUIBUS HIC INNOC...IPSE IN PACE

Three days before the Ides of June. The deposition of the blood of the holy martyrs who suffered under Florus the President in the town of Milevum in the days of incense-burning: among whom this (man) Innoc(ens) is himself at peace.

Florus we know to have Governor of Africa under Diocletian, and to have applied the test of"turification" i.e. burning incense to the gods in an attempt to stamp out Christianity. ${ }^{3)}$ Presumably those to whose memory this inscription was set up refused to burn incense.

1) An Boll $54 / 314$
2) Monceaux HLAC iii 177-178
3) von Soden, Urkunden nr. 5 (kI T 122 p .7 )

Our next example, bV 65, we give in the first place without comment:-

MEMORIAE ENNAGI ET SEXTI KL AG
MEMORIA BEATISSIMORUM MARTYRUM ID EST ROGATI MATENNI NASSEI MAXIMAE QUEM PRIMOSUS CAMBUS GENI TORES DEDICAVERUNT PASSI XII KAL NOVM

K ( CCXC PROV ( a. 329)
(to the?)memory of Ennagius and Sextus, the Kalends of August The"memory"of the most blessed martyrs, namely Rogatus,
$=$ Matennus, Nasseus, and Maxima, $=$ dedicated by their parents, Primosus and Cambus. They suffered twelve days before the Kalends of November (in the year) 290 of the Province.

Memoriae Ennagi et Sexti kl Ag is a later addition (p.176)
In view of the date (329) it is extremely unlikely that the martyrs in question belong to the Diocletian Persecution, as Duchesne and Rossi, on the basis of an extensively emended entry in the Hieronomian calendar, suggest: ${ }^{1)}$ it is almost certain that the text refers to those fallen in the Catholic $v$. Donatist struggle?) Whether they be Catholics or Donatists, however, we do not know, and apparently have no means of finding out. On the whole we judge it more likely that they were Donatists, in view of the general tendency of all minorities and nonconformist bodies to regard themselves as martyrs to the truth, and their opponents as traitors.

There is no doubt at least about the Donatist origin of our next example, namely cV 157, which is strietly speaking an epittaph:-
MEM ROBBE SACRA DEI
GERMANA...HONOR...
QU. . ESIRENS..EPI..
CAEDE TRADITORUM
VEXATA MERUIT DIGN-
ITATE MARTIRI VIXIT
ANIS I ET REDDIDIT
SPM DIE VIII KAL
APRILES PRO CCCXCV ( 8.434 )
(to the?)memory of Robba, cousin of Honoria(?)............... ???.......................... molested by the slaughter of the "traitors", she deserved the dignity of martyrdom. She lived for 50 years and yielded up (her) spirit on the 8th day before the Kalends of April (in the yearof the) Province 395
L)Di LAI 191 n.
2) Won Soden, Urkunden no. 34 .

The decisive phrase here is "caede traditorum vexata". During the Persecution of Diocletian, the term "traditor" was applied to anyone who gave up copies of the Scriptures to the pagan authorities.' The Donatist schism began when it was pointed out that the Catholic clergy included many who during the persecution had been guilty of handing over the scriptures in this manner?) Henceforward the Donatists never wearied of speaking of the Catholics as "traditores!' In this inscription, therefore, we are told that Robba suffered at the hands of the "traditores" ( Traditorum taken as subjective genitive). The information, moreover, that she well deserved the glory of martyrdom (meruit aignitatem martyrii) shows how the Donatists continued to multiply their saints, regarding the Catholics as for this purpose equivalent to the pagans, their victims therefore as Christion heroes.

The last of our texts to be adduced in this connection is strictly speaking not a Chureh document at all, but a state titulus. Even then only the skill of de Rossi has been able to locate its historical situation. From the fragments (here indicated as usual by capitals) we gather that a persecution of some kind is in question. De Rossi's restoration of the lacunae (minuscules here) enables us to refer the document to the pacific policy adopted by Hilderic towards the Church on the death of his predecessor Thrasamuna. According to this interpretation, the text records the liberating of the Catholic Church from persecution at the hands of the Arian (Vandal) party3)

1) Acta $\operatorname{ss}$ Saturnini etc.,ii
2) von Soden, Urkunden no. 6 A ( $\mathrm{kl} \mathrm{T} \mathrm{nr} 122 \mathrm{p} .8-9$ )
3) Schwarze, Untersuchungen p. 172

Here follows this text (cIV 115):-

IN NOMINE domiNI Et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi tempore DOmiNI Hildericis regis Qui... IongaMQUE PERSECUTIONEM PAcaVIT HANC ECCLESIAM.

> In the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the time of our Lord King Hilderic
> $=\quad$ who....quelled...and long persecution, this church...

At best, however, this last example tells us very little, and nothing at all that is new. We therefore pass immediately to consider the texts of our last class, $\not \subset n$ namely those texts which, although of themselves not primarily memorials to the martyrs or saints, seive nevertheless to supplement them, and to that extent should be treated along with them.

## 5. Transitional

In addition to the genuine martyrs' memorials which form the nucleus of our hagiographic texts, there are a few peripheral items Which fall to be discuased here, those namely which, although they belong fundamentally to a distinct literary category ( ten dedications ex-voto, one invocation, five epitaphs, and one State document) contain significant references to the saints, and on that account claim attention at this stage.

Dedications ex-voto as a class will be considered fully later on. In the meantime it will be dufficient to remark, that they are by no means a fresh creation of the Christian spirit, but on the contrary, are found first of all in connection with the worship of pagan gods, recording the discharge of vows previously undertaken.)

1) Eitéquenf Dessau, Lateinische Epigraphik 31-32

We have already made the acquaintance of one such document, viz. bII 112, and the full text has been reproduced on p .194. It is an exceptional document in every respect, but is in the last resort constituted a dedication ex-voto by the unambiguous phrase: VOTA COMPLEVIT ( discharged the vows). There is no great difficulty in understanding wherein the discharge of these vows lay: it is natural to conclude from the inseription, that this particular man, a citizen of Ammaedara of some standing (illustris!) had vowed to the "glorious dead" that he would fashion a splendid mosaic of this kind over their remains.

Such indeed is the natural interpretation of all the more nearly typical texts of this kind also, as in bIV $20 \ldots$...HIC CONFEcerunt VOTUM (...here they completed their vow) and CIV 134...UNA CUM CONJUGE ET FILIS VOTUM PERFECIT. (.. together with his wife and sons carried out his vow.)

A common variation of the distinctive votive formula is encountered in bIV 34:-

* nomina marturou... FORTUNATU QUOD = PROMISIT FECIT

The names of the martyes... Fortunatus did what he promised.
and in bIV 9, a text already familiar in another connection (p.186):-

FLABIUS ABUS DOMESTICUS I NOMINE PATRIS ET FILII DONI MUNTANI QUOD PROMISIT COMPLEVIT $O$ ( $W$

Flavius Avus(?)"domesticus" in the name of FATHER, SON, and
= Sat. MONTANUS, completed what he had promised

Two examples of the use of the verb REDDERE = to give back, to return, ar久 found:-

cIV HIC MERIA SANCTI...<br>127 FLORIDUS PRB VOTUM IN XPO REDDIDI



This latter text unfortunately breaks off at a point where we might see our way to determine the syntax of PORTICUm. As it is, the word seems to be in apposition to VOTUM, whence we conclude that the way Exupius chose of paying his vow was to build a doorway, presumably as a part-subscription to the fabric fund of a new basilica.

It will be observed with reference to both these texts just reproduced, that in each case the donor emphasised the Godward direction of his vow: in the ofmer instance, the wow is paid ostensibly to the martyr, but "in Christ", that is to say, ultimately to Christ, in accordance with the Christianizing function of this and kindred expressions!) In the latter, "in the name of God" is in the closest imaginable juxtaposition to "in the name of the martyrs" and takes precedence over it. It is natural for us to see in these details the expression of a wish to make it plain to all whom it may concern that the vows in question are quite distinct from their pagan prototypes, inasmuch as they are directed not to pagan gods but to the One God revealed in Jesus Christ.

However that may be, the following example leaves no room whatever for doubting that the vow which it records was made to the martyrs themselves (cV 10) :-

MARTIRIB SANCTIS PROMISSA
COLONICUS INSONS SOLVIT
VOTA SUA LAETUS CUM
CONJUGE SUA. . .

Colonicus, blameless man, together with his wife joyfully
$=$ discharges to the holy martyrs the vows he promised.
(for rest of text see p .181 )
1)e.g.I Cor vii 39

Dedications ex-voto resembling those hitherto adduced, and like them device in honour of the martyrs, are not confined to Africa. It is of interest to note that examples of exactly the same pious custom are found at Rome, Aquileia, and elsewhere in the Empire. ${ }^{\text {3) }}$

We conclude this subsection on dedications ex-voto by quoting two items of special interest:-
cIV HIC MEMORIA SANCTI
150 JULIAN $f$ DEPOSITE SUNS A STD EDO EMILIANO FLORIDUS
PRES MISERICORDIA INDIGENS NOTUM EDIT NO DO AJUVANTE

Here the relics of Saint Julian were set down by the holy bishop Emiljus.
Floriaus, a presbyter, being in $=$ need of mercy, return d his vow, the Lord God helping him.

This quaint example discloses one at least of the stresses which underlie this particular type of religious exercise: torment of soul. Poor Floridus, trembling in the consciousness of guilt, promised to make amends, did so, and is happy once more. In what the VOTUM here consists, is not quite evident. At all events Floridus lived to praise God for peace of mind regained. (dino do ajuvante).

If by his act of devotion Floridus had succeeded in squaring his account with the Deity, the authors of our last dedication ex-voto, VIII 177, appear to have gone a step further, and to have established a definite claim on the goodwill of the martyr in virtue of their piety:-


NOMEN MARTURIS
CALENDIONIS
AJUTES QUE BOTUM COMPLEBERUNT

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { The name of the martyr } \\
& \text { Calendio. } \\
& \text { Mayest thou help those who } \\
& \text { have fulfilled their vow. }
\end{aligned}
$$

1) Di 1909,1921,1924
2) Di 1910
3) Di 1919,1928

The text just considered proves beyond dispute that the cult of the martyrs included personal appeal for help on the part of the Christian believer directed towards the martyr to whom dedications ex-voto were devoted. That the martyrs were thought to enjoy offerings of this kind, and that the prospect of such offerings could be employed as a bait in order to attract their attention, seems to be the only interpretation possible of the following item, which is in the form of an invocation (bIII 153):-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SANCTI ET BEATISSIMI MARTYRES } 0 \text { holy and most blessed martyrs! } \\
& \text { PETIMUS IN MENTE HABEATIS UT We beg (you) to bear (us) in } \\
& \text { DONENTUR VOBIS...SIMPOSIUM } \\
& \text { MAMMARI GRANTU ELPIDEFORUM = given you...a feast(???)..? ?Mammari } \\
& \text { QUI HAEC CUB }{ }^{*} / / \text { APCPM SUIS } \\
& \text { SUMTIBUS ET SUIS OPERIBUS } \\
& \text { PERFECERUNT } \\
& \text { (*cubicula?) } \\
& \text { = given you...a feast(???)..? Mammari } \\
& \text { Graniu Elpideforum(?) who complet- } \\
& \text { ed these restingplaces(??)*...??.. } \\
& \text { at their own expense and with } \\
& \text { their own resources(? operibus } \\
& \text { for operis or opibus?) }
\end{aligned}
$$

It will be observed that this text is unsatisfactory owing to the lacunae which disfigure it. We do not propose to defend the numerous conjectures to which we have resorted in order to extract sense from every detail of it. But on the whole its meaning is clear enough. The persons mentioned have erected a shrine of some kind, propably a "mensa" ( p.165-6) whereon they promise to celebrate a feast (simposium:) if the martyrs will in the mean time remember them. Of our five epitaphs which fall to be considered in this connection, the first (cIII 589) records quite simply the interment of a believer in the name of the martyrs:-

| PORTESIf(SI)IN PACE |
| :--- |
| INOCES I NOMINE |
| MARTURum |$=$| Portesius in peace, |
| :--- |
| an innocent man, |
| in the name of the martyrs. |

Our second epitaph to be considered in this connection, (bIV 29), presents some peculiarities:-

CURTIAE SATURNINAE QUAE
HIC FUIT AN LX MAEVIUS
FAUSTUS CONJUGI FIDELIS-
SIMAE CUM FILIS FECIT
MAEVI OCTAVIANUS FORTUNAT(US)
PETRUS PAULUS SATURNINUS

To his most faithful spouse Curtia Saturnina who was here for 60 years Maevius Faustus
$=$ together with his sons made (it). Maevius Octavianus Fortunatus Petrus Paulus Saturninus

First of all it must be remarked, that a priori there is nothing specifically Christian about this inseription at all. It is an epitaph constructed on normal pagan principles. The circumlocution "hic fuit" for "vixit" is unexpected, but not decisive. The decisive factor lies in the series of names following"fecit", which closes the epitaph proper. Maevius, Octavianus, and Fortunatus are presumably the sons referred to (cum filis). What of the other three names Peter, Paul, Saturninus? If they also are the names of sons, it is wellnigh certain that two of them must be Christian. But such a curious situation is improbable in the extreme. The coincidence of the names Peter and Paul on one stone can hardly mean any thing else than that it is the apostles who are intended. In this case Saturninus is doubtless the celebrated martyr (p.147). And if we further ask, Why Saturninus rather than any other martyr? the name of the deceased may perhaps supply the answer: her family may have been connected with Saturninus the martyr. Here then we have to do with an epitaph of a Christian lady, inscribed, in addition, with the names of three martyrs: the great apostles, Peter and Paul, and a famous African Victim with whom she may have had a family connection, Saturninus.

Portesius, as we have seen, was buried in the name of the martyrs. Curtia Saturnina has the names of the martyrs themselves graven on the stone which perpetuates her memory. One and the same interest is served by both procedures: in each case the deceased is brought into association with the heroes of the faith.

There was, however, a much less abstract method of achieving this association in ancient times, as the three remaining epitaphs show:-

| cV 122 | MORIAE. . NOCEIVTIS |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | ..T..IN PACE. . CTOBRES DIE |
| (2.406) | SEX. .PR CCCLXVII FU. |
|  | TRIBUS PATER ET... MATER |
|  | EJUS APUT...S APOSTOLOS |
|  | PETRU ET...N NOMINE DEI |
|  | ET CRI...EMOR...RUNT |

cII $79 \quad \Delta \frac{P}{\omega}$ CRESCONIA VIXIT IN PACE AN XXII M II D X ETT PRO HUNC LOCUM SANCTUM ANIMAM SUAM DEO ET XRO EJUS TRADIDIT
....remory..innocent...in peace... October...sixth day... province 367...?hisfather and motzer... beside the (holy?) apostles Peter and (Paul) in the name of God and (his?) Christ... (they) made(?) fthis) memorial.

Cresconia lived in peace for 22 years 2 months and 10 days $=$ and gave her soul over to God? and His Christ for the sake of? this holy spot.
cII $106 \ldots$. . RENOVAT. . DEDERAT DATUS.. ...renews?... Datus(?) had given(?) NS AD SANCTOS..POS VIXIT $=$..Innocent(?) near the saints M X V...VII
(or, holy [martyrs])...placed. He lived 15(.) months (?)...

It is not of course possible to construct elaborate theories on such slender evidence, but these items, tanfalizingly incomplete as two at least of them are, seem to illustrate the ancient custom of burial in the immediate proximity of saints' remains or other holy relics. What surprises us, however, about these texts, is not the fact that they are fortheoming, but the fact that they are fortheoming in such meagre quantities. It is from the richness of well-authenticated material of this kind in Gaul, ( Rome, ) and further afield 3) that we are able to interpret these three inscriptions at all in the first place: alone they could not be treated as anything but inexplicable anomalies. Burial near relics is seemingly not at all an African, but a transmarine, and especially a Roman phenomenon. The external

1) LeBl $293,354,478,492,557$
2) Di 2126-2167 (42 examples!)
3)Di 2168-2172,2175-2185
distribution of such texts suggests this, and so does therr internal distribution. Of these three texts just reproduced, the only examples of their kind to be found in Africa, not one is from the region chiefly responsible for hagiographic material, namely Numidia: one is from Mauretania, and the other two from Byzacena. This proves that Africa received this custom from overseas.

Finally we consider the most curious inscription of all, namely cIV 38. It stands on a Byzantine fortress, and although for this reason We reckon it a state document, it is a sorry specimen of official Latin. It is meant to be written in metre. After describing the structure concerned and praising the speed with which it was built, the pompous placard proceeds:-

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { NULIUS MALORUM POTERIT } & \text { of evil men none shall be able to } \\
\text { ERIGFRE MANUS (PATRICI } & \text { raise his hand (against it). } \\
\text { SOLOMONIS INSTITUTIONEM } & \text { No one shall be strong enough to } \\
\text { NEMO EXPUGNARE VALEVIT) } & \text { storm what Solomon the Patrician } \\
\text { DEFENSIO MARTIRUM TUETUR } & \text { has set up. The martyrs defend this } \\
\text { POSTICIUS IPSE GLEMENS } & \text { gateway. Clement and Vincent the } \\
\text { ET VINCENTIUS MARTIRES } & \text { martyrs guard this entrance. }
\end{array}
$$

CUSTODIUNT INTROITUM IPUM
The first two lines are plain enough. "Defensio martirum tuetur posticius ipse" is not Latin at all; but we give above what we think the sense of it is. "Ipum" we take to be for "Ipsum", and parallel to "Ipse" (! ) above; "itself" however signifies nothing at all in the context: hence our rendering "this", whicn we think is all that the writer means. All such barbarisms and uncertainties of detail heweex however notwithstanding, the total sense of the passage is tolerably patent: the martyrs in question appear before us in a prophylactic role. Their function is to protect the citadel from attack. Once the State's foes, they now afford it supernatural aid.

It is obvious that these inscriptions just considered possess a significance out of all proportion to their numbers.

In the first place, their formal significance alone is of no small importance. We expect the cult of the saints to call forth a literary category of its own: but when such a form does not suffice to express its peculiar driving-principle, but requies to be supplemented by other categories, then the presence of such a periphery - vota, invocations, epitaphs, State documents - shows plainly, that here we have to do, not with a mere departmental interest, but with an element of early Christian praxis which occupies a dominant position, and whose ramifications extend throughout a large part of the every-day life of the Christian community. When the cult of the saints did not occupy the foreground to the exclusion of other interests, it could generally, and with little troubly, be perceived lurking in the background as a larger or smaller element of the total context.

Much more enriching, however, is their material significance. Regarded from this point of view they serve to unify the provisional results already reached on questions of detail. The virtual apotheosis of the martyr has already emerged in connection both with lexical (pp.161-162) and syntactical problems.(pp.184-188) In the former case the etymology of SANCTUS, in the latter case the juxtaposition of the martyrs with, and in the extreme instance of Montanus, their assimilation to the Deity, raised this question. Now we are able to complete the evidence: vows and invocations, which we see addressed to martyrs, are types of address appropriate only to the gods, or God. They are not forms of address normally directed to human beings. Bereft by evangelical preaching of his old gods, the convert found surrogates
in the heroes of the new faith. A similar unification is provided by the epitaphs, and above all by the one and only state document which mentions the martyrs. In unambiguous language this speaks of the martyrs Clement and Vincent as the guardians of the citadel. (p.205) Such a conception of the martyr's rôle is quite consistent with the idea of the martyr as the healer of bodily ills, or at least as the mediator of such healing. (pp.189-191) But, visible modifications being much harder to produce, in the opinion of antiquity, than those that are invisible, (Mt ix 5!) the martyrs, in order that such efficacy should be ascribed to them, must a fortiori be assumed to have possessed similar powers to perfection in unseen regions, where, for want of concrete checks, the pious imagination must inevitably have endowed these saintly personalities, who on earth refused to surrender the faith on any conditions whatsoever, with the irresistible potency of magic. In the light of this deduction many problems can now at lefngth be settled. Now we know, for example, why first the names, then, in response to a desire for greater stimulus to the imagination, the remains or other relics of the martyrs were of such extraordinary importance: a basilica equipped therewith would be safe from the spiritual powers hostile to the Christian faith (p.169). Similarly we now know why first the names(0) of the martyrs were coveted as adjuncts to an epitaph, then the tomb itself was by preference excavated in proximity to the holy remains themselves (pp.202-204): the departing Soul wished protection on its perilous venture into the Beyond. Here likewise belongs the military language of hagiographic literature (pp.175-6): the martyrs are victors in the spiritual struggle, the natural leaders, inspirers, and heroes of the faithful, all under the "signum" or banner of Christ, the Commander - in - Chief. (cIV 33,p.168)

## (g) Results

The heroes of the persecutions were honoured in the African Church under the title of martyrs, latterly under the title of saints. The cult reached its maximum before the end of the fourth dentury, and was centred chiefly in Numidia. Round a nucleus of purely local dedications there gathered in time dedications to exogenous heroes from all quarters of the ancient world, notably from the East during Byzantine times. Paty strife produced fresh heroes, certainly on the Donatist, perhaps also on the Catholic side. Among specifically Donatist dedications we incline to reckon Donatus and Montanus, but it is no longer possible to distinguish dedications in general with any confidence. The distribution of the texts, both as to time and place, suggests howfer that a considerable proportion are Donatist, although this impression cannot be demonstrated in detail.

There are no clear indications of the widespead use of relics before the fifth century, from which terminus they increase however in number. Previously the name or memory of the martyr was deemed sufficient inspiration. There is evidence of the preservation of the blood of the martyrs, and a few texts refer to portions of the cross, whose distribution however obliges us to conclude that they were spurious.

Prophylactic and other magical functions were ascribed to the martyrs, such as efficacy in faith-healing and in providing protection to the state. The cult of the martyrs was the form under which converts to Christianity combined their worship of the pagan deities with their allegiance to the new faith.

## III - Scriptural Citations: The Bible and its Use

We have already noticed a few Biblical figures included among the non-official saints of the African Church (pp.172-174). Following up (on) the suggestion of this discovery, we now pass to consider the inscriptions, 46 in all, which consist $\not \approx$ exclusively of recognizable quotations from the Bible itself, distributed according to the following table:-
(a) Distribution

|  | 2 |  | $b$ |  | c | = | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II | - | + | 1 | + | 5 |  |  |
| III | 2 | + | 5 | + | 11 | $=$ | 18 |
| IV | - | + | 6 | + | 6 | = | 12 |
| V | 1 | + | - | + | 9 | = | 10 |
|  | 3 | + | 12 | + | 31 | = | 46 |

The general tendency shown by these figures conforms to expectations based on the fundamental THIRD TABLE of Part I. Perhaps the topographical ratio should be interfeted in favour of Numidia, as in the case of the memorials to the saints; but the preponderance is much less clearly marked. The chronological ratio al so, though a slight real preponderance of the later period seems to be indicated, is on the whole lacking in decisive features. It is to be confessed that the sparseness of the material in general prevents us from establishing results of special significance at this stage.

From the nature of the case no morphology is possible in this
category. We have no choice but to reproduced the texts themselves in extenso, in canonical order, together with critical remarks on the relation of each item to the Vulgate text on the one hand, which is the obvious foundation on which to carry out comparison, and on the other, to the 3rd-century African N.T. as reconstructed by Hans Freiherr von Soden. ${ }^{1)}$ The bracketing of references, without comment $\not \not$, indicates identity of text, and want of variants.
(b) Text
cIII 24 + ABRAM ET ISAC Vulg Gen xxii 7sqq Abraham, Isaac
bIII 246 BEATUS HOMO... Vulg Ps i 1 beatus vir
cV 13 EXSURGE DOMINE DEUS EXALTETUR MANUS TUA
cV 14 RESPICE ET EXAUDI ME DOMINE DEUS MEUS
cIII 685 +... DNS ADJUTOR ME
cV 15 EXALTA TE DMNE QUIA SUSCEPISTI NE
cV 16 ET NON JUCUNDASTI INIMICOS MEOS SUPER ME
cV 23 LETAMINI DOMINO ET EXULTATE JUSTI ET GLORIEMUR OMNES RECTI CORDE BONO QUI ISCRIPSIT
bIV 1 ... AUS EJUS IN ORE ME. .
....EN EXALTAVI T..M
bIJ 79 EXAUDI DEUS ORATIONEM
(Vulg Ps x 12)
(Vulg Ps 12.4)

Vulg Ps xxvii 7 dominus adjutor meus
Vulg Ps xxix 2 exaltabo te domine quoniam suscepisti me

Vulg Ps xxix 2 nec delectasti inimicos meos super me

Vulg Ps xxxi 11 Laetamini in domino et exultate Justi et gloriemur omnes recti corde

Vulg Ps xxxiii 2,4 semper laus ejus in ore meo, et exaltemus nomen ejus
(Vulg Ps liv 1 ) MEAM AURIBUS PERCIPE BERB. .ORIS MEI SANTO R.

1) Texte u. Untersuchungen, Neue Folge Bd XXXIII

|  | Vulg Ps lv 5 in deo speravi non timebo quid mitut faciat mihi caro <br> " Heb xiii 6 dominus mihi adjutor non timebo quid faciat mihi homo |
| :---: | :---: |
| $c V 215$ IN DEO LAUDABO VERBU IN DEO LAUDABO SERMONE IN DEO SPERAVI NON TIMEBO QUIT MIHI FACIAT HOMO | do. |
| CIII 26..IC NOBISCU DNE SIGNU I...DI UT VIDEANT QUI...E ODERUNT ET CONFUNDANTUR+ | Vulg Ps lxxxv 17 fac mecum signum in bonum, ut videant qui oderunt me et confundantur |
| bIV 48 ADFERTE DOM MUNDUM SACRIFICIUM ADFERTE DM PATRIAE GENTIUM | Vulg Ps xcv 8 afferte domino patriae gentium afferte domino gloriam et honorem afferte domino gloriam nomini ejus |
| cIV 257 INITIUM SAPIENTIAE | (Vulg)(Ps cx 10) |
| cV 17 SALUTEM ACCIPIAM ET NOMEN DOMINI INVOCABO | Vulg Ps cxiv 13 calicem salutaris accipiam et nomen đomini invocabo |
| bIV 116 HEC PORTA DOMINI JUSTI INTRABUNT | Vulg Ps cxvii 20 haec porta domini justi intrabunt in eam |
| cIII 658 +DMS CUSTODIAT INTROITUM TUUM ET EXITUM EX HOC NUNC ET USQUE IN SAECULUM AMEN FIAT FIAT (52) + | (Vulg Ps cxx 8) |
| bIV 129A水 ${ }^{\circ}$ AECLESIAE DOMNI IN DEO GIVITUR FIAT gAX IN VIRTUTE TUA ET ABUNDANTIA IN TURRIBUS TUIS | (Vulg Ps cxxi 7) |
| cIII 526 аVT $\lambda_{\eta} \sigma \alpha T \in$ idwp $\mu \in T^{\prime}$ \&iqpoourms | (Septuagint Isaiah xii 3) |



(c) Interpretation

Our procedure begins with (I) a closer statistical analysis of the material from the viewpoint of its Biblical distribution, passes thence to (2) an examination of such exogenous parallels as are fortheoming, and concludes with (3) remarks on the relation of
the inscriptions to the official text of the Scriptures. By this means it is hoped to reach an understanding of the place of these citations in the every-day life of the time.

## 1. Statistics.

It is obvious in the first place that the texts are by no means evenly distributed throughout the Canon. While the ratio in which the O.T. and N.T. are represented (24/22) calls for no special remark, certain outstanding concentrations in each division are noticeable. In the O.T. the overwhelming bulk of citations are to be traced to the Psalms (18), only 6 items referring to the other books. Only one Psalm is quoted twice, however, viz. 56.4 (cIV 26, cV 215)"I will hope in God, I will not fear what Man may do to me! On the other hand, the N.T. quotations are more evenly distributed, with two exceptions: Lk ii 14 ("Glory to God in the Highest, etc.") appears 9 times, and Romans viii 31 appears 6 times. These passages being abstracted, however, there still remain 7 items chosen from the rest of this division. The following tables show the details:-

OLD TESTAMENT

|  | Psalms |  |  | O.T.ex Ps |  |  | O.T.in toto |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 686 | b | $c$ | a | b | c | a | b | c |  |  |
| II | - | 1 | - = 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | $=$ | 1 |
| III | - | 1 | $3=4$ | 2 | 1 | $2=5$ | 2 | 2 | 5 | $=$ | 9 |
| IV | - | 4 | $2=6$ | - | - | - = | - | 4 | 2 | $=$ | 6 |
| V | - | - | $7=7$ | 1 | 7 | - | 1 | - | 7 | $=$ | 8 |
|  | - | 6 | $12=18$ | 3 | 1 | $2=6$ | 3 | 7 | 14 | $=$ | $\underline{24}$ |



These figures, in so far as they justify any inferences at all, suggest the following conclusions:-
O.T. Chronology as a whole normal. Topography shows preponderance of Mauretania in Psalms, of Zeugitana in other material.
N.T. Chronology normal throughout, limewise Topography on the whole. The preponderance of Byzacena in producing examples of Lk ii 14 is however noteworthy.

## 2. Parallels

Ps exfí cxiv 13 ( cV 17) is found in Gaul, where the version, unlike our African example, reproduces the Vulgate tradition: dalicem salutaris accipiam.)

The famous glass bowl of Podgoritz ${ }^{2}$ ) supplies legends similar to those we have noted in reference to the book of Daniel and the book of Jonah:t

Daniel de laco leonis ${ }^{3}$ ) (cf. aV 22)
tris pueri de ecne caminí (cf.bIII 68)
Diunam de ventre głtion queti liberatus est ${ }^{5}$ (cf. aIII 69)
1)Di 2418A
2) Kraus RE i 614 fg 220
3)Di $2426 e$
4) ib. $f$
5) ib. $a$

With cV l2 (Mt xxii 37) we may compare the inscription at Nola: dilige deum ex toto corde et proximum sicut tel ${ }^{\text {l }}$

Romans viii 31 (Vulg) is reproduced in Calabria?) With the citation from Vulg Ps xxii l, nil mihi deerit, which usurps the apodosis in cIV 84 compare the inscription from Rome: dominus regit me et nihil mici deest. ${ }^{3}$ )

In connection with cII 104, which combines Acts iii 6 and Ps cviii 6, it is of great interest to notice the same N.T. passage combined with a similar O.T. citation in a graffito from Malta: in nomine dni ins $x i$ surges et ambulas dne salba me. ${ }^{4}$ (cII 104...salbu me fac).

With these $\mathbf{f e w}$ instances the comparative material is exhausted so far as the West is concerned. This surprising resulit holds good not only for individual citations but for inscriptions of this category generally. Of the 29 Biblical citations collected by Diehl in his introductory syllogy, the great majority, namely 23 , are African, only 5 being drawn from elsewhere; and in his large work the ratio is similar. From all quarters the extra-African material of this class, including examples found embedded in texts of a fundamentally differeant character (which we have systematically excluded from our list of Arrican citations), does not amount in bulk to moee than two-thirds of corresponding African material. In other words, Africa itself is far richer in texts of this category than the whole of the rest of the West together.

On the other hand the parallels forthcoming from the extreme East, namely Syria, are remarkably copdius. From that quarter we find Ps.cxvii 20 (bIV 116) attested not once but many times.) The same
1)Diehl LAI 292
2)Di 2489
3) Di 2403A
4) Kaufmann,Handbuch p. 297
5)CIG 8930-8934;Le Blant,Manuel p. 80
holds good in the case of Lk ii 14 (cII 201 etc.) and Rom viii 31 (cIII 27 etc.) both of which recur again and again in that region. ${ }^{\text {T }}$ Psalm 23 (Vulg 22) 1, which we find curiously combined with this oitation inkIV 170, is likewise attested therel) Naturally all these Syrian examples are in Greek. In general the Scriptures were cited on monuments much more freely in the East than in the West?)

We therefore conclude that the practice of inscribing Biblical verses on durable material, for which Africa is apparently conspicuous among Western Provinces, must in large part have been derived from the East, in all probability during Byzantine times, when intercourse between these two main divisions of the ancient world was, at least so far as concerns Africa, particularly long and close. We must likewise however ascribe a considerable amount of this material to the activity of the African spirit itself, in order to justify the facts as established by the evidence.

## 3. Tradition

As is evident from the full text of our inscriptions and their rudimentary apparatus, the majority show the Biblical text in a flux. Only a few items conform to the Vulgate and it is nowhere clear that they do so on principle. On the other hand the divergence in any given case does not usually amount to much more than a colloquial lapse. For textual purposes the inseriptions are of little use, but where several versions of the same passage are encountered they give

1) Kaufmann, Handbuch pp.411-412
2) ib. pp78-74
the impression of stability. For this we must presumably thank the Vulgate, although its influence cannot be demonstrated in detail. Here and there (e.g.bIV 48, cIII 19, CII 104) considerable differences occur however, and one notes the use of SERMO as an equivalent of VERBUM (cV 215) as Tertullian's well-known statement leads us to expect ${ }^{7}$ ) together with the consistent preference for EXCELSIS as against the official ALTISSIMIS in the Lucan doxology (pp.212-213). Such a freedom of citation rules out the possibility of the Africans holding any rigid theory as to the immutability of the text. The Scriptures were not therefore cultivated solely for their own sake.
(d) Situation

What then controlled the choice of precisely this material? That is the final question arising from the consideration of the texts in hand.

In view of the large proportion of Psalms quoted, we can hardly be wrong in tracing a considerable part of this activity to the influence of the liturgy. From the earliest times the psalms were in use among the Christians as part of their worship. The same holds good of that most popular of all N.T. passages, the doxology in Luke, whose liturgical use began early.

Quite a different interest must be supposed to lie behind that other very popular N.T. passage, Romans viii 31, "If God be for us, who can be against us?! Like the only Psalm passage to be repeated twice, (lv 5: I will hope in God, I will not fear what Man may do to me) it was probably resorted to in times of opposition and persecution.

1) Adv. Praxean 5
2) Eph v 19,Col iii 16, etc.
3)Lietzmann, Die klementinische Liturgie (kl T 61)23/12

Such a text would naturally give encouragement to the hard-pressed. The fact that both passages are encountered chiefly in Zeugitana and Numidia is of no special consequence in view of the smalness of their number, but it is possible at least that some of our examples are to be traced to the Catholic-Donatist struggle.

A similar explanation may be in order regarding the mention pf Daniel, the Three Youths, and Jonah (p.212). Possibly also bIV 116 (Ps xevii 20: this is the gate of the Lord; the just will enter it) springs from Donatist circles. In any case the sentiment agrees well enough with the perfectionist ideal of the Donatists?)
eII 104 (Acts iii 6) plainly refers to the cult of Christus Medicus (pp. 189 sqq.) as does no doubt also the "have faith and walk" of bIV 4 which Nonceaux regards however as a reflection of 2 Cor $v$ 7: per fidem enim ambulamus, for by faith we walk.

The reference of cIII 526 (Isaiah xii 3, therefore with joy will you draw water) is obscure, but may relate to the Johannine teaching on the Water of Life ${ }^{3}$ ) since among the numerous figures Which accompany the text (peacock, vase, nereid, gladiator, etc.) there occur the Good Shepherd (John $x$ ), a cross, a stream, a sheep, and a stag. In particular it should no doubt be brought into connection with the epitaphic REFRIGERIUM-fomula (pp.356-369). For the rest, the citations are didactic, referring to the Christian teaching on Providence ( cV 150), morals (cIV II7, cV 12), the Person of Christ (cIII 19,24), and the benefit of Justification (cIV 256), that is to say, if our reading of this last example is correct.

1) Monceaux, HLAC iv 455
2) Monceaux, HLAC i
156
3). Jonn iv 14

Corresponding to their prevailing interest most of these inscriptions are located in basilicas, namely in the pavements or walls. Some are found written over doorways (e.g. bIV 116, cIII 658) and one occurs, appropriately enough, on an altar-stone (bIV 48).
(e) Results

The Bible was quoted more extensively in Africa than in any other Western Church, or even than in the West generally. On the dther hand it shows affinity with the Eastern Church, particularly that of Syria, not only in this general custom, but also in the choice of specific passages.

The two Testaments contribute about equally to the material reproduced. Of the O.T. the Psalms are most frequently drawn upon, especially in Mauretania. The N.T. is more evenly represented, but by far the most popular items are Lk 1114 and Romans viii 31. Citations of the former verse are concentrated chiefly in Byzacena, while the latter is quoted in the landward part of the country. (Zeugitana, Numidia).

In addition to the prevailing interest underlying the selection of Biblical material for inscriptions, which is plainly devotional, one detects the influence of two further purposes, namely polemical on the one hand, and didactical on the other.

While in general the readings accord with the literary tradition of the Scriptures, noteworthy variants occur here and theee, and examples of illiteracy abound.

## IV - Acclamations : The Question of Morale

Among the Biblical passages dealt with in the preceding section, we noticed not a few obviously selected on the ground of their appropriateness as providing encouragement to those faith wanted such a stimulus (pp.218-219). This ever-recurring practical need, however, called forth a liferary category of its own, in the shape of short pithy phrases, generally expressing a wish, which we call acclamations. As in the case of the Scriptural Citations, but for different reasons, these pieces are not adapted to morphological analysis. On the other hand the typical cases grop themselves naturally into those belonging to public life, and those belonging to private life, while the non-typical cases are as usual most conveniently dealt with separate1y. Our procedure is therefore prescribed for us by the nature of the texts themshes, our approach as usual being by way of indispensable statistics.
(a) Distribution

|  | a |  | b |  | c |  | x | $=$ | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | - |  | - |  | 1 |  | - |  |  |
| II | - |  | 2 | + | 4 |  | - | $=$ | 6 |
| III | 3 | + | 7 | + | 6 | + | 1 | $=$ | 17 |
| IV | 2 | + | 12 | + | 24 | + | 3 | $=$ | 41 |
| V | 2 | + | 6 | + | 4 |  | - | $=$ | 12 |
|  | 7 | + | 27 | + | 39 | + | 4 | $=$ | 77 |

From this table it is at once plain, that whereas the Chronology of our acclamations presents nothing unusual, their Topography on the other hand is remarkable for the decisive concentration of texts of this kind in Numidia. The ratio represented by the figure 41 can only be compared with the corresponding element in the table drawn up in the case of the martyrs' memorials (p.142). We can hardly err if in advance we ascribe the displacement of material to the Catholic-Donatist controversy. Only when we examine the texts in detail, however, will we discover the extent to which this cause has operated.
(b) Public

At the head of this subsection stand five texte, four from Zeugitana, and one from Numidia, which probably belong to the fourth century, on account of their reference, viz.:-
bIII 122 IN HOC SIGNO....
bIII 171 IN HOC SIGNUM SEMPER VINCES atw
bIII 44 IN HOC SIGNUM SEMPER VI.....I M LV.....
bIII 187 ...OC SIGNUM VINCIMUS INIMICDS
bIV 59 GLORIOSUSQUE NOMEN... ..OC SIGNUM VINCIMUS INIMICOS
in this sign....
in this sign shalt thou ever conquer
in this sign (shalt thou?) ever (conquer?)...???...
$=$
....this sign we conquer (our) enemies
most glorious (in?) name(?)... ...this sign we conquer our enemies

It is obvious whence arose this popular slogan, namely the legend of Constantine's vision of a cross in the heavens? ) Elsewhere in the West similar versions are encountered: in hoc signo, Sirice,(vinces) occurs

[^19]in Rome, ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) in nomine Xpi vincas semper occurs in North Italy ${ }^{2}$ ) while a more obscure reference is forthcoming in Spain : signum per quod vis victa tirani antiqui atque Erebi concidit imperium. 3) Therewith, however, the comparative material appears to be exhausted: it is with surprise that we find so few paralells outwith Africa ${ }^{\text {foe }}$ to such a popular reference. Nowhere do we find the quotation so frequently forthcoming as in Africa: such seems to be the result of inquiry in this direction.

It will be noted that the texts in question reproduce the famous ' $\in V$ Toúty VIK $\hat{X}$ most variously, and in the greatest variety of combinations. This does not surprise us, since such tendencies are natural in all instances of oral tradition. In general the effect of all such variations is to adapt the saying to the circumstances of particular persons or parties. It is natural also to find numerous instancfes of illiteracy, such as we find here, in quotations banded down from generation to generation without literary control. Finally the mere popularity of the tale is significant for the power which the Early Church was ready to ascribe to the Cross as a prophylactic emblem (compare the similar finction of saints, p.205).

The rest of our public acclamations are connectedfoth the Catholic-Donatist controversy: deo gratias, deo laudes, bonis bene.

From the polemical and expository writings of Augustine, it is obvious that in the fifth century "Thanks be to God:" and "Praise be to God!" ( deo gratias, deo laudes) were the party-cries of the Catholics and Donatists respectivelyf) Diehl treats these expressions

1) Di 1620A
2) Di 1626 A
3) $\mathrm{Hu} \operatorname{sp~} 10$
4) Monceaux HLAC iv 439
as citations from Scripture, but in view of the large number of verses which could be adduced to prove this connection, the reference is so vague that conscious dependence on the Bible is most unlikely. On the other hand, we can account for "Deo Gratias" on the basis of precedence, since this expression is found in the mouths of the martyrs of the primitive period, not once but many times.) By employing the expression as a war-cry, therefore, the Catholics may have wished to emphasise their historical connection with the classical heroic tradition of the faith, in opposition to the pretensions of the Donatists.

However that may be, our inscriptions corroborate and illustrate most vividly what we already know from Augustine.
(1) DEO LAUDES occurs either alone (bIV 149; CIV 2,9,15,16,20,244, 267; XIV 26) with a verb (deo laudes dicamus, let us utter praises to God, bIV 52; cIV 31, llo: deo laudes h...omnes dicamus, let us all utter, , praises to God bIV 145, cI 4 (d)o(mi)ni (La)udes canam(us) tas let us sing the praises of the Lord) or otherwise incorporated in a wider syntactical context ( cV 6 deo laudes super aquas.. praise be to God upon the waters, Ps xxviii 2,3 ?Vulg, Di 2406; cIV 217 bocoum ...mus deo laudes plur fecerunt onm, ?vow...they made more (?)praise to God; cIV 244 in nomine...risti..i..i..deo laudes, in the name of Christ,...praise to God.)
(2) Only one example of DEO GRATIAS is fortheoming in isolation, (cIV 30) although several examples will yet be noticed embedded in longer documents of different category.

[^20](3) BONIS BENE ( $B$ B ) is a 3rd-century pagan acclamation, found on African stones, meaning "may it be well with the good." and of course, by implication, "May it be ill with the wicked!"l) Its Christian use in Africa is mllustrated by the following texts:-

| cIV 271 | (f) B B | $=$ | may it be well with the good |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bIV 101 | B \& B DEO LAUDES | $=$ | may it be well with the good Praise be to God |
| cV 156 S | SPES IN...EI | $=$ | Hope in (the name of ) God! |
|  | PER TE NUBEL |  | Through thee, 0 Nubel, we see these |
|  | ISTA VIDEMUS |  | things. Mayest thou keep (them) |
|  | FIRME POSSIDEAS |  | securely, and thry (successors) |
|  | CUM TUIS B B |  | May it be well with the goodl |
| bIV 165 | BONIS BENE VIVAS | $=$ | May it be well with the good: |
|  | OPTATE CUM OMNI |  | Mayest thou live, O Optatus, with |
|  | CLERO TUO |  | all thy clergy. The Basi发ica was |
|  | BASILICA EDIFICATA |  | built at the request of Optatus |
|  | (EST) EX INSTANTIA |  | the presbyter. Happy (may he be!) |
|  | OPTATI PRB |  | Praise be to God. |
|  | FELICITER |  |  |
|  | DEO LAUDES |  |  |

From its coincidence with Deo Laudes on two of the four stones, we conclude that Bonis Bene was adopted by the Donatists. There are no clear examples of its use among Catholics. In considering the expression, we recall one already noticed in connection with the martyrs, namely "dignis digna! merentibus coronam!" which corresponds with "bonis bene" structurally, and may indeed proceed from the same party. (p.181)

In general it will be observed that all three expressions just investigated have this in common, that for the most part the stones, rings, and other articles on which they occur are located in one and

[^21]the same region : of the 21 texts cited (chiefly Deo Laudes), three come from the peripheral provinces (cI 4; cV 6,156), and the rest (eighteen), that is to say, the overwhelming majority, from Numidia. Here therefore we have the explanation, in large part, of the peculiar distribution of acclamations in Africa (p.222). Secondly we observe that these acclamations produced by the Catholic versus Donatist struggle are peculiar to Africa, being found nowhere else in Christendom. Thirdly the ratio : Deo Laudes / Deo Gratias is most significant. On general grounds Monceaux has reckonea that fully half of the epigraphical material of Africa must be traced to Donatist sources; ${ }^{1)}$ but the statistics suggest a much higher proportion. However that may be, the inscriptions attest the bitterness of the conflict and the extremely narrow limits within which it was decided. Finally the opposition of two slogans or party-shibboleths such as Deo Gratias and Deo Laudes is a phenomenon we can easily understand from recent experience, namely the situation in Austria in the early Summer of 1937 immediately before the Anschluss, when the Catholic (Christian Democrat) party and the National Socialist party made similar use of the acclamations "Gruss Gott!" and "Heil Hitler!" respectively. The texts reproduced on the preceding page, in adaition to the Catholic-Donatist acclamations they are intended to illustrate, contain further acclamations, namely "spes in nomine Dei" (cV 156) "vivas" and "feliciter"(bIV 165) which, being more or less private expressions having little or no direct reference to public events, fall to be considered along with like slogans in the next part.

1) Monceaux, HLAC iv 438

## (c) Private

The acclamations here treated are (1) spes in deo and its variants; (2) vivas in deo and its variants; and (3) utere fellx and its variants.
(1)SPES IN DEO (=hope in God), an expression found also in the Christian inscriptions of Rome, central Italy, and Spain, ${ }^{\text { }}$ ) is attested without the slightest ambiguity four times in Africa (bIII 123;
cIII 5l; bIV 31; xIV 27). It is almost certainly the reading of
xIII 627: SPES IN.... In two examples the reading is a matter of dispute, but no doubt we should recognize the acclamation at least:
bII $85 \ldots . . .$. ISVES $*$ IN $\psi^{*}$ DEO
cIII 49 QUQUIQI SVES INDO////IN DEO $\omega$
It oceurs certainly also on a very ornate stone, accompanied by palins, doves, and a chrism:
cIV 83 SPES IN DEO


In another piece the reading is obscure, but probably we should accept "perennis" as the right word:-
bV 66 SPES IN DEO PERENNIS = eternal hope in God.
In yet another, Christ is included in the acclamation :-
cIVr $\neq f$ SPES IN DEO ET CHRISTO EJ(US)
In another stone Christ alone is mentioned:-
cIV 246 spes in cristo nostro flabiants bita $\theta$
Another example is doubtful, but should probably be translated "hope (is) with (Christ)" the accompaning Chrism standing for the name:bV 29 SPES PVDA i i.e. spes apud Christum

[^22]A piece already quoted on $p .225(\mathrm{cV}$ 156) includes the variant SPES IN NOMINE DEI, according to the editor's restoration of the lacuna ( $=$ hope in the name of God).

Finally we note cIII 291: W $D$ IN ISPE DEI PASCASI ( $=$ In the hope of God, 0 Pascasius).

The distribution of these examples is normal, so far as one can judge from their comparatively small number.
(2) The acclamation "Mayest thou live in God!" is of very frequent occurrence, the order of the words being either VIVAS IN DEO, or InDEO VIVAS, etc. Curiously enough, the former order, which is exceedingly common in Rome, () Gaul, ${ }^{2}$ ) Spain, (3) even in Britain4) is comparatively rare in Africa. We count only the following examples:aIII 76 (opisthograph)...DIVO CLAUDIO / VIVAS IN DEO bII 82.....(VIVAS) IN DEO
cIII 886 (ring) VIVANIS
aIII 26 PANCHA....VIVAS IN (DEO)
aIII 16 VIBAS IN DEO GADE SEMPER (= live in God, rejoice always) It will further be observed as a peculiarity of these pieces, that they are confined to the Eastern portion offthe country. We conclude from this, that this particular formula was imported from overseas.

The order IN DEO VIVAS, on the other hand, extra-African examples of which are less numerous, although the formula does occur in Rome ${ }^{5}$ ) and Arles, ${ }^{6)}$ is more frequent, and more evenly distributed, especially in the centre of the country, than the other. We count four examples of the expression in isolation, viz. bIV 158; aIV 3; cII 14; cIV 85.

[^23]We have two examples of a definite person being apostrophized:bV 100 K ARSITE IN DEO VIVAS $=0$ Arsitus, mayest thou live in aIV 1 FORTUNI PR....IN DEO BIBAS
$=$ O Fortunius, presbyter, mayest
thou live in God.
and two of a definite person being the subject of the verb in the thira person:-
aV 2 PAULUS IN DEO BIBAT = May Paulus live in God.
bIV 130 FLAVIA IN DO VIVAT = May Flavia lizve in God.

The wish for everlasting life in God, which we should probably interpret eschatologically, is expressed in cII 130 :-
ECCE TUA VITA CUN DEO $=$ Behold, may thy life be with our
NOSTRO IN AETERNUM
God for ever although the ellipse of the verb may indicate a mere statement. In any case, eternal life is the object of an unambiguous wish outside Africa alsol) In contrast cIII 555 appears more modest: 7 * MULTOS ANOS $\otimes$ BI $\mathcal{\&}$ BAT $=$ may he live for many years. cV 187 IN DEO $\nVdash$ EMKIFE////, although unintelligible, appears to belong here, as does also apparently the legend on an article made by a potter for housegold use ( cV IZ669) QUI FECERIT VIVAT ET QUI EMERIT (= Whoso made it, may he live, and he who purchased it), although its Christian origin cannot be established absolutely.

Finally we quote a compound example, bIV 169: PA(T)E(R)NE VIVAS CUM TUIS IN E...VIVE ET VIDE SPES IN DEO 承 Yi.e., May you live, O Paternus, both you and yours, for ever (?). Live and see. Hope in God.
1)Di 2188,2189,2191
(3) UTERE FELIX, lit. to use, practically to live, happy or happily, is a cormon acclamation on Christian "instrumenta domestica" ${ }^{1}$ ) especially in Spain.?) Africa offers the following example:-
bV 20 UTERE FELIX

in which the Monogram may have the force of the name "Christ", so that we might translate, "live happily in Christ!' A Spanish parallel is fortheoming, namely " utere felix in (" 3)

However that may be, Africa supplied us with another piece, in which the "felix" of "utere felix" is displaced by the phrase "in Cristo", "in Christo" being apparently regarded as the Christian equivalent for the pagan "felix" or "feliciter":-
bV 17 ARCADI UTERE IN CRISTO = O Arcadius, live in Christ (grapes) \& (palm)
A third variant, to which as yet no exact parallel is forthcoming, remains to be cited; 7
bIII 22 录 LOQUERE FELICITER $\alpha \omega=\begin{gathered}\text { speak happily } \\ \text { (i.e. be happy in speech) }\end{gathered}$
Here the reference may perhaps be to the N.T. teaching on the right employment of the gift of speech. (n any case "felix" is a word of good omen, as in the pagan graffito BONUM FAUSTUM FELIX, i.e. good, favourable, happy.)

In general the sparseness of the material in this subsection forbids dognatic conclusions. Perhaps, however, the Mauretanian provenance of 2 as against 1 from Zeugitana, taken together with the marked popularity of such formulae in Spain, might justify the tentative inference, that "udere felix" etc. are Spanish in origin, and not African.

1) Di $880+\mathrm{A}, 2205 \mathrm{~A}$
2) $\mathrm{Hu} \mathrm{Sp} 399,350$
3)Di 2243 4)Jac 3
3) Di klT $56 / 44$

## (d) Miscellaneous

The typical acclamations having been dealt with, it remains to discuss a series of short pithy texts which, if they do not all conform to the typical pattern, are more properly to be reckoned in the category of acclamations than in any other division. So varied are they, that the application of statistical methods to them is useless; for the most part, also, parallels, whether from heathen epigraphy or from the inseriptions of non-African Christendom, are almost entirely wanting. In spite of this manifest lack of order in the material, one large unifying principle can be detected as underlying them: all refer, directly or indirectly, to the Deity. Such an orientation supplies us with a basis whereon to work. We propose therefofe to begin with the simplest texts, praising God, to pass therefrom to acclamations expressing commands or wishes in respect to God, and to conclude with statements about God, without however observing rigid divisions in the exposition, which would be useless. Our first text is Greek, and proclaims the Oneness of God:bIV 131 AKw EIC\& \& $\theta \in . C$ One God...?

This is a formula peculiar to the Eastern Church, where it is frequent, particularly in Egypt, Western instances being altogether wanting.)
cIV 25 DOMINE PROTEGE NOMEN GLORIOSUM (= protect Thy glorious Name, O Lord) may be a reminiscence from the Psalter, although definite connections cannot be established. It is not even certain whether it is a Christian text, since it might equally well be Jewish. On the whole however it is probably Christian.

1) Kaufmann, Handbuch pp. 71-72

Two exhortations fall to be recorded:-
CIV 166 FIDE IN DEU ET VALES $=$ Trust in God and you are well
cIV 19

(ama deum ???) $=$ Love God (Iintel)
although the latter instance is from the nature of the case highly doubtful.

XIV 21,DEUS NOBISCUM (God be with us) may represent the name Immanuel ( Jrijny , see Isaiah vii 14. More probably, however, it is a reminiscence of the ancient greeting of the leturgy, dominus vobiscum, the Lord be with youl)
cIV 162, DEUS FAVET (=God is propitious) expresses a conviction already familiar to us from texts previously examined, e.g. cIV 137, deo fabente; cIV 5, propitio deo, cIV 36 auxiliante deo. It is noteworthy that all these phrases are found in Numidia, although no explanation suggests itself at this stage why that should be so.

God as the giver of desired objects is praised in two texts:cIV 56 (winged figure) A DEO DATUR VICTORIA = Victory is the gift of God
bIV 66 IN CRISTO PERSEVERES
PATER DAT PACEM \&
$=$ Mayest thou stand fast
$=$ in Christ. The Father gives peace.

With regard to the former of these, the winged figure in question which accompanies the legend may be the godess Victory. If so, this piece is a curious instance of religious symcretism, in the sense, that it places a Roman Deity under the God of the Christians, the Roman Deity being depersonalized in the process. Such an interpretation would well suit what we already know of the Christian view of Constantine's victory as the gift of God (pp. 222-223). The latter

[^24]text contains a disputed reading PACEM/PANEM. Reading PANEM, some translate: "The Father gives bread", the reference being then to the Eucharist.) We prefer however the reading PACEM, translating it as on the preceding page, because (I) we are able to adduce as parallels DOMINUS PACEM DAT (=the Lord gives peace) from Rome, ${ }_{9}^{2}$ ) and TIBI DETUR PAX A DEO (=peace be given thee from God) from Spain; 3) and because (2) this reading, unlike the other, which has no obvious connection with the words immediately preceding, welds together the thought series of the whole, thus : "stand fast! peace will, come sooner or later:" Both these texts, therefore, taken together, express the conviction, that all will be well in the long run, since God is in control. bIII 202, PAX DEI PATRIS ( $=$ the peace of God the Father), in which the same thought comes to expression, may have been suggested, in particular, by the N.T. epistolary greetings Phil iv 7,Col iii

 Peace is likewise invoked on a lintel, bV 64 HIC PAX $*$ ETERNA MORETUR ( $=$ here may peace eternal dwell). The Monogram may be regarded as representing the name "Christ", in which case we would require to translate "The peace of Christ etc." although this is not altogether likely in view of the adjective which accompanies the word"peace!" We are invited rather to think of the mere Chrism itself as surety of peace, indeed as a charm whose use on the building in question would place it under the protection of God.

Another inscribed lintel confirms this interpretation. We refer
L) Monceaux HLAC iv 447
2)Di 2395
3) Hu Sp 2
namely to cIV 248, HIC DEUS ABITAT fow (= here dwells God). In texts already examined we find the basilica spoken of as the house of God, according to various turns of expression: domus dei, domus domini, ${ }^{2}$ ) domus dibina; ${ }^{3)}$ once we encounter the phrase "avitatio sps sci", i.e., the dwellingplace of the Holy Spirit. ${ }^{4}$ ) Presumably such references supply us with the key to the understanding of this otherwise enigmatic inscripation. It therefore represents a thought-series first clearly formulated in classical Judaism, 5 ) which must have preserved its continuity throughout N. T. times among the vulgar at least, Paul's higher teaching ${ }^{6)}$ notwithstanding: to wit, that God dwells in the temple consecrated to Him and bearing His mark. Further light is cast on the subject, regarding the question namely, as to what was the peculiar efficacy of the Divine Presence, from another tradition which reinforced this tendency. We refer to the Hellenistic hero-cults, and adduce in particular the following two pieces connected with the worship of Hercules ${ }^{7}$ ):-
(I) ${ }_{0}^{\text {e }}$ toû $\Delta$ iòs $\Pi \alpha \hat{l} k \alpha \lambda$ ivelkos The son of Jove, Hercules brilliant
 unsev EíElaito kakD̈́s
(II)Hercules invicte... hic advenisti; ne quid hic fiat mali.......
evil thing enter in

O invincible Hercules,......
$=$ here art thou come; let no ill happen here.......

We learn from these texts, that the presence of the god protected the builaing in question from evil. It is much to be regretted that no further examples analogous to our African lintel are forthcoming from the West; but we know of at least one curious text found in

[^25]```
the Eastl)
```



```
K TOMKÊ, Mndtv Eiof́Tw Kakov \(=\) let no evil thing enter in
```

which, since it makes explicit the wish suppressed in cIV 248 but underlying it, fills the morphological lacuna between it and the pagan material adduced towards its interpretation, thereby supplying the transition between the two types. And if we further ask, how this prophylactic rôle was possible in the case of the God of the Christians, the inscriptions already examined supply the answer. We know that the saints of God assumed such a rôle, their names possessing such an efficacy (pp.205-206). A fortiori therefore God's name, above all embodied in a symbol ( $\mathcal{F}^{( }$etc.) , must rank as even more potent. If Hercules on account of his success in ridaing the earth of noxious monsters qualified for prophylactic finctions in respect to the possessions of his rotaries, Christ, who in similar fashion had vanquished Satan, had equal right. Having dealt successfully with Man's chief foe in person, Christ drove his satellites the Demons out of individual persons whom they had been sent to torture, and even invaded their last lurking-place, namely Hades, where the very doorkeepers shuddered at His presence. (Finally He rose from the dead, thereby exhibiting most palpably His complete supremacy over the malignant powers of the cosmos.5) To His disciples, inspired by faith in His ultimate return in power, ${ }^{6)}$ He entrusted the task of combatfing the Demons wherever they were encountered, especially in the sphere of polytheism? In this situation every martyr was a soldier, and the Christian life was military service. (p. 207 etc.) The evils of life persisted nevertheless,

1) Deonna in RA xxii 67
2) Ik iv $1-12$
3) Mt Fiii28-32 etc, Mk i 23-27
4) Lietzmann, Symbole (klTl7/18)pp32-34
5) Acts ii 24
6) Apoc xxii 20
7) Justin Apol i 5
and since to the mind of antiquity, they could not be accounted for except by the hypothesis that they were the work of demons pervading space and ever and anon threatening destruction to man ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) it was natural for Christian converts, knowing of Christ's victory over Satan, to place themselves and their property under His protection.

This interpretation also clarifies two other pieces, cIV 167
 oútos (= request. The Saviour is he). It must be confessed however that of these cII 78 is far from satisfactory. A "proskynema" we know to have been a prayer offered by travellers at pagan temples on bebalf of absent friends; ) and it has been suggested that we read "Soteroutos" as genitive of "Soterós" a proper name.3) Hence it may not after all be a Christian piece. On the other hand, Le Blant reports Christian "proskynemata" at saints" shrines in Gaul, the object being the same as in pagan piety4) But if this case is not decisive, cII 151...E DNE IN JANUIS NOSTRIS $+(=\operatorname{Tarry}(?)$ O Lord within our doors) is tolerably clear, namely in a prophylactic sense.

We conclude our treatment of acclamations with the strangest example of all, cIII 25. On this piece, in close proximity to a representation of Amor and Psyche, we read the cryptic legend:ONNIA DEI SUNT. AGIMUR NON AGIMUS = All things are God's. We are acted (upon), we do not act.

Again it is not even certain whether this is in fact a Christian inseription. The figures are pagan, and the words need not express

[^26]anything more than a philosophical commonplace concerning the Deity in general. On the other hand representations of Amor and Psyche are well known to archaeologists as figuring not only on pagan remains, but also as occurring on monuments whose Christian origin is authenticated beyond dispute: in such cases they are thought to symbolize for the benefit of converts at home with Graeco-Roman mythology the love of God toward the Soul which the Christian gospel proclaims.) At a much later period Bernard de Clairvaux expounded the Song of Songs, a wholly secular production whose eroticism is certainly not a whit more refined than that of the graceful Hellenistic tale here in question, as typifying the relation of Christ to the Church?) There is therefore no inherent improbability attaching to an interpretation along these lines.

If then this piece is Christian, what of the acclamation, what, in particular, of the laconic assertion, "agimur, non agimus" ? The nearest analogue in early Christian literature we can think of in this connection is Paul's utterance (Gal ii 20) :-


That is to say in general : the religious man is no longer an independent being in contrast to God, but rather the passive vehicle through which God Himself acts. It is a cominonplace of mysticism.) Applying this clue to the acclamation, we translate it freely: "God controls everything. Even when we think we are ourselves acting independently of Him, it is really He who is acting all the time in us; we do not act, but are acted upon, that is to say, we really do nothing and are pesi passive; He alone is active." The mythological group serves 1) Kaufmann, HCA 306
3) van der Leeuw, Phanomenologie der Religion $75 / 4$ of Chr. (1925)p. 129
to reinforce this doctrine by showing its necessary connection with the Christian conception of God as Love (I John iv 8 etc.). It contributes namely the reminder: "Love as a matter of human experience is ultmately beyond the control of individuals: this is acknowledged on all hands. Ultimately therefore also the Love of God carries us beyond ourselves! Hence cIII 25, if it is a Christian inscription, springs from a circle interested in mysticism. Its inststapnce on the passivity of the human being in relation to God, on the other hand, taken together with what we know about the currency of similar conceptions among the Montanists (pp.186-187), suggests that its author might have been a Donatist. It must be confessed however that the stone baffles us in the last resort, and that the above interpretation, with all its manifest defects, is the only alternative we have to dismissing the acelamation as unintelligible.
(e) Results

The Christian life appears to have been one of perpetual conflict, amid which members of the Christian community took encouragement from short, pithy, incisive proverb-like sayings, partly inspired by Scripture, partly original, exchanged between individuals and groups.

Collectively the Chureh was obliged to defend itself from enemies threatening it from without. The legend of Constantine's vision of the Cross ( in this sign prevail) provided the appropriate stimulus in this case. Internally also different Church-parties had slogans of their own with which to brace their adherents. (e.g. "glory to God" versus "praise to God")

Individual Chriatians, finally, devise short phrases with which to confront personal problems. The most common greetings of this kind in general use were "hope in God" and "live in God. Since however the calamities of life were ascribed to demons and not understood as part of a natural process, a variety of special formulae were employed invoking the protection of Christ as the successful opponent of the dreaded demonic powers.

In general Affica apears to be peculiarly rich in this type of document, importing what was not indigenous. Acclanations are found in sll periods, no exceptional concentrations being noticeable.

## V - Imprecations : The Use of Magic

A few of the acclamations just considered tend to go beyond the mere need of encouragement, and possess in themselves a certain prophylactic efficacy (p.234). Such texts provide the transition to magical inscriptions proper, of which Africa offers a handful, viz.:-
(a) Distribution


Obviously no decisive conclusion can be obtained from such meagre quantities. The dominance of Zeugitane in the later period is such as we might expect. We proceed therefore immediately to the texts themselves, which call for special treatment, since they are without
exception the strangest and most difficult of all our inscriptions． We postpone all discussion of thern until they are set out in extenso， without even being translated provisionally，in order that they may as far as possible be made to explain each other by being set out in immediate juxtaposition and furnished with serial numbers．
（b）Text
（1）cIII 604： －BICIT LEO DE TRIBUS JUDA RADIS DAVID INBIDIA INBIDIOSA NICIL TIDIAT ANIMA PURA ET（M）UNDA（M）ICAEL RAFAEL URIEL GBRIEL + VICTORIA $\dagger$
$\begin{aligned} & \text {（2）cIII 603：} \frac{\text { BICIT TE LEO DE TRIBUS JUDA G．VIC }}{\text { IINBIZ SAINARIOS AINBICTADAS }} \\ & \\ & \text { IATURABISQ ISNEAONIUM GELLUM } \\ & \text { FEREIT TOT ONFIAN }\end{aligned}$
（3）cIII 609：十．．．．NBIZIA INBIZIOSA INBIZIA PATIATU AUBIS CUI SE NOCTU CCLUM FECERIT NICIL IIBI AD ANIMA PURA ET MUNDA QU BOCATUR ISTEFANIA
（4）cIII 888：INVIDI（A I）NVIDIOSA NICIL TIBI AD ANIMA PURA ET MUNDA QUIRIACE SATAMALINA NON TIBI $P(R A) E V A L E A(N) T$ LIGABIT TE DEI BRACHIUM DEI ET CHRISTI ET SIGNU ET SIGILU SOLOKO + PAZCASA
ID NON PRAEVALEAS INF LIGABIT TE BRACHIUM DEI QUIRIACE IN DEO VIVAS
（5）cIV 96：$\frac{0}{6}+$ IN + INBIDE QUID LACERAS ILLOS QUOS CRESZCERE SENTIS
TU IIBI TORTOR TU TECUM TUA BULNERA PORTAS
（6）cIV 118：IN DEO SEMPER VICTORIAM INIBANT A早虽
Monceaux，BSNAF 9／218 Bruston，ib 392 BUcheler（Diehl 1627）

TU QUI MULTA DUCIS LAUD－TU QUI DUCIS MULTIS IbUS INVIDEAS FUGGE ET NON LAUDIBUS INVIDEAS LEGES LIVIDE NEMO TIBI IRRITUS ET NON LEG－ ISTA LIBENTER OBIT

ITIME LIVIDE NEMO
TIBI ISTA LIBENTER OBIT
(7)xIII 665:....AUT MORE INFELIS AUT QU...所 JUBEAT INBIDERE NOLI...

(9)bIV 182: \& THXWMOPBIWHKEBEHMNOOMA + PSHITANTPACMC
(c) Interpretation

Our most convenient procedure is from general to particular, culminating in a translation of the texts in question.

## (1) General

A preliminary inspection of these nine pieces reveals the recurrence in all but two of them of one element which is of decisive importance since it serves to constitute the radical homogeneity of group containing it, namely the stem INVID under many forms: the verb in the infinitive INVIDERE (7) and in the present subjunctive INVIDEAS (5), and the ađjective in the vocative INBIDE (5), INVIDIA, INVIDIOSA (4), INBIDIA, INBIDIOSA (1), INBIZIA, INBIZIOSA (3), INBIZ (2). From this common feature it is at once clear that all seven pieces are connected with the theory of the Evil Eye, that is, the belief that many of the sufferings of life are to be traced to the ill-will of certain persons or powers who have the faculty of afflicting with detriment or suffering anything or any one on which or on whom they gaze.) The verb indicates the act of gazing with baleful intent, while the adjective is applied to the being endowed with this malignant potency?) The adjective LIVIDUS is also so used, ${ }^{3}$,
1)Hastings ERE v 608
2)Lewis-Short,p. 995
3)ib p. 1073
and coincides with "invideas" on (6). Our conclusion therefore that (1-7) have this particular superstition as their origin is doubly certain. Here accordingly we have in the alosing period of the Church in Africa a system of belief and custom already ancient, as is proved by the survival among Punic remains, in this same region, of the two most popular antidotes to the threaty) the Staring Eye and the Phallus.' Neither of these potent symbols, however, figures on our Christian amulets: in their stead Christ's Cross or Monogram everywhere prevails. The only example where it is lacking is (7), whose fragmentary condition however leaves the question open as to whether any Christian symbol originally stood alongside the text. In the case of (8) there is no specific mention of the evil eye, yet the Cross is stamped on both sides of the disc. It therefore at least reinforces the text. (9) is for the present altogether unintelligible, but the Chrism and the Cross are as usual conspicuous. That is to say: we conclude on the ground of the consistency with which Christian symbols adorn such texts, taking into account also the known efficacy of symbols generally in the history of magic, that the function of Crosses and Chrisms is not merely decorative, but also prophylactic.

A closer examination of these pieces reveals a further common feature, this time of a formal character. (1) and (2) share the clause BICIT (TE) LEO DE TRIBUS JUDA; (1), (2),(3), and (4) all share the expression INVIDIA INVIDIOSA severally represented; (3) and (4), probably also (1)(see below) share the clause NIHIL TIBI AD ANIMAM PURAM ET MUNDAM; while SIGILU SODOMO in (4) represents the C CPAIIC
1)Hastings ERE v 612
2) Gauckler NPC i 176/16,20;177/61;178/W64

COnOMOYNICin (8). Such recurring features, which are interchanged seemingly at pleasure, show clearly that the formation of such texts is subject to merely mechanical laws, not at all to organic principles. Each example is the result of ready-made formulae thrown together without inner cohesion, and is therefore entirely lacking in originality. Our magical texts, in other words, are loosely stitched together out of technical commonplaces current among professional circles. The way in which this recipe is applied can be studied from the following interesting text of the same kind, from Rome:-l)
bicit te leo de tribus Juda, radis Davit Jesu \& stus ligabit te, bratius dei et sigillus salomonix abis notturna, non baleas ad anima pura et supra quisuis sis

Of this text the first line is manifestly identical with the opening clauses of (1) and (2); the second line is essentially the same as lines three and four of (4), being parallelled to a less extent by the opening of the second line of (8); and the third line corre sponds to material present in (1), (3), and (4). Morphologically therefore the Roman example represents a contamination of five items in our African material. This does not of couse mean that it was composed directly with their help, but indicates rather the existence of a common fund of magical formulae to which a professional fraternity had access, from which each individual drew from time to time according to his requirements, and part at least of which might yet be reconstructed from the material common to all extant texts of this type. Such a hypothesis seems necessary in order to account for the structural peculiarities of the texts in question.

[^27]This result automatically prescribes our next task, whereby the general approach to the problem will be exhausted, the investigatior namely into each of these typical elements in turn from the point of view of their content. We begin with the malign power against which the spell is directed (avis notturna), proceed to the beneficent power invoked (leo de tribus Juda, radix David; signum, sigillum Salomonis; brachium Dei), and conclude with the specific method of operation (bicit, nihil tibi ad animam, ligagit). In this way we hope to gain a general picture of the typical features of the magical text and therewith firm foundations on which to carry out criticism upon the pieces concerned in detail.

Only by circuitous routes can we establish the nature of the being against whom the spells are as a rule directed. Our African material proviaes the following meagre clues:-

INBIDE (5) cannot be an imperative, as in that case it would be impossible to relate it syntactically to the rest of the piece. If is therefore a vocative, and masculine. It may therefore be adaressed to a human being, an "invidious" man, a man, that is, in possession of the Evil Eye. On the other hand it might refer to an evil spirit, as the following vocative construction on a similar text outwith Africa makes explicit: inmondissime Spirite Tartaruce, ${ }^{t} 0$ thou most unclean spirit Tartarucus, the epithet "unclean" here being readily intelligible from its frequent use in the Goapel tales?

MEMICIMENI in (8) is obviously a participle of the verb $\mu 16 \in \hat{N V}$ $=$ to hate, and may stand for the vocative masculine $\mu \in \mu \| \mu \in Y \in$, representing perhaps the Latin"invide", or the vocative feminine
1)Di 2389
2)Mt $x$ l, xii 43,45 etc.
$\mu \in \mu \subset \mu \in V \eta$ with the ellipse of the name of some disease-name such as $\Pi \quad \delta \alpha \gamma \rho \alpha,=$ gout, examples of this construction, both with the ellipse ( $\varphi \in \cup \gamma \in \mu \in \mu / \sigma \mu \in \forall \eta$, इo of the disease instead of the adjective ( $q \| f \in$ Modaypo Meeocus . 6 E (wkel) being already known!) In such cases the disease is personified as an evil spirit. On the other hand a papyrus amulet at Oxyrhynchus appears directed against a "hated spirit", peufe
 participle might refer to a hunan being, but if, on the analogy of the examples just cited, we prefer, as we do, to regard it as feminine, then we have a right to postulate an ellipse, in all probability the name of a disease.

Such is doubtless the sense in which we ought to interpret the feminines INBIDIA INBIDIOSA (1), INVIDIA INVIDIOSA (4), INBIZIA INBIZIOSA (3). The last-mentioned text however has this curious addition: PATIATU AUBIS CUI SE NOCTU CCLUM FECERIT. This as it stands is hardly intelligible. The Roman amulet reproduced on p.243, however, speaks of an "abis notturna" i.e. "avis nocturna" (= night-bird). It seems therefore as if we should see in (3) a similar reference (...aubis cui se noctu...) although we are as yet far from knowing the real translation of this clause. Corroboration is fortheoming in the shape of a picture engraved on the disc, in the centre of the inscription, regarding which there is no doubt whatever: it represents an owl. A similar engraving accompanies (4), al though no night-bird is there mentioned. On account of the peculiar dominance of the eyes within its total facial complex, this bird can well be credited with
1)PW iv 2376 2)Pap Oxy 1151, Goodspeed-Colwell no. 50
possession of the Evil Eye. Its strange ery, moreover, not at all like the cry of other birds, and the mere fact of its activity being confined to the hours of darkness, as if it sought cover for deeds which would lead to its pmishment, carried out in broad daylight, combine to qualify it exceptionally well for the role of a bird of ill omen. One recalls that in Jewish law the owl was reckoned among those birds which it regarded as ritually unclean, compare the reference already given to the"unclean spirit"Tartarucus (p.244). In these circumstances we might construe INBIDIA ete. with "owl" understood, or a circumlocution therefor, as in (3), for which (4) supplies the desired precedent. The Roman spell speaks of the owl as feminine (abis notturna), so that in such a case INBIDIA etc. Woula be quite in place. CUI in (3), if indeed it represents QUI, is confessedly masculine, and therefore contradicts this theory; but it may equally well be a feminine assimilated to the masculine form, according to the transition presupposed by the corresponding forms in the modern Romance languages, where the distinction of gender is lost.') At all events literary standards cannot be expected to hold good for barbarous rubbish such as this. Until evidence to the contrary is forthcoming, therefore, we adhere to the view, that so far as the texts before us are concerned, the feminine form of the adjective denotes a bird of ill omen, for example the owl, or, if such a reference stands in contradiction to the context (which is not the case here), to some disease personified as an evil spirit.

The power invoked as an antidote is variously described. The most frequent is what our texts term LEO DE TRIBUS JUDA ( $=$ the lion from

1) Lev xi 16-17, Deut xiv 15-16
2) LeBl,Man 196-197;Appendix I nos. 4,29,37,54,56,65,81,87,100,110,
$118,134,139,163,166$
the tribes of Judah) (I), (2). Of these pieces (I) adds RADIS DAVID (root of David), and this is very probably the reading in (2) also, in which the corresponding portion runs G. VIC. The proximate surce of this double expression is the N.T. Book of Revelation $v 5$, with the Vulgate version of which, "bicit leo de tribus Juda, radix David" (the lion of Judah, the root of David, has prevailed) our readings are identical, and combines two O.T. verses relating to the lineage of the Kings of Isreal and regarded as Messianicl) The compound expression is therefore simply a circumlocution for Christ.

Our fourth example (4) speaks in this connection of DEI BRACHIUM DEI ET CHRISTI ET SIGNU ET SIGILU SOLOMO, literally, "Of God the arm of God and of Christ and the sign and the seal of Solomon! It is obvious that some emendation is required here: as it stands, the phrase is overburdened withfords which stand in no syntactical relation at all to the whole, it ascribes an "arm" to Christ as well as to God, and speaks of a "sign" and "seal" of Solomon. The basis of our reconstruction must be the three instruments invoked: the arm, the sign, the seal. Three persons are concerned, namely God, Christ, Solomon. The only question is how the instruments are to be allotted between the persons. First of all, the"arm of God" is a familiar O.T. symbol of providence and aid, as well as of intervention; ${ }^{2}$ ) it must therefore stand. And the "sign of Christ" is also well known (signu Cristi p. 168), its prophylactic efficacy having just been discussed (242). Hence we must ascribe the deal to Solomon. Assuming therefore a uniform order in the relation between the nominatives and the genitives throughout, and taking "sigilu Solomo" as our model, since

[^28]in virtue of its position it alone is certain，we venture to read BRACHIUM DEI ET SIGNU CHRISTI ET SIGILU SOLOMO，＂the arm of God，the sign of Christ，and the seal of Solomon．＂

Of these，the two former are fomiliar enough（ p .247 ）；but what is the＂seal of Solomon＂？The answer to this question is of importance not only for this particular piece，but for the interpretation of another in our African collection，namely（8），which likewise contains the expression：Gppayis conopouvor The Roman text（p．243） refers to it also：＂sigillus Salomonix＂

Thanks to the labours of a French specialist，the literature of this problem is already assembled and to hand．Unfortunately most of the examples are of the laconic non－committal type with which we are familiar，and therefore contribute nothing to our understanding of the phrase？）One example deserves however to be reproduced，partly because it is parallel to（4）so far as it goes，（although the word in this case is not＂seal＂but＂sign＂）in the sense that Solomon is therein mentioned in juxtaposition to divine figures，and partly because of its striking syncretistic quality：－

ter dico ter incanto $\quad$\begin{tabular}{l}
thrice I say，thrice I sing a spell <br>
in signo dei et in <br>
signo Solomonis et <br>
in signo domna Artmix

$\quad$

in the sign of God and in <br>
the sign of Solomon and in
\end{tabular}

the sign of the godaess Artemis Otherwise the only mention of the seal of Solomon in antiquity occurs in the fourth－century Parisian Magical Papyrus，line 3039：－4）
 ү入wórav tou lepeuío kos E入á入りrev．．．．

I adjure thea．．．by the seal which Solomon placed on the tongue of Jeremiah causing him to speak．．．
1）Perdrizet，бфркVis Co入opcuvor，REG xvi（1903）pp．42－61
2）ib．44，48，50
3）ib． 44
4）ib． 57

This verse makes it plain that the Solomon in question is not the Byzantine military governor of Africa (who is in any case excluded by the currency of the phrase far beyond the bounds of that country) but the legendary Jewish monarch famous for his wisdom? piety, ${ }^{2}$ ) and regal splendor.) There, however, the enlightenment we receive from the Papyrus ceases for the moment at least, and we are confronted with glaring contradictions. Who was the Jeremiah mentioned therein? Prima facie it cannot be the celebrated prophet, who belonged to the epigonic period.) Can Hiran of Tyre be meant? If so, there is nothing in Solomon's relations with that potentate ${ }^{5}$ ) to correspond with the incident cited. There is in fact nothing at all in the primitive tradition of Solomon generally to answer in any way to the situation. There is no mention whatever of any miracle done by him, far less of any seal employed by him as an instrument of wonder-working.

We are forced therefore to investigate second-line evidences, those namely dealing with Solomon without mention of his mysterious seal. Here again amulets are fairly numerous, but lacking in new information. Most of them reproduce the familiar "flee, invidious spirit, s. pursues thee!" type6) One Latin example occurs, which is more of general interest as illustrating the technique of spells than of significance for the cult of Solomon:-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { in charta virgine seribis } \\
& \text { quod in dextro brachio } \\
& \text { ligatum portet ille qui } \\
& \text { patitur, recede ab illo } \\
& \text { Gaio Seio, Solomon te } \\
& \text { sequitur }
\end{aligned}
$$

you write on unused paper, which the patient is to wear bound to his right arm, the words: depart fwom John Doe, Solomon is on your track:

1) lKings iii 16
2) 2 Sam vii 12
3) Mt vi 29
4)Jer i 2
4) IKings ix 11 etc
6)Perdrizet pp. 47-48

As decisive for the interpretation of the rofle of Solomon in ancient magic, Perdrizet adduces the intaglio IAN - CONOM $\omega$ - CABAC which plainly assimilates Solomon to the O.T. Deity,Jahu Tzevaoth. Here, he reasonably argues, we have before us the ultimate apotheosis of Solomon, and therewith the key to the baffing reference in the Parisian Papyrus: the calling of Jeremiah to the prophet's office. ${ }^{\text {l }}$ God, we are there told, touched Jeremiah's mouth, thereby bestowing upon him the boldness of speech requisite for his responsible task; but the Papyrus, in view of Solomon's apotheosis, speaks with right of Solomon as the one who caused Jeremiah to embark on prophecy.) Hence we arrive at a consistent picture, into which even such unusual texts as the Latin spell reproduced on p .248 can be incorporated without difficulty: the cult of Solomon as virtually a deity. It is not difficult to understand the possibility of such a development, in view of the tendency shown by the formation of the Solomon-legend as a whole. Even the primitive tradition speaks of him as without exception the wisest man of his time, his repute as an expert in the knowledge of plants and animals in particular, and in the administration of justice and the settling of disputes being international.3) The accumulated proverbial wisdom of the Jews, when brought together, was en bloc ascribed to his authorship.) In similar fashion, no doubt on the ground of his famed insight into the property of plants, to which the ansients attributed magical power, as in the case of the mandrake, there seems to have grown up a corpus of magical formulae to which his name was attached; at all events Origen and Josephus speak of demons being exoroised according to prescriptions

1) Jer i 9
2) Perdrizet $p .57$
3) lKings iv 29-34
4)Proverbs i 1
4) Gen $x x x$ 1-24
of Solomon handed down for that purpose.) He was known moreover in Islam, and a tale in the Arabian Nights relates how he confined demons in casks.3) In circles which could produce and hand down such tales and beliefs the apotheosis of their central figure was natural and inevitable.

Yet the Seal of Solomon for the sake of whose interpetation we have been obliged to investigate thus far remains a mystery. The archaeblogical, literary, and even botanical evidence adduced to prove that it was a five- or six-pointed star ${ }^{4)}$ is mostly modern and of extremely doubtful value. The only honest verdict is a negative one: we do not know. We do know, however, that in the Early Church the word CQfayls was widely applied to the sign of the Cross, especially in connection with the ritual of baptism, confirmation, and orders.) In all probability therefore the author of the Paris Papyrus passage frequently quoted in this connection, which remains the most important commentary to the problem, had this custom of ditual crossing, or a finctional equivalent to it, in his mina.

Hence when the Seal of Solomon, in our African material, is associated with the arm of God and the sign of Christ (4), or is invoked against a demon alongside a Cross (8), no essentially fresh element is thereby introduced. It means rather that in the demonic conflict which calls forth such texts in the first place, the resources of the beneficent powers are reinforced to the maximum along the path of religious syncretism.

A kindred problem, the identity namely of $\delta^{3}{ }^{3} \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \mathcal{S}^{3} A p$, "the
1)Perdrizet pp.44-45
2) Koran xxxiv 10-13, xxxviii 29-39
3)Perdrizet pp.60-61
4)ib.pp.56-57
5)Kraus RE ii 770-771
angel Ar", who likewise figures in (8), is equally obscure. No angel of this name is otherwise known the name is not even known as that of any mortal. The name itself is far from securely established; the variants, such as they are, suggest Apart申 or ApSat, which seems to be Semitic, although the meaning is not clear. Perdrizet, who has collected all the relevant material, can think only of David's courtier Asaph (Neh. xii 46 etc.) but his argument is extremely fragile?) The opinion of Levy, that the name is 'Ap $\delta_{\alpha} \phi$, meaning one who pursues, from the root RDP to pursue ${ }^{2)}$ appears to be the most nearly satisfactory of all conjectures hitherto, inasmuch as in (8) that is precisely the function of the angel in question. It is refreshing to pass from tantalizing obscurities such as these to the consideration of the dynamics of the spell proper, since on the one hand the elements hither to treated in isolation and thus contrasted are therein observed in their primitive concrete unity as mutual counterparts generating the magical action as a whole, and on the other, the magical action itself is subject to direct examination in an atmosphere of freshness and immediacy.

To begin with, defensive formulae claim our attention. The standard expression of this type is NICIL TIBI AD ANIMA PURA ET MUNDA, i.e., nihil tibi ad animam puram et mundam, which lies before us in two clear examples $(3,4)$. A similar phrase is used, almost, it would seem, as a technical term in the vocabulary of demonology, in the narratives concerning the encounters between Christ and the demons exoraized by Him in the Gospels. On seeing Him approach, they,
1)Perarizet,pp.51-52
2) Levy,Byzantion IV (1931) p. 478
or he, are represented as crying out in terror, "What business have you with us/me?", thusk-

Greek



Latin (Vulg)
quid nobis et tibi
quid mihi et tibi
(compare the O.T. challenge exchanged between strangers or hostile or, suspicious travellers 88am xvi 10, xix 22 Tí cusik ki 山utb LXX, quid mihi et vobis Vulg)

The phrases are not of course identical, since in each case the purpose is different; but the fundamental idiom is the same. The use of the preposition $A D$ in the inscriptions with the accusative of the person is apparently a construction of reference?) PURA and MUNDA, "pure" and "clean" must here have a technical meaning, the ANIMA or soul to which they refer being ritually immune from demonic interference through association with Christ's symbol, the Cross. We therefore translate the expression, "You have no business with (this) pure and clean spirit:

At first sight NICIL TIDIAT ANIMA PURA ET (M)UNDA in (I) is a variation of this phrase. This is the opinion of the editors, ${ }^{2}$ who, reading TIDIAT as "taedeat", translate: "may nothing molest (this) pure and clean spirit!. Donsidering the context, however, we prefer to regard TIDIAT as representing TIBI $A D$, thereby bringing this instance into line with the examples just discussed. It is not simply a question of barbarism or careless engraving: a much less naive
I) Lewis-Short p. 28
2) RPE $17-18 / 14$
explanation may yet be forthcoming ere we have finished examining the texts of this category. Nothing hinders us in the mean time from proceeding to the consideration of a more aggressive type of formula current in this connection: the use namely of the verbs sicumen to pursue, VINCRRE to overcome, LIGARE to bind.
"To pursue" occurs in (8): "Flee, invidious spirit, the angel Ar(aph) pursueth thee!" Such is plainly the meaning of queuve $M \in \mu I \sigma I \mu E V I$ SIOKI TE $O^{2}$ 'ayYE入OS Ap[DX4]. We have already had occasion to refer to morphologically identical examples from outside Africa, showing that this imprecation belongs to a common type. (pp. 245,249 ) To these we would merely add a sentence taken from a 6 thcentury Egyptian papyrus recording a prayer addressed by one Silvanus to Christ and Saint Serenus:-1)

|  | I, Silvanus the son of |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | give thanks and bow my head before |
|  | thee, begging and exhorting |
| Po | chase away from me Thy |
| du Tor saímora Tpoß | demon of the Evil Eye et |

No more complete or explicit commentary than this could be desired.
VINCERE occurs in (I) and (2) in the perfect BICITA(vicit), in the former absolutely: "The lion of Judah etc. has prevailed" f(FB (BICIT LEO...) in the latter with specific object:"The lion... has prevailed over thee"(BICIT TE LEO...). That is to say:"Christ has vanquished fthee)" (p.247). Exactly the same formula is used in the oft-cited Roman example (p.243). The victory of Christ over malign powers, incluđing death, is of course the familiar teaching of the primitive Church?

[^29]The strongest word, however, encountered in our African material is LIGARE (= to bind) which occurs in (4), and there twice, in the form LIGABIT, which might conceivably be a barbarism for "ligavit" and therefore perfect, but which considering its context we prefer to regard simply as future indicative: "the arm of God(and the sign of Christ and the seal of Solomon) will bind thee! Similarly the Roman analogue on $p .243$ contains the imprecation: "Jesus Christ \{has bound \} thee, and the arm of God, and the seal of Solomon! Compounds of this simple verb are to be found, such as REligare ( $=$ to bind back, confine) in the Christian amulet belonging to the 6 th century addressed to The most unclean spirit Tartarucus" (inmondissime spirite Tartaruce) "whom the angel Gabriel has confined in chains of fire" (quem angelus Gabriel de catenis igneis relegavit) ${ }^{l}$ ) and OBligare, as in the heathen spell in which the writer charges the being he invokes to bind his enemy securely by the feet, etc:..."obliga illi pedes!'2) the Paris Magical Papyruse provides us with an example of the Greek equivalent to this Latin expression, and that in no uncertain manner:-3)
 Secueblu $\delta \in \sigma$ luais, $=$ bound with fetters you can neither


Obviously therefore we have here to do with no mere isolated device proceeding from the originality of a private mind, but on the contrary, a technical term universally recognized and applied as a matter of course in texts of this type. And in fact the presence of this expression constitutes the piece in which it is found as belonging to a distinctive class of spell: such a text is called a "defixio" The connection is made clear by the definition of Philoxenos,
1)Di 2389
2) De 8755
3)Pap Par 1245

DEFIXIONES : KQTर $\delta \in \sigma \mu 01 .{ }^{1)}$ That is to say: "defixiones" are charms for binding demons. The root is De-figere, to fix down, secure, fasten. In practice, however, a more drastic meaning attaches to the word and its derivatives. According to Kuhnert, "the real meaning of defigere is to stick into, the word having assumed a technical sense in connection with a special kind of magic. The idea underlying its use is, that the magic works like the boring of a skewer. Just as such an instrument maims a person, and deprives him of the free use of his powers, so also does the magic act. The person mentioned in the spell falls a victia to death, or is tortured with pain or sickness, until, by the fulfilment of a certain condition, he is in the position to liberate himself from the effect of the malignant weapon, namely the magic spell. This idea is very ancient...I recall the wellknown parallel in German superstition, to the effect that by driving a nail into a person's footprint you may kill the man himself..."2) By drawing an image of the person to whom he wishes ill, therefore, and by piercing this image with a skewer or nail, the author of a defixio contrives his enemy's ruin. Thus on one such document we find the express statement: oculos...defico in as tabellas, I pierce his eyes in this tablet?) Without quitting African soil we may read the epitaph of the wife of an army officer who "was laid low by incantations"( carminibus defixa jacuit). ${ }^{4}$. This is plainly the meaning th of the crude images associated with the texts already discussed in connection with the Seal of Solomon (p.249), showing Solomon on horseback transfixing with a lance a demon extended on the ground beneath him. ${ }^{5}$ ) By representing the unwanted disease as a demon
1)PW iv 2377
2) $i b .2373-4$
3) De 8751
4)CIL8 2756
5)Perdrizet p. 60
captured, held down, secured, and utterly subjugated by Solomon, the author of every such amulet reinforces his imprecation by giving it the power of a defixion."

The word LIGABIT however is quite as charcteristic of the "defixion" type of amulet as the word "efigere" itself, since it expresses the same fundamental idea, that namely of binding, holding down, fixing, securing, forcing, mastering, vanquishing, and with it we must associate this complex of ideas as a whole. When therefore our inscription (4) speaks of the arm of God, the sign of Christ, and the seal of Solomon as "binaing" the demon against which the spell is directed, such language constitutes the text in question once for all as a defixion, in which the God of the Christians is invoked against maleficent demons. This type of Christology dates apparently from the primitive period of the Church, where we find its ultimate basis: as a result of the Coming of Christ, an angel is observed to take a głreat chain in his hand and therewith to bind ( $\in \mathscr{\prime} \delta \eta \sigma \in \nu!$ ) the Archdemon himself, Satan, in the bottomless pit.) There is a manifest connection between the N.T. verse and our defixion. Both share the same fundamental system of magical conceptions.
(2) Particular

The way has thus been cleared for an examination of each text taken by itself. We propose to carry out this examination by translating each piece according to our knowledge already gained so far as we can, noting individual peculiarities as we go along.

[^30](1) + The lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has overcome you. You have no business with (this) pure and clean spirit, invidious one. Michael, Raphael, Uriel, Gabriel. + Victoria + Apart from the phrase "pure and clean spirit", which is not here to be taken in a moral sense, but, as in the mysteries, as indicating that the subject is free from demonic contamination ${ }^{1}$ ) the chief peculiarity of this piece is the mention of the four Archangels, all of whom were combined in this manner in the East as early as the 2nd century?) only Michael and Gabriel however being Biblical, Raphael and Uriel on the contrary being attested epigraphically in the West only from the 6 th century onwarās.) Only the Biblical Archangels, moreover, are at all clearly characterized. Michael is the chief of all angels $\frac{4}{4}$ ) and God's champion against the Devil and his hordes, whom he vanquishes on God's behalf, ${ }^{5}$, the saint therefore, who like another dragon-slayer, St.George, has been accorded veneration throughout the Church () Gabriel, who in the Bible is depicted as God's messanger entrusted with special missions to mortals?) came to be Michael's assistant in his conflict against the Antichrist?) and thus finally his equal as the terror of demons, as the spell directed against Tartarucus on p. 255 plainly shows. Both Archangels are associated with Christ in Roman material9) and mentioned separately elsewherel ${ }^{10}$ )

[^31]All four figure on an item found in Sofia: Mihel Vriel (G)abriel Rafael.) The association of as many angelic powers as possible by name together with Christ is most appropriate on a document of this kind, đirected as it is against one of the demons.

Victoria is apparently the name of the "anima" in question, namely the person who fears the demon, and on whose behalf the spell has been devised. It is to be noticed that the name is flanked by crosses, and thus, as it were, protected both behind and before against the assault of the dreaded demon.
(2) The lion of the tribes of Judah has overcome you..t...??????????? This is identical with (I) so far as we have translated it. Otherwise it makes no sense. G.VIC may represent "David" as already pointed out (p.247) ; but as a whole we do not yet venture to suggest further reconstruction of this baffilng phenomenon.
(3) +Invidious, invidious, invidious..?..bird...night?.....You have no business with the pure and clean spirit which is called Istefania.

The difficulties of translating the former portion of this text have already been discussed (p.245). For the rest we are on familiar ground (pp.252-253). As in (1) the name is given, and the person specified thereby, who seeks protection.
1)Di 2430
(4) Invidious one, invidious one, you have no business with the pure and clean spirit of Quiriaca. May they not prevail over you, Satamalina. The arm of God, the sign of Christ, and the seal of Solomon will bind you. + Pazcasa / May you not succeed in this thing, 0 ill-omened one. The arm of the God of Quiriaca will bind you. - May you live in God.

At least two persons seem to be addressed here, corresponding to the phrases "invidia etc." and "in deo vivas", which exclude each other absolutely. "invidia etc." can only be applied to the demon against which the amulet is directed (pp.245-246), and "in deo vivas" is an acclamation of goodwill exchanged among fellow-Christians already familiar (pp.228-229). We have confadence therefore in taking this distinction within the spell as the basis of our interpretation.

There appear however to be three proper names involved. Of these Quiriaca is certain: she is the "pure and clean spirit" in this case, and moreover is mentioned again in connection with the arm of God. (see p. 247) Satamalina, however, is also hailed in a similar fashion, as is the only way to construe "Satamalina non tibi praevaleant", if this is in fact the correct reading. Does she then share this spell with Quiriaca? Finally we must account for Pazcasa, which is almost certainly a proper name. At all events, it is only as a proper name that it can be intelligibly incorporated into the text at all. Who is she? The proximity of the cross suggests that she is a third person sharing the spell and its benefits. In that case we have here a communal amulet designed to protect three ladies from a common demonic foe. If on the other hand the cross be regarded as appended to the defixion-clause, Pazcasa may be a mere signature,
that namely of the person who drew up the defixion on behalf of two clients.

At all events it is beyond dispute that the text is in fact the work of a professional exorcist undertaken on behalf of another person or group of persons. Only thus can the dialogue be understood. The sense fundamentally runs: "Demon, begone! \& Take comfort, madam, all is well! This result confirms tentative conclusions drawn earlier from morphological premisses (p.23).
(5) $\frac{p}{\alpha}+$ Why do you tear at those, 0 invidious man, whom you perceive to be making headway? You are merely torturing yourself: your blood is upon your own head.

Such seems a justifiable, if somewhat free, rendering of this simple item. It is a mild imprecation, reminding the envious man, who resents his fellow-citizens' success, that far from doing himself any good, it he is simply calling forth retaliation and thereby adding to his own misfortune. It is manifestly an original piece, standing in strong contrast to the pofessional productions hitherto examinea. Yet the magical presuppositions lurk quite near the surface Sor those who have learned to recognize them, particularly the "leceras", which is in conformity to "defixion" methods of speaking, and "invided which has obviously a direct connection with the cilt of the Evil Eye. The cross and chrism serve here, as elsewhere, as prophylactic stigmata: whether the envious man takes his advice or not, the anonymous author of this piece takes the precaution of proptecting himself at least against any risk.
(6) In God they ever marched on to victory. Af W You who turn away your face and take no pleasure in reading these things, may you be dreaded by all, envious man, none by you.

This is a curious document in more ways than one. In the first place the reading has occasioned much dispute. The first part, to be sure, offers no difficulties: it obviously refers to the glorious achievements of some amp of the Christian Empire, and is inspired by the popular Constantine legend, which produced many acclamations by way of imitation (pp.222-223). It is the latter part, on the other side of the chrism, which has given rise to differences of opinion. The crux, it would seem, lies in the order in which we are to take the lines. As they stand on the stone, the words may be treated as in either of the first two columns. It cannot, however, be claimed that so arranged they yield any adequate sense. Only by drastic manipulation can the savants of the BSNAF extort any meaning, and that by no means unanimously approved, and by no means natural or convincing. Bllcheler's reading, on the other hand, obtained by readjusting the lines, dispenses with the elaborate system of conjecture required by previous editors, with the result that it is much shorter and consequently leaves far less to the interpreter's reconstructive ability. It is this version, therefore, that we have adopted. In substance its meaning is identical with that of the other readings it replaces, the only difference between it and them being one of detail.

Whichever reading be preferred, the nature of the document is beyond dispute: the coincidence upon it of the words "invideas" and "livide", which, as we have already seen, are technical expressions,
(pp.241-242) establish its connection with the cult of the Evil Eye. "Whoever" so runs the sense of it,"grudges this membrial, and is jealous of those who have earned it, had better turn his attention elsewhere. He is a despicable creature who deserves to be avoided wherever he goes!' That is to say: he is exhorted to turn his Evil Eye away from the monument in question, and direct it wherever else he pleases: by so doing he will only reap ill-will from others in return, in the shape of retaliation, and will deserve all the enmity he thereby evokes. So expøunded this text reveals the same fundamental assumptions as the one which precedes it. Strictly speaking, the "nemo tibi" does not make sense. Probably we should regard it as a rhetorical extravagance designed to produce balance: "tu....omnibus,...nemo tibi": It is therefore, like the preceding example, a mild imprecation, and is furnished, again like it, witha a chrism, as a precaution.
(7)..or in the manner of the unhappy man, or of him who (?)... of God bids not to look enviously upon.....

We confess to being able to make very little of this text, which we associate with the cult of the Evil Eye only because of the word "inbidere", and judge also to be Christian only because $\widehat{\mathrm{Di}}$ is a very common contraction for Dei on Christian texts. From what remains of it, a certain affinity might be argued to exist between it and the two items just discussed; but nothing decisive can be established by means of it, and nothing new energes from it.
(8) +Flee, invidious spirit, the angel Ardaph pursues you: + The Seal of Solomon. Give help to John!

The greater part of this inscription has already been discussed in different connections (flee, etc.p.254, Ardaph p.252), (seal of Solomon, pp.248-251). The only element not yet discussed is the petition: "give help to John! And this we do not propose to handle thoroughly at this stage, as the type of text of which it is an example falls to be dealt with in our next section, where an ample discussion of Byzantine seals bearing analogous invocations will be undertaken. Let it suffice to observe in advance, that this is an oriental formula, and constitutes an extraneous phenomenon from every point of view, when occurring in this text.

Here therefore we have to do with a composite spell, somewhat analogous to (4) in this respect namely, that it is directed to two opposing quarters. Here however it is a simple matter to determine the way in which this is achieved. Between the imprecation "flee... you!" and the invocation "give...John" there stands "the seal of Solomon", a phrase syntactically related to neither, but in the intention of the author, related to both. On the one hand, it represents God's antagonism to the invidious spirit, on the other, God's readiness to help his worshipper John. Thus it holds the document together. As usual the cross is used prophylactically.
(9) 床 ...........??????????????????

This piece baffles us completely. It is Christian, probably fourth century. Otherwise we can make nothing of it. We regardit as a magical text on the ground simply of its obscurity. Elsewhere in our magical material we have been brought to a standstill, viz. in the case of (2) and (3), although never so completely and so desperately as here.

But even in this extremity, the result of experience holds good: the mere forthcomingness of analogus cases is the first step towards the ultimate understanding of a problem. If namely our African material of this category abounds so richly in obscurities, the phenomenon may perhaps after all be grounded upon the nature of the material itself, instead of upon our own lack of exegetical equipment. This possibility, suggested by internal evidence, is much reinforced by external evidence. We find namely that philological blind-spots of this kind are quite a feature of magical texts in general. Meaningless patches occur in heathen defixions.) of the seven texts edited by whinsch three contain passages of some length which defy translation, although here and there a few groups of letters admit of explanation as Semitic or Egyptian, none of the suggestions offered in this direction however being decisive? ) The same scholar has likewise edited afresh about 250 lines of the great Paris Magic Papyrus, and within this excerpt we encounter not one but several sets of verses from which nothing at all can be extractea. 3) Here therefore we appear to have before us a characteristic feature of demonological technique: obscurity cultivated for its own sake.

If however we look more closely at our African material, we soon begin to see the way in which this is at least sometimes and in some cases brought about. It will be remembered, for example, how the Roman amulet was employed in the interpretation of (3) which without it would have resisted interpretation to an even greater

1) De $8752-4,8756$
2) Wunsch, Ant FI $1,3,4$
3)k1184 pp. 21,26,28,29
extent than it actually has done (p.245).
Similarly within our African material we have had oceasion to interpret one obscure text by bringing alongside it a morphologically analogous text, itself already understood. In this way we interpreted G.VIC in (2) by means of DAVID in (1) (p.247).

Suppose now we tackle the second line of (2) on this principle, reproducing inf generally in minuscules, but printing in majuscules whatever we can parallel elsewhere, albeit sporadically:-

INBIZsAinarIOSA INBIctadas

Here the common salutation of the invidious spirit (I)(2) is seen in sonewhat sketchy outline. The next line:-

IATURABISqISnE NOnTUmgeILUM
is manifestly comparable to the corresponding line in (3), and line 4:

## FEReIT to tonFIAN

seems at least to recall the FECERIT and ISTBFANIA of (3).

In face of these strange examples of correspondence, not only of isolated groups of letters, but of the order in which these groups occur, the impression gradually forces itself upon us with (tact greater conviction the longer we consider the problem; here is no mere illiterate scrawl or shorthand method devised to meet a lack of space, but a deliberate, purposeful, yet at the same time arbitrary manipulation of originally straightforward text. In terms of the two texts handed above, this explanation means that (3) and (2) represent progressive stages in the distortion of an original text now lost, or perhaps of two đistinct originals which
were at least morphologically similar. On comparing (2) and (3), however, we are unable to detect any regularity in the modifications there onserved. The relation of the two texts does not appear to be subject to any law, as would be the case were the differences between them unconscious. They must consequently be artificial, contrived with an end in view.

What then could have been the purpose in thus twisting and disfiguring a straightforward text? The answer is to be sought in the purpose of compositions of this type as a whole: in the last resort, defixions and kindred pieces are intended to be read by other than human eyes. ${ }^{\text {l }}$ (Ulimately all magical texts are adaressed not to men, but to demons. In all probability, therefore, this wilful disguising of the text should be understood as an attempt to attract the attention of the demons concerned, at all events to witharaw the imprecation from the understanding of man, in the hope that if it were ever understood and read, it would be understood and read by the right person. Such may indeed be the explanation of the confused state of (6) which, as already seen, (p.262) demands no small readjustment to render it intelligible; for although it is ostensibly adaressed to a certfin type of human being, it is ultimately an amulet directed against the Evil Eye, which is fundamentally an impersonal force independent of the individual who mediates its influence. In that case we see one very simple method of "manipulation", namely the displacement of phrases and clauses. Without however having had the opportunity of examining the stone for ourselves, we do not wish to insist upon this explanation. It is enough to have indicated

[^32]the possibility of this particular application of a hypothesis whose general validity we think to be soundly established.

For if such is the ultimate explanation of the obscurity of texts like (2), it must be confessed that the purpose is admirably realized, at least in the negative sense. In order to make any given text impossible to understand, all that is necessary is a jumbling of the letters, together with wholesale removal of letters and meaningless addition of letters. Such an operation would result precisely in an incoherent string of alphabetical characters like that which now lies before us, and would likewise defy emendation, which depends on connections governed by laws, precisely because it involves in advance a renunciation of all consistency, order, and connection in general.

Hence, in our opinion, the obscurity of (9). Here, however, we are at a more nearly complete loss than in the case of the group (1)-(3), because points of contact similar to those emerging there are not to be found between (9) and the only text with which we can for this purpose compare it, nemely (8). No doubt the second portion, that from the cross onwards, might represent an original sppay's Eotounvor, as most of the alphabetical material required for this phrase seems to be present, but there is no positive evidence in this direction. With the rest of the inscription, which is considerably longer, the prospects of restaring a possible original are still more remote. Not until fresh material of the same kind is forthcoming will it be in our power to decipher this puzzle, and even then will scarcely be able to translate more than fragments, for want of hermeneutic criteria.
(d) Observations

Standing back now from our material and surveying it as a whole, we are impressed by a number of features in it which could not be profitably discussed in connection with any one item of detail.
(I) The universality of this particular type of praxis is the most remarkable aspect of? subject-matter. In the realm of magic, apparently, it is quite out of place to discuss local phenomena as if isolated and only secondarily to be submitted to the comparative. It was impossible in the first place even to understand the texts without the collation of much exogenous material, both Christian and non-Christian. Then again nothing of any importance emerged in the course of analysis which could rightly be stigmatized as peculiar to Africa. On the other hand, the specifically Christian element is not, actually so large as it at first seems. Even the N.T. references which underlie the vocabulary are almost without exception confined to the Apocalypse, the essentially Judaistic quality of which is well known, while the O.T. has been frequently adduced and found to contain the fundamental source of many a word or phrase. In general indeed texts of this type frequently reflect a want of definiteness which renders a decisive answer to the question: Jewish? Ethnic? Christian? wellnigh impossible, as when Jesus is included among a score of deities known to be Greek or Semitic, or altogether unknown? ) The Evil Eye itself is dreaded everywhere and 旺出 all times ${ }^{3}$ ) including Jewry. ${ }^{4}$ ) In the last resort, the name and sign of Christ, and nothing

[^33]else, enables us to identify Christian material of this type. Apart from that everything in them is of non-Christian origin. A Christian defixio or other spell is Christian because it invokes Christ against the dreaded power.
(2) In particular, the "sign of Christ", i.e. the Cross, and cruciform symbols generally, have in themselves prophylactic value, since they represent Christ Himself, who is thus associated, as we have seen, with the Arm of God and the Seal of Solomon (pp.247,251). The fact moreover that the Cross thus superseded the phallus as a Charm against the Evil Eye (p.242) raises the question whether it did not at the same time function as its surrogate. General grounds speak in farour of this hypothesis, inasmuch as to the ancients, far from being an obscenity, the phallus "as the symbol of reproduction epitomized the Will-to-Live in contrast to the forces of destruction and death"I) and was thus well adapted to epitomize also the work of Christ, who, as we have seen, was praised by Paul as having triumphed over death and the devil (p.254). In particular, a Spanish amulet (saec. XI) A $\omega$ CRUCIS ALMAE FERO SIGNU FUGIE DEMON? " "I carry the sign of the life-giving Cross: demon, begone!" further supports it, since $A L M A E$ applied to the Cross cannot mean kind, gentle, etc. but, corresponding to its philology, life-giving, exactly as when applied to Priapus.3) Finally, the hypothesis might well account for the fact, never hitherto explained, that the Cross, originally shaped like the letter $T^{4}$ ) soon developed an extra limb. The hypothesis thus solves more than one problem.
I) Florenz in Chantepie d.1. Saussaye,LBRG i 295
2) Hu 3 S 268
3) Buecheler, CLE 1504 B 31 O PRIAPE FAVE ALME
4) Epistle of Barnabas ix 8
(3) In connection with the phenomena of distortion(pp. 264-268) and rhetorical redundance ( p .263 ) it occurs to us to point out two further irregularities of a similar kind. (a)In (1) to (4) inclusive we find a longer and shorter form of the adjective "invidious" alternating, amounting in the case of (3) to a triple fo rmula of address. The accumulation of superfluous words produces a jingle. (b) The alliteration "tu tibi tortor tu tecum tua (bulnera por)tas" in (5) is likewise noteworthy. Taken together all these aberrations from the normal seem to belong to the technique of the amulet. Otherwise it is difficult to account for such a number of them being found on such a small number of pieces belonging to the same category.
(4)Lastly the proper names are so distributed between the genders as to raise a sociological issue of some importance. It will be noticed that feminine names (Victoria, Istefania, Quiriaca, Satamalina, Pazcasa) predominate strikingly over masculine names (John) in the ratio $5 / 1$. This onesicedness is modified to this extend, namely that in (5), (6), (7), and (9) the question is left open, no names there occurring, so that these may have originated from men, as (5) and (6) probably have. It might also be pointed out that of the feminine names two (Satamalina, Pazcasa) are somewhat doubtful. Nevertheless of the first four texts, which constitute the nucleus of our collection, and are the most detailed and personal of all, not one contains a man's name, however many or few women's names they contain: three at least of these are certain, and a fourth is very probable (Pazcasa), being perhaps the name of the redactor of the spell in question. We have a right therefore to ask whether, as
suggested by the statistics, this particular type of religious praxis was of special interest to women rather than to men. In view of the prejudice,given expression first in the primitive period of the Church ${ }^{\text {l }}$ and by no means extinct even to-day, against the collaboration of all believers without exception and on an equal footing in the management of Church affairs, it is antecedently not improbable that those whom tradition excluded from official positions should seek the catharsis of their religious enthusiasm starved thereby in the realm of the unofficial. It is even possible that for the same reason they should embrace this type of exorcism on a professional scale. From the witch of Endor ${ }^{2}$ ) onwards female specialists in the art of magic have been exceedingly common. The Montanist movement, moreover, boasted the possession of prophetesses, the words of the two most famous of them, Priscilla and Maximilla, being as widely circulated as those of Montanus himself, and was the object of indignation at the hands of Catholic fathers because of the freedom it allowed its women members of speaking in the presence of congregations assembled for worship.) Now we know of the strength of Montanism in Africa, and have reason to see its influence in the later Donatist schism (pp. 155-156), in the early development of which, moreover, one of the leading parts was played by a certain Lucilla. (s) it possible, in these circumstances, that Victoria and her friends were Donatists? If so, are we to ascribe magiaal praxis chiefly to the Donatists? It must be confessed that these questions do not admit of a decisive answer, and that even the question of the interest of women as a

1) $1 \operatorname{Cor}^{2} 34-35$
2) I Sam Xxviii 7
3) Bonwetsch,TGM (klT 129)pp.15-20
4) Irenaeus adv.haer.iii $2 / 9$, Bonwetsch p. 3
${ }^{5}$ ) Optatus de schismate Don.i 16; Gesta apud Zenofilum, vSoden, UED p. 48
class in magic cannot be maintained with absolute confidence in view of the relatively small nember of texts concerned. But until evidence to the contrary is forthcoming, it is reasonable to draw attention to the striking want of balance as between the names from the standpoint of their genaer.

An interesting link binaing this observation to the first (pp. 269 sqq.) is suggested in the form of the name Istefania (3). The prothetic vowel is a characteristically Semitic phenomenon, where $S$ is followed by $T$ or other hard consonant.) Were the authors of our first four texts for that reason Jews, that is, Jewish converts? Such an inference would be consistent with the conspicuously Jewish bias of the technical pocabulary (lion of Judah, Root of David, seal of Solomon, the Archangels, arm of God). The relationship of Scriptural phylacteries, prescribed by Jewish law? ) to amulets of this type is after all by no means remote. On the other hand the prothetic vowel in itself might equally well be reckoned as an element in the transition from Vulgar Latin to the modern form of Latin seen in the Romance languages, ${ }^{3}$ ) a process which is unambiguously attested elsewhere in our material, as has been established already on p. 246. Hence this hypothesis, namely that the amulets circulated mainly in Jewish as distinct from non-Jewish sections of the Early Church, does not admit of an absolute decision. But it succeeds uncommonly well in reducing to order the diffuse phenomenon of African Christian magical praxis.

1) Daviđson,IHG p. 23
2) Deut $\vee i$ 6-9
3) LeBl, Manuel pp. 196-197
(e) Results

Dread of the Evil Eye continued to haunt the ancient world long after the political triumph of Christianity, and prevailed throughout the period here under review. As a protection against it the traditional spells were still employed, Christian symbols, namely the Cross and Monogram, performing the prophylactic functions of the now discarded Eye and Phallus. In addition, the names of God, Christ, Solomon, and of the Archangels were likewise invoked.

In the redaction of amulets and defixions resort was had to literary deviced such as circumlocution, alliteration, reiteration, parallelism, and deliberate but arbitrary distortion, presumably with a view to reinforcing their magical efficacy. Alongside casual unofficial imprecations directed against the Evil Eye in general it is possible to distinguish spells of a highly technical quality produced by professional exorcists to the order of individual clients wishing protection of this kind against specific troubles. The custom generally was favoured chiefly by women. That it prevailed for the most part in Zeugitana during Byzantine times corresponds to anticipations based on general statistics, and has apparently no special significance.

Collation fails to reveal any local peculiarity of importance in the material, which produces formulae of international currency. On the other hand the controlling influence is everywhere distinctly Jewish, the vocabulary being derived from the apocalyptic literature of the primitive Church.

## VI - Invocations : The Cult of the Virgin

Both among texts connected with the martyrs (pp.201-202) and in the last section ( $p .264$ ) we have encountered appeals for help to higher powers. The fundamental literary structure of such appeals or invocations, namely a noun in the vocative combined with a verb in the imperative, when applied to our African material as a principle of isolation, releases sixty-two pure examples of this category, all of them Byzantine, distributed throughout the country in the following proportions:-

## (a) Distribution

|  | II | III | IV | V |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| c | 2 | 55 | 4 | 1 | 62 |  |

The outstanding predominance of Zeugitana in this table suggests that this type of inscription was produced in official circles. In fact most of the texts are taken from lead seals belonging to the members of the Imperial Court and Government Headquarters at Carthage.
(b) Morphology

By definition the invocation is radically the syntactical combination of a noun in the vocative and a verb in the impenative. Quite a number of our texts correspond to this simplest of all types of structure. Generally however the name of the author is mentioned. Occasionally his official title is added. In a few cases this basic procedure is subject to variation. Owing however to the smallness
of the surface at the author's disposal, namely the two sides of a lead seal, the invocation never blossoms forth in any luxuriance to sppak of, but is confined within the aforementioned narrow limits. We have here therefore a convenient basis on which to work, and will deal respectively with our material under three classes: (l)noun+verb, (2) same plus name, (3) same plus name and designation; together with a subsection devoted to miscellaneous texts.

## (c) First type

We count among examples of this type not only those texts which never contained more than the two indispensable words, but also tho which once containea aditional matter which has now become illegible, since in both cases what we have before us is the invocation in its simplest form, and therefore in the form which calls for discussion before the less simple specimens. In the mode of writing, there is a distinetion to be observed throughout between texts written in a straightforward manner, and those written in the form of a monogram constructed so as to represent the Cross. (cruciform monogram). The distinction does not justify the separate treatment of the texts thus differing from each other, but an asterisk ( $\%$ ) will distinguish, in the course of what follows, the cases in which this special arrangement of the letters occurs. Whether written normally or as a cruciform monogram, however, the texts in question are generally ridded with contractions and suspensions of every kind, according to the space available. No notice will be taken here of such calligraphic niceties except where cases of doubt arise.

These, then, are the texts belonging to this simple type:cIII $83,682 *, 683 *, 691 *, 740 *, 760^{*}, 770 *, 779 *, 782^{*}, 799 *, 803 *, 813,827 *$, $830 *, 834^{*}, 837 *, 847 *, 854 *$ 。
cIV 208,209,210.
and the invocation which they all reproduce is one and the same:$\theta \in O T \delta k \in \beta$ 何 $\theta \in 1=$ Help thou, O Mother of God:

Exact parallels to this expression are not wanting, either alone or in combination with other words: similar seals have been found, but only in the Eastern portion of Europe. () Much commoner is the morphologically similar invocation kúple BónGel (help thou, o Lord!), likewise found in the East, including the Balkans ${ }^{3}$ ) and the Danube region, ${ }^{4}$ ) as well as Phrygia, where one example at least is ascribed by its editor as not later than the fourth eentury.) The idea of the help of God in general is common in the Christian epigraphy of the East? ) where the controlling influence is thought to be liturgical, 8 ) but may quite as readily be only Biblical, the Psalms in particular expressing this conception again and again. ${ }^{9}$ ) One item from Phrygia even invokes the help of an Archangel. 10)

We proceed therefore to a closer examination of the expression THEOTOKOS. Church History is familiar with this neat compound primarily in connection with the Nestorian Controversy. I) Into the details of this case, which Sidney Cave does not hesitate to call "sordid", ${ }^{12)}$ we have no occasion to enter: it will be sufficient to state in this connection, that about 430 Nestorius of Antioch, then Archbishop of
7) Byzantion iv 189-191,454; v 628; Vi 271-272; Ramsay CBP no. 425
2) Byz. V 651 3)ib. 614 4) Byz. vii 322,330 5) Ramsay nos. $404,433,671$
 IO) Ramsay no. 442 11) Socrates HE vii 32-35 12) Cave DPC p. 110

Constantinople，protested against the term Theotokos，which was apparently popular，thinking it idolatrous and ridiculous，proposing in its stead Christotokos，Mother of Christ，as mare becoming． Theotokos，however，was destined to remain，since it had been in use for so long．It was not indeed Biblical，but Socrates remarks that it had been used both by Origen and Eusebius．Alexander of Alexandria， moreover，（died 328）writing against the Arians，had used it．3）Gregory of Nazianzus had also used it ${ }^{4}$ ）together with some other of the fathers of the Early Church5）Therefore Cyril of Alexandria，in his polemical correspondence with and about Nestorius，upheldit，${ }^{6}$ ）and finally the Synod of Chalcedon（451）made use of it in the appropriate place，doubtless as a deliberate repudiation of Nestorius＇views？）

Apart from its literary jise，however，Theotokos enjoyed a wide－ spread popular currency．From both extremities of the Mediterranean we are able to illustrate its non－literary use：from a papyrus amulet in Egypt，${ }^{8}$ ）and from Spain，where，although the Greek term is wanting， yet inscriptions are to be found bearing Latin equivalents，namely genetrix domini ${ }^{9)}$ and deipara virgol0）There are however two realms in which Theotokos is particularly conspicuous as the favourite epithet of the Virgin：popular poetry，and the liturgy of the Mass．

In the Byzantine hymns of the fifth and sixth centuries Theotokos occurs not once but many times，${ }^{11)}$ and when it does not occur，the idea is expressed in other words，such as＂all－holy virgin，mother of Christ，Mグフnp Xpiorỗ＂I2）＂all－holy virgin，who bore，unwed，the
1）Cave 109－111
2）Socr．HE vii 32，ed．Bright p． 316
3）Lietz．Symbole p． 9
4）Kidd ii 84 p． 109 5）Sophocles，Lexikon p． 578 6）Kidd ii 193－195
7）Lietz．Symbole p． 35 8）Pap Ox ll5l 9）Hu Sp 240 10）Hu Sp 273
11）Maas，kIT 52／53 i $2 / 8,7 / 17$ ，iii 4 p .30 12）Mas i $1 / 6$
 the title of Theotokos, persisted far into Mediaeval times. In the thirteenth century, for example, we find Nikephorus Kallistus Xanthopoulus addressing hymn after hymn "to the supremely holy Mother of Gढd" (Gis गiv imepdyidy Georbkov) ${ }^{2}$ ) and using such expressions

 she who bore God the Word without seed.4) However questionable, therefore, the title seemed to the practical Nestorius, it was not considered out of place in poetry.

Still less does it seem to have been out of place in the Liturgy of the Eastern Church. From the time of John Chrysostom down to the end of the eighth century there were three stages of the Mass as celebrated at Constantinople where the word Theotokos occurred. First in the opening prayer of adoration, God is asked to accept the worship of sinners and grant them His pardon, "through the intercessions of
 saints who have deserved well of thee from time immemorial:5) Then in the prayer following upon the consecration of the elements, the priest beseeches God to attend to the words of his worshippers, reminding Him at the same time of the supplications "of the all-holy, immaculate, supremely glortbus and blessed one, our lady, the God-
 Mapids) and of saint John, the forerunner and baptist,...and all

thy saints! ${ }^{1)}$ Finally after the distribution the priest invokes the blessing of God "throught the prayers and supplications of our holy, ( $\theta \in 0$ (bkou)
glorious Lady, the God-bearing and perpetual Virgin Mary, and of all the saints who have deserved well of thee from time immemorial! ${ }^{2}$ ) From the Byzantine Liturgy the term passed into the Canon of the Roman Mass, where, following upon the Pater Noster, the priest prays thus: "deliver us we beseech Thee 0 Lord from all evils past present and future, by the intercessions of the blessed, glorious, and perpetual Virgin Mary, Mother of God (beata et gloriosa semper virgine dei genitrice Maria) together with Thy blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and Andrew, and all the saints! ${ }^{3)}$

From the foregoing paragraphs it is clear that the term Theotokos Was an extraordinarily popular one, and that its currency extended far beyond the period here reviewed. But an examination of the passages containing it tells us something more, and of even greater value for our understanding of the invocation Theotoke Boethei: it is evident from them, that the invocation "help thou, O Mother of God" is meant to secure for the supplient the intercession of the Virgin before the throne of grace. In the Primitive Church there wats but one mediator between man and God, namely Jesus Christ, although the intercessions of the Holy Spirit are also mentioned; ${ }^{5}$ ) but Byzantine Christianity knows of a host of mediators and intercessors whose outstanding merits gain for them special favour in God's eyes, namely the saints, whose pleas He can scarcely bring Himself to refuse.

1) Baumstark p.12/2
2) Baumstrrk p. 16/2
3)Lietz.klTI9 p.17/16
3) 1 Timothy ii 5
4) Romans viii 26-27

If a reason be sought for this development, one lies close at hand: as a result of the theological speculations whose endless ramifications constitute a great part of the History of the Eastern Church, God had been removed into the region of abstract notions, far away from the needy human heart, so that in order to maintain communion with Him the worshipper, who, then as now, could not bring himself to adore logical categories concerning whose validity he could hardly dare to cogitate without involving himself in fearful heresies, was forced to seek third parties less remote from himself as intermediaries between himself and God. Even Christ was now useless for this purpose, the unintelligible disputes concerning His Nature operating in the same way as the foresaid controversies concerning God. And if God listened willingly to His saints, who had deservedfell of Him, much more would he feel obliged to relent to the entreaties of His own Mother. Hence the popularity of the term Theotokos. It enabled the worshipper to apply to God a wellnigh irresistible pressure. The best commentary on this situation which occurs to us at the moment is the Mediaeval plea put into the mouth of the Virgin and addressed to God: I) $\begin{array}{ll}\text { O Herr Got und ewiger sun, } & \text { O Lord God, eternal Son, } \\ \text { erparm dieh ueber den Sunder nun, } & \text { have pity now upon the sinner, } \\ \text { sich on die prust dy saugtn dich, } & = \\ \text { look on the breasts that gave } \\ \text { vergib dem Sunder durch mich! } & \\ & \text { forgive the sinner for my sake! }\end{array}$

It is to be confessed that much of the material we have adduced in the interpretation of Theotoke Boethei is later than our texts, especially the last quotation. But this does not invalidate their evidence so completely, when owing to the cramped space available for our

[^34]invocations, the necessity of laconic brevity in their composition is borne in mind. If we do not seek outwith them the material for there interpret tion we must go without altogether, since by themselves they tell us nothing, simply repeating as they do the same formula again and again. We therefore see in these African invocations the rudiments at least of the attitute made explicit in the quotation on the foregoing page: the Christian therein applied to God the most cogent argument he knew. Since the simple term Theotokos enabled him to do this with the minimum of trouble, it is no wonder that the scruples of an intellectualist like Nestorius were of no avail in stamping out the custom. And where we find the phrase set out in the form of a monogram desplaying the contours of the Cross, this is a device we have already learned to understand, from our study of magical texts in the last section: the author thereby reinforces his cry for help, already couched in irresistibly affecting language, with the weapon of magic. He excludes the malignant influence of demons and the evil eye, powers which threaten to intervene everywhere to the destruction of promising enterprises, so as to ensure for his prayer a pathway clear and free from hindrance from his own need to God's grace. Both negatively and positively therefore the cruciform legend Theotoke Boethei restored to the Byzantine Christian, by way of magical and devotional praxis, that of which the intellectualistic wranglings and ecclesiastico-political feuds of the preceding centuries had bereft him: namely, access to the living God through Jesus Christ.

## （d）Second Type

The following texts show the Theotoke Boethei（TB）formula combined with the proper name：－
cIII 704 TB＊／$\alpha v \vee \alpha \ll 1 *$

CIII 759 TB＊／ $1 \in \rho \alpha T \in C O *$
cII 4 TB／＇｜cuávou
cIII 855 TB＊／${ }^{2} \mid \omega \alpha \vee \vee o U^{*}$
cIII 653 ＋Theotoce Voethi Johannh
cII 99 TB／METósov
cIII $797 \mathrm{~TB} * / M \in+$ dSou＊
cIII $572 \mathrm{~TB} * /+$ 之epríou
cIII 784 TB＊／Z $\alpha$ 人の人í＊
With the exception of cIII 653，the names are not syntactically combined with the invocation，indicating merely by the gendtive the person to whom the seals belong．Only in two examples（cII 4， 99）is the cross lacking，being otherwise represented in the ordinary way or by means of the invocation or name or both taking the form of a monogram constructed on the basis of a cross．Apart from the Latin transliteration（cIII 653）and of course the universality of the $T B$ formula itself，these pieces show nothing remarkable and need not detain us further．
（e）Third Type．

This subcategory consists of nineteen pieces，all of which bear the invocation $T B$ ，together with the name of the person concerned and
his official designation. Hence these items are of considerable importance from a sociological point of view.

We begin by disposing of a doubtful case, namely the term reútefip.
 No official is known of this name. ${ }^{\text {. }}$ Perhaps therefore it is no title at all, but only the epithet "younger" to designate the son of a person of the same name already known. (Normal we)

Five instances occur of the title Patrician, a Byzantine office constituting the highest civil honour open to the citizen, and conferred only upon ex-consuls and ex-prefects, being held for life:- ${ }^{2}$ )
clII $744 \mathrm{~TB} * /+(r \epsilon) v \vee \alpha(\delta) i ́ \mathrm{U}$ Tatplkíd +
vIII 733 TB*/E己̀ $\mu \mu \pi$ Ti CO TRTPIKÍN
clII $758 \mathrm{~TB} * /+{ }^{2} A \rho K \alpha \delta i \omega$


It will be noticed that in the last three ins\&tances the consular
rank ${ }^{3)}$ formerly held by the Patricians in question is explicitly mentioned. Only in clII $700 \varnothing$ is there no cross involved.

Now followfour holders of the title Cubicularius, chamberlain, formerly an attendant of the Emperor at table, latterly a mere sinecure conferred for the sake of honour:-4)

clII $821+T B($ theotoce voethi) Joannei/+cuvicu...pref....
clII 767 +Theoto...../cuviau.
clII 709 TB*/ OEOqUत人KTW cubiculario
I) Byz.v 628
2) Byz.iv 115-116
3) ib. 133
4) ib. 98

We count two Eparchs, i.e. provinciarum praestes, civil
 two seals of the same holder of this office) and one consul, cIII


Finally we have one example each of a Vestitor, or keeper of

 OTpatopov), a Royal Physician, (cIII 703: TB*/N|Kíou latpo ${ }^{\circ} \beta . .$. ) and a bishop, (cIII 769:TB乏eplavổ/episcopi T(a)ranti). CIII 715: TB+/Pwavro SI S $\beta \lambda \alpha K E p \vee \omega V$ is an unsolved mystery.

We notice how in the case of most of the Patricians and Chamberlains ( p .285 ) the name and title stand in the dative, and therefore in syntactical connection with the invocation proper (help thou, O Mother of God, - patrician, chamberlain), and how, in most other cases it stands in the genitive, therefore without this type of connection, signifying merely the owner of the seal. Probably it is a mere coincidence that underlies this marked onesidedness in the distribution of case-suffixes. At all events we see no obvious explanation of it.

## (f) Miscellaneous

Our miscellaneous texts of this category fall into two subdivisions. First we propose to consider the rest of the seals beginning with the invocation to the Theotokos (TB). However these differ from the foregoing examples or among themselves, they possess one comnon

1) Byzantion iv 88
2)ib. 68
2) ib. 127
characteristic: they add, namely, to the particulars already familiar the word Doulos (=slave):-

ie, - of Thy servant John, one of the Eparchs(p.286)

i.e., - Thy servant Niketas the drungarius(chief of
. © ouryos or ThyMe, of 1000 men, officer of and military rank, 4 th rank of nobility) ${ }^{\text {l) }}$ and archon of Melete.
clII 734 TB*/ Meppau VGurfpon doit on Tins Gov i.e., - of Peter junior (?p.285) servant of God
 i. e., -of Thy servant Andrew the bishop.

The use of Doulos in this connection and according to the above constructions is very common, not only upon seals such as the above? but also in the papyri 3) It is the natural counterpart of Despoina, (=lady, mistress) the liturgical title of the Virgin Mary(pp. 279,280). The relation between God and worshipper had for many centuries been thought of under this figure, see for example the O.T. K verse:-4)

Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress: so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God, until that he have mercy upon us.
which shows plainly enough how
firmly this conception was grounded in the Biblical, and therefore Christian tradition. Its application to the Virgin as well as to

1) Byz. iv 79
2) Byz.v 616, viii 322;Ramsay
CBP p. 718 \& no. 442
3) Pap Ox lis; Lietz. GP(kIT14)no. 25,p.29 4) Psalm cxxiii 2 AV .

God Himself must have had the effect, in practice, of reducing the distance between the two considerably. Combined with the use of the title Theotokos, and the syntactical interchangeability of this designation with kúpios (p.277), this employment of the word soûhos to describe the worshipper, whether as related thereby to God or to the Mother of God, must certainly have succeeded in bringing about the theoldgical revolution against which long ago Nestorius, the anathematized heretic, had issued stern warning: ${ }^{1)}$ the Virgin had become a Goddess, not of course in the teaching of the theologians, but in the devotional praxis of the worshipping community.

This impression holds good throughout, even in the case of nontypical examples. cIV $207 \mathrm{~K}[\tilde{p} \mid \epsilon]$ Bon $\theta[E 1] T \hat{\omega}$, $\sigma \vec{\sim}$ doulw (help, o Lord, Thy servant) and cIII 527 KUpb....which should probably be read in the same manner, are syntactically identical with the $T B$ seals, that is to say: God and Mother of God are syntactical equivalents. Moreover cIII 678... Soúhou Tîj $\theta$ EOTÓKOU, (servant of the Theotokos), reproãuces a well-known formula expressing devotion to God and Christ, as will be seen in connection with the epitaphs (pp. 394-395). Finally by setting in juxtaposition the two texts:-

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { cV } 163 \text { DOMINE JUBA NOS } & =\text { Help us, O Lord: } \\
\text { cIII } 47+\text { SCT MARIA } & =\text { Holy Mary, }
\end{array}
$$

in which God and the Virgin are invoked on equal terms, we gain a neat epitome of the already well-established result: the Byzantine Church invested the Virgin with virtual Gohood.

1) Cave, DPC p. 111
(g) Results

The cult of the Virgin Mary had its sat at Carthage among official circles during the Byzantine period, being encountered elsewhere only sporadically. It came from the East, and included the title Theotokos (Mother of God) which, in the West, is encountered only in Spain, in Latin translations. The controlling influence throughout was liturgical. A few invocations are addressed directly to God, under the title of Kyrios, Dominus. Otherwise the Theotokos is uniformly invoked. Frequently the invocation was written out as a cruciform monogram, with an obvious magical purpose. The purpose of invocations was to secure the Virgin's intervention on behalf of the writers, who thought thereby to soften God's anger towards them by appealing to Him in a manner calculated to overcome all resistence. For all practical purposes the Virgin was transformed into a Goddess.

## VII - Dedications : Piety and Respectability

If our material includes appeals to the Deity for aid, it also records offerings made over to the Deity, thereby preserving evidence of the reciprocity of religiबus praxis. The texts in question number forty-two, distributed thus:-
(a) Distribution

|  | I | III | IV | V | $=$ | 19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| b | 3 | - | 14 | 2 |  |  |
| c | 3 | 4 | 10 | 6 | $=$ | 23 |
|  | 6 | 4 | 24 | 8 | $=$ | $\underline{42}$ |

Topographically considered, this table furnishes two remarkable features: the small total credited to Zeugitana, and the outstanding Numidian total. The relatively small chronological increase in items posterior to the fourth century is also noteworthy. We therefore best formulate the general impression left by these statistics if we draw attention to the displacement of the material as a whole in favour of 4 th-century Numidia, without however at this stage being in a position to account for this displacement.
(b) Moephology

In contrast to the invocations, which are directed to the Deity, the dedications record the good works of the pious, so that their interest is concentrated on the private individuals who are their authors. Hence the occurrence of proper names in the nominative together with a verb indicating a religious achievement is the fundamental stigma diagnostic for this type of inscription. On the other hand both name and verb may be suppressed, but the name of God in the dative given, in which case also we recognize a dedication. In addition the special kind of offering is frequently indicated, together with details explaining its purpose yet more clearly. Morphologically therefore this category is most flexible. Nevertheless it is possible to classify, if somewhat roughly, our African dedications along these lines. Desékaing from general to particular according to our usual approach we prose to discuss in turn (1) the object, and (2) the subject of the dedication, each subdivided in terms of the foregoing distinction. This means that having distinguished first between ordinary (undifferentiated) offerings from vows, then between
different modes of carrying them out, we pass to consider the names and circumstances of the individuals concerned, and pass finally to an understanding of the ultimate purpose underlying the custom. The exposition closes with a miscellaneous section, containing material which is fundamentally non-typical.

## (c) Object of Dedication

The most convenient subdivision here is that into direct and indirect. (1)Direct Object

Here again we further subdivide, namely into abstract and concrete. $\alpha$ Abstract

We note to begin with two neutral dedications consisting merely of datives, namely cIII 6669 and cIV 37:cIII 666 DEO / DO $=$ to God / the Lord Which is doubtless a genuine Christian piece, to be compared with the Roman acrostic: Constantina Deo ${ }^{1)}$ and the dedication: $\mathcal{T u l l i o r u m}$ Deo sancto. ' Of pagan prototypes we may quote a $\pi$ curikxkois 日e ois 3) and "omnibus diis et caesaribus:4) Our other example, cIV $37 \frac{p}{A T w}$ NUMINI ATw $=\frac{f}{A} w$ to the Godhead $\frac{p}{4}$ is unique, and would certainly be judged pagan were it not for the unmistakable chrism with which it is so emphatically flenked. The word Numen has already been discussed; ${ }^{5}$ ) here it appears to be more nearly abstract than Deus, whence we translate it Godhead, as above, or Deity. Otherwise these laconic texts teach us nothing. We pass thereforl to examples of richer content.
1)Di 1768
2)Di 1949
3) Richter, Lat. Sacralinschr. 26
4) Richter 33
5) pp.137-138 hereof

Quite a number of texts record the fact that the dedication was made "in the name of God, etc.", the following variants of this common phrase being found:-


There is nothing peculiarly African in this formula, which, occurring throughout Christendom, is in the last resort Biblical. ${ }^{\text {l }}$ (t places the offering in question before God (and His Christ) by consecrating it in His Name. The phrase "Name"of God is peculiarly Jewish?) whence its N. T. use.

More definite is the frequent formula "de donis Dei" (from the gifts of God) of which we note the following variantstcII 119, cIV 155 DE DONIS DEI = from the gifts of God cV I48 DE DEI DATA = from the gifts of God CIII 598 DE DEI... = from (the gifts) of God.

This formula is common enough outwith Africa on Christian stones. The first is the standard expression, and with the other two we may compare the de Dei dona of Sardinia, and the de data dei of North Italy. ${ }^{6)}$ "De Dei donum" occurs on a Jewish inseription in Gaul.)
1)Di pp .475-476
2)Dalman WJ pp.182-183
3)Di 1935+A etc.,pp.377-8
4) Di 1936
5) Di 1942
6) LeBI, Ep. Chr.p. 45

In view of the comparative material just cited the most ready interpretation of this phrase is one in terms of the usage whereby the first fruits of the earth's produce wers dedicated to God, according to the copious prescriptions of Jewish ceremonial lawl) This seems all the more in place, since PRIMICIE (primitiae), the
 Hence we are led to infer from these texts that they record the offering to God, in ceremonial fashion, ${ }^{\text {of }}$ a token portion of the produce of nature, which is referred, in the Biblical tradition, to His gift

On reflection, however, this conception must be admitted to be extremely odd and hard to reconcile with what we aldeady know of Christian praxis. It was fundamental for the Christian dispensation that in it all sacrifice was done away ${ }^{4}$ ) Jesus Christ Himself being in particular the "first-fruit ( $\alpha(\pi \times P \times Y:$ ) of them that sleep" 5 ) Hence we have a right to doubt this interpretation on principle.

Our doubts are further confirmed by other items found within the category in question, namely in texts which speak in this connection not only of God, but of Christ, viz,:cV 80 DE DEI ET CRISTI
cV 78 DE DI ET XP।
cII 168 DEI DEI ATEE CI
cIII 104 DD ET CRISTI
cIV 39.A@W DEI ED CR.. $=$ (from the gifts)(sc. donis) of God and Christ.

Within a theory of ceremonial first-fruits such a combination is quite without point, constitutes inceed an insoluble problem.

1) Ex xxii 29, xxiii 16, xxxiv 26; Lev xxili 9; Num xxviii 26 .
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { 2)bIV } 64 & \text { 3)Ps cxlv } 15-16 \text {, Wt. xxiv } 45 & \text { 4)Hebr.x } 18 & \text { 5)l Cor } x v \\ 20\end{array}$

The difficulty is aggravated by a complete lack of exact parallels: nowhere save in Africa do we find the expression "de Dei et Christi". Instead we find something more remarkable still:-

| Di 1935 | de donis dei et | $=.$. God and the saints | (Rome) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Di 1937 | de donis dei et scsrum Johanni et Pauli | .. God and the = saints John and Paul | (Ravenna) |
| Di 1938 | de donis dei et domni Petri | $\begin{aligned} &= \text {. God and } \\ & \text { saint Peter } \end{aligned}$ | (Perusia) |
| Di 1940 | de donis di et sci Pauli | $=\text { } \quad \text { saint Paul }$ | (Dalmatia) |
| Di 1941 | de donis di et sci Cosma et Damiani | ..God and saints = Cosmas and Damianus | (Bulgaria) |

We have here, in other words, a combination even harder to reconcile with the hypothesis of first-fruits than "de donis Dei et Christi!" OnIy by a strained exegesis could Christ be so far identified with God as to be regarded as the Creator: the Logos-theology necessary to such an operation lies far outwith the sociological strata brought to light in these present investigations. By no exegesis at all could the saints be incorporated into such a picture, since nowhere in Christian literature are the functions ascribed to them which are necessary to this role.

The hypothesis of first-fruits, however appropriate it may or may not be in the case of the formula "de donis" when applied to God alone, must consequently, in other cases, and perhaps uhiversally, rest on a radical error underlying the interpetation of "de donis" hitherto assumed. The phrase has throughout been given a concrete reference, "dona" being taken to refer to specific objects, and "de" being
treated as indicating physical abstraction from such a collective object. Without however passing beyond the literature of epigraphy, we find an abstract use of a similar preposition, namely "ex" (lit. out of), in pagan texts of the same category. There we find dedications undertaken

$$
\text { ex viso } \frac{1}{2} \text { ex oraculo, }{ }^{2} \text { ) ex voto }{ }^{3}
$$

phrases of which the only possible translation must undoubtedly run:-

| $\ldots$ as the result of | - | a vision |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\ldots$ as the result of | - | an oracle |
| $\ldots$...as the result of | - | a vow. |

Now when, on the analogy of these firmly-established examples of the abstract use of a preposition fundamentally indicating motion away from a given situation, we translate DE DONIS DEI, etc. by "as the result of things given we gain the sense: "as the result of what God has granted", "as the result of a benefit received from God" hence, "in return for boons granted by God (and Christ,/and the saints....)! That is to say: the formula DE DONIS DEI etc. signifies the squaring of accounts as between the Deity and the worshipper. Formerly God had answered a prayer directed towards Him by the person concerned; now the person, mindful of his gratitude, presents an offering by way of token paynent.

The resulting picture is in complete agreement with what we already know of the relations between the Christian individual on the one hand, and (God, Christ, ${ }^{5}$ ) and the saints ${ }^{6}$ ) on the other. It likewise

1) Dessau 3168,3526
2) Richter 26
3)Dessau $3008,3042,4656,3418$ etc.
3) p. 277 hereof
4) pp.190-191 hereof
6)pp.201-202 hereof
accords with what we know of pagan praxis. Among Latin texts of the same category we note a dedication erected to the Bona Dea by one of her worshippers to whom she had restored the use of his eyes after physicians he had consulted had given him up as a hopeless case; ${ }^{1}$ ) while two ladies make similar offerings to Minerva, one for the cure of a bodily infirmity not specified, ) the other, because the goddess had come to her rescue when her hair had begun falling out?) We are able moreover to trace this element in religious praxis in a region and among a community of particular interest to $u s$, by the study, namely, of the Punic inscriptions found at Carthage, which date from the century immediately preceding the Christian era. Among these remains many a dedication survives to record the gratitude of the worshipper to Baal Haman, on the quite general grounds, that "he gave ear to his voice" ${ }^{4)}$ or that "he gave ear to his voice, and blessed him! ${ }^{5)}$ or simply that "he blessed him! ${ }^{6)}$

Hence we have a right to conclude, that in the case of all the texts we have hitherto examined, the dedication was made with reference to some benefit received in the past, that is to say, retrospectively. They were not spontaneously or disinterestedly produced, from a mere wish for religious pleasure. On the other hand there is nothing to suggest that were envisaged in advance when the worshipper was himself in need, the answer to his prayer being thought of as an indispensable condition of their fulfilment. The texts which yet remain to be discussed do however possess this trait, and for that reason form a compact and distinctive subdivision, being known as "vote" or vows.

1) Richter 51
2) Richter 171
3) Richter 172
4) Gauckler NPC ii p. $301 \mathrm{no.1}, \mathrm{p} .553$ no. $8, \mathrm{p} .555 \mathrm{no} .10, \mathrm{p} .579 \mathrm{no}$.
5) ib.p. 328
6) ib.p. $301 \mathrm{no}$.

They are called by this name on account of the occurrence in them of the word "votum"(vow, from voveo $=I$ vow). This fundamental diagnostic stigma is associated with a variety of different verbs.

In our African material the standard construction is VOTUM SOLVERE (to discharge a vow) of which we count ten examples, viz. bII 72,llo; bIV 57,IO8-111,I51-152; cII 21. Next comes VOTMM COMPLERE (to fulfil a vow) which occurs six times: bII 80; bIV 24,112,137; cIV 136; cV 164. VOTUM REDDERE (to give back what was vomed) occurs four times: bIV 18; cIV 131; bV 12,68c. In bIV 15 VOTUM occurs, but a lacuna has removed the verb. The expression on our single Greek
 Latin EX VOTO ( p .295 ), Єưń uniformly representing the Latin "votum" as we see from bilingual texts such as the dedication at Tarentura) and from the juxtaposition of the septuagint and Vulgate versions of the 0.T.)

Extra-African Christian votive offerings abouma. ${ }^{3}$ ) Votum solvere occurs also in Rome 4) and Ravenna, 5) votum complere in Gaul, ${ }^{\text {(5) }}$, and
 Phrygia, ${ }^{9}$ together with the variant $\left.\Pi\langle\varphi\rangle \in \dot{i} \chi \hat{\eta} \leq 10\right)$

Texts of this type abound also in pagan epigraphy, vota in the Latin ${ }^{\text {Il }}$ ) having its counterpart of the East in the Greek (ư $\chi$ 人 i. ${ }^{12 \text { ) }}$ Here too the current verb is solvere ${ }^{13}$ ) although the expression ex voto is also used (p.295). Reddere also occurs ${ }^{14}$ ) but complere is not found, and appears to be confined to Christian remains.

1) Diehl, klT38-40 no. 38
2)Jud xi 30, Ps cxv 18 xlix 14 lxv 1
3)Di pp.373-375 4)Di 1906A+B 5)Di 1907 6)Di 1919 7)Di 1909
8)Di 1910 9)Ramsay 665 10)Ramsay 671 ll)Dessau,Lat. Epigr.p. 32
18)Ramsay p.78, nos. 304306307 I3)Richter 51667479108109117 155157159160162163165169172180 etc. 14)Richter 39

Not only in classical epigraphy, however, did the Early Church find ready to hand prototypes of this category. From the barbarians also, namely the Punic colonists, whose remains have already been mentioned (p.296) did the African Church derive a precedent. From the votive offerings of Carthage the following well-preserved specimens may be quoted as showing the characteristics of the Punic development of this type of inscription:-

Gauckler 7 it .... לyב ל ל
的
Gauckler b b

(1)
to lord Baal Haman the vow which.......son of Sophet vowed to him, because he blessed him
(2)
to Iord Baal...vow of Melq(artf.. son of Sophet because he heard his voice and blessed him
(3)
to the great Tanit-Pene-Baal and to lord Baal-Haman a vow performed by H - ete.

Nor may it be objected that the above examples have been modelled on Roman prototypes. Such an hypothesis is quite superfluous, since the key-word in all three, namely 7T], witnesses to a much more ancient ancestry: this is the same root as that which appears in the Jewish lewbooks in those passages containing Iegislation anent vows ${ }_{9}^{\text {I) }}$ and is everywhere (see p. 297 for examples) represented in the LXX by $\in \dot{v} \times \eta^{\prime}$, and in the Vulgate Latin by "votum". In a very old story telling of the tragic results of a rash vow (Judges xi 30) we read that "Jephtha



[^35]Moreover from the Psalms we cull the following emphatic examples:-

## Septuagint Vulgate

 TW゙ Kupín


anglice: I will pay my vows to the Lord,.........
and pay thy vows to the Highest,........ respectively.
to Thee shall the vow be payed.

That is to say: long before Christians had occasion to to use it, the vow was a regular element in the religious praxis of antiquity in pagan cults of all races, both Indo-European (Roman, Greek) and Semitic (Jewish, Punic). The African Church derived the custom (I) as a branch of the Church Catholic, from the Jews, by way of the Scriptural tradition, (2) as a Mediterranean branch of the Church, from the Hellenistic (Graeco-Roman) community which surrounded it on all sides, (3) as the Church in Africa, from the Phoenician settlers in Zeugitana. What we have before us in these Christian texts is the resultant of the three traditions just mentioned welded together under the impress of the Christian mission. They are Christian only because they are directed not to Apollo, Venus, Baal, Tanit, the Bona Dea, or Jahweh, but to Christ.

Our dedications, then, fall into two classes, distinct, yet not discontinuous in the ultimate sense: offerings in general, and votive offerings, the latter setting forth articulately the connections to be assumed, for the most part, as implicit in the former. It is there-
fore of interest to ask the question, whether any dimensional peculiarity can be found to correspond in any sense to this morphological
distinction. We find the answer by isolating the votive offerings from the general mass, and by constructing for each division a table of the usual kind showing the relative distribution of each type, thus:-


No significant topographical fact emerges from these figures. The chronological proportions, on the other hand, exhibit the most violent displacements. Roughly calculated, about three-fourths of the votive offerings belong to the fourth century, while almost nine tenths of the general offerings are posterior to the fourth century. Here and there, it must be adraitted, difference of opinion is possible owing to the brevity of this or that text; only two items bear dates, the rest having been allocated on the basis of the standards set forth in the Prolegomena to Part I, pp. 22-33, after the most careful and deliberate consideration of the relevant details. On the whole however we have confidence in the substantial correctness of the chronology of these texts, enough at least to enable us to claim the right to draw from the above figures the general conclusion: votive offerings as a class are earlier than those belonging to the less closelydefined type.

The interpretation of this phenomenon presents no special difficulty. In discussing votive offerings we found (p.299) that this type of inscription, and with it the entire praxis which called it forth in the first place, was alreadyplong before the time of Christianity fimly established, the result of an already long development. Nothing therefore is more natural than to suppose that thet the Early Church conformed to a precedent of such standing, and expressed itself in terms of such an appropriate formula, before devising methods of its own towards the same end. Indeed it is possible that the phrase $D E$ DONIS DEI etc. may have been just such a device; if so, that explains why it is found only on Christian inscriptions, why, perhaps, it is at first sight so obscure. At all events we found it necessary when dealing with this formula to postulate a no doubt rudimentary and retrospective, yet efinite votive reference associated with it. (pp $\frac{1}{\underline{2}}$ 295-296). On the basis of more recent discoveries we are now in a position to say: chronological facts confirm this view, since for a long time before this formula came into use, Christian dedications had already been votive, and without doubt during its currency continued to serve this purpose. The praxis, in short, remained the same, while the terms used to decribe it were gradually changed. It is possible, therefore, although by no means neccesary, that all our dedications, whatever their manifest character, were ultimately the result of vows undertaken in connection with an invocation.

## $\beta$ Concrete

We nave hitherto considered the dedication in the abstract. We pass now to the treatment of it in the concrete, with the question namely,
of what did the individual dedication consist?
The first and most general of all answers is derived from the archaeology rather than from the epigraphy of our material. The editors inform us that our texts as a whole come from basilicas. In general the epigraphical evidence is extremely vague: verbs like FACERE (to make) (cIII 104, cV 78 80, bIV 103, cIV 4 23) PERFICERE (complete) (cIV 155, cV 180) or DEDICARE (dedicate) (bIV 15) tell us next to nothing. Likewise the information that an item issues from a workshop (EX OFFICINA LAURI cII 2I, EX OFFICINA FORTUNI ET VICTORIS bIV 137) means little from this point of view. Two pieces (bIV 64, cV 164) refer to the entire basilica as an offering. But of all the tems used in this connection perhaps the most interesting is the verb TESSELARE (to pave), whose presence ( $\mathrm{cIV} 87, \mathrm{cV} 73,148$ ) tells us that the dedicant was responsible for that part of the floor of the church in the immeaiate neighbourhood of the inscription. Just as, therefore, the Roman citizen might fulfil his vows by erecteng an altar ${ }^{1}$ ) or statue, ${ }^{2)}$ or a Jew subscribe towards the paving of a synagogue, so the Christians of these early times, not only in Africa, but everywhere in the ancient world4) regarded it as a work of piety towards God to contribute to the fabric of their places of worship, where it was not in their power to raise an entire basilica. From the nature of the case, gowever, it is not possible to do justice to this topic without passing beyond the technical scope of our present investigations, from epigraphy to archaeology.

1) Richter 60,74
2) Richter 63
3) Diehl, klT26-8(anhang) no. 358
4)Kaufmann, Handbuch pp.388-407; Diehl, ILCV ii/lo, esp.nos.1863-1897

To whom were offerings dedicated? In general we know already, namely to God and Christ. (pp.291-293). Even when the fact is not made explicit in so many words, (e.g. PETRONIUS CUM SUIS POSUIT DONUM DOMINO, = Petronius and his family set it up as a gift to the Lord, cIV 188) it is rightly to be assumed that the dedication is directed to God in Christ. Two notable exceptions, however, fall to be cited, one made to a bishop, the other to a group of saints:-


Other dedications made to the saints have already been discussed among transitional types under the category of martyrs' memorials (pp.199202)(see also the important dedication on p.194). It may be weal for the sake of gaining perspective to recall these items already cited. (1)p. 194 very elaborate mosaic dedicated in fulfilment of a vow to martyrs of the Persecution of Diocletian. (2)p. 199 three votive offerings to the martyrs, two mentioning the definite promise involved (quod promisit fecit, quod promisit complevit), the third containing the verb Redaere. (3)p. 200 two votive dedications, one containing the word redare, the other the word solvere, also "promissa" (4)p. 201
two votive offerings (reddere, oomplere). The two pieces on $\mathbf{p} .202$ scarcely come under this particular subdivision, one being a vague and ill-Refined dedication, the other being an epitaph.

Thus we possess quite a number of dedications resulting directly from promises made to the saints. Nor is this phenomenon confined to the African Church, since in addition to the material already adaced in illustration of the De Dei Donis formula ( p . 294) we know of many votive texts elsewhere in the West recording offerings made to saints ${ }^{1}$ ) and even to clergy? Pagan prototypes, in the strict sense, are wanting, but we recall an item already cited on p.291:-

$$
\text { omnibus diis et caesaribus }=\text { to all gods and kings }{ }^{3} \text { ) }
$$

which is analogous to our material to this extent namely, that in it mortals share divine honours. In this connection it will be remembered that Divinity, in some sense or other, was freely ascribed to the Emperors, even well on in the fourth century (p.133). On the other hand the virtual apotheosis of the saints has been repeatedly noted in more than one context (see convenient synopsis, p.206).

The Christian dedications of Noth Africa, then, while a few of them may have been spontaneous, constituted on the whole the fulfilment of vows antecedently undertaken. At first the traditional pagan type of formula was adopted, to give place later to the phrase "de donis dei" and "de donis dei et Christi", which expression was peculiar to Africa, its counterpart elsewhere in the West being "de donis sanctorum..." On the other hand the African Church made offerings to the saints

1) Di 1921,1923,1928
2) Di 1924,1929
3) Richter 33
quite freely. The usual form of offering was a contribution to the fabric of the local basilica. Neither in the praxps as a whole nor in any of the details mentioned, except the "de donis" formula, can anything be detected which is either peculiarły Christian or peculiarly African, apart of course from specific names here and there. With these results the topic is exhausted from the objective viewpoint.
(d) Subject of Dedication

The dedication, votive or otherwise, is a distinctively personal document ( p .290 ). Proper nanes are therefore forthcoming in texts of this category more copipusly than in any of the epigraphical types hitherto considered. The following single names occur without further renark:-

AUDEODATUS CIII 104
CARDELA bII 110
CRECIUS bIV 103
DEMETRIUS CV 80
DOMITIUS(A?) cV 80
DONATIANUS (?) CIV 23
FLORUS bV 12
FORTUNIUS bIV 137
GEMILIANUS CIV 23
LAURUS CII 21
Matrona bV 12

MAXIMINUS bIV 57, (?) CIV 155
NAVIGIUS cIV 18
PETRONIUS bIV 24, cIV 188
POTENTIUS cIII 598
PUBLIUS bIV 24
SABINA bV 68c
SATURNUS cIV 155
TUUNINUS bIV 24
VICTOR bIV 137
VITAIIS bII 110
VLPIANA cV 180

Of these, Adeodatus, Victor, and Vitalis appear to be specifically Christian.) Donatus, an extraordinarily popular name in Africa, borne there by over seventy bishops, not to speak of laymen and pagans ${ }^{2}$ ) and Matrona, a common Roman name, both occur in African Jewish material.) With the exception of Tunninus, which appears to by a thinly disguised Latinism for Tunnin, a name not known outside Africa, and is probably therefore native, the rest are common Graeco-Roman names.

Double names are quite common. Among them we count four "viri clarissimi", that is, men of senatorial rank ${ }^{4}$ :-

FL FELIX v c ex prime (?) bIV 108
FL PAULUS $v$ e ex trib bIV 109

FI URANIUS $v$ e tribumus
bIV 151
one "mag(ister)", UMBRIUS FELIX, on a stone dated 408, namely cV 78, and two "viri honesti", or men who although belonging to none of the recognized orders were yet private citizens of considerable standing: ${ }^{5}$ )

FL VEGLUS v h
PONPONIUS RUSTICUS v h
bIV 110
bIV 1 II

Lastly we have one TITIUS ADEODATUS, bIV 112, described as "sacerdotalis", who therefore must have been a prest, and, presumably, on account of the name Adeodatus, a Christian; and one FELISX SANCCARIUS, bII 72, without further designation.

Our triple names,
FABIUS SULPICIUS CRISOGONUS
cV 148
FL INNOCENTIUS NUM
cV 73
L AN PUSINNUS
bII 80
call for no special remark.
Two presbyters are mentioned in our material, namely ALEXANDER

1) Kraus RE ii 481-482
2) Mesnage, L'Afrique chretienne,index
3) Marucchi Chr. Epigr.p. 18
4) Monceaux, RA 1904 i 360
5) Hirschfeld,SBBA 1901 i 608
(cIII 654) and FLORIDUS (cIV 131). In this connection the "sacerdotalis" recently mentioned (bIV ll2), although as before remarked (p. 306) he was a Christian, and bore a characteristically Christian name, does not come into consideration. The priesthood to which he belonged was certainly not the Christian priesthood, but the pagan. He was probably a flamen perpetuus, exercising no longer any religious, but only civic functions. (See under the State tituli,pp.125-126,139).

So far nothing peculiarly Christian or African has been observed. Both in extra-African (Christian) and in pagan circles laymen in official positions and clergy have been known to share this type of praxis!) Nor are collective dedications (bII llo,bIV I37, cIV 23 155, cV 148) or offerings made by the heads of households on behalf of their fanilies, by means of the formula "cum suis" etc.(bII 72,80;bIV 57; cIV 188; bV 12; cV 180) at all unique.' Throughout, therefore, it appears that what emerges from the texts in these features is the comrion property of antiquity as a whole.

The ratio of triple names to single names is roughly equal to that of any representative collection, e.g. our dated material(p.24). The difference in favour of the latter is less than one per cent. This index of social standing ${ }^{3)}$ is therefore not at all decisive. On the other hand the distribution of state titles and titles of courtesy in the dedications surpasses the corresponding ratio in our dated epitaphs by a decisive figure (10/1) which is notewthy even considering the Mauretanian provenance of the latter, consequently its relative poverty official personnel. While therefore it might not

1) Di 191919301937,18661871187318871907 1928; Richter 557491 117 161,60 210252254 2) Di 1867187619091921 1942, Richter 102 103 163, 253;Di 18651868 1880-1884, Richter 6667227
2) Sandys,Lat.Epigr.p. 219
be possible at this stage to reach satisfactory conclusions on the social stratification of this particular type of material, we gain from the data the undoubted impression: here speak men who enjoy honour and prosperity and have advanced in life.

Hence we are encouraged to ask, is there an inner connection between the two, namely the position they occupy in the worla, chiefly perhaps as a result of their own endeavours, and the dedications which perpetuate their names? It is notable that the dedications made by the State officials and the clergy are all without exception votive. A pagan votive offering supplies us perbaps with the key to the interpretation of this situation:-

Herculi sacrum..servos vovit, liber solvit (Diehl,klt38/40,no.70) i.e.,

Sacred to Hercules. (the dedicant) undertook the vow when a slave, and discharged it on gaining his freedom.

That is to say: this wormipper of Hercules was originally a slave, but wibing for freedom invoked the intervention of the god, promising to do the god a service in return for his boon, and does so on finding himself in his improved condition. This being so, there is nothing to prevent citizens of the Christian Empire, eager for promotion either in Church or State, resorting to the same technique, the praxis necessary thereto lying already conveniently to hand (pp.299-301). It is much to be desired that this interpretation should receive more corroboration than we are at present in a position to supply, since if it were firmly established it would provide us with a much more
significant insight into the piety of the Early Church than could any merely statistical result. The elaborate votum bII II2 (p.194) might well be interpreted in this sense, the dedicant carrying the epithet "illestris", a courtesy title applied from the middle of the fourth century onwards to men of high rank. ) Otherwise the context of the vow remains hidden from our view.

In strong contrast to the retrospective orientation of such texts as these stands the attitude plainly underlying the following deđications:-
cIV 18 I N PATRI DOMINI
DEI QUI EST SERMONI
DONATUS ET NAVIGIUS
PECERUNT CEDIENSES
PECKATORES
cV 73 FL INNOCENTIUS NUM PRO SALUTE SUA SUORUMQUE OMNIUM TESSELAVIT
cIV $87 \ldots(a) \ldots S U B D I . . C U M$ S.. MISSU..PLEVIT. . 0 TESEL
(b)..ANIUS CONSERVA ET INFANTES EORUM OB DESIDERIUM ANIMI SUI TESSELAVERUNT
(c)..DEVOTIONE PARENTUM TESELAVIT BONO SUO ET SUORUM

In the name of our father the Lord God who is the Word

$$
=\text { Donatus and Navigius }
$$ sinners of Cediae made it

> Plavius Innocentius Num( a?) $=$ made this part of the pavenent Ior his own salvation and that of his family
(a)..subdeacon?..promise?..fulfil?.. ....tile...
(b)..???keep... and their children. They made this mosaic on account of their spirits' need $=$
(c)...the devotion of parents.

He made this mosaic for his own benefit and for that of his family.

When the men of Cediae (cIV 18) call themselves sinners, according to a usage frequent in the early Church, that is a plain indication that their offering is designed to secure forgiveness; it is an act of merit whereby they hope to lay claim to divine mercy. It is natural

[^36]to understand the "desiderium animi" of cIV $87(b)$, the "bonum" of cIV $87(\mathrm{c})$, and the "salus" of cV 73 in this sense. All three therefore look towards the future and constitute a preparation to face it. It will be observed moreover that with the possible exception of cIV(a), which so far as it goes has the apparence of a votive offering, all the texts of this group are ordinary (i.e. non-votive) dedications, Hence we are tempted to generalize: votive dedications render thanks for past benefits, ordinary offerings seek to fortify the soul in face of future possibilities. Such a conclusion agrees well with the historical relationship between the two types of offering, since the priority in time of the votive over the non-votive offering can be understood from the religious point of view. Whereas we can adduce many pagan prototypes in the case of the votive offering, in addition to those already cited on $\mathrm{p} .296 \frac{\mathrm{l}}{\text { ) }}$ which give thanks for bodily benefits, we can think of no example outside Christendom illustrating the presentation of offerings as a meritorious work undertaken to earn the forgiveness of sins. That is to say: as the pagan element in the praxis diminished, the Church drew more and more upon its internal resources as a community witnessing to God's forgiveness of the sinner in Jesus Christ.

This transition may be studied most palpably in the text cV 78:-

DE DI ET XPI
UMBRIUS FELIX
MAG FECIT VOTUM
REDDIDIT DO =
PRECATUR PRO SUIS
PECCATIS SALVIFICETUR
(A.D.408) AP CCCLX ETYIII

As the result of what God and Christ have given. Umbrius Felix,magistrate, made it. He made good a vow to God. He begs on behalf of his sins that he may be saved. (date).
1)Richter $37,79,84,109,119,127,206,151,147,182,229$.

Here almost every type of dedicational feature is united. The piece is fundamentally a votive offering (votum redaidit), yet begins with the formula "de Di et Xpi", which we have already had cause to regard as its Christian alternative (p.301); the dedicant is a man of some ständing socially (double name, "magister") ; and he seeks the forgiveness of his sins (precatur....salvificetur) like other Christian dedicants.) Finally the date of the offering lies precisely where in terms of the results hithe reached it might have been predicted to occur. (408). The dedication of Umbrius Felix looks therefore in both directions: as the fulfilment of a vow, doubtless in connection with the dedicant's election to office, contains the past; and as a meritorious work, it claims God's indulgence, which is naturally an experience lying wholly in the future. Hence it brings together moments of the plaxis elsewhere found only in isolation, e.g. in the dedications CV 10 and CIV 150 already cited in connection with the cult of the saints ( $\mathrm{pp} .200-201$ ) of which we consequently gain a more profound understending than formerly. Having obtained from the martyrs some (unspecified) benefit, Colonicus makes good to them the vow undertaken previously in that connection, "with a joyful heart" (laetus): that means, the VOTUM conforms to the familiar pagan prototype, and settles a. "covenant" Floridus the presbyter, on the other hand, makes good his vow in order to obtain mercy, of which, as he himself explains, he"stood in need"(misericordia indigens): that means, the VOTUM is a pious act having merit of its own and therewith power to secure the favour of God at a time when it will be too late to undertake any fresh activity, the sinner being required instead to render a final account what he has done in the past. 1)D1 2348

This ambiguity encountered in the word VOTUM as it occurs in Christian dediations has a counterpart in pagan sacral epigraphy, where the phrase "pro salute" raises similar problems. Altar after aItar is erected to this or that god or godaess "for the well-being" (pro salute) of the regning Emperor or his officials.) Such texts function much as do the pieces cited on p.309, although in this case "salus" has no eschatological reference as in Christian literature, but denotes only and always health of body and general material wellbeing.) In contrast thereto stand the numerous public and private votive offerings referring to benefits already received, likewise exclusively physical (pp.296,310). These correspond, mutatis mutandis, to the Christian votive dedications. Texts not infrequently occur, however, on which both stigmata (pro salute, votum) coincide. Strictly these are votive dedications, and ought to refer to the past; but "pro" means on behalf of, and does not refer to an occasion, for which an altogether different word is regularly used, namely "ob! ${ }^{4}$ ) The contradiction resulting from this situation can only be disposed of by treating such items not as votive offerings but as announcements to the effect that the worshipper has fulfilled a vow undertaken some time previously to pray for the welfare of the person mentioned. We have no occasion to pursue this problem for its own sake, but merely draw attention to its existence as illustrating the process suggested in the case of Votum in Christian epigraphy. Materially the problems differ, but formally they are identical. We feel on firmer ground for having adduced analogous phenomena.

1) Richter $83,86,114,7 \pm 9125,188,204$
2) Lewis-Short 1621-1622
3) Richter $35,79,84,119,127,206$
4) Richter 109,118,147,182,229

In the light of the results just reached we may profitably reconsider the provisional conclusions summarized on p .301 regarding the relation between votive and non-votive dedications. There the view was expressed that all dedications without exception might be fundamentally votive in intention even if not manifestly so. Now we are in a position to modify this tentative generalization by adding: but in fact non-votive dedications can be referred to quite another interest, namely the accumulation of merit to the credit of the dedicant. The Christian dedication, in other words, having been originally modelled on a pagan prototype (votum) developed in the course of the early part of the fifth century a specifically Christian orientation based on eschatological expectations. In the process its votive character gradually receded into the background in favour of its value as an achievement of piety claiming divine recognition. In this way we gain a consistent picture of the evolution of this particular element in early Christian praxis. At the same time, by discovering the ultimate subjective source of the phenomenon and therewith the solution to the objective problem, we have pursued the exposition to its natural limits, to wit, a unified viewpoint. It remains only to deal with the few items of our collectidn exhibiting non-typical features which it was impossible to organize wi thin the structure of the general scheme.

## (e) Miscellaneous

In pursuance of a method which is of service even for the understanding of such heterogeneous material as is brought together under this all-embracing heading, we propose dealing in turn with four more
or less distinct groups: (1) 45 texts illustrating the scope of the dedication,(2) 3 texts illustrating the divine sanction of the dedication, (3)3 texts connected with the Catholic-Donatist struggle, and (4) 4 texts of irreducible individuality and without mutual connection.
(1) The following four texts are of interest as showing the extent to which a given work was undertaken by different dedicants:-
cV 148 敒 DE DEI DATA. . IN IS PREDIS FABI SULPICI CRISOGONI ET FABI CRISOGONI FILI. . TECLATAM A FUNDAMENTIS QUEPIT ET DEDICATIONEM PERDUXIT
cIV 155 DE DONIS DEI HUIC FUNDUS AB (IN) COLIS CONSTRUCTUM SATUR.. DE...PERFECIT CUN MAXININI MAXIMINI BIBO FELICITER
cV 164 EGO PREFECTUS JUGMENA INCOAI ECLESIA ET DEUS COMPLEVIT IN NOMIN ISPIRITI SANTI IN ANI PROVICIE = CCCCXXXV (A.D. 474) NOS ZABENSES CONPLEVIMUS

As the result of what God has given .. ?..
(names)
$=$ (he) began(quepit=coepit?) the mosaic from the foundations and carried through the dedication.

As the result of what God has given Saturninus(?)... completed..built by the inhabitants from the found-
$=$ ations(?funditus) with.(names) I live happily.

I a prefect..?.. began the church and God finished it in the name of the Holy spirit $=$ in the 435 th year of the province. We the citizens of Zabi* completedit.
bIV 15 ..IN N DOMINI N CRIST. VOTUM QUOD PROMISIT V. FRATRIBUS SUIS DULC... CONJUGE SUA CASTA .... = A SOLO DEDICAVERU..... IN CRISTO VIVAS UT IN ME.

[^37]bIV 64


QUE PRIMITIE NOSTRE VIRTUTIS EX LECTIONE ET ASPECTU PROBANTUR NAM NOVUM EDIFICIUM QUOD CERNIS NOSTRO
LABORE HOC INCEPTUM
ADQUE PERFECTUM EST
(ornaments)
What the first-fruits of our piety are, you see for yourself if you read this and look around you; for this new building which you see
$=$ was begun and completed through our labour.

Of these pieces the last is undoubtedly the most interesting, as it is the only text mentioning first-fruits. From this expression we gather that the dedicants were recent converts to the faith, and that this generous mode of mitnessing to their new-found convictions was regarded as an offering to God. Fo\&r the rest we note the significant confession of contentment in cIV 155,bibo feliciter, which realls already familiar acclamations (p.230), as well as the acclamation in bIV 15, "in Christo...etc." which likewise reproduces a known type (p.229).
(2) Three pieces mention the divine sanction of their existence:-
bIV 24 PUBLIUS PETRONIUS TUNNINUS VOTUM QUOD DEO ET CHRISTO EJUS IPSI PROMISERUNT ET COMPLEVERUNT FAVENTE DEO GADINIANA FLORE
cV 180 IN NOMINE DONINI SALVATORIS SANCTO VITALIANO EPISCOPO ULPIANA GUM SUIS CHRISTO JUBENTE PERFECIT
bV 12 CUM CLERO TUO FLOREAS UT HOC FIERET DEUS JUgSIT = FLORUS WET MATRONA CUM OMNES FILIOS SUOS VOTUM REDDIDERUNT

Publius, Petronius, and Tunninus fulfilled the vow promised by them to God and His Christ, $=$ with the favour of God..... (Gadiniana flore: CIL editors despair of interpretation)

In the naine of the Lord our Saviour, to the holy
= bishop Vitalian.
Ulpiana and her household completed it at the command of Christ.

May you flourish with your clergy that this may come about. God commanded it. Florus and Matrona with all their sons made good their vow.

Here the formulae of sanction FAVENTE DEO, CHRISTO JUBENTE, and DEUS JUSSIT plainly correspond to pagan prototypes like "visu jussus", commanded by a vision.) It is perhaps of special significance that in cV 180 Ulpiana should stress the fact, that Christ bade her make this offering to a bishop: did doubts lurk in her mind as to the apprpriateness of such a dedication? A similar interest attaches to bV 12, which records the wish of the dedicant that the bishop and his attendant clergy should flourish, in order that his boon might be granted. In any case, he adds, the dedication is a result of God's express command. He wishes for the priest's intercession on his behalf, and applies subtle coercion: pray for me, or fall short of your calling as an obedient minister of God:
(3) Three pieces shom contact with the Catholic-Donatist struggle:-

| IV 137 | VOTUM COMPLETUM DEO GRATIAS AGAMUS EX Oficina Fortunt ET VICTORIS FILI |  | Our vow having been completed let us give thanks to God. From the workshop of Fortunius and his son Victor. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bIV 57 | MAXIMINUS CUM SUIS VOTUM SOLVERUNT LAUDE DM | $=$ | Maximinus and his family have discharges their vow. Praise the Lord. |
| cIV 136 | .. MINA ARMIGERORUM BOTUM CONPLEBIT DOGS(=deo gratias) | = | .....?...of the "armigeri" <br> fulfilled his vow. <br> Thanks be to God |

The Donatist origin of bIV 57 and the Catholic origin of the other two pieces is at once apparent from their acclamations (pp.223-224). One is tempted to formulate questions of importance in connection with this interesting group of votive dedications. Does their existence, for example, furnish us with the key to the problem of
the peculiar topographical distribution of dedications in general ( p . 290) and of votive dedications in particular (p.300)? Is it possible, in short, that the two parties opposed each other not only with ecclesiastico-political, but also with liturgical weapons, each appealling against each other not only to the State, but also to God through works of piety? If so, is this sufficient to account for the territorial displacement of the material? Are we to infer further, from the respective ratios, (pp. 226,316) that votive dedications were more irequently employed for this purpose among the Catholics, and mere acclamations anong the Donatists? It must be confessed that while pointing in these directions the evidence is far from decisive. Since we can distinguish Catholic from Donatist material only on the basis of outstanding stigmata (acclamations) which cannot be expected to accompany every monument, we have no meañ of drawing up reliable statistics, and are not in a position in any given case to refer an item wanting such stigmata to its authentic source. We must content ourselves therefore with having merely drawn attention to these interesting possibilities, without having established their necessity. Of the details of these three pieces, nothing calls for remark, except ARMIGERORUM,CIV 136. Who were the"armigeri?" On another African stone, part of which has already been reproduced ( p .179 ), we hear of one Flavius Nuvel, one of those in command of the arm-bearing knights, FLAVIUS NUVEL EX PRAEPOSITIS EQUITUUI ARMICERORUM (BV 67). The word "armiger" started as an adjective, being applied most variously both in prose and verse, later as a substantive denoting fighting-troops in general, those for example of Alexander, Darius, Solomon, and Theoderick(ThLL if 613-614). In our present text the name probably
refers to some cavalry regiment for whose designation it was specialized.
(4)Finally four highly individual pieces claim our attention.

CII 21 IC OFICINA IAURI PLURA FACIAS ET MELIORA FDIFICAS
SI DEUS PRO NOBIS
QUIS CONTRA NOS
CUJUS NOMEN DEUS SOIT
BOTUM SOLVIT CUM SUIS
GEON FISON TIGRIS EUPRATES

Here is the workshop of Laurus. May you do more and build better. If God be for us who can be against us?
He whose name God knows discharged his vow with
$h_{i s}$ household.
GEON FISON TIGRIS EUFRATES

Together with the familiar N.T. aitation in lines 4 and 5 (see p. 213) this piece combines a reminiscence from Gen ii lo-15, Geon Fison Tigris Eufrates representing the four rivers of Paradise there mentioned, namely Pison, Gihon, Hidaekel, Euphrates. The presence of these names can inly have an eschatological meaning: they typify Heaven, and so inform us that this piece, though fundamentally a votive offering, belongs to the transitional class, its function being to win God's favour. The phrase "cujus nomen Deus scit" emphasiges the God-ward direction of the offering; so long as God knows the dedicant's name, it does not matter whether mortals are told it or not, since in any case it does not concern them. In this feature we may perhaps recognize the same device as that already known as belonging to magical praxis (p.267), namely an attempt, by means of concealing something from mortal eyes, to bring it emphatically to the notice of those that are immortal. On the other hand we note the excellent slogan (lines 2-3) destgned to catch the eye of the employee as he enters the door of the works (ic oficina Lauri) every day. This text combines almost every aspect of life, dealing as it does alike with this world and the next: it contains Biblical citations, acclamations,
and magical formulae, and at one and the same time addresses God and man, records a pious achievement and gives information.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { cII } 119+\text { INTUS AQUE DULCES } \text { Within are sweet waters and } \\
& \text { BIBOQUE SEDILIA } \\
& \text { SAXA NIMFARUM QUE }=\quad \text { seats of living rock. ?? of the } \\
& \text { FLORENTI FUNNDATA } \text { nymphs...founded by the labour.. } \\
& \text { as a result of what God has given. }
\end{aligned}
$$ LABORE S DE DONIS DEI

Written on a fountain, these barbarous lines, of which a genuine translation is impossible, are apparently inspired by the verses of Virgil(Aen.i 167-158):-
intus aquae dulces vivoque sedilia saxo,
nympharum domus.
i.e.,

Within are sweet waters and seats of living rock,
The dwelling-place of the nymphs.

From the distorted character of the citation it is obvious that the lines were inscribed not from a copy of the poem on papyrus or vellum, but from memory. Virgil was the one poet of the pagan Empire who was extremely popular among literary circles in the Early Churchl) and the above inscription witnesses decisively to this popularity by showing that it extended beyond literary circles, and was prevalent also among those who could not or did not have direct access to the poet's writings on their own account, but eeinea picked up scraps of his verses by ear. Apart from this quotation the piece corresponds to expectations. Probably we should regard the fountain as the work of one of the name of Florens. That it is Christian the Cross and votive formula at the end leave no doubt. While therefore the appropriateness

[^38]of the quotation to the vehicle on which it appears is obvious enough, the question arises, what if any is the significance of both from the Christian viewpoint? We may of course regard the text as the work of an artisan qua artisan, who nevertheless takes this opportunity of offering his work to God. On the other hand it would be quite in order to see in the quotation a subtle reference to the after-life, in which case our exegesis of the piece would fall together with our interpretation of the last example, namely in terms of eschatological expectations, in terms therefore also of the theory of meritorious piety. The evidence in favour of this view will be discussed under the next section on epitaphs in connection with the funerary acclamations containing the word REFRIGERIUM and its derivatives, and if treated here would be altogether out of place. We defer the discussion of this problem until the appropriate stage of the exposition, therefore, contenting ourselves for the moment with having drawn attention to its existence.
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { clII } 654+\hat{u} \pi \dot{\epsilon}_{p} \in v \times \hat{n} \\
& \text { ai ournpías } \\
& \text { A } \lambda \in \xi 2 v \text { Spot } \pi \text { 位SBUTKU } \\
& \text { ai tits ounßíov outou } \\
& + \text { as the result of a vow } \\
& \text { and for the sake of the } \\
& \text { salvation of Alexander } \\
& =\text { a presbyter and his } \\
& \text { wife. }
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

Had we been confronted with this text at an earlier stage in the investigation, it would have completely baffled us; but on the basis of previous experience we have no difficulty in recognizing it as yet another example of the transitional type of VOTUM, designed to secure divine indulgence. Euche and soteria represent votum and salus ( p . 297,310-311). The reference of soteria is of course, as in Christian literature generally, eschatological.

CV 80 DMS DE DEI ET CRISTI VOLUNTAS PIIS DEMETRI UNA CUM DOMITIO SORES MARTI V LUCCIOSA = FECERUNT..PATRI SUI DONATI S A...M

To the infernal gods. As the result of what God and Christ have given, the will of the most
$=$ loyal Demetrius together with Domitius...?...they made it. to(?of) his father Donatus(?)..??.

The obscurities affecting the details of this text do not prevent us from determining its fundamental nature. It is no longer a dedication in the primary sense, but, as the DMS formula shows, an epitaph, which the votive formula DE DEI ET CRISTI tells us was raised as the result of a vow. The DMS will naturally fall to be discussed in the next section on epitaphs. Otherwise this text offers nothing on which to remark, but as lying on the periphery of the category we have been discussing, and as providing the transition rrom this category to the next, it is the proper itern with which to bring the discussion of votive and non-votive dedications to a close.

> (f) Results.

From the fourth century onwards the wealthier members of the Christian community were in the habit of contributing to the fabric of the local basilicas, such liberality being regarded as an offering to God. At first offerings of this kind represented the fulfilment of vows undertaken in prospect of worldy promotion, quite in the manner of the pagans. In the course of the fifth century, under the influence of specifically Christian teaching, a metamorphosis took place whereby the offering came to be viewed as a meritorious work claiming God's mercy and forgiveness of past sins. In this connection offerings were made to Christ, the saints, and even departed clergy and clergy still Iiving, in order to enlist their intercessions. Nurnidia was the chief
seat of the praxis, which may have played some part in the CatholicDonatist struggle, both parties on this hypothesis being assumed to have commended themselves to God through such acts of piety.

## VIII - Epitaphs: The Christian in Life and Death.

All men are mortal, and therefore epitaphs far outnumber other types of inscription, public or private, in any representative collection, African or non-African, Christian or pagan. Whereas in the present instance the texts hitherto discussed were executed either in the name of the community (State tituli, martyrs' memorials) or at the behest of certain sections of the community (charms, invocations,etc.) or by the individual in certain non-typical sttuations (dedications, etc.), and therefore number only 480 or thereby, the epitaphs far exceed this figure, so as to constitute indeed, by virtue of their mere bulk, the nucleus of the collection as a whole. When Monceaux first approached the problem of African Christian Epigraphy he found over a thousand epitaphs.) Since then fresh items have served to swell this total. We have already had occasion to refer to the enormous mass of fragments Delattre salvaged from the debris of the Carthage burial-grounds, together with the impossibility of computing the number of whole texts it represents (p.6). Here we emphasise the arbitrary nature of the extent to which this material has been incorporated in our table. On gen eral grounds we calculate the epitaphs to be extant to the number of about 2500 , of which however not more than 2000 are beyond doubt entire.

[^39]
## (a) Distribution

From our remarks on the previous page it will be obvious that no table can be drawn up as in the case of other categories, which should show the precise distribution of the Christian epitaphs of North Africa. Instead the overwhelming bulk of the epitaphs in contrast to that of the rest of the extant inscriptions, even taken as a whole, justifies us in resoting to the THIRD TABLE showing the distribution of our epigraphical material in general. There we note merely the outstanding proportions, already adopted as the basis of statistical criticism hitherto, namely the dominance of Zeugitana on the one hand, and the extremely small bulk of Tripolitanian material. Together with the preponderance of later over earlier material, this accords with expectations: the same proportions hold good for African Epigraphy as a whole, as may be found from a survey of the total contents of the eighth Volume of the CIL and its Simplements. Apart from this it will be of use to recall from time to time the fact, that Byzacena and Mauretania contribute a roughly equal amount of material, in spite of their territorial disparity ( $B / M=$ about $I / 4$ ). Otherwise nothing of significance is to be derived from the distribution of the epitaphs, which naturally corresponds as a whole to the distribution of the Latin- and Greek-speaking population of the country.

## (b) Morphology

The epitaph is the most flexible type of inscription that exists. It may be of any length, from three words to twenty lines of verse. Generally speaking the more laconic precede in time the more florid.

But however they differ in other respects, all epitaphs have this in common: owing to their fundamentally personal orientation as documents intimating the decease of a particular individual, they contain at least a proper name, that of the deceased. To this nucleus there was generally aded in earliest times the pax-formula,「in pace", (=in peace). As time passed further additions appeared: a verb came to be included telling of the man's death, sometimes alone, more often combined with the pax-formula (died in peace), the date of death being frequently subjoined; quite as common was a clause telling the number of years the man lived (vixit - ). It is impossible to enumerate the countless elaborations carried out on the basis of this radically simple and characteristic framework. One and all, however, they may be regarded quite conveniently as so many adjuncts to either of these two verbs, the verb signifying death, and that signifying life. Anong the former we may reckon all references to the tomb, and burial, and the after-life; among the latter, all references to the deceased's station (civil or ecclesiastic), achievements, and experiences. In this way it is possible to account for almost everything we are likely to encounter in dealing with the Christian epitaphs of North Africa.

Our problem consists in devising a scheme which shall do justice to the constitution of the epitaph as above outlined, and at the same time correspond to the demands of regular and systemdic exposition. We must proceed as before from general to particular, thereby securing firm foundations for each succeeding stage in the demonstration. We must likewise follow so far as possbible the chronology of the material.

At the same time typical features and non-typical features cannot be segregated with the same rigour as in dealing with other types of inscription without the accumulation towards the end of the section of an unwieldy mass of miscellaneous material lacking inner cohesion. A subsection devoted to anomalous items there must of course be; but so far as possible the descent from general to particular will be carriea out within each division.

Hence we propose opening the discussion of this extraordinarily rich and complicated class of material with an examination of the pax-formula, dealing in turn thereater with the clauses signifying the death and dife of the person concerned, together with their adjuncts, and cldsing with an examination of the names encountered and individual inscriptions whose peculiarities demand separate treatment.
(c) Pax-formula

The pax-formula, besides being traced widely among the doubtful fragnents in section $x$ of the general table, appears unambiguously 548 times, alone and variously combined, as follows:-

|  | a |  | c |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | - | - | 2 | 2 |
| II | 8 | 46 | 82 | 136 |
| III | 77 | 96 | 203 | 376 |
| IV | - | 6 | 18 | 24 |
| V | - | 5 | 5 | 10 |
|  | 85 | 153 | 310 | 548 |

While nothing very remarkable is to be found in the chronological distribution of this formula, its topography shows a heavy displacement in favour of Zeugitana and Byzacena as against the rest of the country. In particular we must note the comparative rarity of the pax-formula in Numidia and Mauretania, especially the latter, where, if evenly distributed, we would expect to meet it five times as often. When we consider that the pax-formula was adopted as the principal secondary stigma whereby in the first place we isolated the Christian from the pagan material of Africa (pp.16-17) (that is to say, it constitutes a peculiarly Christian mark, practically diagnostic of Christianity) then the statistics on the previous page leave us with thint, the preliminary impression ${ }^{\text {/ while Zeugitana and the other Eastern }}$ provinces were deeply and thoroughly penetrated by the new religion, in the west, and particularly in Maretania, its impact upon pagan life was in comparison quite superficial.

This impression remains strong when we inspect the pax-formula more closely, and construct a fresh table showing its distribution in isolation, that is, joined without further elaboration to the name of the deceased (e.g. aIII 20 JULIUS IN PACE = Julius in peace):-

|  | A | B | C |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | - | - | - |  |
| II | 8 | 6 | 2 | 16 |
| III | 77 | 46 | 82 | 205 |
| IV | - | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| V | - | - | - | - |
|  | -85 | 53 |  |  |

These figures include the Greek equivalent expression Ev Éphry, which occurs not infrequently (cIII 628,631,633,634, see also the fragment xIII 550) including examples from the pre-Constantinian period (aII 4, aIII 54) when we find also the Greek version in Latin letters $E N$ IRENE (aIII 49). Numerous illiterate versions occur, e.g. IN PACI, IM PACE, CUM PACE (aII 4), CUM PACE (aIII 75), IN PACAE (bIII 143,151,159), together with abbreviations like PAC (cIII 15) and PC (bIII 179).

Copious analogous matter from the rest of Christendom, chiefly from the famous catacombs of Rome, which witnesses to the universality of this formula in epitaphs of the Early Church may be consulted in the pages of Kaufmann, () Marucchi, 2) above all of Diehl3) Apart from a few ill-guthenticated instances (pp.16-17) the fommula is al together unknown in Graeco-Roman epigraphy. Here then is an epigraphical novelty wholly, it would seem, to be referred to the spairit of the new religion One has only to bear in mind the extreme rigidity inherent in literature of this kind, which is produced not by individual genius in the freedom of original self-expression, but by quite humble persons, entirely lacking in creative genius, working according to example and convention, to realise the greatness and thoroughness of such a revolution. It could have been produced only by a radical reorientation in the attitude of the ancient world towards the problem of death.

The morphological revolution was not however altogether without peparation. Numerous Jewish inscriptions of this type are known, not only in Africa, but elsewhere in the ancient world, chiefly at Rome,

[^40]which differ from the Christian texts not only morphologically, but in the proper names they bear, or the liturgical symbols with which they are adorned. Still more common is the bare root $\quad$ (Hebr. "peace" asyntactically placed at the end of an otherwise normal Latin epitaphl) We are here in touch with a very old Semitic stigma, which appears not only in the query regularly brought forward at the approach of strangers, "come you in peace?" (Y込, DTUT) to which the reassuring counterpart runs: al\} shalom, "in peace!"? but also in the greeting with which, in the Koran, the blessed are welcomed to Paradise: "Peace be on you: "3) the original Arabic, es-salam halaika, ranning exactly parallel to the Hebrew Thy mibl. Moreover the words Islam and Moslem reproduce the same root SLM, IsIam being submission to Allah, and a Moslem being one who through submission or resignation to the will of Allah has found peace.5) The pax-formula therefore witnesses to the Jewish tradition in the Early Church.

Nevertheless it would be a mistake to see in the pax-formula nothing more than a relic of the historical connections of the Church. On the negative side we notice that frequent $a s$ is its occurrence on Jewish epitaphs, it does not there occupy the all but universal position it enjoys in Christian material. One can only say, that it is found quite often; one can by no means say, that it is in practice constitutive for the religious origin of the texts condaining it, as in the case of Christian pieces. The Early Church had no illusions regarding its relation to the Jews; the Apologists treat Judaism as on the level of paganism. ${ }^{6}$ ) Hence the presence of the pax-formula

1) Monceaux 120-121,Cabrol XI 2/2564
2) 1 Kings ii 13,1 Sam xvi 4-5
3) Koran 36/55,39/73
4) Palmer i 15n on Koran 2/105
5) Wendland,Kultur 395
in such overwhelming quantities among our Christian material must spring from some internal condition of the Christian faith in addition to the original Semitic tradition.

From the inscriptions themselves we learn what was this surce. In a handful of texts the words IN PACE are followed immediately by the Constantinian Monogram, whose position shows clearly enough that the sculptors who used it in this connection regarded it as more than a symbol, namely as a suspension for CHRisti, and consequently as syntactically combined with the pax-formula (bII 36, bIII 34,104, cIII 313):-

IN PACE $f_{k}=$ In the Peace of Christ
with which we may compare among others "in pace $\mathcal{F}^{\prime \prime}$ at Rome.) That this interpretation is correct, appears from aII 32:-

IN PACAE KRISTE $=$ In the Peace of Christ,
as also from the frequently-recurring phrase (oIII 551, cIV IO9, cV 95)
IN PACE DOMINI $=$ In the Peace of the Lord.
That is to say: the pax-formula is not only a relic of Bemitic piety, but the expression of Christign experience. Christians found peace in the Lord Christ. The literature of the primitive Christian community abounds with references to this experience?)

When we press closer towards the understanding of the pax-formula and ask, what kind of peace is this which it proclaims, and what is its context? the snswers diverge in two distinct directions. On the one hand phrases such as TUTUS IN PACE (=safe in peace)(bIII 2), IN PACE

[^41]AET = in eternal peace (cIII 505), SEMPER IN PACE = in peace for ever (cIV 23I), IN PACE ET REQUIE = in peace and rest (cIII 486), above a.ll IN PACE ET PARADISSU = in peace and Paradise (cIII 322) have a very plain eschatological reference: the Christian has nothing to fear from death, knowing that as a follower of Christ he shares Christ's victory over it. (p.270). On the other hand phrases like IN PAC ECL =
 in the Catholic peace (cIII 708) suggest rather a state of peace to be enjoyed here and now in the fellowship of the Church. But for the thorough investigation of the problems raised by this divergence of orientation onserved in the simple pax-formula, we must resort to the examination of the compound pax-formula, where the same divergence is carried deeper, so as to produce a double set of phrases, in which the word Pax (in pace) is combined on the one hand with a verb of dying or departing, and on the other, with one signifying the life of the deceased in this vorla, almost always Vixit ( $=$ he lived). Thus in order to follow up the Pax-formula through all its modification $s$ we are obliged to undertake investigations of considerable scope under the headings of (1) the death-clause and its adjuncts, and (2) the life-clause and its adjunets, respectively.
(d) Death-clause and its Adjuncts

Like pagans ${ }^{1)}$ and Christians ${ }^{2)}$ of other parts of the Roman Empire, the Christians of $N o r t h$ Africa employed a variety of terms to denote

[^42]death, such as MORIRI) (xIV 92, bV 62,120, cV 8,124,125) OBIRE (bV 105, cV 26) and DEFUNGI (cIV 215), all of them direct and unambiguous, together with EXIRE (bII $877^{133} \mathrm{bV} 28$ ), a picturesque metaphor meaning to leave the stage. From the viewpoint of both traditions, however, such expressions are exceptional rather than regular, but for quite different reasons. Pagan epitaphs mention the death, after all, only very rarely (p.17), and when they do so, only by inscribing the Greek letter Theta. (for $\operatorname{QANATOC)}$ casually and asyntactically alongside the general announcement?) On the other hand mention of the death of the deceased is so common among Christian epitaphs as to rank as a diagnostic stigma ( p .17 ), and is almost always indicated by means of a circumlocution, the verbs most frequently used for this purpose being compounds of "cedere"(decedere, discedere, recedere) and the euphemistic verb "dormire!' Alternatively "deponi", in the form "depositus" is used to indicate burial, and exceeds in frequency any other method of referring to the person's death. "Quiescere" and its more usual compound "Requiescere" are also used widely in this connection. In each case the pax-formula is sometimes associated with the verb. When it precedes the verb in question, we have no means of telling whether it is to be taken in close connection therewith, or whether we ought to regard IN PACE as belonging syntactically only to the name of the person mentioned, in which case the verb stands altogether by itself thereby bringing a division into the text. Punctuation, which alone could settle the problem, is lacking on our material. No doubt however exists where the verb precedes the pax-formula: such constructions can

[^43]only mean "departed etc. in peace." In general therefore we propose regarding only the latter order as signifying a genuine synthesis of the pax-formula with the verb. In the tables which follow the numbers in brackets indicate those cases where such syntheses occut.

DEPOSITUS, together with the simple POSITUS, denoting burial, is the most popular of all the venos used in our African material in this connection. Here follows the distribution of both:-

POSITUS


The figures for Positus are too small to support any inference of importance, but in the case of Depositus, which is otherwise normal, We notice the peculiar position of Mauretania, where the term is practically confined to the fourth century, and that on a scale lower than prevails in the rest of the country. Much the same tendency has already been observed with regard to the distribution of the pax-formula in general in this province (pp.325-326). Probably similar causes may be presumed to operate. We know that Depositus was widely used in Christian epitaphs in the Westl) especially at Rome, and we have already encountered this verb, together with

[^44]the noun Depositio，in connection with the remains and relics of the saints（pp．193，195）．It may have had a solemn portentous tone in the ears of those who made use of it．It may have expressed the care and ceremony with which the remains of the pious were wont to be laid to rest．But we have no direct proof of this．

Much less frequent is the straightforward verb SEPELIRI，of which two examples occur（cIV 274，cV 121）．Corresponding to DEPOSITIO （bV 3，4，14，19，cIV 70，？DEPOSIT〈A〉ORIA cV 37）we have from this verb（to bury）the abstract noun occurring in bIV 134：ERIT IN PACE SEPULTURA EJUS $\mathbb{x}^{8}(=$ his burial will be in peace）which is obviously modelled on the characteristically Jewish epitaphic formula＂ev eipiry并 Kolujols $\left.\alpha \dot{u} \operatorname{rou}^{I}\right)$ by a man who no doubt was himself a convert from the synagogue．

Sometimes combined with the Deposition－clause，and sometimes standing alone，are the numerous euphemistic verbs denoting the experience of death itself．Of these by far the most frequent is DISCESSIT（ to go apart，away）which it is convenient to set along－ side DECESSIT（to go down，away），thus ：－

|  | DECESSIT |  |  |  | DISCESSIT |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | a | b | c |  | a | b | c |  |  |
| II | － | 1 | I（1） | $=2(1)$ | － | － | 1 | ＝ | 1 |
| III | － | 2 | 4（1） | $=6(1)$ | － | － | － |  |  |
| IV | － | 2（1） | － | $=2(1)$ | － | － | － |  |  |
| V | 2 | － | 14 | $=16$ | － | 50 | 51 | $=$ | 101 |
|  | 2 | 5（1） | 19（2） | $=26(3)$ | － | 50 | 52 | $=$ | 102 |

[^45]From this table a striking contrast emerges, DECESSIT being fairly evenly distributed both chronologically and topographically, apart from a somewhat conspicuous displacement in favour of Mauretania, DISCESSIT on the other hand being practically confined to this province, where it appears to have been particularly well established before the end of the fourth century. The Mauretanian bias is however common to both verbs: of the 131 examples of their combined use, no fewer than 118 or $8 \%$ are located in Mauretania, precisely the fegion, namely, in which the pax-formula (which is combined with these verbs only outside of this province) is most sparse.(p.326)

Of the two verbs, DECESSIT seems to be the more popular elsewhere in the West, ${ }^{\text {I) }}$ although DISCESSIT also occurs in extra-African Christian material , ) and on one Jewish epitaph in Carthage?) We should probably infer from this that whereas DECESSIT is originally a Roman formula, DISCESSIT is native to Africa.

Next in frequency come QUIESCERE and its more commonly-employed compound REQUIESCERE, which together occur 76 times:-

QUIESCERE REQUIESCERE

|  | b | c |  |  | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II | - | 3(1) | $=3(1)$ | 2 | 19(8) |  | 21 (8) |
| III | I(1) | - | $=1(1)$ | - | (1) | $=$ | 2 |
| IV | - | 3 | $=3$ | - | $30(11)$ | $=$ | 30 |
| V | 3 | 3(2) | $=6(2)$ | 2 | 8(2) |  | 10(2) |
|  | 4(1) | 9(3) | $=13(4)$ | 4 | 59(22) |  | 63(22) |

1)Di 2807-2814,2816-2816C,2817-2818
2)Di 2851-2852
3) Monceaux 136

Here again we encounter striking features: the chronological bias in favour of the later period, and the even greater topographical displacement in favour of Numidia and Byzacena, particularly the latter. So strongly does this double fact contrast with the corresponding proportions observed in the group imnediately preceding, that a rough generalization appears justified, positing $D E(D I S) C E D E R E$ and (RE) QUIESCERE $)$ as virtual alternatives. With such a generalization the respective distribution of the pax-formula as a component of the clause stands in perfect agreement.

There is nothing exclusively African to be detected in the use of these verbs: QUIESCERE is common throughout the West, whether alonel) 2) and the same holds good of its compound REQUIESCERE, which likewise appears everywhere, sometimes alone, sometimes together with the pax-formula following. () Both verbs occur also in Jewish material. ${ }^{5}$

We have 43 examples of the verb RECESSIT in this connection:-

|  | b | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | - | 1 | $=$ | 1 |
| II | - | 14(1) | $=$ | 14(1) |
| III | 12(2) | 3 | $=$ | 15(2) |
| IV | 2(2) | $6(2)$ | $=$ | $8(4)$ |
| V | - | $5(2)$ | $=$ | $5(2)$ |
|  | 14(4) | 29 (5) | $=$ | 43(9) |

[^46]The dominant position of Byzacena as the seat of this formula is brought out clearly enough in the table; and the chronological distribution suggests that the verb came originally from Zeugitana. The paxformula occurs with this verib more frequently than with decessit but less frequently than with (re)quiescere. RECESSIT is common throughout the West, both alone ${ }^{\text {l }}$ and in combination with the pax-formula. ${ }^{2}$ 26 examples of DORMIT occur:-

|  | b | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II | 16(16) | $7(6)$ | $=$ | $23(22)$ |
| III | I(1) | - | $=$ | I(1) |
| IV | - | 1 | $=$ | 1 |
| V | - | 1 | $=$ | 1 |
|  | I7 (17) | 9(6) | $=$ | 26(23) |

Two outstanding facts emerge from this table: the verb in question is practically confined to Byzacena, few examples moreover belonging to the period later than the fourth century; and over $90 \%$ of the instances of its use are combined with the pax-formula (dormit in pace). DORMIT is common in Christian material in the West. ${ }^{3}$ ) On Jewish stones we find the curious compound obdormit, the usual term however in epitaphs of this kind being the abstract noun dormitio, 5) plainly modelled on the Greek KOIMHCIC, the very comnon Jewish epitaphic formula (p.333).

We close this section on typical verbs by setting forth, in all

1) Di 2823-2832,2842-2842C
2)Di 2836-2839B
3)Di 3197-3228
2) Cabrol viii/I:217
3) Di $4923,4978-4979,4985,4917$
its various forms, an expression found only in Mauretania, and that overwhelmingly in the period posterior to the pourth century, which cannot be conveniently tabled according to the customary scheme:-

NOS PR.... cV 88
NOS PRECESSIT IN PACE cV 130,205
NOS PRECESSIT IN PACE DOMINICA cV 131,202,204
IN PACE DOM PROC bV 86,128
IN PACE DOMINICA NOS PRECESSIT bV 120
PRAECESSIT CV 60
PRECESSIT IN PACE DNI bV 85, cV 94,95,182
PRECESSIT NOS IN PACE bV 122, cV 117,12I
NOS PROCESSIT IN PACE DOMINICA eV 203
Precessit in pace is found in Rome, Calabria, 2) and Belgic (aul. 3) Other. Wise the formula is without parallel outside Africa.

On the periphery of our typical formulae stands HIC JACET (here lies) of which eleven examples occur: cII 7l, cIV 98, cV 3,4,19,23,24, 27.29,30,32. This expression is common throughout the West. In four cases (cV 4,23,24,27) the person concerned is called "transmarinus", a technical term of Vandal times signifying that the bearer was an immigrant from overseas; ${ }^{5)}$ it is therefore most likely that Africa derived HIC JACFT from Rome. Its Greek equivalent Ev Ofor KITh (cV33) is particularly common anong Jewish epitaphs.

It will be observed that hitherto nothing has been said of parallels or lack of parallels in Graeco-Thoman epigraphy. The reason for this is to be sought in one of the fundamental principles adopted

1) Di $2846+\mathrm{A}$
2) Di 2847
3)Di 2848
3) Di 3057-3068,3071-3078
4) Schwarze, Untersuchungen p. 155
5) Cabrol xi/2:2564,RPE 20/84-89,21/74-75
for the identification of Christian material (p.17). According to this principle mention of death on an epitaph (other things being equal:) is diagnostic of Christianity. This principle was derived, quite empirically, from an examination of a representative collection of texts. It rests therefore on no mere doctrinaire assumption as to the a priori impossibility of a death-clause in a pagan epitaph. As we have indeed seen only recently (pp.330-331), death-clauses do in fact occur here and there among pagan material. But in the form with which we are familiar in Christian epigraphy (decessit, requiescit, dormit,etc.) they are so excessively rare that in any given case the text cannot be other than suspect. A text, because it appears in Wilmanns, is not for that reason necessarily pagan; and Dessau does not in his collection distinguish in principle between pagan and Christian pieces. In other words, there is no absolute canon which can confidently be invoked in this delicate matter. In these circumstances we have thought it better to neglect such sporadic examples of the various verbs above discussed as we have found in ostensibly pagan epitaphs than to adduce them and having done this to raise the question of their real origin. Hence we do not deny that such verbs appear in the epitaphs especially of the later paganism, but draw attention to the difficulty of proving the pagan character of the stones on which they may be found to occur, and content ourselves with the generalization, that the regular mention of the death of the person concerned is an outstanding peculiarity of Christian epitaphs.

For all that there is little in the verbs just discussed which could be called specifically Christian, or which would not be equally fitting on pagan stones. To go apart, to go down, to rest, to sleep,
are sufficiently general expressions; while to return need not mean more than to return to the earth, and to go before has no specifically Christian meaning by itself. It is mainly in the added phrase "in pace" that we detect the Christian orientation. It is not of course thereby denied, and it certainly could not be refuted, that Christians read into these verbs appropriate thoughts. After all "to sleep" was the regular euphemism current in the Primitive Church, ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) which in this respect reproduced Jewish tradition, and "to depart" was used in this connection in one of the canonical epistles attributed to Paul. It is just possible, moreover, that with "pre(o)cedere" the Christians associated the Johannine conception of Christ as the preceder. ${ }^{4}$ ) It is impossible however to prove the necessity of these associations: we can only draw attention to them as on the whole likely and probable. For the rest the expressions we have just examined are quite colourless.

One noticeable feature of detail calls for comment before we pass on. cII 34, perhaps also cII lly, bears the verb Requiescere in the subjunctive form REQUIESCAT (= may he rest). This is the only example in the whole of our material of a wish being expressed. Otherwise Whatever the verb, the indicative, sometimes present, sometimes perfect, but always the indicative is used. The repose of the deceased is thus assumed. We have no occasion here to investigate the extent to which the indicative prevails elsewhere in the Christian epigraphy of the West; but we venture to see in this feature of Christian epitaphic language, in Africa at least, a very strong contrast to the typical attitude of paganism, where the characteristic fomulae OSSA TUA BENE

[^47]QUIESCANT (!) and SIT TIBI TERRA LEVIS, i.e. may your bones rest in peace, may the earth lie light upon youl) betray a persistent anxiety as to the condition of the deceased. In spite of the fact, therefore, that the pax-fomula is generally classed as an acclamation, we venture to interpret it when occurring alone with the help of the verb when this becomes explicit, in the sense not of a wish, but of a statement of fact: it means that the person concerned is actually in peace. So emphatically was this conviction established that on one of African epitaphs the prayers of the deceased are requested on behalf of the survivors (bIII 36) IN PACE BSTO ET ORARI PRO NOBIS (= be thou in peace and pray for us). Elsewhere in the West such petitions were common, notably at Rome, and are manifestly absurd unless we assume the security of the deceased in advance. The assimilation of the dead man to the saints in the character of a mediator is plainly enough brought out in this significant text (pp.185,190,200-202).

It now remains to deal with the less-frequently-occurring terms employed as the nucleus of the death-clause, those namely which are of no statistical value but only of individual interest.

First as an appendix to verbs already treated we note cIII 511: JACET IN PACE $\oplus$ where the cross might represent a suspension for CHristi (he lies in the peace of Christ), and the expressions involving the verb "dormire":-
bII 98 DOR IN PACE IN CHRISTO = sleeps in peace in Christ
CIII 64 DORMIT IN PACE $f=$ sleeps in (the) peace (of Christ) where the source of the Christian's peace is plainly declared.
1)Dessau,Lat. Epigr.p. 26
2) Kaufmann, Hanảbuch p. 134
3) Di $2335-2337,2338,2340$

The verb REDDERE (= to restore, give back) occurs not infrequently: aV4,cIII72,bIIII20,183,186,206, cIII91,611,CIV225, and the abstract nofn corresponding thereto REDDITIO thrice: bII48,50,bIIII. The noun which in these examples we are to supply is presumably "spirit", as is seen from the expressions ANIMAM REDDIDIT, gave back his spirit (bIII26) and ANIMAM TRADIDIT,gave over his spirit (cII 79). The expression is to be traced through the usage of the Early Church ${ }^{\text {l }}$ to ancient Jewish tradition?

In quite a number of instances the verb is RECIPI (to be received) (bV 127) or ACCIPI ( to be accepted) (bV 138, cV 1,65,126) of which the exclusively Mauretanian provenance is to be noted in passing. The precise reference is not immediately clear from the African examples; on examining analogous extra-African material, however, we think it probable that admittance into the company of Christ and the martyrs is meant. If so the thought underlying this expression is somewhat similar to that found in Jewish material, where on a number of stones we are informed that the deceased has en申tered the company of the "righteous: ${ }^{4)}$

Hitherto we have been dealing with expressions readily parallelfed in extra-African Christian material. ${ }^{5}$ ) We pass now therefrom to deal with formulae exclusive to Africa.

An interesting group of four texts (cIII 507-510), in place of the customary words, contain the curious phrase MANET IN PACE ETERNE (=he dwells/remains in everlasting peace). A variant of the Decessit-formula meets us in IN PACE ET CONCORDIA DECESSIT (bIV I7), i.e., he departed

1) Mt xxvii 50
2) Gen xlix 33
3) Di $3331-3344 \mathrm{~A}$ 4) Cabrol xi/2: $2575,-93,-95,-97$,
2601. 
5) Di ce XVI,XX,XXI,.
in peace and concord. A unique verb occurs in cV 98: SYSCESSIT. On the basis of the foregoing investigations we of course know what it means; but it is a matter of difficulty to penetrate the subtlety of the prefix sub. Probably however nothing extraordinarily subtle is thereby intended, the verb representing one or other of those already familiar, perhaps Decedere. Another somewhat perplexing text,(bIV 100) UNO EODENQUE IN PIE VITAM ADEPTA FUNCTAQUE EST (In one and the same day she acquired and relinquished life) the editors interpret as referring to baptism, by distinguishing a double sense in the word VITA: she died (functa est) on the day when she received the (new) Iife (adepta est). Otherwise it would be hard to account for the verb adipisci, which denotes effort, life here and now not generally being regarded as the result of individual achievement such as this verb presupposes. Lastly examples of violent death are found in CV 135 GLADIO PERCUSSUS (thrust through with the sword) CI 3 PER GLADIUM INDOMITEN OKISUM (not admitting defeat, slain by the sword) and cIV 218, cV 68 A MAURIS OCCISUS (slain by the Moors).

Passing from the death-clause to its accessories, we notice first of all references to the tomb. The terms in question are chiefly three, namely MENORIA (memorial), MENSA (table), and DOMUS (house). Of these, Memoria and Mensa are already familiar, having been encountered in connection with the cult of the martyrs ( $p \mathrm{p} .163-171$ ). They may therefore be presumed in advance to possess the same significance here also: Memoria functioning as a portmanteau term sometimes concrete, otherwise abstract, in its reference; and Mensa pointing to the habit among the ancients of holding feasts at the tomb at fixed intervals in honour of the dead. Nothing in the
epitaphic use of these words contradicts such a reading of them, and what can be definitely established regarding their syntax supports it. Memoria frequently occurs absolutely, and in such cases apparently announces the nature of the monument, namely as a memorial (concrete). The same holds good when in is construed with the genitive of the person concerned, which happens more frequently. On the other hand it might equally well, in this position, be interpreted abstractly, as "memory", while an abstract meaning seems indicated when the word appears in the form MEMORIAE, almost always with the genitive, and therefore to be read as a Dative Singular. In two cases only, one of Which is by no means certain, (cV 25,113) does MENORIAE appear absolutely. In these isolated cases it is most likely Plural, indicating the "remains" themselves. Finally it is necessary to draw attention to the welI-authenticated instances where NENORIA is the object of a verb of erecting or fashioning, namely ponere (to place), (bV 4) and facere (to make) (bV 14,55,120,131,161; cV 86,210) and is then elearly to be understood in the sense of "memorial", "monument" The details may be set forth conveniently in the usual table, in which brackets indicate instances of genitive construction:-

## MEMORIA

MEMORIAE

|  | a | b | c |  | a | b | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II | - | - | - = | - | - | I (I) | - | $=$ | $1(1)$ |
| III | - | $2(1)$ | - = | $2(1)$ | - | - | - | $=$ | - |
| IV | - | 2(2) | $I(1)=$ | 3(3) | - | - | - | $=$ | - |
| V | - | $23(12) 33(22)=56(34)$ |  |  | $2(2)$ | $5(5)$ | $11(9)=$ |  | 18(16) |
|  | - | $27(15) 34(23)=61(38)$ |  |  | $2(2)$ | 6(6) | $11(9)=$ |  | 19(17) |

Only one peculiarity stands out in this table: the overwhelmingly dominant position in it $f_{\text {f }}$ pe Province of Mauretania. Nevertheless there is nothing peculiarly African or Christion in this (epitaphic) use of the tern: it is found on extra-Arrican Christian materialy) and on pagan stones, ${ }^{2}$ ) including Jewish epitaphs. Anomalous versions of course occur now and then: IN WEMORIA( $m$ )"to the memory of..." (c.gen.) (bV 69), MEMROA, a mere curiosity without significance from our point of view (cV 184), and the suspensions, likewise insignificant, except perhaps for their evidence as to perfunctory tendencies in the composition of this type of text, $\mathbb{M}$ (c.gen.) (bV 125) and $M M$ ( $c V I 68$ ). In addition we note cV I: HEC MEMORIA EST (c.gen.) (=this is the memorial of...", and the expression, natural enough, MENORIAE AETERNAE "to the everlasting memory of..."(bII 46, c.gen.). This is a common pagan phrase, ${ }^{4}$ ) which survived elsewhere also in Christian material. ${ }^{\text {() }}$ MENSA is found only in Numidia and Mauretania:-

| IV | 3 | 3 | $=$ | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V | 11 | 5 | $=$ | 16 |
|  | 14 | 8 | $=$ | 22 |

from which figures the dominant position of Mauretania once again energes clearly. The chronological displacement in favour of the fourth century is also to be noted. The epitaphio use of Mensa is further attested in Christian material outside Africa.) Examples of

1) Diehl iii 550-551
2) Wilmanns ii 681
3) Wilmanns 1
5)Di 3701 6)Di 3705,3706+A,3707

642,1644,248,151I
3).Di 4896,4958
its use on pagan epitaphs are not quite so easily established; but there is no positive ground for accepting certain instances listed in Diehl ${ }^{\text {l }}$ as Christion, which might equally well be pasan, and at least one well-authenticated pagan instance is known ${ }^{2}$ ) in which the expression "mensa marmoria" (i.e. a table built of marble) is used in this connection. Apart from this however the literary history of the term leaves no doubt as to the pre-Christian nature of the idea underlying it: we have here to do with a funerary feast held in memory of the departed (pp. 165-166). As in the case of Mmeoria, Iensa is described in terms of durability (MENSA PERPETUA, bV 7).

In referring to the use of both terms aIready enoountered in hagiographic texts we do not of course suggest that it arose first in connection with the martyr-cult and was subsequently applied to ordinary funerary purposes: rather, it is natural to assume on general principles that the historical process took precisely the reverse direction. The hagiographic must represent a special application of the ordinary epitaphic use, since martyrs' memorials are essentially cenotaphs.

Characteristically and exclusively epitaphic, on the other hand, is the third most frequently employed term of this category, DOMUS, meaning "house", which occurs only once absolutely, (DOMUS RED OCATI, cIII $584,=$ the house of Revocatus) being usually combined with an epithet, either (A) ETERNA(LIS) or ROMULA. We will discuss each of these current phrases in turn (DOMUS aETERUAIis, DOMUS ROWULA).

[^48]There is no need to construct a table of the usual kind showing the distribution of the expression DOMUS (A)ETERNA(LIS), since it is confined to Mauretania and the fifth and following centuries. It is regularly combined with the verb "facere"(to make), and occurs seven times (cV 76,137,127,128,138,168,185). It will be observed that these items are shared by two settlements in the extreme west of the Province, namely Altava and Volubilis (pp.l09,llo). From this it is clear that the phenomenon is purely local.

In these circumstances it does not surprise us to discover but few exact parallels in Christian material outside Africa: in fact we can point only to one instance of Dornus Eternalis, namely in Romel) Nevertheless similar formulae, presumably meaning much the same, are irequent enough, such as casa perpetua, cella eterna, and perennia sedes, ${ }^{4}$ ) at Rome; eterna sedes in Spain; 5) and the expression haec domus, haec mansio sempiterna, at Saloni. 6) The durability of the grave as a dwelling is apparently proverbial in the Early Church, coming to slightly different expression in different places.

On the other hand DOMUS AFTERNA is current in pagan epitaphs? ${ }^{7}$ variations of the phrase being DITIS AETERNA DONUS (the everlasting dwelling of Dis) and LETI DOMUS (the dwelling of death)? An illiterate epitaph of a Jewess preserves for us DOMI HETERNAF, obviously the same formula. Indeed the expression may very well have come from the fist originally, where it has an exact counter-

1) Di 3646
2) Di 3696
3) Di 3697
4)Di 3699
5)Di 3700
6)Di 3695
4) Wiamanns 290,550,557
5) 优 Imanns 551
6) Di 4897
part in the current epitaphic formula found by de Vogüé in the inscriptions of Syria，frby $\cap \lambda$, beth＇alma，literally，house of eternity．Exactly the same expression occurs in the old Testament，
 J Oby Mユークr）where the Septuagint reproduces the＂construct＂phrase quite slavishly ．．．．Eis oikov aicuros outou，and the Vulgate copies it meekly，quoniam ibit homo in domum aeternitatis suae（sic！）． Here plainly we should do justice to the original by translating idiomatically：in DOMUM AETERNA（LE）M suam．Our own popular King James version，＂for man goeth to his long home＂is nearer the Hebrew than either the Greek or the Latin versions．Finally the ancient Egyptians possessed a circumlocution spplied to the tomb corresponding to DOMUS APTHRNA（LIS）which Prof．Lange of Copenhagen renders＂dwelling for eternity＂，Wohnung fur die Ewigkeit？At all events，whether our expression came from the Orient or sprang from identical ideas independently originating in different parts of the ancient world， the Iact remains securely established，that in employing it the Early Crurch，particularly the Arrican Church，drew upon current pagan usage ready to hand．Augustine（Enarr．in Ps．48）rebuked his fellow－ countrinen and fellow－Christians，perhaps those of Altava and Volubilis，for using this unregenerate phrase as if they had no faith in the promise of the resurrection．${ }^{3}$ ）

Complete mystery shrouds for us the meaning the other
combination of DOMUS with which we must now occupy ourselves，namely DOMUS ROMULA．（bV 95，96，101，102，119，142，145；cV 160，161，162，165）

[^49]Here again it will be observed that it is a purely local formula that is in question: all these items without exception are located in one place, Numerus Syrorum, between Altave and Volubilis, the seats of the Domus Aeterna(lis) phrase. (p.110) With one exception (cV 165 , Where the verb is facere) all instances of its use are combined with the verb INSTITUERE, to erect. Further it will be noticed that DOMUS ROMULA flourishes chiefly in the fofurth century. The standard phrase is DOMUM ROMULAM INSTITUERE, to erect a "domus romula". The variants are DOMUM RONNIA IST (bV 142), DOM $R$ IST (bV IOI), and DOM RUN FACERE (cV 155). DOMUS ROMULA occurs on three further pieces in the same locality which however are completely devoid of Christian stigmata, and may on that account be pagan; at least wave reckoned them as such and therefore excluded theml) Apart from these items the phrase DOMUS ROMULA is nowhere attested, either in Christian or in pagan material. It is unique, and exclusive to this village. No one knows what it means. The "casa Romuli" at Rome naturally suggests itself to the mind, but no connection can be established between it and our African formula. The variants noted above seem to indicate that even the lapicides responsible for stones thernselves lacked a clear notion of what they were cutting; if so, we may feel somewhat consoled. But consolation is no substitute for information, and of that we have none whatever. At most we venture to draw attention to the mutually exclusive relationship between the two formulae, which belong to different commuities, and more or less to different periods, and are combined with different verbs. On the other hand

1) Di 3691B-D
2)Cabrol iv/2: 1451
their syntactical relation to the rest of the epitaph as a whole is identical. Ultimately therefore their meaning must be the same. We might reconstruct their respective histories by supposing that the communities in question at Numerus Syrorum and Altava were the descendants of 2nd. or 3rd. century mainlanders who separated before colonizing that part of Africa, and lived more or less in isolation thereafter. If in the course of the fifth century an offshoot from the Altava community travelled west to settle a.t Volubilis, this would account for the exceptional construction DOM RUN FACERE (cV 165) at Numerus Syrorum, through which the Altava natives would be obliged to pass. On the other hand DOMUS ROMULA might be a corruption, although of what, it is impossible to conjecture. Again, we know of no region on the mainland or in Africa corresponding to the hypothetical "Urheimat" of these wanderers. In short, we confess ourselves totally at a loss regarding the explanation of Domus Romula and its relation to Domus Aeterna(lis), and have no choice but to recora the problem as it stands, in the hope that the fure will contribute fresh evidence towards its lucidationd

For the fest, the tomb is called by a number of quite straightforward names familiar to us as being common to the epigraphy of antiquity generally, both pagan ${ }^{1)}$ and Christian, ${ }^{2}$ ) namely TUMULUS or mound, cIV 217,218,60, cV 151; SEPULCHRUM or burial-spot, bIII III, CIV 243; LOCUS or resting-place, CIII 297; and TITULUS or head-stone, cV 130. We note the variants LOCUS MEMORIAE, CV 179, and the verb TI TULARE, bVII5, to provide a titulus (=titulum ponere, cV l30).

1) Wilmanns ii 678-679
2)Diehl part II chapter 24 (ii pp. 222-245, nos.3498-3597 ex Afr.)

Finally a few highly original expressions fall to be mentioned, which will be readily interpreted from what has gone before:CIV 187 DOMUS EST IC MORTI (S) = Here is the house of death bV 24 HEC EST PAUSA HE EST = This is rest, this is DMS ETERIA $\quad=\quad a n$ everlasting dwelling

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { bV } 19 \text { MENSA HAEG EST ETERNA } & \text { This table }(t) \text { is an everlasting } \\
\text { DOMUS ET PERPETUA } \\
\text { FELICITAS DE OMNIBUS }= & \text { dwelling and perpetual happiness. } \\
\text { MEIS HOC SOLUM MEUM } & \text { Of all that is mine this alone } \\
\text { I can call my own. }
\end{array}
$$

PAUSA in bV 24 is a Latin formation based on the Greek TFWOW (= to stop, cease) and is commonly used to describe death in the sense of cessation from labours and troubles.) Otherwise these quaint legends explain themselves on the basis of previous discussions. A glance shows how emphatically pagan in inspiration all three are: there is simply nothing characteristically Christian in the sentiment of any one of them. On the contrary, cIV 187 expresses mere fatalism, bV 19 perhaps dry stoical humour, while bV 24 is quite unoriginal, not only in content, but even in form, compare the authentic pagan 存taph: - ${ }^{2}$

HAEC EST DOMUS AETERNA, This is the eternal dwelling, HIC EST FUNDUS, HEIS $=$ this the estate, these the gardens, SUNT HORTI, HOC EST $=$ and this is WOMUETTUM MEUM my monument.

A clear picture thus results from the examination of the phrases applied to the tomb in Early Church times. The outstanding feature is the absence of specific mention of the tornb in the centre of the coraunity, where the new religion has established itself most securely, and its presence, frequently with considerable elaboration, on its periphery, where the attitude thereby coming to expression, far

[^50]2) Wilmanns 557
from exhibiting specifically Christian traits, evinces on the contrary a recognizably pagan orientation. In this manner would we generalize on the facts just established regarding the distribution of the formulae just considered: on the one hand, the fact that they occur seldom or not at all in Zeugitana, where the Christian comnunity is undoubtedly thickest, on the other, that fact that they abound almost exclusively in Mauretania, in particular in the Western part thereof. The original creative impulse of Christianity and therewith its power to produce characteristic forms of expression seems to have spent itself amid the vast territories of liauretania. Such is the impression left on the observer by the evidence handled in the immediately preceding pages.

As accessories to the death-clause it is convenient further to reckon the formula of dedication to the shades of the dead, Dis Manibus Sacrum, variously abbreviated, generally however in the form DMS, and the abbreviation HSE, representing Hic Situs Est (= here is placed), which is appended to an epitaph, just as DMS is prefixed thereto. DMS is a characteristic morphological element in pagan epitaphic epigraphy auring the Imperial period, and represents a conventional and stereotyped version of the original phrase, which, in several variants, was written out in full during the earlier period.) Similarly HSE is a cureent pagan convention ${ }^{3}$ ) standing for the sentence earlier written in full. ${ }^{4}$ ) In the typical pagan epitaph of the Empire the two abbreviations coincide on the same stanes, DMS $A X$ at the head, and HSE at the foot.) Otherwise there is no
1)Dessau,Lat. Epigr. 27
2) Wilmanns ii 681
3)Dessau,Lat.Epigr. 17
4) Wilmanns ii 681-682
5) CIL8 /i,pp.492-521;Suppl IV pp.2533-2537 etc.
inner connection between the two. Among our African Christian epitaphs DMS occurs 106 times, and HSE 19 times. Five examples occur of their coincidence, as indicated by the brackets in the following table showing their respective distribution:-

|  |  | DMS |  |  |  | SE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | a | b | c |  | a | b | c |  |  |
| II | - | 4 | 14 | $=18$ | - | 4 | - | $=$ | 4 |
| III | - | 3 | 1 | $=4$ | - | - | 1 | = | 1 |
| IV | - | 7 (5) | 15 | $=22(5)$ | 1 | $7(5)$ | 6 | $=$ | 14(5) |
| V | - | 27 | 35 | $=62$ | - | - | - | $=$ | - |
|  | - | 41 (5) | 65 | $=106(5)$ | 1 | II(5) | 7 | $=$ | 19(5) |

The negative result in the case of Zeugitana in both instances shows first of all the radically peripheral nature of these formulae: they occur precisely in those regions least completely penetrated by the new faith. Woreover we are able on the basis of the above figures to determine the centres from which each may be presumed to have spread: the seat of the Christian employment of DMS was undoubtedly in the West, namely in Mauretania; while that of the Christian employment of HSE, a phenomenon of very much slighter extent, was in the East. This is proved not only by the respective displacenent of the proportions considered in themelves, but by the fact that the five instances of the coincidence of the two formulae fall precisely where we should in advance expect the traditions to join hands, in the Numidian settlements namely of Theveste and Madaura, which lie cose to the frontiers of Byzacena and Zeugitana respectively (pp.105,102).

On the other hand the chronological peculiarities of these formulae are less decisive, in so far as they diverge from general expectations. All we are at liberty to infer is the early appearance and short life of HSE as against DMS, and the gradual extrusion of the latter from Zeugitana, where it was at no time very popular. The slightness of the figures in this respect however forbids us to regard such tentative inferences as conclusive.

Wheh greater reward is to be gained by passing to a comparative scrutiny of these expressions, for here the originality of the African community is very plainly observed. We have already established the pagan quality of the formulae in question (p.351). We have now to record, that whereas DMS is of very common occurrence alike among extra-African Christian epitaphs ${ }^{\text {I) }}$ and those of Latin-speaking Jews, ${ }^{2}$ ) and "hic situs est" is likewise common property to these groups, albeit introducing rather than concluding a text ${ }^{3}$ ) the stereotyped conventional abbreviation HSE, on the contrary, is exelusively African, whether in isolation or in combination with the DMS. We have hitherto failed to trace examples of its use in Christian material outside Africa. HSE, therefore, and much more DMS... $\operatorname{HSE}$, constitutes a peculiarly African Christian phenomenon. It is apparently impossible to penetrate further towards an understanding of these abbreviations without raising controversial iscues. HSE, to be sure, is plain enough, and presents no problem. It is the DMS which troubles the critics, all of whom ask the question, how is the presence of so flagrantly pagan a legend on the
1)Di 3884-3932
2) Di $_{1} 4853,4859+A, 4875-4878,4924,4918,5000$
3)Di 3083,3084;4925
graves of Christians possible? Two solutions have been offered. The Christians of the time may have read an alternative meaning into DMS. Thus one of our African pieces reads: DMS DONIS MEMORIAE SPIRITA////// TIUM (bV III) whatever that may mean; Monceaux regards it as an attempt to Christianize the abbreviation by raisreading it.) On the same principle it would be possible to defend same such hypothesis as that the Christians regarded DMS simply as a contraction of the word DOMUS, (the vowels being omitted) which as we have seen (pp. 347-9) is a common enough circumlocution,or rather euphemism,for tomb. Two considerations support this suggestion: of the eleven stones inscribed DOMUS ROMULA enumerated on p. 347, nine, i.e. all but cV l6l-162, bear also the abbreviation DMS; moreover, DMS appears as the undoubted contraction for DOMUS on bV 24 (already reproduced on p.350): DMS ETERNA. It is therefore quite possible that in the region at least Where DOMUS was a current technical term for tomb, DMS was regarded as a contraction for this euphemism. Unfortunately we are not in a position to offer direct proof of this hypothesis. In any case it Would not hold good in other regions where DOMUS was not used in this technical sense. Hence no generalization along these lines is universally applicable to the phenomenon in question. On the whole therefore the alternative explanation is to be preferred, namely to suppose, with Becker,') that the inscribing of DMS was so perfunctory by the tine Christian stonecutters came to employ it, that the letters had lost all special meaning, and simply branded the stone

[^51]2) Kraus, REi373-374
whereon they appeared as devised for funerary purposes. Indeed it is highly probable that the DMS was in very many cases engraved on tombstones as a matter of course during their preparation, before they were earmarked for any single customer. Even to-day every large sculptor's yard contains one or two ready-made itens on which, in adaition to the customary geometric and symbolical designs, one may read the conventional headings "In Memoriam", "To the Glory of God,etc." the rest of the surface being left blank for the reception of individual particulars to be filled in when the stone in question is definitely selectec. It is natural to suppose that this custom prevailed at the time of which we are now speaking. On the whole therefore we should no doubt conclude that for the Christians whose monuments now occupy our attention the DMS formula was in fact of such slight significance as to cause no perceptible offence on religious grounds. Moreover if this is so, it serves to temper our estinate of the significance of the word MENSA already discussed (pp.344-345) with which we cannot be wrong in connecting the DMS formula. Both relate to the cult of the departed spirits, DMS serving as a dedication of the stone to their honour, and MENSA referring to the celebration of a saced repast in their memory. Both, it will be observed, have their seat chiefly in Mauretania. If therefore DMS in Christian times can be said to have sunk to a mere convention, neither must we take MENSA ton seriously. In the mean time we record the facts as they stand, and reserve inal judgment until we are in a postion to enjoy a broader view of 1) Kaufmann, Handbuch 37
general Christian praxis, subjoining as usual anomalous forms of both expressions for the amusement of those with a taste for philological sports:- DM bII 129, bV 130, cV 99, DM cV 205, D $\checkmark$ S bV 75 , DIM (dis inferis manibus) bV 152,154,163,DMM cV 192, 129 , $\Delta \Delta \mathrm{MM}$ cV $159,189,191,193,196 ;$ HIC S SET CIV 38, HST CIV 235, HES aIV 4.

Finally we popose to consider, as the last of the regular accessories of the death-clause, the African examples of the widespread early Christian epitaphic acclamation REFRIGERIUM and its variants, which may be conveniently rendered "refreshment", its literal equivalent, without raising more specific questions of interpretation at this stage. It is most unfortunate that the three most recent contributions to this problem ${ }^{\text {l }}$ have remained out of usluites reach, efforts to gain access to them notwithstanaing. Had Cabrol's magnificent "Dictionnaire" not been aut short by the outbreak of war, the expected article on REFRIGERIUM would no doubt have compensated considerably by setting forth all the new texts. In the mean time reviems indicate that Armellini's contention that Refrigerium is to be understood as referring to the heavenly repast of the faithful ${ }^{2}$ ) has been supplemented by two further theories, one that Rerrigerium means simply rest and nothing more, thet other, that it points to the slaking of the thirst of the soul by means of the Living Water. All viewpoints agree in interpreting the expression eschatologically.

1) A. Audollent,Refrigerium(mélanges Havet $1909 \mathrm{pp} .595-599$ ) ; A. M. SCHNEIDER,Refrigerium nach literarischen Quellen u. Inschriften (Freiburg im Breisgau,1928);A.Parrot, Le Refrigerium dans l'au-dela (Paris 1937).
2) Kraus RE ii 685

The relevant African texts follow in rough chronological order:-

|  | m |
| :---: | :---: |
| aIII 32..NL REFRIGERIT..AI VINCENTI. . . . . . . . . . . | .? refresh....Vincentius. |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { aIV } 2 \text { BONO ISPIRITU MARINIANI } \\ \text { DEUS DEPRIGERET (sic) } \end{gathered}$ | May God refresh the good soul of Marinianus |
| bII 52 NN PREREGRINUS (sic) CUI DEUS FRIGERIT(sic) | ?? Peregrinus, to whom God send reireshment (?) |
| BIII 251 \& PUER INNOCENS NOCENS (sic) NOMINE VITALIS VICSIT ANJNIS SEX IN PACE ET IN REFRIGEU K | * An inndcent lad, by name Vitalis, lived for six years. (day he be) in peace and reireshment $\lll K$ |

bV 111 DivS...tat....
MESAM CUM TITULUM RENRIGERATIONIS POSUIT DEDICAVI $\mathbf{T Q U E}$

To the Infernal Gods............
$=$ he placed and dedicated a table of
$=$ refreshment together with a headstone (or, a table with a headstone of refreshment???)
cIV 143 HUJUS ANIMA REFRIGERAT whose soul enjoys rerreshment, KORPUS IN PACE $=$ and his body rests in peace. cV 41 QUIESCIT
(Notes:- bVill has been discussed in another connection on p.354, and is reproduced in full as no. 8 of the dated texts given in the Appendix. The last example is a verse common to each of two long metrical epitaphs which will be discussed later in this section.)

A preliminary glance at the above texts shows first of all very clearly, that REFRIGERIUM must have a very general reference: meticuluous distinctions are entirely Ioreign to the authors of such illiteracies. A like broad application of the conception is also apparently to be reckoned with: as noun it may be concrete (REFRIGERIUM aIII 78, bIII 251) or abstract (REFRIGRRATIO bV III);
as verb it may be transitive, the case of the object being dative (bII 52) or ablative (aIV 2) or intransitive (cIV 143-cV 4I). And if REFRIGERIT (aIII 32) is, as it seems, transitive, we have here a monstrosity indeed, namely a 3 rd- or 4 th-conjugation suffix to a normally lst-conjugation verb. It is simpler, however, to regard the $T$ as the first letter of TIBI or $I E$, and RERRIGERI as a contraction for REFRIGERET, after the analogy of de Rossi's interpretation of the same phenomenon found on Roman stones? Even simpler and better is the recent suggestion that REFRIGERI is a barbarous formation based on the analogy of the conmon imperatives EUTYCHI (EÚUÚXEl) and EUPSYCHI (EUU廿ÚXEl) in which case it would of course bétransitive?) Either way the inscription in question does not admit of a decision.

For the most part these features can be parallelled in extrad African Christian material without difficulty. Thus although we can as yet find no example elsewhere of the abstract use of the root FRIG, its concrete use is common enough; 3) and we meet in adaition the form REFRIGIUM, unless we choose to treat this as a contraction. ${ }^{4}$ ) The verb, likewise, is amply attested as intransitive, and when transitive, with the noun following both in the dative ${ }^{6)}$ and the ablative ${ }^{7}$ ) as mell as in the accusative case. (8) What we encounter of this particular expression in Africa, therefore, is substantially typical of the Early Church as a whole. The distribution of the texts noreover, in so far as their small number can be regarded as statistically valid, suggests Carthage as the centre from wich it

1) Kraus, RE ii 684
2)Di 2317 note
2) Di 2320-2322A
4)Di 2322A
5)Di 2314-2319
6)Di 2309,2310
7)Di 2308
8)Marucchi, Epigr. nos.92,95,95,97,99
spread to the rest of the country. Hence it no doubt came from Rome originally, most of the extra-African examples of its use being located in the catacombs there.

Such general considerations notwithstanding however, we are not yet in possession of the key to the exegesis of the REFRIGERIUM formula itself. And in fact, numerous as are the texts concerned, they nowhere provide us with more than a vague general impression. We learn indeed that it is an experience of the soul, associated with peace, ${ }^{\text {P }}$ ) granted by God, and even the martyrs 4) to those who stand fast in the faith.5) But on the central problem they cast no light at all.

Hence we are obliged to make an excursion into the literary as distinct from the epigraphical use of the expression. To carry out a complete investigation of this kind would throw the exposition quite out of balance by passing beyond the limits set at the beginning. The aim in general being to illustrate Church History from the Inscriptions, we are forbiden on principle to reverse the process. We must therefore select according to some principle fundamental to our entire procedure. Now it has been noticed, from the categories of inscription already handled, that so far as the illiterate masses of the Church were at all interested in literature, only two classes of writing come into consideration: namely, the Passion-narratives of the martyrs, which must have been tolerably familiar to those responsible for hagiographic monuments of such frequency as are here to be found, and the Scriptures, quotations from which, chiefly in Latin, constitute an epigraphical
I)Di 2308,2313,2320
2)Di 2304
3)Di 2308A,2309,2312
4)Di 2310
5)Di 2312
category by themselves. The Bible, therefore, and the Passions of the nartyrs, being as we know from the inscriptions themselves the literary products of the Early Church most likely to influence the essentaally illiterate in their choice of language and the sense in which they make use of current expressions, must serve to explain for us the epigraphical significance of REFRIGERIUM also.

In the Vulgate REFRIGERIUM and its variants is frequently
 pedigree, and of extremely general significance, meaning relief, refreshment, airiness, coolness, the root being the same as that found in the adjective $\psi 0 \times p \sigma_{s}$, cool, cold ${ }^{l}$ ) (frigidus!) Its earliest canonical appearance is in Exodus xxiii 12, where the ancient Jewish Iaw prescribes the observance of the Sabibath as the day of rest,
 refrigeretur filius!' Similarly Jeremiah invites the restless to return and walk in old paths that they "may find repose" for their souls ( $\alpha$ 人V., REF.) (vi l6), and in the Acts of the Apostles (iii 19) Peter refers to the last days when the world's turmoil will come to an end in the restoration of all things in God's Kingdom as "the times of refreshment, Kגlpol "XVQu"\}tws, tempora refrigerii!" Then again in the Second Epistle to Timothy (i 16) Paul is represented as praising a friend, "Because he has often given me refreshment,
 context suggests that the reference is to the providing of occasional meals, just as in our modern use of the word. On the other hand,
an altogether different interpretation of the expression is inevitable in Luke xvi 23-24. There the scene before us is removed quite into the realm of the Transcendental: we see on the one hand Paradise, on the other Hell, and between the two there is"a great gulf fixed.' Lazarus enjoys his ease in the former: the rich man scorches in the pitiless flames of the latter. In his agony he addresses from afar Abraham, who presides over the denizens of bliss:"Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his
 ut REFRIGERET linguam meam); for I am tormented in this flame:" Here at least we have a gloss on our problem-word which is wholly free from ambiguity: Lazarus in Paradise enjoys cooling draughts of water. In this sense he experiences REFRIGERIUM; he is refreshed, REFRIGERAT; and the sight is too much for poor Dives, who would welcome but one drop to relieve his parched jaws.

Passing now to Passion literature connected with the sufferings of the martyrs, we find that examples of REFRIGIUM (Refrigerare, rather, since the noun nowhere occurs in this category) are confined to one composition, namely the Passion of Perpetua, as it happens an Airican docunent. There the verb occurs no fewer than three times. In each instance, 2.5 we learn from a contemporary Greek translation fortunately extant, and edited together with the original Latin by J.Armitage Robinson (Cambridge Texts and Studies vol.I, 1891), a different Greek verb is employed to render the one Latin verb, so that we are in a position to determine its meaning most precisely. This document therefore, which is thus unique from our present point of view, and constitutes the last court of appeal for all
engaged in this particular dispute, we will quote freely in order to set all the issues in as olear a light as possible.

First of all, in chapter III, the verb is rendered by the Greek verb Hedesthai. Perpetua, narrating her visions, speaks thus of her dead father: "Then in a few days I gave thanks to God, having seen my dearest father, and felt relieved now that he was gone " (et
 be little doubt as to the correctness of this rendering, compare the

 "to obtain some relief". ${ }^{\text {l }}$

A stronger shade of meaning occurs in chapter IX (CIS i 74) : .... ut et nos et illi invicem REFRIGERAREMUS (TKpnyope $\bar{\gamma} \sigma_{\alpha} 1$ ) where the Greek requires us to translate, "that we and they should in turn encourage one another", the funamental idea here being of stimulating the spirit, of refreshing the emotions.

Finally it is necessary to reproduce a substantial part of Perpetua's vision of her young brother Dinocrates, who preceded her on the way to martyrdom. Two passages come into question, describing the appearance of Dinocrates as he appeared to his sister after having made the supreme sacrifice:-

VII (CTS i 72)...I see Dinocrates issuing forth from a place of darkness,...very hot and thirsty...In that place where Dinocrates was, there was a vase full of water, but its eage stood higher than the lad mas tall; and Dinocrates strained towards it as if wishing to drink....
VIII (CTS i 74)..I see that place which I had seen previously, and Dinocrates, no longer squalid, but well clotheg, and enjoying refreshment (REFRIGERANTEM,

1) MM i 40
ova孔 $y$ (orra), and where the wo und had been, I see a scar: I see also that vase which $I$ had seen before, but with its brim level with the lad's waist. And he drew water from it without interruption. And above the vase's eage there was a phial of gold full of water. And Dinocrates approached and began to drink therefrom; and the phial remained always full. And having sated himself he left off drinking the water in order to play about in his joy, as is the manner of children.

No more plain description of REFRIGERIUM could be desired than this admirable scene. Dinocrates here enjoys "refreshment"(REFRIGERANTEM). In what does his refreshment consist? This, precisely, to which alone the entire passage is devoted: issuing from a place of darkness, overcome by heat and thirst, he refreshes himself with copious draughts of eool water, which flows never-ceasingly for his benefit; then, his natural vigour restored, he goes off to romp.

These then are the texts which must be decisive for the direction in which we are to interpret the REFRIGERIUM formula. From them it is in the first place obvious, that we are amply justified in retaining for general use the word "Refreshment" as the equivalent for REFRIGERIUM, both being equally wide in their application. Inspecting the passages more closely, we see moreover that all the different interpretations of the word now current find undoubted support therein, whether in terms of rest from labour, cooling drink, or nourishment; in addition it is clear from the texts that Rerrigerium may also signify psychic conditions such as relief and a feeling of encouragement. Finally however, when it comes to ultimate classification, one distinction emerges as fundamental. It will be noticed that the scope Of REFRIGERIUM is without limit, embracing expeeiences of the individual both in this world and the next. Now the various applications of $\sqrt{ }$ PRIG observed in these passages can be organized so as to
correspond to this twofold context. Wherever this world is in question, both in the Bible and in the Passion-narrative, the meaning of REFRIGERIUM varies according th the erstwhile situation, indicating now repose, at another time nourishment, yet again peace of mind, the renewal of flagging spirits, and so forth. When on the contrary the scene depicts the soul's adventures after the death of the body, both sources are unanimous in using REFRIGERIUM in one sense, and in one sense only: that namely of refreshrnent in the form of cool water. In this respect the Lazarus-Dives situation and Perpetua's vision of Dinocrates hang precisely together quite without the least contradiction or inconsistency, each serving to elucidate the other. Jeremiah vi 16 and Acts iii 19 do not invalidate this inference, since the one refers, if not indeed to bodily ease, only to a psychic condition of contentment here and now, and the other, if not this-worldly in its reference in the usual sense, is certainly not to be understood to refer to a merely individual experience of the other world, but rather to the collective event, quite distinct therefrom, of the Last Judgment in which both worlds will pass away, an event therefore which is unique in itself and so cannot come into consideration at all in this discussion $\frac{1}{2}$

In the epitaphs, however, the REFRIGERIUM formula is employed not at all in a this-worldiy, but only in an other-worldiy context: written as an acclamation, it serves to wish the dead man well on his perilous journey into the Unseen. Hence we conclude in general, that the epitaphic use of REFRIGERIUM and its variants refers to the cooling draughts of water enjoyed by the blessed dead in Paradise.

When we now return in the light of these investigations to the African instances of the expression (p.357) for which the conclusion re have thereby reached must hold good, we find in general nothing in them to contradict it, but observe on the contrary that they derive from it a heightened significance for us. They envisage the happy lot of Lazarus and Dinocrates.

In one case only riight doubt on this point reasonably arise. bV 111 speaks of the tombstone as a table (MEnSA) and thus raises the question whether REFRIGERATIONIS should not be taken along With it rather than with TITULUM, the reference then being to the feast celebrated in honour of the departed. There are however insuperable objections to this procedure. For one thing, if we read as $t$ in that case we must, "A table of refreshment, together with a title", the position of CUM TITULMM is intolerably harsh, indeed without example. There is no reason for it being where it is, and it is too violent a displacenent either for a careless or for an illiterate stonecutter to perpetrate. Apart from this, what would be the reference of TITULUM according to such a view? Apparently it would then refer to the inscription; but this is a trivial matter for such a cumbrous course. In short, REFRIGERATIONIS cannot go with MEnSA, but must go with TIrulum. Only thus can the Latminity of the piece be maintained.

It must be confessed, however, that by translating "A table together with a title of refreshment", we have raised another problem in adaition to refuting an impossible interpretation. Assuning that refreshment signifies the heavenly experience of Dinocrates, what
can a "title (headine) of refreshment" mean? That is our final problem.

In the want of parallel phenomena, we resort to an hypothesis. TITULUM REFRIGERATIONIS Must refer to the letters DMS which stand at the head of the inscription: they are the only feature of the monument, apart from the inscription itself, to which the term could be applied. The connection is provided, unfortunately, by nothing more substantial than a previous hypothesis devised towards the understanding of these letters, namely that DMS might sometimes have been regarded not as signifying Dis Manibus Sacrum, but as representing DOMUS, the common euphemism for a tomb in antiquity (pp. 354-355). This slender edigraphical ground we now venture to reinforce by means of a psychological association between "house" and "refreshment" in the technical (eschatological) meaning of the term. In hot countries a house is regarded, not, as in temperate or cold regions, as a source of warinth, but as a shade from the fierceness of the sun's scorching rays. It becomes therefore a symbol of refreshment, REFRIGERIUM. Further, human life, with all its restiess activity, corresponds precisely to a day filled with work, from which a man is glad to retire in the ee日z evening to his house, there to slake his dry throat with cool drinks. Even to-day the metaphor is used with charning effect in the liturgical prayer, familiar to more than one generation,(BCO 279):-

O Lora, support us all the day long of this troublous life, until the shadows lengthen and the evening comes, and the busy world is hushed, and the fever of life is over, and our work done. Then, Lorä, in Thy mercy, grant us safe lodging, a holy rest, and peace at the last; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

That is to say: in setting up "a table together with the title of refreshment" the person responsible for bV III, having constructed a mensa or table whereon to hold commenorative feasts in honour of the deceased, is understood in addition to have bestowed upon it the character of a house by means of the letters DMS, in this way he doing all 1 could to secure for the dead man the desired REFRIGERIUM in the other world, which the tomb, now no longer only a mensa, but also a domus aeterna, most powerfully symbodizes. To be sure there is no question of claiming for this theory the cogency of an argument equipped with full proofs; but perhaps we may be permitted to draw attention to another inscription, not hitherto specially mentioned, Which appears to lend it sone support (Di l565B):-

MALIIUS TIGRINUS
OB REFRIGERIUM C
...DOMIM AETERTALem VIVUS FUNDAVIT

MALLIUS TIGRINUS
WHILE SIILL ALIVE
$=$ ESTABIISHED AN "EVERLASTING HOUSE" FOR THE SAKE OF REPRESHMENT...

How the lacuna following $C$ in the second line is to be filled up, Thether with CONJUGI or CARIS SUIS, is of small importance from our present point of view, since it affects only those for whom the tomb was prepared; the exegesis of the whole admits of no reasonable aubt whatever. Mallius Tigrinus, as the inscription itself announces quite unambiguously, prepared a tomb, calling it by the name of "everlasting house", in order that its occupant, whether himself or another, inight enjoy REFRIGERIUM. That means however, that his choice of this name for the tomb contributes in some way towards the desired boon. It is therepore natural to regard this piece as a commentary on bV III, and to make use of it in this manner to cast light on an otherwise obscure problem.

It will be observed that the inscription just quoted does not contain any specifically Christian stigmata, either primary or secondary, and so raises the question whether REFRIGERIUM is altogether peculiar to the Christian vocabulary of antiquity. Certainly it is a characteristic feature of pre-Constantinian Christian materiall) On the other hand it is excessively rare on authentic pagan inscrip-tions. We can think only of one item on which the expression appears. ${ }^{2}$ ) Fortunately the paganism of the piece is beyond doubt, for not only is the characteristic pagan headine DM followed by the announcement, that "in this mound lies a lifeless body whose spirit has been recieved into the company of the gods, according to its deserts"(in hoc tumulo jacet corpus exannmis cujus spiritus inter deos receptus est, sic enim meruit), but also, the dead man, we are told, was a Roman knight (equs Romanus) and "ran as a Lupercus" (Iupercus cucurrit), that is, was a member of the college of Lupercalian priests, whose duty it was to race round the Palatine each year on the 15 th of February in order to promote fertility?) On the other hand the REFRIGERIUN - Pormula, although syntactically unclear (VIVS LOCI REFRIGERAS =?vivus locum refrłgerii 〈comparavit ? 〉, i.e. perhaps, "rnade ready a place of refreshment while still alive"?), is to be identified without difficulty. This example may however be simply the exception which proves the rule, and may illustrate the assimilation of paganism to a victorious Christendom, since in any case the inscription belongs to the style of the later Empire.

[^52]On the whole therefore we incline to see in this expression one characteristic of the religious language of the new faith, without however affirming or denying anything at this stage regarding the general idea underlying it. With the mere use of the word we remain within the realm of religious praxis: its ultimate significance belongs on the contrary to the ideological problem.

We are thus at the end of our investigations on the death-clause and its adjuncts, which embrace one aspect of the epitaph. The total impression left by the facts recorded may be summarized under three heads. (l)Apart from the mention of death generally, the Christian element seems remarkably slight. A fomula or its variant here and there, for example REFRIGERIUM, is all there is to witness to the new faith. For the rest, pagan elements prevail, in numerous variations, developed in quite a pagan manner. (2) For the most part Affican piety reproduces that of the ansient Christian Empire generally, and that of Roman Christianity in particular. Nevertheless peculiarly African features do occur occasionally: DOMUS ROMULA in Western dauretania is an extreme example of this. (3) The ratios Christian/Pagan, African/European vary according to the locality: strongly characteristic African phenonena prevail in the landward parts, European in the urban centres and along the cofst, while the predominantly pagan quality of Mauretania, especially Western Mauretania, as against the rest of the country, is very strongly marked, the Eastern portion, especially Zeugitana, being much more thoroughly penetrated by the Christian mission. Such are the general distinctions which emerge from the foregoing study of this aspect of the epitaph.

## (e) Life-clause and its Adjuncts

The verb VIVERE "to live", in the form VIXIT (XIXERUNT), "he (they) lived", which is current in epitaphs both pagan and Christian, provides the nucleus of this section. For reasons which are self-evident it does not give rise to variants (in particular, euphemisms) as does the corresponding verb in the previous sedtion. On the other hand numerous instances occur in which it is incorrectly spelt: the index compiled by Diehl in this respect holds good for our African material alsol) But to record and table variations of this kind would be a waste of labour, since any inferences therefrom mould be circular, illiteracy having been adopted as one of the guiding-principles in the chronological ordering of the material (p.30). Moreover the topography of orthographical freaks would possess significance only in a general orthographical context, which it is no part of the intention here to supply. Pinally, the mere distribution of the verb itself is of no significance, since it woula reproduce that of the whole category, its presence in many cases having served to establish the literary identity of the inscription. Hence we pass to a more fruitful inquiry, namely the verb in its combinations and implications.

First of all its synthesis with the pax-formula calls for attention. Here it is impossible to decide when the order In PACE VIXIT is or is not a genuine synthesis, exactly as in the case of the verb indicating death (pp.331-332). It is of such frequent

[^53]occurence, however, that it would be well to tabulate the instances both of IN PACE VIXIT and of VIXIT IN PACE, which latter at least is a genuine synthesis in this sense:-

## IN PACE VIXIT

|  | b | $c$ |  |  | b | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | - | - |  |  | - | 2 | $=$ | 2 |
| II | 29 | 39 | $=$ | 68 | 12 | 41 | $=$ | 53 |
| III | 45 | 108 | $=$ | 153 | 6 | 13 | $=$ | 19 |
| IV | 5 | 5 | $=$ | 10 | - | 12 | $=$ | 12 |
| V | 2 | 3 | $=$ | 5 | 3 | 2 | $=$ | 5 |
|  | 81 | 155 | $=$ | 236 | 21 | 70 | $=$ | 91 |

Here we observe in the case of both formulae the decisive gravitation towards the Eastern portion of the country, with a corresponding deficiency elsewhere, especially in Mauretania. On the other hand the overwhelming ascendancy of Byzacena as the seat of the second formula, even as against Zeugitana, suggests that what concerns us here is a distinction in the order of words rather than in the meaning of the phrases themselves. That is to say: it is probable that a very large proportion of the 236 instances of IN PACE VIXIT is to be taken as a suhstantial equivalent of VIXIT IN PACE. If this is so, the peculiar position of Byzacena in the second table has less significance than at first sight. On the whole we should in all probability content ourselves with the generalization, that (IN PACE)VIXIT(IN PACE), "he lived in peace", is characteristic of the Eastern portion of the country. There are no chronological
peculiarities to be observed in its distribution.
Both forms of the expression are common in the Early Church generally; ${ }^{\text {I) }}$ but neither in Jewish nor in ordinary pagan epitaphs does the formula seem to occur at all. It is thererore a characteristic feature of Christian epigraphy. Its meaning is not imrnediately clear from its eplgraphical use, but patristic references determine for us its significance: the peace to which this phrase refers is naturally not the peace of death, which has engaged our attention already, but peace here and now in this life which the Christian enjoys as a result of his faith, in other words, the peace of the Church, as an inscription quoted on p .330 ( cV 173) expresses it? In other words we are to infer from the information, that a man lived in peace, that he was in full communion with the Church, that is to say, probably baptized. Finally we note the variants bV 106 VIXIT... CUM PACEM, a striking gramatical irregularity, with which we may compare.. CUI TITULUM on a stone already examined (p.357, bV III), and the explicit phrase VICSIT IN PACE IN HOC MUNDO, cI l, "lived in peace in this world", where the this-worldy context of the expression is very clearly declared.

There are thus two aspects under which we may view the private Christian of antiquity, as a member namely of the world on the one hand, and of the Church on the other. This general distinction supplies us with a convenient framework whereon to construct the rest of our exposition dealing with the life-clause in its wider sense. We propose

[^54]therefore to examine in turn what the inscriptions tell us of the wo $\frac{7}{n d l y}$ and churchly existence of the African Christian community.

In the first place foll to be recorded indications of the deceaseds public status. Our material includes in this category three physicians, namely a MEDICUS ${ }^{\text {l }}$ and two men of apparently higher standing, each of whom calls himself an ARCHIATER?) The legal profession is represented by the factor of an estate, PROCURATOR FUNDI BERBENNESIS,') a law-agent, ACTOR, and a barrister who is at the same time a Roman knight, patron of learning, and model of virtue, withal moreover a candidate for baptism (p.389), EQ R ADVOCATI ONNIUM LITTERARUM ET VIRTUTUM VIRI... $\operatorname{AUD}(\mathrm{I}) \operatorname{ENTI}(\mathrm{S})^{5)}$ Of army personnel and State officials we count a soldier, MILEX BE NUM HIPP REG ${ }^{6}$ ) a centurion, CENTURIO, ') a veteran, VETRANUS, ${ }^{8}$ ) three KAGISTRI MILITUMM 9 ) a PRINGEPS, ${ }^{10)}$ (wo TRIBUNIII) and two DISPETSATORES, ${ }^{12)}$ or cashiers in charge of income-and-expenditure accounts [3) We encounter also a very grand personage in a SENATOR DE NUMERU BIS ELECTUM ${ }^{14}$ 4) the phrase, according to Diehl, being analogous to the honorific titles bis piae, bis fideles, frequently appliea to legions ${ }^{\text {I5 }}$ ) To the senatorial order ( p .306 ) we reckon a solitary VIR CLARISSIMUS, ${ }^{16)}$ while to a somewhat more humble rank belong the nevertheless respectable "gentleman" VIR HONESTUST77) seven "ladies", HONESTAE FHINAE, ${ }^{18)}$ and an honourable matron, HONESTA MATRONA.9) Finally comes a man who earns his bread with his hands, namely a stonecutter, we might now perhaps call him a "monumental scupltor", LAPIDE CESORI (sic), ${ }^{20}$ ) and a man in the street, CIVIS, citizen? ${ }^{21}$ )

1) $b V 122$ 2) cIII 147,489
3)bIII 77
4)bIII 148
5)bIV 23 6) CIV 44
7)bII 120
8)bIII 174
2) CII 83, cIII 596, cV 132
3) cV 185
4) cV 67,122 12)bV 105.136 13)Liebenan in PW V 1189 14) cIV 184
15)Di 495 n 16)cII 131 17) cIV 38 18)bIIM11中, bIII 29,37,282,
cIV 59, cV 34,35 19)cIV 109 20) cV 8 21) cIV 58

Parallels to all the foregoing items of information, apart of course from insignificant variations in detail, may be found, for Christian material, in the indices of Diehl, for pagan, in those of Wilmanns and Dessau, and there is no point in accumulating here the references these scholars have already tabulated with an industry beyond all praise. It remains only to mention the unique case of the FLAMINES PBRPETUI, of which we have four in Africal) and none at all among the Christian dead elsewhere in the epitaphs of the Early Church. With them we must also associate the SACERDOS ${ }^{2}$ ) whom we shall have occasion further on (p.392) to prove to be a representative not of the Christian clergy but of an otiose priesthood discharging no longer any religious, but only civil duties. We have already noticed that Airica is the only part of the ancient world where "priests" of this type are mentioned on the dedications erected to Christian emperors (pp.125-126), and we had occasion to refer to the survival of pagan priesthoods again when dealing with specifically religious votive dedications (p.307). We found the possibility of this survival in the decline of such priesthoods from religious orders to merely State functions, the Flamen Perpetuus in particular having traditionally had charge of the worship of the emperor in the Provinces (p.I39). During Christian reigns the worship of the emperor must of necessity have suffered reduction to the level of mere homage. At all events no doubt is possible as to the religion of the African Flamines perpetui here in question: the use of

[^55]symbols (cII 131,147) and the expressions IN PACE BIXIT (cII 32), FIDELIS VIXIT IN PACE (cIII 600) (see pp. 384-385), and CRISTIANUS (CII 147) are quite without anbiguity. Even the DECCESIT of cV 160 must for want of a more distinct stigma be regarded as decisive, according to the principles on which a great part of the Christian material of Mauretania has been isolated. These priests, moreover, belong to the later period, namely between A.D. $402(\mathrm{cV}$ I60) and 526 (cII 147), so that an ample period can be proved to have elapsed during which the metamorphosis, one familiar to all students of language, could have taken place without difficulty. They represented the comanity in the presence of the emperor, exactly as our own provosts or mayors do to-day: only thus could they hold their priesthood without compromising their Christianity.

In view or the richness of the material as a whole, it is surprising that we should possess, not so many details of the worldy condition of the deceased, but so few. The texts here discussed number 40 , i.e. no more than about $1 / 60$ th of all the epitaphs. The overwhelming bulk of the epitaphic texts tell us nothing at all about the earthly standing or calling of their dead. The reason for this may lurix in the peculiar distribution of these. 40 texts taken as a whole:-

|  | a | b | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II | - | 2 | 4. | = | 6 |
| III | - | 5 | 4 | = | 9 |
| IV | - | 2 | 7 | $=$ | 9 |
| V | 1 | 3 | 12 | $=$ | 16 |
|  | 1 | 12 | 27 | $=$ | 40 |

Por here it will be observed, on the one hand that there is a slight but quite noticeable chronological displacement downwards, on the other that the dominant position of Mauretania is decisive. In other words: where we have a right to expect that government and military officials, professional men, and skilled workers should be most numerous, and where social position should be of most consequence, in Carthage namely and its immediate surroundings, Zeugitana, the cultural centre of the entire country and point whence Roman influence spread throughout the land, in short the midale region of African civilization and its most populous district, precisely there, as appears most plainly from the table, this type of evidence is most scanty! Obviously a factor operates here upon the formation of our texts, almost, it would seem, directly proportionate to their distribution, whereby reference to the worldy condition of the decessed, rigorously suppressed where the Christian community is most thickly concentrated, finds expression only towards its periphery. The hypothesis, formulated by earlier investigators in the case of Roman material, that this factor is none other than the the other-worlaly orientation of the life of the Early Churchl) and which has also been convincingly demonstrated as the controlling influence in the development of Early Church Art? explains everything It accounts alike for the topographical peculiarities of the texts in question, ( 0.326 ), and for their chrono-logy, since otherworldiness such as that of the primitive period of the Church ${ }^{3}$ ) must naturally

[^56]be expected to lose influence as the world persisted instead of passing away. Indeed a source of this other-worldiness seen to operate in our inscriptions must be sought beyond the primitive eschatological hope of the New Testament, which alone could not have influenced the Christian community for so long. It is necessary to postulate a general tendency and taste towards and for the Transcendental as such, in order to account for the facts observed. In order that the Christians whose monunents we now study should have shown so little interest in their worldy condition, a widespread and deep-rooted aversion must have ontrolled their thinking such as is difficult for us now to appreciate.

For this reason it is vain to draw any conclusions from the inscriptions as to the proportion of Christians in any given category, as for example LeBlant does in estimating the strength of Christianity in the army ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) Still less can general inferences be valid as to the social distribution of the faith as compared with that of other religions. When Toutain, on the basis of inscriptions, reckons the indigenous African cults to number few in their membership who are not humble, ${ }^{2}$ ) that is a convincing demonstration; and if or when anyone undertakes a similar task in respect of the Jewish component of the ancient world, that will likewise lead to a result interesting and insctructive in itself. But we cannot know, and never will know, the sociological stratification of the Early Church so long as we confine ourselves to its monumental remains, and it

1) LeBl, Manuel 15-16
2) Toutain, CPER iii $1 \pm 3$
will forever be impossible for us to compare it with that of its religious environment and so gain a significant result. The utmost that can be said is that in fact Christianity penetrated all sections of the community: that at least is clear from the variety of callings fulfilled by the few individuals in the African Christian community whose morldly condition is known to us. And when all is said and done the mere fact that we know little of the average Christian as a citizen of the Roman Empire and a member of ancient world, provided that we know at the same time the cause of our ignorance, may well be more significant than the knowledge thereby lost to us for our ultimate understanding of the piety of the Early Church.

No such problem arises in references to private life, for reasons Which are self-evident, for here the data consist of the mention of the family, which is a constant reature in epitaphs in all ages and places. The compiling of a vocabulary in this connection brings no reward, since nothing of significance emerges from nere words used to inaicated relationship, such as father and mother, husband and Wife, son and daughter, brother and sister. Among the less usual terms, however, we may note the old Latin phrase PATER FAMILIAS, (father of family) which occurs only in Mauretanial) and the corresponding phrase MATER FAVILIAE, also confined to Mauretania? ) al though IIATER FILIORUM is found in Byzacena; 3) none of these three expressions is attested on Christian material outside Africa. Similarly we may note the unique occurrence of the poetic word for mother, GENETRIX, in Numidia.) On the other hand we note as variants

1) $\subset V 137,138$
2) cV 76
3)bII 31
3) $\operatorname{CIV} 224$
of the common "uxor", "marita", etc. (wife), the words COMPAR or equal l) and CYMBIOC or life-partner, ) which apparently are charactersific of Christian material ${ }^{3}$ ) and may therefore be regarded as welcome symptoms of the influence of the new religion in which the equality of the sexes is at least declared as an ideal, although it should be stated that both terms are to be found also in Jewish epitaphs.)

As might be expected, a large variety of laudatory expressions falls to be recorded, giving testimony of the affection with which members of the same family regarded one another. Such phrases abound, ranging from the praise of general edcellence, such as PIUS, PIA, dutiful, FIDELISSIMUS ( -A ), most faithful? ${ }^{7}$ ) MIRE BONITATIS ET (AC) TOTIUS INTOCENTIAE, of marvellous goodness and entire innocence, OPTIMA FEIINA, best of Women 9 ) to full-blooded expressions of endearment such as CARISSIMUS (-A), dearest, $\frac{1}{0}$ ) DULCIS, sweet, ${ }^{I I}$ ) DULCISSIMUS,
 DULCIS ANIMA, sweet spiritl, 5) INNOCENTISSIMUS, most innocent ${ }^{1}$ 6) PIUS INOOCENTISSIMUS, dutiful and most innocent, $\frac{7}{9}$ ) DULCIS ET TOTIUS INHOCENTIAE, smeet and of entire innocence, ${ }^{\text {l }}$ 8) and CASTA MATRONA CONIUX ANAITISSIMA, chaste matron and most loving wife.9) Such terms are easily parallelled not only in extra-African Christian, but also in pagan epitaphs, ${ }^{20}$ ) and the question has been raised as to the precise value of superlatives of this kind, since it is incredible that altogether perect specimens of humanity should abound to the extent to which the inscriptions would lead us to believe? ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) Of course
1)bII 36
2) CIII 654
3) DiehI iii 497,4107+A
4) Galatians iii 28
5)Di 4980, Ca xi/2:2579,2595 6)bII76,bIV83,85,86,91, cIII108, cIV95,etc 7)bIVI9 8)bIIIII2-114 9)bVI39 10)bV95,96,101,142, cV160,16I 11)bIII $289-292,6 V 76,79,101,115,116,118$ etc 12) cIV138,aV5,6, bVI22 13)bV136,162 14) cV151 15)bIII222 16) CIV239 17)cIV239 18)bIII64 19)bV35 20)Di 4326-4357, Wilmans ii 682-686 21) Mortheote, EC 68-69
constantly-recurring situations tend to produce stereotyped formulae, and in our African material there are a few instances where the stonecutter has been so weary of reproducing the same expressions over and over again that he inadvertantly applied laudatory epithets not to the deceased, but to those who erected his memoriall) At the same time there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of such epithets. To raise the question whether the dead were such paragons in fact as the laudatory epithets and phrases make them out to have been, is frankly pedantic. Their value for us is rather of quite another kind: they reflect the accepted ideals of domestic virtue current among those circles at that time.

We know of only one phrase, or at most two, which besides being written in full, lurk also behind a suspension, that phenomenon Which above all others supplies an index to conventionality in the style of monuments. The suspension in question consists of the letters BM(bII 106,61,111,121, cII 163, cIV 29, cV 160) once written $\operatorname{BMR}(c y 59)$ Which might a priori represent either of the comnon phrases BONAZ IVINRIAE (to the good menory of of good memory, according to syntax) and BENGERENS(NTI)(well-deserving). Whether written in full of abbreviated in this ranner, both expressions are a regular feature of the epitahs of the ancient worla, both Christian ${ }^{2}$ bnd pagan 3) In Africa their respective distributions among Christian naterial nay be tabulated thus:-

|  |  | $B M(R)$$c$ |  |  | BOITAE GEVORIAP |  |  |  | Bentubrenti |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | b |  |  |  | b | c |  |  | b | c |  |  |
| II | 8 | 1 | $=$ | 9 | 4 | 1 | $=$ | 5 | 1 | - | $=$ | 1 |
| III | - | - |  |  | - | - |  |  | - | - |  |  |
| IV | - | 14 |  |  | - | 1 | = | 1 | - | - |  |  |
| V | 3 | - |  | 3 | - | 2 | $=$ | 2 | 4 | 1 | $=$ | 5 |
|  | 11 | 5 |  | $\overline{26}$ | 4 | 4 |  | $\overline{8}$ | 5 | 1 |  | $\overline{6}$ |

1) $\overline{379,101,129,130,164}$
2) Diehl iii 490-492
3) Wilmanns ii 382,712
from which proportions it is obvious that $B M$ should be regarded as representing BONAE MENORIAE rather than BENENERENTI, not only because of the much greater frequency of the former term, but also because of its distribution, which corresponds to that of BM much more closely than does that of BENEMERENTI. Comnon to all three features is the negative role of Zeugitana. It would seem moreover that Numidia was the seat of BONAE MEMORIAE, and Mauretania the seat of BENEMERENTIZ both being found also in Byzacena. So far as these slight figures have validity, therefore, they indicate that the praise of the deceased was suppressed in the Rarly Church just as was any mention of his public dignificance, presumably for the same reason.

Perhaps the sane factor operates to exclude from our texts all expressions of grief at bereaषement, which are quite exceptional. Such phrases as we find are peculiar to Mauretania: DOLENTES PARENTES, sorrowing parents? L) LEGE ET DOLE, read thou and grieve thou?) FABENTE DEO SIIE DOLORE FILIORU DISCESSIT, thanks to the Pavour of God he died without having the grief of mourning for children, 3) and the epithet CRUDELIS, (lit., "criel"), which we must apparently understand by transference in the sense of "immatura norte" since it complains of the hard fate of those who have died before their time, ${ }^{5}$, the key to this interpretation being found in the fairly common pagan extravagance of the type CIL v 154: "She never committed any fault save by dying,...I never received any pain from her except byd death" ${ }^{6}$ ) Elsewhere in the Christian Empire such expressions occur;' but nowhere

1) bV 132
2) CV 79
3) BV 6
4) bV 101,143,156
5) Monceaux HLAC iii 198
6) Northeote EC 70
7) Diehl iii 516-517,503
are complaints of this type so lavish as in pagan texts, which abound in references to "unjust portune", 1 ) "the unjust and grievous dispensation of Fortune'g) and "the hateful Parcae" who "decreed a grievous fate and the end of life,"3) in endless variety. ${ }^{4}$ ) only the peculiar use of CRUDELIS discussed on the foregoing page is exclusive to Africa, where, in adition to its appearance on the inscriptions quoted, it occurs on two texts which may be Christian, but which, since they lack all Christian stigmata, we have treated as pagan. The discussion however of these and kindred texts must not be allowed to conceal from us the fact that they constitute exceptions and occur only on the periphery of the Christian commanty, where Christian influence is least strong. As a general rule the Early Church dia not lament its dead, and in this respect differed from its pagan environnent.

We close our discussion of the worldy existence of the African Christians as reflected in their epitaphs by quoting an inscription in which the public and private aspects of the problem are neatly combined, the headstone namely of Pescennia Quodvulteus, who was

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { bIII } 37 \text { HF BOINIS NATALIBUS a gentlewoman of good birth, } \\
& \text { ITATA MATROITAJITER } \\
& \text { ITJPTA UXOR CASTA - a chaste wife } \\
& \text { VATER PIA GENTIT }=\text { and dutiful mother; } \\
& \text { FILIOS III ET FILIAS she bore three sons and two } \\
& \text { II VIXIT ANNIS XXX } \\
& \text { a gentlewoman of good birth, } \\
& \text { respectably married, } \\
& \text { a chaste wife } \\
& \text { she bore three sons and two } \\
& \text { daughters and lived thirty years. }
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, of all our texts only two mention the deceased's birth: one man, we are told, was born "at the sixth hour", NATUS ORA SEXTA, ${ }^{6}$, $n o t h e r$ at a place called Casae Ninores, NATUS CASAS MINORES?
1)Diehl kIT38/40,481
2) ib. 474
3) 1 ъ. 462
4) Northcote EC 66
5)BII 20
6)cIV 98

Such texts serve to remind us, by their mere forthcomingness, that the epitaphs as a whole show very little interest indeed in the details of the mundane life. Only exceptionally do they illustrate the life of the Christian considered as a citizen of the ancient worla.

The situation is in every respect reversed when we pass to consider the average Christian no longer merely as a citizen of the Roman Empire, but as a member of the Church; for here we are copiously and precisely instructed. Even when the deceased holds no ecclesiastical office, he is very frequently described as belonging to the faith. For this purpose two titles, originally epithets, come into consideration. The one is PIDEIIS, faithful, of which we count no fewer than 457 examples in our African material, and of which numerous instances occur also elsewhere in the Christian West.) In Byzantine times it is represented in Greek by TICTOC ${ }^{2)}$ and by Latin in Greek characters, $\phi \mid \triangle C \wedge(C .3)$ CRISTIANA FIDELIS, a rare combination, ${ }^{4}$ ) provides the transition to CRISTIANA,5) now the regular word, but in inscriptions of the Early Church very pare indeed. FIDELIS is thought to apear in one Jewish Iragment, b) but is otherWise unattested in this technical sense of Christian, belonging to the Paith? ) outside the Chumeh itself. On pagan epitaphs it appears occasionally in the superlative as part of laudatory phrases.) on the other hand FIDELIS was very frequently abolied collectively to Roman legions in a stereotyped maner, in combination with PIA,

1) Di 1351-1379
2) CIII 708
3) CIII 641
4)bIII 29
5)bIII 274
4) Monceaux 147
7)Kraus REi506
5) WiIm 269,2569
so as to produce the regular formula, LEGIO - PIA FIDELIS, $=$ the legion, dutiful and reliablel) This is the only example of the regular use of the word in a tecknical sense which we find in pagan epigraphy, and it is just possible that we should recognize in it the archetype of our well-known Christian formula. Harnack has shown how completely the Early Church adopteã military language in setting forth its message: baptism was the sacramentum or oath sworn to the colours, the martyrs are the officers who lead the Christian soldiers in their campaign against the demons, Christ is the imperator, the Church is the camp of God, whoso yields to persecution is a deserter, heretics and schismatics are mutineers, Christians must do picket duty and keep guard,i.e. by praying ana fasting they fulfil "stations" and "vigils", the Christian life is a splendid struggle against the Devil, admirea by God and the angels?) Not to pass beyona this present investigation, we have already been led by inscriptions of another category to appreciate this warlike attitude on the part of the Early Church (pp.175,207). There are therefore good grounds for thinking that FIDELIS is not adequately to be translated "believer" but implies a much more warlike attitude than that word suggests. If in fact it was transferred from the legions to the Church, being there applied individually instead of collectively, and that is the history of the term here proposed, then the Churchmember of early times must be thought of as a warrior of Christ, a legionary, exactly as in the Salvation Army of to-day, which Farnack praises as the most remarkable Christian organization

[^57]of modern times, since it reproduces to a degree otherwise unknown the aggressive temper characteristic of the Early Church?)

The other current term used in the same sense is INNOCENS, harmiess, innocent, without guile, which occurs 32 tines in our African texts, as often in Christian epitaphs generally?) It can also be traced in Jewish material,' and, like Fidelis, is common on pagan texts, usually in the superlative. () Its syntax corresponds exactly to that of Fidelis, since it is regularly treated as a noun. The only difference between the two words seems to be, that whereas FIDELIS is applied to Christians of all ages, INNOCENS is applied, in the examples where the age is given ( 15 in number), only to very young persons, the ages in question varying from 30 days to 10 years, giving an average age of "innocents" of seven years. It may of course be disputed whether INHOCENS has any reference to Church membership at all. We find however the terms IHNOCENS (INNOX) and FIDBLIS frequentiy combined, INOCENS PIDELIS5) and FIDELIS INTOCENS.' On general grounds, also, it is extremely probable that INNOCENS, which occurs so much more frequently in Christian than in pagan material as to be quite a characteristic of the former, should become a technical term indicating Church membership: baptism in the Early Church purified the sinner, who, having received it, was thereupon reckoned blameless, that is to say, "innocent" like a chila, with the result, that controversy raged as to whether sin committed after baptism were Porgivable, and to what extent?) Hence we conclude

1) Harnack, Vilitia Christi 7
2)Diehl iii 539
3)Di 4959,Gsell 1080
2) Wilmanns 2233,2590
5)bIII 75, cIII 350,375 , cV 53, CIV 232
3) CIV 228
4) Shepherd of Hermas, vision ii 4
that a Christian, until he was twenty years of age, but certainly no longer, might be called either FIDELIS or INNOCENS, graece âkokos 1) but after that year, only FIDELIS. Whereas INNOCENS is the more tender epithet, indicating blamelessness, FIDELIS brands him as a soldier of Christ. In either case it must be assumed that he is baptized, unless evidence to the contrart is forthcoming.

Finally the distribution of these two terms is most instructive:-

## FIDELIS

|  | b | c |  |  | b | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II | 3 | 43 | = | 46 | 2 | 2 | $=$ | 4 |
| III | 5 | 357 | = | 362 | 6 | 16 | $=$ | 22 |
| IV | 7 | 33 | = | 40 | - | 4 | = | 4 |
| v | 1 | 9 | = | 10 | 1 | 1 | $=$ | 2 |
|  | 16 | 442 | = | 458 | 9 | 23 | = | 32 |

for here the outstanding feature, the predominance namely of Zeugitana as against the negative rôle of Mauretania which corresponds thereto, presents a displacement directly opposed to that observed in the case of data concerning the worldy condition of members of the Early Church (pp.375-376, 380-381). This contrast holds good even when the general position of Zeugitana as a source of epitaphic material is taken into account. What we see therefore in this table is the congestion of references to the churchly status of the Christian towaras the nucleus of the Affican Christian community, and the sparseness of such references at its periphery.

1) CIII 89

The same general proportions hold good in the case of the three most numerous classes of the alergy attested in the inscriptions, namely the bishops, EPISCOPI, elders, PRESBYTERY, and servants, DIACONI, of which 23,33 , and 15 examples occur respectively, together totalling 71, distributed in the usual manner as follows:-

| II | 2 | 14 | = | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| III | 26 | 9 | $=$ | 35 |
| IV | 1 | 8 | $=$ | 9 |
| V | 2 | 9 | $=$ | 11 |
|  | 31 | 40 | = | 71 |

It will be observed that these titles, which of course are common in Christian inscriptions everywhere? correspond exactly to the graduated orders of the Christian ministry repeatedly mentioned together as mutually supplementary elements in the organization of the Early Church, for example in the celebrated Iormulations of Ignatius: Apart from this the inscriptions contribute nothing to the problem of their inter-relations, since their respective duties are nowhere therein described.

IWO Offishoots of the diaconate, the archdeacon (ARCEDIACONUS, bII 5I, ARCH...?, cIII 147), presumably a higher rank, and a lower one corresponding thereto, the subdeacon,SUBDIACONUS (bIII 14,I5,199, cIV 212, cV 185, 177,192 ), provide a transition to the minor clergy, of whom we count eight readers, LECTORES, (bII 65, CII 31,134, bIII 16,

1) Diehl, part II, cc.1-4
2) Ignatius, Philadelphians, intro.l iv, Smyrnaeans viii l,xii 2, etc.
cIII 2,3,214,215,613), two acolytes, ACOLUTHI (cIII 149,216), and an exorcist, EXORCIS(TES), CIII 148. All these may be parallelled in the aforementioned chapters of Diehl. with the addition of his 5 th chapter. It is presumably here that the FIDEJES and INHOCENTES already discussed have their place; for the only other rank we encounter after the minor orders just mentioned is that of hearer or AUDIENS, bII 2I(2), bIV 23, a pre-baptismal grade of which we hear also on Roman inscriptions, the titie signifying what is meant by the much commoner expression "catechumen: ${ }^{1)}$

That we have only three examples of the lastrmentioned grade is most tantalizing, since a statistically reliable collection of hearers or catechumens might supply an indication of the age at which it was common to baptize in the Early Church, and might even give some clue as to when infant baptism became a matter of course. As it is, in one of the three instances occurring in our African material a lacuna hides the age, and the remaining two examples show the bounds to be extreme enough: one year(bII 21) and thirty-two years(bIV 23). From these two texts alone nothing can be concluded. In order to arrive even at a preliminary understanding of this fascinating problem we must seek help outside Africa. Fortunately extrałAfrican Christian material, especially at Rome, abounds in mention of a grade not to be found in African naterial, namely that of neophyte, that is to say, a person who has been newly baptiged, the name being given only to baptized persons of not more than eight days' standing? ) From the thirty-eight examples of this grade given by
I)Di 1509n
2)Kirsch in Kraus Re ii 831 , Weiss ibid. 488

Diehl mentioning the age, ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) we see that baptism could be administered when the candidate was as young as 8 months?) or when he was as old as 42 years, ${ }^{3}$ ) and that the average age at which the believer was baptized lies bevteen 10 and 11 years. In all probability this average holas good for Africa also. All the relevant texts of the Early Church must be reduced to chronological order before we are in a position to establish the extent to which this average varies in the course of history, and therewith to settle the problem in detail. In the mean time we draw attention to the interest of this figure, and pass on to consider to what extent the ages of the other groups in the hierarchy of the Early Church are significant. Of the average age of "Innocents" we have already spoken (p.386), the only grade in which it is apparently correct to speak of an upper limit. The youngest "Innocent" in Africa lived only 30 days ${ }^{3}$ FIDELIS is applied from the age of 3 months upwards.) Our acolytes and our solitary exorcist were probably men in the prime of life, like their counterparts in other lands; ${ }^{5)}$ but their ages cannot be gathered from the stones in question becase of lacunae. The extreae youthiulness of our African readers (lectors) is remarkable: this grade contains one of ll years ${ }^{6}$ ) and one of 5 years?) It was not however altogether unusual to have mere boys occupying this position in other churches of the West, since lectors are known in Gaul at the age of $13^{8}$, in Spain at that of $144^{9}$ ) in Rome at those of $12^{10)}$ and 16 1 ) and at Florence, lectors have been discovered at the ages of Irl2) and 5 ! 3) The practice apparently gave rise to a scandal, and was suppressed

1) Dieh il
282-287
2)Di 1481
2) CIII 105
5)Diehl i 242-245
3) LeB1 484
4) Di 1277
5) Hu Sp 314
6) Di 1277A
by Byzantine legislation. (The age of 19 years 5 months for a subdeacon ${ }^{2)}$ should not probably be considered abnormal. No age is discoverable in the case of our archdeacons. Our youngest deacon, a man of 35 years 3) does not represent an exception, since several still younger deacons are known elsewhere, aged 314) 30, 27, 27, and 25.) The age at which presbyters become quite common, namely 32,) seems nomal; but our material includes two remarkable exceptions, in boys of $13^{9}$ ) and $8^{10)}$ burdened with this office. Diehl, in the latter instance, wishes to read 58, 1) but this arbitrary correction still will not account for similar instances elsewhere of extremely youthrul "elders", one namely aged 19 at Arles $\frac{1}{2}$ ) and another aged 8 years 4 months at Rome. ${ }^{\text {l3 }}$ ) When finally we pass to bishops, it accoras well with the responsibilities of this supreme office that its occupants should not generally be younger than $52^{14}$ ) or 58. . $^{15}$ But it is startling to find a young man of 23 called a bishopl6) Perplexity deepens when it is discovered that in Gaul a bishop is to be found aged only 16.7) Without knowing more of local conditions it is impossible for us to explain these freaks. Until futher light on the subject is for thcoming they can only be pointed out, as features of the African Church and of the Early Church generally: in both cases, the lower limits in the age of the clergy taken as a whole exceed expectations. Whether any law lurks beneath this curious phenomenon, and if so, how it operates, is not immediately obvious.

In addition to the grades of the fundamental hierarchical

1) LeBl ICG vol.ii p. 211
2)CIV 185
2) CIV 217
3) Di $1214,-22$
4) Di 1213,1221
6)Di 1205
5) $D_{i}$ I202
6) cIV 76 9)cII 73 10)CII 163 11)Di 1185
by Byzantine legislation. (The age of 19 years 5 months for a subdeacon ${ }^{2)}$ should not probably be considered abnormal. No age is discoverable in the case of our archaeacons. Our youngest deacon, a man of 35 years, ${ }^{3}$ ) does not represent an exception, since several still younger deacons are known elsewhere, aged 314, 30,5) 27, (and 25?) The age at which presbyters become quite common, nanely 32 , seems normal; but our material includes two remarkable exceptions, in boys of $13^{9)}$ and $8^{\text {IO }}$ burdened with this office. Diehl, in the latter instance, wishes to read 58,1) but this arbitrary correction still will not account for similar instances elsewhere of extremely youthrul "elders", one namely aged 19 at Arles, 2 ) and another aged 8 years 4 months at Rome ${ }^{\text {I3) }}$ When finally we pass to bishops, it accords well with the responsibilities of this supreme office that its occupants should not generally be younger than $52^{\text {I4 }}$ ) or $58^{15}$ ) But it is startling to find a young man of 23 called a bishopl6) Perplexity deepens when it is discovered that in Gaul a bishop is to be found aged only 16.7) Without knowing more of local conditions it is impossible for us to explain these freaks. Until futher light on the subject is forthcoming they can only be pointed out, as features of the African Church and of the Early Church generally: in both cases, the lower limits in the age of the clergy taken as a whole exceed expectations. Whether any law lurks beneath this curious phenomenon, and if so, how it operates, is not immediately obvious.

In addition to the grades of the fundamental hierarchical
1)LeBI ICG vol.í
2)CIV 185
3) CIV 217
4)Di 1214,-22
5)Di 1213,1221
6)Di 1205
7) $D_{i} 1202$
8) CIV 76 9) CII 73

organization of the Early Church just mentioned, the inscriptions yield a large variety of miscellaneous thtles, the precise scope of some of which it is not at once easy to determine.

Of these the most perplexing is SACERDOS, priest, which occurs once, absolutely, i.e. without other title (cvi bo):-

DMS FLAVIUS DONATUS SACERDOS QUI VIXIT... DISCESSIT....FILI PATRI KARISSINO ET BM DOMUM ROMULAN ISTITUERUNT...

Sacred to the Infernal Gods. Flavius Donatus, priest, who lived....departed.....his sons
$=$ raised a "domus romula" to their dearest well-deserving father.

It is clear that Flavius Donatus is most probably not a member of the Christian clergy at all, since family life was forbiaden them by the thira Canon of the Council of Nicea in 325 , and since the Whole cast of the epitaph sugeests that the deceased functioned as one of those public officials, found among Christians only in Africa (pp.374-375), in all likelihood a flanen perpeturs; we therefore exclude him from the clergy. On the other hand SACERDOS is found applied to bishops and presbyters in the Early Church, though always with some indication to show that their "sacerdotium" or priesthood is the Christian, and not the pagan priesthood, even when, as in the case of the stone at Kirkmadrine, we cannot tell whether the reference is to bishops or presbyters?) In Africa itself, SACERDOS is applied to a presbyter, and also to a bishop; ${ }^{4}$ ) while of two other biskops we are told of one that he lived for so many years, "during which time he administerea his priesthood to the Lord...", INTER QUIBUS SACERDOTIUM DNO ADMINST..., 5) Of the other, that he

1) Diehl iii 399-400
2) Di 1120
3) bV 149
4) cV 82
5) cV 83
spent eight years and eleven months in the priesthood, FECIT IN SACERDOTIUN ANNOS VIII NEN XI.

ANTISTES,"one who stands before the rest, takes peecedence", the name by which Tertullian adaresses the Roman governing classes? appears as the title of a man with a period of 37 years' meritorious service in a "chair" to his credit, TERDENOS ET VII SEDIS QUI MPRUIT ANNOS, ${ }^{3}$ ) and whom we therefore take to be a bishop, reference to a bishop's tenure of his "chair" (sedes) being frequently found in episcopal evitaphs of the Early Church.) The title "antistes" is in fact quite common in the West, and we have already encountered it as applied to the famous martyr-bishop Cyprian in a text relating to his relics (p.193) when we discussed its honorific value.

CLERICUS, clerk, is the title by which five of our African church officials are known, one of whom calls himself in adaition an "innocent!" ${ }^{7}$ This title, which was popular also in Spaing) seems quite general in its application, signifying no one grade of the ministry in particular, but the ministry in general, the reference being to the manner of its maintenance or historical origin9) Since CLERICUS is aplied on an extra-African stone to a man who is at the same time an "ostiarjas" or beadle, 0 ) we should probably place our African "clerics" among the minor orders. Had they been bishops, presbyters, or deacons the fact would probably have been mentioned.

IINISTER, servant, occurs twice: DEI MINISTER, servant of God, 1 ) and MINISTER ALTARIS, servant of the altarl2) Both expressions have

1) cV 117
2)Tert.Apol.I
2) CV 19
4)Diehl iii 406
3) Diehl iii 320
4) CIII 146,571, cIV 27,71,88 7)cIV 88
8)Di 1292,1293
9)Peters in Kraus RE ii 215-218
10)2349
Di) 1I)bIII 248
12)bIV 70
parallels in extra-African material, which in addition to making mention of "ministers" without qualificationl) speaks also of "Ministers of God!' ${ }^{2)}$ and "Ministers of the Altar! ${ }^{3)}$ If the former expression emphasizes their allegiance, the latter helps us to establish their identity. It is highly improbable that "minister" constitutes any order other than those already familiar to us. Rather, the word itself is the precise Latin equivalent of the Greek J/akovos, which Souter ${ }^{4}$ ) does not hesitate to translate "waiter", in view of the use of the verb occurring in the account of the institution of the order of deacons, where these are set apart to feed the poor because the preachers of the word have no leicure Sidkovk Tpard Juls, to serve tables.) In the course of time however deacons were charged with duties other than dispensing charity: their service remained a service of tables, but it was no longer only the table of the needy that they strove to furnish, but the table of the Lora, Tp. Kupiaus) Their duty, in other words, embraced also attendance at the sacrament of the altar, where they assisted the celebrant?) Hence they might well be called servants of God, servants of the altar. There are good grounds therefore for identifying MINISTER and DIACONUS, servant ana deacon.

The idea of service which came to expression in these titles gave rise to others also, in great variety. First of all the word SERVUS, slave, occurs in the following combinations:
 cIV 215) SERBUS DOMINICUS cIV 2193 slave of the Lord
bV 28 PATRIS ET FILI SERVUS slave of the Father \& the Son

I)Diehl iii 369
2)Di $146 \ln$
3)Di 1194,1196
4) Souter, Lexicon 62
5) Actis vi 2
6) $1 \operatorname{cor} x 21$
7) Munz in Kraus RE $\ddagger 356$

Then comes FAMULUS (-A), personal attendant, house-servant:-
CII 212 FAMULUS DEI, servant of God cIII 366-367 DEI FAMULA, servant(f.) of God, cIV 224 FAMULA XPI, servent(f.) of Christ.

Finally we have two "handnaids of Christ" :-
BV 5 ANCILLA CRISTI, bV 103 ANCILIA *
Elsewhere in the Christian West such expressions are common, the same nouns being employed.) Famulus is particularly common in Spain?)

What do such titles mean? With the exception of the Byzantine seals, where the possessor declares himself to be the slave (doulos) of the Nother of God (p.287), and which suggest therefore that an expression of piety is in question, and nothing more, we find nothing in the Christian inscriptions of Africa that we can adauce towards their explanation. What we know of extra-African examples, homever, strengthens the impression that almost anyone who wished might call himself or herself a "servant (servus, fomulus, -a, ancilla) of God, Christ." In Spain, FAMULUS DEI is Iound added to the names of presbyters 3) and deacons4) On the other hand, "Famuli" are known of a tender age at which no church office is possible,
 and one yearll) "Handmaids of God/Christ", (ANCILLAE DEI/CHRISTI), moreover, range from twelve years of age ${ }^{12)}$ to the ripe ages of eighty ${ }^{13)}$ and one hundred.4) In other words, the expression "servant etc. of God/Christ", apart from being applied to those in the prime of Iife and burdened with ecclesiastical office, could be borne also by

1) Di 1419-1473
2)II 1424-1430,1436-1441
2) $\mathrm{Di} 1175 \mathrm{ABD}, 1177+\mathrm{A}$
3) Di $1227+A$
4) Di 1421,1444,1450
6)Di 1451
5) Di 1451A
8)Di 1428
9)Di $1423,1424 \mathrm{Dn}, 1446$
10)Di 1422
II)Di 1427
12)Di 1468
13)Di 1466
14)Di 1467B
many whose sex or age debarred them from active participation in church organization, and who could only receive the general titles of INNOCENS or FIDELIS. Certainly there can be no question at all of inferring from any of these expressions the existence of any office or grade in the hierarchy corresponding thereto. Rather we have to do here with titles arbitrarily assumed by religious enthusiasts.

People of this kind are mentioned by the inscriptions, but not often. We hear of a "religious", RELIGIOSUS, ${ }^{\text {P }}$ a title elsewhere popular, especially as applied to the higher clergy?) One of our deacons is at the same time an abbot, ABBAS, ) of which title there are naturally many examples outside Africa, al though it seems unusual for a deacon to hold it, the lowest grade mentioned in this connection being that of presbyter!) Finally of the African FAMULI DEI just discussed, one calls himself a hermit, EREMITA, (he sole example, it would apar, of this title in the West. These three texts exhaust the contribution of epigraphy to our knowleage nî ascetic praxis among the Christion male population of North Airica.

On the other hand the inscriptions tell of many women who renounced normal existence for the sake of religion. The texts in question show the following titles adopted as tokens of this decision: VIRGO (virgin) cII 16,23,26, bIII 17,18, cIII 232,235,499,553, cIV I39, cV 22; VIRGO INNOCEISS (virgin, an innocent) cIII 642; VIRGO FIDELIS (virgin, a believer) cIII 29,236; VIRGO SANCTA,(holy virgin) cII 17, cIII 233,547; VIRGO SACRATA(consecrated virgin) cIII 622; CASTISSIVA VIRGO...PUELLA (most chaste virging...a girl) cIV 226;
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PUELLA (girl) CI 1, bIII 20,208,245,275, CIII 181; PUELLA SACRA (sacred girl) bIII 19, cIII 590; SANTISSIMA PUELLA (most holy girl) bII 30; PUELLA...FIDELIS MENTE CONSOCIATA DEO (girl....a believer, With her mind in companionship with God) bII 39. One may of course dispute the significance of the words "girl" and"virgin" in the case of the relatively young, for example in the case of a PUELLA agea 6 (bII 39), and in the case of a VIRGO agea II (cIII 642) or 12 (cIII 499) or 16 (cV 22) ; for in the former instance, the word is quite appropriate, and in the latter the emphasis upon youthful prospects cut off is an epigraphical comonplace copiously illustrated in pagan epitaphs.) But the various phrases embodying the the epithets "sacred","holy","consecrated", and the like, suggest vexy clearly the idea of a life completed subject to religious vows; and the vord PUELLA, when applied to persons of thirty and over (bIII 245,275), are not indeed impossible, but are much more likely than not to have been so applied in a technical sense. Both terms, nanely VIRGO and PUELLA, are Prequently encountered in Christian material outside Africa?

Whatever scruples hinder the above interpretation of VIRGO and PUELLA being accepted, there can be none regarding the meaning of DEVOTA, (devoted, sc. to God), CV 103, which is richly attested elsewhere also, ${ }^{3)}$ or of SANCTIMONIALIS, an evithet of specific application, only applied to virgins undertaking vows, $\frac{4}{}$ ) occasionally attested in the West, ) of which we have three African examples?)
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Such texts may indicate the direction in which we should interpret FAMULUS(-A), ANCILIA, and other titles of humility. The first convent erected in Africa was that planned by Augustine at Hippol) It is therefore nost likely that the inscriptions now in question, many of which are earlier than this foundation, reflect private zeal in the cause of asceticism, in other words quite an unofficial type of unorganized piety.

If further we tabulate the 46 texts discu申ssed on the last four pages, that is, the epitaphs of "servants", "consecrated virgins" and the like:-

|  | b | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | - | 1 | $=$ | 1 |
| II | 2 | 5 | = | 7 |
| III | 8 | 16 | $=$ | 24 |
| IV | 1 | 8 | $=$ | 9 |
| V | 4 | 1 | $=$ | 5 |
|  | 15 | 31 | $=$ | 46 |

$\neq$ werive the key to the location of the religious enthusiasm they express. So far as the figures go they are in every pespect normal, mith one exception. The displacenent, it is true, is very slight, but a carefful comparison with the Third Table (p.110) supplemented by the tables given of FIDELES and INHOCENTES, which are still more relevant, will reveal a noticeable preponderance of Numidian material. INumidia, it will be renembered, was the seat of the enthusuastic cult of the martyrs and saints ( p . 208) . A connection between the two, namely the veneration of the martyrs and emulation of their heroism through supererogation, is not unlikely.

[^58]When on the other hand we compare the latest table with that showing the distribution of bishops, presbyters, and deacons (p.388) the Numidian preponderance emerges very clearly indeed, since it happens that in both tables the total for that province is constant, while the non-Numidian totals in the case of the clergy are greater than in the case of the "enthusiasts"(except for the Tripolitanian entry on p .398 , which is statistically insignificant). This means that the "enthusiasm" of the Numidian Christians offers a contrast to the piety of settled organization, officialdom, clericalism, common pedestrian religion, or whatever else it is convenient to call it. We have long ago observed the traces of Montanism, the religion of the spirit if ever there was one, and of Donatism, the faith of the rigorist, in this province (pp,151,155-156). Hence it answers to what we know of Numidian typical attitudes, to see in the texts now under consideration evidence of a desire for religious perfection not attainable through comnon praxis. In addition to this, the preponderance of women over men (p.396) may indicate the popularity of this particular type of religiosity among those who found themselves debarred on principle from fulfilling their religious desires within the forms of service approved by the official Church. Doubtless both tendencies acted and reacted upon each other to produce the condition in which as a matter of fact we find the inscriptions: by inclination and from necessity, the Numidian Christians, if we may use the word in so broad a sense, became the mystics of the African Church.

As usual the analysis of the typical neglects a number of individual pieces which resist classification, together with a few
miscellaneous points of interest not easily handled in the body of the analysis. To both types of residual matter justice may be done in the present instance by subjoining three paragraphs dealing with the praise of the religious character, the duration of the clerical office, and doubtful cases, respectively.

Under the first heading it seems worth while to draw attention to the atmosphere of sanctity surrounding the clergy in the Early Church. This appears in the modification of the formula BONAE MEMORIAE (p.380) into SANCTAE MEMORIAE (sacred memory) in the case of bishops (cIV 73, cV 117), a phenomenon characteristic of the Early Church as a whole, ${ }^{\text {, }}$ together with the application of the epithet SANCTUS to the Dishop, whether directly (cII 198) or through the phrase SANCTUS PATER, "holy father" (cV 83), the use of "pater" in this sense, with which the supreme grade of the Mithraic hierarchy is to be compared, being found elsewhere in Africa ( cV 82,1I7) , and in ancient churches of the West generakIy: It is possible moreover to interpret cV 82 SACRA DEI SACERDOTIS SOROR so that the bishop's sanctity extends to his immediate relations, ("the holy sister of the priest of God"), although many will prefer Monceaux's punctuation SACRA DEI, SACERDOTIS SOROR, ${ }^{4}$ ("virgin of God, sister of the priest") which recognizes the lady in question as possessing sanctity in her own right. However that may be, clerical sanctity is clearly expressed on the epitaph of a deacon, of whom it is said that he entertained angels, and had the martyrs for his companions, ANGELORUM OSPES MARTYRUM COMES (bIII 248). Now we know of one who showed hospitality to angels,
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namely Abraham the patriarch; ${ }^{1)}$ and "associate of the martyrs" occurs commonly in Christian laudatory epitaphs?) Both expressions are to be understood in the same sense: this revered deacon was one of the few, belonged to the religious élite. More human are the qualities of another cleric, this time a presbyter, who is praised as " a guardian of discipline, exemplary in the manner in which he carried out his duty", DISCIPLINAE CUSTOS PIETATIS MAGISTER (bIII 249). Such words recall most strikingly the Calvinistic ideal of the elder, whose duty it is, according to the original Geneva constitution, to watch over the conduct of the individual, admonish those who go astray from the path of rectitude, and report difficult cases. ${ }^{3)}$ In this connection it is of interest to notice that one of our inscriptions (cII 188) appears to mention a penitent sinner (PENITEN...), although the reading is far from satisfactory. On the other hand, private aspects of clerical virtue come to light in the quasi-title applied to two bishops, that namely of "laver of the poor"(AMATOR PAUPERUM, cIV 143) (PAUPERUM AMATOR, CV 41). That a layman might also be described in these terms, is shown by bIII 291: PAUPERIM AMATOR CULTOR DEI, "a lover of the poor and one that cherished God! Gospel passages like Mathew xxv 3l-46, xxvi li which bring devotion to God into connection with almsgiving must lie beneath this particular combination. CULTOR DEI is not of course an official title indicating grade, but is to be interpreted along the lines of those titles of humility already discussed (pp. 394,395). Such titles are very ancient: foühos $\theta$ coủ for example occurs again and again as a name applied to the pious
5) Genesis xviiì
6) Diehl iii 329
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man in the Shepherd of Hermas $\frac{1}{9}$ ) while Paul, writing to the Romans
 Philippians in a like manner being sent in the name of Paul and Timothy servants of Christ Jesus, foûdoi Kuintó Y Moô (i 1). CULTOR and AMATOR, moreover, are neatly combined on a metrical inscription erected in Rome by an admirer of the famous bishop Damasus, who calls himself "one who cherishes and loves Pope Damasus," DAMASI PAPAE CULTOR ATQUE AMATOR2) Finally the epitaph CIVICA DEI MINISTER IN PACE / SECUDE AMATOR PAUPERUM IN PACe (bIII 248) falls to be mentioned, in which the names Civica and Secude are plainly masculine, since if they were not, we should expect ministRA and amatRIX, both of which are amply attested in Christian material when the names in question are feminine. AMATOR PAUPERUM we know already; but what of DEI MINISTER? On pp. 393 394 we assumed that this title was tantamount to MINISTER ALTARIS, i.e. to DIACONUS. Its juxtaposition to AMATOR PAUPERUM however raises doubts: probably we should see in it only one more variant of the "servant of God" formula, therefore a title of piety with no hierarchical significance attached.
cII 73 tells of one who lived for such and such a time, including a number of years "in the grade of presbyter", IN PRESBYTERIO. Similarly we hear of bishops who lived for a number of years, "of which he lived twelve in the episcopate", IN QUIBUS VIXIT IN EPCO AN XII (cIV 73), "during which he did service to the Lord in the priesthooa!'..(lacuna), INTER QUIBUS////////SACERDOTIUM DNO ADMINST ( cV 83). It was quite customary to mention the priesthood thus 4) We hear also of a presbyter who lived 44 years in the diaconate
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and years six twonths in the presbyterate, FAUSTINUS PRESB VIXIT IN dIACONATU ANNIS XXXXIIII ET IN PRESB ANNIS II MEITSES ¢ (cII 90). In Roman epitaphs of the clergy we find many such careers sketched, the more elaborate of which remind us forcibly of pagan cursūs honorum. I) It will be observed moreover that the epitaph of Faustinus makes no mention of his somatic age. Many African bishops likewise neglect all mention of the length of their lives, telling only of the number of years they spent in the priesthood: bII 93 IN EPISC VI AN $\mathrm{X} / / /$, cV $14 \pm$ DURABIT IN EPISC AN XXII ET $\mathbb{M} / / / /$, CV 68 IMPLEVIT IN EP AN XVIII, CV 117 QUI FECIT IN SACERDOTIUM AN VIII. Parallels to this phenomenon elsewhere in the Christian Empire are by no means wanting. It is obvious that in such cases the mere length of time spent in this life counts for little, and does not deserve to be mentioned on the monumental stone: it is rather the part of it spent in the priesthood that is of importance.

On the periphery of this group of texts lie a handful of titles hitherto passed over because of their ambiguity: from the inscriptions themselves it is not immediately clear whether VICE PREPOSitus cV 168 , EXCEPTOR bIII 267, NOTARIUS $a V$ 5, and PRIMICERIUS CIV 68,70 are to be reckoned aivil or ecclesiastical officials.

VICE PREPOSitus cV 168 is in the first place ambigious. A "praepositus", as the philology offth term implies, is a man set over other men, an overseer of inferior officials. As such it occurs frequently on pagan inscriptions, in various connections3) As such, also, namely as the title of laynen holding civil and military posts of responsibil-
1)Diehl 998,1038
2)Diehl 1032,1034,1036,1057
3) Wilmanns ii 649
ity, it appears on numerous Christian inscriptions. ${ }^{\text {I }}$ On the other hand Praepositus is applied to a variety of ecclesiastical officials, including bishops and those second-in-command to abbots, to men, that is, whom we otherwise know as priors?) Here again the inscriptions attest its ecclesiastical use. ${ }^{3)}$ Our African VICE PREPOSitus, therefore, would be some one acting on behalf either of a worldy official, or of some of the higher clergy. That his name is Julius, and that the epitaph comes from Mauretania: these are the only factors which contribute, even indirectly, towards a decision. On the whole, our VICE PREPOSitus was probably a civil official, the prefix indicating deputed powers being unknown in Christian epigraphy, That is the utmost that can profitably be said about this baffling case. EXCEPTOR bIII 267 is originally a military official ${ }^{4}$ ) who as such appears on Christian inscriptions.5) On the other hand the Early Church employed "exceptores" to write down to dictation the Acts of the Martyrs, ${ }^{6}$ ) and an official of this kind is attested epigraphically?) Here then is the same dilemra as before.

NOTARIUS aV 5 in Imperial times was an amanuensis or shorthand writer in general ${ }^{8}$ ) and as such figures in Christian material ${ }^{9}$ ) In Christian times notarii were employed for various literary purposes, as librarians who had custody of precious documents such as the Acts of the Martyrs, and as secretaries to the Church Councils, for writing out the minutes and redacting the proceedings? ${ }^{10}$ ) Of these notarii or clerks the Christian inscriptions know several
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examples. ${ }^{1}$ The epithet applied to our notarius, INGENIOSISSIMUS, most skilful, together with the early date of the stone in question, namely 225, suggest that he was a civil notarius, without connection with the Church apart from his ordinary membership, which is to be inferred only from the mention of the deceased's death (DECESSIT), as in the case of many other Mauretanian inscriptions.

PRIMICERIUS CIV 68,70 is a Byzantine official, "a person at the head of everything" according to Suidas, often however holding the position of second-in-command, at all events someone of ultimate or nearly ultimate responsibility in any sphere whatsoever? Naturally many civil servants of this kind are recorded in Christian inscriptions. 3) But in the Church Primicerius was a name given to a great variety of different officials: in Gaul he had oversight of the lectors, in Rome of the notarii (!), and in Constantinople he was the archdeacon, just as elsewhere (namely Gaul) he was called the first of the minor orders of clergy. (Many Primicerii of this kind figure in the Christian inscriptions. ${ }^{5}$ ) The fact that our African Primicerii bear the names of Donatus and John favours the view that they were ecclesiastical rather than civil Primicerií; but this argunent from the singleness of the names cannot be held as decisive for Byzantine texts, since we see from the invocations to the Theotokos (p.285) that single names were regular at that time in official circles.

If by setting all four titles together we can hope to solve the problem on grounds of probability, then we should choose to
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regard the VICE PREPOSitus and NOTARIUS as civil officials, and the EXCEPTOR and PRIMICERIUS as ecclesiastical officials. In the case of the two former titles, inner grounds would then be treated as decisive; while in the case of the latter two, both might be connected With the African interest in the martyrs, whose Acts must have been familiar Church reading. Perhaps therefore these officials took part in preserving this tradition. Alternatively we might associate the NOTARIUS with the EXCEPTOR and PRIMICERIUS, the VICE PREPOSitus being then alone reckoned a civil official. If we wished to connect all three Church ofricials by regarding them as associated with the cult of the martyrs, and at the same time to formulate our decision on the basis of what we know $\circ$ of the respective distribution of civil and ecclesiastical offices in our material(p.384), that is the way in which we should settle the problem. On the whole however such a solution depends more upon general stidistical presuppositions than upon concrete evidence, which in the case of so few texts, where each by itself is of such importance, must be given the benefit.

The problems handled in the above paragraph must not be allowed to obsess us, however, and leave us with a misconception regarding the true condition of the Christian life of the Early Church which the inscriptions reflect. We have been at pains to distinguish the civil and ecclesiastical status of the African Christians, to contrast their condition as citizens of the Roman Rmpire and as members of the Church. The great bulk of the epitaphs are silent on both topics, assuring us only that the dead whose memory they perpetuate, in life and/or in death, were/are"at peace". Several mention the deceased's position in the Church, whether as priest or layman. A much smaller
number give us a glimpse of the public positions a Christian might in those days fill, or of the details of his private life. A few texts are so impartial as to reflect the life of the deceased under both aspects simultaneously. We think in this connection of the two flamines perpetui who described themselves as a "believer" and a "Christian" respectively (p.374); we think of the noble "Roman knight, barrister, possessing all manner of culture and virtue" (p.373) who Was not ashamed to confess himself a candidate for baptism, a "hearer" (p.389) ; we think finally of that headoiece of great simplicity erected over the remains of one who was at the same time a good army man and a good Christian, cII 83: MG ML FIDELIS IN XPO, a military magistrate and believer in Christ.

The above discussion of the life-clause and its adjuncts neglects, for reasons of convenience, two topics whose treatment under this head would have thrown the exposition out of balance: the subject of names on the one hand, and ages on the other. In both cases the material far surpasses in richness anything we have hitherto handled, since every epitaph once bore a proper name, whether this can now be recovered or not, and most epitaphs, excluding the epitaphs of the earliest period of all, mention the number of years the deceased Iived. Investigations carried out in both of these directions must therefore be expected to yield well-grounded and characteristic information. We accordingly propose to bring our discussion of the typical features of the African Chris女ian epitaph considered as an epigraphical category to a close by investigating in turn the problems raised (1)by the Names (2)by the Ages recorded in our material.

## (f) Names

All the names found in the Christian epitaphs of North Africa are reproduced in full, systematically arranged, and furnished with apparatus, as an Appendix inserted behind the exposition as a whole. This arrangement enables us to attack onomastic prablems without delay.

The texts concerned number 1732, distributed thus:-

|  | a | $b$ | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | - | 2 | 1 | $=$ | 3 |
| II | 78 | 114 | 159 | = | 351 |
| III | 60 | 200 | 523 | $=$ | 783 |
| IV | 4 | 82 | 160 | $=$ | 246 |
| v | 4 | 170 | 175 | = | 349 |
|  | 146 | 568 | 1018 | $=$ | 1732 |

The proportions of the THIRD TABLE are here in general reproduced. It will be useful for future discussion to notice once again the outstanding ratios: the equality of Byzacena and Mauretania is here a most helpful index, Zeugitana accounts for roughly half of the entire material, Numidia for between an eighth and a ningh part, while Tripolitana is an almost negligible quantity. There are no chronobogical peculiarities worth mentioning. This table in fact is the nearest indication we possess of the distribution of the epitaphs as a class. For this reason it zeflects the distribution of the African Church generally. Its function must therefore be to
supply a foundation for the criticism of departmental tables to follow. The first of these is a double one, correponding to the distribution among our material of SIMPLE and COMPOUND names respectively. By the latter we mean those names constructed on the traditional Roman principle of a Nomen or Gentilicium preceded by a Praenomen and / or followed by a Cognomen. The tripartite name is historically prior to the bipartite name in pagan epigraphyl) In the course of Christian centuries both tend to disappear in place of the single name, ${ }^{2}$ ) which previously had been generally confinea to slaves and men of humble station. (The table with which we begin sets forth the fundamental contrast, that namely between the SIMPLE and COMPOUND type:-

|  | a | b | c |  | a | b | $c$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | - | 1 | - | $=1$ | - | 1 | 1 | $=$ | 2 |
| II | 70 | 87 | 133 | $=290$ | 8 | 27 | 26 | $=$ | 61 |
| III | 57 | 174 | 508 | $=739$ | 3 | 26 | 15 | \# | 44 |
| IV | 3 | 54 | 127 | $=184$ | 1 | 28 | 33 | $=$ | 62 |
| V | 2 | 105 | 88 | $=195$ | 2 | 65 | 87 | $=$ | 154 |
|  | 132 | 421 | 856 | $=1409$ | 14 | 147 | 162 | $=$ | 323 |

From a comparative study of the above tables our first result emerges without ambiguity. To the fundamental morphological distinction within our material there corresponds on the one hand

[^59]a chronological one, inasmuch as Compound Names fall off after the fourth century, Single Names on the contrary showing a decisive increase, exactly as de Rossi described the process in the case of the Roman catacombs and cemeteries, and a topographical one, the seat of the compound name being Mauretania (Maur/Byz = 154/61:) and the West generally, that of the simple name being Zeugitana and the East (Byz/Maur $=290 / 195:$ ). The negative result in the case of Zeugitana on the table of Compound Names is particularly striking.

If we further subdivide the Compound Names:-
DOUBLE TRIPLE

|  | a | b | 0 |  |  | a | b | $c$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | - | 1 | 1 | $=$ | 2 | - | - | - |  |  |
| II | 8 | 22 | 25 | $=$ | 55 | - | 5 | 1 | $=$ | 6 |
| III | 2 | 25 | 13 | $=$ | 40 | 1 | 1 | 2 | = | 4 |
| IV | 1 | 23 | 30 | $=$ | 54 | - | 5 | 3 | $=$ | 8 |
| V | 2 | 57 | 81 | $=$ | 140 | - | 8 | 6 | $=$ | 14 |
|  | 13 | 128 | 150 | $=$ | 291 | 1 | 19 | 12 | $=$ | 32 |

we see clearly once again the overwhelming position of Mauretania,
 moreover encourages unusual confidence in the chronological features of these two tables, since almost half the material is precisely dated. The early character of the compound name is very plainly brought out here, especially in the case of the triple name, where the progressive decline is steep enough to become manifest, a very rare phenomenon indeed in epigraphical statistics. In other
words, within the priority of Compound Names as a whole, we have succeeded in establishing the priority in time of the Triple Name over the Double Name, exactly as is attested for pagan material. The position hitherto gained may thus be generalized in a sentence: the contrast between Single and Compound $\ddagger$ Names is that between Zeugitana and the later period on the one hand, and Mauretania and the earlier on the other.

To reach an understanding of this contrast exposed to view by consideration of the mere form of the names in general, it is necessary to undertake an examination of their content also. The transition is supplied by a preliminary classification of the entire material on the basis of a comparison, carried out in the most minute detail, between our African Christian texts on the one hand, and the general epigraphical material of antiquity on the other. Dividing this larger background into Pagan (in the narrower sense,="ethnic"), Judaic, (i.e., of Jewish origin, written in Greek or Latin), and Christian, and dividing what remains of African Christian names after as many as possible have been traced through any or all of the foregoing divisions of the epigraphical context into "African"(土.e. names peculiar to Africa, but showing some affinity to extra-African or extra-Caristian material) and the ultimate irreducible residue, or "Hapax Legomena" to which nothing at all related can anywhere be found, we arrive at the following nine groups:-

| (1) CPJ = Christian-Pagan-Judaic | (5) $P=$ Pagan |
| :--- | :--- |
| (2) CP $=$ Christian-Pagan | 6) J Judaic |
| 3) PJ = Pagan-Judaic | (7) $C=$ Christian |
| (4) CJ $=$ Christian-Judaic | (8) Afr = African |

$$
\text { (9) Hapleg }=\text { Hapax Legomena }
$$

That is to say: CPJ names are names common to all types of ancient epitaph, and therefore characteristic of none; CP names are names found in all but Judaic material; PJ names are names found in all except Christian epitaphs; CJ names are names shared by Christian and Judaic material, but lacking in Pagan (ethnic) epitaphs; $P, J$, and C names are those found only in Pagan, Judaic, and Christian eptaphs respectively; Afr names, as just explained, are names which appear to be African variants of names found in any or all of the preceding groups; and Hapleg names are names to which no parallel or analogy, however remotely related, can up to the present be found in any group whatsoever.

As a system of division the above scheme has at least one great advantage: it casts purely empirical foundations on which to work towards the isolation of those items in which we are primarily interested, namely the names in our material which owe their existence to the Christian religion, i.e. the characteristically Christian kernel nucleus of the whole. It is a matter of surprise that previous investigators have overlooked the necessity of regarding this inquiry as an indispensable preliminary to the Christian interpretation of the names. In the otherwise excellent handing of the problem first by Kraus ${ }^{1)}$ and then by Cabrol ${ }^{2)}$ the question which stands in the foreground muns "what does this name mean in terms of the Christian faith?". Only subsequently does the question occur to them, "is it found in non-Christian material?". That this order is methodologically wrong is obvious from the errors of classification which not infrequently result from it, e.g. the listing of VICTOR as a name specifically Christian. ${ }^{3)}$ Here on the contrary we ask first the
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question, "into what group does this item fall?", then, but only if the answer is "C", the question "what does it mean in tems of the Christian faith?" If the answer to the former question is "either CPJ, CP, PJ, CJ, P, J,Afr,Hapleg' we do not proceed to the latter question at all, for a name which occurs in all kinds of material including Christian material, but does not occur only in Christian material, cannot be reckoned a peculiar product of the Christian faith. On the Other hand, even if the answer is " $C$ ", the item $\begin{aligned} & \text { if } \\ & \text { in question }\end{aligned}$ need not be a specifically Christian product in the sense of having direct connection with the faith, since it might represent a development of Pagan usige which took place only in Christian times. If no answer is forthcoming to the latter question in the case of an item belonging to group $C$, then we conclude that it is a name of this kind. Groups Afr and Hapleg stand by themselves. They may contain names of specifically Christian origin, in the sense that certain names must be accounted for in terms of the faith; if so, then these groups must be examined individually, but only after group $C$ has been treated; and if any "Christian" names are isolated, it means that they are peculiar products of the African Church, and are to be forthwith added to the Onomasticon of ancient Christendom. It is a priori more likely however that the overwhelming bulk if not all of groups Afr and Hapleg are mere African forms and nothing more. Thus having established what items of our material are IN FACT found only in Christian material, and having isolated them from those which are IN FACT found elsewhere also, or only elsewhere, we inspect the Christian material so isolated and seek its connection with the faith, only thereafter occupying ourselveskith Afr and Hapleg
names. The descending order of the group enables us moreover to simplify the division of the texts in question, since by combining the first six groups on the one hand, and the last two on the other, and setting group C by itself over against them, we reduce the divisions to three, namely (1)Non-Christian, (2)Christian, (3)Local. Hence by delimiting the scope of our researches according to our point of view and purpose at any given stage in the investigation, so that whenever we wish to look for anything we know immediately where to look in order to find it, and by excluding arbitrariness in the selection of material, instead placing the investigation on firm foundations, the classification of the texts in question according to the different groups as here expounded promises to justify itself when put into practice.

The application of the above system of classification to the material in hand can omly be carried out provided certain complications are taken into account. In the first place the material must be sifted afresh, since it is no longer a question of the internal distribution of texts, but on the contrary of the external distribution of names. The reason for this appears on mere inspection: texts and names by no means coincide, but several names occur more than once, i.e. embrace two or more texts, and several texts contain more than one name. Secondily, while single (simple) names, considered by themselves, may be analysed forthwith, compound names as they stand cannot be analysed at all, since parallels to double, triple, and quadruple formations are altogether sporadic and exceptional, therefore useless for our purpose. We have no choice but to resolve the compound
items into their elements and treat them for the time being as simple names. Thirdly however, we hereupon discover that a considerable part of this material so disintegrated is identical with part of the list of simple names. The texts do not of course cofncide, but only the names. The following diagram, which is not drawn to scale, but is merely symbolic, illustrates this relation:-


Here the larger of the two intersecting circles represents all the names found in the list of Simple Names. The smaller one likewise represents all the onomastic component-material found in the list of double, triple, and quadruple, i.e., Compound Names. The area over which the onomastic material of both morphological divisions is identical, i.e. over which both circles overlap, we call the Common and mark C. A represents the onomastic material peculiar to the Simple Names, and $B$ that peculiar to the Compound Names. To indicate this contrast we denominate $A$ and $B$ Simple Nett and Compound Nett respectively. Hence A+C represents the onomastic material of the Simple Name division, taken by itself, and B+C
that of the Compound Name divisionk likewise taken by itself. For these magnitudes we propose the titles Simple Gross and Compound Gross respectively. Now had we been calculating texts, the total would have been the sum of the Gross elements, $A+B+2 C$. Here however where it is a question of names, or rather of onomastic raw material, ve must be careful to observe that the total is the sum of the Nett elements together with the Common elements, counted only once, viz., $A+B+C$.

The significance of these divisions is plain. C reflects the most general usage of all, since it covers common ground. A+C and $B+C$ may be expected to exhibit a divergence of tendency corresponding to the selection of material characteristic of the two types of name respectively. Finally $A$ and $B$ taken in close jutaposition must provide the strongest possible contrast between the two morphological divisions, since mediating factors have been entirely abstracted, thereby leaving the contrasted phenomena to face each other in sheer opposition. Bearing in mind moreover the strongly-contrasted tendencies, both chronological and topographical, already observed in the respective distribution of the two morphologically distinct groups ( p .41 l ), we may be able to turn the anticipated contrasts to good account, namely by interpreting them in terms of internal distribution, and thus surmounting, of course in a very general manner, the limitations of the method here employed, which excludes the direct classification of names under the headings of century anđ locality.

Treating the masculine and feminine forms of names not as two names but as one name, therefore, we construct in the first place
the following table of absolute figures, showing the morphological distribution throughout our onomastic material of the groups distinguished on p. 4II, the figures referring as usual to components:-

| Group | Common | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gross } \\ \text { Simple/Comp } \end{gathered}$ |  | SimpletComp. |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CPJ | 36 | 72 | 51 | 36 | 15 | $=$ | 87 |
| CP | 34 | 174 | 107 | 141 | 74 | $=$ | 249 |
| PJ | 5 | 10 | - | 5 | - | $=$ | 10 |
| CJ | 1 | 6 | - | 6 | - | $=$ | 6 |
| P | 3 | 30 | 40 | 27 | 37 | $=$ | 67 |
| $J$ | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | $=$ | 1 |
| C | 7 | 69 | 19 | 62 | 12 | $=$ | 81 |
| Afr | 2 | 139 | 50 | 138 | 49 | $=$ | 189 |
| Hapleg | 3 | 118 | 59 | 115 | 56 | $=$ | 174 |
|  | 91 | 619 | 326 | 530 | 243 | $=$ | 864 |

By applying to the above somewhat diffuse table a twofold process of reduction, (I) combining namely the groups as recommended on p . 414, and (2) transforming the absolute figures into figures per cent, we may conveniently concentrate it in the following manner:-

| (Combined) Groups | C | AC | BC | A | B | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pagan | 87 | 47 | 61 | 41 | 52 | 49 |
| Christian | 8 | 11 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 9 |
| Local | 5 | 42 | 33 | 48 | 43 | 42 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

These proportions reflect a well-defined situation the chief features of which can be summarized under five heads. (I)More than nine tenths of the total onomastic material is void of specifically Christian marks: in other words, the Christian element is astonishingly small, traditional Pagan usage in the first place, and local precedent in the second, controlling in the main the selection of names. (2)As might be expected from this result, the common pool on which both types of names draw is overwhelmingly Pagan in quality, local elements in it amou_nting to but half of even the Christian component. (3) The proportion of Christian names is decisively higher among the Simple Names than among the Compound Names (gross 11/6 pc, nett $12 / 5 \mathrm{pe}$ ). (4) The same holds good, although not to so great an extent, in the case of"Local" material. (5)Pagan components, on the Other hand, are by no means so nymerous in the list of Simple Names as in that of the Compound Names.

Here again, therefore, a clear correspondence is established between the distribution of the names among the groups and the fundamental morphological classification of the texts: the contrast between Simple Names and Compound Names is at the same time a contrast between Christian, and to a slighter extent, "Local" names on the one hand, and Pagan, "international" names on the other. But Simple Names are chiefly nuclear (Zeugitana) and late, whereas Compound Names are chiefly peripheral (Mauretanid) and early (p.411). Hence we are justified in regarding the morphology of our material as the midale term between its internal and external distribution, and in formulating the inference: the choice of specifically Christian names, together with the emergence of local onomastic
peculiarities, is a relatively late phenomenon, confined chiefly to Zeugitana and the Eastern, more dendely populated part of the country, earlier generations of Christians, in particular those living farther West, namely in Mauretania, having been for the most part content to assume names ready to hand at that time.

With this ptovisional conclusion the preliminary investigations come to a close, and the way is opened up for a more intimate examination of the question: to what extent does the faith come to expression in the names borne by its adherents?

As announced, (p.413) we attack the problem at its centre, namely the prima facie "Christian" material embraced under the initial "C". Here the first step is classification, on the details of which no two critics will probably be found to agree. But names derived from the Bible are obviously the most conspicuous objects to begin with, names of evangelists and apostles supplying the transition to an equally obvious group, that namely derived from well-known historical figures whose achievements were decisive for the destiny of the growing Church. Then on etymological grounds a variety of names must be traced to the teaching of the Church on such subjects as God, Christ, and the Christian mode of life generally: these it is conven ${\underset{e}{i}}_{i}^{n}$ to call Dogmatic. Connected in thought with the foregoing, and very hard to distinguish from them methodologically, yet materially independent, stands a group which for want of a better expression we will call Moral, since they refer to moral qualities. Finally a space must be reserved for names springing from Pagan prototypes and having no essential connection with the rise of the new religion, being
only contemporaneous therewith: such names may properly be called Neatral. Between the Moral and Neutral sections, however, will have to be placed a small number of names of a type quite characteristic of the new faith, which it is convenient to call Derogatory names. Dividing therefore the $C$ group on the usual morphological basis, and uniting it again in order to secure an average reading percent, we construct the following table:-

| Category | A | B | $\underline{\text { C }}$ |  | $\underline{A B C}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biblical | 1 | - | - | $=$ | 1 | (1\%) |
| Historical | 4 | - | - | $=$ | 4 | ( $5 \%$ ) |
| Dogmatic | 20 | 1 | 3 | $=$ | 24 | (29\%) |
| Moral | 8 | - | - | $=$ | 8 | (10\%) |
| Derogatory | 4 | - | - | $=$ | 4 | ( $5 \%$ ) |
| Neutral | 25 | 11 | 4 | $=$ | 40 | ( $50 \%$ ) |
|  | - | - | - |  | - | - |
|  | 62 | 12 | 7 | $=$ | 81 | ( $100 \%$ ) |
|  | - | - | - |  | $=$ | - |

Undoubtedly the most striking feature of the whole is the unexpectedly high proportion of Neutral names, which equal in number those of all the other categories put together. On the other hand, recent experience prepares us for the morphological distribution of these categories: it is striking indeed, but by no means contrary to reasonable expectations, that most of the categories should lie completely on one side, namely among the Simple Names as such; and it is quite natubal for Simple and Compound Names to ohare only the two categories of greatest bulk. Presumably we are at liberty to advance to chronological and topographical conclusions on the ground of
the morphological displacement here observed as when the same tendencies emerged on a larger scale (pp.418-419): Neutral names are chiefly peripheral and early, other categories nuclear and late.

It must be admitted, however, that at one point the classification is not nearly so clear-cut as the figures tabulated might suggest: in the last resort it is impossible to draw a rigid line between the Moral and Neutral categories. Had not almost every name been included in the Moral category which was compatiple with what we know of Christian ethics, this category would have been very much smaller, and the Neutral category correspondingly larger. The conclusions reached on the basis of the figures tabulated thus stand. But in order to illustrate the practical difficulty of deciding whether in fact a given name should be denominated Moral, in the sense of reflecting Christian ethical standards, or Neutral, in the sense of being an independent development of purely Pagan traditions, we offer the apparatus of the first four names embraced under the heading Moral to which immediate analogies, constructed from exactly the same roots, and expressing the same ideas, were forthcoming from nonChristian (CPJ,CP,P) and Local (Hapleg) groups. The names in question signify "Lover", "Goodness", "Chaste", "Joyful", "Honour":-

AMATOR: Amabilis, Amanda, Amantius CP
BONITAS: Bonosus CP Bonosula Hapley
CASTULA: Castus CPJ
GAUDIOSUS: Gaudentius CPJ
HONOR: Honoratus CPJ
Such names, if classified according to roots, would be reckoned Neutral; classifying them according to stems, we have given them the benefit of the doubt and treated them as Moral. There are at all events no positive grounds for their exclusion from this category.

The question however, how are we to delimit these two bategories? leads to a further problem when traced to its roots, to what extent namely "Christian" names are to be traced in Pagan and Local groups. When for example we find Lazarus and maria, paulus and gTEPhANUS, PERPETUA, MONTANUS, MENA, and SALSA, to mention only a few, attested in groups CPJ, CP, P, and Hapleg, it can scarcely be doubted that the popularity of such names among the Christians of the period is to be referred to their connection with martyrs, apostles, and Biblical figures already familiar to us from the hagiographical texts. The pioneers of the faith did not themselves of course bear "Christiar" names, but current (Pagan) names, so that such names fall in the first place to be catalogued under the appropriate groupe. But the continued use of these now famous names in the Christian community cannot be dissociated from the personalities of those of the faith who first bore them: on the contrary, we must regard such names, prima facie Pagan or Local, as belonging for purposes of interpretation to group C. Forty nine names of this type can be distinguished, again, it will be noticed, almost exclusively from the Simple Names:-

| Category | $\underline{A}$ | $\underline{B}$ | $\underline{C}$ |  | $\underline{A B C}$ | Total \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biblical | 3 | - | - | $=$ | 3 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Historical | 7 | - | - | $=$ | 7 | 14 |
| Dogratic | 31 | 1 | - | $=$ | 32 | 67 |
| Moral | 3 | - | - | $=$ | 3 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Derogatory | 4 | - | - | $=$ | 4 | 8 |
|  | - | - | - |  | - | - |
|  | 48 | 1 | - | $=$ | 49 | 100 |

Here the numbers involved are too small for any inference of consequence to be drawn from the percentages. On the other hand an important situation results from the absolute total, namely 49. It will be observed that this figure challenges comparison with the absolute total of Neutral names belonging to group C, namely 40(p.420). Without being quantitatively equal, therefore, these two totals are Virtually interchangeable: the proportions of the fundamental tables on p .417 would suffer no statistically significant modification, if the entire Neutral category were removed, and the material just tabulated, namely that isol-ated from Pagan and Local groups, distributed among the other categories. By carrying out this transposition we reach a slightly higher "Christian" total (+9), from which all neutral elements have been purged, that is to say, no longer a prima facie estimate, but a critically purified inventory of specifically Christian material:-

| Category | A | B | C |  | ABC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biblical | 4 | - | - | $=$ | 4 | ( $5 \%$ ) |
| Historical | 11 | - | - | $=$ | 11 | ( $12 \%$ ) |
| Dogmatic | 51 | 2 | 3 | $=$ | 56 | (62\%) |
| Moral | 11 | - | - | $=$ | 11 | ( $12 \%$ ) |
| Derogatory | 8 | - | - | $=$ | 8 | (9\%) |
|  | - | - | - |  | - |  |
|  | 85 | 2 | 3 | $=$ | 90 | (100\%) |
|  | - | - | - |  | $=$ | - |

Here the morphological tendencies run in the same direction as those of the table on p .420 with this difference only, that they are even more emphatic. Our preliminary impressions therefore hold good.

This then at last is the specifically Christian nucleus of our African onomasticon reduced to its quintessence, and nothing any longer hinders the free examination of it in detaild Our most convenient course is to reproduce the list in extenso, $C$ group items in majuscule and supplementary matter in minuscule, together with synoptic indieations of the source in each case, and to embody the discussion of all relevant problems in a series of observations corresponding to the separate categories.

```
C OPJ CP PJ GJ P I APr Hapleg
```


## Biblical

## MI CAEL

Susanna.
Maria.
Lazarus.
Historical
MATEUS
JOHANNES
PETRUS
Paulus
Stephanus
Perpetua
Montanus . . . . . . . +
CYPRI ANUS
Mena(s). . . . . . . +
Salsa.
Monica
Dogmatic
ADEODATUS
DEODATUS
DEUSDEDIT
Deuhabet
Abedaeu.
QUODVULTDEUS
Vincetdeus
DEOGRATIAS

Dogmatic (continued) $\quad$ CPJ $\underline{C P}$ PJ $\underline{C J} \underline{I}$ Afr Hapleg
QUIRIACUS
Quirillus. . . . . . . . . . . +
DOMINICUS
Dominicellus . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . +
өEOAOrNOC
THEODOSIUS
Theodorus. . . . . . . . . . +
Theodotus. . . . . . . . . . . +
EPIPGANIUS
PASCASIUS
Anastasius
INNOCENSA
Innocens . . . . . . . . . . . +
Innocentius. . . . . . . . . +
Innoca
Innox.
Fidelis. . . . . . . ... . . . +
Cristia. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . +
Puella
Servus
NATALICUS
Renatus.
atanasus

```
Redempta . . . . . . . . . . .+
RENOBATUS
Renovatus. . . . . . . . . .+
Reparatus. . . . . . . . . . .+
Restitutus
Salva.
Salvianus.
Salvinus
SECURITAS
Securus.
TUTA
Tutta. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .+
Benedictus
Irene. . . . . . . . . . +
Ireneus. . . . . . . . . +
Liberatus.
AGAPE
Gratia . . . . . . . . . .+
Spes . . . . . . . . . . . . .+
SPERANTIUS
SPESINUS
ISPESINA
SPESINDEO
VIGILANTIUS
GREGORIA
```

```
Moral C CPJ CP PJ CJ P
AMATOR
BONITAS
CASTULA
Castitas. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . +
Caritas . . . . . . . . +
Caritosa. . . . . . . . . +
DECORA
gAUDIOSUS
GELASIUS
HONESTA
HONOR
```


## Derogatory

## STERCORIUS

Sterculus
Coprscanus.
Prejectus
EXITIOSUS
GLORIOSUS
PORCELLUS
Gulosus

## Observations

Biblical. Micael, Susanna, and Lazarus have already been encountered in hagiographical texts (p.172), the first-mentioned also in magical texts ( p .258 ), where he appears as God's champion. The Archangel is therefore an intelligible ideal, such as the zealous Christian might well wish to emulate. The significance of Susanna can hardly be that which controls the choice of this character when associated with the saints, namely as representing the Church, innocent of the filthy imputations cast against it from Jew and Roman alike (p.173): rather the reference here must be personal, namely to individual blamelessness. In view of the canonical history of the Bible, and the presence of the name on Jewish material, it is probable that Susanna was derived not so much from Biblical sources as from popular tradition. Lazarus signifies doubtless the gratitude of the sinner to Christ
for well-being restored, corresponding to the rôle of this character in the cult of Christ the Healer (p.191), with which the exclusively African occurrence of this personal name is to be brought into connection. Owing to the fact that Maria is commonly found as the feminine of Marius, therefore as indicating connection with the Gens Maria, Diehl does not commit himself on the question, whether in any given instance its occurrence on Christian material should be understood in this sense or referred to Biblical precedents.) The a priori ambiguity of this name however notwithstanding, we cannot be wrong in holding that the Christian circles among which it was current must certainly have regarded it as a reminiscence of one or other of the Gospel figures bearing it, whether Mary Magdalene, the victim of daemonic possession released by Jesus, ) the sister of Martha and Lazarus whose piety Jesus commended, \%) or Mary the mother of Jesus. ${ }^{4}$ ) Here again general grounds are not decisive. Probably however the ambiguity is to be traced to the bearers of the name themselves: motives of humility would argue for the two former Marys as supplying the inspiration, while on the other hand devotion to the Mother of Jesus, whom we know to have been worshipped under the name of Theotokos (pp.275-289), and/or an unacknowledged desire for identification with her, may have operated to popularize the name. At all events the Virgin could never be very far from the thoughts wherever this name was mentioned. If we have a generalization to make, it is to express surprise that the Bible as such contributed so slightly to the choice of names. There can be no question of any wholesale

1) Diehl iii 106
2) Luke viii 2
3) Luke $\times 42$
4) Matthew i 18
sifting of the Scriptures in search of names; we can scarcely speak even of the scriptural foundation as the dominant one, far less as the exclusive one. The cult of the saints appears a source at least equally fruitful.

Historical. Our first five names under this head would doubtless be grouped by some under the Biblical category, and in fact it is difficult to draw the line clearly at this point. Mateus refers to the evangelist, called by Christ from the "receipt of custom:") Johannes is doubtless the favourite disciple of Jesus ${ }^{2)}$ rather than the Baptist or Theologian. Petrus is of course the man Simon, so renamed by Christ at Caesarea Philippi3) and Paulus the aealous Jew converted on the road to Damascus.4) Stephanus is presumably the first martyr.5) All save Matthew figure in our hagiographic t $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{t}}$ ts as saints honoured throughout Christendom. (pp.145-148). Whether these be Biblical or not for the purpose of classification, the remaining names on this list admit of no doubt, since they are not at all encountered in the Bible. Perpetua, Salsa, and Cyprian recal the famous martyrs of that name who witnessed for Christ in Africa (pp.144,147,151). Montanus we know also, as the name of the famous schismatic, honoured in Africa (p.151). Mena is doubtless a reminiscence of the Eastern saint whose cult we have likewise noticed (p.149). Monica is the only name of this group which we have not met before in the inscriptions; but we can hardly be mistaken in referring it to the popularity of Augustine's mother, whose influence on Africa's greatest Church leader was of decisive importance for his spiritual development towards final conversion. ${ }^{6}$ )

1) Matthew ix 9
2) John xiii 23
3) Matthew xvi 18
4) Acts ix 3
5) Acts vi 5
6) Augustine, Confessions vi 1

From these names it is quite clear what type of personality was admired by the Early Church: martyrs and leaders, local heroes naturally occupying a favoured position. Had the list of saints venerated in the African Church been applied without discrimination to the onomasticon as a principle of isolation, then our collection of historical names would have been considerable enlarged; but scarcely a single item would not have admitted doubts, especially in the case of the more rarely-occurring names. Only those were therefore included which seemed beyond doubt to have actually been inspired by the reminiscence of historical figures.

Dogmatic. A glence is sufficient to show at once that this is not altogether an appropriate heading, since the theological reflection evinced in the names concerned is of the humblest. But treated strictly as a portmanteau term embracing popular teaching on subjects of the most miscelleneous character it need not be misleading. The names have been organized into groups corresponding more or less distinctly to reflections on God, Christ, and the Church, both collectively, and individually.

The names of the first group are Latin (Adeodatus-Deogratias), Greek (Theodoulos-Theodotus), and mixed (Quiriacus etc.). Of these, the Greek names are regularly-formed, and refer to God as the Giver (Theodosius, Theodorus, Theodotus) and to the believer as God's slave (Theodoulos). Very instructive is the appearance of Theodorus and Theodotus as the names of votaries of Zeus, Mithras, Hermes, and the Magna Mater, as proved in the apparatus to these names in the Appendix: such formations were found ready to hand by the Christian mission, and forthwith applied to the Christian God.

Theodoulos, on the other hand, is plainly derived from the phrase Doulos Theou (p.394). Of the mixed group, Quiriacus corresponds exactly to Dominicus, since it is the Latin transliteration of the Greek Kupiakós, just as in the New Testament kupfrios represents Quirinius: ${ }^{\text {() both mean "belonging to the Lord" Dominicellus and }}$ Quirillus are their respective diminutives. In so far as the root is pre-Christian it probably refers to the Emperor, who had the title of Kúplos in the East, just as he had that of Dominus in the West (p.118). Here again therefore the names reflect a Christian victory: subjects of the Emperor have become subjects of God. The Latin names, lastly, are of special interest. In the first place it is only by courtesy that most of them can be called Latin at all: morphologically they are quite alien to classical tradition. Deogratias is simply the war-cry of the Catholics answering to the Deo Laudes of the Donatists (pp.224-225). Deodatus might be defended as representing Theodotus. But the structure typical of the rest, namely the bare juxtaposition of a noun and a verb, is quide unclassical, its nearest parallel being Hebrew formations like Sh'mu-El, Immanu-El, J'ho-Jadha, with which the pages of the Old Testament fairly swarm. It is to be noted in this connection that one of the names in question, Abeddeu, is attested to Jewish material. Here then is the clearest eviaence that could be desired, that semitic influences have been at work: it is to be assumed that such forms point to an influx from the synagogue. Materially, also, these names of converted Jews are of considerable interest, since the piety they reflect is of a characteristic quality. God is in possession (Deuhabet, Abeddeu) and will prevail (Vincetdeus) so that man must submit to His Almighty Will (quodvultdeus). All that
1)Luke ii 2, Acts $\vee 37$; Souter,Lexicon 141-142
2)Deissmann, NB $44-45$
man enjoys is God's gift (Adeodatus, Deodatus, Deusdedit); and if we think especially of Adeodatus \& as applied by parents to their children, acknowledging thereby the natural context which must be taken into account in our interpretation of the material as a whole, a delightful picture results, of God as the giver of offispring. There thus emerges from names of this type a well-defined piety, based on frank anthropomorphism, and affirmed with uncompromising moral earnestness, which no one need misunderstand, who is familiar with the Psalms. Of conceptual theologizing there can here be no question.

Of the names inspirea by Christ's earthly existence, Epiphanius, Pascasius, and Anastasius, referring to His epiphany, passion, and resurrection respectively, comprise the sum total. The fact that the last-mentioned is well-attested in Jewish material suggests the history of these three items. To Jews Anastasius would refer to the resurrection of the Israelite in the Age to Come according to apocalyptic expectations: ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ( Christians must thereupon have applied it chiefly to Christ's resurrection, and formed Pascasius and Epiphanius on analogy.

The next paragraph consists of names which recal the technical terms indicating churchly status already discussed on pp.384-403. Cristia is the only name here which prima facie excludes an exegesis in terms of purely pagan precedents, although the Appendix adduces pagan names which it resembles. It is clearly a fomation buildt on Christos, and is peculiar to Africa. Nevertheless it is hardy possible that Christians could have made use of the other names of this group without thinking at the same time of "fideles", "innocentes",

1) Dalman, WJ 134-139
"virgins", and "servants" of God. For this reason we feel justified in listing them as Christian from the point of view of hermeneutics. Finally a large number of names falls to be considered in close connection with the Christian's private experience of the faith. The first three have been isolated only because they stand somewhat apart from the rest, inasmuch as they refer to the fundamental problem of birth and death. Natalicus signifies belonging to the "day of birth",
 we already know from our study of hagiographic texts to be a euphemism for the day of death, indicating that with death there begins the eternal life in which the faithful need fear death no more(pp.183-4). Atanasus (Athanasius, immortal), which would surely have been correctly spelt had it referred directly to the famous champion of orthodoxy, is at once clear: it signifies the irmortality enjoyed by the Christian. Renatus (reborn) refers very plainly to baptism: without being born again of water and the Spirit no man can inherit eternal life. 2) That every instance of the name Renatus is not however forthWith to be claimed as proving a Christian origin without further scrutiny, is apparent from an authentically pagan inscription bearing not indeed the name, but the word: at Rome in the year 376 a "vir clarissimus" who was already an office-bearer in the mysteries of Mithras and Liber dedicated an altar to Cybele and Attis as a token of gratitude for "rebirth into eternity acquired through the taurobolium and criobolium" ${ }^{3}$ ) TAUROBOLIO CRIOBOLIOQ IN AETERNUM RENATUS. We see from this inscription how easily technical expressions could
2) Cabrol xii/2:891
3) John iii 5
4) Wilmanns 110
pass from one sacramental system to the other: cultus proved common ground between Christianity and the mysteries. There the element was blood, here water; there the action was celebrated in the name of Attis or Mithras, here in that of Christ. In both cases however the action was identical, namely baptism, and its purpose one and the same, namely to win eternal life, to be born again to immortality. Such is the import of this onomastic triad, historically considered.

The first sixteen names of the remainder of this category (Redempta - Liberatus) exhibit this relationship in very clear detail. Only three of the names in question are exclusive to Christian material and yet it is impossible that the other thirteen could have been used without conscious reference to the Christian teaching of salvation. This shows to what an extent the vocabulary of the Early Church was enriched at the expense of its religious rivals the mystery cults, or at least of its religious environment generally. Restoration, redemption, renewal, wholeness, security, peace, blessedness, freedom: to unite all these subtle nuances and thereby to enlarge and refine the means of its self-expression was the achievement of the growing Church. Agape, "Love", a N.T. keyword, likewise proved the nucleus round which Gratia (grace) anả Spes (hope), current pagan abstractions, readily gathered, beyond doubt to be interpreted evangelically by the Christians who bore them as names. But if we inquire into the force whereby such a synthesis was in the last resort possible, the group of names closing the category, which stand out conspicuously by reason of its specifically Christian character, supplies the answer.

[^60]Sperantius, Spesinus, Ispesina, Spesindeo speak of hope (Ispesina is probably the name of a converted Jewess, see p .273 , and Spesindeo is an acclamtion, see p. 227), and Vigilantius, together with Gregoria, its Greek equivalent, of expectancy, compare YpyYopeire, "watch!" 1 ) That is to say: what welded together with such freedom so many diverse elements was the one force which alone was in a position to do so because it stood above and outside then, namely the Christian eschatological hope which treated "everything that exists as relative and provisional: ${ }^{2)}$ In the light of this hope, nothing concrete was sacred, everything might be put to use: with its eyes fixed on the future, the Church, and it only, was capable of turning the past to account in the interest of its world-mission. Hence its vitality, and therewith its capacity for metamorphosis.

Moral. It is with a burdensome sense of anticlimax that we pass to this category, to review the sober and respectable virtues therein reflected! And yet Caritas and Caritosa provide us with a point of contact with the foregoing list, slender though it be: these names, derived from the epithet, quite neutral from the religio-historical point of view, Carus ( = dear), possess a warmth lacking in our words "charity" and "charitable" whereby we are bound nevertheless to translate them; and as used by our African Christians, must certainly have had Christian associations, since the word "caritas" is the Vulgate representative of the Greek "agape" e.g. in I Cor xiii. For the rest, the names are commonplace enough, and, as before remarked, ( p .421 ) the category as a whole hard to delimit objectively; we will delay therefore no further, but pass to the next and last.

[^61]Derogatory. Stercorius, Sterculus, Coprscanus - untranslatable, but all derived, the two former in Latin, the last-mentioned in Greek, from the idea of dung; Prejectus, outcast; Exitiosus, destructive; Gloriosus, boastful; Porcellus, diminutive of pig; and finally Gulosus, glutton: surely a unique thesaurus of concentrated abuse! Let us inquire into the possibility of such names.

Nick-names based on personal oddities of physique or character, such as almost everyone acquires from one's schoolfellows, are popular everywhere among primitive societies; if we mention one community in particular, it is that of the natives in South India, for which Mr. Thurston has drawn up an excellent inventory from his own experience?) More relevantly we note the Roman custom of devising mild soubriquets of the same kind?) although this practice was not prevalent in North Africa to the extent of its popularity elsewhere?) Finally, it has been observed among the modern Arab settlers of the same territory, that they use a variety of names superficially similar to the aforementioned nick-names, but with quite another intention: in this case playful banter is far from their thoughts, the names in question being assumed as charms against the Evil Eye, based on the underlying thought, "I am a mean, despicable fellow, with nothing about me you could in the least admire or envy! ${ }^{4}{ }^{4} 4$ ) On the other hand, the Primitive Church, like all minorities, was at first unpopular. In fact, it was positively loathed and despised, and to be a Christian was in the eyes of Roman society

1) Thurston, Ethnographic Notes 536
2)Sandys,Latin Epigr. 211
2) Thieling, Hellenismus 92
3) Cabrol xii/2:1525
infinitely worse than being a Jew. One must read the disdainful words of Roman philosophers and historians themselves to appreciate the virulence of this unanimous hatred, and thanks to Harnack, who has assembled all the passages in question, (his may be done in a few moments. It is no rhetorical exaggeration, but the bald tryith, when Paul tells his readers that they are "offscourings! 2) Far from adopting an apologetic attitude, however, the Christians of the early generations were taught by Paul to congratulate themselves on one thing only, the cross of Christ? ${ }^{3}$ ) which scandalizes the whole world, Jewish and Graeco-Roman alike ${ }^{4}$ ) Paul himself declaring in the course of a description of his own sufferings endured on Christ's behalf: "If I must needs glory, I will glory of the things which concern mine infirmities! ${ }^{5}$ (The Early Church therefore, from motives of humility and devotion to Christ whose sufferings on Man's behalf it preached and made known to all and sundry, positively affirmed the abusive epithets cast in its teeth by the ancient world and rejoiced to confess its faith thereby. Such is the generally-accepted account of the origin of the Derogatory Names. ${ }^{6}$ )

With this explanation we have no quarrel: it is entirely adequate so far as concerns the early period. The fact however, that many of our African texts bearing names of this type must be assigned to a much later period (see Appendix), suggests that the theory should be broadened somewhat. It is common experience that names tend to lose their significance in the course of generations, the original meaning frequently dropping altogether from consciousness in the end.

1) Harnack, Mission i 336-346
2) I Cor iv 13
3) Galatians vi 14
4) 1 Cor i 23
5) 2 Cor xi 30
6) cabrol xii/2:1521

The situation thus created favours the investment of the now otiose names with associations and meanings not originally foreseen. Now apart from the use of derogatory names in Christian inscriptions, we have referred ( p .435 ) to two examples of a similar custom hermeneutically discontinuous: on the one hand, the ancient Roman application of descriptive nick-names, whose basis lay in a wish for childish sport; on the other, the modern Arab employment of illfavoured names designed to avert the Evil Eye. Between the purposes envisaged by these two examples of the same custom there is no obvious continuity whatsoever: a midale term is altogether lacking. But if there is here no logical link, there is at least a dimensional one, namely the Christian civilization attested in our material, which shared their territory and occupied the seven centuries lying between them. We know that the African Church, like its counterparts elsewhere in the Roman Empire, took to itself Roman derogatory names, not in jest, but in earnest, as an act of piety; we know also (p.274) that from Flavian to Byzantine times the African Christians, again like their brethren in other lands, feared the Evil Eye and directed phylacteries against it. If therefore there was ever a transition from Roman to Islamic praxis in the use of derogatory names, it took place towards the end of the fourth or in the course of the fifth Christian century, when the derogatory names, assumed in times of persecution, had become meaningless in view of the reversal of the Church's fortunes and were accorded a new significance in association with the conflict between Christ and the malignant forces of darkness. To be sure the fact of this transition cannot yet be proved: in order to settle the problem we should have to produce charms bearing names
of the type in question. But until such texts are forthcoming, or evidence to the contrary is brought forward, the hypothesis of a transition of this kind accomplished on the soil of Christian Africa is tentatively offered towards an understanding of the development of religious praxis.

A rich and varied religious life thus unfolds itself under these names which have hitherto been occupying our attention: knowledge of the Scriptures and profound regard for the heroism of the saints and martyrs of the heroic age; the cultivation of staid Roman virtue and the extravagances of grotesque zeal; loving and trustful medidation on the goodness and power of God and His Revelation in Jesus Christ; above all, the rejuvenating power of Christian experience, which enables the believer to fulfil earnestly all earthly tasks without being thereby overwhelmed amid earthly cares, his solidarity with the Christian community securing for him an eschatological standpoint independent of the world and therefore superior to it.

That is one side of the matter. The other side energes from the table on p .417 , whose proportions forcibly remind us that such texts are relatively few in number. More than nine tenths of the entire onomastic material is neutral, betraying nothing of the religious connection of the persons concernea, far less bearing any indication as to the quality of their faith. To complain is useless, and even hypocritical: the contrast finds,its exact parallel in this country during the 17 th century, when, alongside commonplace names like Robert Douglas, the enthusiasts here and there produced monstrosities like Praise-God Barebones. Only, in this instance, the ratio in favour of the commonplace element was probably even higher than in

Flavian, Vandal, or Byzantine Africa. Again, the negative influence of the mere fact of heredity from the point of view of hermeneutics must be taken into account: we know very well to-day, how useless is the inference from the forthcomingness of a popular name like Peter or John to the religious persuasion of the person concerned. Naturally this particular kind of limiting factor operates far less strongIy in our African material than in the discussion of more recent examples; yet we must reckon with it to some extent, however small. Hence from the proportions before us we conclude, not the faithlessness of the African Christians, but the thoroughness with which the Early Church on the one hafnd, and Roman civilization on the other, achieveфd mutual interpenetration: on the average, once the persecutions were over and the Constantinian religious reform securely established, less than one tenth of the Christian population of the Empire wepe felt the tension of their position keenly enough to declare openly by their names that their citizenship was that of the CIVITAS DEI. The rest were content with Roman citizenship. We decline at this stage to express congratulation or regret, but simply record the situation as it stands.

Meantime how ought the neutral (Pagan and Local) material (91\%!) be treated? Clearly, whoever occupies himself with this enomous residue analyses no longer Christian, but purely Pagan phenomena. His procedure must needs resemble that carried out in the case of the Christian names: first, prima facie filing of examples; then, critical purging and supplementing; finally, analytic exegesis and the formulation of general conclusions. As a result of such labour a variety of interesting facts will doubtless be brought forward,
together with much certainly, which is of significance for the study of the decline of pagan antiquity. As a whole, however, nothing likely to add substantially to our knowledge of Christian Africa, or modify the conclusions already reached thereon, is to be expected from an undertaking of this kind. Consequently it lies outwith the scope of the present investigations.

Nevertheless we may perhaps be permitted to select a few topics in this connection which seem of special interest from the point of view underlying this study as a whole.

First of all, the Pagan groups include a variety of names which on general grounds we should judge to have been particularly offensive to an earnest Christian piety, those namely surviving from polytheist mythology. Here it is of course no assy matter to distinguish all the names which might or might not have been derived from heroes and other mortals celebrated in the epic literature of the ancient world; but ACILLES, BRESEIS ( the bone of contention between himself and Agamemnon), and AENEAS, whose connection with Dido must undoubtedly have made a strong impression on the imagination of Roman Africans, detach themselves readily enough from groups CP and P. HERCLANIUS, too, (CPJ) belongs here as recalling the most famous of all classical heroes. ROMULA (CP) and REMUS (Afr) remind one of Rome's joint founders; while the presiding genij of Nature and Art find expression in such names as FAUNUS (Hapleg), MUSA, CALIOPE (CP), and MUSILUS. (Afr.) OLIMPIA (CPJ) directs our gaze to the home of the high gods, where Zeus is naturally to the fore, JOVIN,JOVINUS,JOVINA(CPJ), JOBIANUS, JOBIANA (CP), LATONA (Hapleg) sitting by him, between them their huntress-daughter, honoured by a worshipper who, in a manner
already familiar to us, calls himself ARTEMIDORUS (CP). Not far off stand HERMES, YYE|A the daughter of Asclepius and goddess of health, NICE (Victoria), and GALATEA, daughter of Nereus and Doris (CP.). The patroness of Athens finds a worshipper, namely PALLADIUS(CP). EVASIUS (Afr) recalls the orgies of Dionysos. In the background lurk the Parcae, fatale (CP). But over all the youthful and genial Goddess of Love sheds her warmth and radiance, attracting as large a circle of onomastic admirers as Zeus himself : AFRODITE, AFRODISIA, VENUS, VENERIUS, VENERIA (CP,CPJ). Of these components the bulk are naturally Simple Names; Venerius (-a) is Common; and Remus, Venus, Afrodite, Afrodisia, and Faunus are peculiar to the Compound Names. Quite a Pantheon is thus represented. To what extent we shou=ld take it cum grano salis is naturally the question: nevertheless the presence of such names as these, and that in such quantity, confirms the impression earlier formulated of the complete fusion of the Church on the one hand and the spirit of antiquity generally on the other. Complete, perhaps, is a rash word: thanks to the vital tithe, the fusion was not quite flawless. The names in question have quite another significance; they represent Christ's victory or the gods of Greece and Rome, which itself must have been complete before their very names could have meant so little.

The Local names too have a problem of their own, namely the extent to which it is possible to assess the native element in the African Church. HANNIBAL, ANNIBAL (Afr), JUGRATUS, JUGRATA (Afr), JUGURTA, JAGURTE (P) explain themselves as Punic. The same must hold good for MIGGIN and its numerous variations (Afr), since there occurs a form MEGGENT (Hapleg) in which the final $T$ recalls the
regular Semitic feminine suffix such as always asserts itself e.g. in Hebrew "construct" nouns. MEDDEN (Hapleg) and TZIDDIN (Afr), since they reproduce the same formal type, are no doubt likewise Punic. Of JADER, (IIDIR) and SAMMAC (Hapleg)(Common), of JAHIN(US), TRUTOM and TZOZUS, $-A$, (Hapleg), of BROCCU (Afr, feminine!) and above all of SGLIPAO (Hapleg) we can say nothing at all. Obviously what we have here are the Latinized forms of barbarian names, but whether Punic, Lybic, or Berber it is not within our competence to distinguish. On account of the prothetic vowel we regard ISCANTIUS (CP) ISPIACUS, ISTTORACIUS, Zand ISTABLICIUS as Semitic, perhaps Jewish, variants on Latin or Greek roots. (Hapleg). BARGEUS (Afr) looks definitely Jewish. UNTANCUS and USTRIUT (Hapleg) are likewise obscure, but lead to names easy to recognize: ARIFRIDA and MUNIFRIDA (Afr), together with FRIDILA and $\phi P|\Delta E P| X$ (Hapleg) are plainly Vandal. Regarding the root $\operatorname{FRID}$ underlying all four examples, the cynic will be disposed no doubt to remark, that those who carry war into their neighbour's territory always prate loudly of peace; yet these names might just as readily be brought into connection with the Christian experience of peace which comes to such frequent expression in our material (IN PACE, REQUIESCIT \&C IN PACE, VIXIT IN PACE, IRENE, IRENAEUS, etc, q. v.) It is at once obvious that in view of the great sparseness of the names here under discusision we cannot in any sense speak of an indigenous Church. The African Church was fundamentally and all the time Roman: at both chronological extremities of its history Greek elements appeared, and here and there barbarians are encountered, but not unless they are first of all Latin- or Greek-speaking citizens. Hence non-classical items form a minority, and an exceedingly humble
minority at that, when set against our material as a whole. And yet this limitation notwithstanding, the mere presence of such names, few though they be, is a tribute to the catholicity of the Gospel, which they show to have been shared by races who refuse each other the share even of the fruits of the earth, down to the present day: Roman and Greek, whiteskin and blackskin, victorious and subject peoples, Teutons and Semites!

Passing to the more formal aspect of the material, we wish to draw attention briefly to a subject which for reasons of exposition could scarcely have been treated before with any convenience, to wit the morphological curiosities which combine two names by means of QUI ET, "who (is) also", "alias", "or". Our African examples are the following:-

ISTABLICIUS QUI ET DONATUS bV 155 (Hapleg)
VIPIus SERELLIAS QUI ET MACCAL bV 93 (Hapleg)
WITPTURius(?) QUI ET MACCAL bV 92 (Hapleg)
BERUS ICOSITANUS Q ET IOMNINIus bV 49 (2b)
L P Martis QUI ET PATTISSO bIV 157 (3)-
SUSSANA QUE ET LOLLIANA BIII 284h (CJ)
TE D QUI ET EVASIUS cII 190 (Afr)
CRESCENS QUI ET CAPO CIII 605 (CPJ)
Names of this type abound in Christian materiall) and for that reason have been brought into connection with baptism, which we know to have been the occasion for assuming a new name in token of conversion. ${ }^{3)}$ On the other hand names of this type were not uncommon in pagan times, the construction being identical; ${ }^{4}$ ) slaves in particular bore such names.5) Are quasi-double names"Christian" therefore or neutral? That is the problem.

1) Diehl iil 575
2) Cabrol $\mathrm{xii} / 2: 1518$
3) Harnack, Mission ii 38-39
4)Sandys,Latin Epigr. 213
4) Cagnat 79

The grounds for thinking of a connection with baptism, and therewith of a "Christian" interpretation, are sought first and foremost in the fact, that after his conversion Paul was styled in precisely
 Saul being the name he received from his parents, and Paul the name he chose for himself after baptisml) Only, there is nothing specifically Christian about the name Paul (see Appendix). Nevertheless Asia Minor has yielded a number of very early Christian inscriptions whereon authentic Christian names, e.g. Kupldkós, Stephana, Maria are coupled with neutral names in this manner?) Moreover analogies are to be found in Jewish material, where we hear of Beturia Paulina nomine Sara, and Cocotia qui et Juda.)

On the other hand, Ramsay has shown altogether convincingly that Saul chose the name Paul in order to gain easier access to Roman ears: he was not only a Jew of Tarsus, but also a Roman citizen, and the name Saul being suitable in the company of his fellow-Jews, he wished one (Paul) which would secure for him a respectful hearing among Roman citizens wherever he might meet them. The names Saul and Paul, therefore, were not what we have been in the habit of calling "components", but genuine alternatives: when using one, he would make no reference at all to the other, corresponding to his sometime environment. 4) And in fact many of the texts cited in Cabrol, e.g. Muscula quae et Galatea, Maxima quae et Jovina, Vitalis qui et Dioscurus etc., are not even neutral, but positively pagan5) Only the British example is positively Christian, Cadvalla qui et Petrusб)
I) Acts xiii 9
2) Cumont in Harnack, Mission ii 39
3) Diehl 4897,4930
4) Ramsay, St.Paul 81-88
5) Cabrol xii/2:1518,
6) Cabrol xii/2:1519

The evidence is therefore not decisive in the sense of providing an infall ${ }_{\text {L }}{ }^{\circ}$ le general rule. QUI ET may introduce a specifically Christian name, presumably following baptism and confession of faith, or a neutral or even a pagan name from motives not at all religious, according to circumstances.

With this double possibility in view let us return to our African specimens. First of all, there are no specifically Christian names among them. The nearest, SUSSANA (bIII 284h), is as we already know a Jewish name, and moreover is in this text not the name assumed in addition, but the name in addition to which LOLLIANA is assumed. The person in question, Susanna, was a Jewess who wished to be known among her non-Jewish friends as Lolliana. This case belongs therefore to the Pauline type precisely. The same holds good in the case of ISTABLICIUS (prothetic vowel,p.442!) who wished to be called Donatus, (bV 155). The same typical situation, but with the details reversed, confronts us in bV $92 \& 93$ : in each case the name standing in front of the QUI ET, although obscure, appears to be a Latin name of some sort, while the additional name is MACCAL. What this name is, we cannot tell; but general grounds speak for identifying it as Punic, see pp.441-2. If this is so, it is easy to reconstruct the situation: these Romans had intercourse with the Punic element of the country, probably by way of trade, to such an extent, that it was convenient for them for business purposes to have a Punic name. That they both chose Maccal indicates thet this particular name was one of the most popular names at the time, known even to Romans. A somewhat different explanation is appropriate in the case of bV 49: here we learn from the names that Verus, whom we find buried at Tipasa, was not a native
of that place, but had formerly belonged to Icosium and Lomnium, i.e. modern Tigzirt (CRAIBL ed.). L.P.Martis (called Pattisso) and Crescens (called Capo) on the other hand (bIV 157, CIII 605) are more difficult to define, the names being quite colourless. As for T.E.D., whoever that is, who chooses for himself the name of EVASIES, we have already established ( p .141 ) the Bacchic origin of this surname. So far as our African examples are concerned, therefore, it will be seen that the QUI ET formula introduces in general a neutral name, for the purpose, it would seem, only facilitating intercourse; once, a positively Pagan name; never at all a Christian name. It has no reference whatever to baptism.

With this problem we close our remarks on the Christian names of North Africa. It is to be hoped that nothing of real importance for our understanding of the religious praxis of the country has been omitted. The subject of names is one of endless interest, and a great deal can be gathered which serves to enlighten us on matters of detail. On the other hand the numerous problems, lexical, grammatical, orthographical which rise in dealing with minutiae of this kind have no contribution to offer towards the solution of the main question at all corresponding to the labour required to expound and organize the material concerned. They are therefore neglected on principle. Whoever turns to the Appendix, however, will find pleasure in the innumerable oddities and curiosities therein set forth, together with the indispensable apparatus. Ten minutes' perusal of the onomasticon in detail will reveal many strange, unfamiliar, and unexpected specimens and not a little to excite speculation in a variety of directions.

## (g) Ages

The first and only scholar to occupy himself with the ages of the deceased recorded on the Christian epitaphs of North Africa was Henri Leclercq, who in 1904 tabulated the meagre sum of 202 items in order of decades, without however drawing therefrom any significant conclusion? ) One can see why the discussion of such data as they stood must of necessity have been unfruitful: the critical foundation, namely an examination of the mortality-rate of the ancient world as a whole, was at that time altogether lacking. But in 1913 a study of this kind was at last publiked by W.R.Macdonell in a paper entitled "On the expeatation of life in ancient Rome, and in the provinces of Hispania and Lusitania, and Africa", based on the inscriptions then accessible in the CIL.) The "expectation of life" is of course quite distinct from the mere "mortality rate" as understood by Leclercq, and Macdonell's diagrams were consequently of no use from this point of view; but Macdonell tabulated all his material behind the text, thereby setting it at the disposal of any who might wish to study it for other than his own purposes. Yet we have hitherto failed to trace any rehanding of the problem of Christian vital statistics in the light of this magnificent contribution: whether from ignorance, or indolence, or the gratuitous assumption that nothing of interest promises to come out at all commensurate with the irksome toil needed to organize the material on both sides, the matter rests where Leclercq left it, to this day. Shane moves us resolve that it shall

[^62]To face page 448

so rest no longer.
First of all the fundamental conditions of the problem must be learnt from Macdonell's tables. On a uniform method we proceed to perceptualize all quantitative concepts by resort to graphs, the xłaxis being devoted to decade-groups, from Zero (the units) to Ten (the hundreds) including in this last group all material of 100 years or over, and the y-axis representing the number of items in the several groups, the scale of course varying in each case according to convenience. For tabulating purposes the letters of the alphabet may be employed to represent the groups, e.g. $A=0-9$ years, $B \in 10-$ 19, $C=20-29, \& c$. Throughout therefore the letters $A-K$ will serve in this manner to indicate the age groups.

Applying this proceaure to Macdonell's material, we select his African tables as the basis. Our first two tables consequeatly set forth the distribution (1) of the population as a whole, (2) of the male ( $O^{\circ}$ ) and female ( 9 ) elements, the respective graphs being at the same time inserted opposite:-
I - Africa (total, general)

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 823 | 995 | 1476 | 1386 | 1112 | 985 | 1079 | 1189 | 926 | 403 | 317 |

## II - Africa (do. in section)

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | $J$ | K |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O | 479 | 571 | 806 | 747 | 635 | 611 | 633 | 726 | 589 | 264 |
| 午 | 344 | 424 | 670 | 639 | 477 | 374 | 446 | 463 | 337 | 139 |

It will at once be observed that the general graph consists of three troughs and two crests, the latter symbolizing positive mortality, the former, mortality of a relatively light rate. It accords with
general experience that the prime of life should contain the central trough, which we shall therefore denominate the climactic trough, and that deaths should be even fewer at the extremities of life, in early childhood on the one hand because nature tends at this period empatically in the other direction, in old age on the other because relatively few individuals attain it. The corresponding troughs may therefore be conveniently called the infantile and senile respectively. Moreover, the popular wisdom of antiquity, generalizing as we of today might do on the tendency to die once the prime of life is past, rightly declares: ${ }^{I}$ The days of our years are threescore years and ten, and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow! Hence the crest in the H (70's) group, like all the features hitherto discussed, answers to common expectation: it is natural to speak of it as the postclimactic crest. But we contemplate with horror the supreme magnitude of the crest which precedes the climactic trough (therefore the preclimactic crest), which rears its ugly summit among the $20^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$. It appears that this high pubertial mortality is the chief feature in which the vital statistics of anîtquity present a strong contrast to those of modern European civilization; the ratio of those attaining a great age seems also to have been higher than now. Natural Selection is obviously invoked to account for both peculiarities: those who survived the hard conditions encountered from 10 to $20-30$ were in a position when the time came to outlive the"allotted span", whereas modern life is less hard at first and consequently less long?)

[^63]To face page 450



IV

This contrast emerges in clear and pathetic detail in the second graph. Here the troughs and crests occur, as is to be expected, where the they did in the first graph, but female preclimactic crest is noticeably more steep than the male. That puerperal disturbances operate here, there can unfortunately be no genuine doubt, in view of the absurdily early age at which it was not unusual for girls of the time to marry.) On the other hand the slight rise in the 100's as group $1^{\text {against }}$ the 90's ( $q$ ), where the male element shows a steady decline throughout, illustrates how delicately the principle of selection works compensation.

Such is the background against which we are to set our Christian material. Its characteristic features may be summarized under three heads: (1) the extremities lie in troughs; (2) the climactic trough occurs in the 50's; (3) the preclimactic crest occurs in the $20^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, and the postclimactic erest in the 70's.

But when we proceed to draw graphs for our Christian ages in the same manner:-

## III - Christian(general)

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 98 | 66 | 69 | 54 | 45 | 58 | 72 | 62 | 42 | 10 | 8 |

## IV - Christian (in section)

|  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| J | 54 | 30 | 35 | 27 | 24 | 36 | 43 | 35 | 27 | 5 | 5 |
| 후 | 31 | 30 | 29 | 15 | 16 | 22 | 24 | 21 | 12 | 5 | 2 | what do we find? This namely: in the general graph, there is a minus displacement of both the climactic trough (40!) and the

[^64]postclimactic crest (60:), while the preclimactic crest is only mildy suggested at 20 , the graph rising slightly at this point, but not so high as at 60. Instead, when we trace the graph backwards, we find it surging up and reaching its maximum in the units group! Standing back and comparing graphs I and III, indeed, we gain the impression that the Christian graph (III) is a version of the General African graph (I) which has been displaced in a minus direction with ever-increasing momentum, not piecemeal but bodily, the original asserting itself only where it was most emphatic, namely in the 20's group, whこere III shows a slight concession, the real preclimactic crest of the latter occurring however in the units group, there being no introductory trough. The two graphs coincide more or less only in the senile trough, where they share a steep drop to 90 , and a shallow one to the 1000 s group.

The mystery deepens when we turn to examine graph IV and compare it with graph II. Here the male readings coincide in essence with those of the general graph. The female readings, on the other hand, show certain notable peculiar ${ }_{1}^{i}$ ties. In the first place, since there the 20 reading is higher by 5 than the 60 reading, the contour of the corresponding element in II, and $I$ as a whole, is distinctly preserved as it is not in the male section of the graph. The initial drop, in particular, is nothing like so steep as in the male section. Then again, the climactic trough is displaced twice as far, namely into the $30^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$. To be sure, the difference in reading is minute, only l, but there it is. Apart from this detail, the female element of the Christian graph may on the whole not unfairly be characterized as less violently at variance with the
general African (I,II) graph(s) than the male. The male element however, because of its larger bulk, determines the contour of the Christian graph (III), as it does for the same reason in the case of the general African graph. It should be mentioned, that Macdonell takes no account of the distinction between Christian and Pagan, so that the contrast which here emerges would be sharper were it possible to abstract the Christian element from Macdonell's tables. As it is, the Christian element does not amount to so much as one tenth of all the material now extant, at lèst to judge from the CIL. When this circumstance of the ase is taken into consideration, the aberration of our Christian readings from the "general" is all the more striking. What therefore does it mean?

Prima facie it is natural to seek for a biological explanation: taken generally the Christians were the invalids of the Roman Empire, whose will-to-live succumbed from ten to twenty years, on the average, before that of their more robust fellow-citizens. Christianity, therefore, is a pathological sympton, not far removed from insanity, devised by the weak and timid as a compensation for satisfactions denied them by the world about them, in which as a matter of fact they were not capable of maintaining their existence: a splendid apologia for paganism, which modern pagans of the $\mathbf{N i e t z s c h e}$ type, had they possessed such statistics, would not assuredly have neglected! Let us examine this "argument".

Having never seen this "argument" urged in the concrete, for the simple reason that the data requisite, namely a system of graphs setting forth the contrast in question, is only now for the first time available, we do not know how its fauteurs would set
about expounding their case; but this we do know, that they would have to confine themselves to the barest generalities, and could not get to grips with the details at all without at the same time relinquishing their contention. It has already been observed in the case of the graph showing the general African population in section (II), that the female readings, which reflect a struggle against adverse circumstances not found to operate in the male readings, show at the same time the well-balanced effect of the principle of selection, inasmuch as the heavier pubertial toll is offset by a proportionately higher rate of survival in old age (pp.449-450). That is to say: an unfavourable variation on the preclimactic side is offect by a favourable variation on its postclimactic side, the climactic trough itself remaining constant. Such is the pattern of variation to be expected as a result of biological factors. The modifications are generated round the climactic trough, and a displacement ( $-/+$ ) on the preclimactic side is offset by a displacement IN THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION ( $+/-$ ) on the postclimactic side of the graph. But this is not at all the pattern observed in the displacement of our Christian readings! In characterizing this displacement (p.451), we spoke of a wholesale shifting in one direction only, whereby not only both crests, but the climactic trough as well, were negatived by a whole decade in the case of the trough and postclimactic crest, and by two decades in the case of the preclimactic crest. In other words: the centre whence this movement is generated is not at all the climactic trough, which itself suffers displacement along with the whole, but lies beyond the graph, the mode of its operation being to contract the graph bodily towards


Zero. The movement is thus not symmetrical, with its focus lying at the centre of the graph, as in the case of a variation grounded on biological modifications: on the contrary it is altogether asymmetrical, its focus lying wholly outwith the graph itself. For this reason alone it is impossible to ascribe the displacement of our Christian readings to any biological factor whatsoever.

Exactly how biological factors do produce displacements, we can show by a concrete example. As is well known, the Jews were hated and despised in the ancient world, much as they are to-day, and were relegated so far as possible to the basement, so to speak, of the community, where living conditions were worst. Now the Jewish texts of Africa are too scanty to be of statistical value; but Diehl has given us a valuable appendix of representative Jewish epitaphs, of which 60 give precise information on the age of the deceased. These texts thus afford us a cross-section of Romanized Jewry contemporary with our Christian material. From them we are able to construct the following graph:-
V - Jewry

|  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | $I$ | $J$ | K |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\circ^{x}$ | 4 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 1 | $I$ | 2 | 1 | 3 | - | - |
| O | 12 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | - | 2 | 1 | 3 | - | - |
| Total 16 | 12 | 6 | 8 | 5 | $I$ | 4 | 2 | 6 | - | - |  |

Meagre though these quantities be, yet so far as they go they are quite decisive. In general, the climactic trough is where it should be, namely at 50. That, however, is the only constant feature in
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a graph otherwise violently displaced. But observe in what manner! The preclimactic portion resembles at first sight that of our Christian graph, inasmuch as the figures for the first ten years of life are enormously in advance of any other group. But whereas the pagan preclimactic crest asserts itself in the Christian graph, in the Jewish graph it is displaced in the positive direction. Why? The selective principle operates here: those who survived the gruellif hardships of infancy were able to postpone the pubertial threat by ten years: On the postelimactic side a similar state of affairs is to be recorded: because of a mortality-tendency of exceptional severity among the 60's, the surviving remnant postponed the postclimactic crest for ten years, i.e. displaced it from 70 to 80 : This complex graph therefore is exquisitely symetrical in every detail: not only are the two sides, each considered separately, perfect specimens of the way in which the selective principle affects statistics, but the graph as a whole is beautifully balanced, for the large-scale minus displacement of the preclimactic portion has for its counterpart the large-scale plus displacement of the postclimactic portion (units for $20^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, $80^{\prime}$ s for $70^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, $50^{\prime}$ s constant). The contrast between this graph and the Christian graph could scarcely be more striking, and is but deepened when we pursue it into the details. For the postclimactic portion the readings of the two sexes coincide; but observe the distribution of the readings in the preclimactic portion. In the Christian graph, the male readings run emphatically higher than the female readings, although even the latter succeed in counteracting the pagan tendency to form a trough. Here on the contrary the male readings conform more closely to the
characteristic pagan tendencies, producing however at the same time a plus displacement of the preclimactic crest (30 instead of 20 ; selection!), while on the other hand the female readings are prodigious in comparison, with the result that the preclomactic crest is postponed, not by ten, but by twenty years! Hence at bottom the prima facie resemblances between the preclimactic portions of the two graphs, Christian and Jewish, is manifest only. The fine balance observed in the latter, above all in detail, is entirely lacking in the Christian graph, although the data are so very much richer. The steep trough represents (1) in the Jewish instance, an infantile mortality-trend of shocking proportions, independent of the trend underlying the preclimactic crest, (2) in the Christian, a minus displacement of the pubertial mortality-trend underlying the preclimactic crest. In the former case the readings point to a biological situation in which girls were cruelly sacrificed in favour of boys, in the latter the readings are incapable of any biological interpretation at all, the displacements being wholesale and totally asymmetrical. In detail and as wholes, therefore, the two graphs, Jewish and Christian, form a thorough contrast. The former is an excellent example of biologically-conditioned variations, while the latter is owing to its structure utterly incapable of any imaginable interpretation in terms of biological law.

A negative conclusion is thus so far won, which may be formulated somewhat as follows. While the general structure of the graph representing Christian African vital statistics is of course like all graphs of this type based on biologically-conditioned foundations, when compared with the corresponding graph drawn for the population
of the country as a whole it shows a unilateral displacement towards zero, whereby the readings as a whole are shifted by an average of $10+$ years, the focus of this homogeneous movement being wholly transcendent. The cause of this displacement cannot be biological however, since if it were, the displacement would not be unilateral, but symmetrical; the readings would not be shifted as a whole, but would be drawn together or dispersed; and the focus would not be transcendent, but immanent, namely lodged in the climactic trough; as we see for example from Jewish vital atatistics, which reflect a struggle against extrenely unfavourable living-conditions. Sectional analysis emphasizes this impression moreover, inasmuch as in material which is biologically conditioned, for example the Jewish, the displ=acement is more marked in the case of the female readings, whereas in the Christian material on the contrary, the displacement is more marked in the case of the male readings. This contrast in the dynamics controlling these statistical elements present in the picture before us is consequently of the greatest possible importance, since it proves that Christian vital statistics are not structurally different from those of the ancient world at large, like the Jewish, being modified, like them, by an internal principle operating organically, namely the principle of natural selection, but are on the contrary structurally identical with those of the ancient world at large, the readings in their entirety however being thrust backwards by external pressure, the source of which is unknown, the rate of displacement being nevertheless calculable, namely lo+ years. The Christians in question, therefore, were not a conspicuously depressed class, like the Jews, but constituted a genuine cross-
section of the ancient world as a whole, being neither more nor less healthy. But the figures employed to describe the "ages" of these Christians on their epitaphs do not represent their physical, somatic, biological "ages" at all! Their physical ages have been taken as a basis to be sure, but have suffered manipulation, not haphazard, random, arbitrary, or frivdlous manipulation, but uniform and wholly consistent manipulation, the effect of which was to reduce the physical ages all round by an average of $10+$ years:

Nov this is altogether astounding and bafiling: How are we to account for it? Since this uniform displacement of $10+$ years is not found except in our Christian material, we have a right to conclude in the first pare that its ultimate ground lies somewhere among the peculiarities of Christian praxis. We cannot tell at the moment what this factor is; therefore we shall provisi onally call it simply the "displacement factor", symbolizing it in case of need by means of the letter $X$, for that described it exactly: it is the unknown element of our problem, towards whose identification we are now about to strive. And we already know two things about the mode of its working: (I) it reduces the somatic age by an average of $10+$ years, thereby producingla manifest age; and (2) it operates in this direction more strongly among male than among female material.

Equipped with this meagre but well-grounded information, we can add to our stock of knowledge on the way in which $X$ works, and therewith delimit our conception of it, by resolving the Christian graph afresh on the customary twofold basis of chronology and topography, the characteristic significance of which we have on former occasions learned to appreciate. We will refrain from analysing
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the material in both directions simultaneously for fear of invalidating our inferences, the smallness of the figures which would then result promising to prejudice their statistical reliability. It will be sufficient for our purpose to draw first a chronological graph, then a topographical one:-
VI - Christian (in chronological section)

|  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b | 34 | 22 | 31 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 26 | 19 | 13 | 2 | $\overline{8}$ |
| C | 64 | 44 | 38 | 38 | 29 | 41 | 46 | 43 | 29 | 8 | 8 |

## VII - Christian (in topographical section)

|  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| II | 35 | 20 | 22 | 18 | 11 | 15 | 19 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| III | 29 | 18 | 20 | 12 | 10 | 16 | 13 | 20 | 16 | 1 | 3 |
| IV | 18 | 12 | 4 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| V | 16 | 16 | 23 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 28 | 22 | 15 | 6 | 2 |

From the chronological graph it is obvious that the influence of X, which was not powerful enough to counteract the biologicallyconditioned preclimactic crest, had consolidated itself sufficiently to do so in the later perioa. On the other hand, the broadening of the climactic trough in the 4 th century as against the later period is somewhat striking: the displacement tendency must have been stronger at this point in the 4 th century than after it. Without knowing more about $X$ it is impossible to say what the DE 4 th-century reading has to do with the period of stability $C D$ in the later period, or even whether there is in fact any connection between the two. Probably the dikeness is only superficial, and of no genuine statistical importance. In general this graph suggests the tentative conclusion: in the 4 th century $X$ operated sporadically, namely with greater efect in the climactic area than in the preclimactic. In
the later period this tension was neutralized. The chronology of X therefore attests a process of consolidation in this respect.

At first sight the confusion of the topographical readings inspires despair: how can such divergent elements be held together within the span of one theory? On工e is even tempted to ask the question, whether the readings are too low to be statistically reliable. For this very reason the Tripolitanian material has been neglected on principle. Yet since the figures in question reflect a historical phenomenon it must be possible to reduce them to order ultimately. Only we must not make the mistake of asking too many questions at once; rather we must be content with superficial impressions before seeking to understand the details.

Prima facie, then, the outstanding contrast which emerges from this graph (VII) is that between Numidia and the rest of the country. The point at which this contrast is most glaring is the 20's group: the tendency of the Numidian readings, which elsewhere corresponds at least substantially with thet of the others, here contradicts them most uncompromisingly, for whereas the rest of the country, that is, Africa as a whole, shows here a crest, Numidia on the contrary shows an extremely steep and emphatic trough, which, since it descends lower than any save the senile trough, must undoubtedly be identified as the climactic trough. Here then we have the truly remarkable displacement of 20 years from the average Christian, and 30 years from the pagan climactic crest: In other words, $X$ has reduced the somatic age of Numidian material, not by 10 years, nor even by 20 , but by no fewer than 30 years! The postclimactic part of the Numidian curve appears to be determined by the sharp crest
in the 30's preceding a shallow trough in the $40^{\prime \prime}$ s and leading to the main postclimactic crest, as might be expected, in the 60's. That the secondary crest in the 30's is biologically conditioned, is probable in view of the slight rise in the $100^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, which together with it reflects the operation of the selective principle. It is therefore of negligible significance from our point of view, and in itself of small importance. Hence our first conclusion on the basis of the topography of African Christian vital statistics runs: The displacement due to X reaches its maximum in Numidia, and that in the most decisive and emphatic manner.

Of the other three readings, that of Byzacena reproduces the total Christian reading most closely, since its troughs and crests occur quite in the typical manner. The only feature which calls for remark is the secondary crest on the preclimactic side (20), which surpasses the climactic crest. Even so however, the typically Christian shape is emphatically preserved, and the grest in the 20's remains a secondary one. We might do justice to the situation by observing that of all the regions concerned Byzacena is the most nearly typical, a slight weakness of the influence of X on the preclimactic side notwi thstanding.

The preclimactic portion of the Zeugitana readings reproduces that of the Byzacena material with insignificant variations, until the climactic trough is reached. This lies, like that of Byzacena, in the typical position, namely among the 40's. But thereafter the line is broken in a manner which reminds us forcibly of the corresponding portion in the readings of Jewish material: there is a premature erest at 50 , a trough at 60 where we should have
expected the postclimactic crest, which instead is restored to the original pagan position (70); then follows a steep trough to 90, and finally a smart upward movement to 100. Now Macdonell declares it as the first of his findings, that the expectation of life in ancient Rome was noticeably lower, owing to the unhealthy living conditions of the populous city, than in the provinces, where more salubrious conditions prevailed, the contrast being that between urban and rural conditions, a contrast namely which we of to-day understand very readilyl) Therewith he provides us with the key to the understanding of the Zeugitana postclimactic readings. What Macdonell observed on a large scale may be expected to hold good on a small one: Carthage stands to Africa as a whole as Rome to the provinces, being the cultural, commercial, and administrative centre of the entire country, and it by far its most populous city. Zeugitana material therefore, which is chiefly Carthaginian, must be expected to reflect Carthaginian conditions. On the analogy of Rome, and indeed on grounds of general experience also, we may take it that Carthage was less healthy than the rest of Africa. This accounts for the peculiarities of the postclimactic Zeugitana readings, which in terms of this generalization are to be interpreted biologically. The severity of living-conditions thus produces the premature crest at 50 , while the principle of natural selection offsets this irregularity by postponing the genuine postclimactic crest to 70 (i.e. "somatic" 80 , compare Jewish graph!) and yielding yet further compensation in the fom of the emphatic upward spring in the final group (100). But for the influence of this biological

[^65]principle, the Zeugitana readings would have reproduced those of Byzacena on the postclimactic side, exactly as they do on the preclimactic. There is one slight difference to be taken into account howver: in the graph as it stands, the postelimactic crest equals the secondary preclimactic crest, whereas in Byzacena it stands a trifle lower; probably therefore if we could assess the biological counter-tendency and abstract it, the postclimactic crest would, standing now at 60 , surpass the preclimactic cest by a considerable margin. In that case the Zeugitana readings would conform even more closely to the typical than they in fact do now. Even as it is, Zeugitana emerges as more nearly typical than Byzacena in this respect. We therefore formulate the conclusion: apart from modifications to be traced to peculiar living-conditions in the city of Carthage, the readings of Zeugitana show the same influence of X as those of Byzacena, and are even somewhat more typically Christian.

We are thus left with Mauretania, of which it may be said in general, that its readings are morphologically akin to those of Zeugitana (biologically-conditioned modifications apart) and Byzacena, that is to say, typically Christian. Certain points of detail call however for remark. Whereas the postclimactic crest occurs where expected, namely among the 60's, the climactic trough is displaced 10 years from the typically Christian, and 20 years from the pagan climactic trough, that is to say, among the $30^{\prime}$ s. In this respect Mauretania stands between Numidia (p.460) and the typical examples (Zeugitana, Byzacena). In this conne=ction it must however be borne in mind, that the political boundaries of the regions in question are arbitrary from the viewpoint of religious praxis, so that e.g.
it is ultimately impossible to maintain rigid distinctions of this kind in the case of the Mauretanian-Numidian frontier. Mauretania, moreover, is a large territory, exceeding in area all the other regions combined; hence one formula cannot be expected to hold good uniformly over all parts of its vast spece. On these grounds it is natural to associate this particular feature of the Mauretanian readings with the region adjoining Numidia, dominated by Sitifis. Mauretania's mediating role so far as concerns its vital statistics can thus be connected with spatial contiguity with respect to Numidia. But the Mauretanian readings are peculiar in another detail: the incipient drop from units to tens here characteristic of Christian readings and the incipent rise characteristic of pagan readings have been neutralized, producing a stable constant for two decades (16-16). This feature of the Mauretanian graph is therefore neither typically Christian nor typically Pagan, but neutral. How does this come about? Three causes are possible: (1) $X$ must have been so weak, that instead of counteracting the biological tendency as it did elsewhere, it merely neutralized it; (2) the biological tendency must have been so strong that it neutralizea $X$; (3) both $X$ andthe the biological tendency must have have been simultaneously so strong or so weak, that mutual neutralization resulted from the tension produced. Of thef these, (3) must be rejected, provisionally if not irrevocably, since it implies a delicacy of balance between two independent and mobile tendenctes such as is altogether exceptional in historical processes. (2) implies an extraordinarily low rate of infantile mortality, but is possible and must be considered. The selective principle is as usual decisive. Now in order that survival during the first decade
should be so simple and automatic, and the living-conditions so completely free from obstacles to growth that the influence of $X$ was neutralized, it is necessary that not more than one child throughout all Mauretania should have died under the age of ten: Moreover, if all had in fact survived save one, the troughs and crests of the following periods would have reflected a most emphatic shortening of life, and nothing of this kind is anywhere observed! A very steep senile trough at least should have developed, and what do we find? A drop in the last decade proportionally quite as shallow as that of Byzacena! Most decidedly therefore: (2) is so extremely improbable as to be virtually impossible. By elimination therefore we resort to (l), which implies a specifically Christian influence so drastically diluted as to be scarcely distinguishable from paganism. Naturally one hesitates to entertain such a conception in view of the strength of the Christian influence, which, in the shape of $X$, is responsible for the striking displacement of the climactic trough (p.463); but necessity, or in other words the virtual impossibility of the alternatives already examined, forces us to reconsider the matter. As has already been pointed out (pp. 463-4), Mauretania is extensive enough to embrace within its bounds a great diversity of tendencies: if it adjoins populous and deeply-Christianized Numidia, it also spreads far to the West, even to the Ocean, and its southern frontier mingles almost indistinguishably with the Sahara, whose nearest inhabitants are unknown and $\not \subset$ wholly ignorant of the faith. It is therefore at the same time an outpost of Christendom for the greater part of its enormous area. It is from this aspect of Mauretania that we derive the possibility of accepting (I) as fundamentally correct.

Mauretania, therefore, emerges from the statistics as a motley region, whose characteristics in this respect can only be summarized by means of a double formula: inasmuch as the climactic trough occupies a position between the corresponding troughs of the typical regions on the one hand and of Numidia on the other, $X$ is seen to exert an influence much above the average; but inasmuch as the primary preclimactic crest has been COMPLETELY NEUTRALIZED, the influence of $X$ is seen to be almost negligible. In order to account for this contradiction, it is suggested that these two contrasting values of X correspond to the Eastern and Western portions of Mauretania respectively.

The topographical distribution of the displacing-factor X may therefore be formulated under four heads: (1) the influence of X is typical in Zeugitana, biological modifications on the manifest curve being taken into account; (2) it is slightly less than typical in Byzacena; (3) it is most emphatically stronger in Numidia than elsewhere, the decisive displacement being three times as large as in typical material; (4) in Mauretania it is partly of great strength, less than in Numidia but more than in typical material, and partly almost negligible, emphatically less namely than among typical material, the large area of this region and therewith the possibility of wide variation being invoked to account for the contrast.

With this fourfold formula our direct knowledge of the way in which X operates, here typically, there a-typically, is at lengith exhausted: the vital statistics can help us no more. But observe what we have thereby won. We know now that the influence of $X$ varies (I) in the course of time, being more firm and consistent
the longer the new faith has consolidated itself as a phenomenon of ancient civilization, and (2) from place to place, being more or less typical at the nexucleus, and distinctly a-typical at different parts of the periphery of the African Christian community. This gives us an opportunity of learning more about $X$, since throughout the exposition as a whole we have been accustomed to note the significance of distribution both chronological and topographical, and having postponed the discussion of the problem in hand thus far we are able to correlate it in this respect with the outstanding distributional features, not only of the epitaphs, but of all the inscriptions we have had occasion hitherto to examine. Let us therefore retrace our steps along these lines and see if we can delimit $X$ further still. First of all the chronology of $X$ adds but little to our knowledge, since from it emerges only the fact already indicated (p.458), namely that the factor of displacement is peculiar to Christian material. It is a meagre advance to learn what we chould have been able to deduce therefrom, that as the Church increased as a force in the world, so likewise did $X$ increase. Nevertheless we record this obvious situation and pass on to a much more fruitful discussion, namely the significance of the topographical distribution of the influence of $X$.
(I)Since $X$ operates typically in Zeugitana, its influence here coincides with the other characteristic features of this region, already familiar: first, Christian material as a whole (THIRD TABLE) and Christian epitaphs in particular, as illustrated e.g. by the names of Christians, are most thickly concentrated in this region ( $p$. 408) ; Zeugitana is likewise the seat of such characteristic elements of the Christian epigraphical vocabulary as the"acclamation" IN PACE
(p.326) and the titles FIDELES and INNOCENTES as applied to Christians (p.387); it is also the seat of the cult of the Theotokos (p.275) and of the application of Christian symbols and symbolic formulae to the warding-off of the Evil Eye ( p .240 ), as well of the use of Simple Names, including those characteristic of the faith (p. 409). In short: Zeugitana emerges again and again as a region in which the Christian faith has been so firmly established that it can afford the luxury of cultivating itself, of developing in independent directions, of producing characteristic features. It is natural to conclude from this that $X$ is one of these characteristic products.
(2) The same holds good in general for Byzacena, as will readily be seen from the sample tables already cited. Occasionally however, as when it shares with Mauretania an overwhelming statistical superiority over Zeugitana as a seat of the formulae DMS and HSE (p.352) and accounts for practically all the African examples of the pagan eauphemism DORMIT ( $\theta$ died) (p.336), Byzacena retains non-Christian traditions to a slight but well-definea degree corresponding to its vaguely peripheral situation. When thererore we find X likewise modified in the same direction and to much the same extent in this region, it is impossible not to associate this variation with the characteristic tendency of Byzacena as a whole, and conclude that here again $X$ is a factor peculiar to Christianity which suffers modification from pagan sources corresponding exactly to that affecting characteristically Christian features as a whole.
(3) Numidia was noticed first of all as the seat of the cult of the martyrs and saints in Africa (p.142), in particular of the use of the word SANCTUS as a technical term within this cult (p.157).

Secondy, it was noted as the seat of popular slogans, (p.22l), especially of the party-cries of the Donatists, DEO LAUDES and BONIS BENE (pp. 225-226). Thirdly,it was observed as accounting for nearly half of the total dedications, votary and otherwise, produced by Christian Africa as tokens of piety (p.289). In Numidia dedications ex-voto were even employed by Donatists and Catholics against each other in the sense of appeals to the Deity (p.316). Fourtinly and finally, the unoficial titles assumed for the sake of piety (servant of God, ete.) by the serious-minded of Africa are observed to show a definitely Numidian displacement (p.398). In short: all the Numidian peculiarities belong to a well-derined and easily-recognized and characterized type, namely that which could only be produced by a zealous, earnest, humourless, alnost stubborn enthusiasm, which finds pleasure in fanatical excesses of all kinds, the antithesis, on short, of worldiy wisdom or common sense. To repeat a former remark generalizing this peculiar Numidian attitude, (p.399), we might say of the Numidians that they were the"enthusiasts" or"mystics" of the African Church, meaning thereby, that Numidia was the seat of all kinds of religious extravagance or "Schwarmerei" Nothing therefore is simpler than to posit a connection between this freak of religious sentimentality, namely the curious piety of the Numidian Christian comnunity, and the equally monstrous displacement recorded in Numidian Christian vital statistics, and to enunciate the obvious generalization: the displacement-factor $X$, though characteristically Christian, is not a regular part of official praxis, but is rather to be traced to the temperamental tendency of religiously enthusiastic individuals, who wish thereby to accomplish a distinctive and neritorious religious work.
(4) If Numidia thus supplies us with the positive aspect of the problem, Mauretania supplies us with the negative. A study of all the tables in detail which have hitherto been set forth will show, that just as Numidia shares Mauretanian tendencies to a certain extent, so also Mauretania shares to a noticeable extent those of Numidia, as for example in the case of the hagiographic texts, where Mauretania, which produces material in general equal to that of Byzacena (THIRD TKBLE), far exceeds the output of Byzacena, altho ugh it does not of course equal that of Numidia in this respect (p.142). This comes about naturally enough, since the frontiers dividing the two regions are artificial and cannot be expected to have controlled the flow and ebb of influence from the one to the other in the rigid manner necessary for preserving the self-respect of our altogether pragnatic tables: As we had occasion to point out when discussing the Mauretanian readings therefore (p.464), here also we must accept Numidian-Mauretanian action and inter-action as an ineluctable fact which defies all attempts to eliminate it by means of theorizing. Hence we ah have no difficulty in connecting the two phenomena and in concluding: in so far as the displacement of the Mauretania readings reproduce the tendency of Numidian displacement, $X$ falls to be explained as in the case of its appearance in Numidia, relevant modifications however being taken into account.

But if we abstract Mauretania entirely from Numidia, and consider it by itself, a very different picture results. On the negative side, a glance at almost any table will show that where Zeugitana is strong, e.g. IN PACE, FIDELIS, Mauretania is weak. That is to say: Mauretania is lacking as a whole in characteristically

Christian features. On the positive side, we find that Mauretania surpasses the rest of Africa as the seat of neutral expressions like DECESSIT and DISCESSIT $(p .333)$ and MEMORIA ( -AE ) ( p .343 ), and of positively Pagan words and formulae like MENSA (p.344), DOMUS (A)ETERNA (LIS) (p.346), DOMUS ROMULA (p.348), DMS (p.352), together with references to the worldy condition of the deceased ( $p .375$ ) and the traditional pagan tripartite name and bipartite name ( $p \mathrm{p} .409-410$ ). That is to say: Mauretania is by far the most conservative of the African districts, and whatever is peculiarly Maueetanian is at the same time either neutral or pagan. Mauretania makes no contribution to the characteristically Christian element in the African Church: on the contrary, characteristically Christian influence is nowhere so weak as in Mauretania. But here again general imptressions and the inferences suggested by Mauretanien graph-readings coincide precisely! To be sure this wins for us no new insight, but reinforces the interpretation of $X$ already formulated. To the positive conclusions which emerged from an examination of Numidian phenomena, Mauretania yields a negative supplement: where Christian influence is least strong, there $X$ likewise exerts but a weak influence. $X$, therefore, once again assumes a specifically Christian quality. This has now been definitely established all along the line, in every detail, both negatively and positively, both chronologically and topographically. Only two steps more are required to complete the evidence. Retracing our steps to the earlier part of the inquiry, we find in the first place (pp.451-452) that $X$ exerts greater influence on the male than on the female readings. The difference is not great, but quite distinct notwithstanding. What does this mean? Apart from
two special examples we know of no category throughout all our material in which we find any radical distinction between the sexes. The exceptions are (1) invocations to the Theotokos, and (2) amulets devised against the Evil Eye. (q.v.) The former, so far as any information on the subject is forthcoming, is confined to men, namely Byzantine government officials. The latter is chiefly popular among women, although one man is mentioned (pp.271-272). Both forms of praxis are quite unofficial. That is perhaps the most significant observation that can be made about them from this point of view, since the fact that the invocations to the Theotokos are stereotyped formulae reproduced again and again on Byzantine seals in exactly the same fashion, and that the amulets are in fact too fev to have statistical validity, warns us against taking the contrast too seriously. Frankly, we confess that these examples cast no very obvious light on the problem in hand, unless it is to emphasize the unofficial character of such practices: neither the civil servants nor the humble victims of superstitious fear belonged to the clergy. It is here indeed, in the thought that the apostolic boast "there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal iii 28) notwithstanding, there was one class in the Church from which women were excluded, namely the regular clergy, that we should perhaps seek a commentary on our problem. Here to be sure is a cloed society, which more than any other corresponds to what is wanted. Whereas any boy mightaspire to the priesthood, no girl could do so. This is a contrast of life-orientation which we would do well to bear in mind. What do we know, therefore, that is relevant, of the official clergy as such? This, namely: that clergy are frequently
found of an age at which we should expect them scarcely equal to the responsibilities of clerical office (pp 390-391) on the one hand; and on the other, that bishops in particular were very careful to record the length of their tenure of the priesthood, even when they omitted to give any information about the length of their life in general (pp.402-403). From the viewpoint of our problem these two features of clerical material hang together: the effect of $X$ is to reduce the somatic age, hence the early age recorded in certain cases of the clergy may not after all represent their somatic age, but a manifest age only; and the lack of interest shown by many bishops in their somatic age, together with their eagerness to emphasize the number of years spent in office, suggests that we are now very near indeed to discovering the identity of $X$.

Everything now hangs as by a thread upon the last item of alI in our apparatus of evidence, our first discovery namely, (p.457) that the minus displacement of the Christian graph as a whole averages $10+$ years. In other words, X is responsible for reducing the somatic age of the African Christian community all round by an average of $10+$ years ( p .458 ). Now where in the whole of our investigation hitherto do we encounter a figure comparable with this decisive quantum? In one place, and in one place only: p.390, where it is established on the basis of statistics, that in the Early Church the average age of neophytes; i.e. persons newly baptized, lay between 10 and eleven years. That is to say: the average period elapsing before baptism and the average displacement of the readings of Christian vital statistics towards zero are of precisely the same extent, namely lot years. Or otherwise:
the manifest age, which we knew to have been based on the somatic age, but at the same time to have been the result of purposeful manipulation ( $p .458$ ), we now know to have been the age of the individual considered as a member of the Church. The implication plainly is, that baptism into the Christian community is tantamount to a fresh start in life; the believer is thereby re-born! Finally we need no longer speak of $X$, or even of the "factor of displacement", for we now know this "factor" no longer as a mere hypothesis as hitherto, but in the concrete. The ultimate source of the displacement in question is none other than the eschatological orientation of the life of the Early Church in general: the Christians whose monuments occupy us in these pages, far from being worldings like their pagan neighbours, regarded their life previous to baptism not as life at all, but as death and nothingness, a thing of no account; on the contrary, their life began for them only when at baptism they confessed their faith in Jesus Christ, the subject-matter of whose preaching, namely the Kingdom of God, was to them therewith a present reality. Their eyes were fixed, not like those of the pagans, with resentment or resignation on the past with its now useless hoard of achievements and enjoyments lost forever, but joyfully and expectantly on the future, looking earnestly towards the day when Christ would return and establish His Kingdom, which He had already brought to themselves, over mankind at large, both living and dead, to be appropriated by those deemed worthy of it. It was the number of years they had spent in this world as citizens of Christ's Kingdom, that is to say, their age as children of God in Christ, that they recorded on their tombs.

Now then let us justify this finding on a somewhat broader basis! And first of all, the interpretation as a whole is not spun from the air, but is firmly grounded, if nowhere else, at least on the ancient view of baptism as mediating rebirth, plainly attested in Christian names of the RENATUS type (p.432-3). To the material there discussed we would here add one of the Numdian eitaphs, (cIV 148) that namely of a young child who had lived only for a few days, only long enough in fact to reaeive baptism, and transferred to the heavenly kingdom (CELI REGNA), so that it seemd, as the sorrowing parent, addressing the child, expressed himself, that "you had been born only in order that you should enjoy such bliss by being born again", PROPTEREA ET NATUS UT CAPERES TANTA RENATUS. The literature of the Early Church moreover abounds in synonyms for baptism which bring the same view to clear and emphatic expression, such as RENOVATIO


Then again Nothcote, who assuredly was entirely innocent of any premonition regarding our discovery, and had consequently no interest whaterer in adducing patristic material in support of it, quotes two most significant passages, ${ }^{2}$ ) one from Tertullian: "our very life is counted only from our baptism" and one from the biographer of Cyprian: "the deeds of the man of God ought not to be reckoned except from the date of his birth to God", which we welcome as the strongest independent testimony in favour of our theory that we could desire. Such utterances commit no mere hyperbole if what we maintain is true, but are to be taken seriously as reflecting regular day-to-day usage.
$\qquad$

1) Kirsch in Kraus, RE ii 823
2) Nor theote, EC 126

Individual inscriptions, on the other hand, rarely make the position explicit, but our African material yields at least one piece in which we are told that the deceased "attained (baptism) on the 3ra of December, and from that day forth remained in the world until the 7 th of December", CONSECUTUS EST (terminus technicus,edd.) III NON DECEMB EX DIE CONSECUTIONIS IN SAECULO FUIT AD USQUE VII IDUS DECEMB, no further particular being wouchsafed regarding his length of life, and nothing at all being said to indicate his somatic age, cV 72 ! Yet another tells us that Rogatianus, a minister of the venerable altar, most faithful to God from dawn of life to day of decease, lived in the Church for 78 years", ROGATIANUS AB ORTU VITAE IN FUNCTIONIS DIEM PROBATISSIMUS DEO VENERANDI MINISTER ALTARIS VIXIT IN ECLESIA ANNIS LXXVIII, bIV 70. Now a man cannot be a "minister altaris" i.e. a deacon, from somatic birth (p.394), indeed one cannot so early properly be called "probatissimus Deo", hence the reference must be to baptism, as it most certainly is in the phrase "vixit in eclesia", although to be sure in view of Rogatianus' great age as a member of the Church (78) his baptism could not have been very long delayed. In addition to these items there are two which must certainly refer both to the somatic age of the deceased and to the length of the deceased's life in terms of Church membership. The texts are these:-

| CII 192 | ISTEFANUS FIDELIS BIXIT | Stephan, a believ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IN PACE ANN XIIII DPS | in peace 14 years. He was buried |
|  | SUB DIE III NN JUNIAS | 3 days before the nones of June |
|  | INDICTIONE SEPTIMA ET | in the seventh indiction and |
|  | IN MILITIA NN III | the 3rd year of his soldiering. |
| cII 193 | RE...LIS VIXIT IN PACE | Re...a believer lived in peace |
|  | ANNIS SIII MNS XI DPS | 9 years 11 months. He was buried |
|  | DE V ID MAIAS IND SEPTIMA | 5 days before the ides of May in |
|  | VIXIT IN MILITIA ANNIS III | the 7 th indiction. He lived |
|  |  | in the militia 3 years. |

In view of the extreme youthfulness of these "believers", it is quite absurd to treat "militia" as literal, and to suppose that we have here veterans from the legions: No; the "militia" in question must certainly refer to the "Militia Christi" which we have had occasion to discuss fully in connection with material already examined, most recently in reference to the very title here assumed, namely the title "fidelis"(pp. 384-386). This being so, we must understand that Stephan was baptized at the somatic age of ll, his companion at that of 6 . To be sure,in dealing with the phrase VIXIT IN PACE, we interpreted it as referring to the peace of the Church, and indicating Church membership, baptism being presupposed in this term. There is therefore a contradiction in our interpretation of the two texts in hand. It is apparent rather than real, however, since we have no positive grounds for regarding baptism alone as qualifying for ecclesiastical "peace", candidates for baptism being in reality being genuine adherents of the faith $\frac{1}{}$ ) albeit on a provisional basis, what we would now call "probationers". It is doubtless as such that Stephan and Re... "lived in peace", their tender years indicating that their parents had fully intended them to be Christians. Moreover by the time the expression occurs on CII 192-3, it had been current for 120 years at least, perhaps more; we must therefore allow for decline of point, as in all cases of popular habit. "(Vixit) in militia", on the other hand, being a rare expression, must be taken much more seriously, and in the present instance must in fact be decisive for our interpretation. We therefore conclude that the youths in question "somatically" aged

[^66]fourteen and nine respectively, had for three years been enrolled under Christ's standard as his warriors, that is to say in simple prose, been members of the Church, been baptized. Northcote supplies us with a Roman example of the same phenomenon, namely the coincidence on one and the same atone of the deceased's "somatic" age and age in terms of Church-membership: PERIT ANN XXXV EX DIE ACCEPTIONES SUAE (terminus technicus) VIXIT DIES LVII, she died at the age of thirty-five. From the day of her receipt (of baptism) she lived fifty-seven days.' All such texts are significant from our present standpoint inasmuch as they show that whenever the life-clause, which as a rule is stereotyped and consequently uninformative, appears in any degree of elaboration, the length of time spent by the deceased as a member of the Church, i.e. baptized, always received emphasis, whether or not his "somatic" age is mentioned. The supreme importance of the former figure over the latter is thus attested for our material as a whole, just as in the case of bishops we found the length of time spent in the priesthood taking precedence of the number of years constituting their "somatic" life (pp402-403). When therefore our epitaphs, under the irresistible pressure of statistical technique, collectively yield what they individually Withhold, the information namely that the manifest age appearing thereon is the somatic age of the deceased minus the age at which he was baptized, therefore his age as a member of the Church, and when moreover the few indiscretions committed by a handful of less rigidly reticent items give explicit precedence to the "ecclesiastic" over the "somatic" age of the deceased, and when in addition to all this, patristic citatio ns can be adduced to confirm results

[^67]already firmly established and reinforced from independent directions, then indeed it would seem that the limits of rational demonstration on purely empirical premisses had at length been reached.

We have thus won a new insight into the problem of baptism in the Early Church, albeit slight in scope. To the controversy about infant and adult baptism however, nothing of importance can be said to have been contributed thereby, fubther than that the fact is established: the automatic baptism of newly-born children was never universal so long as the African Church lasted, namely to the 7 th century. That the average age of baptism was $10+$ years, is known quite apart from the graphs, namely by means of a statistical table of neophytes' ages, such as the one employed as one of our chief items of evidence. What we do learn from the graphs that we have no other empirical means of determining, is the fact that in Numidia and parts of Mauretania the average age at which baptism was administered was raised to from 20 to 30 years. We ought obviously to connect this phenomenon with the Catholic-Donatist struggle which Was fought out chiefly in these regions, both sides rebaptizing adherents won from the opposite faction.) But if we have failed to satisfy interested parties by establishing the point at which it became universal to baptize infants at once, we have failed only because African Church History ceases round about A. D. 700. Macdonell included Spain in his survey, and the attempt might be made to tabulate the material of that country, which extends into Mediaeval times, although it is a question how far Macdonell's findings would be valid for so late a period. But in the event of the material on both sides proving suitable, we can predict the way in which

[^68]already firmily established and reinforced from independent directions, then indeed it would seem that the limits of rational demonstration on purely empirical premisses had at length been reached.

We have thus won a new insight into the problem of baptism in the Early Church, albeit slight in scope. To the controversy about infant and adult baptism however, nothing of importance can be said to have been contributed thereby, fubther than that the fact is established: the automatic baptism of newly-born children was never universal so long as the African Church lasted, namely to the 7 th century. That the average age of baptism was $10+$ years, is known quite apart from the graphs, namely by means of a statistical table of neophytes' ages, such as the one employed as one of pur chief items of evidence. What we do learn from the graphs that we have no other empirical means of determining, is the fact that in Numidia and parts of Mauretania the average age at which baptism was administered was raised to from 20 to 30 years. We ought obviously to connect this phenomenon with the Catholic-Donatist struggle which was fought out chiefly in these regions, both sides rebaptizing adherents won from the opposite faction?) But if we have failed to satisfy interested parties by establishing the point at which it became universal to baptize infants at once, we have failed only because African Church History ceases round about A.D.700. Macaonell included Spain in his survey, and the attempt might be made to tabulate the material of that country, which extends into Mediaeval times, although it is a question how far Macdonell's findings would be valid for so late a period. But in the event of the material on both sides proving suitable, we can predict the way in which

the transition, which must certainly have taken place in the Dark Ages, will manifest itself: as the age at which baptism was common is reduced, so will the displacement, until the Christian graph coincides with the general graph. But even here another interpretation might be appropriate, especially in view of the fact that contemporary pagan material would scarcely if at all be forthcoming: namely that the custom of reckoning the believer's life itself had fallen into disuse: This must certainly have happened sometime, since even those who now decline to baptize infants do not reckon their lives on any basis except the somatic, so far at least as me are aware. Our study therefore closes with unanswered questions, and therewith incites to further investigation, as every undertaking of the kind ought to do. Meantime in view of the novelty of the problem the material, organized in the appropriate manner, is set forth as an Appendix.

From this Appendix a morphological contrast emerges with the discussion of which we may conveniently close this study of epitaphic ages: whoever reviews the figures will be impressed with the fact, that whereas the material as a whole records the deceased's age in terms of years, months, (never weeks!)often days, two different modes detach themselves, each moreover presenting a contrast as against the other: on the one hand, a number of texts are so extraordinarily exact as to record the deceased's age in terms of hours, while on the other, the years are given in round figures, generally multiples of five, and with the nonchalant phrase PLUS MINUS, "more or less" interpolated. Macdonell ( $\mathrm{pp} .366-367$ ) notices this same distinction in Pagan texts, and explanes both quite convincingly: the mention of hours has an astrological significance, the stellar or planetary influence on the
destiny of the deceased being thereby indicated; while the round figures, chiefly fives and tens, indicate the deceased's age in terms of the old pagan Iustral period. Christian examples both of reckoning down to the hourl) and of round figures introduced by the phrase PLUS MINUS ${ }^{2)}$ abound outside Africa, the latter occurring also on Jewish material in particular, both within Africa ${ }^{3}$ ) and outwith it.4) Tabulating the combined use of both types of aberattion from the common usage:-

|  | b |  | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II | 11 V | $+$ | 16 | $=$ | 27 |
| III | 3 | + | 1 | = | 4 |
| IV | 1 | $+$ | 2 | = | 3 |
| V | 10 | + | 33 | $=$ | 43 |
|  | 25 | $+$ | 52 | = | 77 |

we observe at once the peripheral quality of this double phenomenon: Zeugitana and Nurnidia are represented here on a negligible scale. Tabulating them separately moreover: $\frac{1}{\sigma}$

## HOURS PLUS MINUS

|  | b | c |  |  | b | c |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II | 7 | 13 | $=$ | 20 | 4 | 3 | $=$ | 7 |
| III | 3 | - | = | 3 | - | 1 | = | 1 |
| IV | 1 | 1 | $=$ | 2 | - | 1 | $=$ | 1 |
| V | 1 | 1 | $=$ | 2 | 9 | 32 | $=$ | 41 |
|  | 12 | 15 | $=$ | 27 | 13 | 37 | $=$ | 50 |

we can formulate chronologico-topographical generalizations very neatly: the astrological mention of hours is early, and confined

1) Di $4376 \mathrm{~A}, 4587-8,4593,4630$
2)Di 14,59-61,33-34,66,80
2) Monceaux 151
4)Di 4904,4907
chiefly to Byzacena, whereas the lustral formula is late, and confinea chiefly to Mauretania. From what we know already of the statistical peculiarities of Byzacene and Mauretanian readings the above proportions are readily understood, the characteristics of both regions being for us only more closely defined. Both extremities of the country, East namely and West, occupy statistical positions corresponding to their positions on the map, and in addition present mutual contrasts which also correspond in this respect. Moreover the correspondence between form and content which prevails throughout is not only striking in appearance, but inwardly significant also, since the essential soundness of the investigation is corroborated as a whole thereby.
(h) Miscellaneous

The typical features of the African Christian epitaph have now been discussed. The outcome has not however been all gain. Dissection can only be carried out on a corpse, and it must be confessed that a ruthless analysis of the typical in search for general laws, whereby individual items suffer disintergation, results in something approaching a shambles. It will therefore help to restore perspective if a few individually outstanding pieces are reproduced whole and allowed to speak for themsilves. After all that is the only way in which we can regain the standpoint of those for whom the epitaphs were composed in the first place; they were intended, not for the callous eyes of a historian wishing thereby to reconstruct a civilization fifteen hundred years dead and gone, but for the reverent and leidured contemplation of the contemporary passer-by in cemetery or basilica.

Even from this standpoint，however，selection is necessary． There is no profit in reproducing as a matter of course every item which is merely a－typical；a very great deal of g－typical material has only curiosity value．Here the question：Does this piece contribute substantially to our knowledge of Early Church praxis？ must be held decisive，and on this understanding we proceed to handle what remains of our African inscriptions．

In the first place a small group claims our attention as ilIustrating intercourse between Africa and other parts of the ancient world．Italy，naturally，stands at the head of regions Whence immigration into Africa took place，as a fragment near the tomb of St Salsa at Tipasa，an obvious place of pilgrimage，reminds us：bV 23 UNA ITALORUM．More general is the epithet＂overseas＂ （trasmarinus）which became so popular in Africalas to provide a cognomen shared by five individuals in a single locality（see p．626）． Three pieces on the other hand witness to an influx at different times from Egypt：－

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DI } 7 \text {, Eünolpito 'E入hadios } \\
& \text { H⿰讠VES } \gamma \text { jucpos dekwnevte } \\
& \text { SI yoirtos MeTd TouTvevulto = } \\
& \text { GOU ETE AEUTIGEV Mivi Mduvi } \\
& \text { ERSOMIKdTa TuUs Aqpous }
\end{aligned}
$$

cIII 708．．．＇EKTE Mapia
TIGTM．．．． $0 \lambda 1 k \eta=$
MIVI $\theta$ dw $\theta$

Eumoirito Helladios．
He livea fifty years more or less， three months，and fifteen days． Christ be with your spirit． He aiea in the month Pauni，that is， the seventh month according to the Africans．
．．．here lies Mary，a believer， ．．．in catholic（peace？）．．．．in the month of Thaoth．

[^69]cIII 2 DYNAMIUS FIDELIS IN PACE．．．EV MEOOpM．．（Egyptian month）．
From farther afield come：－


 Gipnun＇ETn 5

Here lies Ulpia，otherwise Constantia， of blessed memory，a native of Byzantium，and daughter of Horea， wretched one：－having lived seven years in peace
aII 8 Mapheróry，zuúpvarte $\lambda$ moûa


 kưos exouran elphry tois dyiok＝

You left Smyrna，Parthenope，and came to Lybia，yielding up to God the last of your life．Remember，I implore you，your child and his father，for you live in God and enjoy everlasting riches．Peace be to the saidts in Jesus Christ
bV 11 Matpóvav Tínd doupis Tinv ＇Artohins mequk＇a $\alpha \mu$ évn oriqpoong tumín．



*

You see this matron borne by her relatives to her restingplace． having sprung from the land of Anatolia a pleasing，modest girl，it was my lot to die unexpectedly in a foreign country．I，Maxima，the wife（？）of Tripolitius，lie here，being thirty years of age．＊
cIII 641 Erod $\delta \in$ KITEXPIGKwV 105 80u入os Oesu ó totios Troplupior $K \alpha r \omega 0$ Onvov 〈ov〉 $k \in$ Boop $\eta r \Delta v$

Here lies Cresconius，a servant of God． The restingplace of Porphyrius，who was a citizen both of Kanotha and Bozra．
VICTORIA FIDELES IN PAC $=+$ Victoria．Believers in peace
CRE．．．NIUS FIDEL．．．PACE
cII 71 HIC JOHANNES JACET EX GENERE PROVINCIE SURIE APANIA FIDELIS IN DNO $(\triangle O)=$ bicxit in pace menses cily D KI JANUARIAS INDICTIONE 5

Here lies John，of the people of the province of Syria，from Apamea．He $=$ lived for ten（？）months in peace，a believer in God（？the Lord）．He died on the lst of January， 7 th indiction．

That is to say：the African Church was at all times in lively touch with the Churches of Italy，Egypt，Asia Minor，Constantinople，

Our second group on the contrary records the adventures of those driven hither and thither within Africa itself as a result of religious persecution. Two groups are distinguished, an earlier and a later, the former connected with the Donatist shim, the latter with the Arian heresy, although the certainty of this identification might in some cases be questioned in this latter instance. Nevertheless both subgroups have this in common, that they deal with the destinies of defenders of the "Catholic" faith.

First we have a very distinguished and gallant champion of the faith whose epitaph unfortunately is disfigured by illiteracies:dIV VETERANORUM MEMORIA FELIX
81 CAECILI AEMILIANI CONTINENT NOMEN QUEM PRIMEVUM LEGIONS TRITE AUGUSTE MILITIA PROB ATOM DEDIT JUVENTAS QUEM POS LABORER VIRTUEIS HONISTA = MISSION MERITUM AD FELICE anNas provexit senectus CATOLICE LEG FIDELISSIMA KENTE INSERVIENS VISIT ANNAS LXXXIII IN PACE FIDELIS 水

The ever-green memory of a veteran, Caecilius Aemilianus by name, who gave his youth from the earliest to faithful service in the Third Augustan Legion, and who after a $=$ career of bravery and honour attained a happy Id age, submitting himself most loyally to the Catholic lay.
He lived eighty-three years in peace, a believer. * Another epitaph praises the virtues of one bishop Placentinus:-
 ERS PLACENTTNUS. . BEN TN = holy bishop Placentinus...ruled(?) CATOLICA FLORENTER...XIT ET the city(?) illustriously in the NUNS ETERNE LUCE JAM FRUITUR ...VICXIT ANTIS LXXXVIY Catholic (law?) and now already enjoys eternal light. He lived for eighty-six(seven?) years.

It will be observed that the reference of these two pieces to the Donatist troubles is not explicit; but the symbols suggest the middle and the last third of the fourth century (or first third of fifth century) respectively, in which the reference can hardly be to any other controversy. We are all the more pleased, therefore, to close this subsection with an epitaph whose reference to the

Donatist struggle is beyond doubt. The piece in question has unfortunately no more than MS authority as yet, but is attributed to the pen of Augustine himself:-
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { cIV } 196 & \begin{array}{l}\text { Donatistarum crudeli caede peremptum } \\ \text { Infossum hic corpus pia est cum laude Nabonis. } \\ \text { Ante aliquot tempus cum donatista fuisset, } \\ \text { Conversus pacem pro qua moreretur amavit. } \\ \\ \text { Optima purpureo vestitus sangine causa, }\end{array} & \\ \text { Non errore perit, non se ipse furore peremit: } & \text { n } \\ \text { Verum martyrium vera est pietate probatum: } \\ \text { Suscipe litterulas primas, ibi nomen honoris. }\end{array}$
i.e. ,

Here has been interred with honour the body of Nabo, slain by the cruel slaughter of the Donatists. Having for some time been himself a Donatist, he was converted, and loved the "peace" enough to die on its behalf. Clad in the purple of his own blood for the best of reasons, he did not die through misguided zeal, nor commit suicide through madness! No: His martyrdom was rather a trial of true sense of duty: take the initial letters of every verse one by one, there you will find his rank.

Augustine here contrasts his friend's faithfulness to duty with the Donatists' fanatical craving for martyrdom as a proof of piety. And if we follow his directions in the last line, we of course find that Nabo was a deacon.

Far removed from the subtleties of this artificial production are the simple and vivid pieces we have for chronological reasons connected with the Arian persecutions of the Vandals. They speak for themselves:-
cIV 214 + PRESVITER LIBERATUS
PRO FIDE CATOLICA IN EXSILIO RECESSIT IN PACE ET VX ANNIS LXXV DEPOSITUS EST DIE XVII KA JULIAS

+ Liberatus, a presbyter, in exile for the Catholic faith, departed in peace,
$=$ having lived 75 years.
He was buried 17 days before the Kalends of July.


The three Numidian examples give us the picture of Carthage, now in the hands of the Vandals (that the exiles died after Justinian I had regained the city for the Catholics makes no difference here), as the centre of Arian persecution. The first two examples are plain enough; what is left of the fragmentary third does not mention exile, but since Carthage is mentioned as the home of the dead man (sedis need not mean more than that he lived under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Carthage), and Madaura as the scene of his death, we are justified in concluding that he too was an exile. Madaura appears from these pieces to have been a centre for refugees of this Kind. As for the Mauretanian example, it does not seem necessary, although it is tempting to infer, that this stout ecclesiastic had taken up arms. He may have been the chance victim of a skirmish.

The next group of inscriptions needs a slight introduction. In Africal) as in Gaul, ${ }^{2}$ ) it was quite a common custom, when composing elaborate inscriptions, usually in verse, to resort to manuals containing select phrases already used elsewhere with good effect, notably by the authors of the stones raised in Rome to the memory of famous bishops who had occupied that see.3) In general this problem is a literary one of slight importance for our present point of view, and we would not wish to burden these pages with minute demonstrations of this kind where so little is to be gained for our understanding of popular religious praxis; but in 1922 there was published an inscrifion ade discovered in the ruins of the basilica at Djemila, the ancient Cuicul (cIV 143), which bids fair to surpass any examples hitherto known of this curious custom.

Our story begins in Mauretania, where for many years scholars have admired the mosaics of Tipasa, where one Alexander, a bishop, otherwise unknown, erected a chapel over the renains of local celebrities, their graves being rendered accessible to the public and a "mensa" being erected amid them, so that worship might there take place. An inscription (cV 39) commemorates this achievement of the good bishop:-

Hic ubi tam claris laudantur moenia tectis culmina quod nitent sanctaque altaria cernis non opus est procerum set tanti gloria facti Alexandri rectoris ovat per saecula nomen
5 cuius honorificos fama ostendente labores iustas in pulchram sedem gaudent locasse priores quos diuturna quies fallebat posse videri nunc luce praefulgent subnixi altare decoro collectamque suam gaudent florere coronam
10 animo quod sollers implevit custos honestus undiq visendi studio christiana aetas circumfusa venit liminaque sancta peaibus contingere laeta omnis sacra canens sacramento manus porrigere gaudens
i.e.,

| I) Monceaux HLAC iii 444-5 | 2) LeBlant, Epihr. 58sqq |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3) Kaufmann, Handbuch 338 | 4) Kaufmann, Handbuch 219-220 |

What you see here, the walls crowned by such splendid roof-work, sparkling vaults and sacred altars, is not a sight? devised to please the mighty, but the proud record of a great achievement. It hails forever the name of Alexander who ruled here, and points with joy to the just of former days lodged in this beautiful resting-place, the result of his labour undertaken in response to a public demand. Those whom a long peace concealed from view now shine forth amid the light close to the elegant altar, and rejoice at the flowering of their common crown, the revered guardian having with infinite pains brought it to completion. From all quarters the Christian community thronged round and came eager to see the sight, rejoicing to touch the holy threshold with its feet, each one singing the sacred chants and stretching forward his hands joyfully towards the sacrament.

This turgid eulogy, of whioh lines ll-13 are manifestly modelled on Virgil (Aen ii 63-64:undique visendi studio Troiana iuventus circumfusa venit, ii 239: sacra canunt funemque manu contingere gaudent, CIL8/20903n), resembles in this respect the Damasine eulogies in Rome, which abound in similar Virgilian reminiscences, and otherwise also provide the stylel) More modest is the epitaph of the beloved bishop Alexander himself, which stands close by (cV 4I):-

Alexander episcopus legibus ipsis et altaribus natus aetatibus honoribusque in aeclesia catholica functus castitatis custos karitati pacique dicatus cuius doctrina floret innumera plebs Tipasensis
5 pauperum amator aelimosinae deditus omnis cui numquam defuere unde opus caeleste fecisset huius anima refrigerat corpus hic in pace quiescit resurrectionem expectans futuram de mortuis primam consors ut fiat sanctis in possessione regni caelestis.
i.e.,

Alexander, a bishop born to serve the laws themselvesand the alstars, enjoyed long life and honours in the service of the Catholic Church. A guardian of chastity and himself devoted to charity and peace, he taught the countless masses of Tipasa how to prosper indeed. He loved the poor and devoted himself whole-heartedly to the giving of alms; no opportunity of doing an act worthy of heaven but he took advantage of it. While his soul enjoys refreshment, his body rests here in peace, Iowking to the coming first resurrection from the dead, (and expecting) to share with the saints as his companions in the possession of the heavenly kingdom.

The time is now ripe to turn to the Djemila epitaph (cIV 143);
and what do we find? This namely:-

| Hic ubi tam claris laudantur moenia tectis | = CV39 |
| :---: | :---: |
| non opus est procerum sed tanti gloria facti | $=\mathrm{cV39,3}$ |
| QUIBUS honorificos EUM ostendente labores | = cV39,5 |
| quos diuturna quies fallebat posse videri | = cV39,7 |
| collectamque suam gaudent florere coronam | cV39 |
| undique SE visendi studio cristiana DECURRIT | cV39 |
| liminaque sancta pedibus contingere laeta | cV39,12 |
| SACRAMENTO DEI MEDICINAM SUMERE C....ISMAE |  |
| honoribusque in eclesia catolica UNCTUS | $=\mathrm{cV41}, 2$ |
| cuius doctrina floret innumera plePs CUICULITANA |  |
| cui numquam defuere unde opus celeste fecisset | = CV41,6 |
| resurrectione expectans futuram IN CRISTO CORONA | $=c \vee 41,8$ $=c V 39,2$ |
| culmina quod nitent sanctaque altaria cernis | $=$ cV39 $=$ cV39 |
| CRESCONI rectoris ovat CUM saecula nomen | = cV39 |
| iustos in pulcra sede gaudent locasse priores |  |
| nunc luce profulgent subnixi altare decoro | cV39, |
| animo quod sollers implevit custos honestus | = cV39,1 |
| AETAS IN UNAM CONGERIEM DEO DICERE LAUDES |  |
| omnis sacra canens manus porrigere gaudeT | cV39, ${ }^{1}$ |
| CRESCONIUS legibus ipsis et altaribus natus | = CV41.1 |
| castitatis custos CaritatiS pacique dicatus | = cV41, |
| pauperum amator elemosin deditus omni | cV41, |
| uius anima refrigerat corpus in pace quiescit |  |
| consors ut fiat sanctis in SEDE regni celestis |  |

That is to say: the Djemila epitaph contains the smbstance of both the foregoing pieces, together with a few words here and there, including two lines only, peculiar to itself: (Common matter is given in minuscule, original in majuscule.) Even of the two original
lines $(8,18)$ Sacramento in the former and Aetas in the latter are reflections cV39,13,11 respectively. Now what does all this mean?

Prima facie it would appear that the person responsible for the
above epitaph had seen cV $39 \& 41$, since the series: cV39 odd, cV4I even, cV39 even, cV4I odd lying at the foundation of cIV 143 suggests a system of selection whereby cV 39 \& 41 had been drawn upon alternately. On the other hand, it is formally quite as easily possible that cV 39 \& 41 should have drawn upon cIV 143 similarly.

A closer inspection shows however that any direct relationship such as this between the documents in question is excluded on general grounds. The decisive factor is found in the elements peculiar to cIV 143. Apart from relatively insignificant variations in detail, together with the proper names, which of course are local (Cresconius for Alexander, Cuiculitana for Tipasensis), there are two whole lines and a phrase at the end of another line which come into consideration as the only original elements of cIV 143:-

> 8 sacramento dei medicinam sumere c...ismae
> 18 aetas in unam congeriem deo dicere laudes
> 12...............................in cristo corona

Now of these, line 8 , which the lacuna renders obscure, associates the sacrament with the idea of healing (medicinam) in a manner which reminds us of Ignatius' expression $\Phi$ ápuakov 'KQavatiots, medicine of immortality (Eph.xx 2), and still more of the cult of Christus medicus we have already encountered in Africa (pp.189-190, 219,427), one of the texts in question bearing the Donatist acclamation $\mathrm{BB}(\mathrm{cIV}$ 141, see p.225). Line 12, ..."in Christ a crown" reminds us of quite a number of texts, notable cV 10, "...they deserved the crown of Christ", Cristi meruere coronam,(p.181) and the acclamation bIV 153, dignis digna! merentibus coronam! which we have compared to Bonis Bene! and therefore tentatively associated with Donatist circles likewise (p.225). Lastly, the "deo dicere laudes" of line 18, " the generation (see p.490) (flocked) together to sing praises to God", is indisputably diagnostic of Donatist origin, since"deo laudes" as we have again and again had occasion to observe (p. 224 etc.) was the Donatists' war-cry corresponding to the "deo gratias" of the Catholics. This stone, therefore, in so far as it is original,
bears quite unmistakable marks of schismatic origin: Cresconius, the bishop whose virtues it praises, was a Donatist. On the other hand since the Tipasa stones are void of Donatist stigmata it is natural to conclude that Alexander on the contrary was a Catholic. From what we know of the hostile relations between the two parties, it is unthinkable that any direct transfer fonerary language could have taken place bewteen them. The Cuicul and Tipasa stones are therefore fundamentally independent of each other.

The only alternative possible is, that the Numidian and Mauretanian redactors drew upon one and the same manual which circulated in both parts. This alone can explain the fact that "catholica ecclesia" occurs both in Cuicul (line 9) and Tipasa (cV 4l,line 2). It would not naturally have appeared in a Donatist document; in a Catholic epitaph on the other hand it is quite appropriate. But supppese the line (AETATIBUS) HONORIBUSQUE IN ECCLESIA CATHOLICA (F)UNCTUS to have occurred in a manual, a Catholic would of course have made use of it as a matter of course, while a Donatist, not wishing to renounce what he considered a fine line, would be at a loss to improve upon the word, and would appropriate the line as it stood, with the reflection perhaps, that he was not borrowing from the hated opponent, but was accurately describing his own party, who like all serious opponents of authority, naturally regarded themselves as nearer the real thing, more "catholic" in fact than the Catholics (so-called).

Other grounds moreover speak in favour of the hypothesis of an anthology. It will be observed that throughout, both in Mauretania and Numidia, the lines are ultimately independent. Lines 1 \& 2 of cIV 143, for example, run quite as appropriately as when in cV 39 the
second line is interposed between them. All along this "neutrality" of individual lines is apparent. Sometimes indeed the redactors have found difficulty in gaining connections, and the translation has frequently been more of a paraphrase than a direct rendering. The line cV 39,5 is a case in point. By itself, CUIUS HONORIFICOS PAMA OSTENDENTE LABORES is easily intelligible:"whose creditable labours, common hearsay bearing witness" and might serve as a link between any proper name and a variety of clauses. But as it stands it is extremely with awkward, and indeed will not fit in at all/the the context. It must be understood somehow as indicated by the translation, which follows Kaufman's attempt to render the sense. How it fares in cIV 143 may be seen on inspection: the redactor appears to have wished to connect it more closely with the foregoing line, and change FAMA into EJUS or something of the kind: at all events it promises well for the first half line, but fails to connect up with the following line. Indeed we have not troublea to translate cIV 143 at all; it can only be parapheased, so ill is it put together; whoever presses into the details and seeks syntactical connections, will before long give it up as intractable gibberish. In short we gain from the documents before us the ineluctable impression: here we have the contrast of two alternative methods whereby the contents of a phrase-book may be shuffled and reshuffled, according as whether (1) an epitaph plus a eulogy or (2) a magnificent epitaph-cum-eulogy is required. Proceeding on plan (2) With grandiose intentions sone blundering enthusiast has produced cIV 143, while, working more modestly with plan (I), some one else, With infinitely greater skill, has produced cV 39 and $c V 41$. Both had the same anthology of high-sounding commonplaces, including stray
quotations from Virgil, at their disposal. The separate lines could then be strung together at pleasure, the lone rhapsodist making what adjustments he could in order to adapt them one to another.

Such then was the literary foundation of these three texts. That we are substantially correct in our hypothesis is prowed by another stone found at Tipasa (cV 50) celebrating one Salsa, doubtless the local saint of that name, of which the first line, MUNERA QUAE CERNIS QUO SANCTA ALTARIA FULGENT may be compared with cV 39,2: CULMINA QUOD NITENT SANCTAQUE ALTARIA CERNIS. It will be observed that the material of this hypothetical manual is quite general, and suitable for quite a variety of applications. cV 39,4 for example, which announces that the restoration of the subterranean chapel redounds to the glory of the bishop, might just as well appear in cV 4l, where it would be suitably applied to the mosaic epitaph. Laudatory phrases of all kinds abound, and could be applied to the deceased or to the monument. In fact it would appear that this was approximately the scope of the manual in question, namely to provide for magnificent epitaphs on the one hand, and for the description of improvements to the fabric at the hands of a benefactor on the other. Lines 7-8 of cV 39, moreover, seen to be decisive for the kind of benefaction in view: they are applicable, along with lines ll-13, to the discovery of relics and the founding of an altar thereon. Now we have already established the popularity of relics in the African Church (pp.177-179). Here therefore we are in a position to add to our knowledge of this cult. The anthology which as we have proved must lie at the basis of all these texts must have included in particular a variety of specimen hexameters suitable for use in connection with a sanctuary erected
over newly-discovered relics, together with similar commonplaces useful when a turgid laudatory epitaph on the benefactor was wanted. Blanks would naturally be left for names of persons and places. In terms of this theory, Alexander the Catholic at Tipasa, and Cresconius the Donatist at Cuicul, both found relics and erected shrines to guard them and promote their veneration. From the nature of the case these texts, for all their verbiage, tell us exactly nothing either abat the shrines themselves or about the characters or merits of those who erected them: everything is mere convention. But if these inscriptions conceal in the end what they at first sight might be thought to expose, namely intimate particulars regarding the places where they were found and the persons responsible for them, they speak,more eloquently than they know, of the extent in Africa of hagiographic praxis; for before a manual of monumental commonplaces designed to record the building of sanctuaries over newly-discovered relics could circulate freely anong Catholic and Donatist circles alike, the popularity of relics in Vandal and Byzantine times must have been enormous, surpassing by far anything we might have inferred from the hagiographic texts themselves alone. What first was a literary problem thus leads to important conclusions on African religious praxis.

Here then we come to the end of the epitaphs, in so far as they are of importance for our understanding of this problem. To formulate a conclusion sumarizing the results won by investigations of such extended scope will naturally be difficult in a small space; nevertheless according to our usual custom the following paragraph is offered in the hope of throwing into relief the main items of importance emerging from the necessarily detailed discussion which has gone before.

## (i) Results

Christianity in Africa penetrated all classes of society, and, in so far as they were romanized, all races as well. But if the Church thus won the world, it was at the same time largely conformed thereto. This is clear for example from the names borne by Christians, less than one tenth of the total onomastic material being specifically Christian. It appears also in the choice of epitaphic formulae, the only Christian item in this section to be attested on a large scale being the acclamation "in peace", which is combined with verbs of living and dying in addition to standing alone. Even in this instance the proximate source appears to have been Jewish epigraphy. On the other hand, substantial concessions of this kind made to the spirit of the times are offset very skilfully by one device which not only escaped notice at the time, but has only now for the first time been detected, whereby the years put to the deceased's credit represented not his bodily age, but his age as a member of the Church, that is, the length of time he was baptized. The difference between the two ages averaged $10+$ yeas.

As might be expected on general grounds, Christian elements occur more freely, especially in the more elaborate texts, as time goes on. Zeugitana, including Carthage, and to a less extent Byzacena, were the most thoroughly, and Mauretania the least thoroughly christianized regions, while Numidia was the seat of religious zeal. There is evidence of contact with other provincial churches, as well as with the church at Rome. As a whole our results hold good only for the post-Constantinian period, the number of pieces of earlier date being negligible, and their quality in no way remarkable.

## IX - Miscellaneous

Having filed ftate titulif ${ }^{\text {Church }}$ memorials (i,e, martyrs' cenotaphs), Biblical citations, acclamations, imprecations, invocations, dedications, and epitaphs, we are left with a variety of texts, including all the "fragments", which could not be made to fall into any of these divisions. Hence what we have to deal with in this section is a motley collection entirely lacking inner cohesion. As in the case of the epitaphic residue just discussed, so here, we popose to select significant material rather then to investigate mechanically each and every item regardless of its value from the standpoint underlying the paper as a whole. Our material abounds with interesting problems of detail, which would be suitably discussed in a Corpus Christianum Africanm, but which if discussed here would yield nothing at all of interest to students of early Christian praxis, but on the contrary would only make the exposition more diffuse. The decisive question invariably put regarding $2 \neq 1$ item here considered is, therefore, does thts tell us, either by itself, or in conjunction with other items, anything at all about early Christian praxis? and the text is filed with
or set aside accordingly. Havig announced this proviso, we proceed to discuss relevant texts, adopting the subdivisions of the analysis already undertaken, as the natural and convenient basis.

First of all, in connection with the state tituli with which the analysis op-ened, it is convenient to mention the texts characteristic of the Vandal period, celebrating the benefactions of Vandal Emperors, generally in the shape of Thermae or Baths. These items lie on the periphery of our collection, because (l) in almost every
case the originals have perished, MS tradition alone preserving them; (2) they are highly artificial productions, namely poems written in hexameters; and (3) they are in addition the work of a private poetaster, Luxorius by name. Hence they scarcely fall within the category of inscription as here understood. Yet from one point of view they interest us: poetic conventions like BAIAEA) and PELAGUS, ${ }^{2}$ ) pompous circumlocutions like HIC PIA REX POPULIS THRASAMUNDUS VOTA DICAVIT...CONDIDIT INGENTES PROPRIO SUB NOMINE THERMAS describing the origin of the foundation, and MAXIMA SED QUISQUIS PATITUR FASTIDIA SOLIS/AUT GRAVIBUS MADIDO CORPORE TORPET AQUIS,/HIS THRASAMUNDIACIS PROPERET SE TINGUERE THERMIS:/PROTINUS EFFUGIET TRISTIS UTERZUE LABOR describing the benefit of bathing in these splendid edifices, ${ }^{4}$ ) above all, the elaborate combination of the acrostic THRASAMUNDUS, the mesostic CUNTA INNOVAT, and the telostic VOTA SERENANS in one ingenious example, ${ }^{5}$ ) show plainly, that remeniscences of Horace and Rome's Augustan literature in general are at work, though the spirit of the time is hopelessly decadent. The Vandal Emperors, in other words, would fain emulate the old Roman Emperors who preceded them, and build magnificent bathing-pools, complete with plants for heating the water, ${ }^{6}$ ) wishing thereby to show that the splendour of Rome was once more a present experience. But if the Vandals thus adorned Carthage, Byzantine restorations"from the foundation upwards" serve to remind us that they had previously laid waste and razed to the ground cities like Theveste? ( Zabil () and Timgad?) It is easy to see

1) CIII 519,
655
2) CIII 517
3) CIII 521
4) CIII 520
5)cIII 522
6)cIII 521
5) CIV 1
6) $c V 38$
7) CIV 137
the consistency underlying these diverse modes of behaviour: the Teutonic conquerors, having established themselves in Africa by sheer military might, wished to be known as the champions of Western ideals, more Roman in this respect than the Romans whom they had driven out; it was their desire to maintain Africa as part of the Occident, and to be acknowledged as the fauteurs of an occidental, therefore for the Africans of a Roman civilization. But events brought about a reversal, and to-day there is no more thoroughly oriental spot on the globe than Tunis, within walking distance of Thrasamund's baths.

Two inscriptions may profitab'ly be inserted at this point:-
(1)bIII 35 FANUM DEI MERCURII RUINAM IM....DD(D) NN(N).............CONS.. PROCONSULATU AURELI CELSINI........TIONe SUA RESTAURAVIT..... IMBRIO GEMINIO FAUSTI.
(2) CII 183 IN NOMINE $\triangle O N$ EDIFIKBIMUS TURR TMPORIB DNI MAURICI IMPRS SUB PATRCO GENNAZIO ET JOANNI PRAeFECTO EDIFIKBERUNT...FF MAXIMIANUS ISTEFANUS ET MELLOSUS

Of these, (1) records the restoration of a ruined shrine of the god Mercury in the triple reign of three members of the Flavian dynasty, therefore between A.D. $337+$ and 340-, i.e. under Constantine II, Constantius II, and Constans, ${ }^{1}$ ) and thus reminds us very forcibly that paganism was by no means extinct after the"peace"of the Church. (2) on the other hand records the erection of a Byzantine tower under the reign of Maurice (A.D.582-602) ${ }^{2}$ ) in the name of the Lora", i.e.with the blessing of the Church. That is to say: on the one hand we have positive paganism asserting itself in an officially Christian but in fact neutral environment, on the other, a purely secular undertaking

[^70]carried out under the aegis of the Church. The contrast between Flavian and Byzantine relations of Church and State could not be more neatly epitomized than in the juxtaposition of these two texts.

We turn now to add to the martyrs' memorials a number of mixed items inscribed on the fabric of basilicas. The following metrical inscription, found at Caesarea, may serve to introduce this category:-
cV 69 AREAM ET SEPULCHRA CULTOR VERBI CONTULIT
ET CELLAM STRUXIT SUIS CUNCTIS SUMPTIBUS.
ECLESIAE SANCTAE HANC RELIQUIT MEMORIAM. SALVETE FRATRES PURO CORDE ET SIMPLICI: EUELPIUS VOS SALUTO SANCTO SPIRITU. ECLESIA FRATRUUM HUNC RESTITUIT TITULUM. M. A.I. SEVERIANI C V EX INGenio ASTERI.

## I.E.,

One who cherished the Word brought together both graveyard and sepulchres; he also built a retreat, contributing thereto all his wealth. He left this nemorial to the holy Church. Rejoice, brethren, with pure and simple heart: I, Euelpius, greet you in the Holy Spirit. The Church of the brethren restored this tomb. M.A.I. (?) Severianus, a man of senatorial rank, through the skill of Asterius.

Here we have a pleasant picture of the Early Church community: a pious land-owner, Euelpius, improves the fabric and devotes his fortune, doubtless by bequest, to securing a cemetery; he calls himself CULTOR VERBII, a pious title we already have learned to understand from the analogy of expressions like "servant of God,/Christ,"etc.: he means thereby that he is devoted to Christ. He addresses from the other side his old friends, whom he calls by the name "brethren", after the homely fashion of the primitive Church, () and requests them to regard the enhanced sanctuary and its preeincts as a memorial of himself. In the course of time, however, they make for him a splendid headstone, going about the business in a right brotherly manner: a man of standing defray£s the expenses, and a local craftsman exedutes the work.

1) Harnack, Mission ii 9-10

For the most part inscriptions of this kind are much less elaborate, and tell us much less about local affairs. The Catholic-Donatist disturbance is reflected to some extent in this type of material, rival sanctuaries opposing ome another just as in this country during the Disruption a hundred years ago: thus we find on the one hand CIV 43 BEATAM ECCLESIAM $=$ A blessed catholic Church. Fortunatianus, builder. ATM - ICINA FORTUNATIANI
and on the other, pieces like cIV 133 HAEC FACILIS PATET AULA SANCTIS etc. which Monceaux identifies as Donatist on account of the word SANCTIS, and our most recent accession of all, namely the timgad fragments

| CIV 258 HAEC JUBENTE |
| :---: | :--- |
| SACERDOTE DI |
| OPTATO PEREGI |
| (var.PERFECI) |$=\quad$| I carried out these tasks |
| :--- |
| at the behest of optatus, |
| the priest of God | on the basis of which Albertini concludes that the basilica in question was that of the famous Donatist bishmp Optatus?)

As a whole, however, the keystones and mosaics now under consideration talk not so much of division as of tranquillity and peace:-

CII 24 HIC DOMUS $\oplus$ ORATIO... $=$ here is the house of prayer
bIV 188 DOMUS DEI AULA PACIS = The house of God, the hall of peace
bIV 167 PRAECLARA ET DECORA The splendid and ornamental DOMUS DEI ET XPI house of God and of Christ DOMINI NOSTRI = our Lord SALVATORIS...... and Saviour..............

After all, as the epitaph bIII 143 ECCLESIA MATER VALENTIA IN PACE

1) M onceaux, HLAC iv 454
2) CRAIBL $1939 \mathrm{pp} .100-103$
reminds us, the Church is the Mother of all the children of God, in whose embrace they must all ultimately find reconciliation, if not in life, then at least in death. Cyprian and the inscriptions are here at one.

Three pieces refer to pilgrimage, whether in connection with specific relics or simply with veneration for holy places, we cannot say for certain:-
cIII 81 HEC PORTA DOMUS EST ECRESIE PATENS PEREGRINIS ET P.... bIV 156 ...NTI CIVES ET PEREGRI...IO FUNDATA LABORE. bII 70 ...UM DE 来 PEREGRINATIONE MUNITUM..................... 为

The first of these plainly announces that the sanctuary lies open tox pilgrims; by reading (p)io we may infer from the second that the sanctuary was the result of local townspeqople and pilgrims collaborating in a "work of piety"; while the third seems to reflect a similar situation, although the exact meaning is not at all clear. At all events these items show that pilgrimage was popular from the fourth century onwards: there were in fact holy places to which the pious thronged out of religious zeal.

Passing from the basilica as a whole to its component parts, we notice the curious piece $\bar{B} \sqrt{\text { VIRGINU CANC }}$ (cIV 21), plainly an announcement that this part of the building is reserved for nuns, where the $B B$ must stand for the familiar Donatist acclamation Bonis Bene. If this is the correct interpretation, and no other is at all suggested, then we have here an inconspicuous method of making known the allegiance of a congreagtion by means of artistic datails incorporated in the fabric of the place of worship. It is obvious that the acclamation has no relevance as such in this particular situation, but in abbreviated form has sunk to a mere hall-mark.

Baptism is the subject-matter of cV 47:-
SI QUIS UT VIVAT QUAERIT ADDISCERE SENPER HIC LAVETUR AQUA ET VIDEAT CAELESTia regna.

> i.e.,

Whoever seeks to attain life, let him wash with water and see the heavenly kingdom.

Much more interesting however is the elaborate inscription, the original of which has presumably perished, handed down through MS, the metrical composition namely of Calbulus a "grammaticus", designed for a baptistery in Carthage towards the end of the fifth century (cIII 515). It consists of five parts. First of all the following verses meet the eye of the candidate as he reaches the spot where he joins the clergy:

Crede prius veniens Xpi te fonte renasci: sic poteris mundus regna videre Dei.
Tinctus in hoc sacro mortem non sentiet unquam; semper enim vivit, quem semel unda lavat.
i.e.,

First, as you come, have faith in re-birth by the fountain of Christ:
Thus will you be sufficiently pure to see the realms of God.
Whoever is dipped in this holy element will never feel death; for whom the wave once washes, he lives for ever.

Then as he descends into the pool he reads:-
Descende intrepidus: vitae in fomenta perennis aeternos homines ista lavacra creant.
i.e.,

Go down without fear: these washings create men eternal in the spray of everlasting life.

As he rises from the pool he likewise reads:-
Ascende in caelos, animam qui in fonte labisti,(lavasti) idque semel factum sit tibi perpetuum.
i.e.,

Rise to the heavens, having washed your soul in the fountain; May what you have done once have an everlasting effect upon you.

On the other side, presumably for the benefit of the onlookers, the following couplet is inseribed:-

Peccato ardentes hoc fonte extinguete culpas; currite! quid statis? tempus et ora fugit.
i.e.,

Ye who burn with sin, blot out your guilt in this fountain; Run! Why do you stand there? Time flies, every hour of it! Finally Calbulus signs his name in a tristich with much pomp, which however is o no significance for our understanding of religious praxis. It is much to be regretted that as yet we cannot check this unique example by its original, if it has one. Meantime we record it and pass on.

The last three items which come under the head of inscriptions forming part of the fabric of the basilica are frank curiosities. In each case, a phrase is repeated over a square of pavement in such a manner, that at first glance nothing can be made of it; only when one fixes on the centre, and works outwards vertically and horizontally, therefore tracing a cross, does one succeed in discovering the phrase. SANTA ECLESIA for example, (holy Churah) is thus written ( cV 118):-

|  | AISELCECLESIA |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | ISELCEAECLESI |
|  | SELCEATAECIES |
|  | elceatctabcie |
| 5 | LCEATCNCTAECT, |
|  | Ceatcnanctaec |
|  | fatcmasaitctae |
|  | ceatcianctaic |
|  | LCEATCNCTAECI |
| 10 | elceatctascle |
|  | SELCEATAEGIES |
|  | ISELCEAECLESI |
|  | AISELCECLESIA |

Here, by starting from $S$ in the middle of line 7 and working round the whole design in every direction, we find the phrase SANCTA ECLESIA.

Similarly MARINUS SACERDOS (Marinus, the priest) and SEMPER PAX (peace always) are elaboratea on the same principle (cV 119,120). It is easy to see a connection between these ancient counterparts to our cross-word puzziles, which, it will be observed, are confined to Mauretania, and the well-known triahgular sign ABRACADABRAl) It is but a step, moreover, from morphol=ogical resemblances to essential analogies: these pavenent-idesigns found in basilicas, especially since they incorporate the sign of the cross, must certainly have a prophylactic value, protecting the edifices from the influence of evil spirits. Not only the cross which is implicit in them, but their prima facie meaninglessness must contribute to this end ( $\mathrm{p} \cdot 274!$ ). The phrases in question therefore function as magical formulae, fulfilling thereby a role to which their content appears well adaptea.

Biblical reminiscences appear to underlie cIV 3 DOMINU DUS MOSTER (?Psalms? - passim), cIII 693 AVE (?Maria)(cf.Luke i 28), certainly cIV 65 SALUTIS PRINCIPI... (Hebr. "XpXn Vov TVs ownmpids ii 10, Vulg. auctorem salutis, Vigilius of Thapsus, Africa, saec.V principem salutis, Diehl i 487 no .2498 n ) perhaps also cV 10 ORATIONIBUS SANCTORUM PERDUCET DOMINUS (Apoc. v 8, viii 3-4???). Nothing conclusive follows from these for the most part doubtful texts.

The fragments xIV 26 DEO LAUDES 27 SPES IN DEO XV 30,35 VIVAS IN DEO reproduce well-known acclamations, to which we may add bIV IO2 IN DEO VERTAS (in God is truth), although it is difficult to see at the moment what new knowledge is gained by these slight texts.

As an appendix to the sections on imprecations and invocations we might draw attention in passing to the ounce-weights stamped with
1)Kraus, RE j. 7 ; cf.Greek vowels in Pap.Leid.J 395(Dieterich, 19-20)
the cross (cIII 673-4,425,487,659,880,883), the terra-cottas and gems marked $\mid X Q Y C$ (aIII 1,3,81, aV 7) for which see pp.13-14 horeof and, for the history of the fish as an ancient symbol, Robert Eisler's exhaustive study? ) and the one hundred and eighteen Byzantine seals found in Carthage bearing their owners names in the form of a cross-shaped (cruciform) monogram, or a simple cross alongside the names. (cIII 700 and following passim). We can hardly be wrong in interpreting these phenomena along the lines adopted to explain the cruciform word-puzzles found in Mauretanian basilica ruins (pp. 504-5) and in seeing in them a large-scale magical praxis, whereby ftate affairs and business transactions were placed under the protection of Christ and His Cross. Everywhere in fact where malignant spirits and the Evil Eye threatened to interfere with the plans of men, the cross was invoked in this manner. We are thus in a position to supplement our meagre stock of magical texts strictly understood with statistically significant material of the same order: church, court, and market-place, throughout the Byzantine period, were all alike placed under the protection of the cross, quite as a matter of course, in the most perfunctory manner possible.

Finally, we have very little to add to our treatment of the epitaphs. It is presumed that most of the "fragments" (x - ) are epitaphic, and we have examined them with some care, in the hope of supplementing our knowledge in this direction. But when everything is taken into consideration, including the unsatisfactory state of the material generally, most of which requires substantial conjecture to render it at all intelligible, we must confess that from our

[^71]present point of view the fragments as a whole are worthless. Even as sources of names they add nothing to what we already know. If there is any text we should like to adduce as a final footnote to this rich category, it is bIV 191:-

* SaLVE ETERNUM MIHI f

MAXIME FRATER ETERNUMQUE = VALE

Hail forever, Maximus, my brother! And forever farewell:
where the Constantinian monogran alone suggests a Christian origin, the epitaph being otherwise quite pagan, the SALVE..... VALE in particular being a characteristically pagan formulal) This text is thus a fine epitome of the spirit of the fourth century position of the Church, standing as it did petween the period of the persecutions on the one hand and the Byzantine period of cultural dominance on the other. It reflects the fourth century as a period of transition.

We close this miscellaneous section with a handful of texts that cannot easily be connected with any one category, but stand by themselves. To begin with a few problems must be mentioned, starting with bII 67:-
donnus jainarius unde vinculatus exivit et gratias egit SIMPLICI LIGA VONO TUO SE LIGA $\dot{k}$
Prima facie the repetition of the root LIG (to bind) suggests a defixion; but whatever the text means, it is impossible to make sense out of it along that particular line. "Lord Januarius. Whence having been bound with chains he went out and gave thanks": so far the translation is fairly certain. Moreover we have found DOMINUS inter

[^72]alia applied as a title of particularly profound respect to martyrs (p.163), so that Januarius may well be a martyr; and we know of martyrs having exulted in their chains, rendering thanks to God on hearing the death-sentence ( p .224 ). The meaning of our text is so
far clear therefore: Januarius a martyr is here celebrated, this being the spot where he left his judges (exivit) glorying (et gratias egit) in his shackles (vinculatus). Bruston ${ }^{1)}$ adduces in this connection bIV 138 DONATUS MILE X, already discussed (p.175), which apparently depicts such a scene, and interprets the second line, reading LIGatus....LIGatus, to mean that Januarius is bound to a fellow-prisoner named Simplex (SIMPLICI), although it is not at all clear how we should resolve VONO TUO SE. In spite of this crux there can be no doubt that he is substantially correct, since a coñsistent picture is thus won from an otherwise baffling text.

Another problem is presented by cV 42:-
CLAUSULA JUSTITIAE EST MARTYRIUM VOTIS OPTARE HABES ET ALIAM SIMILEM AELEMOSINAM VIRIBUS FACERE

Here again the first line is fairly plain: "To seek martyrdom by means of vows is the fulfilment of righteousness"; that is to say, a wish for martyrdom constitutes moral perfection. But what of line two? Literally it reads, "you have another work of mercy also, like it, to do with your strength". Here two difficulties confront us:
(I) we should expect "Pro viribus" if the translation is right, and (2) in what sense can martyrdom be regarded as alam, in order that the "alms" mentioned here should resemble it? Regarding (I) we should probably look on VIRIBUS as a contamination of PRO VIRIBUS and VIRIS,

[^73]signifying therefore "to men with all your might". If so, the text sets forth a contrast to martyrdom, in the shape of something else: the latter we do to men; presumably therefore martyrdom is something done to God. We are thus reminded of the evangelical command, to love God with all our heart (on the one hand) and our neighbour as ourselves (on the other). I) In terms of this contrast we can understand martyrdom as the supreme manifestation of love towards Gon, just as the sacrifice of life is the ultimate measure of purely human lové . This exegesis helps to explain (2), since the giving of one's very life may be regarded as the supreme example of alms. We cannot at the moment think of any concrete example of this idea in our immediate material, or even in the Christian literature of the time; but we can point to a passage of Buddhist lore in which this connection is quite explicit. According to Jataka iii $51 / 10$ (Birth-story 361), the god Sakka, disguised as a Brahman, and wishing to prove the character of the Future Buddha, then incarnated in a hare, roamed the forest where the hare lived, and obtained alms from a vafiety of other animals, who had substantial stores; when he came to the hare, however, the latter, having nothing else to offer the Brahman, offered himself with the words,"To-day I will give alms such as I never gave before; ...Go, my friend, and gather wood, and when you have made a bed of coals, tell me. I will sacrifice my life by jumping into the bed of live coals. And as soon as my body is cooked, do you eat of my flesh, and perform the duties of a monk! ${ }^{3}$ ) If as we suggest this tale supplies a key to the thought underlying cV 42 , then it is to be

1) Matthew xxiiif 37-39
2) John $x$ v 13
3) Warren, Buddhism in Translations,HOS iii p. 278
understood as a mild protest against the extravagant zeal for martyrdom, characteristic of the Donatists (p.486), which was now and then cultivated in fanatical circles of the Early Church at the expense of more homely and less spectacular virtues. This holds good even if Monceaux's pmetuation HABES ET ALIAM SIMILEM, AELIMOSINAM VIRIBUS FACERE, ${ }^{\text {I }}$ ) is preferred. Either way, it is as though someone, perhaps a Catholic, had said: "Yes, you are quite right, martyrdom is the ultimate proof of a steadfast faith, and we acknowledge it; but that need not prevent you from being helpful to your fellowmen in the mean time. After all, you may never be called upon at all to witness as a martyr: why then make a special show of piety? Remember the Lord's command, and fuliil the tasks that lie to hand in the need of your brethren, before stretching out beyond what is required of you:" Only by some such resort to direct speech can justice be done to the subtlety of this singular inscription.

A "dolium" or large cask bears the following inscription in cursive, which has long baffled critics (c| Il5):-

ORA PRO QUI FECIT QUI AD MAGIS ERUNOS IAM NOVIT ET BENEFECIT ORA PRO ISCRIPTOREM SIC ABES DM PRO

Provisionally this illiterate piece might be rendered:-

```
Pray for him who made it.
He has already known a great deal of trouble,
yet he did good.
Pray for the writer.
Thus you have God (for a protector?/I seek, I ask, I pray?)
```

[^74]It will be observed that for the most part the inscription is plain enough. The only serious crux is SIC ABES DM PRO. Seston reads here $P$ (eto) $R$ (ogo) $O$ (ro), and Chatelain PROtectorem. ) On the whole we think the latter more probable. This text (saec.V ex.) is of interest only as illustrating the way in which the craftsman might appeal for the prayers of his clients, compare the acclamation "Whoso made it, may he live, and he who purchased it" (cV l69) already mentioned (p.229). That both texts occur in Mauretania may or may not be a mere coincidence.

Of a unique inseription found at Carthage the following tantalizing fragments of lines remain (cIII 28):-

## ISSIMORUM PATRIARCHARUM ET UNIVIR.

pa SANCTITATE UNDE CUM DIU DISCEPTARE
.......IMUS DISPOSITIONEM SANCTAE MEMORIAE.
RE....RE VEL PASCERE NEQUE PUBLICE NEQUE APUT SUO
5
DINARUM NON ACCEDANT SET QUONIAM A.
M HONORIFICENTIA COMMEMORARE ET PR...........
SIMUS SED QUIA RES TAM GRAVISSIMA APIR.
AE APPELLATUR PROTOGAMIA ADEQUE PRIMA.
IONEM VENIRE AUSUS FUERIT Qui VINDICAV.
10
CUMQUE MODO JUBANDOS ESSE PUTABERINT C.
TIS PROMISIT IPSE VOS EIDEM MERCEDI PARTI
QUE DIE NUPTIARUM QUARTA FERIA FIANT.
Prima facie this piece is an official document (patriarchs, I) which deals with regulations of some kind , at first somewhat obscure owing to the seemingly unconnected phrases left in lines l-7, but afterwards, as PROTOGAMIA (8) and NUPTIARUM (12) clearly show, quite definitely concerned with marriage. That is the utmost that can be made of it as it stands. Both extremities of the original have been lost, and their scope is an unknown quantity. Nevertheless in 1921

[^75]a reconstruction of the lost parts was offered by seckel, who, with amazing audacity and something not far short of divination, established the following connections: A general synod issues decrees expelling the twice-married from the Church, in order that it may remain holy (1-2), and while leaving the question open whither the faithful should be allowed to share communion with those expelled on this ground, approving at the same time that they should be given a Christian burial (2-3), providing however that no hospitality be shown them, the faithful being recommended indeed even to avoid frequenting the market-place for fear of the risk of conversing with them (4-5). The decrees further prohibit absolutely the practice, apparently popular, of praying and making offerings on behalf of the welfare of the twice-married dead (5-6). In view of the gravity of the problem the decrees set forth an unambiguous definition of their requirements, by declaring illegal all unions other than those called by the name of PROTOGAMIA (first marriage) and those accomplished immediately after baptism (7-8). Whoever presumes to defy this ruling is to be expelled, a like punishment being visited upon those who approve or encourage such disobedience (9-10). An appeal is made to the parable of the talents (1I) and the text breaks off with the warning, that marriages, elen when legal in the sense of the decrees, must on no account interfere with the regular fasts (12).

One must admire without stint this remarkable feat of minute scholarship, which in fact has remained substantially unchallenged. On the other hand, by assigning the document in question to the third

[^76]century and to Montanist circles on account of its rigorism, and by seeing in it proof of a hitherto unsuspected ecclesiastical system developed within the Montanist movement, Seckel called forth opposition from Bickel, who in a paper issued two years laterl) chose on the contrary to regard it as a Donatist document legislating for proselytes from the Catholic party. Now when expets fall out, a magnificent apparatus of patristic citations being marshalled on each side, it is not altogether easy for the inexperienced observer to see the issue clearly amid the smoke and din of the bombardnent; yet internal, i.e. in this case purely epigraphical, grounds speak in favour of second thoughts on this question. According to Seckel, and indeed prima facie, SANCTAE MEMORIAE (3) is an epitaphic formula in which we recognize a point of contact with material already examined amid a bare region otherwise void of such stigmata. Now BONAE MENORIAE, the current formula of which this is a variation, occurs not at all in the first three centuries in our material, but only from the fourth century onwards (p.380). SANCTAE MEMORIAE, in so far as it occurs, is confined moreover to the fifth and following centuries ( p .400 ) thus resembling SANCIUS generally as an element in the vocabulary of epigraphical monuments, for example as a title for martyrs and heroes ( p .157 ). Hence this document cannot have been drawn up previous to the fourth century, and most probably dates from the fifth or sixth century. With this estimate its orthography and, so far as it can be judged from the CIL, its palaeography also, agree. Therefore although the Montanists did in fact forbid re-marriage,

1) Hermes LVIII (1923) pp.426-440
2)Bonwetsch, Texte zur Geschichte des Montanismus pp.18,24-32
this cannot be a Montanist document. The only circles in which it could have been composed during the fifth century or later were those of the Donatist schismatics, as a part of whose earnest, uncompromising, almost fanatical piety, often noticed before and discussed in closest summary on pp.468-9, its rigorism is readily thinkable, and who even in the fourth dentury possessed the organization needed to issue it, namely the collective authority of regular councils!) Moreover we have repeatedly had occasion to remark upon traces of the Montanist tradition in Donatism (pp.154,162,186-187). Here then it is natural to see one more point of contact. Apart therefore from its significance as the record of a schismatic ecclesiastical enactment otherwise unattested in the sources of Early Church History, cIII 28 has a twofold interest for us inasmuch as it illustrates on the one hand the continuity, proximately historical, ultimately psychological, of the Montanist and Donatist movements, on the other, the handing by Early Church rigorists of a problem as a matter of principle, which in wider circles then, and generally since, has been regarded as indifferent and left to private taste.

Prima facie cIV 63:-
...UNU..VES..RES UNUM D...E MUNUS + AECLESIA..UNUS...OR CELEBRE ...ABET UNA FIDES + DOM...S...MEN..CA ET CURA PROBANTI + TIST.. looks hopeless. On colser inspection, however, it emerges, along with cIV 62 CEDE PRIUS NOMEN...VITATI CEDE VETUSTAS REGIA LETANTER VOTA DICARE BIBET HAEC PETRI PAULIQUE SEDES CRISTO JUBENTE RESURGIT as an adaptation of part of Pope Sixtus the Third's ceremonial inscription at Rome in the Basilica of Santo Rietro in vincoli, ${ }^{\text {P }}$

[^77]of which lines $1-4$ correspond to $C I V 62$, and lines $5-7$ to what is left of cII 63.) We should probably therefore regard cIV 62 and 63 as fragments of one and the same stone. The question of a manual does not arise here as in the case of the Tipasa-Cuicul problem, (pp.488-495) this being plainly a case of direct copying. The tendency however is fundamentally the same, and is of minor interest.

In connection with cIII $28(\mathrm{p} .511)$, cII 81 may be reproduced:-
ENTES ET HOC NON LICERE EC... RIO ABBATEM AUT PRESBUTERU.. NTES MONACHI ABBATEM SIB...SITA DATIONE SANCIMUS AN...IORE ESSE INIQUITATIBUS ALIENUM V...IARUM MINISTRIS AdSOLENT FIERI IU.... IN EODEM SANCTI MARTURIS STEPHANI...ERINT DELECTATI INSUPER VERO EXP...ONASTERIO CONSTITUTAS VEI IPSIS...ANI EDIC...FIRMAVUS P... SOLUM IN TA.
"Hoc non licere", "sancimus", "fieri ju(bemus?)", "constitutas", and "firmamus" combine to fix the category of this piece: it is a legal enactment of some sort. Moreover the mention of "the hoIy martyr Stephen" stigmatizes it as Christian, while the numerous references to presbyters, monks, and an abbot, together with the word ONASTERIO, Which must certainly be rendered"Monastery", further delimit the scope of the document: it embodies regulations to be observed by the "religious". Unfortunately there is not enough continuity to determine the precise terms of the regulations, or even their context. But if we supplement IN EODEM SANCTI MARTURIS STEPFANI by means of MONASTERIO, as (M)ONASTERIO below suggests we should, and translate "in that same monastery of the holy martyr stephen", as if it had been mentioned previously, then it would be possible to regard this piece as regulating the election of an abbot, and directing the clergy concerned to assemble in the monastery for that purpose. At all events

[^78]something of the kind underlies this inscription, which aldne of all our material mentions monks and monasteries, and thus constitutes a precious monument of African conventual praxis.

Four items are of interest as illustrating the way in which metre was used for didactic purposes. All are taken from de Rossi's second volume.

The first, entitled "Verses of the holy Cross"(cIII 516), thus expounds a doctrine which we might well have constructed synthetically for ourselves from the material already examined:-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Qui fugis insidias mundi, crucis utere signis: } \\
& \text { Hac armata fides protegit orne malum. } \\
& \text { Crux Dni mecum, crux est quam semper adoro, } \\
& \text { Crux mini refugium, crux mihi certa salus. } \\
& \text { Virtutum genetrix, fons vitae, janua caeli, } \\
& \text { Crux Xpi totum distruit hostis opus. } \\
& \text { i.e., } \\
& \text { You who flee the snares of the world, employ the sign of the } \\
& \text { cross: a faith armed therewith protects from all evil. The } \\
& \text { cross of the Lord is with me, it is the cross that I ever } \\
& \text { adore, the cross is my refuge, the cross is my certain } \\
& \text { salvation. The mother of virtue, the fount of life, and } \\
& \text { gateway to heaven, the cross of Christ lays low the work } \\
& \text { of the adversary. }
\end{aligned}
$$

To be sure, we know well enough what the "insidiae" of the world are, namely those evil, envious spirits of the ABIS NOTTURNA type(p.245). We know also how the cross was sought as a refuge against every risk wherever misfortune misfortune might threaten, and how Christians resorted to it and carried it with them to every enterprise (p.506). In cIII 623 ( p .241 ) we see how it "distruit hostis opus!' It clears the way also for petitions directed to heaven: invocations to the Virgin are frequently set out in the shape of a cruciform monogram (p.283). We therefore understand what is meant by "janua caeli.

But what are we to make of "virtutum genetrix" and "fons vitae"? Resorting to etymological shifts, we observe the roots VIR $=\operatorname{man}$ and GEN = to procreate, which underlie the former expression; and "spring of life" recalls the Johannine description of Christ's gift to the believer, namely a well of water springing up within him to everlasting lifel) In what sense the Cross can be spoken of in such terms, however, is still far from obvious. We are therefore forced to view the poem as a whole and to ask the question: What is it which the believer carries about with him and cherishes always, from which he derives confidence in the face of the world, with which as with a key he gains access for himself to the delights of heaven, which guarantees to him his manhood and the ability to perpetuate it, the source within him, in short, whence life itself issues without limita The symbolic language of this composition coincides precisely with the imagery, long since familiar, of areams ${ }^{2}$ ) and woris or art, ${ }^{3}$ ) so that what was formerly an hypothesis ( p . 270) can now be claimed as a result, positively attested: the fact namely, that in the Early Church the Cross came to serve as a phallic symbol. We leave it to others to investigate the mechanisms whereby our perfervid poetaster, meditating on the Atonement, at the sane time sang praises to his own vital impulses, and choose rather to infer from the phenomenon as it stands the completeness with which the Gospel permeated the ancient Worla. The stability of religious symbolism moreover is remarkable: the Cross displaced the phallus in Africa (p.242) only to give place to ${ }^{\text {t }}$ once more, namely under Islam, which employs it to this day?)

1) John iv 14
2) Freud,ILPs 126-129
3) Rank \& Sachs, Psychoanalysis 13 sqq.
4) see below p. 589

The second MS text inculcates a prudential morality in a form which for frankness and naiveté can hardly be surpassed (bIII 174):-

Si noseinvitant promissa praemia justis,
Si territ injustis poena praedicta (gehennae),
Si cum Christo esse et (semper) regnare cupimus, Quae ad Christum et regnum ducant, illa faciamus.
i.e.,

If we find the prizes promissed to the righteous inviting, If the penalties threatened to the unrighteous(in hell)terrify us,
If we desire to be with Christ and reign (for ever),
Then whatever leads to Christ and the Kingdom,
that let us do.

The third, inscribed by Peter, a "referendarius", i.e. imperial secretary or liaison officer in charge of negotiations transacted between the Emperor and magistri $\frac{1}{9}$ ) in the Palace of the Vandal kings at Carthage, proclaims a blind faith which will have nothing to do with reason (cIII 597):-

Qualiter intacta processit virgine partus
Utque pati voluit natus, perquirere noli.
Haec nulli tractare licet, sed credere tantum.
i.e.,

How childbirth was possible in the case of an untouched virgin,
And how He who was born could resolve to suffer, be not thou wishful to investigate!
No one has a right to discuss these topics, but only to believe that they were so!

The fourth is ascribed to the great Augustine himself (cIV 193):-
Quisquis amat dictis absentium rodere vitam,
Hac mensa indignam noverit esse suam.
i.e.,

Whoever takes pleasure in puikling to pieces in his conversation the lives of absent parties, let him understand that his own (life) is not worthy of this table.

Thereby hangs a tale, which we cannot do better than reproduce in the

1) Hanton, in Byzantion IV (1927) p. 123
words of the bishop's biographer Possidius:f "Against the depravity of human custom he had this legend written on his dining-table, QUISQUIS AMAT \&c, and he was in the habit of sharply taking to task any who forgot the inscription, saying with much feeling, that either these verses would have to be erased from the table, or he himself would be obliged to take leave of the company and retire to his own room:" ${ }^{1)}$ On the face of it the inscription and commentary appended to it sound apocryphal, and even if it were not, the wood must have long since disintegrated whereon it is said to have been written, so that there is no hope of recovering the original, if any, at this time of day. If this inseription has but a slender right to figure in our collection for preaisely this reason, yet it is too good a one to be spared in a discussion of ancient manners.

Returning to our material of the normal type, we notice with some interest that the Sabbath is mentioned twice: (I)In the year 508, a person whose name is lost (cIV 77) died towards the end of July ORA VIII SABBATORUM DI (E), at the 8 th hour of the Sabbath day; (2) a bilingual epitaph, cII 82 of our collection, reads:-

岑 IN NE DNI..IN HOD....PETRI SENIORIS C...ET OVIIT DIE
SABB....XIIXIII IND COU..

noto $\sigma \theta$ ETOVS $0 \ldots \theta$... $\theta$ add $\pi \alpha$ U..... invt

Now in general, the Sabbath, which is mentioned also in Roman material dated $449^{2}$ ) and $565^{3}$ ), is quite clearly the Jewish feast, since texts can be adduced on which the year and day of the month are given,

1) Riese, Anthol.Lat. 769 note.
2) de Rossi I 745
3) de Rossi I 1098
enabling us to calculate the Sabbath to have fallen on Saturday.) In the bilingual text (cII 82) however, it would seem that avalidu in the Greek portion is the counterpart of DIE SABB... in the Latin,
 If the reference here be to the Jewish Sabbath, one would expect the Greek to read $\sigma^{\alpha} \beta \beta \infty T O V$, transliterating the Hebrew as always in the New Testament?) "Day of rest" however is descriptive, and suggests not only the Sabbath as celebrated by Jews, but also the Sunday as observed by Christians at the end of the fourth century, by which time the legislation of Constantine I, together with the enactments of Gratian and Theodosius $I$, had reduced Sunday to a dies non, on which business and pleasure were alike forbiden, the total result being a virtual Sabbath, or day of rest?) Under these circumstances it is incredible that "day of rest" on a Christian inscription of such late date as CII 82 could refer to Saturday, which was not in fact a day of rest, Sunday alone being appropriate, since it was in fact the one and only day of the week to which the term could be applied by Christians. In any case it is certain that cII 82 is late enough: the cross, the contractions NE $=$ nomine, DNI $=$ domini, the dating by indiction, the orthographical irregularity OVIIT for OBIIT, and COU... "which we must expand COUarta corresponding to IND (=quarta) combine to mark it Byzantine, and late Byzantine at that, probably seventh century. Hence cII 82 attests the beginning of a usage even yet not quite extinct: in Scotland preachers of the old school are still to be fozund, who speak of the Sabbath, and wish to know nothing of Sunday.
[^79]We close this miscellaneous section and therewith the analysis in general by citing one more inscription, whose importance far transcends its length. A ring has been found (cIII 599) bearing the following Iegend:-
(a) (b)

Here RENOBATUS is manifestly the well-known Christian name; H EIM and CE WP (a) are the Greek characters still legible; and the addition marked (b) is Monceaux's ingenious restoration of lost letters. The whole therefore reads, "Renovatus, the hour of destiny awaits you!". The crosses, combined with the name, establish the Christian origin of the text. This must be emphasized, since "He Heimarmene", which Monceaux reads, is not a neutral expression, but a technical term of the Greek mystery-cults, applied to the inexorable influence of the celestial bodies determining the actions of ordinary mortals, the philosopher alone, i.e. the man who attains "gnosis", being able to rise above it and shake himself free from its shacklesl) It is surely significant in this connection that the name Renovatus belongs to the category of Dogmatic names ( p .425 ) derived as a whole from the Greek mysteries (pp.432-433). Monceaux's restoration is thus so far well grounded. Moreover CE is undoubtedly the accusative of the 2nd person singular: Renovatus is thereby addressed as the object of a verb whose subject is He Heimarmene. cup is obviously Hora, "hour", and is to be taken with He Heimarmene. MENEI therefore, or some such verb, is inevitable, and the sense must be that above extracted: as he wears this ring, Renovatus is from time to time warned that fate has the last wod. So then after all, Renovatus is not a "gnostic"

[^80]but on the contrary an ardinary mortal, subject like the common herd to what we now would call the "uniformity of Nature!! Now this is truly remarkable! Here is a man bearing a name and using an expression belonging to mystical religiosity, but in an entirely non-mystical sense: For him, Christ did not apparently fulfil the role of the saviour-god who raised him above the Heimarmene: on the contrary, Christ's role for him was that of the Coming Judge of primitive Christian Apocalyptic ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) depersonalized through assimilation to the idea of universal necessity, in the last resort to the Heimarmene itself. One cannot otherwise account for the orientation of the text. It is as if a man brought up in the tradition of the mysteries, or at least familiar with their language, wes were thrilled by the freshness of a world-view radically different therefrom, and wished th give expression to his new-found enthusiasm in as drastic a manner as possible, with the affirmation namely: religion is not release from, but acknowledgement of, and acquiescence in, above all assent to, the Power in control of events. One must answer for one's deeds some day, therefore have a care! The assimilation of the Gospel to the mystery-cults of its environment has been often enough emphasized. Here, unless we have committed a radical error of exegesis, the relationship is reversed: Christ is no sacramental saviour, but Judge of the individual, constituting him as a responsible person bound to answer for the decisions he makes here and now from time to time. The language of the mysteries is strained to the breaking-point in the attempt to do justice to this non-mystical conviction.

[^81]
## INTERLUDE : TRANSITION TO IDEOLOGY

The epigraphical remains of the African Church, empirically treated, have thus been forced to disclose its Praxis. That a proximate result only has been thereby reached, from the standpoind adopted beforehand, is plain from two considerations. On the one hand, methodological limitations have from time to time asserted themselves, in greater or less measure in the course of the demonstration, and again most emphatically as the attempt is made to gain a general view, inasmuch as beyond the bounds of Praxis large tracts of Ideology are more or less clearly to be discerned. Thus for example the Epitaphs in particular contained data which could be related readily to the worldview of the community, and scarcely or not at all to its mode of life in the sense of habit and action. In general, also, the world-view is to be found implicit in the Praxis: for when men venerate relics of dead heroes, perform vows to the Deity, devise charms against the ills of life, draw inspiration from a holy book, are silent regarding the worldy achievements of the deceased but praise his merits and describe his other-worldly fate corresponding thereto, a specific theory of Deity, divine holiness with which persons and things may be invested, and the relativity of the world, etc. is plainly presupposed. Behind the actions of the community lie its thoughts which aIone make them possible. On the other hand, the Praxis as it lies before us can scardely be sunmarized beyond what is given from time to time under the heading of "Results" appended to the discussion of the separate categories of inscription: of itself it provides no nucleus round which it can be organized in synoptic fashion so as to
produce a clear picture which it would be easy to grasp and formulate in a few words. In order therefore to reduce the Praxis to a unity we must pass beyond it, to a consideration namely of the Ideology of the African Christian community which as we have seen it presupposes, since nowhere else can we find any prospect of unifying our impressions of the popular religion of the Early Church as developed on African soil. But since an examination of its Ideology leads to the ultimate roots of its Praxis also, it serves not only to supplement the results of the foregoing discussion, but also to deepen them; and a significant advance towards the final understanding of our problem is thus won. In this way the posterior justification of ideological questions as an essential stage in the exposition, prescribed a priori beforehand, becomes clear.

## SECTION TWO : IDEOLOGY

Following the method already laid down for this section (pp.114-116) we proceed from Theology through Anthropology to Eschatology, thus coming to closer grips with the problem in successive stages.
(1) Theology

The inscriptions speak of God as commanding, giving signs? ) smiting buildings so that they are consumed with fire, but also as showing favour ${ }^{4}$ ) granting help, and in general being propitious. ( ) and giving victory ${ }^{7}$ ) and peace8) In fact there is nothing fe cannot do: He is

[^82]simply omnipotentl) He can do anything He pleases, whether for Man's good or ill; He is in a position to issue orders and grant requests: in short, He is a person. Men are at His mercy, as we see from a certain class of personal name (pp.430-431 on ADEODATUS, DEUSDEDIT, etc.) but can bargain with Him and lay claims to His recognition, this being the ultimate implication of the custom of making vows, see pp.297-300. In homely fashion, moreover, He is thought of as dwelling in a house, this being the name frequently applied to the church-building.) But although His arm is invoked against demons of mischief ${ }^{3}$ ) and things are said to happen in His sight ${ }^{4}$ ) quite a human picture of the Deity thereby resulting, we are again and again reminded that $H e$ is larger than human: if $H e d w e l l s$ wi th us, it is as a king, since his dwelling is a royal one, a "King's House", a basilica; and if from time to time He is known affectionately as our father, ${ }^{6}$ ) His current designation is Lord ${ }^{7}$ ) exactly as in the case of the Emperors (p.118), and the pious speak of themselves as His slaves (pp. 394-395 on titles of humility). Above all, He is eternal.) He is none other than the Creator Himself? not many but one ${ }^{10}$ )

A prima facie contrast to this personal idea of God is afforded by an impersonal idea, not so much expressed in our material as by implied $\dot{\text { in }}$ it. Almost the only direct attestation occurs in the solitary example of the term NUMEN already discussed (p.291), which

1) CIV23 IN N DEI OMNIPOT 2) CIV281 DOMUS DEI CIII542 DOMUS DIBINE bIV161, CIV247 DOMUS DOMINI 3) CIII888 LIGABIT TE DEI BRACHIUM 4) CIV57 IN CONSPECTU DNI 5) CIV248 HIC DEUS ABITAT XIV21 DEUS NOBISCUM 6)p.524n.8, cIV18 I N PATRIS CIII95 IN NOMINE PATRIS 7) CIV25 DOMINE bIII84 IN NOM DOM, nn. 2,4 8) CIII30 ECCE TUA VITA CUM DEO NOSTRO IN AETERNUM bIIII2 DEPOSITA APUT DEUM IN AFTERNUM 9)bI63 DEUS CREATOR 10)bIVI31 Elc oeac
to be sure is sufficiently unambiguous. Rather one is obliged to infer its existence from such features of the Praxis as the veneration of the relics of the saints ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) the use of their names for prophylactic purposes, 2) the similar use of divine names 3) and formulae ${ }^{4}$ ) together with symbols, alrove all the Crossy) the sanctity attached to specific objects, ${ }^{6}$ ) places, ${ }^{7}$ ) seasons ${ }^{8}$ ) and persons, ${ }^{9}$ ) and lastly, the invocation of divine power in general on the side of life-affirming tendencies against the destructive influence of the Evil Eye, itself an impersonal demonic magnitude, and the impersonal demonic in generallo) Brought together, all these customs proclaim the underlying conviction of an all-pervasive divine quality, emanating from God, $\boldsymbol{K}^{\text {which }}$, any object, person, place, or season, originally neutral, may become invested through association directly or indirectly. An ordinary man, for example, who suffers martyrdom for religion's sake, becomes thereby a saint; his remains are therefore precious to the pious, and the spot where they are buried becomes a holy place of pilgrimage; drops of his blood or articles he once possessed are reverently preserved; and the day of his passion is remembered and celebrated year after year as it reappears in the course of the Calendar. In other words, a certain sanctity or divine quality is transferred by association in a manner almost palpable, exactly like an epidemic. There is literally no lirnit to the variety of directions in which "numen" may be transmitted, once contact has been established with its source, namely God, the Numen as such, and therefore impersonal.
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To the question which this contrast between the idea of God as Personal and Impersonal calls forth, namely: can the Theology of the Early Church be thereby characterized in terms of theological thinking in general? there is no imnediate answer. In its broad outlines the anthropomorphism attested by the material finds ready analogy in that of the ancient world, which formed its idea of Deity from its knowledge of Man; ${ }^{\text {l }}$ no less does the impersonal view of Deity expounded in the foregoing paragraph resemble the world-wide conception we call MANA which likewise was not wanting in the ancient world. On the other hand both types of theory coincide in the old Testament: the propthetic literature in particular reflects the personality of God in bold anthropomorphisms 3) while God's holiness infects in the most palpable manner the tabernacle, the worshippers therein, their eity, and the liturgical apparatus of the temple. ${ }^{4}$ ) Hence the problem: to which source (Jewish/Ethnic) are we to ascribe the ideas in question and in what proportion? A priori both conceptions might be traced to the same quarter, either Jewish or Ethnic; or, they might be apportioned separately. In this dilema the fact that the personal type of theologizing comes to complete expression (i.e. both explicitly and implicit $\notin l y$ ) while the impersonal type must be chiefly inferred from the Praxis (i.e. by implication) is quite decisive: the Idea of God as Personal, since it attains full expression, reproduces inter alia the explicit and fully-conscious teaching of the Church, and is therefore Biblical; whereas the Idea of God as Impersonal on the contrary,
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since it comes to expression in unreflecting action rather than in explicit formulations, is to be referred chiefly to the collective Unconscious of the ancient world in general, in this case the GraecoRoman world-view.

This conclusion reached on the basis of mere form is confirmed by material grounds also. The Anthropomorphisms in our texts are not at all Hellenistic, but altogether Jewish. Thus with the references given on p. 524 may be compared the O.T. idea of God's commandments as providing the foundation of moralityl) of God's will as shown by signs? ) of God's personal responsibility for the events of nature, ${ }^{3}$ ) of God's readiness to show favour to suppliants $\frac{4}{9}$ ) and of God's intervention in human affairs.5) Further on the evidence set out on $p$. 525 it is relevant to draw attention to the fact that in the O.T. the temple is spoken of as God's house, built expressly in order that He should dwell thereing, the "arm" of God") and "sight" of Goid are characteristic, God is called "Lord" ${ }^{9)}$ precisely in the manner of the Jewish kings, ${ }^{10}$ ) and praised as One, I) eternal ${ }^{1} 2$ 2) the Creator of the heavens and the earth!3) Moreover the ideological implicates of the Praxis are Ifkewise entirely Biblical: the dogmatic names concerned have been proved Jewish on the ground both of morphology and hermeneutics (pp43-431), and the votive dedications (pp.297-300) are related to the idea of covenant between God and the worshipper fundamental to the world-view of the Old Testamentl4) The Idea of God as Personal therefore, attested in our material, is through and
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through Biblical. The corresponding Idea of God as Impersonal, on the other hand, although it is consistent with the Biblical tradition as has been seen, has its ultimate inspiration elsewhere, in so far as its history can at all be established; for NUMEN, the only explicit witness to this type of theologizing in our material, is not at all ef a Jewish, but on the contrary a purely Roman term (p.291) applied not only to gods but also to emperors (pp.127,130). The idea, to be sure, is universal; the tradition however of this idea in our material is Roman. Hence the Idea of God current in African Christian circles represents the fusion of two distinct traditions, Jewish and Ethnic. But if it be further asked, How then were they reconciled? that is a senseless question, since on the one hand we are dealing not with a thoroughly-thought-out philosophical conception, but with popular belief, where rigid consistency is not to be expected; and on the other, both types coincide already in the O.T., which the Early Church studied not as historical data chronologically and topographically stratified, but as a closed Corpus of sacred scripture, and therefore of equal value and authority in all its parts!) Quite apart from this a transition from personal theologizing to impersonal is psychologically conceivable, since a residue of "otherness" survives even the most intimate personal intercourse: personality can never be wholly accounted for, but remains mysterious. When personality is further encountered on a uniquely grand scale (e.g. attribute of omnipotence) it is but a slight step from the merely unknown to the awful and demonic as such. For this reason Farmer traces the Idea of God as Personal to Man's experience of society, as Impersonal to Man's experience of nature, ${ }^{2}$ ) adding at once that both are ultimately
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identical.) Both historical and psychological grounds, therefore, speak in favour of this view of the problem. Finally it is perhaps significant that by far the most part of the evidences available as to the explicit enunciation of the Idea of God as Personal comesfrom Numidia (pp.524-525), the Idea of God as Impersonal on the contrary being almost exclusively inferred from Praxis common to all Africa. Numidia, as we know, was the seat of an earnest, zealous Christianity, (pp.468-469) a fitting centre therefore of positive Biblical teaching. Elsewhere Christianity was either less strong (peripheral regions) or more securely established (Zeugitana), so that from different causes an identical result is a priori likely to have issued, namely a relative receptivity towards non-Biblical influences. Hence by formulating the poblem in the above terms we gain a picture consistent both with itself and with what is already firmly established regarding the Praxis of the African Church.

With the possible exception of the Personal Idea of God as "father" (p. 525 n .6 ), which is however emphatically foreshadowed in the O.T. 2) there is nothing specifically Christian in the Idea of God just expounded. To the discussion of Christianity's peculiar contribution to Theology therefore, namely the Doctrine of the Trinity, we proceed forthwith.

First of all, the fact of its originality stands to be established. This is easily done, since from the detailed explanations, precise but in the last resort logically unintelligible, of the QUICUMQUE VULT, to the most recent and illuminating formulations of the dogma,

[^83]in terms of a Divine Society functioning in the unity of one Godhead? the Christian tradition has made it plain beyond doubt, that whatever it means by the Doctrine of the Trinity, it wishes thereby to distinguish its teaching about God from Polytheism on the one hand, for Christian Theology knows only one God, and Monotheism on the other, for it acknowledges in God much more than mere oneness, without at the same time incurring Pantheism, for it affirms personality of God not only as proximately, but also as ultimately valid. It formulates the Idea of God presupposed in Christian experience, and for this reason could only emerge in the course of the history of the Church, and not at its beginning: hence in the primitive period it is lacking or only dimly indicated. Between this meticulously-phrased formula, however, which even yet lacks perfect expression, and the well-known triple juxtapositions with which it is frequently compared, e.g. Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva; Ea, Marduk, Gibil; Mithras, Cautes, Cautopates and the rest, there is but one feature in common, namely the number three, whose magical use is universal; and there the resemblance ends. In every case it is a mere agglomeration of three elements that is in question, a Triad therefore, and not a Trinity in the technical Christian sense, as Clemens has rightly pointed out?)
(How now does this formula fare in our material? "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit", IN NOMINE PATRIS ET FILI ET SPIRITUS SANCTI ${ }^{3}$ ) reproduces the primitive baptism-version ${ }^{4}$ ) and must therefore be assumed to imply acknowledgement of the fantous
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doctrine, although of course it does not expound it. Otherwise the traces of it which can be established are somewhat abnormal. Most commonly all mention of the Spirit is omitted, and confession is made of the Lord our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, ${ }^{\text {I }}$ ) our Father the Lord God who is the Word?) (sermo for verbum, see p. 218) Almighty God and His Son Christ our Saviour, ${ }^{3}$ ) and Christ alone is sometimes confessed.4 Twice, namely in Mauretania, the phrase occurs: "in the name of God and His(sic) Christ, ${ }^{5}$ ) in which an adoptionist attitude to the Christological problem perhaps finds expression. Once "in the name of the Holy Spirit" occurs, ${ }^{6}$ ) and the "sacrosanct Spirit" is once mentioned (cV 69, see p. 500). Usually however the Spirit is but vaguely felt as an element in the formula, or altogether lacking. Once its place is actually usurped by the name of a mortal, when, namely, we read (pp.187-188) "In the name of the Father and the Son and Saint Montanus", with which we may compare "In the name of God and in the name of the martyrs" ${ }^{7}$ ) interpreting both expressions in the same sense: the Church, represented by its heroes, shares in the work of revelation and to that extent has a claim to rank alongside the Deity (a Montanist theory, see pp.187-188). To be sure, the naive character of our sources warns us against taking isolated curiosities of this Kind too seriously, and in any case it becomes increasingly difficult as time goes on, when asking questions about specifically Christian features in the Theology of the African Church, to avoiding- raising points proper rather
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to Eschatology as here understood; but it is possible and indeed necessary at this stage, in view of the condition of the evidence, to generalize the impression produced by the explicit language of the inscriptions themselves: the subtleties of the Doctrine of the Trinity were scarcely understood, and its significance hardly grasped, by the masses in the African Church. Otherwise it is impossible to account for the numerous aberrations which disfigure the formula as reproduced in the material.

In order to supplement this negative conclusion, namely that the African Church as a whole did not understand the Doctrine of the Trinity in its technical sense, by a positive one, in answer to the question namely, Then how did the common people envisage the Godhead Whose t¥uz triune constitution was familiar to all worshippers from the liturgical formulae in which it was praised? we must resort to an interrogation of the Praxis of the African Church as we already know it, since the sources have nothing explicit to say about it. Our leading clue in the interpetation of the Praxis is twofold: it consists on the one hand of the psychological presupposition that the association: Father - Son which the formula contains raises the thought, quite naturally, of a family as the unity embracing both; and on the other, the historical fact, ascertained above, that the Holy Spirit was vaguely or not at all appreciated by the ordinary pious mind, that on the contrary it tended to fall out of the picture either without surrogate altogether, or in favour of a more easily palpable representative of the charismatic function of the Deity. When therefore with this double presupposition before us we look
back upon the Praxis and ask the question: to whom in addition to the Father and the Son did the Early Church address its prayers, thereby bestowing upon these/this person(s) the value of Deity? only one answer is relevant in view of the conditions of the question: the Virgin Mary, Mother of God! (pp.275-289, 518). Ecclesiastical scruples and open confession before a priest notwithstanding, the average wowshipper of the West, when religiously stimulated, pictured the Godhead to whom he paid his vows and offered his prayers and whose protection he invoked against the manifold ills of life, not as a philosophical abstraction far beyond his understanding, but as a familiar group, palpably human: a family namely, father , mother, and child, whereby his sympathy was readily kinaled and adapted to devotional purposes. That the circles in which the Gospel according to the Hebrews was current spoke of the Holy Ghost as the Mother of Christl) does not raise the question of historical connection, but corroborates the likelihood of such a psychological development in general by witnessing to its occurrence in the East several centuries previously. Indigenous grounds are to be sought in the African cult of DEA MAGNA VIRGO CAELESTIS, the great virgin-godaess Caelestis, ${ }^{2}$ ) who shared the attributes of Tantt, Atargatis, Astarte, and Aphrodite, ${ }^{3}$ ) Aphrodite herself, it is to be noted, being praised in the ancient world as a mother-goddess, Venus Genetrix = Aphrodite Geneteira4) Nowhere indeed is the polytheism of antiquity more likely to have survived than just here. We have reason therefore to affirm on the
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basis of our material, that whereas the theologians of the Early Church succeeded in maintaining a specifically Christian doctrine of God by means of the Trinitarian formula, the masses in the Church, unable to grasp this formula or to understand its significance, interpreted it in quite a pagan, non-Christian sense. While the experts understood by the Trinity the Unity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to the popular mind it signified nothing more or less than Father, Mother, and Child. That thereby God's personality Was preserved at the expense of His unity, was inevitable, exactly as it was inevitable that the orthodox formulations of the Christian Idea of Gođ sacrificed God's personality on the altar of His unity. while Hence $\boldsymbol{f}^{\text {the }}$ theologizing of the experts in council resulted in a soulless metaphysic, the nameless multitude of the faithful, finding it impossible to worship an abstraction, fixed with the sureness of instinct upon the form of social organization in which personality reaches its highest development, and envisaged the Godhead no longer as an individual merely, still less as a structure inaccessible even to the most strenuously disciplined intellect, but simply as a farnily, a God namely and a Goddess, together with their Son. Thus the morst fears of theologians, orthodox and heretical alike, were realized and surpassed: the popular religion of the Early Church at the time of its extinction in Africa at the hands of Islam had as its basis a polytheistic Theology.

At bottom the specifically Christian element in the Theology of the Early Church is to be characterized precisely as was formerly its Theology in general, in terms namiely of the contrast bevteen the personal and impersonal Idea of God which comes to expression
therein. But whereas there the Personal Idea proceeded from the historical Church-tradition, and the Impersonal Idea from the nonChristian tradition in general, here on the contrary it is the pagan and unconscious tradition which produces the tendency towards personal, and fully-conscious Christian wrestling with the problem which produces that towards impersonal theologizing. Furthermore, there the Impersonal Idea (Mana) is naïve, and strictly speaking, SUB-personal, whereas here the Impersonal Idea (Doctrine of the Trinity) is the result of critical work whose intention it was to secure a SUPRA-personal picture of Deity. Again, a similar development is to be observed in the Personal Idea; for here a metamorphosis takes place whereby, as a result of excogitation, doubtless by no means altogether fully conscious, the Idea of God as a Solitary Individual, with its inevitable psychological limitations (e.g. the artificial isolation unexampled in nature, and the one-sidedness of the merely male as such) gives place to the Idea of God as a Community, (therefore SUPRA-individual) where alone an adequate and realistic delineation of Personality is possible. Throughout, therefore, the Christian theological problem emerges more and more clearly from our material: namely so to formulate the Idea of God, that its quatitative and qualitative aspects should be held in tension. The reason for this lies beyond the bounds of mere Theology (sic), which we must therefore bring to a close forthwith and start afresh with the question of Man.

## (2) Anthropology

Anthropological judgments fall into two main groups, according as they concern fact (quantitative) or value (qualitative), the former dealing with Man's constitution, the latter with Man's worth. The quatitative problem is twofold however, corresponding to Man's inner and outer constitution, the questions here being: what is Man's individual structure in terms of"mind"and"body"?(Idealism v. Naterialism) and, what is Man's social structure in terms of the concepts "individual"and"collective"(Liberalism v. Totalitarianism). The qualitative problem is likewise twofold, corresponding to the active and passive aspects of Man's existence respectively, the questions here being, is Man good (happy) or evil (miserable) by nature?(Optimism v. Pessimism). It is convenient to associate these questions with the sciences which correspond to them:-

| $\int(a)$ | spiritual / corporeal | - | Psychology |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\{(\mathrm{b})$ | individual / collective | - | Politics |
| f(a) | good / evil | - | Ethics |
| I ${ }^{(b)}$ | happy / miserable | - | Aesthetics |

A convenient schena is thus at hand with which to work.
I(a)Psychology. To the question, how is the individual constituted? there is strictly speaking no direct answer in all our material. A number of,texts, however, formulate the deathclause in such a way as to indicate a theory of the body-mind relationship; the passages concerned are these:-

| cV 157 REDDIDIT SPM | $=$ | gave up his spirit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CII 79 ANIMAM SUAM DEO ET XPO EJUS TRADIDIT | $=$ | handed over his spirit to God and His Christ |
| BIII 26 ANIMAM REDDIDIT | $=$ | gave up his spirit (soul) |
| bIII 212 VITAM SPIRANS | $=$ | breathing his life |
| CIV 182 DE CORPORE EXERUNT | $=$ | they went out of (their) body |
| bIV 2 EXIBIT DE CORPORE SUO | $=$ | he went out of his body |
| cIV 143 HUJUS ANIMA REFRIGERAT CORPUS IN PACE QUIESCIT | $=$ | his spirit (soul) enjoys refreshment; his body rests in peace. |

As they stand, these passages point to three conclusions: (I) any given man can be distinguished into two parts, body and soul, cIV 143. (2) his soul is one and the same with his breath, for which different words are used, e.g. spiritus, anima, cV 157 cII 79 bIII 26, no essential distinction being thereby indicated, but simply the vital principle itself, bIII 212. (3) ultimately a man is to be identified with his soul or breath, rather than with his body bIV 2 cIV 182.

With (I) we may, from kindred material, compare anima(m) corpusque, ${ }^{\text {l }}$ the distinction apparently being final, and the aphorism: "in me is a body of earth and a spirit belonging to the sky", terrenum corpus caelestis spiritus in me.) Morphologically identical analogies to cIV l43 abound:- "you gave, Petronius, your body to the earth, and your soul to Christ", corpus humo animam Chro Petroni dedisti; ${ }^{3)}$ "the stars welcome his soul, nature receives his body",

[^84]astra fovent animam corpus natura recepit; ${ }^{1}$ ) "his spirit seeks the stars, his body lies in the urn" spiritus astra petit corpus in urna jacet?) With (2) the couplet may be compared: "Here Zoticus left a bare empty name; his body has been dissolved into cinders, his life into the air" Zoticus hic nomen nudum vanumque reliquit, in cineres corpus et in aethera vita soluta est?) The pre-occupation With the soul and nonchalant attitude towards what remains shown in another piece, "the stars posses his soul, the earth holds the rest of him" astra tenent animam caetera tellus habet4) provides the transition to the material to adduced in support of (3). Here first we note the couplet "His life's course done he passed to the skies, giving his earthy part to the tomb, his soul to the upper regions", exacto vitae transcendit ad aethera cursu, terrenum tumulo dans animam superis.5) Plainly, since he went aloft, i.e. to the"upper regions"(superis) the deceased is identified with his soul. Speaking of the saints, another piece declares that we have no need of a body in order to reach them, but only of a soul, corpore non opus est, anima tendamus adillos6) Further, two texts, both of thern Christian, "he laid his limbs in the ground, and forged aloft to the stars", membra solo posuit caeli perrexit ad astra? and "having laid his limbs here, he made his way, a pure being, to the sky", hic positis membris purus perrexit ad aethram, leave us with no choice but to see in the deceased a spirit and nothing but a spirit. Finally we can cite a text on which the deceased is roundy described as such in unambiguous language: "O that yon spirit might be restored so as to know how great is my grief', o utinam passit
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reparari spiritus ille, ut sciret quantus dolor estl) Interpreted in the light of their natural context, therefore, these African Christian texts reflect a Psychology according to which Man is to be distinguished into two components, Body and Soul, the latter being the vivifying principle, scarcely distinguichable from the breath, the body without it being mere dust, and is ultimately to be identified with the Soul, leaving the Body at death and enjoying independent existence apart from it: a Psychology therefore, which is emphatically dualistic, vitalistic, and idealistic.

There is no feature of the Praxis which contradtcts this result, and none of any special importance to corroborate or supplement it. It is an instance of fully-conscious ideology explicitly expounded. Whence therefore was it derived?

Apart from its vitalism, for which Biblical precedent can be adduced, Jehovah having created Adam by breathing upon dust,) we can say with conviction: not at least from the teaching of the Church. On the one hand, this is plain from its dualism. It is apparently a vexed question whether trichotomy is a Biblical doctrine; ${ }^{3)}$ but in the New Testament at least a tripartite analysis of Man emerges very plainly. Paul speaks of the spirit ( $\pi V \hat{\nu} \mu \mu \boldsymbol{\prime}$ ), soul ( $\psi \bar{u} X \bar{\eta}$ ), and boay ( $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ ) being preserved entire at Christ's coming $\frac{4}{9}$ ) and the author of another epistle distinguishes in the same way between
 controversy and its allied theological disputes raged at their
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height, and consequently, on the average, within the period covered by our texts, the trichetomy of the teaching of the Church fathers on the structure of the individual was very clearly brought out, namely in connection with the Apollinarian heresy: the heretics held that whereas ordinary men had a body, a spirit, and a mind, Christ had indeed a body and spirit, but the Logos in place of a mind ${ }^{\text {I }}$ ) while on the orthodox side, Gregory of Nazianzus could think of no stronger argument against their position than the soteriological one, namely that as Christ saves the whole of Man and not merely a part, He must have assumed his whole nature, including his mind, that is, must have assumed complete manhood, flesh, spirit, and mind?) To be sure, the terms have changed somewhat since New Testament days, the words now being बóp $\xi, \psi u \bar{\chi} \hat{\eta}$, and Voûs; but that is of no importance from our present point of view. The important point is the fact that from whatever cause, and in whatever sense, a doctrine of psychomogical trichotomy was accepted as a matter of course by theologians of both camps. That influence from theological speculation (Doctrine of the Trinity) played a part, together with Biblical precedent, goes without saying. Psychological trichotomy was quite definitely the recognized teaching of the historical Christian tradition. Psychological dichotomy therefore, or, as we have styled it above, psychological dualism, must have originated outwith this tradition, in some other world-view.
[^85]Just as little, on the other hand, does the idealism attested in our material derive from the historical Christian tradition. Aversion from the body as such is not a Biblical traitl) on the contrary, Paul describes the body as the temple of God's spirit in us, and exhorts the Corinthians to glorify God in the body?) Above all an idealistic psychology is excluded from the orthodox Christian world-view by the baptismal confession of the final resurrection of the flesh, regular from the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian in the West, 3 , and preached as a matter of course in the primitive period. (to the humanist Celsus this belief was nothing less than stark madness.) No: in so far as it is idealistic, identifying Man With spirit and and regarding him as essentially incorporeal, the psychology reflected in our texts originated elsewhere than in the historical Christian tradition.

Whence spring these non-Christian tendencies therefore, the dualism and the idealism of popular African Christian psychology? One can answer without hesitation, from the Greek spirit. This holds good for the dualism:for although the philosophers, like Plato6) and the Stoics ${ }^{7}$ ) for example, frequently expounded a trichotomy of the soul, the body was always left on one side and excluded from the scheme of division, Greek inscriptions knowing nothing of any trichotomy, even of the soul, but speaking of body and soul as contrasted magnitudes, exactly as in our own material8) And for the
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idealism: for so thoroughly was the Greek world-view permeated and dominated by the theory of the soul's infinite superiority over against the body as Man's true substance, that this conviction came to be crystallized into a slogan $\sigma$ wipu $\sigma$ juc "the body is a tomb", which, implying that Man is alive and free to develop his peculiar gifts only apart from the body, circulated not only among philosophical literature of all ages and schools $\frac{1}{9}$ ) but penetrated the popular wisdom of the ililiterate masses also?) Indeed one cannot expound the Greek legacy fortheming in the psychology reflected in our African Christian inscriptions better than in the words used by Harnack to describe the most outstanding feature in the Hellenistic environment of the Early Church: "There is the sharp division between the soul (or spirit) and the body: the more or less exclusive importance attached to the spirit, and the notion that the spirit comes from some other, upper world and is either possessed or capable of life eternal! ${ }^{3}$ )

In view of this strongly Hellenistic quality of the psychology underlying our texts as a whole, it may be worth while asking whether after all the vitalistic element, which has a prima facie Biblical ground (p.540), does not belong to the same tradition. There is a good a fortiori case for thinking that it does, and the epigraphical formula from which we infer the vitalistic element can be paralleled in corresponding Greek material4) If on the other hand the Biblical tradition and official teaching of the Church have contributed at all to the psychology reflected in our material, it

[^86]is here that such influence must lurk. Either way the history of the idea is not substantially affected: Hellenistic tradition dominates the teaching of our African inscriptions on the subject of Man's internal constitution; and its content not at all: the psychology here examined is idealistic through and through. In other words, Man, according to the doctrine presupposed in the texts, is pure spirit, in the last resort independent of body altogether.

I(b)Politics. It is extraordinarily difficult to extract from our sources any answer to the question: is Man an individual or collective being? The problem of Man's external constitution nowhere receives any attention in the texts; not a single word is uttered in all the 3,000 odd items catalogued in Part $I$ which explicitly refers to any known doctrine of society. Any result reached under this heading, therefore, will have to be won indirectly, from an examination of the Praxis. Even here there is no very obvious feature significant enough to support a political inference.

There is only one direction in which help appears to be forthcoming, and even in this case the method of approach is not at all straightforward. We propose, namely, to attempt a general inference from the ideal of conduct reflected in our material. It is well known that the virtues admired from the individual are quite distinct from those admired from the collective point of view. The distinction is nowhere more concisely formulated than in an article contributed by Dr.Gerhard Grafe to the Year Book of Education for 1939 (ed.H.V.Will, London) expounding the NationalSocialist ideal of education in contrast to that current in Germany auring the Weimar Republic. (Year Book pp.262-281). Over against
the liberalistic - individualistic educational ideal of the nineteenth century, represented by the fivefold basis formulated by Herbart, viz. "the ideas of inner freedom, of perfection, of benevolence, of right, and of justice or retribution", (p.264) Grafe sets the ideal prescribed by the Leitgedanken zur Schulordnung issued in December 1933: "The highest task of the school ia the training of youth for service to nation and State in the National Socialist spirit! (p.267) And the National Socialist spirit is conveniently epitomized for us in the anonymous article inserted bewween pp. 569 and 570 of the 2lst (supplementary) volume of the great BROCKHAUS Encyclopaedia (Leipzig 1935) where we read: "It(sc. Nationalsozialismus) sees in the Folk (Volk) not the sum-total of individual citizens, but the living Community (Gemeinschaft) sprung from Blood and Soil (Blut und Boden), to the service of which each individual is with all his powers pledged. From this conviction National Socialism derives its supreme moral commandment (sic!): the common need takes precedence over onels own need, GEMEINNUTZ VOR EIGENNUTZ! In conformity with this spirit, National Socialist education, turning its back upon "the contemplative human being of humanism, who could develop his sqbjective qualities according to the laws of the autonomy of the individual" and "the beautiful classic-humanistic personality standing outside the nation, whose life-circle was an aesthetic world of pure spirit" as ideals, (Year Book p.265) aims rather at "awakening a feeling of responsibility in the rising generation, which enables it to sacrifice its life for eternal Germany" (Year Book p. 278). The contrast between the individualistic and collectivistic Anthropologies, in other words, underlying liberalist and totalitarian systems of society
respectively can be formulated by means of a phrase:-

| Individualism | SELF-DEVELOPMENT | Liberalism |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Collectivism | SERVICE TO COMMUNITY | Totalitarianism |

We are now in possession of a criterion with which to approach the Praxis; for where we see self-development or the cultivation of the personality admired, we have a right to postulate an individualistic theory of society, and where we observe-service to the community or readiness to sacrifice all on its behalf praised, there, we may be sure, a theory of Man as a collective being prevails.

There are two features of the Praxis to which it is natural to turn immediately for information on the moral ideals of the Early Church: the names of i.ts members, and the laudatory epithets and phrases which frequently occur on epitaphs. But what do we find first of all on consulting the appropriate category (moral, p . 426) ? Love, chastity, charity, respectability, joy, laughter, fair dealing: in other words, a strongly individualistic life-ideal. Exactly the same impression results from an examination of the laudatory epithets and phrases commonly used (p.379): the deceased is praised as dutiful, faithful, innocent, sweet, dear, and so forth, in every case the reference being to universal family virtues binding individual to individual, and unfolding before the observer the most delightful picture of personal worth. The one layman of whom we hear anything of interest in this connection (bIV 23, p.373) is a patron of letters and one who cultivates moral excellence: again the individualistic orientation is clearly marked. The entire monastic movement, of Which we have considerable epitaphic evidence (pp. 396-398), is of
course an individualistic phenomenon of great note: its entire lifeideal is one of retreat from society and the cultivation of virtues not possible to an ordinary person living in contact with the community. But more significant than all these items taken either separately or together is the occurrence of that phrase commonly used to describe the pious, both clerical and lay (pp.401,402): "lover of the poor!' Almsgiving, above all virtues, is individualistic, since it presupposes a capitalist society whose economy is based on the axiom of private property, a society therefore in which the rich are forever surrounded by the poor, to whom they are morally obliged to extend relief from time to time. No alternative to this state of affairs occurred to the minds of the Christians Of the ancient world, who relied on poverty as a constant of civilizationl) the famous experiment of the primitive Church towards the relief of destitution ${ }^{2}$ ) being based not on the right of the community as such over its resources, but on the charity of those in a position to contribute to a pool, as the legend of Ananias and Sapphira3) plainly shows. Most emphatically therefore all the evidence of this type proves unanimously, that the Early Church Was individualist in its Anthropology. The virtues praised on its epigraphical remains are the virtues of individualism.

A deeper examination of the Praxis, however, reveals another side to the problen. Gratefully as the Early Church praised the pious and virtuous of its number, it paid homage to another category of the faithful, of whose personal excellence little is told, whose

1) Mat thew $x x v i$ II
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names alone, sometimes, survive, or even are lost altogether, only groups being mentioned, but whose heroic self-sacrifice and fearless devotion to the faith raised them above mere mortals in the eyes of posterity: the martyrs. Let us investigate the problem in this direction also.

It shonid not necessary to emphasize at so late a stage as this the profound significance exercised over the Early Church by the memory of the martyrs, who from the time of Constantine I became the object of an elaborate cult (pp.142-208). One need only remember among other things that their relics were venerated ( p . 177-179) , that votive dedications were made in their honour (pp.199-202), that in fine they were accorded the worship formerly paid to the pagan gods. (pp.160-162). This development of Early Church practical piety Was made possible by the enomous prestife enjoyed by the heroes of the persecutions on the ground of their fearless confession of Christ's name, whereby they spent their bodies and suffered torture and death rather than relinquish their faith: their monuments do not speak at all of their gifts, qualities, or personal achievements, but only of their sufferings and the supreme sacrifice from which they were too loyal to shrink (pp.180-181). Their dauntless witness was described in terms of military service, (pp.175-176,384-386) and as Soldiers of Christ they waged war on behalf of the Church, the Mother of all the faithful (p.501, pp.190-191). That is to say: the martyrs are praised as embodying in the most complete manner possible the ideal of collective virtue, self-effacing service to the community. Martyrdom is the offering of one's individuality on behalf of the community, and as such the highest service one
can render it; while the community on whose behalf the martyr sacrifices himself is none other than the Church. In this context the military vocabulary of the Early Church for the first time assumes full significance. The same holds good of the regular answer given by the typical martyr when asked his name by the tribumal: "I am a Christian" ${ }^{I}$; for he did not wish to be known any longer by the name which distinguished him from his fellow-mortals, but was content with the name comnon to all who believed in Christ which expressed his own solidarity with them. His worth as a person consisted not in his individual qualities or cultural achievements, of which we hear nothing, but in his readiness to spend and be spent to the uttermost in devotion to the Gospel of which the Church was visible witness. One can expound the collective ideal with greater directness only in terms of Paul's conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, apart from which Christian believers are of no significance, and as members of which they can and do alone function aright2) Here, if nowhere else, Christian collectivism attains fully-conscious expression as an ideological dogma.

Our material, therefore, attests both theories of the outer constitution of wan: according to the inscriptions, Jan is both an individual and a collective being. Yet no contradiction is thereby involved. On the one hand, the evidence for individualism is on the average later than that for collectivism, readiness to sacrifice one's person being of primary importance during a period of struggle

[^87]like the three centuries of persecution which the Church endured before establishing itself in the ancient world, the development of private excellence on the contrary being the ideal appropriate to the new situation of peace and security which followed. On the other hand, in so far as the contrasted theories were simultaneous, each had a different context: the believer was a collective being, not as a human being, but as a member of the Church, whose bounds transcended alike himself, his family, and his nation; he could therefore afford to remain an independent individual in relation to his Conerete life-circle, large or small, was indeed obliged so to do. In his worldly relations he was individualistic, his solidarity with his fellow-creatures being one not of blood or soil, but of faith. While fulfilling his duty to society as a socially useful individual, therefore, here and now, the Christian is bound to insist on the relative scope of all such concrete obligations, being responsible in the last resort and all the time to God as a member of the Church, Which, as the community of the faithful of all countries and ages, alone has the right to demand from him unconditional loyalty as a collective being capable of self-sacrifice. In some such terms as these, 'so we should judge from our material, would the Early Church, if challenged, have formulated its attitude to the political problem.

II(a) Ethics. Nowhere do the inscriptions explicitly speak of Man either as good or as bad by nature. The following items of evidence, however, are forthcoming on the optimistic and pessimistic sides respectively of this fundamental problem:-

Certain persons, notably martyrs, are said to deserve well the bliss that awaits them in heaven (pp.181,192). He who prays with a pure heart obtains his desire, acerding to cIV 247 (p.189). There is a reference to the "righteous" in cV 42 (p.508), cIV 256 declares that "the righteous man is a law unto himself"(p.213), psalms are frequently quoted extolling the "righteous" man (p.211) and the Doxology in Luke is regularly reproduced in the form: "Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth to men of good will (sic)" (pp.212-213). Finally some believers are known by the title of "innocent" (p.387). Of large-scale features of the Praxis, the prevalence of dedications (pp. 289-322) might be interpreted as indicating that the pious considered themselves in a position to negotiate with God and even lay claims upon Him.

If ever a case for an optimistic ethic can be argued, these are the grounde upon which the argument must needs be based. Yet they are exceedingly slender. Dedications might point to a fear of divine wrath felt as deserved quite as readily as to a proud independence on the part of the dedicant. The title "innocent" refers to the baptized, not to the individual as such. The Lucan Doxology in its African form may have no reference whatever to the Will of wan in any profound technical sense. The merits of the martyrs and those like them, in a similar manner, need not have been regarded in the light of a scholastic theory of merit. Finally, Monceaux argues convincingly for the Donatist origin of all texts praising the pure and righteous, contrasting with them the more humble attitude reflected in authentic Catholic material, and pointing out the correspondence between this epigraphical contrast and that between
the Donatist ideal of human perfection and the Catholic ideal of Qivine grace.) If this judgment is correct, then it is a question indeed of divergent attitudes emerging in the course of a dispute over Church Praxis, but still very far from being a question of fully-conscious theological differences over the sublimity or depravity of Man's will in the Augístino-Pelagian sense. We conclude therefore apart from a possible Donatist tendency to exalt human worth, our sources provide no good ground for seeing in them an optimistic ethic of Man.

More can be said in favour of a pessimistic ethic. First of all, confessions of sin are found fairly frequently on dedications: we hear in this connection of "the sinners of Cediae" (cIV 18, p. 309) , of dedications undertaken "through the spirit's need" (cIV 87b,p.309) and by the presbyter Floridus "in need of merey"(cIV 150,p.201), and of one who "prays to be saved from his sins" (cV 78, p .310 ). One text (cIV 117) quotes the evangelical promise that whoso seeks shall find ( p .212 ) and thereupon mentions SCRDTM Preces PRO DELICTA POPULI, the prayers of the priests for the sins of the people. The institutior of penance is mentioned (pp.190,401). Finally, names of a certain category point to baptism as mediating a renewal of life (pp.425, 432-433), implying thereby that a sinful condition has been left behind, while we are expressly informed that baptism washes away the sins of the past ( $\mathrm{pp} .503-504$ ). To be sure there is scarcely a word in all this which refers to anything more than the sinfulness

[^88]of specific individuals: a dogma of universal and original sin characteristic of Man as such is lacking, except perhaps in the passages referring to baptism and the names corresponding thereto. Moreover it must be acknowledged that Monceaux's analysis of such language in terms of the Catholic-Donatist conflict tends to modify the seriousness with which we should otherwise be inclined to view data of this kind. Yet the dedicants could not (have all) been mere poseurs, and individual peccadilloes could not have called forth such an oppressive consciousness of guilt as that reflected in the large-scale expiatory praxis of which out texts are evidence. No: those who produced our inscriptions were assuredy no theologians, and their aim was not to expound a theological Ethics; but in so far as their monumental remains speak of human worth, they are unanimous in following the teaching of Paul ${ }^{1}$ ) and in depicting Man as sinful. The teaching of the inscriptions on this subject is undoubtedly pessimistic.

II(b)Aesthetics. One must exercise great care in seeking in the inscriptions their answer to the question: which predominates in human experience, pleasure or pain? since casual judg\&ments on the happiness or misery of this or that particular individual in any one situation are not in themselves enough to support a general inference as to the theory of the affective existence of Man lurking behind the texts. Even names of good omen like Felix, Faustus, Jucundus, with which groups CP and CPJ swarm, are less likely to
1)Romans $v 12$
be descriptive than prophylactic in intention: they may not so much register factual experience as ward off mischievous influences. Most examples of explicit evidence are ambiguous in this sense. In this predicament our most sensible course is to cast about for elements in the Praxis, characteristic of Christian material, Which appear genuinely significant from this point of view. Of these features there seem to be three, although there is naturally a large subjective tendency to be taken into account in a situation of this kind, some being inclined to detect many significant stigmata, others few or none at all. In the first place, however, it seems relevant to draw attention to the fact, already noticed (pp.38I-383), that whereas bitter complaints of the cruelty of the Fates in cutting off a man's life, particularly in youth, are commonly found on pagan epitaphs, such langmage is exceptional in Christian material, and occurs only Where on other grounds we have a right to think that Christian influence in general is less strong than usual. But to lament the loss of life is to regard it as pleasurable and of value in itself; there is so far, therefore, a negative ground for thinking that the Christian of antiquity reckoned life of less account, that is to say, as a source of less pleasure and more pain, than did the average pagan of that time. This impression is further strengthened when we pass to consider the second significant feature, the acclamation "in peace" namely, which, scarcely or not at all occurring in pagan epitaphs, is so common on Christian stones of the same class as to constitute a secondary stigma diagnostic of the Christian origin of the item on which it occurs (p.16). This acclamation, without further elaboration, proclaims that the dead man in question is now
at peace, and therewith implies that his life has been one of turmoil and conflict, therefore a painful and not at all a pleasurable experience. Thirdly and lastly however, all doubts are dispelled by the custom of speaking of the day on which a martyr suffered execution as the "day of his birth" (pp.183-184), an emphatically Christian lexical novelty which so far despises this earthly life as to regard it not as life at all, but ss death and nothingness, in comparison with which death is the beginning of life, and not the end of it, as erroneously assumed by mankind in general. The evidence therefore, in so far as it has anything at all to say on the question before us, is unanimous: Man is not by nature a happy creature. Here again the Christian attitude emerges as pessimistic.

These then are the outstanding features of the Doctrine of Man reflected in the inscriptions. How must the Anthropology as a whole be characterized?

In the first place, we can say: its psychology is idealistic, its estimate of Man in terms of value is pessimistic, its doctrine of society is individualistic but of the Church in particalar, collectivistic. Idemism, pessimism, individualism and collectivism therefore: these are the characteristics which for us determine the Anthropology of the Early Church. We have already seen (p.544) that its idealism was derived from the Greek tradition. Whence came its pessimism? Most significantly Reitzenstein fixes upon the O.T. emphasis on Man's guilt as Christian preaching's special contribution to religion; ${ }^{1}$ ) yet ancient society itself discouraged an optimistic

[^89]theory of Man, inasmuch as on the one hand moral standards were on the declinel) and on the other, men had lost the joy of life and had become spiritually stale, some regarding the Golden Age as a boon of the remote future to be yearned after but not realized, others viewing it as forever lost in an equally remote past, never again to be enjoyed?) Christian pessimism had therefore a double historical ground. What, finally, are we to say about the twofold theory of Man in his social aspect, as an individual namely, in so far as he is involved in the natural orders of family and nation, as a collective being on the other hand, in so far as he is in communion with the Chubch? Formally this double attitude closely resembles the coincidence of individualism and cosmopolitanism in the ancient world generally and among Stoic circles in particular3) To the Christians of that time, so the apologist claimed, every foreign country was a fatherland, and every fatherland a foreign country $\frac{4}{5}$ ) and to that extent they resembled the self-smfficient philosophers, whose life-circle, instead of coinciding with that of their own nation, was at the same time very much narrower and very much wider, according to the standpoint from which it was viewed.) Materially however Hellenistic cosmopolitanism was but a pale abstraction alongside Christian collectivism, whose warlike ethic demanded of every believer the limit of self-sacrifice or apostasy. The contrast is between indulging in noble phrases and being in earnest. The Christian Doctrine of Man, therefore, as it emerges from
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the inscriptions, is a product partly of the Hellenistic environment of the Early Church, and partly of the original Christian experience itself. To the former tradition must be ascribed its idealism, to the latter its collectivism, and to both its pessimism, probably also its individualism. While however a fairly clear picture is so far won, there remains nevertheless a question still outstanding. It will be noticed that all the problens concerned, that of Politics alone excepted, thereby receive a one-sided solution. The social organization of Man, according to the findings, has a double basis, Man being acknowledged both as individual and collective in his outer constitution. Hence the question: how is the symmetry of the result in this single instance related to its want of symmetry generally? The case admits of two possibilities which are mutually exclusive: either (1) the general want of symmetry is normal, the single instance of symmetry being exceptional; or (2) the single instance of symmetry is normal, the general want of symmetry being exceptional. In other words: Christian Anthropology is fundamentally one-sided, its doctrine of society however calling for further investigation on account of its irregular (symmetrical) structure; or, Christian Anthropology is fundamentally symmetrical, as in its doctrine of society, but has otherwise come to incomplete expression. The solution of this dilemma, like that of the theological problem previously exposed, lies outside the bounds of mere static ideology, and is to be sought in ideology raised to the dynamic level, namely eschatology, to which we consequently pass forthwith.

## (3) Eschatology

By Eschatology we understand the discussion of religious dynamics in general (p.116), that is to say of God and Man no longer in and for themselves as hitherto (an indispensable though merely preparatory undertaking) but as they confront each other in the unity of the concrete religious action. In it the theological and anthropological problems are destined to reach internal and external reconciliation. It was found (pp. 535-536) that the Idea of God constitutes a complex, the central motif of an anthropomorphic Deity, derived from Judaism, being flanked on the one side by the Hellenistic view of Deity as an impersonal category of nature, and on the other, by a conception, exclusively Christian, which strove to embody an idea transcending both aforementioned positions, namely the Doctrine of the Trinity, in its pure theoretical form and in its popular liturgical form respectively. This distinction provides the basis of the Eschatology, which will pass from the theological to the anthropological extremity, in conformity therewith, through the Subhuman, Human, and Superhuman stages, in that order.

## (i) Subhuman Eschatology

The element of the Praxis which is fundamental for Subhuman Eschatology is of course the use of magical charms (pp.239-274) in which Christ, under various names, is invoked as a protection against the Evil Eye and all mischievous demonic powers, with which, in Crawley's vivid metaphor, the whole air was charged as with electricity or noxious bacteria (Chantepie d.l. Saussaye, LBRG i 31). Under Christ's
protection were also placed public and private buildings, by means of brief formulae containing the name and/or sign of Christ (pp. 233 -236). The sign of Christ itself is His Cross, the phallic efficacy of which is clearly established (pp. 270,516-517); it protects from malignant influence every object whereon it is inscribed. Private monograms are for this reason frequently cruciform (p.506) and invocations to the Virgin are likewise guaranteed safe access by this means (p.283). Artistic basilica-mosaics conform to the cruciform pattern (pp.504-505). In no category of inscription is the Cross wanting: even State tituli, which resisted "christianizing" more stubbornly than texts of any other type, ultimately came to be adorned with the Cross and its variants, namely in the Byzantine period (p.140). In particular, tombstones are so richly marked with the Cross that its shape and that of its variants, with which the apocalyptic letters Alpha and Omega are frequently combined, provide a trustworthy index to the chronology of epitaphic material. (p.25). Christ's saints, moreover, watch perpetually upon the Byzantine battlements (pp.205-207) guarding the city from earthly and mortal as well as from aerial and demonic foes. That the use of the Seriptures (pp. 209-220) serves a similar purpose, is probable, since Biblical verses are frequently inscribed on buildings.

In short: the Christian of antiquity, whether alive or dead, stood continually under the protection of Christ. Wherever hostile forces threatened him, in the storm and stress of life or in death, Where all was unknown and therefore fraught with terror, a man might swiftly and easily, most commonly by the simple device of the Cross, summon to his aid all the beneficent power of the Creator.

Christ had proved Himself master of all demons and evil spirits, having driven them from before Him wherever He encountered them, 긱 He had overcome even their prince, namely in the bodies of madmen; He had overcome even their prince, Satan himselfe) His name therefore, abbreviated as a monogram $\neq$ and assimilated to the shape of His Cross $\frac{p}{f}$, finally the Cross itself + , remained all-poferful against the same enemies of Man who, at the mere sight of these magic signs, retired vanquished. By association any reminiscence of Christ embodied in Scriptures which foretold Him, martyrs who bore witness of Him, relics of any and every kind, all alike possessed this virtue in greater or less strength.

Such is the picture envisaged by magical praxis. It reproduces the primitive world-view most plainly.) As it emerges from our material it exhibits three outstanding features of phimary importance for our understanding of the Ideology of the Early Church. First of all and characteristic of this type of world-view in general: divine power can be transmitted from its 笑urce by mere contact and association, in this respect very much resembling a fluid. Secondly, and also characteristic of magic as a whole: this power stands under the control of the man who understands the key to its use, so that he can direct it to avert ill and bring good, entirely at his own pleasure. Thirdly: in Christian magic, the source of this beneficent power is Christ, whose Cross, when pictorially reproduced, secures for the Christian believer the inffuence desired.

[^90]
## (ii) Human Eschatology

When the Deity is envisaged as essentially manlike, only on a large scale, the relationship naturally becomes more complex: here personal categories introduce complications which radically alter the mode of action. There can no longer be any question of mere magic, whereby Man forces his will upon his surroundings and obtains immediate satisfaction: on the contrary, he is now confronted with another will with which he must come to terms. He can no longer work his own pleasure "opere operato", but must be prepared to negotiate, propose and accept conditions, renounce awhile the desired end, perform tasks at the behest of the Deity. There are two sides to the personal relationship, as has been rightly pointed out: give and take, or value-resistence and value-cooperation, $\frac{1}{9}$ ) which, as applied to God, characterize Him as the source of absolute demand ${ }^{2)}$ but at the same time also of final succour. ${ }^{3)}$ A situation of extreme delicacy thus results, the religious action being dominated by tension of two wills striving towards mutual adjustment. In practice, since God is ultimately much stronger than Man, this means that Man seeks to please God and receive from God some boon in return.

Naturally a theory like this, universally assumed as the basis of piety, is never once explicitly formulated in material of the type with which we are here occupied. But in the Invocations (pp.275289) and still more in the Dedications (pp. 289-322) it is very clearly presupposed. It dominates the religious thinking of antiquity

[^91]in general ( p .299 ), and, in the form of the covenant-idea, the Biblical tradition in particular: Jacob's vow at Bethel ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) on the one hand, and on the othet, Jahveh's promises and threats ${ }^{2)}$ typify the religious context of the historical Christian tradition. Only by undertaking meritorious works can a man secure rewards.

What then are these works, and what these rewards, as reflected in our African material?

Corresponding to the personal relationship in which God and Man stand to each other, the primary requirement on the part of Man is faith: he must trust God, and show himself trustwo $r$ thy before Him. For this reason the Christian is called "fidelis", a faithful one (p.387) who, as many a votive dedication records, fulfilfs to God What he has promised beforehand. Among more zealous spirits, the martyrs for example, this faith reaches heroic dimensions: the believer then hazards his very life in Christ's service after the manner of a reliable legionary, for life is a strenuous war waged between God and the devil (pp.384-385). On the other hand a radically different conception of faith is found, consisting merely in assent to dogma transcending the intellect: for example, it is not only useless, but positively wrong, to ask how Christ was born or Why He chose to suffer; one must simply accept the facts or renounce the faith (p.518). One might almost say, credo quia absurdum! To be sure, there is no very obvious personal quality in such a faith as this at first sight; yet Christ was the Word of God (pp.218,500,532n2) addressed to Man in Holy Scripture (pp. 209-220) which bore witness to

[^92]Him, so that to doubt anything it contained was tantamount to want of faith. In this sense "blind belief" was no more than a proper acceptance of what God Himself speaks. Anything less, on the contrary, was distrust in the face of God's express utterance. Some such interpretation as this, although it does not occur naturally to the theologian of to-day, is decisive for our understanding of the attitude of the Early Church to this particular problem. Of hope and love, which Paul associates with faith $\frac{1}{9}$ ) our material has little to say. Only in proper names do these ideals find substantial expression (pp.433-434). "Love God" occurs (perhaps) as an acclamation (cIV 19) but the reading is by no means certain (p.232). Another difficult text seems to speak of love to man as a counterpart the love which martyrs show to God (p.508). Almsgiving we know to have been much admired (pp.401-402). It need not be emphasized that the desire for baptism (pp.503-504) and penance (pp.190.401) was pleasing to God. Above all, the monastic ideal was cherished, especially in Byzantine times, as the rowal road to God's favour: in the last resort it was necessary to witharaw from ordinary life in order to merit the title of "devotee of God" or "religious" (pp. 394-397).

And what did pious Christians expect to gain by means of this many-sided system of meritorious conduet? There is good reason for thinking that worldy boons were in some cases the aim of pious works or their occasion ( p .308 ). The desire to appease the offended Deity produced a number of offerings (p.552). But there was one boon above and beyond all others upon which the eyes of one and all were fixed, whether martyrs, ascetics, or ordinary believers, and in favour

[^93]of which earthly joys of whatsoever kind were cheerfully renounced: namely, the hope of imnortality. Being mortals they craved for an experience known only to Godhood.

A variety of forms can here be distinguished. It is convenient to discuss them under the heads of negative and positive.

In the first place a purely negative picture of otherworldy existence confronts us: Christ has robbed death of its terrors, and the departed are at peace (pp. 325 sqq.). The dead rest ( p .334 ) or sleep ( p .336 ), being gathered together with those who have gone before ( p .341 ). The grave is an altar on which the memory of the deceased is solemnly celebrated year by year ( p .344 ) or an eternal dwelling from which he will never be dislodged ( p .346 ). As the examination of the material in question show, all this is essentially tat common pagan property, with this difference only; instead of wishing that it should be so, the Christian is convinced that in fact it is so. Whereas the pagan wishes to be left alone and that the earth should lie light upon him, the Christian takes it almost for granted that he is at peace; at all events he does not worry.

This is the prevailing attitude from the statistical point of View. Occasionally however we are told further of the experiences of the deceased, namely that he is happier than on earthl) or that he enjoys perpetual security ${ }^{2}$ ) or light?) Martyrs are accorded spedeial honours, being crowned4) Such details provide a transiti on to a positive otherworlaly picture proper, which when fully elaborated falls into two distinct and mutually contradictory types.

[^94] FRUITUR PERPETUAM SECURITATEM 3)bIV 79 ETERNA LUCE IAM FRUITUR (4)bIII 283 CORONA ACCEPERUNT CIII 591 VINCENTIBUS CORONA BIII 186 etc.

On the one hand, the soul is depicted as leaving the body forthwith, and enjoying an independent existence, namely in the upper regions. This view comes to expression in such texts as cV 50 CAELO CONSORS SEMPER HABITARE, to dwell in heaven for ever, cIV 143AUT FIAT SANCTIS IN SEDE REGNI CELESTIS, that he may share with the samints a seat in the heavenly kingdom, and cIV 139 QUOD NOMEN SEMPER...ASTRA VIGET, which name flourishes forever among the stars, with which we may compare, amog pagan material:-

$$
\text { sidera me retinent }{ }^{1}=\text { the stars possess me }
$$

vivit et astra tenet2) $=$ he lives and occupies the stars
non tamen ad Manes sed caeli ad sidera pergo ${ }^{3}$ ) $=$ the stars of heaven do I go
and, from Christian material:-
corpore nam tumulo $\quad=$ for with his body he occupies mente superna tenet ${ }^{4}$ ) the tomb, with his mind the stars
rettulit ad Christum celsa ${ }^{5}$ per astra gradum $=$ he returned to Christ by way
Honoratus antistes cujus O $^{\text {}}=$ Honoratus the bishop, whose spiritus astra tenet 6)
presbyter... corporeos rumpens ${ }_{r y}=$ presbyter....who, bursting asunder nexus qui gaudet in astris 7)

Except for the praise of virginity as a special qualification for heavenly bliss therefore, (cIII 591 CONSECRATAE VIRGINITATIS ET CONFESSIONIS VICTRICIA PORTANTES TROPEA VESTE INDUEAEP, carrying the Victorious trophies of consecrated virginity and confession, and
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clad in angelic robes, compare Buecheler 1401 of a virgin, quod tales animae protinus astra petunt = since such spirits forthwith make for the stars, and cIV 139 of a virgin, cited on p.565) there is nothing peculiarly Christian in this view of the soul's destiny. Still less "Christian" is the elaborate epitaph CIII 606 which contains the following lines:

NAM VIVIT HAEC MORIENS AETERNA IN LUCE MANEBIT REDEMTA ET MAGNO PERMANET AELISIO
i.e.,
for Redem $(\mathrm{p})$ ta lives, though dead, and will remain in eternal light and in great Elysium

Reference to the Elysian Fields, which lay however not above but on the surface of the earthl) is of course found in pagan material?) and is not wanting $\dot{\phi}^{i}$ Christian material outside Africa3) Presumably Christians thansferred Elysium from the horizontal to the vertical transcendental axis. Both, as we see, exist already in paganism. Finally we must ask whether the characteristically Christian REFRIGERIUM-acclamation (pp. 356-369) presupposes a specifically Christian theory of the Transcendental. The answer is in the negative. The picture to which it points, namely that of the soul enjoying cool draughts of water, occurs repeatedly in non-Christian ideologies. The earliest instance of the theory is in Babylonian eschatology, where it is thrice attested: the Gilgamesh Epic speaks of one of the denizens of the other world resting on a couch and drinking

1) Rohde,Psyche i 69,76
2) Buecheier, CLE 1311
3) Kaufmann, Handbuch 87
clear water; ${ }^{1)}$ a clay cone once buried with a Babylonian coffin expresses the wish on befalif of the deceased, "may his name continue to be blessed in the world above; in the world below may his departed spirit drink clear water"; ${ }^{2)}$ and a corresponding curse is pronounced against any who should presume to transgress the Laws of Hammirabi: "May the blighting curse of Shamash come upon him quickly! May he cut off his life above! Below, within the earth, may he deprive his spirit of water!"3) Next, Hellenistic epitaphic material provides frequent examples of acclamations of the type:


 Finally, Islam is familiar with this picture: the Koran abounds with references to the "gardens beneath which rivers flow"7) and cooling draughts of pure water in Paradise: ) In particular the Al Aaraf surah is of great interest here, since it depicts the Other World as consisting of two divisions, Paradise and the Fire, separated by a ridge, the inmates of the Fire appealing pathetically to the inmates of Paradise to pour out water upon them, in a manner strikingly reminiscent of the Dives-Lazarus scene in the New Testament already examined in connection with the Refrigerium-formula. Water is of course of primary importance in hot countries, so that the question of historical transmission is superfluous, adequate psychological grounds being ready at hand. In so far as borrowing
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does in fact come into consideration for our Christian material, Rohde is undoubtedly right in concluding that Greece acquired the theory from Egypt?) Indigenous points of contact existed already in Orphic eschatology?) and the paramount importance of the Nile for Egypt's earthly life ${ }^{3)}$ points to that country as an obvious source of this type of eschatology, since it thereby was in possession of the natural conditions required to provide a concrete prototype of an Other World offering cool refreshment to the virtuous. That Christianity derived it from Hellenism is most probable from what we know already of their mutual relations. A Biblical and therefore internal tradition in favour of the theory was however not wanting: our material mentions the rivers of Paradise of Jewish mythology (pp. 318-319) $\frac{1}{2}$ That Babylonian tradition is at work here, as elsewhere in the 0ld Testament $\frac{4}{3}$ ) is probable, since Palestine was well watered and therefore lacked the natural conditions necessary for the indigenous growth of the theory. However that may be, Christian eschatology in this respect fuses Jewish and, by way of Hellenism, Egyptian traditions in the doctrine of Refrigerium. And if we $\not \subset$ seek a synoptic view of the Christian theory of immortality as hitherto expounded on the basis of the inscriptions, we cannot improve upon the prayer incorporated in the Canon of the Mass:-5)

Memento tiam Domine famulorum famularumque tuarum $N$ et $N$ qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei et dormiunt in somno pacis. $=$ IpsisDomine et omnibus in Christo $=$ quiesentibus locum refrigerii lucis et pacis ut indulgeas deprecamur per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

Remember also 0 Lord thy servants $N$ and $N$ who went before us with the sign of faith and sleep the sleep of peace. To them $O$ Lord and to all who rest in Christ grant a place of refreshment, light and peace we pray thee, by the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

[^95]On the other hand, a totally different eschatology emerges at rare intervals in our material. Only two texts are explicit on the subject, that namely of a presbyter named Vitalis on the one hand, belonging to the year 456:-

and that of a virgin on the other:-

CIV 61 年" $^{\prime \prime}$ NEMINEM DEBERE MORTI MEAE INVIDENDO LABORARE ET TU IN CHRISTO RESURGES $=$ EGO CASTHE SANTIMONIALE. .

No one need trouble to cast the Evil Eye on my death. You, too, will rise again in Christ. I, Casthe, etc.etc.

Here, as elsewhere frequently in Christian material $\frac{1}{9}$ ) the Resurrection of the Body (see p.542!) at the Second Coming of Christ, and not at all the evaporation of the spirit alome into celestial regions, is envisaged. The immortality of which these and kindred texts speak is not an experience to be enjoyed immediately on the death of the body, but a prospect lying in the indefinitely remote future. The Transcendental is here no spatial magnitude, ever present, access to which is renewed every time a man, this man or that other man, dies, but a temporal event destined to happen but once, for which the Church as a whole waits. In a word: here is no longer Individual Eschatology, but Collective Eschatology. No more complete or thorough-going contrast could be desired:

[^96]Are we then in possession at last of what has so long eluded our grasp hitherto, namely Christian eschatology in and for itself? To be sure, there is no difficulty in proving that this was the eschatology of the Primitive Churchl) once the inexorable course of events had made it clear that the Advent was no longer to be expected within the lifetime of the first generation, as originally thought? ) When we penetrate further, however, and ask the question namely, whence springs the ideological foundation of these expectations? the answer: nowhere save in Jewish apocalyptic prophecy, which looked for a renewal of the world at the hands of the Creator, both the dead and the living receiving according to their deserts3) and therewith provided the prototype for Christian eschatological reflection, jsettles the problem with decision. Whether one compares the Revelation of John in the New Testament with the Book of Daniel in the Old, or seeks to isolate Christian from Jewish elements in the SibyIfine Oracles, the result is the same: one may speak of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology, or Christian apocalyptic eschatology modelled thereon, but never of apocalyptic eswatology itself being peculiarly Christian. Christian apocalyptic eschatology differs from Jewish apocalyptic eschatology in one respect only, namely in this, that Christ therein takes the place of the Messiah, or better: the two are fused into one figure, the Creator of the World, Who in His own time will judge His creatures, both living and dead, appointing the wicked to death and the righteous to life, and that not one of tenuous spirituality, but one enjoyed in the concrete by men complete

1) 1 Cor xv 51-54, Acts ii 14-40, Mathew xxvii 52, et al. 2) John xxi 21-22, I Thess v 9-10
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in body as well as spirit. As in Individual Eschatology, which we found to be the product of non-Christian theologizing, the soul mounted aloft to Christ (p.565), so here in Collective EschatoIogy, the body is expected to rise in or through Christ, a Christian meaning being thereby given to what is,just as much as the other, a fundamentally non-Christian, because pre-Christian, eschatological formula. We are therefore as far as ever from the desired goal of a specifically Christian eschatology.

In place of this we have as elements of an eschatology associated with the name of Christ the existence of two distinct eschatological types, one an eschatology of the individual, the other an eschatology of the community. The latter is on the whole earlier than the former in attaining explicit fomulation, and has Jewish apocalyptic speculation as its proximate source, although other nations have produced similar theories of history, for example the North American Indians, who look for a renewal of the world in the remote future; ${ }^{1)}$ while the former is a secondary development derived in the main from the Hellenistic world-view. Inasmuch as Individual Eschatology posits immortality as immediately achieved by the soul alone of the individual, his body dissolving irrevocably to ashes, Collective Eschatology on the contrary speaking of immortality as a prospect of the remote future, the believing community as a whole then rising to meet the returning Christ, each individual complete not only with soul but also with(a now imperishable)body, an irreducible contradiction is thereby produced. A superficial reconciliation is achieved, to this extent namely, that in the interval between the
1)Lehmann, Weltuntergang u. Welterneuerung,Zeitschr.f.Eth. 1939 p. 113
death of the individual and the resurrection of the community as a whole, in which he is destined to share, the deceased occupies a negative or neutral position ( p .564 ) , being simply "at peace" (cII 195, p. 569). That is to say: he is free from worry, since he has faith in Christ and leaves the future in His hands. We should propably interpet most instances of the IN PACE acclamation, not further elaborated, in this sense, the parallel acclamation in Jewish material being amenable to a similar exegesis (pp.326-328). That this neutral formula provided the occasion for misunderstanaings, by prompting the imagination in favour of individual-eschatological elaborations (e.g. in pace et paradissu, cIII 322, p.330) was inevitable, with the result that throughout the period covered by our material, both types of eschatology flourished side by side, the logical absurdity of their coexistence notwithstanding. They were held together, not by a theory, but by the conviction which lay deep beneath them and has already come to typical expression in bIII 174 ( p .518 ) and in the last resort underlies all Human Eschatology: to wit, that so long as men worship God as manlike, they must expect from Him retribution according to their merit. But once let the question be asked, How then does this come about? and irreconcilable theories make their appearance. There appears to be no one answer, even in the Early Church. In this situation however it is our duty to ask further, Why did Christianity not reach a decision on the matter? Why on the contrary did the Early Church hold the alternative possibilities in tension? Superhuman Eschatology alone possesses the solution of this final problem.

## (iii) Superhuman Eschatology

When all is said and done, however, the pursuit of the manlike Deity comes to a halt at length before the inevitable acknowledgement:

```
My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither
are your ways mg ways (saith the Lord) for
as the heavens are higher than the earth,
so are my ways higher than your, ways, and
my thoughts than your thoughts!)
```

and there remains nothing for Man to do but to qualify every positive assertion about God with a negative one, of which procedure, the celebrated "via negationis" of all thorough-going mysticism, the dialogue between Gargya and Ajatasatru is forever the classical expression?) To advance therefore from this impasse towards a more fruitful solution, from a merely negative to a positive formulay that is the problem of Superhuman Eschatology.

It is possible within narrow limits to predict the general structure of any possible Superhuman Eschatology on the ground of what has already been established at more easily accessible levels. When namely in Subhuman Eschatology the initiative rests with Man, who has control of the religious action (p.560), Human Eschatology on the other hand ascribing much less complete independence to Man, corresponding to the more thoroughly developed idea of Deity, the action being no longer onesided, but determined by the mutual relations of two persons bound together by rights and obligations ( p .561 ), the process may be expected to go further in Superhuman Eschatology: the initiative must pass wholly to God, Who, in so far
I)Isaiah Iv 8-9
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as He thereby transcends the scope of humanity in His actions, must at the same time exhibit traits which because human categories are no longer sufficient to explain them, and superhuman categories are lacking, must be described in subhuman terms. And in fact both these tendencies may be very clearly observed, namely in mysticism. On the one hand, the mystics one and all declare the extremity of religious experience to have been reached when God alone is active, Man as such being reduced to utter passivity!) On the other hand it is notorious that the mystical idea of Deity is unanimously impersonal, the impersonal and non-human character of the Deity coming not only to grand and noble, but frequently to ignoble and fantastic expression, as in the assertion that God would not exist but for Man?) It is clear however from such language that in spite of its heroic efforts mysticism does not possess the solution to the problem. The fact that self-deification is far from unkown in mystical piety ${ }^{3}$ ) is of symptomatic significance in this connection: the worshipper, seeking God, returns upon himself. Obviously there is something wrong with a technique which leads to such absurdities. But most significant of all from our special point of view is the fact that in fysticism, not sporadically but as a constantly-recurring, almost diagnostic feature thereof, the active life is indifferent to the mystic, who is raised by his piety above "ordihary" morality.) This however means an end to decision and responsibility: where rights and obligations are renounced, so also is personality, which must be
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conserved at all costs. Otherwise the so-called Superhuman Eschatology is only Subhuman, neither God nor Man being adequately envisaged. It is better in these circumstances to content oneself with Human Eschatology, where at least the idea of Man receives justice, and the idea of God so far as that is possible within anthropomorphic limits, than to elaborate under the nam of Superhuman Eschatology an account of the mutual relations of God and Man in which even Man is not adequately described, far less God, and which therefore is inferior even to Subhuman Eschatology, since it does not so much as fulfil its own claims. No: however completely the initiative may rest with God, and however high God may stand above human categories, nether He nor Man must be conceived as less than human: only in so, far as these three expectations are realized have we the right to speak of Superhuman Eschatology at all.

Now where in all our material is Superhuman Eschatology to be found? Nowhere is such an eschatology expounded in detail; naturally not, since the inscriptions were produced for the most part by quite humble people, and certainly not in the interest of speculative theology! It must therefore be sought in the Praxis, or not at all. And since the possibility of it was given in the Doctrine of the Trinity attested in our material (p.536), a feature, therefore, which is quite peculiar to Christianity (p.531), it is to the specifically Christian element of the Praxis to which we must turn for instruction.

When the Praxis is reviewed from this point of view, it is astonishing how little there is in it of which we can roundly say: this is entirely new, without prototype or analogiey in all the
ancient world, this is unique, this is an absolutely exclusive product of the Christian tradition! Here and there expressions are to be found hard or impossible to parallel in detail, and of course the name of Christ is encountered everywhere, bearing Witness to the origin of the monuments on which it occurs; but the way from such isolated features to an eschatological theory is not at all manifest at this stage. The Praxis as a whole can be accounted for in terms of ancient usage in general.

There is one, and only one, renarkable exception, and that on a large scalef, the practice namely, whereby, in those regions most intensely evangelized, the age of the deceased was reckoned, not from his birth, but from his baptism(pp.473-480). Nothing resembling this custom has been known before or since, and at present we are not able to demonstrate its existence outside Africa, and will not be able to do so until the material of other Christian countries has been statistically organized. This feature of the Praxis, therefore, is destined to supply what we seek, or the eschatological problem must be given up as insoluble.

What therefore is the eschatological meaning of this custom? Life, it prociaims, begins at baptism. A man who dies at the somatic age of 70 having been baptized at the somatic age of 20 is said to have lived 50 years. At the same time, Christian baptism, like its prototype in the mysteries, confers eternal life on the person baptized(pp. 503-504). From what point then is the baptized reckoned immortal? The custom under discussion implies two negative answers to this question which are of very great eschatological importance. First, not from somatic birth: life in the concrete according to the
ordinary meaning of the word is not the scene of eschatological action, as such. Only after baptism does it have eschatological value. But second, not from somatic death: a possible Transcendental is not the scene of eschatological action, as such. The Christian lives not from somatic death, but from baptism,or not at all; the dead are beyond baptism. In other wordsf, to abide by our example, the eschatologically decisive period for the Christian is the period of 50 years between the age of 20 at which he was baptized and the age of 70 at which he wae died. Superhuman Eschatology thus holds Subhuman and Human Eschatology in tension, inasmuch as on the one hand these types have a this-worldiy and other-worldly orientation respectively, and on the other, Superhuman Eschatology, by declining absoIute validity to either worlddy , confers relative validity to both. This world is eschatologically significant, because it is the scene of baptism; but apart from baptism, it is of no eschatological significance whatsoever. The other world is involved in the consequences of baptism, but apart from baptism has no existence in its own right. To be sure, a this-worldly or an other-worldly orientation is indispensable to any eschatology; but Superhuman Eschatology does not regard the decision as one of importance. Superhuman Eschatology proclaims the relativity of eschatology in general.

But a positive implication also inheres in this feature of the Praxis, corresponding to the function of baptism. In baptism, namely, the individual confesses Christ by passing into the Church. Eschatologically interpreted, this means: God challenges Man to accept or reject Himself in and through the community of believers
historically continuous with the first disciples of Jesus Christ, crucified under Pontius Pilate. The individual's conduct therefore, the choice he makes in affiming his solidarity with the Church or his isolation and aloofness from it, with the judgment on a specific historical problem therein pre-supposed; that, and that alone, and that above ally is of decisive and radical importance from the standpoint of Superhuman Eschatology.

As in mysticism, God here holds the initiative throughout; but observe in what manner: Not by descending upon the individual emptied of all individuality and using him as a mere automatic instrument of His will, but by calling the Church into existence without the permission of the individual and previous to the individual, thereby confronting him with an unforeseen problem over which he has no control. As in mysticism also, God here transcends completely the limits of manlikeness; but observe again, in what manner Not by emerging to the intelligence as an absolute logical category of which one must forever say "not this, not this", still less as an Unknown Something dependent on My Consciousness, but by making Himself known in and under the concrete world-process as it passes before, draws near, and ultimately engulfs the spectator in the stark objectivity of history. And lastly, mysticism is loft far behind inasmuch as here the individual, far from being robbed of his personality, has it not only conserved for him in full measure, but over and above that, infinitely enhanced also; for decision, that is to say, control over one's actions according to one's insight of the situation, inevitably presupposes personality, even constituting it where before it did not exist, and this holds good a hundredfold of a decision which brings
the individual right out of his loneliness and isolation and casts him straight into the whirlpool of the community-life, where, surrounded on every side by his equals, and therefore subject all the time to the laws of rights and obligations welding together the social order, he is forced to adjust himself from time to time to the common interest as the changing situation demands. Here, to be sure, all talk of superiority to moral considerations or of selfdeification is simply impossible. No: in Superhuman Eschatology, Man is Man and while he is complete Man, he still remains Man only; and God remains God. How He works, how, above all, He deals with Man, is not to be expounded; it can only be experienced.

The eschatological question on p .572 has thus already been answered: the contrast between the Imnortality of the Soul and the Resurrection of the Body emerged because Superhuman Eschatology, the specídically Christian eschatology, taught neither, although each separately could be expounded and were actually expounded in a Christian sense (see p.571). Superhuman (Christian) Eschatology indeed, as we see clearly enough, considered in and for itself, does not represent God as disputing with Man and instructing him on his constitution and destiny, but as requiring of him a decision here and now. The excellence or want of excellence to be found in Man's theological language are alike irrelevant?)

In an altogether similar manner the ideological problems which emerged at lower levels find thete solution here. Thus when it is found that Christian Anthropology issues in the dilemma formulated on p. 557, the reason for this is now obvious. On the

[^97]basis of the superhuman-eschatological results already won, we recognize without difficulty a the tension between Individualism and Collectivism as typical. Only an individual can make a decisi on; but only as affirming his collective character can the individual make his decision in the first place ( p .579 ). The relative validity of both accounts of Man's social structure is thereby establishea, the absolute validity of either being at the same time denied outright. It follows that the onesidedness of Christian Anthropology in other respects is superficial only. From the results of the eschato ogical discussion (p.579) it is plain that Christianity as such is nedither idealistic nor materialistic, but can be expounded and has in fact been expounded in terms of either type of psychology according to circumstances. That an idealistic psycholdgy prevails in our material is thus quite to be expected, in view of the idealistic orientation of the psychology favoured at that time in that civilization. The pessimistic tone of Christian value-judgments characteristic of the material has an altogether analogous basis. In shorty, Christianity as such is not concerned with a possible Doctrine of Man in the abstract, but only with the behaviour of this or that man in the concrete as he makes answer to God's inescapable interrogation!) All other questions, however interesting, are therewith relegated to the background.

Not only the anthropological, but also the theological problem is clarified when reconsidered in the light of Superhuman Eschatology. There the quantitative and qualitative aspects of Deity

[^98]produced a dilemma of the now familiar type (p.536). Since personality cannot in the last resort be abstracted from persons - it must be affirmed most emphatically, persons: the solitary individual, surround by mere things is as such devoid of personality, which can only be developed in a society of individuals mutually bound together by rights and obligations - the ascription of personality, or manlikeness, to God inevitably leads to polytheism, complete manlikeness involving the necessity that the Godhead should coniorm to the requirements of mankind's social structure. A single anthropomorphic Deity, like the single human individual, requires one or more counterparts in relation to whom for the first time it becomes possible for Him to unfold His nature. But God's unity thereby falls to ruins. On the other hand, God's unity can only be maintained at the expense of His personality: the more carefully it is formulated, the less manlike does God become. Such is the problem underlying the Doctrine of the Trinity. The question naturally arises: Whence comes the necessity of this fruitless grappling? Were it not much better for the Christian theologian to content himself with a moderate theory of unity and a moderate theory of personality, e.g. that there is but one God, and that He is merciful, etc.etc.etc.? Superhuman Eschatology disposes of this senseless question once for all by drawing attention to the crux of the problem: crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato (p.578). Quite apart from the dicate distinction previously drawn between "Trinity" and "Triad" (p.531) one feature distinguishes Christianity from all religions without exception, however much it resembles them in other respects: never once, before or since, has the historical as such been reckoned decisive for the
religious action, save in Christianity. Of all the numerous Saviour-religions of the ancient world which Christianity so strongly resembled, not one dared to depict the saving act as having taken place during a Roman official's tenure of office, none in fact was in a position to refer to any current system of timereckoning whatsoever. Christianity, on the contrary, began wi th a deed of God in history. To be sure, Christianity made copious use of myth in its preaching; but the process of Christian tradition was not from myth to history as in the other Saviour-religions of the time, but on the contrary, from history to myth2) as a comparison between the synoptic and the Johannine gospels plainly shows.) It was in order to formulate this experience, namely that God was encountered not apart from, but in the course of history, that the Church undertook the impossible theological task of expounding God as Three in One and One in Threa. There can be no question of "understanding" this formula; in the sense of a theoretical grasp, an ability to delimit it conceptually, no one in fact "understands" it, has ever "understood" it, or has any prospect of ever "understanding" it. But whoever is not too proud to share the fellowship of the witnessing community which cherishes the New Testament and lives by it, knows well enough what it means.

The Christian world-view in its entirety therefore, as it emerges from our material, can be described in terms of a twofold principle. In the first place we have the Church's experience of
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God in history, itself devoid of ideological content, and consisting instead of Man's acknowledgement of God in Christ. In the second phace we have all the ideological riches of the ancient world, in which however all experience of God in history is lacking. Christian Ideology represents a synthesis of the former, which because of its want of content, and the plastic function we must ascribe to it, we choose to call the Formal Principle, and the latter, which on account of its wealth of shapeless content, and the passive rôle we must ascribe to it, we denominate forthwith the Material Principle. The synthesis was no arbitrary one which might have been avoided. On the contrary, it was necessary in the interests of the Christian mission which without it would have been impossible. The primitive Christian experience was bound to make use of current ideological categories in order to make itself articulate, whether internally, i.e. that the Church should make its existence clear to itself, or extemally, i.e. that the Church should be able to communicate with the world at large and proclaim its message in a manner all might understand. This accounts for the juxtaposition in Christian Ideology of elements of every kind, regardless of logical consistency: any theory at all in its environment was of service to the Early Church for the purpose of formulating the fundamental Christian experience, which because it was the result of God's initiative and not the result of Man's excogitations about God, was ideologically neutral and capable of being expounded with equal success (and inevitably also, equal lack of success!) in terms of any and every ideological category. In the process, as was natural, the raw stuff ready to hand in the environment
was subject to greater or less modification according to circumstances, with the result that however closely Christian material may resemble non-Christian material of the same class, it can always be distinguished therefrom, By the mere name of Christ if by nothing else. Generally the difference is more subtle, as for example in the ease of the Doctrine of the Trinity, which, while resembling other triadic formulae, is nevertheless distinct from them ( p .531 ). Moreover all such differences have this in common, that they can be traced to the specifically historical experience of the Church which controls the process as a whole. Thus to abide by our example, the Doctrine of the Trinity owes its peculiar Structure to the desire to embrace history in a special manner as the decisive scene of God's initiative in His dealings with Man (p.582). In a word: the Christian experience of God in Christ at once smote hard upon the world-view of the ancient Hellenistic (Judaeo-Graeco-Roman) civilization, and reconstructed it from top to bottom so that directly or indirectly Christ came to be invested with all the predicates of Deity then current. In this way emerged the world-view of the Early Church.

The above formula serves also (mutatis mutandis) to clarify the Praxis, which owing to its diffuse character stands in sore need of some such organizing principle (p.524). Here namely it is at last plain why the specifically Christian element is of such slight bulk in relation to the whole. Of the epigraphical categories only the martyrs' memorials and the quotations from Scripture are exclusively Christian types of inscription, the historical
orientation of which is manifest: both serve to preserve connection with the Church's concrete origin. Otherwise no new forms were called forth, but traditional customs were retained, vows, charms, dedications and the like continuing in the community as worke of piety, the name of the Deity alone being changed.

The chronology and topography of the material can likewise be understood from this point of view. On the one hand we observe the decisive importance of the 4 th century inasmuch as none of the categories apart from the epitaph are found before that period: only after the victory of Constantine I had praced the Church in a politically secure position does Christian epigraphy flourish, and the community develop a many-sided religious praxis. On the other hand, the map of Christian Africa can be divided into well-defined zones according to the familiar military pattern: the entire western part of the country, Tingitand and part of Caesarean Mauretania namely, corresponds to a typical patrol area, pagan influence there prevailing, and Christianity being content with sporadic thrusts counterbalanced by judicious accommotions; the rest of Mauretania, Numidia, and part of Byzacena together constitute an area of strong points, where Christianity and Paganism grapple desperately, the former winning in the end in spite of ominous reverses of detail; finally, Carthage and its neighbourhood, corresponding to its central position, enjoys relative security and emerges in our material as the seat of a sedentary Christian existence indulging freely in self-development.

Lastly, peculiarities in detail are to be understood in the same way. VIXIT IN PACE for example (pp. 371 sqq.), the most notable
of the few formulae exclusive to Christian material, emphasises the fact that the Christian possesses peace not only at death but in life also, and thus refers directly to the eschatological constitution of the Church (pp.576-577), nothing more being thereby involved than a most significant modification of the traditional VIXIT formula. It is needless to multiply examples of the uniform mode in which the formal and material principles combine to produce the Praxis as it stands in the material before us: the prevailing paganism of the Praxis as a whole, relieved here and there by significant Christian modifications, is a regular phenomenon which can be studied in detail over and over again, alike on a large and on a small scale, on almost every page.

Such then is the populer religion of the Early Church as reflected in the Christian inscriptions of North Africa, in some ways a typical, in other ways a unique example of a western province of the ancient Roman Empire. Before formulating general conclusions it will be instructive to notice the resemblances and differences between it and the piety of Islam, the religion which succeeded Christianity as the prevailing faith of North Africa, and which for that reason is of special interest in this connection.

The Arabic inscriptions of the first two centuries following the Hegira, of which a negligible number are to be found in North Africal most of those to be cited coming from Egypt, reflect an earnest monotheistic tpiety of a type strongly reminiscent of the

[^99]01d Testament religion. The epitaphs are rigidly stereotyped, and invariably embody a summary of the Moslem confession. Typical of literally hundreds is the following Egyptian example:-1)

This is that of which Abd Allah son of Lahia
al-Hadrami bears witness: namely that there
is no god but Allah alone, without associate,
and that Mahomet is his servant and messanger.
It is as a witness to this faith that he
spent his liff, died, and will rise again,
God willing. May the mercy and pardon of God
be upon him!........................................................................
Here the oneness of God is proclaimed, Mahomet is hailed as His prophet, and the deceased hopes for resurrection, resting in the mean time on the mercy of God. Other texts, elaborating the above scheme, tell us further that God is one, without companion or child ${ }^{2}$ ) (an obvious reference to the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity, misunderstood from its popular version, see.p. 535., which is thereby resudiated), that God is merciful, loving, indulgent, one who pardons, is near to the worshipper, and hears willingly, is immortal and omnipotent, having control over life and death $\frac{4}{9}$ ) and demanding obedi事nce.) The Koran is the supreme revelation, taking precedence over the Pentateuch and the Gospel, both of which are thereby accorded relative validity\%) Eschatology in the narrower sense dominates Moslem epitaphs, especially from A.D. 800 onwarãs, the faithful regularly attesting their belief in the "verities" of death and resurrection') death, paradise, hell, resurrection 8 ) and death, resurrection, the last judgement, paradise, hell, and Munkir and Nakirg) i.e. the angels who preside at the "examination of the

1) RCEA 55
2) RCEA 248
3) RCEA 197
4) RCEA 103
5) RCEA 38
6) RCEA 193
7) RCEA 63
8) RAMCA 65
9) RCEA 117
tomb: ${ }^{1)}$ Belief in angels generally is mentioned 2 ) but Allah's absolute sovereignty is not thereby prejudiced; He remains the sole disposer of human fortunes, consigning the obedient to paradise, and the disobedient to hell.3) The pious Moslem styles him@elf aba Allah, Servant of God ${ }^{4}$ (cf.pp. 394-395!), this designation being so popular as to gain currency as a proper name, Abd Allah or Abdullah5) Thus at the time when Islam, convinced in its destiny as a religion for all mankind, ${ }^{\text {( }}$ ) swept Christianity from Africa and established itself there in its stead, its piety was of the fullbIooded, straightforward, purposeful type already familiar to us by the name of Human Eschatology. Its strongly-delineated idea of God as single and manlike, its doctrine of the other world, and the moral earnestness of its anthropology combine to justify this generalization. This religion, inspired throughout by the Koran, had a mission and knew it.

It was this vigorous faith that drove Christianity from Africa about A.D.700. Far other is the Islam which occupies Africa to-day. Allah now has 99 names, to be repeated by the pious in their exact order by means of a rosary; 7) the names of the four archangels Djebril, Mikail, Azrail, and Israfil, tattooed on the limbs, give protection against bodily maladies; 8 ) Koran texts serve the same end when worn next the person; ${ }^{9}$ ) holy men(marabouts) spread sanctity (baraka) all around by mere contact when alivelo) their very spittle being prizedll) and when dead they continue the
I)Palmer,Koran p.lxix
2) RCEA 132
3) RCEA 153
4) RCEA $9,14,18$
5) RCEA 54,87
6)RCEA 242
7) Doutte 199-203
8) Doutté 165
9) Doutté 226-233
10) Doutté 439-440
11) Doutté 440-441
influence from the tomb, which accordingly becomes a place of pilgrimage, and the centre of a cult of relicsl) A stone rubbed against the body and lodged in a sanctuary cures illness?) Sorcerers of a standing far below that of the marabout ${ }^{3)}$ are yet credited with magic power whereby they but wish for a thing in order to bring it to pass.4) Magic is always in demand against the Evil Eye5) belief in which is now part of orthodex Moslem faith ${ }^{6}$ ) amulets of $2 l l$ kinds being devised for this purpose?) ranging from the Hand of Fatma ${ }^{8}$ ) and the Phallus ${ }^{9}$ ) to cryptic signs ${ }^{10}$ ) including the Seal of Solomon, of which there are two forms, viz. and the former (5-pointed) being more popular than the latter 6-pointed version!l) The best commentary on this richly-varied and allembracing praxis is Section $V$ of the analytic part, dealing with Christian charms (pp. 239-274), with which it shares numerous features, both formal and material, supplemented by the discussion of hagiographic texts (pp.142-208). There can be no doubt about it: here we have the clearest possible instance of Subhuman Eschatology that could be desired. Fro worshipping God as a being before whom he was responsible the Moslem has degenerated into a worker of magic, oppressed by the fear of the Impersonal yet employing the Impersonal to his own ends.

Islam thus exhibits the same practical and ideological features, speaking broady, as the Christianity it replaced, with

1) Doutté 443
2) Doutté 447
3) Doutté 54
4) Doutté 316
5) Doutté 317-318
6)Doutté 322
6) Doutté 147-149
7) Doutte 325
8) Doutte $325 n$
9) Doutté 154
10) Doutté 156-157
the exception namely, that the Superhuman Eschatology which makes the latter what it is, is altogether lacking. Islam, in other words, is a teaching about God and a technique whereby Man hopes to worship God; but nowhere is Islam exhibited as an Act of God Himself. The highest point reached in its teaching about God is that He is One, and therefore essentially an isolated magnitude; and the furthest extent of the worship of God it prescribes is absolute obedience. Nowhere does anything emerge in it which might not have emerged for example in Judaism had the Jews maintained national solidarity on their own soil and filfilled the role of a victorious instead of a vanquished people. Nowhere is God a historical experience in the Christian sense.

Admittedly it is difficult to discuss such an intangible phenomenon as the specifically Christian (p.582), but the position may be conveniently epitomized by means of a reference to the peculiarities of epigraphical style found in Christian remains in contrast to pre-Christian and post-Christian material of the same type. Whereas pagan epitaphs regularly record the number of years to the credit of the deceased, but omit all mention of the date of his death, that PERFIDUS INFELIX HORRIFICUSQUE DIESI) and the epitaphs of Moslems (see RCEA passim) on the other hand record most scrupulously the date of death or date on which the tomb was built, never once telling how long the deceased had lived, the typical Christian epitaph unites both items of information. This characteristic feature of Christian material is symptomatic:

[^100]whereas the average pagan Roman dreaded death as robbing him of life without holding out any better prospect by way of compensation, and the pious Moslem pictured the other world as so delicious as to render this world of little account, the Christian had discovered something better than either, in comparison with which and apart from which both were to him equally important and equally lacking in importance: namely, life in God through Christ. The authentic Christian experience thus subtlely asserts itself a posteriori anid the welter of religious phenomena in general.

## CONCLUSION

A generation ago Harnack ascribed the victory of the Early Church over the ancient world, in particular as against two other claimants to the title of a universal religion, namely Manichaeism and Neoplatonism $\frac{1}{9}$ ) to its extreme simplicity, which enabled it to develop without limit in a syncretistic direction, and so fulfil the religious needs of all types of men; ${ }^{2}$ ) while with special reference to Mithraism, the foremost representative of the mysterycults contesting the field against Christianity, Cumont drew attention to the fact that whereas Mithraism and other kindred cults remained essentially oriental in character, Christianity on the other hand developed along European lines and so drove its rivals from the scene?) In the present investigation Christianity

1) Harnack, Mission i 393
2) Harnack, Mission i 397
3) Cumont,Les Mysteres de Mithra 208-209
has emerged as, in its essence, even simpler than Harnack supposed, and, in its manifestation, even more richly sqncretistic, while its "European" quality is everywhere attested in Cumont's sense, the extent to which Christianity emerges as a Graeco-Roman phenomenon being truly remarkable.

Since however the material is overwhelmingly post-Constantinian, the interest here lies not so much in the rise of the Early Church as in its African development. The specifically African stignata, viz.: Christian FLAMINES PERPETUI (pp. 126,374-5), DOMUS RONULA (pp.347-349), DNS-HSE (p.353), the Montanist "Trinity"(pp.186-7), Donatist slogans (pp.224-226), and the exceptional popularity of Biblical texts (p.220) define for us the character of African Christianity as such: in Africa the Church was externally more generously accommodating and internally more in earnest than elsewhere. Africa was thus far a land of extremes. Hence no doubt the historical importance of the Arrican Church.

But the chief problem of the African Church, the problem which more than all others receives light from the inscriptions because of their chronology, is and remains its own tragic destiny: its wholesale extinction in favour of Islam by the year 700. Holne, it Will be remembered, ascribes this calamity to the fact that Africa Was Christianized only in so far as it was already Romanized, so that the African Church disappeared automatically with the expulsion of the Romans from the country and its occupation by the Arabs (p.3). In this connection it has been convincingly argued that the want of a vernacular Bible was the main cause, Egypt and Armenia being cited as examples of the steadfastness of non-Roman and non-Greek
elements once the Scriptures have been put within their reachl) on the other hand Toutain has maintained that although the conservatism of the natives was proof against the numerous mystery-cults of antiquity, it was unable to withstand aggressive and intolerant religions like Christianity and Islam?) Essentially the same solution, formulated however with infinitely greater precision, and grounded on a general judgment concerning the cultural problem of North Africa as a whole, is offered by Thieling, who declares that the native population, being itself incapable of independent achievements of cultural importance, has fulfilled instead the role of intermediary in the development of civilization, accepting for the time being but not absorbing or inwardly appropriating the influence of foreign powers by which it is from time to time subdued: thus it has successively adapted itself to Punic, Greek, Roman, Vandal, and finally to Arabic conquerors, and at present stands under the influence of the French? (There are thus two answers to the problem at present current: (I) The natives were not gained for Christianity, otherwise Africa might still be Christian; and (2) Whether they were or not, they would not in any case have proved loyal.

That the native population was not in fact evangelized except in so far as it was in the first place Romanized, has been securely established: the Church in Africa was Latin, and the native element was insignificant ( p .442 ). That is all that the inscriptions have to say on the problem as hitherto formulated. They suggest two further reasons, however, for the downfall of the African Church,

1) Cooksey, The Land of the Vanished Church 21-22
2) Toutain, CPER iii 118
3) Thieling, Der Hellenismus in Kleinafrika 3
which are no doubt ultimately connected: (1) The Cnurch in Africa was never so stable as elsewhere; one cannot peruse the texts for long without being reminded of the Donatist troubles, the Vandal invasion, and the Byzantine recovery. The arrival of the Arabs found a Christianity exhausted by continual struggles between political and ecclesiastical rivals whereby the possibility of a peaceful and settled condition was again and again postponed by internal and external dispeace. In face of a united and aggresive Islam the constitutionally weak African Church had no choice but to disintegrate. (2)It must be seriously questioned whether the inward condition of the African Church, and the critical moment, was much better than its outward condition. If the inscriptions witness at all faithfully to the piety of the African Church, it is obvious that under the Byzantines African Christianity resembled very much the African Islam of to-day, that is to say, was a degenerate phenomenon, whereas the Islam to which it fell resembled very much the zealous African Christianity of the persecution-period (pp. 587-589), when the splendid conduct of the martyrs of Africa in face of official opposition resulted in the province becoming afterwards outstanding in the West as a seat of the veneration of the saints. In other words: round about 700 the youthful and fresh Islam was in fact superior to the Church in Africa even from a religious standpoint: so far removed from the simplicity of the Gospel had the piety of the African Church become, that the incoming Islan in fact showed itself a higher religious achievement. The African Church was ripe for reform, but no movement in that direction coming from within, judgment descended from without, and the African Church was not
reformed, but destroyed. The Church which once had witnessed gloriously, after resting on its laurels and indulging in selfdevelopment to the point of schism, was no longer capable of life. Now it is altogether excellent to mourn the loss of North Africa to the Church, and to pray for the day when that land will once more be claimed by the Gospel; but a much more urgent task lies directly to hand: namely to learn from the mistakes of that great Church of North Africa, which in its day produced Tertullian, Lactantius, Cyprian, Augustine, and countless martyrs and saints. As we see them at a distance of a thousand years and more, these fatal errors were the following:-

First, the sense of mission was lacking. The Lybic-Berbers ought to have been evangelized, so that even on the withdrawal of the Latin governing element they might have had the chance at least of standing their ground. We have no right to say in advance whether any ethnic group is likely to prove loyal or not, when once in possession of the Gospel. Christ died for all men without exception, the weak and despicable included. Christianity is not limited by civilization, but is addressed to all men everywhere unconditionally.

Second, human arrogance produced fatal schisms. Christianity is not an achievement of man, and can never become an achievement of man. The Donatists, in spite of all that has been said in praise of them, were fundamentally wrong in so far as they strove for human perfection at the expense of Christian unity.

Third, in the course of time the kernel of the Gospel sank from View beneath its ever-thickening husk, namely the theological language in which it was expounded in word and deed. The primitive
message, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himselfy) produced an infinite series of analytic judgments until connection was finally lost and nothing remained except a miscellany of religious commonplaces whose luxuriance was now quite beyond control.

Such are the sins of the African Church for which it paid with its life, and not of the African Church only, but of the Early Church as a whole, indeed of Christendom itself, our own generation included: Let us see what they involve for us.

There can be no dispute at all about the first, at least in princiche, although in practice it is becoming increasingly hard to overcome natural antipathies in loyalty to the Gospel. Nothing must be permitted to obscure from us the fact that even our enemies have access to God's grace?)

The second point is more difficult to avoid. The ideal of human perfection is meritorious, and negligence for the sake of securing all-round agreement is to be condemned. Hence there will always be tension within the Church regarding this problem. But in the last resort it is clear that we should choose to renounce personal satisfaction rather than reduce the scope of the Christian mission. After all, our ultimate worth lies in our faith towards God. The thira sin of the Early Church is the one we have least reason to condemn, in view of the extreme difficulty of avoiding it. As we see from the inscriptions, we should not, but for Christianity, have any notion of God at all except as abstracted from history; even when in control of history, as in the Old Testament, He is all the

1) 2 Cor 19
2) Barth, Letter to French Protestants, CNL Books no.11,p. 34
time transcendental in relation thereto. But the Church witnesses to the conviction that without renouncing transcendence God "was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself" (p.596) and claiming its acknowledgement of Himself in a concrete and decisive manner. The Gospel is thus a synthetic judgment a posteriori concerning God, presupp_osing a possible world-view and requiring for its formulation a system of analytic judgents in terms thereof. No formulation however simple can dispense with this presupposition: even the apostolic formulation for example, which is here employed, presupposes a system of theological ideas, one namely which views the world as being at variance with God. In other words, the "kernel" in the metaphor ( p .595 ) can never exist without a "husk" of some kind, exceptintheimmediateconsciousnessof the believer, whereit consists in the attitude of his wi l I slone. Once the Christian seeks to conceptualize his experience in order to have it clearly before his own intelligence, or wishes to communicate his discovery to others, the "husk" at once appears of necessity, in terms of his own world-view. The "husk" is capable of endless elaboration according to the type of world-view into which the "kernel" penetrates ( p .584 ). This is the process known as syncretism. Plainly vigilance is necessary to ensure that the "husk" is pruned from time to time to preserve the outline of the "kernel" and to free from hindrance its continuous movement forward. Harnack says this in different words when, having described the process whereby the Gospel developed into patristic theology, he states that the further expansion of Christianity "depends also on the capacity of

Christianity to strip off once more any collective syncretism and unte itself to fresh coefficients. The Reformation made a beginning in this direction. ${ }^{1)}$ But the Early Church did not exercise this needfulf criticism! Instead it allowed the "husk" to grow so enormously thick as to obliterate the "kernel" and bring it to a standstill. Without metaphor: the ideological elaborations, having first served to expound the Gospel, began to be cultivated for their own sake, and were organized into a world-view regarded as of value in itself; and stagnation resulted. To this day Roman Catholicism perpetuates the world-view and therewith the praxis of the Church of the Middle Ages, and this is the sharpest condemnation that can be pronounced against it?) The revolutionary programme of the Gospel, namely to proclaim the Incarnation far and wide, lapsed into a conservative one of pietistic, ritualistic, mystical and magical religious self-culture. Such was the condition of the African Church under the Byzantines. No wonder therefore that the advent of Islam spelt its downfall.

The last word however need not be and should not be pessimistic. The trageay of the African Church is not the measure of its special guilt, which Christendom as a whole shares, the African community as such being merely the victim of circumstances: it lay namely in the path of Islam's drive westward. We ourselves here and now are by no means differently placed, for, the happiest imaginable synthesis with civilization notwithstanding, the Church to-day which still enjoys a certain prestige may at any time without notice be summoned to close its ranks, renounce all, and witness to Christ with its very life as often before. But we have this advantage over
1)Harnack, Mission 1397
2) Harnack, Wesen 76
the Early Church, namely that whereas the Early Church lacked experience, we who now know its melancholy history are able to see the issue with unclouded eyes: we know what has in fact happened, and why it happened, and therewith how the mistakes then committed may be avoided in the future. For a much deeper reason also, however, we refuse to be pessimistic. Following the example of Paul, who resorted to a biological analogy in order to expound the relation of the Church to Christ (p.549), we take the liberty of expounding the relation once again in parable along the same lines. As in the history of the human race the continuity of germ-plasm ensures that each generation normally has a fresh start notwithstanding the imperfections which have come to mar the existence of its predecessor either from folly or misfortune, the precious heritage of life being thereby preserved sweet, wholesome, pure, strong, and capable of endless development ${ }^{1)}$ : in exactly the same way the quintessence of the Gospel is indestructible and may always be recovered from beneath its indispensable but relative practical and ideological superstructure by whoso sincerely seeks it. In a word: God speaks to Man therein, and nothing that Man can do will reduce Him to silence.

But having said this and drawn comfort from the though. that God will not forsake us,all our blunders notwithstanding, we must add immediately, that the Church is not for that reason His? automatically maintained. There is no necessity for proving it; we can see it for oursalves as a stark fact: in Africa the Church

[^101]is no more! God does not therefore relieve us from personal
responsibility. On the contrary: God summons us to the maximum of personal responsibility! To be sure we cannot reconcile this fact with the ascription of Christianity to God's initiative, far Iess furnish it with cogent proofs; but we are sure of it nevertheless, and see in it the expression, under the aspect of a contradiction, of the inevitable character of Superhuman Eschatology ( p .575 ).

Religion is no arbitrary product of civilization, but the most profound interpretation possible for us of the totality of existence. But whereas in general this interpretation is sought by Man, who thereby strives towards God, it is plainly the claim of Christianity that in Christ God once and for all summoned Man, and still summons him through the Church, which alone witnesses to Christ and preserwes historical contact with Christ. For this reason, Christianity is not a religion on the same level as other religions, but Religion itself? ) It represents God's answer to Man's cry. A world-view is naturally necessary for its exposition, and it is capable of being expounded in terms of any and every world-view, while by its nature proclaiming the relativity of all possible world-views in general. It is the temptation of the Church, as a human community, to arrest the progress of the Gospel throughout mankind but by setting ideological limits to the Gospel, and ultimately to lose sight of the Gospel amid the details of a specific world-view. It is the duty of the Church on the contrary to renounce this course, which

[^102]leads to stagnation, and criticize its theological language from time to time to ensure the pure proclamation of the Gospel in the theological categories current from time to time in its everchanging environment. Loyalty to the Gospel also involves readiness to witness on its behalf when called upon even to the renunciation of life itself.

Such is the picture of Christianity, reduced to its quintessence, which the Christian Inscriptions of North Africa reflect. In order rightly to appreciate the significance of the African Church and its historic role however, it is in the last resort necessary to give up the spectator's position and assume that of the participant, sharing its fortunes for good or ill. Only then will Praxis and Ideology cease to be mere phenomena requiring examination alternately, and become for us complementary aspects of one unified experience. At the point where the writing of history comes to an end with unanswered questions, the active fashioning of history begins with novel situations and their unforeseen demands. Behind us lie problems. Before us lie tasks.
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## APPENDIX I - DATED TEXTS

Date

225 Memoriae Praetoriani fili dulcissimi homini
(1)
ingeniosissimo notario $\nabla$ an XXXXV m III d XVII Romae decessit XV $k$ nov a $p$ CLXXXVI Maurusius filio

226

Memoriae Primae filiae dulcissimae $v$ a IIIIII
decessit $V$ kal sept a p CLXXXVII
(3)

Rasina Secunda redd XVI kal novem p CLXXXXVIIII
aV 4
(4)

DMS Fuscia Aemilia qui vix an XXG et disc $X$ kal bV 108
(5)

> Secundo C...ni patri dulc...mo vixit an. X.. dis die XYII..a p CCLXVID
(6)

DMS L Crepereii Evassi vixit annis L discessit k mai an CCLXXI $p$
(7)

318 Bona memoria Em Martis et filiae ejus vicxit annis kl maiias p CCLXXSIII
(8)

DMS donis memoriae spirita(ntium?) Julio Calvo bV 111 marito Fau...n et Rogatio filis carissimis Aurelia Rogata lenita dolorem mesam cum titulum refrigerat ionis posuit dedicavitque Calvus vix anis LXV o Rogatus anis XX Fau vix anis XLIIII p CCLXXVIIII
(9)

321
..I...eo na.... Variae ancille Cristi vixit in Deo annis prope LX et fecit sibi ipsa sana santorum mensa die SII kl julias dedicante Avianio Crescenti ....p CCLXXXV

324 Mensa eterna Januari a LXXV dec kal septetm(?).. bV 24 hec est pau(s)a he est dms eterna L T Cicero ei f a p CCLXXXV

327 Memoria Vipi Serelli qui et Maceal vicxit annis XL bV 93 disc nonas junias marito dulcissimo (pro) CCLXXXVIII
(I4)
Kemoriae Ennagi et Sexti klas memoria beatissimorum martyrum id est Rogati Matenni Nassei Maximae quem Primosus Cambus genitores dedicaverunt passi XII kal nown ${ }^{\circ}$ CCXC prov

332 DMS Florentia Monnina Jun vicxit annis IIII dis bV 113 VII idus oct a p CCXCIII
(16)

333 DMS Crepereiae Primae matri dulcissime vic annis bV 114 LXV dis X ka mart filii et nepotes fecerunt pro CCXCIIII

333 Memoria Ulpie Florentine vixit annis XXIII

BV 115
discessit 5 nonas octobres a p CCXCIIII
frater sorori dul titulavi

| 333 | Memoria C...Luciani q vixit annis LXX discessit kalen novembres anno pro CCXCIIII fili patri dulcissimo fecimus | bV. 116 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (19) |  |
| 335 | DMS posui Valerio Restuto disp patri amantissimo vixit annis LIII dis IIII idus sep $p$ CCXCVI | bV 136 |
| +339 | ...oria Honorati ...i bicxit anni...minus XX discessit in p p CCC..... <br> (21) | bV 117 |
| 42 | ```Memoria posuit Usc...Victorine marite dulcis vix an XL dis III ka m p CCCIII (22)``` | bV 118 |
| 342 | Mensa $P$ Aeli Nampulit $v$ a LXXXIII milli d d idus maias an $p$ CCCIII fecit $P$ Ael Donatus filius ejus <br> (2) | bV 18 |
| 343 | Remi Emeritus vicxit an LXXX discessit III idus novembres $p$ CCCIV <br> (24) | bV 77 |
| 344 | Memoria Aurelia Saturnina vixit annis LXV discessit III nonas novembres pater et filii fecer anno p CCCV (25) | bV 91 |
| +344 | DMS Aelius Delius Eusus qui vixit plus minus LXX diseessit XII kalendas junias Aelius Junior filius carissimus...parentes istituterunt domum romulam anno pp CCCV............ <br> (26) | bV 119 |
| 345 | Memoriae Maeci Rustici qui processit in pace dominica et vic annis LX Maecius Victor fecit an $p$ CCC et sexta <br> (27) | bV 85 |
| 347 | Pit...pe quae vixit annis $X X V$ di pri idus dec p CCCVIII | bV 160 |

349 | Flore bone memorie conjugi quetus maritus mensam |
| :--- |
| perpetuam posuit quae vicsit annis IX decessit |
| octav kal martias anno proviciae CCCX |$\quad$ bV 7

+349 Memoria de* | possionis Dativais qui et Saguntinais |
| :--- |
| santimonialis die SIII k jun posuit Privata |
| mater an p CCCX......... |$\quad$ bV 4

350 Memoria Titi Felicis vixit annis IIII dis XE bV 141 ka fb a p CCCXI

350 Memoria Sulpicia Faustina vix an XXX dis III id bV 161 aug maritus carissime fec p CCCXI
(32)

350 Memoria Vałeria Saturnina matri amantissime vix bV 162 an LX đis XVI $k n p$ CCCXI
(33)

351 DIM Julia Silviana vicx annis XXIII discessi nonas
bV 163 marsas p CCCXII e(?)

351 DIM Sedata Januaria vixit anis LX discess YIX bV 154 ca junias p CCCXII

351 den...dn...n...vixit annis $p$ m XVIII disc VII kaI bV 164 julias pater dul fecit a p CCCXII

DdS Aurelius Martis vicsit anis XXXVI dis VI k
bV 75 apriles $p$ CCCXIII

352 Loliae Nittunae qui in pace dominica nos precessit bV 120 qui vixit annis p m XXVIII C Julius Acmtus maritus ejus memoriam fecit p CCCXIII moritur XI kaI septembres

Bone memoriae Rozoni medici vixit annis LXX dies XX prescessit (nos) in pace $\mathrm{X} G \mathrm{kaI}$ maias pr CCCXYII

360 XL mensa haec est aeterna domus et perpetua
felicitas de omnibus meis hoc solum meum Aper
fidelis in pace vixit anis LXV dep ejus $X$ kal bV 19
360 XL mensa haec est aeterna domus et perpetua
felicitas de omnibus meis hoc solum meum Aper
fidelis in pace vixit anis LXV dep ejus $X$ kal
360 XL mensa haec est aeterna domus et perpetua
felicitas de omnibus meis hoc solum meum Aper
fidelis in pace vixit anis LXV dep ejus $X$ kal sep an $p$ CCCXXI

361
DMS Quintius Quintus crudelis vixit anis $C$ discessit bV 101 Xद kalendas januar Quintus Felix pater fil kres. ume dom $r$ is....t an $p$ CCCXX
(43)

* Memoria sacta Victorinus Miggin septim idus bV 27 septmr...stdabula.it de lignu crucis de ter... promisonis ube natus est Cristus apostoli Petri et Pauli nomina marturu Datiani Donatiani Cipriani Nemesani...itim et Victorias ano provi...ecenti viges...posuit Benenatus et Pequaria

Memoria Aurelius Sammac vix anis LV dissit II non bV 76 maiias frater duc fec ano CCCXXII
(46)

362 Memoria Florentie Maximus vixit annis XV disc VI ka bV 124 mar p CCCXXIII

Memorie depositionis presbiteri Securi posita a
bV 3 fratres Fatale et Flora vicsit annos LY ano $p$ ~CXXIIII depositio Bassi fratris VII idus octobres

368 .....idus...acerđos....s prb ann XSII....anis LSIII.. (49)

377
*M Calvari in pace vixit anis tres adagp cui bV 125 memoria fecit M Arimanus Aus cum Ajutore filio suo an $p$ CCCXXXVIII
+379 DMS....slacia R....ia vc an...de $V$ idus a..p CCCXL.. bV 126
(51)

* Memoria Valerie Germane vicsit anis XXVIII dist bV 79
(52)

DA ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\text {MS }}$ hanc memoria quam fecit Eustasius et Julia bV 14 Crescentina uxor ejus in nomine Dei et Cristi ejus pro tempore sui depositione eorum ad perfectum dedicatu est die idus martias anno provincie CCCXIV filius Silvani.........

| 389 | DMS Quinta Januaria qui vicsit annis LXX dicest | bV 102 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| III nononas octobrs orem Januarius et Victorin |  |  |
| istitu domum romul fili anno pr CCCI |  |  |

390 Memoriae Witpturi quin et Maccalis vix annis LXXX bV 92 dies XIIII kal feb fili dulci fecerunt pro CCCLI

391 | Memorie Julie Vale Valenfa qui in pace dominica |
| :--- | :--- |
| prececsit qui vicsit annis XV Julius Caiius |
| mesa...............pr CCCLII |

(57)

392 DMS Julius Secundus vixit annis LXX et discessit bV 95 X kalendas febrarias Julius Fronto filius patri krissimo benemerenti domum rom istituwit an p CCCLIII
(58)

Julia Monnina ve a XIII de II $k$ feb an $p$ CCCLIII bV 129 pt dul fecit

392 DM Julius Saturus inn ve an XI de $V \mathrm{kI}$ januar bV 130 p CCCLIII p dul fecit
(60)

393 Memor...tr...ls vixit annis L...XIIII k feb fili bV 131 duc fecerunt pro CCCLIV
(6I)
Mem Aurelii Victori vix an XV disc X d kal Julias a p CCCLIIII

394 Memo Flavi Januari ve an XII de TI idus januar bV 78 pro CCCLV $\oplus$
(63)
$+400$

DMS Flavius Donatus sacerdos qui vixit annis p m CV cV 160 discessit VII kalendas junias Flavius Moninus Faustus fili patri karissimo et bm domum romulam istituerunt anno pp CCCLIII
(73)

405

Hic jacet Eulogius Trasmarinus qui vixit annos cV 4 N‘III ano CCCLX¢

Ic jacet Crisacius Trasmarinus qui vicsit annos
cV 23 XXXV plus minus anno pro CCCLXVI $\alpha$ w
(75)

Ic jacet Costantius Trasmarinus qui vicsit annos cV 24 viginti septe pIus minus an p CCCLX $\} \propto \omega$
(76)

Hic jacet Irineus Trasmarinus qui vixit annis cV 27 quadracinta plus minus an $p$ CCCLXVI
(77)

Modanius annorum XVIII avia ejus Vic(?) torina cV 28 annorum LX quieve日unt in paee an $p$ CCCLXVII +
(78)

(79)

De Di et Xpi Umbrius Felix mag fecit votum reddidit cV 78 Do precatur pro suis peccatis salvificetar a $p$ CCCLX et $¢$ III
(80)
a水 $w . . . \mathrm{Cl}^{\text {V }}$ Vetti Auni et...et...sororibus qui ante cV 81 ...dormierunt et Juliae Maximae matri sue Valente aci...d an CCCLX et SIII
(81)

Memoriae Aureliae sororis qui nos precessit in pace
cV 204 dominica et vicxit anis pl m LV et dissit $\mathrm{X} k$ julias ano pro CCCLXXI Emilius Victorinus una cum filis suis mesam fecerunt
(82)
412 Julius Donatus vicxit anis LX filiollius fecit dsc cV 106

414 Memoria Reparati Arelli Faunus re p CCCLXXV eV 123
(84)
$414 \underset{\text { an } \mathrm{p} \text { CCCLXX et } V}{\text {..ti..so...vixit an LXXII decessit } V}$ idus jan cV 201
$415 \quad$ Hic jacet Vitivideus vixit annis quinquaginta $\quad$ cV 29 plus minus an p CCCLXXVI 为 $\alpha$
(86)

416 DMS Seppius Marcellus qui vixit annis plu min XL eV 161 discessit X klendas decembres Seppius Secundus frater carissi et benemerenti salute doms romula istituerunt anno provinciae CCCLXX et septima
(87)

418 Memorie Evaisse qui vixit anis p m XXIII discessit cV 181 in p CCCLXX et nono.......
(88)

419 Mesa Saturnini lapide cesori provincia civis(???) cV 8 mortus est anno paludensis(??) + mensis(?)marti anno provincie CCCLXXX
(89)

"ogxXI kalndas octobres an CCCLXXX
(90)
$419 \begin{array}{ll}\text { Memoria Januarius vixit annis LXXX percus } \\ \text { discessit } Y \text { II kal junias pro CCCLXXX }\end{array} \quad$ CV 134
(91)

419 DM Leppidius Cassus qui nos precessit in p et vicsit cV 205 p m LXXIII uxor una cum filio fecerunt an p CCCLXXX

| 420 | DMS Sulpicia Onerata vixit an LXXX dis VII idus maias p CCCEXXXI | cV 142 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (93) |  |
| 420 | ....mo....matissia Silvana vix anis LV dis nonas septe ano p CCCLXXXI | cV 207 |
|  | (94) |  |
| 421 | $\Delta \Delta M M$ Perelius Reparatus vixit an...ve de... CCCLXXXII (95) | cV 193 |
| 422 | Memoria sancti semperque gloriosi patris nostri Nemessani eps vixit ahnis LX...inter quibus XSII.. quos sacerdotium dno administravit et requievit in pace XI kI jnauaria \& G bIXXX et III Julia Geliola sacra Dei sacerdotis soror vixit annis L...et requievit in pace....nona octo $\& q$ NLXXX et III | cV 82 |

(96)
?423 Memoria Florensia Fabia vicxit anis LXXXV discessit cV 104
(97)

424 DMS UIpius Germanus vicsit anis XLV discessit VII cV 210 kal martias pater filio memoria fecit an pro çCCLXXXV

425 DMS Crepereius Honorius vicxit anis XXX discessit cV IOl X $\subseteq$ I kalen nove pater dul fec p CCCLXXX 5
(99)

425 Memo Migaracru...vixit annis...die id junias cV ll2 anno proc. 6 GCLXXXVI

DMS Aurelia Satura qui vicsit annis XL disces X
cV 165 kal novembes dom run ann pr CCC et LXXXI
(101)

427 Victor vixit in pace annis XXX p m d VIII k decem Hierio et Artubure

| 428 | DM Anerenia Januaria vicsit anis XCV discessit |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | III idus novembres pro CCCLXXXUIIII |

Mem Crescentis pb vixit annis LV dis III ka martias anno pro CCCXCV
(111)
（112）

Turasius presb in pace vix an XIIII men III dies cIV 144 XVII depsus id oct Aetio et St（udi）o c（ons）s
（113）
Ulpius Donatus vicsit annis X decessit IIII
cV 195 kalendas novembres anno pro CCCC
（114）
$\Delta \Delta M M$ Julius Lucius vixit anis LXX i pce
cV 159 ann ppp CCCC

Hic jacet antistes sesque Novatus terdenos et VII cV 19 sedis qui meruit annos recessit die X kal septemb pr CCCCI＋
（ユ1す）
（Cl¥audia Urba（n）a qui vixit annis plus minus LX cV 166 dissesit IIII idus novembres Sepius Donatianus filius Mateus domu romul istituerunt ann provicie CCCLXXX et．．．．．．
（117）
Memoria Eli Mugiar（i qui n）os precessit（in）pa（ce）cV 130 dominica vicxit a．．．scessit XV．．a．．XC et．．．sod．．．． lius vixcit an p m．．．．．m．．．．．discessit idus marsas Elius sossanus una cum patribus suis titulum posuerunt an CCCCIII
（118）
Hic requiescit Romanilla honesta femina qui vixit an cV 34 XIII recessit in p d pr n julias an pr CCCCV XIII

Wemoriae．．．nutta II a vixit annis LXI discessit cV 113 pri nonas julias a p CCCC et 仕
(121)

| 448 | Deposita oria (?) Felicie die XIIII kal marti an $p$ CCCCVIIII dps Risliri XV....ae............. (122) | cV 37 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 449 | DDMM Blattius Macximus viesit anis LXV et decessit an pro CCCCX (123) | cV 190 |
| 450 | (4) Memo Aurelia Tifalis vicxit annis VIII dis idus nove a p CCCCXI <br> (124) | cV 100 |
| +450 | ```Gaudentius \(r\) in pace anno XIIII 杂 \(\}\) \\ Felicitas \(r\) in pace anno XII \({ }^{\mathcal{S}}\) (125)``` | cIII 618 |
| 450 | Memoriae Juliae Pullae qui nos precessit in pace dom vixit ani pm XV et disc...idus august ann pro CCCCXI memoriae Depusinne (quae) nos precessit in pa(ce) dominica et vixit anni plu m XXFI et discessit....idus augus...anno pro CCCC et.... | cV 131 |
| 452 | In hoc loco sancto depositae sunt reliquiae sancti Laurenti martiris die III nn aug cons Herculani ve die domn dedicante Laurentio wsp(?) mor dom an $p$ CCCCXIII amen <br> (127) | cV 9 |
| 452 | ```Memoria Junia Fortuna vixit anis p m XC discessit } kI austa pr CCCCXIII (128)``` | cV 141 |
| ? 452 | $\oplus$ Billatica vixit annis XVIII plsm requiebit in pace die VI kI julias anno XXVIIII (I29) | cII 76 |
| 453 | Memroa Cecilius Julianus vixit anis LXXX discessit III idus apriles pp CCCCXIIII | cV 184 |

(130)


DMM Julius Lucianus sunzaconus vicxit annis IX et decessit CCCCXLII
(133)

M $<M$ Aurelius Lucius qui nos processit in pace cV 203 dominica viesit annis plus minus XX pr CCCCXX

MCOM Julie Celse qui nos precessit in pace dominica
cV 206 vicsit anis plus minus XXXI et discessit tersiu kal augustas (???) provincia CCCCXXI
(135)

Mem Bonifati preb vixit an LXXV mortus est di XIIII cV 124 kal octob a p CCCCXXII
(136)
....us vicsit annis LXXXI recessit p CCCCXXIII
cV 200
(137)
(U) Ipius...Cilanu...suit an XXX de(?) CCCCXXIIII cV 194
(138)
...moria Juli Sandali vixit an LXXIII acceptus est
cV 65 an $p$ CCCCXX $\{$ die $乡 I$ idus....ptembre

| 467 | Hic requiescit Emerita honesta femina qui vixit anis LXXV recessis in pace die $V \mathrm{kl}$ agusta an p CCCCXXVIII (140) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 468 | ...recessit nos in pace...aposus bone memoriae.. viscini(?) a IIII non nove..b et sepultus est d non ...novemb prov CCCCXX et nona <br> (141) | cV 121 |
| 469 | DMS memoria Aureli Macersumis qui vicxit annis pIus minus LXV et discessit in pace Dni anno CCCCXXX | cV 90 |
| 469 | DMS memoriae Aureli Secundi qui vixit an III m XXXV et discessit in pace die camasemeres(?) an pro CCCCXXX <br> (143) | cV 91 |
| 469 | ...Caius Junius...missimione (?missione) vixit ann XXX mortuus est anno p CCCCXXX <br> (144) | cV 125 |
| 469 | ...is viesit anis $X X X$ et(?) decessit an provinciae CCCCXXX <br> (145) | cV 199 |
| 470 | DMS memoria Juli Emeriti qui vixit annis plus minus LXXX et precessit in pace domini....a p CCCCXXXI (146) | cV 94 |
| +470 | $\Delta \Delta M M$ Calpurnia Amacrona Acerva vicsit anis $V$ et $4 I I$ et decessit provinciae CCCCXXX et........ (147) | cV 191 |
| 471 | Memoria Propertiae Gududiae fidelis in pace vixit annis LX accepta est die III kal april a p CCCCXXXII (148) | cV 126 |
| 474 | ...rece...s in pace bone memoriae Faustina die IIII nonas decembres prov an CCCCXXX et quinta | cV 121b |

474 | Ego prefectus iugmena(?) incoai eclesia et Deus |
| :--- | :--- |
| complevit in nomine Spiriti Santi in ani provicie |
| CCCCXXXV nos Zabenses conplevimus |$\quad$ cV 164

475 DMS memoriae Aureliae Lorida quae vixit annis XXX 4 cV 92 et discessit in pace an(?) die viavic(???) an p ccccxxxc

Hic requiescit sanctae memoriae pater noster cV 117 Reparatus eps qui fecit in sacerdotium annos VIII men XI et precessit nos in pace die undecimu kal aug provnc CCCCLXXX et sexta
(154)

Memoria Aureliae Felicia vixit annos LXX recessit cV 63 die III idus deecembres an CCCCXXXGI
(155)

Mria Julia Unna vxt annis LX disit XI kal feb cV 140 a p CCCCXLI
d $\mathbb{K}^{10}$ Memoria Marcelli recessit die martis luna(?)
cV 66 XXI idus augustas a $p$ CCCCXII

[^103]| 485 | Memoria Sittia Prima vixit annis XVI dis XI kal martias an pp CCCCXL 9 | cV 111 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (159) |  |
| 486 | ...nom.....is..cius vic annis LV et decessit ... + CCCCXLSI | cV 197 |
|  | (160) |  |
| 488 | $\Delta \Delta \mathrm{MM}$ Ulpius Marcus vicsit annis LS et aiscessit III idus marsas pp CCCCXI\&III | cV 196 |
|  | (161) |  |
| 489 | DMS Atilia Ince(n)nua vixit anns LX dis V idus novembres Stacciu Victor maritai pos an p CCCCL | cV 152 |
|  | (162) |  |
| +490 | Mria Flav Mafic dc pr..(???) vixit anis XLV..?.. iemu(???)...martis(?) pp CCCCL........ | cV 102 |
|  | (163) |  |
| 491 | Hic est Antonia Emerita qui vixit annis plus minus LX et dise in pace Dni ano prvinc CCCCLII | cV 89 |
|  | (164) |  |
| 493 | DMS memoria Julii Januari qui vixit annis plus minus XXX et discessit in pace Dni die nonu kal januarias annis provineia CCCCLIIII | cV 95 |
|  | (165) |  |
| ? 493 | DMS Petronius Pampilus vicsit annis X disce XV kl nove.... CCCCLIIII..... | av 208 |
|  | (166.) |  |
| 494 | Memori...Aelie....o....ule qui n precessit in $p \mathrm{Dn}$ vixit ann $p \mathrm{~m}$ SIII et dis IIII $k$ janu an $p$ CCGCLV | cV 202 |
|  | (167) |  |
| 495 | ...Itis exiliis....probatus et fidei catholicae adsertor dignus inventus inplevit in episcopatu an XVIII m II d XII et occisus est in bello Maurorum et sepultus est die VI id maias p CCCCLVI | cV 68 |

495
Memoria Juli Capsari plo vic an XCII diis XIIII
cV 105 kl maias an p CCCCL5
? 508
Hic requ... Fíííus(???) Ge....idelis....n pace an cIV 77 ....menses $V$ dies.....(nat?) us est ann $\uparrow I$ domn reg ..(Trasa?)mundi III non febrarias et recessit ann XIISI ka....augustas ora VIII sabbatorum die
(170)
$\mathbb{R}$ quiebit Festa in pace s a SII kl martias ano cII 156
(171)

519 DMS Aennia Julia vixit annis plus minus LX(X)V et cV 88 nos pr.......ni die IIII kalndas martias anno prov CCCCLEXX
(172)
 cII 147 XXXII quievit $乡$ II id decembres anno IIII d $n$ regis Ildirix
(173)

530 * * Mem Flavia Saturnina devotae vxs annis pl m
cV 103 disct XVIII kal octobres an pc CCCCXCI
(174)

531 Hic Desiderius jacet natus Casas Majores Reni filius
cIV 98
Respecti episc vixit in pace fidelis annis XXVI depositus anno primo domn regis (G)eli(meri) XI kl febr

534 + Quintus diaconus Justinianae Cartaginis regionis secunde depositus octabu decimu calendas decembres

CIII 607
(176)

536 * $+*$ Mem Julius Donatus pater familias cui fili fecer cV 137 domum eternale vixxit annis plus min LXXV dec VII idus nob anno proc CCCCXCVII

Anno VI $k$ die VIII $k$ augustas $F l$ Anu(s)...serbus

cIV 215

540 Onorata bene vixere per annoz IIIIX(?) sepulta cIV 274
(180)

543 Hic memoria sancti Juliani deposite sunt XI die cIV 130 mensa \& ano XVII Justiniani
(181)

543
$f_{\text {Mem }}$ Juliae Justa mater familiae cui fili feceru cV 76
543 domum eternal vxit annis pl min LXXXV dic die VI kal septembr anno proc DIIII
(182)
$\oplus$ Aprilia fidelis vixit annos LXXV recessit in cIV 45 pace sub die III kal septemb anno XXIIII Kartaginis
(183)
+568 Hic abentur reliquie beati martiris et antistitis
+568 Hic abentur $\quad$ Cypriani dps a beat Melleo epsco ann IIII dni Justini imps

577 Domn sedis Karthaginiensis veniens Kr... aput col Madauros defunctus est in pace fidelis vixit.... III........iciter
(178)
(बW) Donatianus prsb in exilio pro fide catolica cIV 99 hic aput col Mad relegatus recessit die nonas apriles anno VII Karthaginis vixit annis XCVI
(179)

## IIII kl maias anno \&I

...sussa...ixit an.... LXXXXXI...e IIII nona....
cV 144 tobres D et X XII
(184)

DMM Sallustucius Manno vixit annis LXXX a p cV 129 DXXX et octava et decessit
(recto) + In nomine Dni Di Jhu Xpi Di et salvatoris nostri et maximorum benefactoru Eracli pissimi imperatoris....pacifico anno bicesimo quinto et Costintinis benefactoris inpre Eraclis benefactoris cesaris Costintinis indeti(?) benefactoris imperatoris anno bicesimo quinto et post consulatu ejus anno quinto Eraclio...benefactoris cesaris anno quinto petuorum victorie impratoru sub die sesto idus februabias ind decima in oc benerali locum deposite sunt reliquie sactoru martiru (verso) + id est santi Istefani sacti Focii sacti Teudori et sacti Bictoris confessoru per manus beatissimoru episcoporu et id est Leoncius epes sacte elesie... Medimus armarius sacte elesie linfersis(?)...domno ...conserbandos...+....africana probincia primorü Bitalionis dicamus Do reliquias + et o...clius nr debotissimo scrissi ejus crissi(?) 早
(190)

649 Memoria....cui fili et mater fec...mum eternale.. cV 127 cessit in pace an pro DCX

655 MM Juli vice prepos cui parentes et nepotes fecerunt cV 168 domum eternale vixit annis XVIII descessit $\Delta \mathrm{kI}$ novembres ano pro DCXVI

679 Memoria Juli....cui fili fecerunt domum eternale cV 128 vixit anis plus mus LXIIII dscessit in pace die VI qaustas ano pr DCXI

## APPENDIX II - ONOMASTICON

(1)Compound: l,Double 2,Triple 3,Quadruple 4,Apparatus (Compound nett)
(2)Simple (Apparatus, *Common)
(1) Compound
l,Double
(a) Nomina

Ael Mazica cV 22
Elius Mugiarus cV 130
Elius Sossanus cV 130
Aemilia N.... CIII 553
Aemilia Theodora cIV 6
Aemilia Valentina $6 V$
Aemilius Donatus bIV 83
Em Martis bV 62
Emilius Sabinus bIV 84
Emilius Victorinus cV 204
Aennia Julia cV 88
Antonius Junior cIV 129
Anius Benedictus bV 23
Attia quintula bII 41
Q Attius cIII 506
Aurelia Emerita bV 90
Aurelia Felicia cV 63
Aurełia Galla bV 144
Aurelia Lorida CV 92
Aurelia Sallustia bIII 34
Aurelia 今atura cV 165
Aurelia Saturnina bV 91
Aurelia Sirvata bIII 217
Aurelia Tifalis cV 100
Aurelia Bicla bII 105
Aurelius Lucius cV 203

Aurelius Macersumis cV 90
Aurelius Martis bV 75
Aurelius Robustus aII 29
Aurelius Sammac bV 76
Aurelius Secundus cV 91
Aurelius Victor bV 89
Caecellia Maxima aII 4 C Rogat a
Caecilius Aemilianus bIV 81
Caecilius JuIianus cV 184
Caelius Pergulus bIV 85
Calpurnia Kassuntina cIV 237
Calpurnius Crescentio bIV 86
Cassia FaustacV l53
Cassius Brumasius bII I26
Petronianus Cassius bV 63
Cilonia Grata bII 22
Claudia Urbanaci l66
Claudius Macrunius bIV 88
Claudius Nutricosus bII 73
Claudius Saposus bV 6
Curtia Saturnina bIV 29
Canpesis Domitius bIII 222

Fabia Restituta bII 25
Fabricia Faustiniana bIV 89
Fabricius Bonifatius cII 98
F Afrodisia bIV 30
Fl Amanda cIV 58
Flavia Domitia aII 10
Flavia Fortunata cIV 232
Flavia Rogata cV 133
Flavia Saturnina cV 103
Flavia Secundina cII 17
F Agasparus cIII20
Fl Anus cIV 215
Flabius Argutio cII 200
Fla Asterius cIV 229
Elavius Aventius cIV 230
Flavius Castrensis bIII 290
Flavius Donatus cV 160
Fl Gantius bIV 175
Fl Getulius cIV 5I
Fl Eustasius bV 14
Flavius Januarius bV 78
Flavius Nuvel bV 67
Flavius Petronianus eIV 231
Fl Pompeianus bIV 90
Fl Silbanianus cII 132
Fl Syrus bV 105
F Lucilus bII 125
Fl Martialis bII 120
Fl Urbanus cIV 182
Fl Valens cIII 23
Flavius Victorianus cIV 221
Fl Vitalis cIII 488
Fl Ziper cV 67
Gallius Victorinus bIV 91
Herennius Alvinus cIII 82
Aerennius Caicralis bV 143
Aerennius Constantius bV 143
Julia Afrodite cIV 236
Julia Aurelia bV 96
Julia Celsa cV 206
Julia Crescentia EIV 182
Julia Crescensa cV 62
Julia Crescentina bV 14
Julia Dam.... bV 146
Julia Dativa cIV 124,237
Julia Faosa cV 107
Julia Florianae bIV 68
Julia Fortuna cV 141

Julia Fortunata bII 101,B III
Julia Geliola cV $82 \quad L 47$
Julia Eanuria bV 156
Julia Justa cV 76
Julia Marcella bIII 195
Julia Maxima cV 81
Julia Meggent bIV 93
Julia Prima cV 108
Julia Pulla cV 131
Julia Restituta bII 76
Julia Rocata cII 3
Jul Sapida cV 109
Julia Secunda bV 147
Julia Silviana bV 163
Julia Tutta bV 71
Julia Unna cV 140
Julia Vagula aII 21
Julia Victoria cII 172,cIV238
Julia Vitrubia bIV 69
Julius Adeodatus bIV 112
Julius Aemilianus bV 145
Julius Cresconius cIV 234
Julius Capsarius cV 105
Julius Donatus cIV 235
Julius Donatus eV 64106137
Julius Emeritus bV 134, cV 94
Julius Fortunatus
Julius Fronto bV 95
Julius Germane cV 138
Julius Honorius cII 32
Julius Jader bIV 172
Julius IIAIR cV 61
Julius Januarius cV 95
Julius Lucianus cV 192
Julius Lucius cV 159
Jul Maxim cII 19
Julius Maximianus bIII 267
Jul Mescent cIV 252
Julius Pascasius bII 103
Julius Prinus bV 33
Julius Rogatus cV 154
Julius Secundius bV 33
Julius Saturus bV 130,132
Julius Sabinus bII 65
Julius Sandalus cV 65
Julius Secundus bV 95
Julius Servilianus cIV 240
Julius Victor cV 79
Julius ......nus cIII 557
Junia Inocensa bV 152
Junius Secundus cV 96

Caius Junius cV 125
Leppidius Cassius cV 205
Licinius Curiosus eII 176
Lollius Simone bV 9
Hortesus Lucius bV 151
Lurius Fortunatus bIII 28
Maecius Rusticus bV 85
Magnia Crescentina aV 3
Macnia Evassa bV 59
Maevius Faustus bIV 29
Maevius Octavianus bIV 29
Manilius Apicius bIII 146
Manilius Silvanus bIII 285
Marius Victorinus aII 4
Minucius Apronianus cIII 600
Numisius Felicissimus aIII 25
Pescennia Quodvultdeus bIII 37
Petronius Pampilus cV 208
Pompeia Maxima cIII 367
Pompeius Cercadio bII 102
Propertia Gududia cV 126
Quintius Quintus bV 101
Iscantius Faustus bV 40
Sepius Donatianus cV 166
Seppius Marcelius cV 161
Seppius Secundus \&V 161
Servilia Optata CIV 239
Servilius Primulianus CIV 239
Sittia Prima cV 111
Statilia Hilara cII 184
Sulpicia Faustina bV 161
Sulpicia Onerata cV 142
Titius Salvianus cV 209
Ulpia Migaratru cV 112

Ulpius...Cilanu cV 194
Ulpius Donatus cV 195
Ulpius Germanus cV 210
Ulpius Marcus cV 196
Ulpius Valerianus cV 151
Ulpius Victor cV 151
Umbria C...do cII 180
Umbria Veia cII 180
Umbrius Victorianus cII 180

Valeria Germana bV 79
Valeria Saturnina bV 162
Valerius Costantinus bV 142
Valerius Donate cV 155
Valerius Innocentius cII 133
Valerius quintosus cV 98
Valerius Restutus bV 136
Dinamius Valerius cII 148
Bebius Pomponius bII 84
Vipius Serellius qui et Maccal
bV 93
Virgilius Atticus bII 129
Vitrubia Fortunata cIV 95

## (b) Cagnomina

Innocens Emilianus bIV 186
Fortunata Anicula cIV 176
M Arimanus cV 22
S Atticus bII 5
Gyele Babatus cIII 450
Viventius Barcinonesis bIII 75
Katullinus Benedictus cI 2
Venus Bonifatia cIII 315
Ispiacus Cerialis cV 135
Innox Decefolles cIII 16
Pius Demetrius cV 80
Mamma Donata cII 58
Quintilla Donatianilla bII lll
Vadius Donatianus bII 37
Letorius Bonatus bV 153
Caneia Emerita aII 17
Remus Emeritus bV 77
Victor Fabacius cV 162
Florensia Fabia cV 104
Quintus Felix bV 101
Titus Feliz bV 141
P Festia cIV 109
Salva Fortuna eIV 22
Felix Fortunius bIV 94
Dester Frequentinus cIII 15
Mauricia Galla cIV 224
Teudona Gilissuponis(?) cII 124
Eúropita 'Eरhudios bI 10
Creperius Honorius CV IOI
P Hospia bV 23
Berus Icositanus bV 49
Honoratus Ingenus bIII 148
Locata Innoca bIII 40
Cristia Januaria cII 121

Quinta Januaria bV 102
Sedata Januaria bV 154
Felix Junior bIII 128
Elurus Laconus bV 67
Albula Liparitana aIII 58
Caius Lucianus cV 110
Sallustucius Manno eV 129
Caesillia Maxima aII 10
Blattius Macximus cV 190
Secundus Maritus bIII 86
Iar Moderatus bIII 200
Januarius Monnica cIV 135
Astius Mustelus cII 147
Suminus Mustula bII $11 I$
Victor Nepos cII 139
Vincentius Optatius bIII 206
Marcus Optatus cIV 154
Urbica Peregrina bIII 230
M Plancus bIII 219
Fortunius Pr....aIV I
Perelius Reparatus cV 193
L Rogatus bIV 50
Innoca Rustica bII 4

2,Triple
(a) Nomina

Elia Dativa Maxima bIV 82
Aelius Delius Eusus bV 119
P Aelius Donatus bV 18
P Aelius Nampulus bV 18
M Aemilius Euproper cIV 6
Q Annia Fausta allI 2
Reparatus Arellius Faunus cV 123
Calpurnia Amacrona Acerva cV 191
M Cal(purnius) Varus cV 22
M Domitius Antoninus bII 3
Longeia Flavia Laurentia cIII 547
L Flavius Ic...cII 203
Jul Equitia Juliana bIII 282
(b) Cognomina

Acensa Donatilla Avella cIV 173
LT Cicero bV 24
Sil Umber Domitianus bV 105
3,Quadruple

Rasina Secunda aV 4
Mecenatia Secundula bIII 29
Omidia Septimina bV 140
Felix Serv...bII 27
Verulus Sidoniensis bIII 117
Faustus Succuus cV 215
Nauta Tenttanus bII 113
Victoria Trasmarina cV 23
Costantius Trasmarinus cV 23
Crisacius Trasmarinus cV 23
Eulogius Trasmarinus cV 4
Irineus Trasmarinus cV 27
Cianus Vadanus cV 162
Celsinus Venerius bIV 87
Januaria Vestiaria aII 28
Staccius Victor cV 152
Antistia Victoria bIII 64
Procula Victoria cIII 124
Datibus Victorinus bIII 90
Q Vieius cII 18
Astius Vindicianus cII 131
Gratiosus Vitalis bIII 59
Arimétus Zarzio bII 19

Julius Donatus Honorius bV 145
Julius Honoratus Fortunatianus biv
Arrius Julius Rogatus cV 189
Q Julius Minucianus bIV 21
P Junius Maximyis cIII 192
M L Lucretia CIV 104
Q Licinius Faustus bII 89
Verrius Petronius Candidus bII 60
L Popilius Honoratus bII 92
Raetoria Tertia Jugrata bII 69
I Turpilius Marianus bIV 23
Valerius Germanus Hordinatus bV 142
C Vettius Aunus cV 81

L P Martis qui et Pattisso bIV 157 Mesuleolus Resus Ponponius cV 182 L Crep Secundinus

> 4,Apparatus (Compound Nett)

## CPJ

AFRODISIA Di3/13 W2/371 Di3/184
CAELIus Di3/3I W2/314 Di 4921
CLAUDIus Di3/38 W2/3I7-9 Di3/185
DOMITIus Di3/49 W2/324 Di3/186
EULOGIUS Di3/55 Th I32 Di 4866A 4896B
LUCRETIA Di3/101 W2/340 Di 4891
MAECIUS Di3/103 W2/340 Di 4888
POMPEIUS Di3/128 W2/349-350 Di3/188
QUINTIUS Di 396 W2/352 Di 4998 QUINTILLA Di 3611 3617n W 286 Di 4964
SITTIA Di 4859 W2/358(-us) SOSSANUS Di3/151 (Sossus,Sossinus) W2/398(Sossianus) Di 4862(206б1גyロ~s)
ULPIus Di3/172 W2/367 Di 4870, 4876(-a)
VENUS Di 2372,2194n W2/400 Di 4904(Benus)
BERUS Di3/165 W2/401 Di $4875(\mathrm{~V}-)$

## $C P$

AFRODITE Di3/13(Aph-) W2/371
ALVINUS Di3/7(Alb-) W2/370(AIb-)
ANNIA Di3/1I W2/306
ANTONINUS Di3/12 W2/371
ANUS Di 2614Bn Di3/11 (Annius) De 549795708q; W2/305306 (Annius)
APICIUS De 26647252
ATTICUS Di3/17 W2/372
ATTIus Di3/17 W2/309
CAECBLLIA
CAECILIA $\mathrm{Di} 3 / 30 \mathrm{~W} / 313-314$ CECIIIUS,-A
CALPURNIus Di3/32-33 W2/315
CANDIDUS Di3/33 \$2/374
CASSIUS Di3/34 W2/316-317
CELSA Di 2440 W2/375
CERIALIS Di3/36 W2/375
CICERO Di 627A W2/375
CRESCENSA Di $3 / 42$ De 6554(-tia)
CRESCENTINA Di3/43 De 75188431
CRESCENTIO Di3/43 W 571505
CURTIA W2/323

DESTER Di3/47(-x-) W2/377(-x-)
DOMITIANUS Di3/49 W2/378
DEMETRIUS Di3/47 W 1501
AENNIA Di 828(E-) W 253(E-) EQUITIA Di 335n W IO9 (Aequitius)
EUSTASIUS Di3/56 De 7856(-a)
FABIus Di3/58 W2/325-326
FABRICIA Di 4264G W2/326
FRONTO Di 22014667 W2/381
GALLA(-us,ize) Di3/73-74 W2/381
GALLIUS Di $3738 B$ W $2761 B 2553$
GRATA Di3/77 De 21082703
HERENNIUS, AER- Di3/79 W2/332
HILARA Di3/80 W2/383
INGENUS Di 4303796 W2/384 (-uus)
INNOCENS Di 2876 3394A 4543
W 2083
JUNIus Di3/93 W2/337
LICINIUS Di3/100 W2/338
LOLIIUS Di 3999B W2/339
LURIUS Di $157(-\mathrm{a})$ W2/340
MANILIUS Di3/104 W2/341
MARIANUS Di 30On 4641 W2/386
MARIUS Di 3/107 W2/342 387
MARTIALIS Di3/107-8 W2/387
MAXIMus Di3/110 W2/387
MINUCIUS Di 97 W2/343
MODERATUS Di 4274Da W2/388
MUNIUS Hu Sp 212 De3/102
OCTAVIANUS Di3/118 W 1229
PAMPILUS Di 3993A (-f - W2/390 ( $-\mathrm{ph}-$ )
PERELIUS Di3/124(-11-)De 5161b
PIUS Di 41434593 W2/392
PONPONIUS Di3/128 W2/350(-m-)
POPILIUS Di 2219 W2/35I
P(ublius) Di 29314527 w passim
SALLUSTIA Di 2003 W2/354
(I)SCANTIUS Di 755 n W 2380 ( $\mathrm{Sc}-$ )

SECUNDIUS Hu Br 150 W $2 / 355$
SEDATA Di 3126A W 2456(-a\$)
SEPTIMINA Di 2960An 3378A 4510nn W 15482121
SERVILIus Di $1302787 \mathrm{bc} 503 \mathrm{r7n}$ W2/357
SERVILIANUS D1 2851E W 2198
STATILIA Di3/152 W2/358
SULPICIA Di3/153 W2/359
SYRUS Di3/154-155 w2/399

| TERTIA Di3/156 |  | GILISSOPO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TITIUS Di 3609 |  | GYELE |
| T(itus) Di3/1? |  | ICOSITANUS |
| VALENS Di 3/16 |  | INNOOCA |
| VALERIANUS D |  | INNOX |
| VARUS Di $13^{\circ}$ |  | LETORIUS |
| VERRIUS Di | $35)$ | LIPARITANA. |
| VETTIUS Di 35 |  | LOCATA |
| BEBIUS Di |  | LORIDA MECENATIA |
| VINDICI ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | ; $/ 136$ | MEGGENT MESCENT MESULEOLUS |
| ACENS.' |  | MIGARATRU MUGIARUS |
| ARELJAJNTVBIA |  | NUTRICOSUS |
|  |  | NUVEL |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { BLA }^{\prime} \\ & \mathrm{CA}^{\top} \end{aligned}$ | j6) | OINERATA |
|  | ) | HORDINATUS |
|  | Th 96) | PERGULUS PRIMULIANUS |
| $\bigcirc$ | 7) ${ }^{\text {( }}$ | QUINTOSUS |
|  |  | RAETORIA |
|  | 1 | SALIUSTUCIUS |
|  |  | SILBANI ANUS |
|  | ( 1647) | SILVIANA SPIACUS(ISPIACUS) |
|  |  | SUCCUUS |
|  |  | TENITANUS |
|  |  | TIEALIS |
|  |  | UNNA |
|  |  | VADANUS |
|  |  | VADIUS |
|  |  | VERULUS |
|  |  | VICTORIOLA |
|  |  | VIEIUS |
|  |  | ZARZIO |

TERTIA Di3/156 W2/399
TITIUS Di 3609A 4128B W2/360-1
T(itus) Di3/158 W2/400
VALENS Di3/160 W2/400
VALERIANUS Di3/162 W2/400
VARUS Di 131 W2/400
VERRIUS Di 3890A W 2349
VETTIUS Di3/165 W2/365
BEBIUS Di3/166 W2/366(Vibius)
VINDICIANUS Di 446An De 6952

## P

ACENSA W 1996(Accensus)
ARELLIUS W2/308
AUNUS De 4687
BLATTIUS W 123
CAESILLIA De 3498(-1-) W 209(Caesellia)
CASTRENSIS W2/374
KATULLINUS W2/374(C-)
CELSINUS W2/375
CILONIA De 3199
CREPERIUS De3/55(-ei-)
FABRICIUS W2/326
FAUSTINIANA De 5720
FLORIANA W 100(-us)
LEPPIDIUS W2/338(-p-)
LONGEIA De 4003(-us)
MAZICA Th 136
MAGNIA De 7936
NAMPULUS De 79449097
NAUTA W 2643; W 784 (Navita)
NUMISIUS W2/345
OMIDIA De 8478
OPTATIUS W 122(-a)
PESCENNIA De 7877
PETRONIANUS W2/391
PLANCUS W 11122597
PROPERTIA W2/352(-us)
QUINTULA De 72317532
SATURA Th 122
SEP(P)IUS W2/356(-pp-)
SILIUS W2/357
UMBER W 2197
UMBRIUS(-ia) W2/368(-us)
VAGULA De 8489(-us)
VEIA W2/364(-us)
VIRGILIUS W2/365 (Verg-)
VESTIARIA W 521 (-us)
VITRUBIA W 2657 (-uvia)

## C

ARGUTIO Di 2824A
BRUMASIUS Di $2708 n$
COSTANTIA Di3/40 (-n-)
FLORENSIA Di3/69(-entia)
GANTIUS Di 1910A(C-)
INNOCENSA Di3/85(-entia)
MAEVIUS Di 4275C
MANNO Di 976 n 16160
MARITUS Di 2617
PULLA Di $734 n$
SATURXINA Di 3847
AVENTIUS Di3/17(Habentius)

## Afr

ELURUS (Aelurio W 755a)
ALBULA (Albus, Albucianus, Albius, albinus De3/166)
ANICULA (Anicilla W 713)
ARTMANUS (Arimo De 3470)
ASTIUS AÓTEIOSTh 144
BABATUS (Barbatus W 537)
BARGEUS (Barg. .ot De 3287)
CANEIA (Cannia,-us W2/3I6)
CANPESIS (Camp...Di3/33, Campana W 2315, Campester De 2735 7631 1715)
CAICRALIS (Cerialis Di3/32)
CRISTIA (Chrestus etc. W2/375)
CURIOSUS (Curius W 214)
DELIUS (Dellius w 2845 ThlZ4)
E(NFNAXIOC (Ennodius De 2959)
EUPROPER (Euprepos Th 105)
FABACIUS (Fabatus Hu Sp 13,
De 2721,-ius,-ia De 1200
FAOSA (Favor etc, W2/329)
FESTIA (Festiea De3/195)
FREQUENTINUS (-ens W2/381)
GELIOLA (Queliola Di 2831)
GETULIUS (-eus De 5460, -icus W2/38I)
GUDUDIA (Gude ADe 4065)
HORTESUS (Hortensius,-ia, Hortesius W2/332)
HOSPIA (Hospita Di3/82, Hospes W2/383)
IAR (Jarine De 6056)

| LACONUS (Laco, Lacon De3/207) |
| :---: |
| MACERSUMIS (Macer W2/386) |
| MACRUNIUS (Macrinius W2/340) |
| MAMMA (Mammula W 2105 691) |
| MARTIS (Marti Hu Bp 58) |
| MAURICIA (Mauricus $W$ 1198) |
| MINUCIANUS (Minicianus De 2722) <br> MUSTELUS (Mustela?Mustelica?Th135) |
|  |  |
|  |
| REMI (?)US (Remmius De 3/123-124, Remus LeBl 657) |
| RESUS (Resius W 868,Rhesus Di3/136) |
| SALVA (Salviustia W2/396) |
| SANDALUS (Sandalius De 8146) |
| SAPOSUS (Sap...W 2023) |
| SERELIUS (Serenius De 3025 2881) SIRVATA (Ser- De 6991) |
|  |  |
|  |
| SILVANIUS (Silvanio Di3/149) |
| STACCIUS (???Satius De3/136) |
| TRASMARINUS,-A (=Pelagius? Th 96) |
| SUMINUS (Su...inus LeBl 287) |
| TUTrA (Tutus LeBl 123) |
| VIPIUS $\left(\begin{array}{l}?=\mathrm{Ul} \text { 年pius Di } 3 / 170) \\ \text { see BEBIUS CP) }\end{array}\right.$ |
| ZIPER (Zipe De 2045,Zip W 1647) |
| Hapleg |
| ACERVA |
| AGASPARUS |
| AMACRONA |
| ARITECTUS |
| AVELLA |
| BARCINONENSIS |
| BICCLA |
| CAPSARIUS |
| KASSUNTINA |
| CASSUS - |
| CERCADIO |
| CIANUS |
| CRISACIUS |
| DECEFOLIES |
| DONATI ANILLA |
| EVASSA |
| EYMOIPITO |
| EUSUS |
| FAUNUS |

LACONUS (Laco,Lacon De3/207) MACERSUMIS (Macer W2/386) MACRUNIUS (Macrinius W2/340)
MAMMA (Mammula W 2105 691)
MARTIS (Marti Hu Bp 58)
MAURICIA (Mauricus W 1198)
MINUCIANUS (Minicianus De 2722)
MUSTELUS (Mustela?Mustelica?Th135)
RASINA (Rasinia,-us W 1181 W2/353)
REMI (?)US (Remmius De 3/123-124, Remus LeBl 657)
RESUS (Resius W 868,Rhesus Di3/136)
SALVA (Salviustia W2/396)
SANDALUS (Sandalius De 8146)
SAPOSUS (Sap...W 2023)
SERELIUS (Serenius De 3025 2881)
SIRVATA (Ser- De 6991)
SIDONIENSIS (Sidonius De 7756)
SILVANIUS (Silvanio Di3/149)
STACCIUS (???Satius De3/136)
TRASMARINUS,-A (=Pelagius? Th 96)
SUMINUS (Su...inus LeBl 287)
TUTPA (Tutus LeB1 123)
VIPIUS $\left(\begin{array}{l}?=U l \neq 1 \text { pius Di } 3 / 170) \\ \text { see BEBIUS CP) }\end{array}\right.$
ZIPER (Zipe De 2045,Zip W 1647)

## Hapleg

ACERVA
AGASPARUS
AMACRONA
ARI TECTUS
AVELLA
BARCINONENSIS
BICCLA
CAPSARIUS
KASSUNTINA
CASSUS
CERCADIO
CIANUS
CRISACIUS
DECEFOLLES
DONATI ANILLA
EVASSA
EYMOIPITO
EUSUS
FAUNUS

GILISSOPO
GYELE
ICOSITANUS
INNOCA
INNOX
LETORIUS
LIPARITANA
LOCATA
LORIDA
MECENATIA
MEGGENT
MESCENT
MESULEOLUS
MIGARATRU
MUGIARUS
NUTRICOSUS
NUVEL
ONERATA
HORDINATUS
PERGULUS
PRIMULIEANUS
QUINTOSUS
RAETORIA
SALLUSTUCIUS
SILBANI ANUS
SILVIANA
SPIACUS(ISPIACUS)
SUCCUUS
TENITANUS
TIBALIS
UNNA
VADANUS
VADIUS
VERULUS
VICTORIOLA
VIEIUS
ZARZIO
(2) Simple (Apparatus,*Common)

## CPJ

*AELIA CV 202 Di3/3-5 W2/302-303(Aelius) Bi3/184
*ANTONIus aII 4 cIV 174 bII 88 Di3/12-13 De3/15-16 Di 4937
*AURELIus aIII 29 cII 184 cIII 24524635595 bIV 159 cIV 255 cV 204 Di3/21-24 W2/311-312 Di3/185
*BENEDICTUS CIII 304580 CIV 148 Di3/27 W I744 CaXII2/1552(=Baruch)
*CASSIA bII 63 Di3/34 W2/317 Di 4896B Kotria
*CONSTANTIUS CIII 44106271 Di3/41 W2/376. CaXII2/1547(K-)
*DONATus aII 13 cII 144294 bIII 228 cIII 3958260 bIV 144159162 cIV 2732648017168 bV 224461158142 cV 149 Di3/50 W2/378 Mon CaXII2/1547 1552 (=Nathan) CaXII2/1547 ( $\phi$-)
*FELICISSIMUS CII 158 bIII 127 Di3/60-6I W2/380 -A aII 4 bII 74
*FELIX $\operatorname{AIII} 4$ cII 37137296 bIII 75158169 cIII 65188253334 335389401 bII 17a bIV 49167 cIV 93 IO9 bV 26158 cV 78 FELIS bIII 229 Kraus RE ii 476 W2/380 Di3/186
*FLAVIus bIII 225 cIII $179338 \mathrm{cV} 160 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 64$ W2/327-8 Di3/186 *FORTUNATIANUS aIII 57 Di3/71 De3/196 CaXII2/1547
*GAIus aIII $55 \mathrm{cV} 76 \mathrm{Di3} / 73 \mathrm{~W}$ 1204(C-) Mon CaXII2/1547(r-)
*GERMANUS bII 93 bIII 280 Kraus RE ii 479 W2/382 Di 4965
*HONORATus aIII 33 cII 194 cIII 642 bV 150 cV 93 ONORATA cIV 274 Di3/82 W2/383 Mon CaXII2/1547( $\theta$-)
*JANUARIus aIII 3455 bII 6780 cII 216222 cIII 86 bV 246860102 cV 116134 cIV 222 Di3/84 W2/383-384 Mon
*IRENEUSCIII 602 IRENE aII 7 bIII 41 Di3/88 W2/384 Di 49324974
*JULIUS, JULIA aIII 19-21 bII 30 cIII I91 bV 135 cV 126136168185 Di3/89-92 W2/333-337 CaXII2/1547
*JULIANus aIII 19 eII 1186 eIII 352 bV 69159 Di3/91 W2/384 Mon
*JUSTus cIII 90 cV 26 Di3/93-94 W2/384 Mon CaXII2/1548 1552(ZADOK)
*LUCIANUS bIII 140 Di3/10I W 230 Di 4888(-is
*LUCIUS $\operatorname{bII} 109 \mathrm{cV} 147$ Di3/IO1 W 701792 Mon CaXII2/1548
*MARCELLus bIII 37 eII 127 cIV 467579 MARCELUS bIV 17 cIV 40 Di3/104-105 W2/386 CaXII2/1548
*MARCUS, MARCIA bIII 37 aII 22 Di3/105-106 W 1482 WZ/342 CaXII2/1548 *MAXIMus cII 4092 bIII 167 bIII 60 cIII 256362 cIV 168 bV 65 cV

Kraus RE ii 478 Di3/111 W2/387 Di 4861A CaXII2/1548
*PEREGRINus aII 18 bII 52 cIII 533 cIV 216 bV 155 cV 79179
Di3/123 De 3498 W2/391 Mon
*POMEIANUS CII 83 bIII 247 Di 861 B 933 ba 2799 B W2/392 Mon (-a)
*PROCULA aIV 4 cIII 578 Di3/132 W2/393 Di4953(Procla)
*QUINTus aII 4 bII 78 bI 2 eII 32 cIII 208607 Di3/134 W2/394 Di 4903(Cuyntus)
*RESTITUTus aIII 40 bII 97 bIII 54 131-133 cIII 126128129220 306387388 cV I67 Di3/136 W2/395 CaXII2/1548
*RUSTICus aII 4 bII 9115 bIII 185198 cIII 394 Di3/139 W2/395 Mon *SABINus cIII $41 I$ cIV 106 bV 68 Di3/140 W2/395-396 Di 4873A 4995 Mon CaXII2/1548
*SECUNDINus aIII 4 cII 149162 Di3/144-145 W2/397 Di 4876
*VALERIus aIII 9 bIII 109 bV 142 BALERIA cIII 133 Di3/161-163 W2/362-364 Di 4992 CaXII\&/l549
*VICTOR aIII 75 aIII 50 bIII $96 \quad 140$ cIII $134135 \quad 316$ cII 75140 cIV 172 bV 6169708696 BICTOR CIII 407 408412447493 *VICTORIA aII 4 aIII 3051 bII 124 bIII 73 141 154 bIV 97159 bV 2 cII 13 cIII 137162101 409-411 469507590591641 BICTORIA CII 53 cIII 138 MOn 554642 Kraus RE ii $482 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 167-168$ W2/40I Diehl 4912 IKrup
*VICTORINUS bIII 4187 cII 67 CIII 262412 cIV I80*VICTORINA aII 23 bIII 3742 cIII 366 BICTORINA BIII 170 BITORINA bII 205 Di3/168-169 W2/401 Mon CaXII2/1549
*VITALIS bII 104 bIII 287251 cII $134195 \quad 212$ VITALE bII 116 BITALIS CIII 15 Di3/17I W2/401 CaXII2/1552(BitusßTTגN| = Hayah, Hayw )

ALEXANDER CIII $407 \mathrm{cV} 39-41$ ALEXANDRIA bV 106 ALEXSANDRIA cIII 33 Kraus RE ii 479 W 1211406 Di 48884967 Mon
APER bV 19 Kraus RE ii 477 W2/37I CaXII2/1547
CARA cV 10 Di3/34 2588 689(K-) W2/374(-us) Di 4922
CASTUS bV 160 CASTA bIII 6970 CASTHE CIV 61 Kraus RE ii 480 W 1354582157 CaXII2/1547
COLOMBA CIII 270 Kraus RE ii 477 W1967(-us) Mon
CRESCENS CIII 292 cV 85 CRESECENS qui et CAPO CIII $605 \mathrm{~W} / 376$ Kraus RE ii 480 Di 48774917
CRESCENTINUS bIII 71212 Di3/43 De 3579 CaXII2/1547(-a)
EUTICHIUS aIII 52 cIII 175 H EUTICIUS cIV 145 EUTICIA cIII 173 EUTITIA cIII 621 Di3/57 W 1355(Eutic..) De3/192 Di 4875
FELICITAS BIII 696197246296 cII 36 cIII 6768120258262379 $411447618643 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 61 \mathrm{~W} 13892190 \mathrm{CaXII} 2 / 1547(\varphi-)$
FLORUS bIV 109 bV 160 cIV 218 FLORA bV 3( $7!$ ) Di3/70 Kraus REii 478 W2/380-381 Di 4974
GAUDENTIus bII 29 cIII 64361876 Di 2789 Kraus RE ii 482 De 6167 CaXII2/1547(C-, = Yitzkhak, Isaac)
HELENUS aIII 17 ELENA aII 15 Di 935A(Helena) 3988Cn(Elena, Elene) 3009G(Elenus) W2/382(Helenus,Helena) Di 4863(Helene)
HERCLANIUS aIII 18 Kraus RE ii 476 De 6122b Di $4877(-\mathrm{a})$
HILARIUS bIII 226 HILARUS cIV 69 HILARIA bIII 30 Di3/80-81 Kraus RE ii 482 De 1838 W 1499 W2/383 CaXII2/1547 i入小p 1552(Yitzkhak,Isaac)
JOBINUS CIII 433 JOVIN CII 57 JOVINA CIII 15 Di3/87-88 W2/384 Kraus RE ii 476 Di 4948 ( $-\mathrm{b}-$ )
LEO bIII 98 LEA CIII 356 Di3/97 Kraus RE ii 477 W2/385 De 7699 8458 Di 4978 CaXII2/1548 1552 (=Ari)
LEONCIUS cIV 111 LEONTIA BIII 99 cIII 351 cIV 14 Di3/98 W2/385 CaXII2/1548
LONGINUS aII 7 Kraus RE ii $480(-\mathrm{a})$ W2/385(-us) Di 4895 (-us)
MARCIANUS aIII 71 MARCIANA CIV 91 cIII 643 MARCIANE $8 I I 414$ Kraus RE ii 476 Di3/105 De 44012181144633463398225 (-a) De 392(-e) Di 4869n(Marcianc ${ }^{\text {( }}$ ) W2/386(-us)
MARGARITus bIII 100 cIII 354614174 Kraus RE ii 478 De 2818 Mon

MARIA bV 94 MAPIA CIII 626708 Kraus RE ii 482 Di3/106 W 123(daughter of one L D Marius) ef W2/386 De 6336(Jul Maria) De3/98 (gentilicia, gens Maria) Di3/188
MARINUS CIII 202 MARINA CIII 299 Kraus RE ii 478 Di3/107 W2/386387 CaXII2/1548
MAXIMILLA CIII 625 Di3/110 W2/387 Di 4882 n
OLIMPIA CII 105 Kraus RE ii 476 Th 121 W2/389(-us,ius) Di 4866(-ius)
PAULINUS CII 177 cIV 225 PAULINA aIII 68 bIV 100 PAULINE bII 98 Di3/122 W2/390-391 Di 4897
RUFILLA cII 59Di 2949An 2502n(P-) W 1931 Di 4975A
RUFINUS bIII 135 cIII 393 RUFINA bIII 208 cII 23161 CIII 463 Kraus RE ii 477 Di3/139 W2/395 Di 4859A 4861 CaXII2/1548
SECURUS bV 3 SECURA bV 44 Di 2797 n 4490 W 1579 Di 4926
SORIC CII 109 SORICA CIII 223399 Di 2122 W 1934 (Sorex) Di 3908A
STEPHANUS (-F-) bIII 108 232 cIII 312400 ISTEFANUS CII 192 ISTEFANIA bV 127 cIII 225 eV 55 Kraus RE ii $482 \mathrm{~W} / 398 \mathrm{Th} 113$ Di 4927
SUCESSUS bIII 138 Di3/153 W2/398 CaXII2/1548(-a)
URSACIUS CIII 14 Kraus RE if 478 De 2799 CaXII2/1549
VALENTIA bIII 143 Di3/160 De 6741 Di 4883(B-) (Balencia)
VERNACLUS CII 52 BERNACLUS aIII 47 cIII 406 VERNACLA bII 44 cII 51 BERNACLA cIII 231 Kraus RE ii 480 Di3/165 W2/401(Vernus,-a) Di 4858

## CP

*AEMILIANUS bIII 63 bIV 259 cIV 255 Di3/5 W2/369
*AMANDA bV 48 Di/3/9 De 5268
*APRONIANUS CIII 431 Di3/14 W2/371
*ARIUS CIII 500 Di3/15(Arrius) De 3153(gent)
*BONEFATIUS AIII 60 cIII $19 \quad 3879157-159205 \quad 254 \quad 255 \quad 290 \quad 346 \mathrm{cV} 124$ *BONIFATIA aIII 31 bII 21 bIII 67286 cII 49 cIII 156 256-260 304381472556649 BONI中ATIA CIII 89 VONIFATIA cV 31 VONIFATZIA CIII 89 Kraus REii 480 Di3/29 De 2072
*CRESCONIUS BII 54 cIII $4683164275-277 \quad 278293439505613641$ cIV 143 CRISCONIUS CIII 279(XPICK(NN...cIII 641) CRESCONIA CII 79 eIII $575280657 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 43$ De 6122
*COSTANTINUS bIII 199 CONETANTINA CV 145 Di 2195 Di3/41 De3/183
*DONATIANUS BII 24 bIV 2 GIV 5099 DONATIANA cV 214 Di $404 \mathrm{~W} 2 / 378$
*EMERITUSbIII 95 cII 30 cIII 443 cIV $97 *$ EMERITA CII 69 cIII 328 cV 35 Di3/52 Hu Br 102(Emereto) W2/378
*FAUSTUS cIII 62 cV 160*FAUSTA cIII 332 Kraus RE ii 476 W2/379-380
*FELICIA bII $63 \mathrm{cIII} 177446 \mathrm{cV} 37 \mathrm{Di} 2553 \mathrm{n} 3463 / 3 \mathrm{~W} 2702$
*FORTUNATUS bII 7 bIII 607721 bIV 170 cII 38 cIII 184202261 448561 cIV 43107 *FORTUNATA aII 4 bIII 37262245 bIV 97 CIII 314344449508 cIV 220 Di3/71-72 W2/381
*FORTUNIUS bIV 115 cIII $69425 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 72 \mathrm{De} 3 / 196$
*INNOCENTIUS bIII 78 eII 159 Kraus RE ii $480(-a)$ W 2861 De 6730
*LAURENTIA BII 130 LAURENTIUS CV 114 Di3/95-96 De 8701
*LUCILLUS bII 109 cIII 92107 Di $62 n 21274237$ W2/386
*MAXIMIANUSA bII 47 Di3/110 W2/387
＊NEPOS CIII 85 Di 2303 Il91 W2／389
＊OPTATUS CIV 258＊OPTATE CII 186 Di3／119（－a）Kraus RE ii 476 W2／390 ＊PETRONIUS CIV 74 Di3／124－125 W2／348
＊PRIMUS bIV 11 cIII 305 ＊PRIMA aII 10 bII 6375 cIII 207457 aV 6 Kraus RE ii 477 Di3／131 W2／393
＊REPARATUS bIII 105 cII 47 cV II7 REPARATA CIV $47 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 136$ De 3366
＊ROGATUS bV 65 bIV 168 ＊ROGATA bIII 234 bV 69 cII 64 Di3／137 W2／395
＊SALVIANUS bV 35 Kraus RE ii $480 \mathrm{~W} / 396$
＊SATURNINA aII 4 cIII2 Di3／143 WZ／396
＊SATURUS bV 73 KRAUS RE ii 476 W 1729
＊SECUNDUS CIV 133 cV 149 SAECENDUS CII 183 ＊SECUNDA BII 23 bIV 104 CIV 168 SECUDE bIII 248 Kraus RE ii 477 Di3／144 W2／396－397
（＊IHEODORUS BII 51 cIII 466 cIV 140 TEODORUS CIV 72179 ＊THEODORA CIII 227 cIV 42 日GO\＆NPA bII 10 Di3／156－157 De 1275（a399） 1308（a525）1311（a540）4247（dedication to Mithras ex viso！） $\$ 528$ 4172（priest of Mater Deun！）4290（ded．Zeus！） 6855
＊URBANUS aII 4 cIII 416＊URBANA CII 112 bV 41 Di3／173 W2／402
＊URBICA CIV 139 URBIKUS aII 4 Di3／173 W2／402（－c－）
＊VALETINA aIII 44 Di3／160 W2／400（－nt－）
＊VENERIA aII 9 Di3／164 De3／252
＊VICTORIANUS cII 185 cIII 59412 Di3／168 WZ／401）
＊VINCENTIUS aIII 32 cIII 414 CIV 4893 VINCINCIUS bII 16 BINCENTIUS cIV 168 VINCENTIA bII l22 bIII 38145211281 cII 207 cIII lIO 232264 Kraus RE ii 482 Di3／170 De 769144743961 516892942010203827795149 1272（a389） 9355
＊VIBENTIUS bIII 280 CaXII2／1513（－v－）De 9440（－v－）
ELIANUS bIII 62 Di3／4（Aelianus）W2／369（Aelianus）
ACILLES EIII 237 Di3／2 De3／162（Achilles）
AGATHE CII 213 AGATE CIII 151 Di3／6 W 569 1644（Agathe）
AGISILI．．．cIII 118 AGISILD．．．cIII 433 Di 1407An（Agisild）W llo（Ages－ ilaus）
ADJUTOR bIII 176 AJUTOR cV 22 AJUTORIS cII 2 Di 27081552 W 265 2038（Adjutor）
AMABILIS CIII 152 Di3／9 W 15522288 249（年）
AMANTIUS CIII 288 cIV 89 AMANTIA $\operatorname{CIII} 287$ Di3／9 Kraus RE ii 480 W 90
ANNEUS cIII 242 Di3／lI（gent）W2／305（Annaeus）W 66（Anneus）
ANTISTIA bV 47 Di 1352A（AVイ1の日もは）W2／306（Antistius）
APRIK（？L）IS bII 20 APRILES bIII 288 Kraus RE ii 479 W2／371
APRONIUS CIII 153 Di 373 3584B W2／307
AQUILINUS cIV 114 Di3／14 W2／37l
ARABIA CIII 661 Kraus RE if 479（Araba）De 5756（Arabus）
ARTEMIDORUS CIII 100め Di3／15 W $2 / 372$
ATILIA cV 152 Di3／16 De3／20
attalus bJII 66 Di 628 De3／172
AUGUSTA ©III 576 AGUSTA CIII 34 Di3／17 W 2228
AVIANUS c 174 Di3／18（－ius）LeBl 551A（Avia）Hu Br 37 （Avanus） w 1419 （Avianus）
BASTLIUS CIII 498 Kraus RE ii 481 W2／312 373
BASSUS bIII 30 bV 3 BACCOC CIII 36 Di3／26 W2／373
BELLATOR cII 191214 Kraus RE ii 482 De 9321

BENENATUS bIII 241 cIII $17139154249-251552 \mathrm{cV} 171179$ BENENATA bII 59 bIII 126 229 cIII $37252289435 \quad 537$ cIV 228 Di 2120 2838 3082A 287837554680 De 7659 a 7815 2886(Eugenia) De I244 (Eugenius) Th 132 (Eugenia, Eugenius)
BONOSUS CIV 67 BONOSA cIII 496 Kraus RE ii 480 Di3/29 W 2860 De 6Il4 9099
CALCEDONIA bIII 210 cIII 879 Kraus RE if 479 (Chalcedonius) De 3011 (Carchedonius)
CALEINDIO bIII 262 bIV 173 Di 14441951 2278A W 255
CALIOPE CIII 605 CaXII2/l495(Calliopa,Calliopius) W 1748 (-11-) Th 117
CALLISTRATUS CIII 261 Di 172A WI57 2874
CANDIDA aIII 6961 cIII 938116262263538 Kraus RE ii 477 W $125 \quad 2622414$
CANDIDIANUS bIV 189 Di 1713098 W 13871501
CARITAS bV 69 Di 2106 De3/l80 (Chares, Charinus, Charis, Charisius, Charite, Cari the, Charitinus, Charito, Charitosus) Th 96 ( X (ep,s)
CARITOSA CIII 268 Kr aus RE ii 481 see Caritas
CATULLINI cIV 34 Kraus RE\#i $480(-a)$ W2/374 (-us)
CESARIUS aII 4 Kraus RE if 481 W 109 (Caesarius)
CLARUS CIII 436 Di 3810 W2/375
COLONICUS CIII 105 COLONICA BIII 172 bIV 95 Di 762 n 3344 De 2889(-nus)
CRESCENTIUS bII 18 CIII 13163 CRESCENTIA aII 10 bII 23 bIII 70283 bV 51 Di3/42-43 De 6554(-ia) W2/376(Crescentio)
CRESCENTIANUS bIV 144 Di3/42 W2/376
GRISPINA bII 121 cII 205 cIV 168 Di3/43 W2/376
DALMATIUS cIII 322440 Kraus RE ii 479 De 8987
DECIMIA bIII 252 Di 1154 W2/324
DECIUS CIII 14 Kraus RE ii 477 (Decia) W2/324 (Decius)
DESIDERIUS cIV 98 Kraus RE ii 476 De 83807538
DIGNA cIV 28 Kraus RE ii 480 De 20665257
EGNATIANUS bIV 63 ENATIANUS cIII 545 Di 3996(Ign-) Di 427OB(Egn-)
W 1747 EUTICIANE bIII 80
EUTICIANUS BIII ( 239 EUTYCHIANUS aII 31 Di3/57 W 1642(-c-)
FATALE bV 3 Di 3334 (Fatalisq ) De 38004167 (Fatalis) 8244 (Fatales)
FELICIANUS aII 4 bII 28 bV I2 cIV $250 \mathrm{Di} / 60 \mathrm{~W} / 380$
FESTA CII 156 cIII 540 Di3/63 W2/380
FIDELIS cIV 42 Di 1970Fab(Fitdelis) W 1739 (cf.W2/380 Fide,-inus, $-u s$ )
FLORENTINUS cIV $222 \not \approx$ FLORENTINA aII $5 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 70 \mathrm{~W} / 380$
FLORENTIUS CII 119 CIII 297 bV 124 FLORENTIA CIII 180 bII 39 Di3/69-70 De3/196
FLORIUS cV 167 Di 3960 n W 1575 (Florio)
GALATEA CIII 541 Ca XII2/1518 W $403 \mathrm{Th} 119\left(\Gamma \alpha \lambda \psi_{1} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{N}}\right)$
GENTILIS aII 4 Di 255 De 22122452
GENEROSUS bIII 59 GENEROSA CIII $186 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 75$ De 5117
GRATIA DV 63 Kraus RE ii 480 (Gratus etc.) De 8232
(H)ADRIANUS cIV 169 cV 20 CaXII2/1510 W2/382

HERMES aII 33 Kraus RE ii 476 W2/383 Th 119
HILARIANUS aII 4 Di3/80-81 W 1142936
YTEIA CIII 627 Di3/83 De3/203 Th 120
JOBIANUS cII 91 JOBIANA CIII $102 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 87$ De 1992
"10ds aIV 60 Di $3572 \mathrm{Bn}($ Fabinus Isas)De 6903(Isasoँ)
JUCUNDUS bIV 67 JUCUNDA CIII 190 Di3/89 W2/384

LAETA cIII 353 LETA CIII 194 Kraus RE ii 480 (Laetus) W 2368
(Laeta) ef. Th 96 (=Chaeron, X $\times 1$ pay or = Laida Ndidys 127)
LAMPADIUS CIII 193354 Di3/95 W2/385
LOLIANUS bIII 284d LOLLIANUS bIII 284e Di3/100 W2/385
LUCANUS aII 4 Di l379n W2/385
LUCILIANUS cII 39 Di3/10I W 3572372
MAIA CIII 196 CaXII2/1504(Maius) W2/386(Maius)
MAJOR aII 10 (위!) Di 1988(우?) 819n W2/386
MARINIANUS aIV $2 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 107$ De 2457128546417723
MARTANA CIII 360550 Di3/107 (Marthana) W 2502 (Martanus)
MARTINUS aII 4 cIV $86 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 108 \mathrm{De} 3 / 213$
MAURA aIII 36 Kraus RE ii 479 W 2658
MAURICIUS cIV 147 cV 132145 146(idem) Kraus RE ii 479 De 9131 112711285038
MAXENTIUS cIII 200 Di3/1IO W 1066
MAXIMINUS aII 4 Di3/110 W2/387
MEMMIUS aII 4 Di 39791799 W2/342-343
MENA CIII 214 LeBl 551A(Menas) W 2679 Th 109 (Mnvás)
MUNATIA bIII 274 Di3/114 De3/102
MONTANUS bIV 60 Di3/1I3 W 2881 608ef 1668
MUSA CIII 202 Di3/114 W 6962200
NEPOTIANUS bIII 291 Di 1934037 W 1747
NICE aIII 23 CaXII2/1517 w2/389 Th 121 (=Victoria,Th 96)
NONIUS CIII25 Di3/117 De3/104
NOVELLUS aII 4 NOVELUS aIII 24 NOVELLA cIII 216 Di $3191 A$ De 4499
PALLADIUS cIV 73 CaXII2/1496 De 14462317
MAPOEVOMH aII 8 Kraus RE ii 479 W 121 Th 122
PASTOR aIII 42 bIII 265 Kraus RE ii $478 \mathrm{~W} / 390$
PAULUS aII 4 aIII 65 bV 13 cII 10 CIII 103533 PAULA aII 4 cIII IO8
Kraus RE ii 482 Di 3/122 W2/390-391
(TE入人 1 10s
PELAGIUS CIII 577 Kraus RE Ai $779(-a)$ De $72648722 a c 7941$ Th 133 PERPETUA AIII 27 bIII 6244 cII 38 cIII 206377 Di 4013 De 1639 FILOCALUS(Ph-) CII 43 FILLOCALUS cV $106 \mathrm{Di} 963 \mathrm{~W} 579(\mathrm{Ph}-)$
PLACIDUS CIII 137 Di 407 AB W2/392
POMPONIANUS cIV 112 Di 2974n W2/392
PORFYRIUS aIII 70 TOPQUPloscIII 641 Di3/129 De 6122
PREJECTUS CIII 651 CaXII2/1525 ( $=$ Fi-Metigech) De $8727(-\mathrm{ae}$ -
PRIMULUS aIII 41 PRIMLA CIII 536 Di3/130(-u-) Di 1588 De3/230
PRISCIANUS bII 106 Di 4042 4272 W2/393
PRIVATUS BIII 249 PRIVATA bV 4 cIII 591 Di3/131 W2/393
QUETUS bV 7 Di 3/134 (Quietus) W 2868
QUIRIJLUS CIII 166 Di3/45 De 7183
REDEMPTA CIII 125 REDENPTA CIII 209 REDEMTA CIII 606 Kraus RE ii 481 W 1707 (Valeria Redempta) De 7805 (Scantia Redempta)
RENATUS bIII 130 bV 1098 bIV 166 cIII $815 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 137$ De 4984
RESPECTUS CIV $98 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 136 \mathrm{~W} 24112472$
REVOCATUS CIII 391 REBOCATUS CIII 548 Di $35914209 \mathrm{~W} 1548(-a)$
ROGATIANUS BIV $70158 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 137$ W $14882396 \quad 1$
ROMANUS AIII 77 bIII 198 bV 96 cIII $256308 \quad 392$ Kraus RE ii 479
ROMULA bV 80Di 35144374 De 7337
ROSARIUS bII 8 Kraus RE ii 478 W2/395(Rosiarius)

SABINIANUS CIII 616 Di3/140 W2/396
SALVINUS bIV 114 cIII 511 Di 1799 De 3968
SATURNINUS aII 4 bII 123 bV 67 cII 49 cIII 398533 Kraus RE ii 476 W2/396
SCRIBONIUS bIV 190 Di 4128 W2/355
SECUNDIANUS BII 36 SECU DIANUS CII $65 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 144$ W2/397
SECUNDILLA bV 83 Di3/144 W 122
SENTIA bII 71 Di 4350A De3/130
SERTORIA bV 35 Di 3258An W2/356-357
SEVERINA bII 131 Di3/l48 W 1750
SILVANUS BIII 136 bV 105 SILVANA cV 207 Kraus RE ii 478 Di3/149 W2/397-398
SIMPLICIUS BIII 137 aII 11 SIMPLICIA bV 72 Kraus RE ii 480 Di3/149 W 2267 De 4558
SPES cII IIQ CIII 224 Kraus RE ii 481 De3/244 (dq)
THKE $O C$ aII 4 Di 3014(Teleforus) W 106(Telephus) Th 122
TERENSUS eV 173 Di3/155-156(Terentius) W2/360(Terentius)
TERTULLA bIII 275 Di3/156 W2/399
THALLUSA cIV 42 Di 3701A(Tallusa) W 512(Thallusa)
THEUDOTUS CIII 314 Di3/157 De 935393571697 4215(Mithras!) 4065 (Hermes!)
TITIANUS CIII $402 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 158$ W2/400
TULIA bV 135 Di 3958n 4056(Tullia) De3/144(Tullia)
VALERIANA aIII 46 Di3/162 W 122308
VENUSTUS bV 60 Kraus RE ii 480 W2/401
VICTORIBUS bIII 74 CIII 605 Di3/168 CMCh 101
BIOLA cII 84 Di 4588(Viola) W 296(Viola)
ZENON bV 51 Di3/176: W2/402
ZOSIMUS bII 116 Di3/176 W2/408
ZOTICE aII 7 CaXII2/1513(ZWTIK日 Di3/176. De 7466a(Zotiche) W 577 (*us)

## PJ

*ASTERIUS CV 53 De 337780878247 Di $4649 b$ CaXII2/1547 Mon
*DATIVA bV 4 DATIBA aII 4 cIII 194 441*DATIBUS CIII 167323324 W2/377 CaXII2/1547
*FAUSTINA aII 4 cII 35 cIII 333352 cV 121 FAYSINA aII 56 *FAUSTINUS bII 2 cII 18990 cIV 4140168 W2/379-380 CaXII2/1547
*RESTUTUS SII 35 cIII $39127221222320 \quad 389390$ RESTUTA bII 36 CIII 17128219 bIII 106134 W2/395 Di 4922


AMMIA aII 4 W 50813182556 CaXII2/1546( ${ }^{\prime}$ AuM1 2 )
ANIA bII 60 W2/306(Annia) Di 4920(Annia) 4907(Anna)
ANTUNINA BIII $185 \mathrm{~W} / 37 \mathrm{I}(-\mathrm{a}) \mathrm{CaXII} 2 / 1547$ I)
DEUTERIUS CIII 648 DEUTERIA aII 25 De 6122 CaXII2/I547 (cf.Th 96 1I8) MATRONA CIV 92 De3/214 Mon

## ©

*FORTUNA CII 12 cIII 181 I82 183.296302 340-342 343 Di3/7I Di 4859
ABUNDANTIUS CII 208 ABUNDANTIA bIII 284a CaXII2/1517 Di 49044930 ANASTASIUS cIII 62283 ANASTASIA bIII 289 cIII 34 Di3/10 Kraus RE ii 481 Di4934 49584982
(H) ABEDDEU(S) cII 92 Kraus RE ii 481 Di 4960 (Abedeu)

PATRICIUS bV 63 PATRICIA cV 146 Di3/122 CaXII2/1552 Di 4908 flotplkid SUSANNA bIV 109 SUSSANA que et LOLLIANA bIII 284h Kraus RE ii 482 Di 4118B EWEANH

## P

*JUNIOR aII 4 W2/384
*ROBUSTUScIII 307 W 1510
*SAPIDA aIII 66 De 6883
EGIPTIUS cIV 36 EGIPTIA cII 97 aIII 62 EGYPTIA bIII 181 EGITIA bIV 97 Th 123(Clodia Aegyptia)
AENEAS bIII 176 Th 116 W 2502 (Aenius)
ALCTMUS bV 69 Th 98 W 1295
BARBA CIII 247248 De $5562 \mathrm{c}^{7} 6545 \sigma^{4} 8325 \sigma^{\circ}$
BIO CIII 253 Th 100
BRESEIS CIII 358 Th 117
CATULLUS aII 4 W 7091
CIVICA bIII 248 || 31917151750
CONCESSUS CIII 43 W 2812c
COTTA CIII 272 W2/376
CUSTOS CIV 185 De 4l81a
FAONIUS CII 34 W 2079 2192(Favonius)
JUGURTA aIII 64 JAGURTE cIII 298 W 2356632
MARSIANUS CIII 485 De 67306733
MASSA CIII 361 De 45804614
MONICA CIII 95 *MONNICA cIV 169 MONNIKA bII 17c De 8086
MONIMUS cV 160 W 294n
NOVATUS cV 19De 1982
QUADRATIANUS CII 4445 W 836
ROGATILLA BIII I De 4930
RUTILIUS bII 94 W2/353-354 W 1865
SATULLA CIII 126 De 6379
SILIUS bV 157 W2/357 (NASO, CRISPUS W 21532662 W2/377)
SODALIX CIII 23 De 3611 7706(Sodalis)
SOLA bIV 159 De 1999 ( 7 ! )
TIRO CIII 228 W 17532384
TYRANUS CII 111 WZ/400 Th 115

## J

NONNUS eIV 160 NONNOC eIII 773 Di 4895A(Nonna)

## C

*ADEODATUS bIV lI9 213 cIII 238 cIV 4966 cV 52 ADEUDATUS cIII 358 cIV 66 ADEODATA BIII 124 WV 148 cII 74 cIII 31150239 432 ADEUDATA CIII 240 ADEOTA bIV 113 Kraus RE ii 481
*DYNAMIUS cIII 2 Di 4190 1806d3
*GRATIOSUS CIII 80 Di 1048
*HONORIUS bII 57 cII 28198 Kraus RE ii 482
 PASCASIA bII 43 cIII 122123204 Di3/121
*QUODVULTDEUS CII 46 cIII 236380381459 cIV 76 bIII 247278279 QUODVULDEUS cIII 382-385 QUODBULDEUS cIII 617 bIV 97 QUODBULUS cII 66 COVULDEUS bIII 284a COVULDUS bIII 207 COVLDS bV 138 COBULDEUS bIII 104 CODBULDEU cIII 486 CODBUL cIII 473 COBUL CIII 622 Kraus RE ii 481
*SECUNDULA bIII 85 Di3/145
AMATOR bIII 182 Kraus RE ii 480
AGAPE bII l8ld Kraus RE ii 481
ARATOR bV 28 Kraus RE ii 478
ATANASUS bIII 65 CIII 244 Di 2609A(Athanasius)
AUSANIUS CII 181 Di 1206
BONITAS bIII 191 ( 01 ) Di 2587n ( $9:$ )
KARTHAGO CIII 491 Di 3575(Cartago)
CASTULA bII 48 bIII 186 Kraus RE ii 480
CERULUU CV 36Di 934B(Geruulus)
CLARISSIMA CIII 268 Di 2988n
CYPRIANUS CIII 216239431644 CIPRIANUS CII 136155 CYPRIANA CIII $38 \mathrm{cV} 1 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 44$
DECORA aIII 76 LeBl 35
DEODATUS bII 63 DEUDATUS bIV 117 Di 1222
DEOGRATIAS BIII 90 CIII $105253 / 5 \quad 54168169329657$ Kraus RE ii 481
DEUSDEDIT $\operatorname{bIII} 92$ cIII 126213 Kraus RE ii 481
DOMINICUS CIII 326 Kraus RE ii 481
EBENTIA bIII 193 Di 4221 LeBl 643(Eventia)
EPIPHANIUS CIII 329 EPIFANIUS CIII 647 cIV 34 Kraus RE ii 481
EULALIA cIII 499 Kraus RE ii 479
EXITIOSUS CIII 264311330 bIII 198 CaXII2/1525(=El-Menfeg)
FLAVIANILLA bIV 67 Di 2163
FLORIDUS cIII 277339 FLORIDA aIII 63 cIII 513 cIV 165( $\mathcal{O}^{\prime}$ :)
Kraus RE ii 478
GAUDIOSUS bIII 53 cIII 78345 GAUDIOSA CII 63 cIII 77174546 Kraus RE ii 480 Di3/74
GELASIUS cIII 185 cIV 94 Di3/75
GENNADIUS CIV 154 Di 2581 ln 4559
GLORIOSUS CIII 216 256414 cIV I2 25 GLORIOSA CIII $187 \quad 345 \quad 347$ Di 2978D
GREGORIA CII 196 Di3/77
HONESTA bV 63 Di3/82
HONOR CII 157 Di 4714B
JANUARIANUS bV 41 cII 100 Kraus RE ii 479

JOHANNES CII 7172101 cIII 8889351535 cIV 70 bV 104 JOANNES cIII 189647657 cIV 281 cV 170 JOANES cIV 142 JOHANNA cIII 535 Kraus RE ii $482 \mathrm{Di} 3 / 86$
LEPORIUS CIII 290 Di3/99
LILLOSA cIII 558 Kraus RE ii 478 (Liliosa)
MAIULUS aII 24 Di 3599
MATEUS cV 166 Hu Sp 225
MAURUSIUS aV 5 bII 58 Di 3040
MICAEL bIV 128 Hu Sp 479
MUNERIUS bIII 284f Di 42604622
NATALICUS CIII 203 NATALICA CIII 268 NATALIKA CII 157 Di 4590
NAUCELIUS bIII 291 Di 725
NAVIS(G?)IUS CIV 32 Kraus RE ii 479 (Navigius)
NONNICA bV 67 Di3/117
PETRUS BIV 109161 cII 4282 cIII 165657 cIV 53 cV 70 bV 94 Kraus RE ii 482
PORCELLUS bIII 82 Kraus RE ii 478 (Porcella)
POTENTIUS eV 50 Di3/129
QUIRIACUS cIV 3655 CaXII2/1516
RENOBATUS cII 217 CIII 599 Di3/136
ROMANILLA CV 34 Di 2542 4157A
SATURNUS CIV 801 Di 4135 F 4143
SECURITAS CIII 354 Di 2700
SMARAGDUS cIII ll7Kraus RE ii 478
SPERANTIA bV 44Kraus RE ti 481
SPESINUS CIII 311 ISPESINA cIII23 Di 2706An
SPESINDEO cIII 311 SPENDEU cII 50 Di 2512B(Ispe..) Di 3649 (Sperendeus) Di 2950B(Spesideu)
STERCORIUS b.III 283 Kraus RE ii 478 CaXII2/1525(=El-Khamaj)
ӨEOAOVNOC CII 9 CaXII2/1515
$\theta \in \infty 0 \triangle O C 1 O C$ cIV 147 TEHODOSIUS cIV 147 Kraus RE ii 481
TURTURA aII 26 Kraus RE ii 478
TUTA CIII 229 Kraus RE ii 482(Tutus)
VEN AN ANTIUS bV 58 Kraus RE ii 478
BIGULANTIUS bII 132 UGLATI cIV 233 CaXII2/1505(Vigilantius)
VITALIANUS eV 180 Di3/171

## Afr

\%JUGRATUS bII 69 (see JUGURTA P)
*MUSTULA bIII 101 cIII 62 bII 61 (Di3/1I4 Muscula W2/388 Mus,Musclos
ALEXIS cIV 88. (Th 98 Alexa,Alexo Di 459838 ll27 3970A W2591 Alexius, Di 4903 Alexus)
ANERENIA cV 99 (Hu Sp 378 Anerius)
APISILIA aIII 45 (De3/16 Apisius)
APRILIA CIV 45 (see Aprilis CP) $\quad$ Arcontia)
ARCELITIUS eIV 35 (W2/37I Argentillus De 8127 Argentius LeBL 657
ARESIS bIV 159 (De 7970 Ares 7333 Arescon Th 99 Arescus A peorkwl)
ARGUTA cIV 241 (Di3/14 Argutio)
ARIFRIDOS bIII 260 (Hu Sp Argefredus 520)
ARISUS aII 20 (De 9395 Aris)

ARISTILLA aII 27 (Kraus RE ii 480 W2/372 Aristo)
ASINARIUS cIII 245 (Kraus RE ii 477 Asella W2/308 CMCh 297 Asinius De 3513 Asinianus)
AQUISA aIII 65 ATQUISITOR bIII 284b (Kraus RE ii 48 Atquisita)
AUREA CIII 218 (De 7901d Aura)
AUSITICE aII 1 (Th 144 Lat audeo + Gk TúXİ; better A
ORICLO aIII 39 (De 8380 Orcilus; = Auriculus, edd.)
AXIDO CIV 159 (De 1356 Axia 1401 Axius)
BALSAMIUS bII 42 (LeBl 556A Balsimius De 4440 Balsamo)
BARENOLIMUS...MAURENTIUS bIV 80 (LeBI ii 621 Maura,-us,-icus,-usius)
BAVARIA cV 174 (Lebl 32lC Bavo)
BAZA cII 154 (De 5496 Baxo q )
BAZUZICE bIII 36 (LeBl 625637638 Basilius Hu Sp 45 Basilia Hu Sp 28 Bassilla De3/174 Basil...
BLOSSUS bIII 148 cIII 490 (Di 276585 WZ/313 Blossius)
BONIA... cII 16 (LeBl 609 Bonita De 1977 Boniata)
BROCCU CV 2l(W $5582246 a b$ Brocchus De 4516a Borroco)
BRUMASA aII 4 (Di 2708n Brumasius LeBI 640 Brumachius)
BURAIDO CIV 44 (Di 1666 Buraidus De 8888 Burdo)
CALBESSANUS bIII 187 (Di 3973A Calvisianus De 8864 Kか入ountwvos)
CALPURINUS bII 76(see Calpurnius p.627)
CANDIDOSA CIII 264265 (Di3/33 Candida etc.)
CAPRUS CIII 660 (Kraus RE ii 477 Capra W 608 f Capriola De 4812 59516581 Capella)
CATULA aII 16 (W 547 roo Catulus De 6293 Catulla Di3/35 CaXII2/1547 Catella)
CESINUS cIII 201 (De 911939 Caesianus 6911bis Caeso)
CITEUS cII 96 (W 1973 Citus Hu Sp 153 Cit...)
CLOTEIANUS CIII 512 (W2/376 Clodianus)
COLICIA bV 67 (Di 4236 Collecius Di l822 Collecia De 9988904 F9059 Collega)
CONSORTIOLA bII 46 (W 1545 Consors)
COPRSCANUS bV 139 bF (Th 126 Cprus KOTfPos)
CORINTHIADUS CIV 42 (W 300 Cdrinthus Di 40864533 Corinthias De 2746 Corinthianus)
COTA cIV 175 ( $\mathrm{Hu} \mathrm{Br} 47 \mathrm{Co..}$. )
CREMENTIA bIII 155 bIV 125 bV 103 cIII 484 (Kraus RE ii 480 Clemens W2/375 Clemens W2/376 Clementinus, -ina, -ianus)
CRESCITURUS BIII 280 CERSCITURUS bII 95 (see Cremcentius CP)
CRISPA CIII 281 (W2/377 Crispus)
DEPUSINNA cV 131 (name? eif Diehl klT62/1543 Spude pusinna miserina v an II m III a XX 1544 Nicephorus pitinnus qui vixsit annos duo, Rome)
DEUHABET CIII 170 171/H DEUABET CIII 325 (Di 3635n.....bet)
DICENTIUS CIII 172 (Kraus RE ii 80 Decentius)
DOMITUS bV 96(see Domitius p. 627, Di3/49 W2/378,324)
DORSI CIII 442 (Th 104 Doris foupls)
EGISIA bIII 233 (De 2014 Egist...)
EIFOLUS aII 4 (W 2702 Aepolus)
ENNGUS bV 65 (Th 131-132 Enagius, Ehagia )
EVASIUS (TED qui et) cII 190 (Th 146 EU* ${ }^{3}=$ Dionysos)

EXZOSA cII 650 (Exitiosa? see Exitiosus C)
FANIA cIII 176286 (W 2717 De3/62 Fannia)
FLABANA cIV 138 (Di3/64 W 27161172316 Flaviana)
FRICUS cV 58 (LeBI 640 Frigia $W 2789$ Frigeridus)
GULOSUS cIII 188 GULOSA CIII 348 (De 6099 Gulalsa)
(H)ANNIBAL aIII 29 ANNIBAL CIII 595645 (Th 96)

IGNICIA aIII 72 (Di3/85 Ignatia, Egnatia W2/325 Egnatius)
JORTICIUS bII 100 (Th lor Eorte De 3988 Ehorte = Heorte, Jorte l770)
JUNANUS CII 146 (Di 2816 W2/384 Junianus)
JUNCINA bII 17 b (Juncinus W2/384)
LEPIDIANUS CIV 223 (see Leppidius p.628)
LIBERATUS bIV 47 cII 88 cIV 71 LIBERATA cIII 195 (Di 4407 LeBl 115)
MAJORICUS bII 32 MAIIORICA CIII 357 (De 8500 Afr)
MAMME bV 52 (see p.629)
MANIA cIII 510 (w 1807 Manius $22 / 341$ Manlius)
MARALAFUS CIII 197 (LeBI 46 Mapa...De 1311 8615b 9389 Mar...)
MARITIS cIV 184 (Kraus RE ii 478 Maritimus De 7226 Maritalis)
MART cIII 359 (Di 3727H Mart... )
MARULES aIII 22 MERULUS cIII 584 (W2/387-388 Marullus,-inus,-ina,
Merula De 3387248353696579 Merula ${ }^{\top}$ De 6892 Merulinus)
MATENIUS bV 65 (W I249 Matenianus CMCh 187 Maten)
MATIANA CIII60 (see Matenius:)
MATUS bV 140 (De 7222 Matho)
MAURICELUS CIII 199 (Dez/214 Mauricius, Mauricus, Maurus, see CP p 635)
MELLOSUS CIII 301 MELOSUS cIII 453642 (Hu Sp 186 Meliosa Hu Br 242 Melius CaXII2/1552 Meliosa = Doeborah)
MENDICUS CIII 363 (De 8280 Menda)
MERITIS bIII 200 (Di l968e Merita De 9418 Meritus)
MESSORA cV 79 (Kraus RE ii 478 Hu Sp 188 W 213 Messor)
MIGGIN bII 108 MIGINUS CV 177 MICCE CIII 55 (De 5313 Migio)
MINA cV 172 (Di3/112 Mena De 1117 Min... De 7242 Moniod)
MNESIPPA aIII 38 (De3/216 Mnasis Mnesius Mnester Mydowy, NVMof np)
MUNIFRIDA cIII 368 (Hu Sp 504 Munfredus)
MUSILUS cIII 649 (LeBI 517 Musaeus)
NARDINARIUS cIII 302 (De 8088 Nardis)
NARDUS CIII 7 (De 7785)
NASSEUS bV 65 (W 2864 Nassius)
NATALIUS cIII 97 (W2/389 Natalis LeBl 609 Natalis)
NEBEA bIII47 (De3/IO3 Naevius, Naevia)
NEMESSANUS cV 82 (Kraus RE ti 476 Nemessianus Th 121 Nemesis)
NICOTYCHUS cIII 371 (De 3/219 Nico,-cles,-lais,-laus,-machus)
NOVICIUS bV 158 (De 7300a Novicia Hu Br 84 Nuvintii)
ONONUSA aII 10 (Di3/118 Nonusa, Nonnosa)
OPTANTIUS bII 34 (LeBl 117 Opt...)
PAULUM aIII 8 (see Paulus CP)
PEPERINUS bIII 46 (Kraus RE ii 478 Peperusa) Filocurius)
FILOCTRIUS bIII 172 (Th 111 W 314 Philocyrius De 8093 -k- 8089
PONTUS cIV 178 (W2/392 De3/118 Pontius Ponticus)
PORTESIUS cIII 589 (De 5465 Portesis)
POTENTIANUS bV 103 (W 1575 Potentina)
PRIMOSUS bV 65 (W 751 Primosa)
RETITUS aII 4 (De 8566a-c Retus)

ROGATULA CIII 551 (see Rogatilla P p.637)
ROSATUS CII 70 (Rogatus? seep. 633)
ROZONUS bV 122 (Di3/138 Rozonius Di 3665 a Podonius Severus)
RUSTICEIA cV 154 (LeBl 119284 Rustic...)
RUSTICILIA cII 48 (see Rusticeia)
RUTUNDA CIII 494 (Di 2692 Rutundula)
SAFRAC cIII 309 (Di 3755A Safragius)
SALSA CV 49 (De 8764 \&
SAMISIN cIV 106 (Hu Sp 219221 Samson, cf.Hu Br 61 62)
SAMUS CIV 172 (W 1304 SAMIUS)
SATURINUS bIII 4 bV 55 (Hu Sp 403 Saturina)
SATURAS bV 54 (W 1375 Satyrus Di3/143 Saturus)
SECUNDOSA CIII 465 (see Secundus etc. CP p.633)
SECUndulus,-a? CIII 21593 (see Secundosa)
SEROTI aII 4 (W 15011503 Serotinus)
SERVILIANA bIII 107 (Kraus RE ii 480 W 2198 Servilianus)
SEBERUM aII 9 (Kraus RE ii 480 W2/397 Di 4972 Severus CaXII2/1548-a)
SILBUDI cIV 80(De l'302 Sividius 1281 Sibidius 6124 Subidius)
SISATIUS cIV 192 (Hu Sp 324 Sisenandus 244261 Sisnandus)
STERCULUS BIII 284g (Di 2543 n sim)
SUNNIUS bIII 37 (W 897 Sunna)
TILAUGE bV 57 (De 4648 Tilander, but cf. Tilduyars Dietrich ML 18/8)
TRIUMFALICA CIII 403404 (W 2707 Triumphalis)
TZIDDIN CIII 132 (Di3/160 Stiddin De 8258 Tzitta)
BALERIOLIS CII 29 (De 8454 Valeriola)
VANDIA aIV 4 (De 4833 Vangio)
VARICA CIII 467(De3/251 Varia)
BENATIA aII 30 (Di3/164 Venantia)
BILLATICA CII 76 (De 4848a Billo)
BINCAMUS CIII470 VINCCANUS bIII 102 (De 883 Viñcianus 9160 Bicanus)
VINCELNALOS CIII 283 aII 4 BINCEMALOS CIII 413 BICEwALOS CII 86
(Di 2123 ll56n Vincomalos 4957 Vincomalos)
BINCENTIOLUS CIII 472 (see Vincentius p.633)
VITATIUS aIII 11 I2 (De 45628742 Vitalius)
VITIVVIEUS cV 29 (De 7734 Vivi)
VITULA CV 71 (W2/401 Vitulus Kraus RE ii 478 Vitella)

## Hapleg

*DONATILLA cIV 168281
*JADER cII 8 bIII 176
*SAMMAC CV 175
ABIARICA CIII 30
AGONIOSUS CIII 149
ALBORIA CIII 32
ALOMIUS cIII 434
AMEPASSASIUS cIV 254
ANTISTA cII 5
ANTISTES cIV 19
APIRIUS bV 86
APTACIDA bV 15

ARCELLUS cV 66
ARGEDUPEAS CII 135
ASCENTESIA cV 60
ASIRIA bIII 85
ASTANIA CV 44
ASTORTA aIII 28
AULURULA cV 29
BABELO CII 33
BADUMAS cII 93
BENEFICUS CIV 219
BENESIANUS CIV 217
BOINUS cIII 155

BOLITANA CIII 12
BONISINIA cIII 154
BONISPERA CII 169
BONOSULA CIII 160
BRINCULUS bIII 79
CAMBULUS CIII 534
CAMPRATIUS CIII 161
CASTITAS bV 43
CEADES bV 50
CHARAIIHA bII 83
CHINITUS cIV 42
CONISUS bIII 71
CONTROSARIUS CIII 562
CORISIUS bIII 168
COSTRIUS cIII 596
COTTINUS cIII 489
CREDITE... bIII 209
CRUNNITUS CII 170
CRINITUS CIII 61I
CUFILIAS bIII 227
DERISOR bIII 151
DOMINICELLUS bII 96
DONATULA bII 114
EVAISSA e干 cV 181
FASIR cIII 331
FASTIDITUS bII 2655 bIII 45
FATIBENIA CIII 295
FINTERA cIII 509
FRIDILA cV 59
GARDAIUS CIII 574
GELLULUTUS bIII 149
GILIUS cIII 315
JAHINUS bII 15
ICOSUS ait 6
IMAIS bIII 157
LATONA cIII 355
LAZARUS bIV 161
MARDULUS cIV 213
MARTIANA CIV 40
MEDDEN CII 87
NEDIMUS cIV 111
MELOCIANA CIII 358
MINARCIUS CIV 177
MODANIUS cV 28
MOLENDARIA CIII 201
NABORIANUS CIII 582

OSTARICCUS cV 45
PASSIUUS bIV 96
ФPI $\triangle \in R P X$ cV 33
PLACENTINUS bIV 79
PONPONIFEVA cV 97
PRAETORIANUS aV 5
PREFECTUS cV 217
PRIVA aII 4
PRIVATIANUS cII 187 bIII 273
PUELLA CIII 379
P+TROIA cIV 161
SEVIENUS cIII 646
SAGUNTINA bV 4
SANNASUS bIV 2
SARGANIUS aIII 5
SAUTILIA bII I
SAUSA aII 4
SELBULUS bIII 184
SERBUCA CIII 571
SERMONI cIV 32
SERUS CII 205
SERVUS aII 10 cII 107 and
SERBUS CII 163
SESCENS aII 8
SGLIPAO bIV 98
SILIQUESIS CII 108
SINDIVULT cV 54
ISTABLICIUS qui et DONATUS bV 155
ISTTORACIUS CIII 313
SUBITANUS CIII 226 aII 12
SUDVUITUS bV 32
SYMPOSIUS bIII 153
TATON aIII 43
TILLA aIII 7
TRUTOM bII 49
TURASIUS cIV 144
TURASSUS cIII 7
TZOZUS BIII 90
TZOZA CIII 230
UNTANCUS cV 30
USTRIUT cIV 81
VASILA EIII 178
VESEMES AIII 48
VICCF VV 142
VIMIASUS aII 10

VINCETDEUS bIII 258
WITPTURI qui et MACCALIS bV 92
VIXA CII 25
ZIENOBIA cIII 648

## APPENDIX III - VITAL STATISTICS

|  |  | 10d | cIV 161 | $\pm$ | $4 y$ | 29a |  | cV 151 | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 30d | bIII 239 | m | 4 y | lm |  | bII 55 | m |
|  | 3 m |  | bII 98. | $\pm$ | 4 y | ln |  | bIII 45 | m |
|  | 3m |  | cIII 105 | m | 4 y | 2 m |  | cII 70 | m |
|  | 3 m | 3a | bII 47 | m | 4 y | 2 m 17 d |  | bIII 157 | $\pm$ |
|  | 4 m |  | cV 60 | f | 4 y | 7 m 3 d |  | cIV 178 | m |
|  | 8 m | 30才 | bIV 186 | m | 4 y | 1 m 7a | 5 h | cII 109 | m |
|  | 1 m | 25d | cII 139 | m | 5 y |  |  | bII 32 | m |
| Iy |  |  | bII 21 | $\pm$ | 5 y |  |  | CII 50 | m |
| 1 y |  |  | bIII 191 | m | $5 y$ |  |  | cII 134 | m |
| 1 y | 2 m | 15d | cIII 491 | f | $5 y$ |  |  | CIII 202 | $f$ |
| 1 y | 6 m |  | cIV 52 | 1 | 5 y | 3 m |  | bIV 95 | ¢ |
| ly | 6 m |  | cIV 89 | m | 5 y | 4 m |  | cIII 165 | m |
| ly | 6 m |  | cIV 92 | 1 | $5 y$ | 9 m 27 d |  | cIV 54 | ? |
| $1 y$ | 6 m | 14. | cIV 47 | f | 5 y | 10m |  | cIV 160 | m |
| 1 y | 7 m |  | cIII 620 | ? | 6 y |  |  | bII 39 | I |
| ly | 8m | 7 \% | cIII 466 | f | 6 y |  |  | CII 5 | f |
| ly | 9m |  | bIII 103 | m | $6 y$ |  |  | cII 149 | m |
| 1 y | 10m | 6d | bV 28 | m | 6 y |  |  | bIII 75 | m |
| 2 y |  |  | bIV 95 | f | 6.9 |  |  | bIII 251 | - |
| 2 y | 1 m | 25d | bIII 87 | m | 6 y |  |  | cIII 158 | m |
| 25 | 3m |  | CIII 375 | m | 6 y |  |  | cIII 187 | f |
| 2 y | 5m |  | cV 45 | m | 6 y |  |  | cIV 239 | m |
| 2 y | 6m |  | CII 44 | m | $6 y$ |  |  | bV IOI | m |
| $2 y$ | 6 m | 22d | bII 73 | m | $6 y$ | 3m 5d | 7 h | bII 5 | m |
| 2 y | 7 m |  | bIII 65 | m | $6 y$ | 11m 20d |  | cIV 94 | m |
| $3 y$ |  |  | bII 108 | m | 7 y |  |  | cII 36 | f |
| $3 y$ |  |  | cII 210 | $?$ | 7 y |  |  | cII 49 | m |
| $3 y$ |  |  | bV 125 | m | 7 y |  |  | CII 136 | m |
| $3 y$ |  |  | bV 153 | m | 7 y |  |  | cII 154 | f |
| $3 y$ |  |  | cIII 647 | m | 7 y |  |  | cIII 45 | 5 |
| $3 y$ | 3m | 25d | cV 91 | m | 7 y |  |  | cIV 179 | m |
| $3 y$ | 6 m |  | XIII 559 | ? | 78 |  |  | cIV 199 | $\pm$ |
| 35 | 9m | 10d | cII 105 |  | 7 y | 10 m |  | bIII 17 | $6 ?$ |
| 3y | 1 Im | 7 d | XIII 513 | ? | 8 y |  |  | cII 6 | ? |
| 4 y |  |  | bII 23 | f | 8 y |  |  | cII 370 | m |
| 4 y |  |  | bIII 289 | f | 8 y |  |  | cII 163 | m |
| 4 y |  |  | cIII 441 | I | 8 y |  |  | cIII 41 | 9 ? |
| $4 y$ |  |  | CIII 453 | m | 8 y |  |  | cIII 47 | 5 ? |
| 4 y |  |  | cIII 474 | ? | 8 y |  |  | cIV 27 | m |
| 4 y |  |  | cIII 642 | m | 8 y |  |  | cIV 53 | m |
| 4 y |  |  | bV 141 | m | 8 y |  |  | cV 100 | f |
| 4 y |  |  | bV 165 | m | 8 y | 1m |  | cII 169 | f |
| 4 y |  |  | bV 113 | f | 8 y | 3m 2ld |  | cIII 49 | 2 m |
| $4 y$ |  |  | cV 171 | ? | 8 y | 3m 24a |  | h bIV 85 |  |


| 8 y | 8 m |  |  | CIII 601 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 y | 8 m | 5d |  | CII 176 | m |
| $8 y$ | 10m | $6 \pm$ |  | cII lol | m |
| 8 y | IOm | 24d | 6 h | bII 121 | $f$ |
| 9 y |  |  |  | CII 48 | f |
| 9 y |  |  |  | CII 71 | m |
| 9 y |  |  |  | bV 86 | $\mathrm{f}^{9}$ |
| 9 y |  |  |  | cV 32 | ? |
| 9 y |  |  |  | cV 202 | $f$ |
| 9 y | llm |  |  | cII 193 | ? |
| $10 y$ |  |  |  | bII 23 | f |
| $10 y$ |  |  |  | CIII 606 | ? |
| 10y |  |  |  | cV 195 | m |
| IOy |  |  |  | cV 208 | n |
| IOy | 6 m |  |  | bII 69 | m |
| 10y | 8 m |  |  | cIV 67 | m |
| 10y | 10m |  | 5 h | CII 177 | m |
| 11y |  |  |  | CIII 642 | ${ }^{\text {f }}$ |
| l1y |  |  |  | bV 130 | m |
| 11y |  |  |  | cV 54 | ? |
| 119 | 9 m |  |  | cIII 61.3 | m |
| 12 y |  |  |  | bIII 67 | $\mathrm{f}^{5}$ |
| 127 |  |  |  | CIII 499 | f |
| 12y |  |  |  | cIV 71 | m |
| 12y |  |  |  | bV 78 | n |
| 12y | 11m |  |  | bII 16 | m |
| 13y |  |  |  | CII 73 | m |
| 13y |  |  |  | CIII 448 | I |
| $13 y$ |  |  |  | cIV 173 | I |
| 13y |  |  |  | bV 36 | m |
| 13y |  |  |  | bV 129 | f |
| 14y |  |  |  | bIII 30 | m |
| 14y |  |  |  | CII 51 | f |
| 14y |  |  |  | CII 192 | m |
| 14y |  |  |  | CIII 498 | m |
| 14 y |  |  |  | cIV 159 | $f$ |
| 14y | 5 m |  |  | cII 180 | f |
| 15y |  |  |  | bII 102 | m |
| 15y |  |  |  | CII 53 | $f$ |
| I5y |  |  |  | CII 213 | f |
| $15 y$ |  |  |  | CIII 359 | ? |
| $15 y$ |  |  |  | cIV 237 | f |
| $15 y$ |  |  |  | bV 89 | m |
| $15 y$ |  |  |  | bV 124 | $f$ |
| $15 y$ |  |  |  | bV 128 | f |
| $15 y$ |  |  |  | cV 131 | $f$ |
| $15 y$ | 2 m | 50 | 3h | cII 172 | 1 |
| $15 y$ | 5 m |  | 7 h | cII 110 | 1 |




| $38 y$ |  |  |  | cII 195 | m | $50 y$ |  |  |  | bII |  | m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38 y |  |  |  | CIII 58 | In | 50 y |  |  |  | cII | 8 | m. |
| 38 y |  |  |  | CIII 214 | m | $50 y$ |  |  |  | cII | 33 | ? |
| 39 y |  |  |  | cIV 51 | ? | 50 y |  |  |  | cII | 43 | m |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 y |  |  |  | cIII | 164 | m |
| 40y |  |  |  | bII 9 | $?$ | $50 y$ |  |  |  | bIII | 200 | m |
| 40 y |  |  |  | cII 132 | m | $50 y$ |  |  |  | bIII | 222 | m |
| 40 y |  |  |  | cII 140 | m | 50 y |  |  |  | cIII | 166 | m |
| 40 y |  |  |  | CIII 357 | ? | 50 y |  |  |  | cIII | 298 | $?$ |
| 40 y |  |  |  | CIII 553 | f | 50 y |  |  |  | cIII | 314 | f |
| 40 y |  |  |  | cIII 656 | m | 50 y |  |  |  | cIII | 314 | m |
| 40 y |  |  |  | cIV 44 | m | 50 y |  |  |  | cIII | 412 | ? |
| 40 y |  |  |  | cIV 81 | ? | 50 y |  |  |  | cIII | 421 | $f$ |
| 40 y |  |  |  | cIV 230 | m | 50 y |  |  |  | cIII | 536 | ${ }^{\text {f }}$ |
| 40 y |  |  |  | bV 93 | m | 50 y |  |  |  | bIV | 84 | m |
| 40 y |  |  |  | bV 118 | f | 50 y |  |  |  | cIV | 69 | m |
| 40 y |  |  |  | bV 156 | f | 50 y |  |  |  | cIV | 235 | m |
| $40 y$ |  |  |  | bV 166 | m | 50 y |  |  |  | cIV | 229 | m |
| $40 y$ |  |  |  | cV 27 | m | $50 y$ |  |  |  | bV 1 | 10 | m |
| 40 y |  |  |  | cV 79 | $\mathrm{f}^{2}$ | $50 y$ |  |  |  | cV 2 | 9 | m |
| 40y |  |  |  | cV 161 | m | 50 y |  |  |  | cV 6 | 1 | m |
| 40 y |  |  |  | cV 165 | $f$ | $50 y$ |  |  |  | cV I | 57 | f |
| $40 y$ | 5 m |  |  | bII 42 | m | 50 y |  | 7 d | 8 h | cII | 92 | f |
| 40y | 5 m |  | 7 h | cII 185 | m | $50 y$ |  | 13d |  | bII | 28 | m |
| 41 y |  |  |  | bII 132 | m | $50 y$ | 6 m | 13d |  | bIV | 189 | m |
| 41 y |  |  |  | bV 82 | f | $50 y$ | 11 m | 15d |  | bI ${ }^{\text {r }}$ |  | m |
| 41 y |  |  |  | cV 182 | m | 52 y |  |  |  | CII |  | m |
| 42 y |  |  |  | cV 34 | $f$ | 52 y |  |  |  | bIV | 2 | m |
| 42 y |  |  |  | cIV 241 | ? | 52 y |  |  |  | cIV | 73 | m |
| 42y |  | 15d | 5 h | bII 60 | m | 52 y |  |  |  | cIV | 182 | $f$ |
| $43 y$ |  |  |  | bIII 291 | m | 52 y |  |  |  | cIV | 224 | $f$ |
| 43y | 2 m |  | 4h | cII 98 | m | 52 y |  |  |  | cV 8 |  | m |
| 43y | 3m | 17d |  | cIV 144 | m | 53 y |  |  |  | cII |  | $f$ |
| 44y |  |  |  | cII 77 | ? | 53 y |  |  |  | cII | 38 | m |
| 44y |  |  |  | CII 180 | ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | 53 y |  |  |  | bIII | I 4 | m |
| 44y |  |  |  | bIII 290 | m | 53 y |  |  |  | bIII | I 56 | m |
| $44 y$ |  |  |  | cIV 238 | f | 53 y |  |  |  | CIII | I 643 | f |
| 44y |  |  |  | bV 111 | Im | $53 y$ |  |  |  | bV 1 | 136 | m |
| 44y | 3m | Ird |  | cIV 144 | m | 547 |  |  |  | bV | 138 | m |
| 44y | 4m | 7 d |  | bV 35 | $\mathrm{f}^{\square}$ | $55 y$ |  |  |  | bII |  | $f$ |
| $45 y$ |  |  |  | cII 216 | m | $55 y$ |  |  |  | CII | 157 | $f$ |
| $45 y$ |  |  |  | CIII 142 | m | $55 y$ |  |  |  | CIII | I 86 | f |
| 45y |  |  |  | CIII 544 | $?$ | $55 y$ |  |  |  | cIII | I 344 | f |
| $45 y$ |  |  |  | CIII 643 | $f$ | $55 y$ |  |  |  | bV | 76 | m |
| $45 y$ |  |  |  | cV 102 | f | $55 y$ |  |  |  | cV | 85 | n |
| $45 y$ |  |  |  | cV 210 | m | 55 y |  |  |  | cV | 132 | m |
| $45 y$ |  |  |  | XIII 520 | ? | $55 y$ |  |  |  |  | 197 | m |
| 47 y |  |  |  | CIII 328 | f | 55 y |  |  |  | cV | 204 | f |
| 47 y |  |  |  | XIII 786 | ? | $55 y$ |  |  |  | cV | 207 | f |
| 47 y |  | 24a |  | bIV 89 | $f$ | $55 y$ | 3 m |  | 4 h | cII | 175 | ? |
| 48 y |  |  |  | bIII 186 | f | $55 y$ | 4 m |  |  | cII | 170 | m |
| 48 y |  |  |  | bIV 88 | m | $55 y$ | 10 m | 25d | 3h | cII | 115 | ? |


| $56 y$ |  |  | bV 3 | m | $64 y$ | cV 128 ? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56 y |  |  | cV 196 | m | $64 y$ 10m $10 d$ | cII 171 |
| $58 y$ |  |  | cII 121 | f | $65 y$ | bII 18 |
| $58 y$ |  |  | cIII 617 | m | $65 y$ | bII 100 m |
| 58 y |  |  | cIV 182 | [n | $65 y$ | cIII 151 m |
| 58 y |  |  | bV 142 | m | $65 y$ | CIII 174 f |
| 59 y | $2 \mathrm{~m} 22 d$ |  | bV 139 | f | $65 y$ | CIII 218 f |
|  |  |  |  |  | $65 y$ | cIII 370 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bII 24 | m | $65 y$ | cIII 643 玉 |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bII 35 | m | $65 y$ | bIV 67 f |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cII 45 | m | $65 y$ | bIV 91 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | CII 47 | m | $65 y$ | cIV 60 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | CIII 155 | m | $65 y$ | cIV 231 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cIII 137 | f | $65 y$ | bV 19 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | CIII 172 | m | $65 y$ | bV 91 f |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cIII 319 | $?$ | $65 y$ | bV 111 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cIII 646 | m | $65 y$ | bV 114 f |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bIV 29 | $f$ | $65 y$ | cV 62 . f |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cIV 68 | m | $65 y$ | cV 90 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cIV 184 | m | $65 y$ | cV 190 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cIV 216 | m | $66 y$ | bIV 83 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cIV 237 | $f$ | $66 y$ | bIV 93 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bV 5 | f | $66 y$ | cIV 252 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bV 6 | $f$ | $68 y$ | bII 34 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bV 7 | f | $68 y$ | CII 83 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bV 50 | ? | $68 y$ | CIII 545 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bV 55 | m | 69 y | CII 18 ? |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bV 85 | m |  |  |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bV 121 | m | $70 y$ | bII 19 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bV 154 | f | $70 y$ | cII 58 f |
| $60 y$ |  |  | bV 162 | f | $70 y$ | bIII 182 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cV 89 | f | $70 y$ | bIII 273 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | c.V 106 | m | $70 y$ | bIII 274 f |
| 60y |  |  | cV 126 | f | $70 y$ | bIII 288 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cV 140 | $f$ | $70 y$ | cIII 139 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cV 152 | $f$ | $70 y$ | cIII 199 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cV 166 | f | $70 y$ | cIII 218 m |
| 60y |  |  | cV 189 | m | $70 y$ | cIII 225 m |
| $60 y$ |  |  | cV 192 | m | $70 y$ | CIII 231 f |
| $60 y$ | I6a |  | bIII 199 | m | $70 y$ | CIII 252 f |
| $60 y$ | 3 m |  | CIII 82 | m | $70 y$ | cIII 296 m |
| $60 y$ | 5 m | 6 h | CII 19 | m | $70 y$ | CIII 433 m |
| $60 y$ | 6m 20d |  | bII 22 | f | $70 y$ | CIII 497 f |
| 61 y |  |  | bII 65 | m | $70 \%$ | CIII 508 f |
| 61 y |  |  | cII 133 | m | $70 y$ | CIII 510 f |
| 61 y |  |  | cII 160 | f | $70 y$ | CIII 583? |
| 61 y |  |  | cII 162 | 1 | $70 y$ | bIV 90 m |
| 61 y |  |  | cV 113 | ? | $70 y$ | cIV 29 m |
| $62 y$ |  |  | cII 32 | m | $70 y$ | cIV 104 f |
| $62 y$ | 3m 10d |  | cII 102 | m | $70 y$ | bV 54 ? |
| $63 y$ |  |  | cV 185 | m | $70 y$ | bV 80 |
| $63 y$ | 2m 27d | 9 h | cV 49 | f | $70 y$ | bV 95 m |
| $64 \%$ |  |  | cII 30 | m | $70 y$ | bV 102 f |



## APPENDIX IV - A PHANTOM INSCRIPTION

CIL viii 9738 reproduces the following inscription after the French translation of an Arabic History of the Berbers by Ibn Khaldun, in which it is cited as having been seen by Ibn er-Rakik, towards the close of the tenth Christian century, at Tiaret (El-Mansour) in Mauretania (see p.109) : -

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Je suis Soliman le serdeghos. Les habitants de cette } \\
& \text { vilIe s'étant revoltés, le roi m'envoya contre eux; et } \\
& \text { Dieu mayant permis de les vaincre, j'ai fait élever } \\
& \text { ce monument pour éterniser mon souvenir. } \\
& \text { i.e., } \\
& \text { I am Soliman the serdeghos. The inhabitants of this } \\
& \text { town having rebelled, the king sent me against them; } \\
& \text { and God having allowed me to prevail over them, I have } \\
& \text { had this monument erected in order to perpetuate my } \\
& \text { memory. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Here, as the editors point out, Soliman is the well-known Solomon, magister militum of Justinian I, frequently mentioned on Byzantine texts (cIV ll2,137,1,41,etc.), the title "serdeghos" pointing to the Greek "strategos"(=general), which we do in fact find applied to Solomon on a bilingual piece (cIV 1I2). The original, if any, must therefore have been written in Greek. As however this item resembles none of our authentic Byzantine texts in style or content, and seems to have passed through so many hands, it may be questioned Whether an original ever existed at all. If so, it is a unique piece; but provisionally it seems right to exclude it from the catalogue in view of its tradition. It contributes in any case nothing fresh to our problem.
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| Wendt, Bystem | $=$ Hans Hinrich Wendt, System der christlichen Lehre G४ttingen 1906 |
| Wilpert |  |
| Wrede | = Willian Wrede, Die Entstehung der Schriften des Neuen Testaments Thbingen 1909 |

## Note

All citations are given as fully as space permits; contractions are supplied in the foregoing lists. References under (l) together with Marucchi (3) (p.655) are to numbers of items, elsewhere to pages; in the Onomasticon, collections may be cited by volume and page in the case of indices. Where the reference is ambiguous, it is expressly mentioned (page or number).

## ERRATA

The following errors of detail were discovered when it was no longer possible to incorporate the corrections in the text:-
(1) In tine Onomasticon (App.II)*
p. 639 SATURNUS (C) : omit
p. 641 LIBERATus (Afr) : transier to (c) (p.639)
(2) In the numbering of the pages, 282 and 382 were accidentally omitted.
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[^0]:    1) Theologische Quartalschrift, (Tubingen 1885)pp. 58 sqq
    2) Kaufmann, HAE 8,10,84
    3) Rev.Arch 1903 ii 62
    4) Memoires xii/I 161-339
[^1]:    1) Sauer in Buchberger, LThK $V 856$
    2) Leclercq, L'Afrique chrétienne, appendix p. 382
[^2]:    1) Dessau,Lateinische Epigraphik 10
    2)Marucchi,Christian Epigraphy vii
[^3]:    1) Sandys,Latin Epigraphy 1.
[^4]:    1)Revue Archeologique 1903 II p. 61

[^5]:    1) Mittheilungen d. kais. d. arch. Inst. (Ath. Abt.) XXIV 275-293 2)Reden u. Aufstitze I $30 \not 24$
[^6]:    1) Le Blant, Manuel d'Epigr.chret. 185-186
    2) I/5, $6 ; I I / 3,10, I 1 ; I I I / 1 ; 7 ; 15 ; I V / 2,5 ; V / 4,5,11$. (ed.Harnack, Bonn,1912)
[^7]:    1)Kaufmann, Handbuch d. altchr. Epigraphik pp.48-49
    2) Le Blant,Manuel p. 26
    3)De Rossi I/1120,1121

[^8]:    *) Except where otherwise stated numbers refer to CIL8

[^9]:    I) Sitzungsberichte a. preuss. Akad. a. Wiss. Jhrg. 1937,ph-hist. Kl 271 sq

[^10]:    I) Pfister in PWK xvii 1290
    2)Church Scotland Book of Common Order, O.U.P. 1940 p. 27

[^11]:    1) KBnig, Hebr. u. Aram. WBrtb 401
    2) An Boli 28/151 3)ib.149-150
    3) ib. 154-159
[^12]:    1)bIV 9, 2)bIV 51 3)cITI 501 4)bII lor,112; bIII 5; bIV 118,161; bV 65; cII 12,197; cIII 619; cIV 33. 5) Di 2002,2017-8;HuSp 49,184, 519,522;An Boll 28/177-8 6)bII 112; bIII 167

[^13]:    1) PWK $x v / 1: 948$
    2) $\mathrm{Ca} 11 / 1: 442$
[^14]:    1) Wilpert Textb 335-3444 2)ib. 356-361 3) Di 2426e 4) Hu Br 229 c 5) Lietzmann,Ordo Missae (kl T 19)p. 23 6) Euseb HE v l 7) John xi l-46 8) Wilpert 310-321 9)ib. 362-366 10)Hippolytus,In Susannam: Wilpert 362 11) Athenagoras,Legatio pro Christianis iii 12) Wilpert 363
[^15]:    1) Kaufmann, Handbuch 221
[^16]:    1) Bonwetsch, Texte gur Geschichte des Montanismus (kl T nr 129)pp.7-8
    2) Bonwetsch p. 19
    3) Bonwetsch p. 19
    4) Bonwetsch p. 19
    5) Bonwetsch p. 22
[^17]:    1) $\mathrm{RPE} 21 / 36$
    2) RPE $24 / 67$
[^18]:    1) An Boll $54 / 313: \operatorname{RPE} 34 / 37$ omits names.
[^19]:    I) Euseb HE x 6 etc. see BSNAF 1913 pp . 211-216

[^20]:    1)Di 2406, 2467-2471 2)Justin Ap II 2/19, Passio Mart Scill, Acta Proconsularia iii.

[^21]:    1) Kaufmann, Handbuch p. 80
[^22]:    I) Di 2234-2235
    2) Di 2237
    3) Hu Sp 203

[^23]:    1)Di $2146,2148,2193 \mathrm{~B}, 2194+\mathrm{A}, 2195,2205 \mathrm{~A}, 2206 \mathrm{~B}, 2207,2209,2210,2246$
    2) LeBI 336c 3) Hu Sp 203,204
    4) $\mathrm{Hu} \mathrm{Br} 222,223$
    5)Di 2200,2202,2203
    6)Di 2205b

[^24]:    I) Lietzmann klT 61/11 (Clem Lit) 26(Can Ap)27(Can Hipp) 19/7 (Miss Rom)22(Miss Gall)

[^25]:    1)cIV 281 2)bIV 161, cIV 247 3)cIII 542 4)bIV 161 5)2 Sam vii 5 6) 2 Cor $V 1$ r) I, Diehl, Pompeianische Wandinschriften(klp56) no.10, II,Richter,Lateinische Sacralinschriften(klT68) no. 97

[^26]:    1)Pfleiderer, ECCC 84
    2) Deissmann,Licht vom Osten 141nl2-142
    3) Thieling, Hellenismus 53
    4) Le Blant,Manuel 159

[^27]:    1) Di 2388
[^28]:    I)Gen xlix $9+10$, Isaiah $x i \quad$ I
    2) Ex xv 16, Deut xxxiii 27, Job $\underset{\text { etc }}{ }{ }^{9}$,

[^29]:    1) Lietzmann,Griechische Papyri (klT 14) p. 29 no. 25/4-9
    2) 1 Cor xv 25-26
[^30]:    1) Apoc $x x$ 1-3
[^31]:    1) Anrich,Mysterienwesen 15 2) Epistula Apostolorum 13, klT 152/12
    2) Kraus RE i 418-419
    4)Dan $x$ 13,21, xii 1 5)Jude 9; Apoc xii 7
    3) Dieterich, Abraxas 125 7) Dan viii 16, Luke i 19,26
    4) WHnseh, Antike Fluchtafeln, klT20 p. 27,7/4
    9)Diehl 2429
    5) Kaufmann, Handbuch 77145149150279
[^32]:    1)Dessau,Lateinische Epigraphik 33

[^33]:    1) Wrede,Die Entstehung der Schriften des N.T. (THbingen 1907)p. 101
    2) Wunsch, Ant.Flucht. p. 6
    3) Hastings ERE v 608
    4) ib. 613
[^34]:    1) Byzantion iv 353
[^35]:    1) Lev xxvii, Num xxx, Deut xxiii 21
[^36]:    1) Hirschfeld SBBA 1901 i 594-598
    2)Di 2327,2349,2355; Cabrol iv/l:718,720-721
[^37]:    *CRAIBL 1925 p. 264,Albertini on RPE 1926/50

[^38]:    1) LeBlant, Epigr.chret.pp.73-75
[^39]:    1) RA 1903/ii 62
[^40]:    1)Kaufnann, Handbuch p. 135 2) Di Marucchi, Epigr. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 37 etc. 3) Di 2501-2589

[^41]:    1) Di 4393
    2) Rom $x$ 15, Heb xiii 20, Eph i 2, Phil iv 7 , John xiv 2 , xvi 33 ete.
[^42]:    1) Wilmanns 159176228421502472 24769 25162714256 ,Di klT38-40 458481
    2)Di ILCV 2784-2790A 2795-2803B 2879-2883A 2886-2907A
[^43]:    1)WiImanns $158198475154915582412 \quad 2579$

[^44]:    1)Di 2956-2964,2993-2996
    2)Di 2938-2955G 2967-2992

[^45]:    1）Di 48864897 4912，RPE 20／85－87，21／74－75，Cabrol xi 2／2600 sqq．

[^46]:    1) Di 3091-3095,3095C,3106+(A-C),3107+A,3109-3111A,3112+A
    2) Di 3099-3101H,3102 3) Di 3115-3133,3141
    4)Di 3137-3178A 5)Mon 134, Di 4951,4904,4955-6, Ca 8/1:218,222
[^47]:    1)lCor xv 6, lThess iv 13, 2Petr iii 4
    2) 1 Kings ii 10 , Ps xiii 3
    3)Phil i 23 4)John xiv passin

[^48]:    1) Di 3722-3726
    2) Wilmanns 369
[^49]:    1）Dalman WJ 164，Cooke NSI nos．142－143，pp．307－308
    2）Chantepie de la Saussaye I 466
    3）Cabrol iv／2：1446－7

[^50]:    1) Thieling, Hellenismus 72
[^51]:    I) Monceaux, HLAC iji 202

[^52]:    1) Northcote, EC 85
    2) Richter, Lateinische Sacralinschriften 15
    3)Deubner in Chantepie de la Saussaye ii 427
[^53]:    1)Diehl iii 607-611

[^54]:    1) Di $2640,2641,2650+\mathrm{A}$; $2673-4,2686+\mathrm{A}, 2687+\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, 2690-2706$
    2) Nor theote EC 86-87, LeBI, Manuel pp.50-51
[^55]:    1) cII 32, І31,147, cIII 600
    2) cV 160
[^56]:    1) Northeote EC 139-140
    2) Ludwig von Sybel,Historische Zeitschrift, 3te Folge, Bana X,SS I-38
    3) 1 John ii 15-17 etc.
[^57]:    1) Wilmanns ii 576-584
    2) Harnack, Militia Christi 41-42
[^58]:    1) Monceaux, CRAIBT 1913.pp.570-595
[^59]:    I) Marucchi, Epigr. 9
    2) De Rossi, ICUR i Prolegomena p. CXII
    3) Sandys,Latin Epigr. 219

[^60]:    1)Matthew xxii $34-40$, 1 Cor xiii passim, 1 John iv 8 etc.

[^61]:    1) Mark xiv 38, 1 Cor xvi 13
    2) Dibelius, in Oxford Reports iv 33
[^62]:    1) Leclereq,L'Afrique Chrét. i 432
    2) Biometrika ix $366-380$
[^63]:    1)Psalm xc 10
    2)Macdonel1,375

[^64]:    1) Macdonell,369
[^65]:    1) Macdonell,
[^66]:    1) Augustine, ep 67: non solum christianus sed etiam fidelis..... per proximum Pascha baptizatus, in Kraus, RE i 506
[^67]:    1) Nor theote, EC 125
[^68]:    1)Synod of Arles viii, vSoden 2l, Councils of Carthage, Hippo,Kidai 1

[^69]:    1）Schwarze，Unter suchungen155

[^70]:    1) Kaufmann,Handbuch

    478
    2) Diehl iii 215

[^71]:    1)Robert Eisler, Orpheus the Fisher (Iondon 1921).

[^72]:    1) Wilmanns 181, ii 692
[^73]:    1) BSNAF 1909 p. 219
[^74]:    1) Monceaux HLAC iv 466
[^75]:    I)Rev.Arch. 1934 vol.I pp 204-214 (208).

[^76]:    1) SBBA Jahrg. 1921,SS 989ff
[^77]:    1) von Soden, Urkunden $6(p .8), 38(p .56)$.
    2) Kaufmann,Handbuch 385
[^78]:    1) Kaufinann, Handbuch 338
[^79]:    1) Di $1706,4216,(1385=$ CIV77 $)$
    2) Matt xii, 1; Mk ii 23 Ik xiii 14sqq.; John vii 23; \&c
    3) Mosler in Kraus, RE ii 769
[^80]:    1) Anrich,Mysterienwesen 90,92; Reitzenstein,Mystrlg 39,128.
[^81]:    1) Matt. xxiv-xxv \&c
[^82]:    I)bIII2 DEUS JUSSIT 2)cIVI NUTU DIVINO 3) bI6 BASILICE...(FATO) DIVINO ICTA CONFLAGRARET INCENDIO 4) CIVI62 DEUS FAVET bIVZ 4 FAVENTE DEO CIVI37 DEO FABENTE 5)cIV4I DEO JUBANTE CIVI50 DNO DO AJUVANTE CIV36 AUXILIANTE DO 6) CIV5 PROPITIO DEO 7) CIV56 A DEO DATUR VICTORIA 8) bIV66 PATER DAT PACEM

[^83]:    1) H. H. Frmer, World 52
    2) Dalman, WJ 184
[^84]:    I) Buecheler, CLE I77(Christian) 405
    2) CLE 591
    3) CLE 177

[^85]:    1) socrates,Hist. Ecel. ii 46
    2) Greg. Naz. ep. IOI, Patr. Graec. Xxxvii $184 \mathrm{~B}, \mathrm{Kidd}$ DHC ii no. 84 p .111
[^86]:    1) Rohde, Psyche ii $121130161165178253279 \quad 2)$ ib.ii 386 n .3
    2) Harnack,Mission i 33-34
    3) Rohde, Psyche ii 394 n .2
[^87]:    1) Harnack, Mission ii 38
    2) 1 Cor xii 27 et passim
[^88]:    1) Monceaux, HLAC iv 456-457
[^89]:    I) Reitzenstein, Poimandres $180 n$

[^90]:    1) Matthew vii $28-32$ ix $32-33 \mathrm{xv} 22-28$ xvii $14-18$, Mark i $23-27$
    2) Mat thew iv 1-11, Mark i 12-13,Luke iv l-13
    3) Ankermann in Chantepie d.I. Saussaye, LBRG i 145-164
[^91]:    I)Farmer,WG 22
    2) Farmer, WG 23
    3) Farmer, WG 25

[^92]:    1) Genesis xxviii 20-21
    2)Leviticus xxvi 2-end
[^93]:    1) I Cor xiii
[^94]:    1)bIV 79 QUONDAM BEATUS...ET NUNC BEATIOR
    2) bV I39 AETERNO SAECULO

[^95]:    1) Rohte,Psyche ii $391 n$
    2) Olivieri klTl33 p. I2 no.bail. 5

    3 Lange in Chantepie d.I.
    4) Delitzsch, BB passim
    5) Lietzmann,Ordo Missae klT19 16/13-20(28)

[^96]:    1) Diehl 3461-3487
[^97]:    I) Brunner, Religionsphilosophie evangelischer Theologie 79

[^98]:    1) Bul tmann, Jesus 44-47
[^99]:    1)RCEA 5487143181276

[^100]:    1) Buecheler, CLE 1307
[^101]:    1) Thomson, The Science of Life 146-150
[^102]:    1) van der Leeuw, Phănomenologie 644
    2) Harnack, Reden u. Aufsatze ii 110
[^103]:    ...ns s...ii...sul.n pace...cavi...LXV et disce...
    cV 87
    $\dot{\zeta}$ iđus febrar.........pr CCCCXXXXIIII

[^104]:    *The $n$ e $t t$ figures in the tables on pp.408-446 now require adjustment, the figures $p e r$ $e$ e $n t$ however, together with the argument based thereon, remaining as they are at present.

