

‘Cover Names’ and Nomenclature in Late Roman Gaul The Evidence of the Bordelaise Poet Ausonius

By **Altay Coşkun**

With contributions by **Jürgen Zeidler**¹

0. Résumé (en français)

I. Introduction

II. Onomastics and Prosopography: Some New Insights into the Pre-history of the *gens Ausoniana*

1. The Maternal Grandfather Caecilius Argicius Arborius

2. The Father Iulius Ausonius and His Siblings

3. Roman Imperial Names and Some Ancestors of the Bordelaise Clan Hitherto Ignored

III. Conclusions and Outlook

Appendix I: Analysis of PNs in the *gens Ausoniana*

Appendix II: Multicultural Influences on the Choice of PNs: a Statistical Overview

Conspectus over the PNs attested in the *gens Ausoniana*

Table A: Analysis of PNs According to the Individual Records

Table B: Analysis of PNs According to the Different PNs Recorded

Table C: Analysis of PNs According to the Different Basic PNs Recorded

Appendix III: Select Bibliography

1. The Works of Ausonius: Some Editions, Translations, and Commentaries

2. Works on Ausonius and His Family

3. Late Antique Prosopographies / Works on Gallic Prosopography

4. (Further) Works on Celtic, Greek and Roman Onomastics and Etymology

5. Works on Celtic and Druidic Traditions in Roman Gaul

6. List of Abbreviations

Appendix IV: The Family Tree of Ausonius

0. Résumé (en français)

Né à Bordeaux en 311 environ, *Decimius Magnus Ausonius* devint professeur de grammaire en 338, puis professeur de rhétorique vers 360. Sa nomination comme éducateur du jeune empereur Gratien à Trèves en 368 lui ouvrit une carrière politique

¹ My interest in the peculiar names of the *gens Ausoniana* was aroused by Jürgen Zeidler (Trier) early in 2000, since when we have continuously exchanged our views on prosopographical and onomastic problems; as I never had the opportunity to learn any Celtic language, I am particularly grateful that he led me through the outstanding scholarly works on Celtic onomastics, controlled my linguistic analyses, and frequently made direct contributions especially to ch. app. I, the basis of the present paper. I would further like to thank Thomas Corsten who made the unpublished database of the LGPN (Oxford) available to me. Previous versions of ch. II.1-2 formed part of a paper given in the Late Roman Seminar, Oxford 8/5/2001; I would like to thank Roger Tomlin and David Gwynn for helpful suggestions on a draft prepared for that occasion. All secondary literature included in the Select Bibliography (ch. app. III) is only quoted in abbreviation.

fulgurante qui culmina avec l’obtention du consulat ordinaire en 379. Pendant ces années, il profita énormément de sa position à la cour pour favoriser l’avancement de plusieurs de ses parents dans l’aristocratie impériale. Grâce à ses oeuvres littéraires, Ausone n’est pas seulement le plus fameux poète gallo-romain, mais il est aussi une des personnes les mieux connues de cette époque. Les divers obituaires qu’il a composés pour ses parents (*Epicedion in patrem*, *Parentalia*, *Commemoratio professorum Burdigalensium*) invite à suivre l’histoire de sa famille du milieu du III^e siècle jusqu’à la fin du IV^e siècle; histoire que d’autres sources permettent de poursuivre jusqu’au VI^e siècle.

A l’inverse des questions littéraires et prosopographiques, on n’a pas encore consacré une étude systématique au matériel onomastique, alors que beaucoup de noms propres (PNs) rares méritent une explication linguistique. En combinaison avec les riches informations prosopographiques, il est possible d’appréhender la préhistoire des branches familiales à l’aide des méthodes généalogiques et linguistiques: par exemple, pour les familles de *Caecilius Argicius Arborius* (grand-père d’Ausone) et de *Iulius Ausonius* (son père), on peut confirmer une origine celtique; dans le premier cas, il est possible de découvrir un indice d’une ascendance druidique, tandis qu’on peut suggérer hypothétiquement une ascendance servile dans le second. Pour ce qui est d’*Aemilia Corinthia Maura* (sa grand-mère), *Pomponius Maximus* (mari de sa soeur) et *Valerius Latinus Euromius* (son beau-fils), divers indices pourraient révéler une parenté avec des empereurs du III^e siècle. Mais au-delà de ces acquis, l’ensemble de ces 43 personnes (pour lesquelles 86 PNs ou 51 formes différentes de PNs sont attestés) forme une base de données remarquable concernant les coutumes onomastiques; il en ressort notamment, d’une manière impressionnante, une influence surprenante de la culture celtique dans l’Aquitaine du IV^e s. malgré – ou plutôt en interaction avec – l’influence romaine.

La condition fondamentale de cette analyse n’est pas seulement l’arbre généalogique assez volumineux, c’est-à-dire, la concentration chronologique et géographique des données ainsi que l’organisation transparente de celles-ci, mais aussi la notion du *cover name* (CN, nom de code, *Deckname* selon Leo Weisgerber), ce qui signifie un nom d’origine celtique qui prend l’apparence d’un nom latin ou grec. Ainsi, par exemple, *Veneria* ou *Aeonia*. Cette étude encourage à continuer l’enquête avec une série d’investigations limitées à des régions gauloises dans des périodes bien circonscrites. La synthèse des résultats ne promet pas seulement la découverte de principes onomastiques et généalogiques mal connus aujourd’hui, mais aussi une meilleure compréhension des mécanismes et des conditions de la romanisation et des procès d’acculturation qui s’ensuivaient.

I. Introduction

The life of the famous poet Decimius Magnus Ausonius extended nearly over the entire 4th century A.D. (ca. 311-94). He was the son of a medical practitioner from Bazas and a noble, but impoverished woman from Dax. Following the profession of his uncle Aemilius Magnus Arborius, he became an academic in his home city Bordeaux: in ca. 338 he was appointed *grammaticus Latinus*, before advancing to the see of rhetoric in around 360.

Unexpectedly, he was summoned to the Treveran court in 368 to tutor the youthful emperor Gratian. Due to his amiability, he easily inspired affection in his pupil who found himself master of the Roman West in 375. By then, Ausonius was already imperial *quaestor*, but this top position at court was soon to be followed by the praetorian praefecture (*ppo*). Meanwhile, he promoted a number of relatives and compatriots to prominent posts: most notably, his son Decimius Hilarianus Hesperius (*ppo* 376-79) and his elderly father Iulius Ausonius (*ppo* 376-77). After obtaining the consulship in 379, Ausonius retired to Aquitaine.

Questioning the negative judgements still prevalent in modern scholarship, I have tried to demonstrate in my biography of Ausonius that it is too short-sighted to describe the pinnacle of his career as the ephemeral success of a mediocre personality or simply in terms of vain ambitions.² While his character and achievements need to be considered in their 4th-century context, the collective advancement of his clan exemplifies the significance of education and the catalysing function of the imperial court.³ Furthermore, the continuation of the family saga illustrates how the prestige gained in 4th-century Gaul could establish a claim to pre-eminence that survived the confusions of the barbarian raids of the 5th century; the *stemma* (cf. appendix IV) gives at least a vague impression of this remarkable persistence.

However, this paper will rather concentrate on the origins of the Bordelaise clan. By means of the singular collection of versified obituaries mainly written in the 380s, Ausonius traces his ancestors back to the early 3rd century.⁴ But the same poems include

² Cf., e.g., Sivan 1993, 146, who calls Ausonius ‘no more than a small time politician’ with a limited understanding of the Roman Empire; but she rightly acknowledges his contribution to the formation of a Gallo-Roman aristocracy. Far more derogatory are the verdicts by M.J. Pattist: Ausonius als christen, Amsterdam 1925, 92; Jouai 254, T. Honoré: Ausonius and Vulgar Law, Iura 35, 1984 [1987], 75-85, and others, whereas Green 1991, xxxii and Étienne 1962, 348 assess the Bordelaise more positively. For in-depth discussion as well as a reconstruction of the biography and family history of Ausonius cf. *Gens*.

³ For the significance of education cf. D. Nellen: *Viri litterati*. Gebildetes Beamtentum und spätrömisches Reich im Westen zwischen 284 und 395 nach Christus, Bochum 1977; for the presence of emperors in Gaul cf. van Dam 20ff.

⁴ Cf. in particular the *Epicedion in patrem* (ca. 379/80), the *Parentalia* (ca. 388/89) and *Commemoratio Professorum Burdigalensium* (ca. 389); for the chronology cf. *Gens* 94-97, 131-34. – Although Ausonius occasionally transfigures his ancestors, he feels free to mention critical aspects nevertheless, cf. Favez 12f.; moreover, many details communicated in his poems fit together convincingly and thus give

an additional kind of source different in nature: a respectable number of personal names (PNs). Omitting all *anonymi* and more than a dozen of persons for whom kinship can be asserted on onomastic grounds, I still count 43 individuals who are attested to have borne 86 PNs in sum; this sample includes 51 different forms or 48 different basic PNs respectively. Surprisingly, these data have not yet been the object of a systematic enquiry, although they have a lot to offer to linguists and historians alike.⁵

Firstly, it is exceptional that such a high number of PNs is ordered through genealogy outside a Roman senatorial or an imperial family;⁶ these circumstances render some mechanisms of nomenclature visible which are usually hidden from those dealing with epigraphical sources. Secondly, many of the names are extremely rare: some of them are restricted to Aquitaine, whereas others remain *hapax legomena* throughout antiquity. Thirdly, if combined with the available prosopographical information, the analysis of the individual PNs seems to uncover a background for the family branches which goes far beyond the narrative of the obituaries. Fourthly, the list of PNs as a whole is a unique document of the romanisation of Gaul. Most interesting in this regard are such PNs which seem to be Latin or Greek, but whose choice has strongly been influenced by autochthonic traditions. E.g., *Avitianus* or *Veneria* are undoubtedly Latin names, but their popularity in Gaul and Illyricum is probably due to their similarity to Celtic bases; the same phenomenon is more evident in cases as *Aeonia* or *Callippio*: These names sound Greek, but the former is otherwise attested solely in one Egyptian papyrus, and the latter is without parallel at all in the Hellenic world, while various Celtic PNs can reasonably be approached. Leo Weisgerber calls such cases *Decknamen*, so I will speak of ‘cover names’ (CNs) accordingly.⁷

As far as I can see, Ausonius is the only ancient writer who explicitly describes this onomastic principle: commemorating his former colleague Attius *Patēra*, he explains that the *cognomen* was only seemingly Latin (*patēra* means ‘flat bowl’), but in Gaul-

additional support to the author’s credibility. For the case of his father Iulius Ausonius, who is proudly said to have been the leading physician of his time, there is a conclusive confirmation by the medical writer Marcellus (Med. praef. 2, Niedermann² 1.2; 25.21, N. 2.420). Sivan 1993, 50f. poses the question, whether Ausonius has invented or exaggerated most of his family’s past, as, at the time of his writing, it was no longer possible to control the contentions; notwithstanding this, she finds the core of the information likely to be true. More sceptical remains J. Drinkwater: *The Gallic Empire*, Stuttgart 1987, 80. H. Isbell: *Decimus Magnus Ausonius: The Poet and His World*, in: *Latin Literature of the Fourth Century*, ed. by J.W. Binns, London 1974, 22-57, 31f. even purports ‘outright lies’, without evidencing any. See also ch. II.2.

⁵ All PNs are listed and discussed in app. I; I refrain from particular references throughout this paper.

⁶ On a number of large Roman pedigrees cf. Ch. Settapani: *Continuité gentile et continuité familiales sénatoriales romaines: mythe et réalité*, Oxford 2000 (=Prosopographica et Genealogica 2); on imperial stemmata cf. D. Kienast: *Römische Kaisertabelle*, Darmstadt² 1996, 377-82.

⁷ See ch. III for references to Weisgerber and a discussion of the term CN. For processes of acculturation and the so-called ‘romanisation’ see ch. II.3 with n. 31, ch. III with n. 39, and VII.5, in particular the article by Beltrán Lloris which is provided with a large bibliography. Cf. also C. Ando: *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, Berkeley 2000.

ish, its meaning seemed to have been *mystes* (‘one initiated’), hence being quite suitable for a priest of Apollo Belenos.⁸

I shall now set out to explore the pre-history of Ausonius’ family in three sections, before suggesting some paths for further onomastic research. It may be helpful to have the pedigree before one’s eyes (app. IV).

II. Onomastics and Prosopography: Some New Insights into the Pre-history of the *gens Ausoniana*

1. The Maternal Grandfather Caecilius Argicius Arborius

The story of Ausonius’ grandfather is told in *Parentalia* 4: hailing from the people of the *Haedui*, his forbears had been landowners in *Gallia Lugdunensis* and *Viennensis*. They are likely to have lived in Autun which went over to Claudius Gothicus in 269. Hitherto flourishing, the city was made an example by Victorinus in 270. When this emperor died in spring 271, he was succeeded by Tetricus and his homonymous son, who did not hold out any hope of amnesty either. So it was most probably the same year that saw the family set off for *Aquae Tarbellae*, today’s Dax in the South-Western corner of Aquitaine, where Caecilius Argicius Arborius was born in ca. 275.⁹

As the latter cultivated profound astrological skills later in his life (*Parent.* 4.18-22), some scholars concluded that he was of druidic offspring. While Rankin is hesitant in this regard, though erroneously claiming the *Arborii* to be “hereditary priests of Apollo Belenus”, Green rejects the assumption of druidic ancestors; Sivan goes even farther supposing that they hailed from the East and had been converted to Christianity already at an early stage. But one will not find any distinctly Christian feature among Ausonius’ maternal relatives.¹⁰ In contrast, the astrological interest of his grandfather as well as the

⁸ Cf. *Prof.* 4.11f.; further sect. II.1 with n. 14 on Patera’s family. Admittedly, it is difficult to trace a Celtic basis for Patera; however, the long *ē*, which is evidenced by the metre (Iambus), allows to distinguish the word from the Latin homograph.

⁹ Cf. also *praef.* 1.5f.; *Prof.* 16.6-8. The ancestors are nowhere stated to have been citizens of Autun, but the conclusion is frequently drawn by modern scholars (cf., e.g., Sivan 1993, 50f.). For the history of 369-71 cf. I. König: *Die gallischen Usurpatoren*, Munich 1981, 148-57: he dates the siege to late autumn 369/summer 370 and the expulsion of Argicius’ family to end 370/early 371 (p. 149); similarly Drinkwater (n. 4) 79-81. For the imperial chronology cf. also Kienast (n. 6) 246-49. For the year of birth of Caecilius cf. *Gens* 114-18.

¹⁰ Rankin 235 is obviously confused with the family of Attius Patera (*Prof.* 4.7-14); he further states: ‘The association of druids with sacred woodland precincts called *nemeta* implies a suggestive connection with the name *Arborius*’; he regards *Dryadia* as a translation into Greek. Cf. further Green 1991, 307f. and Sivan 1993, 53. However, the evidence Sivan is drawing on is tenuous: the fact that Ausonius’ *matertera* Aemilia Hilaria is characterised as *virgo devota* in the headline of *Parentalia* 6 has barely any significance, because this apposition is an apparent medieval gloss, cf. Green 1991, 310. The latter’s argument can be buttressed by the fact that Hilaria’s motivation for her virginity had obviously nothing to do with religious conviction; cf. *Gens* 221-23 (with n. 109) for an interpretation of *Parent.* 6 (Aemilia

professions of his academic uncle and of his aunt Aemilia Hilaria, a physician, might well hint at some kind of a druidic tradition.¹¹

What do the PNs tell us in this regard? *Argicius* is entirely Gaulish, and *Aeonia* is best explained as a latinised Greek CN for Celtic *Aiunia*, so that Gallic roots of the family are conclusively confirmed. This view is strongly supported by an analysis of the *cognomen Arborius*, which is declared to be the family name in Parent. 4.3: *Arborem Aeduico ductum de stemmate nomen*. Its dissemination clearly reveals that it originated from Gaul, not from Italy, and moreover that it was in all likelihood restricted to this very family.

At any rate, the onomastic motif of the ‘tree’ is essential. This is corroborated by the pseudo-Greek name *Dryadia*, which is exclusively attested for three of Ausonius’ kinsmen commemorated in the *Parentalia* (12, 23, 25). The latter name is probably shaped after Greek δρυάς, δρυάδος, (‘dryad’, ‘nymph of the (oak) tree’, < δρῦς), but the similarity to Celtic **derv(o)-dru-* (root with *Schwebeablaut*) likewise ‘(oak) tree’, may have induced the choice as well. Remarkably, the combination of the latter basis with Indo-European (IE) **veid-/vid-* (‘see’ or ‘know’) results in nothing else but **dru-vid-*, i.e. ‘druid’, whose close connection to trees, whether real or in a metaphorical sense, is undisputed.¹²

When I am tempted to allow the onomastic theme to tip the balance, I do not, however, insist in claiming genealogical descent from druids whose activities had been banned as early as the mid-1st century; nor do I know how far the creation of the name *Arboreus* predates its first attestation in 3rd-century inscriptions.¹³ But I do suggest that there was a long tradition of skills, knowledge and awareness. The latter may even be reflected in reserving *Arboreus* to male, *Dryadia* to female members of the family until the 5th century, which is quite remarkable given that *arbor* – like nearly all species of trees – is female in Latin. In addition, Ausonius who never fails to mention the distinguished ancestors of his friends and kinsmen, does not claim druidic extraction for him-

Hilaria) as well as for a systematic approach to the religiousness of the family. For interpolations in headings of poems cf. also my note ‘Alethius: *quaestor* or *grammaticus*?, and the Problem of Titulature in Claudian’s *carmina minora*’, Prosopon 12, 2001 (<http://www.linacre.ox.ac.uk/research/prosop/prosopo.stm>). But even if *virgo devota* should be considered authentic, there is no need to identify Christian devotion with Greek origin in late 3rd-century Gaul.

¹¹ Cf. Parent. 2-6 and *Gens* 112f. for further details; also Rousselle 241-51, 242 on C.A. *Arboreus*’ astrological interests and Gourevitch 71 on Aemilia Hilaria; for druids as devoted teachers cf. Loicq 11f.

¹² Cf. Latin *videre*; Greek (φ)ειδέναι; German ‘wissen’; the English adj. ‘wise’. It does not matter here whether the former Celtic élite considered itself either ‘seer of trees’ (most recently aan de Wiel) or ‘wises of the cosmic tree’ (‘connaisseurs de l’Arbre du Monde’), as Delamarre 1999, 32-38 suggests. For the pre-Roman history of the druids cf. Loicq, for their development in Roman times Webster. Typical of the Roman view on druids is Plin. Nat. 16.249: ... *iam per se robur eligunt lucos, nec ulla sacra sine earum fronde conficiunt, ut inde appellati quoque interpretatione Graeca possint Druidae videri*.

¹³ Cf. AE 1988,857 (Alpes Poeninae) and AE 1982,274=1983,59 (Etruria), discussed in *Gens* 176.

self, as his colleague Attius Patera did.¹⁴ This reticence once more discards the suspicion that the traces may be fictitious.

2. The Father Iulius Ausonius and His Siblings

Iulius Ausonius has already been introduced as a highly regarded medical practitioner. In his obituaries, he is characterised as modest and peaceful, being a privileged member of the city councils of Bazas and Bordeaux.¹⁵ It is puzzling that there is no mention of the latter’s parents at all. As he had grown up together with his four siblings, at least a minimal memory of them must have been preserved. Consequently, Iulius Ausonius’ origin has been concealed intentionally.¹⁶

Most scholars agree that this deliberate silence indicates a low social standing of the ones passed over: Some assume Iulius Ausonius to be a *libertus*, whereas others think that his ancestors had already been set free; next, one finds the hypothesis that his family had left the Greek East to settle down in Gaul, and finally it is held that his parents had been of curial, though modest, rank.¹⁷ The latter explanations hardly stand up to the benchmark set by the humble episodes in the past of the Arborii and Aemilii; nor can I go along with the assumption that a rhetorician and a son of a doctor should be ashamed of Greek roots.¹⁸

Most importantly, Iulius’ home city is twice stated to be Bazas. Although I am convinced of his unfree origin, I must decline to understand *patria* as ‘place of release’ instead of ‘place of birth’. This interpretation has been put forward by Hopkins, who speaks of a deliberate *suggestio falsi*; but it is incompatible with the context, which explicitly distinguishes between the current residence (Bordeaux) and the place of birth

¹⁴ Cf. also Ausonius’ sceptical comment in Prof. 4.7f.: *tu Baiocassi stirpe Druidarum satus, / si fama non fallit fidem*. Neither druidic ancestry nor a priesthood of Apollo Belenos allegedly held in Bayeux are verifiable, and the move to Bordeaux might have encouraged Patera to draw on the family names (*Phoebicius*, *Patera*, and *Delphidius*; Prof. 4.7ff.; 5; 10.21-30) in order to enhance his position in his new home. However, the fact that already his father bore a Greek name, while his own was Celtic, seems to imply that there was a tradition which at least extended beyond *Phoebicius*.

¹⁵ Cf. Epiced. (v. 4f. for the *curiae*); Parent. 1; he is also praised posthumously in praef. 1.1-14, while he is the addressee of the letter *Ad patrem*.

¹⁶ Cf. Parent. 7, 26f. on the siblings. In this case, it is justified to build on an *argumentum e silentio*, because the poet proves a strong consciousness for genealogy, especially as a criterion for social assessment, cf. praef. 1.5-12; Parent. 2.1f.; 4; 8.1-4; 9.5; 14.1, 5f.; etc.; Prof. 4.7ff.; 14.7; 16.7ff. etc.; Grat. act. 36.

¹⁷ Favez 18 assumes ‘ehrbare, aber recht bescheidene Herkunft’; Rankin 235 and Sivan 1993, 55f. suppose that Iulius or his *pater* hailed from the East; Jouai 18 regards the ancestors of Iulius as the effective owners of the Bazas estate (700 ha!); compared with other contemporary *latifundia*, it appears negligible in his eyes; likewise, C. Jullian: *Histoire de la Gaule*, vol. 8, Paris 1926, 148 calls it ‘terre de pauvre’, but it is surely untenable to take the summits of the Roman aristocrats as benchmarks for Gallic *curiales*. For Hopkins and Green see n. 19 and 20.

¹⁸ Gourevitch 65ff. presents various examples for Eastern physicians immigrating to Gaul. There would have been no need for Ausonius to conceal such a past, as he might have stressed a missionary trait. But as Iulius was never paid for his service, financial motivations for a hypothesised move are even less probable (Epiced. 11), see also below. For Aemilia’s ‘poverty’ see also sect. 3.

(Bazas). One would hence be compelled to purport bare lies, in spite of the poet’s claim not to say anything but by which his father’s contemporaries can recognise him.¹⁹

The key to the riddle is contained in the opening verses of the *De herediolo*: *Salve, herediolum, maiorum regna meorum, / quod proavus, quod avus, quod pater excoluit* (‘Hello there, little patrimony, realm of my ancestors, which my great-grandfather, which my grandfather, which my father cultivated’). Arguing that the *herediolum* was the maternal dowry, Hopkins once again posits a *suggestio falsi*. But as the poem had been composed around 379 and not been published after the author’s death in 394, I do not see a reasonable motive for such a striking deception.

More convincingly, Green interprets the *proavus* and *avus* not as the owners of the estate, but as its farmers, since Ausonius speaks of *excolere*.²⁰ One has to conclude that the *dominus* later freed the five children and appointed them his heirs; since Iulius Ausonius survived all his siblings, the entire patrimony remained with him and could later be passed over to his son ‘in due course’, as stated in v. 5 (*iusta series*).²¹

According to this reconstruction, the estate had automatically made Iulius a *curialis* of Bazas, but his medical profession secured him immunity; that he offered his services free of charge (Epiced. 11), is in unison with the fact that he neither increased nor diminished his inherited estate (Epiced. 17) and maintained the same modest way of life in all his years (Epiced. 8). The praise of Iulius Ausonius’ language skills also fits into the picture: his Greek was better than his Latin due to his medical profession, but Gaulish or Aquitanian are not excluded as his mother tongue, neither of which was assessed worth mentioning in a Latin *encomium*.²² Last but not least, it is no longer

¹⁹ Cf. praef. 1.5ff. *Vasates patria est patri, gens Aedua matri / de patre, Tarbellis sed genetrix ab Aquis; / ipse ego Burdigalae genitus ...*; Epiced. 4f. *vicinas urbes colui patriaque domoque: Vasates patria, sed lare Burdigalam*. Although *patria* can casually adopt the meaning ‘country of one’s choice’ (Prof. 10.52; 18.4), such an interpretation is to be ruled out in the case of Iulius. Cf. also Epiced. praef. 7-10 *neque dico nisi quod agnoscunt qui parti aetatis eius interfuerunt, falsum me autem morte eius obita dicere et verum tacere eiusdem piaculi existimo*. Hopkins’ 241 view, followed by Pastorino 24, would render the poet ridiculous, and in consequence, further verses would need to be cut back drastically.

²⁰ It remains uncertain, whether they had been *vilici*, lived together with their *dominus* in the same *villa*, or obtained the estate as a *peculium*. The *herediolum* is to be placed in the nearby of Bazas, with which the *urbs* mentioned in v. 29 and 32 is to be identified, cf. Green 1991, 282f. with reference to praef. 1.5. Even less convincingly than Hopkins 241, Pastorino 24³⁶ locates the estate between Bordeaux and Saintes, identifying it with the *Lucaniacus*, the dowry of Attusia Lucana Sabina (see app. I under *Attusius*).

²¹ One could also consider the possibility of adoption, but, this way, the former *dominus* could have figured as the poet’s grandfather. A similar reason speaks against the assumption that the children were so-called *ex ancilla nati*.

²² Epiced. 9f.: *sermone impromptus Latio, verum Attica lingua / suffecit culti vocibus eloquii*. Greek as maternal tongue is claimed by Hopkins 241 (blaming the assertion of Celtic as patriotic); Pastorino 13f.; Gourevitch 71; Sivan 1993, 55. Celtic as the first language is generally assumed by francophone authors, cf. C. Jullian: *Ausone et son temps*, in: RH 47, 1891, 241-66, 244; R. Pichon: *Les derniers écrivains profanes*, Paris 1906, 302; Favez 18f. (in n. 25, Aquitanian is considered alternatively); but cf. further Jouai 17; Rankin 232; Alvar Ezquerro 1.15 n. 11. Green 1978, 24 based his point ‘he knew little Greek ... and less Latin’ on a comparison with Amm. 16.5.6f., where Julian’s language skills are commented on (in

difficult to understand, why no husband of Iulia Veneria nor a father of Iulia Idalia is mentioned (Parent. 27f.), for both had been born as slaves.

Is there anything we can learn from the names? Hopkins suggests we translate *Ausonius* as ‘Westerner’, a choice that he considers typical of *servi* or *liberti*. His argument is still influential, but again, I am not prepared to follow.²³

Firstly, the basis of the adjective *Ausonius* does actually not indicate a point of the compass. But deriving from the central Italian tribe of the *Aurunci*, it is usually related to Italy, to the city of Rome, or (since Virgil) also to the Roman Empire, though never to the West in general. This, in contrast, was the case with the adjective *Hesperius*, which originally meant ‘occidental’ and later could also denote either Italy or Spain. By the way, the potential reference to Italy qualified *Hesperius* as a variation of the PN *Ausonius*, whereas in Greek contexts, *Hesper(ios)* related to the evening star.²⁴

Secondly, there is no evidence for *Ausonius* as PN prior to the reign of Severus Alexander (222-35), so that its creation could somehow go back to the *Constitutio Antoniniana* (ca. 212), which granted Roman citizenship to most subjects of the empire.²⁵ Apart from the Bordelaise family, there is one 3rd-century record each for Rome, Pannonia, and Numidia, with a fourth being of unknown provenance. While the first three lack a clear indication of the social standing and are likely to belong to members of the middle-class, the fourth *Ausonius* was a well situated landowner. Twice Eastern origin is obvious, but the same is possible in the remaining cases as well.²⁶

particular: *super his aderat Latine quoque disserendi sufficiens sermo*). The same scholar (Greek in Late Roman Gaul. The Evidence of *Ausonius*, in: *Owls to Athens. Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, ed. by E.M. Craik, Oxford 1990, 311-19, 312) describes Iulius as a ‘Celtic doctor who treated and prescribed in Greek’, but this seems to go too far.

²³ Hopkins 241 considers Iulius *Ausonius* a freedman’s son; the onomastic explanation has been adopted by Pastorino 13f.; Rankin 235; Gourevitch 71; Green 1978, 24 adds that the poet’s plays with his name reveal the intention of the *homo novus* to enhance it, cf. Mos. 451; Fasti 1.10. *Contra* Matthews 82¹, who claims a literary origin. Weisgerber generally rejects the idea to draw conclusions from PNs on the social standing of their bearers: neither need a Greek name indicate a slave or freedman (Ub. 133) nor do Roman names (even *tria nomina*) necessarily imply Roman citizenship (Ub. 142). As for geographical names cf. also Kajanto Cog. 48: only 6% of his evidence were slaves; however, the figure is not representative, because Greek names (such as *Ausonius* itself) are not taken into consideration. In his analysis of ‘Ethnics as Personal Names’ in the Greek world, P.M. Fraser (in Hornblower & Matthews 149-57, with a list of names and an indication of their dissemination on p. 155f.) stresses the wide range of possible motivations for the choice. See also ch. III with n. 38.

²⁴ Cf. Hülsen: *Ausones*, RE 2.2, 1896, 2561; Forcellini & de Vith 5.227f.; A. Otto: *Ausones*; *Ausona*; *Ausonius*; *Auson*; *Ausonianus*, in: ThlL 2.1537-40; L-S 278 for the classical interpretation of *Ausones* / *-ius*; Weiss: *Hesperia*, RE 8.1, 1912, 1243; Forcellini & de Vith 5.738; L-S 697; in particular Solin 1982, 1.382f. for *Hesperia* / *-ius*; conclusive is a bilingual inscription from Arabia (SEG 7.901.7): the author calls himself *Gai Vesperī* (gen.) and *Ε·δ·ν·* ”©nL^aMdv (dat.)

²⁵ Cf. Salway 133ff. or Rix 726f. on the effects of the *Constitutio Antoniniana*.

²⁶ Cf. CIL 3.4211 (Savaria, ca. 220/30) [*Nurjui et L. Sept. Severo An. et L. / Sept. Ausonio An. et Sept. / Sperantio An. et L. Sept. Severae An. filiis An. / pientissimis*; CI 4,31,7 to Flavius *Ausonius* (222/35); CIL 6.34618 (Rome, 212/300): *M. Aurelius Ausonius fecit M. Aurelio Callimorpho filio suo*; AE 1954,156 (Timgad, A.D. 241): *D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / Bolanius / Sabinus Syro-/ foenix vix(it) ann(os) / LV hic s(itus) e(st) s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis) / Ausius Ausonius / sobrinus fecit*. For in-depth discussion cf. Gens.

Next, 16 out of 23 Eastern *Ausonioi* lived in late antique Egypt: all attested for the 4th-century belonged to the highest echelon of society, which is also the case for most of the later name bearers. The remaining *Ausonioi* outside Egypt appear to have been among the better-offs as well. With regard to this evidence, it is awkward to claim the name to be typical of slaves or freedmen.²⁷

Thirdly, all attestations of *Ausonii* in Gaul until the mid-5th century are either related to Iulius Ausonius or to his offspring. Thus the question, how the name *Ausonius* reached the Atlantic border, cannot be explained by the assumption that it was already widespread in the 3rd century.²⁸ Although migration from and intercultural exchange with the East remain reasonable assumptions, I rather suspect that an autochthonic PN (such as a derivative of *Auso* or *Ausios*) is disguised in latinised Greek.

This interpretation is not only encouraged by the Aquitanian origin of Iulius Ausonius himself, but also by the nomenclature of his relatives. As already mentioned in the introduction, *Callippio* was pseudo-Greek and should rather be considered an assonance to the medical herb called *epo-callion* or *callio-marcos* respectively in Gaulish (‘coltsfoot’, French ‘pas d’âne’, ‘tussilage’). Likewise, *Veneria* can be explained as a derivative of **veni-* ‘family, clan’, also underlying the frequent Celtic *Venerius* or *Veneriacus*.

Moreover, there is a general agreement now to connect the *cognomina* of the siblings Claudius *Contemtus* and Iulia *Cataphronia*. While Solin (1982, 3,1276) counts up to nine *Cataphronii* (and the like) in Rome alone, there is, apart from Ausonius’ aunt, no other testimony for this name in Gaul prior to the 6th century. On the other hand, the only three records of *Contemtus* or *Contemta* have been found in Aquitaine: apart from Ausonius’ uncle, we have a Bordelaise funerary inscription on *Claudia Contemta*, who probably died in the late 3rd century, and a letter by Ruricius of Limoges mentioning a *subdiaconus Contemtus* around 500.²⁹

²⁷ The Western evidence for *Ausonii* (3th-6th cent.) is discussed in *Gens*; for the East see my article: *Ausonioi im Osten des Römischen Reiches*, forthcoming in APF 48, 2002.

²⁸ I further argue in *Gens* 165-70 that also the *Ausonii* appearing in 5th- and 6th-century Gaul, Dalmatia, and Italy derived from the same root. At any rate, the name was surely not a tribute to any ancestors, for Iulius Ausonius is declared to have started the family tradition in praef. 1.9-12: *hinc late fusa est cognatio. nomina multi / ex nostra, ut placitum, ducta domo veniant: / derivata aliis, nobis ab stemmate primo / et non cognati, sed genetiva placent.*

²⁹ Cf. CIL 13.705 *D(is) M(anibus) / et mem-/ oriae / Claudia-/ e Conte-/ mt(a)e d(e)ff(unctae) / an(nis/nos) XV / [.].ater / p(onendum) c(uravit)*. The gravestone was found below the foundation of a house near the Roman wall. Merely on this ground, Jullian 1884, 192 supposed that it could have been part of the wall at an earlier stage. But note that also the date of the latter is far from certain: L. Maurin et al.: *Province ecclésiastique de Bordeaux (=Topographie chrétienne de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII^e siècle, 10)*, Paris 1998, 26f. dates back to 270/75, although the first reliable *terminus ante quem* is Aus. *Ordo* 140-45 (388/90). If Cl. Contemta was a relative of *Iul. Contemtus* (see below), she may have died sometime in the later part of the 3rd cent.; if she should have been a great-grandchild of Iul. Ausonius, her death certainly would postdate the composition of the *Parent.* (389/90); but apart from the onomastic argument put forward in the text, also the pagan reference favours the former interpretation.

It is therefore not too bold to posit Celtic or Aquitanian influence for the choice of all of the *cognomina* under discussion, and I even venture the suggestion that the former *dominus* may have been called **Iulius Contemtus**. That he was further related to a *gens Claudia* seems to be reflected in the names of *Claudius Contemtus* and *Claudia Contemta* as well. He will have owned estates in Bazas and Bordeaux, which is suggested by the possessions of the *gens Ausoniana* and confirmed by the dissemination of the names mentioned above. Finally, the medical profession of Iulius Ausonius, the association implied by *Callippio* and the high proportion of Greek CNs among the freedmen (four out of six *cognomina*, including *Iulia Idalia*) suggest that **Iulius Contemtus** was an Aquitanian or Gaulish physician with a thorough knowledge of Greek, just as Iulius Ausonius and Marcellus Empiricus would be a few decades later.

And I even dare to add a final speculation: It may well have been the premature death of the afore-said *Claudia Contemta* – she deceased at the age of 15 – which induced the former *dominus* (perhaps her father or uncle) not only to set free his slaves, but also to appoint them his heirs, thus laying ground to the rise of the *gens Ausoniana*.

3. Roman Imperial Names and Some Ancestors of the Bordelaise Clan Hitherto Ignored³⁰

Emperors had always played a considerable rôle in the romanisation of the provinces, a well known fact which is reflected in the wide dissemination of imperial names (IN).³¹ The clan of Ausonius is no exception: out of 51 PNs, or rather out of 32 different Latin PNs, 13 had been borne by 3rd-century emperors or empresses. However, after citizenship had been bestowed collectively upon most subjects around A.D. 212 and social ascent of *liberti Augusti* had become quite exceptional in the later part of the principate, the resemblance of imperial nomenclature among provincials from that time on needs to be considered more precisely.³² Once again, it is the unique opportunity of the *stemma Ausonianum* that renders visible some peculiar aspects normally hidden from history.

The fact that the oldest imperial *nomina gentilia*, *Iulius* and *Claudius*, are represented, while younger ones as *Ulpus*, *Septimius*, and, above all, *Aurelius*, are not, is hardly

³⁰ All imperial data are given as in Kienast (n. 6).

³¹ Cf. Weisgerber Ub. 276-81, Alföldy 31-53, Mócsy 47ff., and Rix 726 in general.

³² Cf. also H. Sivan: Numerian the Intellectual. A Dynastic Survivor in Fourth Century Gaul, RhM 136, 1993, 360-65: she suggests linking the former governor of Narbonnensis mentioned by Amm. 18.1.4 (*Numerius*, followed by PLRE 1.634 no. 1) and John of Antioch fr. 178, FGH 4.605 Müller (*Numerianus*, followed by Sivan) to the emperor Numerius Numerianus, son of Carus (A.D. 282-83 and 283-84). Given that the latter hailed from Narbonne (cf. Sivan 362 n. 16), the association is plausible, although it is incautious to speak of a ‘definite link’ (thus Sivan 365). At any rate, Sivan 363 is probably right to discard the question of rank in this regard (only *praesides* according to Not. dign. occ. 1.84ff.). One may further add that all six Gallic inscriptions mentioning a *Numerius/-a* are included in CIL 12.

owing to an uninterrupted genealogical tradition from the 1st down to the 4th century. Among others, there were also four Severan empresses or princesses called *Iulia*, while the emperor Tacitus (275/76) was a *Claudius*; a few decades later, the *nomen Iulii* regained importance through Fl. Valerius Constantius (‘Chlorus’, 293/306) and his offspring.

The frequent use of the *nomen Flavii* particularly among late antique aristocrats has nothing to do with the first Flavian dynasty (69-96), but goes back to the verge from the 3rd to the 4th century, when the second Flavian dynasty came to power with the above-mentioned father of Constantine the Great. The name soon became rather a kind of a title of high social standing and therefore outlived this family for centuries.

Aemilius Aemilianus ruled no longer than 88 days in A.D. 253, and nothing important can be said about him. Even his origin is uncertain, apart from an epitomiser’s contention that he was *Maurus genere* (Epit. Caes. 31.2).³³ Is it coincidence that Ausonius’ grandmother was called *Aemilia Corinthia Maura*? One may certainly interrupt the chain of thought at this stage, objecting that Ausonius would not have failed to boast himself of imperial descent and that many alternative explanations are feasible.

However, to be the offspring of an unfortunate usurper who befell the *damnatio memoriae* did not really deserve praise. Moreover, the assumption of kinship or close relation could even account for further details hitherto unexplained: in the *Parentalia*, Ausonius surprisingly detracts from his grandmother’s family by calling her a poor bride (4.14), thereby totally ignoring her forbears; any speculation of a possible genealogical background of the name *Maura* is further undermined in that she is said to owe her *cognomen* to her dark skin. Although such aetiologies are never beyond doubt,³⁴ it may still come true, in which case descentance from a Moorish nobleman would be no less likely a hypothesis. At any rate, the names of *Aemilia*’s children and grandchildren reveal that the *gens Aemilia* was much more important than the *Arborii* in late 3rd-century Dax and enjoyed close relations to other aristocratic clans (Decimii, Magni, Hilarii).

Further details can be added. If *Aemilius Aemilianus* really hailed from Mauretania, his way to Illyricum, where he usurped the purple in his 47th year of age, may well have

³³ Whether he really was, is not entirely beyond doubt. The same is also believed in the case of M. Opellius Macrinus (217/18), but the possibility of misunderstanding a *cognomen*, an *agnomen*, or simply a polemic distortion cannot be ruled out. Whether his skin was darker than that of the Italian usurper Pescennius *Niger* (193/94), hence remains questionable; cf. Kienast 159, 169, 212 on the emperors.

³⁴ Note that Ausonius frequently plays with names, so that the aetiology may also be fictitious; cf. also Parent. 11.5-8; 22; 28; Prof. 7.5-8; 10.23ff. (Phoebicius: *Beleni aedituus* ...); Grat. act. 38; prec. 2.2; 3.2; epigr. 27.3; etc. In particular, the case of his aunt *Aemilia Hilaria* (Parent. 6.3) is doubtful with regard to other Gallic *Hilari(an)i* who seem to have related, if not identical, ancestors, see app. I and IV.

led through Gaul, where he could have held minor posts before. The names of his wife are noteworthy in this regard: while her *cognomen Supera* is a Latin CN of Germanic origin and might link her to (?Northern) Gaul,³⁵ her *nomen gentile Cornelia* is reminiscent of Celtic *corio-* or *cor(r)o-*names, as is *Corinthia*, the first *cognomen* of Ausonius’ grandmother.

While the case admittedly remains hypothetical, the importance of imperial connections during the formative period of late antique aristocracy will become even clearer in the next example. Ausonius’ sister Iulia Dryadia was married to *Pomponius Maximus*, who was born around 300 and is characterised as the leading decurion of the Aquitanian capital (Parent. 15.5-8). One of his sons was called *Pomponius Maximus Herculanus* (born in or after 331). The *cognomina* apparently recall the emperor *Aurelianus Valerius Maximianus Herculus* (285-305/10), but noteworthy the names were bestowed at least two decades after the emperor’s inglorious death.³⁶

The names of *Pomponia Urbica*, the first mother-in-law of Ausonius’ daughter, help to get a few steps further. As a *femina generis clari* (Parent. 30.1) and probably a Bordelaise as well, it is legitimate to regard her as a close relative of Pomponius Maximus (a niece?). This may account for the *nomen gentile* of her son *Valerius Latinus Euromius*, which, once more, hints at the emperor Maximianus. His first *cognomen* may additionally imply a relation to M. Cassianus *Latinus* Postumus who ruled in Gaul in 360-69. Moreover, the *cognomen* of *Pomponia Urbica* seems to link her with the empress *Magnia Urbica*, the wife of Carinus (283-85), who is known to have hailed from Narbonne. This said, also the name of Carus’ daughter (?Aurelia) *Paulina* may imply Bordelaise family connections, not only with regard to the most distinguished Pontii *Paulini*, but also because Megentira, the daughter of Pomponius Maximus, married a *Paulinus* in the 340s.

Thus all of these onomastic parallels could easily be fitted in a geographical, chronological, and social context. Given the plausibility of such imperial connections, *Pomponia Urbica*’s husband, Severus Censor Iulianus, deserves consideration as well. Although no less than 16 *Censores* have been evidenced throughout Gaul, mostly in Narbonensis (11 – compared to 3 in Rome), I now see a real chance that the *consul iterum* of 262/66 *Censor* figured among the forbears of Ausonius’ *consocer*.

While none of the hypotheses can be taken as proven fact, they appear to support each other independently. Their common premise is obvious: they require us to posit an intermarriage policy among the highest-ranging Gallic noblemen, i.e. among potential

³⁵ Cf. Weisgerber Ub. 98, 130f. and CIL 13.5, p. 49 on *Super(a)*. LAGN 643 refers to *Suppo*.

³⁶ Note also Fl. Valerius Constantius *Herculus* and Fl. Valerius Constantinus *Herculus*, but only until ca. 310. The dates of birth depend on the chronology of Iulia Dryadia’s life who died around 376 at the age of 60, cf. Parent. 12.10 with my interpretation in *Gens* 120f.

and (at least ephemerally) successful aspirants to the purple, to an extent which has hitherto only been attested since the 4th century or – apart from the *gens Ausoniana* – since the 5th.

But on the background here expounded, one might venture to add a further possible connection, for which I resume the considerations on the Mauretanian Aemilius Aemilianus and Aemilia Corinthia Maura. If the emperor of 253 should indeed have established kinship relations with Gallic aristocrats, one would expect them to be somehow reflected in the names of the subsequent emperors who hailed from Gaul. It is noteworthy that the grandson of Carus, i.e. the son of M. Aurelius Carinus and Magnia Urbica, was called (?M. ?Aurelius) *Nigrrianus*. The re-appearance of the onomastic theme of darkness in this imperial family as well as in the *gens Ausoniana* (*Maura*, ?*Melania*) may be owing to Magnia Urbica’s family. Her first name seems to be a real patronymic and could thus reveal another tie to Decimius *Magnus* Ausonius and his uncle Aemilius *Magnus* Arborius.

Admittedly, as with every argument mainly built on onomastics, the suggestions for the ancestry of the Pomponii and Aemilii remain hypothetical, and not all of the names referred to were rare enough to allow conclusions from homonymy itself. But the extent to which so many of all relevant IN are repeated in Southern Gaul within one century seems to undermine all too sceptical opponents who wish to explain this constellation by chance alone. The scarcity of indisputable facts about 3rd-century emperors and aristocrats rather urges us to consider such possibilities carefully. And at the very least, the sketched scenarios illustrate pretty well how the multiplication of emperors no longer hailing from Italy could enhance the genesis of noble families in 3rd-century Gaul.

III. Conclusions and Outlook

In the previous sections, I attempted to shed light on the pre-history of the *gens Ausoniana*: a regional background has been asserted for *Caecilius Argicius Arborius* as well as for the *Iulii*, since the Gaulish or Aquitanian origin of their *cognomina* lent additional support to the argument based on other grounds; in the case of the *Arborii* and *Dryadiae*, I ran the risk of being labelled a romanticist by drawing on the literal meaning of the family name;³⁷ combining onomastic and prosopographical data, I moreover ventured to sketch an identikit of the former *dominus* of Iulius Ausonius as well as to trace possible imperial connections of the *gentes Aemilia* and *Pomponia*.

³⁷ Cf. also Höfler on the problem; further various contributions to *HzO*, e.g. no. 66ff., 260 and 281.

However, the significance of this scrutiny goes beyond illuminating unresolved questions about a Bordelaise family. Particularly important was the notion of CN, whose identification would have been less certain without our knowledge about the *gens Ausoniana*. This category turned out to be an additional criterion in the discussion of the ethnicity of name bearers, whereas Greek and Latin PNs are normally regarded as insignificant in this regard.³⁸ But it allows many further insights.

Already Weisgerber suspected – ingeniously, though not systematically – a Celtic or Germanic root behind several PNs of Latin or Greek appearance.³⁹ But he continued to attribute such names to the ‘römisch-mitteländische Schicht’, so that its proportion is as high as 77% in the region of the *Ubii*. In his analysis of the PNs of Noricum, Lochner-von-Hüttenbach suggests to identify 78 seeming Latin PNs, i.e. 12% of the ‘lateinisch-mitteländische Schicht’, as CNs of Celtic origin; unlike Weisgerber, he does not hesitate to add them to the proportion of Celtic elements which thus increases for a quarter.⁴⁰

In contrast to these figures, the *gens Ausoniana* stands out even more remarkably. As it is documented in appendix II, an Italian would have regarded between 60 and 66 % of its PNs as Latin, another 19 to 23% as Greek. Notwithstanding these approximate 84% of cases with Graeco-Roman impact, ca. 60% of the Latin(ised) and up to 100% of the Greek(ish) PNs, that is more than two thirds out of the mentioned 84%, could still appear as originating in Celtic traditions to a Gaul. If one further excludes all the PNs that were born by 3rd-century emperors or their wives, no less than ca. 80% of the remaining Latin PNs seem to have regional roots. Added to the ca. 16% of apparent

³⁸ The use of PNs as a criterion to decide over the ethnicity of their bearer is a disputed issue: while Weisgerber repeats his serious mistrust (e.g., Rhen. 110; Ub. 271; cf. also Walther 1670), Alföldy 16-21 is quite optimistic that the bearer of a Celtic name in Dalmatia was most probably of Celtic origin. See also n. 23. The contributions by Ch. Habicht, S. Hornblower, and P.M. Fraser in Hornblower & Matthews (119-57) are also interesting in this regard, but their observations on (mostly) classical Greece are not easily transferrable.

³⁹ Cf. L. Weisgerber: Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur frührheinischen Siedlungs- und Kulturgeschichte I, RhM 84, 1935, 289-359, 305f. (=Rhen. 113); Die sprachliche Namen der Mediomatriker-namen, RhVB 18, 1953, 249-76, 261f. (=Rhen. 224); but in particular Ub. 116 (‘Mischformen’ as *Secundinius*); 117ff. (‘römische Namen deshalb ... gern aufgenommen wurden, weil sie an einheimisches Namengut anklangen’; significance of *Arto*- and *Urso*-names; 118: ‘So ist dieses römische Namen-material voll von Eigenarten, die auf das Leben der eingesessenen Bevölkerung hinweisen’), 121, 131, 162f., 181ff., 207 and 208-14 (lists of frequent DN). Weisgerber (e.g., Ub. 117, 443) frequently refers to J.B. Keune, Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für lothringische Geschichte und Altertumskunde 15.42ff.; 16, ca. p. 345 (unfortunately not available to me) who had expressed similar ideas previously. Also Kajanto Cogn. 16-19 acknowledges the principle of ‘foreign substrata’ in particular regions, but he concludes this section with reservation: ‘I am certain, however, that in most cases explanations of that type are likely to fail. For one reason or another, a *cognomen* comes in vogue in a particular area, for Latin nomenclature had geographical no less than chronological and social peculiarities’.

⁴⁰ Cf. Weisgerber Ub. 122; the average of the region of the *Treveri* is given as ca. 3/5 (Trier: 72%, but in Waldrach near Trier only 33%; Rhen. 111-114;), while it is 50% among the *Mediomatrici* (Ub. 123f.). For a short summary Tiefenbach 1996, 1198f. Cf. further Lochner-von-Hüttenbach 157.

Celtic or Aquitanian PNs, a total of more than 80%, or, if the INs are excluded, of more than 90% of PNs emerges, which were somehow affected by local onomastic traditions.

These figures are undoubtedly significant for understanding the mechanisms of the romanisation of PNs and likewise for assessing the speed of this process: Celtic was not simply replaced by Latin or Greek customs, but it strongly influenced the selection and even the new creation of PNs nearly half a millennium after Caesar had conquered *Gallia comata*.

Of course, the sample under examination is not representative, since nearly all name bearers lived, at least for a short period, in 4th-century Bordeaux, and all of them belonged, sooner or later in their lives, to the middle- or upper classes.⁴¹ But it is exactly these restrictions which make the material so valuable. Would one not expect late antique Gallo-Romans to be far more alienated from the Celtic heritage, in particular if their ancestors had been Roman magistrates or devoted teachers of Latin? Consequently, the influence of Celtic onomastics will have been even higher in earlier periods as well as in less distinguished social classes.

The concentration of this enquiry on the Bordelaise clan allows us to draw partly different, partly more precise conclusions than other onomastic studies. This is obvious in the case of INs, up to two thirds of which could tentatively be linked to 3rd-century imperial families. If the evidence were isolated, similar suggestions would appear too bold, while the combined cases of homonymy significantly increase the degree of plausibility.

Being aware of the effects of geo-historical factors, Weisgerber, too, opts for scrutinising relatively small geographical units such as the land of the *Treveri*, *Mediomatrici*, or *Ubii*, but his statistics mostly lack chronological differentiations, merging the evidence of roughly six centuries together. At least in this regard, Alföldy’s collection of Dalmatian PNs is more sophisticated: the material is split up into three phases, but the last still comprises more than three centuries.⁴²

To do justice to the afore-said scholars: one has to acknowledge the problem of dating inscriptions, which onomatologists normally rely on. But the apparent difficulty requires that more attention be devoted to literary sources in order that the epigraphical evidence can be completed and better classified. It would be worthwhile to set up an agenda of several case studies on chronologically and/or regionally restricted areas, beginning with Caesars *De bello Gallico* and going at least as far as Gregory’s *Historia*

⁴¹ The ancestors of Caecilius Argicius are possible exceptions.

⁴² Weisgerber shows awareness, e.g., in Ub. 165ff.; but this is not reflected in Ub. 125f. or Rhen. 114. Cf. Alföldy 22f. on chronological and geographical distinctions. Kajanto Cog. 12f. categorises according to sex, life time (republican, imperial) and social rank (senator, freeborn, slaves/freedmen, Christian).

Francorum.⁴³ While Late Antiquity has bequeathed sufficient material, it will be more problematic to find suitable samples for the first three centuries.⁴⁴

One of the first objects could be the inscriptions of the Magdalensberg in Noricum, because its abandonment under Claudius provides a welcome *terminus ad quem* for the datation (41/54). It may next be checked whether the epistolary of Pliny the Younger can be combined with inscriptions from Como. Christian sources would allow us to return to Gaul for the later 2nd and the 3rd centuries: acts of martyrs, *libri sacramentorum*, and lists of bishops may help to form other groups, while the transmission of council acts starts in the 4th, and a profuse production of hagiography at the verge of the 5th century. Although the reliability of most of these texts is doubtful, the onomastic material may still be valuable.⁴⁵

However, given the overwhelming importance of the so-called CNs, such a project should begin with a more precise classification of the phenomenon, because Weisgerber does not always operate with consistent criteria and terminology. A model is required to cope at least with Latin, Greek, Celtic, and Germanic, but it would ideally be adaptable to various dialects of the latter languages as well as to Aquitanian and Illyrian. It would firstly account for the transliteration of PNs into the Greek or Latin alphabet, next for

⁴³ Cf. already Ch.W. Glück: Die bei Caius Julius Caesar vorkommenden keltischen Namen, Munich 1857; H. d'Arbois de Jubainville: Les noms gaulois chez César et Hirtius, *De Bello Gallico*, Première Série, Paris 1891 (uncontinued). One might even consider to extend the scrutiny backwards: the most interesting documents would be the Italian inscription of the *turma Salluitana* (CIL I² 709, 89 B.C.: Untermann 1995, 740f. with further reference) and the bronze tablets from Contrebia Belaisca (*Botorrita*, near Zaragoza; predating 70 B.C.: Beltrán Lloris 144-46 with further references). On Gregory (MGH SRM 1²) cf. R. Buchner, 1955-56; A.H.B. Breukelaar, 1994; M. Heinzlmann, 1994.

⁴⁴ For Late Antiquity cf., apart from the work of Ausonius (which has not been scrutinised exhaustively in this article), in particular the writings of Sulpicius Severus (CSEL 1; Ser. Prete 1955; F. Ghizzoni 1983; S. Weber 1997), Paulinus Nolanus (CSEL 29-30; D. Trout, Berkeley 1999), Sidonius Apollinaris (ed. Loyer; J. Harries, 1994; F.M. Kaufmann, 1995), Ruricius (CSEL 21, including works and letters by Faustus Reiensis; CCSL 64, including also Foebadius, Victricius, Leporius, Vincentius Lerinensis, Evagrius; R.W. Mathisen 1999, including also Caesarius Arelatensis, Paulinus Burdigalensis, etc.), Alimus Avitus (MGH AA 6.2; M. Burckhardt 1938; I.N. Wood: Avitus of Vienne, D.Phil. Oxford 1980), Magnus Ennodius Felix (CSEL 6; MGH AA 7; S.A.H. Kennell 2000), *Epistulae Austrasicae* (CCSL 117). Further ecclesiastical sources can be added, see subsequent note. For a bibliography on prosopographical issues see sect. VII.3, in particular the works by Mathisen on the monastery of Lérins and the bishopric of Arles (with further references to sources). Additional information is to be gained, among others, from works as Marcellus (for Bordeaux, see n. 4); various chronicles (MGH AA 9, 11, 13; MGH SRM 2), or Gennadius: *De viris illustribus* (ed. Herding).

⁴⁵ Cf. Vettors on the Magdalensberg. Cf. *Concilia Galliae* a. 314-506 and a. 511-695 (=CCSL 148/148A); A.N. Sherwin-White 1985 (Commentary on Pliny); CIL 5.2, p. 563ff. (inscriptions from Como); most recently S.E. Hoffer: The anxieties of Pliny the Younger, Atlanta 1999; the *Libri sacramentorum Gellonensis, Augustodunensis, Engolismensis* (CCSL 159, 159A, 159B, 159C); Eucherius Lugdunensis: *Passio Agaunensis martyrum* (CSEL 31; MGH SRM 3); there are further relevant *vitae* in MGH SRM 2-3. See sect. VII.3 on bishops and hagiography, especially Duchesne, Heinzlmann, and Mathisen; also S. Baumgart: Die Bischofsherrschaft im Gallien des 5. Jahrhunderts, Munich 1995; B. Beaujard: Le culte des saints en Gaule: les premiers temps, d'Hilaire de Poitiers à la fin du VI^e siècle, Paris 2000. Of particular interest may also be the *vita* of Ausonius of Angoulême (5th rather than 3rd century) on which cf. *Gens* 168 for the time being.

different degrees of adaptation and derivation, further for all kinds of translations and transformations of an onomastic motif.⁴⁶

But already the term ‘CN’ itself has to be reconsidered, because its connotation of deliberate concealment prejudices the analysis. Often the intention seems to have been rather to vary an onomastic theme than to hide it.⁴⁷ To opt for the – admittedly very technical – term ‘name of linguistic interference’ would not only bridge the gap between variation and concealment, but also be capable of including the highly important category of INs. The method here proposed would hopefully enable us to detect several aspects related to the complex process of acculturation with due respect to regional and chronological peculiarities.

⁴⁶ For Weisgerber and Lochner-von-Hüttenbach see n. 31, 39, 40, 42; for interactions between Germanic and Celtic onomastics cf. Scherer 1955 (‘Namengleichungen’); between Latin and Illyrian Alföldy 15. For a useful typology of ‘Mischformen’ in ancient Gaul cf. already KGPN 49ff. Moreover, studies in neighbouring or modern polyglot regions are worth consulting, cf. the contributions to HzO by Untermann (no. 108), Gorrochategui (no. 109), Tiefenbach (no. 182); Kohlheim (no. 183), Haas (no. 189), Morlicchio (no. 190), Walther (no. 260, p. 1670); on translation of PNs cf. Kalwerkämper (no. 158) and Weis (no. 197).

⁴⁷ The term *Deckname* in the sense of CN has been entirely avoided in HzO; all occurrences (p. 515, 517, 1765, 1788, 1842, 1883) concern pseudonyms either in the context of criminology, secret service, or art.

Appendix I: Analysis of PNs in the *gens Ausoniana*

The subsequent list includes the names of every member of the *gens Ausoniana* and its side-branches which is attested in the works of Ausonius or can be attributed to his family on the ground of undisputed evidence (e.g., Symmachus, *Epistulae*; Paulinus of Pella, *Eucharisticos*). Each individual mentioned below can be found in the pedigree (app. IV) and is further dealt with in my biography of Ausonius, so that I confine myself to giving a brief description of the kinship relation from the latter’s point of view. Not included are probable ancestors or descendants who can be linked only tentatively to the family mainly by means of onomastics.

Every name is followed by the figure of attested individuals, by an indication of its etymological origin (**C**eltic, **G**reek, **L**atin, or **R**egional, if the language other than Greek or Latin cannot be identified with certainty), and, in case of a CN, by a more detailed qualification; irregularly derived or rare PNs (including *hapax legomena*) are marked with * after the letter; uncertain cases are either noted with question mark or set in square brackets; considerations included in the latter are ignored in the statistics (app. II). PNs which have also been borne by emperors who ruled (in) Gaul in the 3rd century or by their wives (i.e. IN), whether this is by chance or by any political or genealogical connection, are signed with ®; all imperial data are given as in D. Kienast: *Römische Kaisertabelle*, Darmstadt ²1996.

If an etymology is undisputed, I usually refrain from referring to scholarly literature (cf. the select bibliography, app. III.4). Where frequency in Gaul is stated, several examples are normally found in the indexes of CIL 12 (Gallia Narbonensis), 13 (‘Three Gauls’: Gallia Aquitania, Celtica, Belgica, whereby the latter includes Germaniae Superior and Inferior), and 3 (among others: Noricum and Illyricum, cf. also ILLPRON and Alföldy’s monograph on Dalmatian PNs); other regions with Celtic influence but a poorer documentation are Spain (CIL 2), Britain (CIL 7, RIB), and Northern Italy (CIL 5, 11). The abundant material of the city of Rome (CIL 6) is qualified to check the super-regional significance of a PN. In case of *cognomina*, Kajanto’s book serves the same purpose; he often conveys a more detailed overview of the dissemination, although his figures are not always reliable.

Most of the entries are followed by etymological sections composed by Jürgen Zeidler (JZ). The goal of these contributions is to show whether or not the names can possibly be explained in a native Gaulish onomastic tradition. So other possible relations, such as Aquitanian-Basque, Iberian, ‘Illyrian’, ‘Rhaetic’, Germanic, ‘Old European’ and so on are usually only touched upon or not fully taken into account. As there is still a lot of work to be done in this particular field of study, it seemed justified to refrain from exhaustive comments and confine ourselves to showing the possibility of a

non-Latin and/or non-Greek origin or assonance of PNs and to working out the probability of a Gaulish onomastic tradition. Proceeding like this, solutions in single cases differing from the ones given here are not meant to be excluded.

1. Aemilius, -ia (6; [?C-]L®): evidenced for his maternal grandmother, who hailed from Dax, and for all of her four children; apparently the name was less prestigious in Bordeaux where it was only given to her grand-daughter (the poet’s sister). The Latin name *Aemilius* was widespread throughout the empire; it maintained its function as *nomen gentile*, so that the family of *Aemilia Aeonia* can be called *gens Aemilia*. It was no important IN; but to assume kinship with the (short-living) emperor Aemilius Aemilianus (A.D. 253) is at least a realistic possibility, see ch. II.3. AC

The name is familiar from Gaulish contexts as well, e.g. as the base for the PIN *Amiliacus* (Amilhac), and is also attested in the magical text from Chamalières (l. 4f., *Aemilion Paterin* [acc.], LG 150–159). There may have been a native word phonetically close to the PN base, perhaps cognate to *amellus* ‘purple Italian starwort?’ (if it is Gaulish, see ACS 1.127, LEW 38). Similar forms as *Ammilius*, *Ammilla* can also be hinted at: they are possibly hypocoristic forms related to *Amius*, *Ammius*, ?*Ammo*, ?*Amma* and the like (ACS 128–132), but may well be derivatives of Lat. *Aemilius* itself. JZ

2. Aeonia[, -ius?] (1[2?]; C-G*): Ausonius’ mother was called *Aemilia Aeonia*, and he himself may have borne the name *Aeonius*, because some MSS ascribe him the *cognomen* *Paeonius*, *Theonius* or similar, cf. Brandes 4-14 or *Gens* 1 n. 1. *Aeonia* appears to be a derivative of the Greek Αἰών ‘(god of) time, eternity’, both of which have only very rarely been used as PNs in the Hellenic world. Only Preisigke evidences one Αἰώνια (P.Oxy 1.43 v. I.12, 3rd cent.), while Foraboschi gives two references for Αἰώνιος (SB 7243, 4th cent.; P.Erlangen 121, byz. period). But cf. also the vocative *Aeoni Gregori* on a Roman inscription (CIL 6.19611, cf. Kajanto Supern. 61, 75). For Αἰών cf. also P-B 1.43, LGPN 2.

The closest Gaulish parallel comes from Apt (Iulia Apta, Gallia Narbonensis: CIL 12, XXV.1, p. 137): AIOYNIAI. Convincingly, Ellis Evans (GPN 432) explains it as female Gaulish PN (dat.), which is supported by one *Aiunus* recorded in Reims (CIL 13.3280 AVIIONI AIVNVS). Note further the names *Aio* and *Aia* in Germania Inferior (CIL 13.3707, 7516a), for which Weisgerber Rhen. 137 hypothesises Germanic origin though. More diversified is the evidence in Noricum and Illyricum (CIL 3): *Aio* (4597), *A[e?]a* (8040), *Aiu* (CIL 11522, also 13.4948=11522), *Aiiu Maci* (11481), *Aiuni* (dat.) *Castici f.* (14364, with Vetters 44), *Aiuccio Nigrini f.* (11809), *Aiucia Primitivi* (4991), *Aiulo* (14352). Some of the latter are (probably too rashly) rejected by Ellis Evans in his discussion of AIOYNIAI. *Aia*, *Aioia*, and *Aeia?* are considered Celtic by Alföldy 145, with references for Dalmatia). *Aiul* is also attested as *signum* of a Treveran craftsman (CIL 13.3778), which Holder interprets as ‘*Aiul(us)* von *Aio(n)*’ (ACS 1.53-55, 70-72; this is, by the way, Holder’s only attempt to explain one of the many names beginning with *aio-*, *aet-* or *aev-*. For different interpretations of *Aet*-names cf. also Alföldy 143). One may add *Aiiuva* from Castel (CIL 13.7280 Castellum Mattiacorum, near Mainz); Mommsen’s suggestion to read *Atiuva* is unsupported. Maybe the *cognomen* of Fl. Atilius *Aiunatin* evidenced in the Jiloca valley before 70 B.C. belongs to the same group, but it is not clear whether the name (bearer) was Celtiberian or Iberian, cf. Beltrán Lloris 141f.

The dissemination of these names strongly supports the assumption of a Celtic basis. Latin PNs denoting ‘eternity’ may help to shed more light on the problem:

	CIL 3	CIL 13	CIL 2	CIL 12	CIL 6	CIL total ⁴⁸
<i>Aeternalis</i>	11	3	–	–	–	16
<i>Aeternus,a</i>	8	8	–	–	(ICVR 822)	16
<i>Aevalis</i>	–	1	–	–	–	1
<i>Perennis</i>	–	–	1	–	11	19
<i>Perpet(u)s</i>	8	32	7	8	15	80
<i>Perpet-</i>	–	6	–	–	2	

The occurrence of ‘eternity’-names in the Three Gaules, in Noricum and Illyricum is far above average, and, interestingly, the use of *Aeternalis*, *Aeternus*, and *Aevalis* is nearly restricted to the regions where *Aiu*-names are frequent. It is therefore justified to claim their extraction from IE **aiu-* (or **aiwo-*) as is the case in Lat. *aevo-* (cf. *aeternus* > *aeviternus*), and G. αἰφο-.⁴⁹ AC

The frequency and dispersion of *Aeon*-names in Celtic areas suggests a respective cultural background. The IE root **h₂eiw-/h₂eyu-* ‘life-force’ (IEW 17f.) from which αἰών is derived (Skt. *āyus-* etc.), has no Celtic correspondence known so far, due to the lack of cognates in the modern languages. Nevertheless, derivatives of this root could have resulted in Gl. nouns like **aiu-* (DLG 36) or **aion-*, **aiu-ko-/lo-/no-/vo-/io-* with varying suffixes, cf. *Aiiuva*; *A[e]a*, *Aioio-rix* and the examples mentioned above (DAG 48, KGPN 120, GPN 432, LAGN 17). The *u/o*-change may be an impact of the abundant *o*-stem derivatives. The meaning of **aiu* comprised ‘agility, vital force’ (cf. the derivative **h₂yu-wen-* ‘young’, IEW 18, 510f.), ‘longevity, (long) lifespan’, ‘duration of time, era’ (IEW 18). The Celtic names probably refer to longevity in the first stance. Other names containing expressions of long life or old age are e.g. compounds of *seno-* ‘old (age)’ (KGPN 266f.) as *Seno-carus* ‘loving old age’, *Seno-condus* ‘having the brains of an old one’; furthermore, there is a goddess *Setlo-cenia* (KGPN 267, LHEB 325) ‘(goddess) of long life’ (less likely Schmidt’s ‘Tochter des Lebens’), the first compound of which is undisputedly *sētlo-* < **saitlo-* ‘seed, lifespan’ (form IE **seh₁-* ‘to insert, sow’, LIV 517f., IEW 889f.), cf. W. *hoedl* ‘lifespan’, dissimilated in OLat. *saiklom*, Lat. *saeculum*, Lith. *sėklà* ‘seed’. JZ

3. Arborius (5; C-L*): *cognomen* of Ausonius’ maternal great-great-, great- and grandfather; the latter’s son and great-grandson (i.e. Ausonius’ uncle and nephew). The evidence for other possible kinsmen is discussed in *Gens* 175-7, while the onomastic motif of the ‘tree’, which is also apparent in the name *Dryadia* borne (at least) by three female members is discussed in ch. II.1. The question of priority among these two names remains open. Some more details and references have to be added.

While Peiper CXV compares the pair *Arborius/Dryadia* to Latin *Veneria*, *Maura*, *Ausonius* converted into Greek *Idalia*, *Melania*, *Hesperius* (but see *ad locos*), Forcellini & de Vit 5.157 tentatively consider Celtic origin. Holder (ACS 1.182) comments “M(ännername). kosenamen”; taking also his entry “Arbor (Rhaet.) Arbon am Bodensee,

⁴⁸ According to Kajanto Cogn. 274; note that he only counts 16 *Aeterni* in CIL.

⁴⁹ Cf. also Sanskrit *ayu-*; without listing any Celtic representative, IEW 17 translates ‘Lebenskraft’.

dann römisch Arbor Felix” into account, I suspect that he assumes Gaulish origin as well. Should these assumptions be right, *Arboreus* could not be a cognate either to Lat. *arbor* (Kajanto 119) or to an IE equivalent, which would have *-d-* in Celtic instead of *-b-* (< IE **-dh-*). E-M 43 reject IE origin of *arbor* because of its isolation in Latin; cf. also Schulze 347 who posits Etruscan origin for various *Arb*-names. But more convincingly, Pokorny (IEW 339) asserts derivation from IE **erdh-*, ‘high’, cf. Latin *arduus* or Gaulish *Ardui/Arduenna* (*silva*).

A relation to the hitherto unexplained PNs *Arbusius* (Trier) and *Arbussonius* (Novaria/Vercella) could be taken into account, but they may well be of ‘Illyrian’ origin. For *Arbusius* cf. H. Finke, in: 17. Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission 1927 [1929], no. 44; for *Arbussonius* CIL 5.6541, 6547, 6517, 6695; further Weisgerber Rhen. 141, ACS 1.80f. with other *Arb*-names; Alföldy 155 considers an ‘Illyrian’ root for *Arbo* (in Germany and Dacia). There are some interesting parallels to refer to. The only three records of *Arbust(t)us* seem to indicate that the name has been forged as a Latin CN in a Celtic environment (CIL 2.4975=10.8059: *signaculum*, 12.5423). Several *Arbuscula*-inscriptions found in Rome or central Italy certainly reflect a Latin tradition, but the fact that the only *Arbusculus* is attested in Moesia Inferior (CIL 3.7482), could imply an autochthonic background and a particular Celtic approach to the Latin word. Likewise, despite the female gender of *arbor*, the PN *Arboreus* had deliberately been restricted to men for centuries, before the first *Arboria* emerges in 6th-century Carthage (L. Ennabli: Les inscriptions funéraires chrétiennes de Carthage, vol. III: Carthage *intra et extra muros*, Paris 1991, no. 545). AC

Latin *arbor* ‘tree’ could either be a phonetic rendering or a translation. An assonance would allow for two possibilities: (1) *ar(e)-* ‘before’ combined with *bōnā* (**bhōnā*) (DLG 82; 84) ‘dwelling’ or ‘the lasting (foundation)’, as e.g. **Arbona*, Lat. *Arbor (Felix)*, now *Arbon*. P. de Bernardo Stempel (in: J.F. Eska, R. Geraint Gruffydd, N. Jacobs, [eds.], Hispano-Gallo-Brittonica. in honour of D. Ellis Evans, Cardiff 1995, 24), convincingly derives from **bheu-* ‘be, exist’ (like Skt. *bhavanam* ‘dwelling’), cf. PNs *Bounis*, *Bounia*, *Bonicus* etc. *Arboreus* would, then, be a variant of *Arbonius* ‘the one from Ar(e)bona’ (ACS 1.181f., attested in Rome and Vienne).— (2) There is a number of PNs beginning with *arb-* without a certain etymology, e.g. *Arbo*, *Arbacus*, perhaps also *Arbonius* (ACS 1.181f.), which may be related to PNs with the basis *arv-*, as *Arva*, *Arvius*, *Arvalus*, *Arvetius* etc. (ACS 1.231f., 244). *arv-* is in all likelihood from zero-grade **h₃r-wo-* of the adjective IE **h₃or-wo-* ‘hasty’ (IEW 331; as to the verb **h₃er-* ‘to dash off’, see LIV 299–301, IEW 326–332). OIr. *rá(a)e* ‘hero’ (< **h₃r-eu-yo-*) and Mlr. *ráathar*, W. *rhuthr* ‘assault’ (< **h₃r-eu-tro-*) may give a hint at a martial connotation of these names.—There is certainly no connection to Mlr. *arbor* ‘grain’, as was sometimes assumed, which derives from **arw_r* (< **h₂erh₃-* ‘break open, plough’, LIV 272f., IEW 62, E. Hamp, *Études celtiques* 31, 1995, 89f.).

On the other hand, there are at least three ‘tree’ lexemes used in native onomastics; (1) *bilio-* (DLG 75) is frequently used in PNs, *Bilicatus*, *Bilisia*, *Bil(l)ius*, *Billiacus* etc., and occasionally in PINs, *Billiomagus*, **Biliācon*, as well as in ordinary language: Fr. *bille*, *billot* ‘tree trunk’ derive from **bilya*, cf. OIr. *bile* (< **bilyom*) ‘tree of great size, sacred tree’ (LEIA B-50).— (2) *prenno-* ‘tree’ (DLG 252, *prenne* in Endlicher’s Glossary, *prinni* in the Coligny calendar, W. *prenn* < IE **k^wresno-*, Irish *crann* < IE **k^wrsno-*, LEIA C-222f.) is also known as a PN element, but is not often used: *Prinilettius*, *Comprinnus*.— (3) *vidu-* (DLG 319, IE **widhu-*, IEW 1117); OIr. *fid* ‘wood’, W. *gwýdd* ‘trees’ etc., on the other hand, occurs again more often: *Viducus*, *Viduco*,

Viducius, *Viduca*, *Viducillus*, PINs *Vidunna*, *Sapaudia* (< **Sapa-vidia*, *Savoie* ‘pays de sapins’). One may also think of Gl. *dervos* ‘oak’ (< IE **doru-* ‘tree, oak’), though not yet attested in anthroponymy so far. It is remarkable that these words seem to be masculine or neuter in Gaulish (*bilio-*, *dervos*, *prenno-*, *vidus*?), whereas Latin *arbor* is feminine and so a bit unexpected as a name element confined to men. This incongruity would find a natural explanation if a Gaulish influence were assumed.

The denominative suffix *-io-* is not significant, because it coincides in Latin and Celtic. While Weisgerber (Ub. 134, 136ff.: ‘Pseudogentilizien’) stresses its function to form Celtic patronymics, Kajanto Cogn. 117 demonstrates its importance for Latin *cognomina*, among others by illustrating the difference between deriving an adjective of material (e.g., *arboreus* / *argenteus*) and the according PN (cf. *Arboreus* / *Argentius*); cf. also M. Leumann: *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, Munich 1977, 286-89 (although he deals particularly with *gentilicia*). JZ

4. Argicius (2; C): the poet’s maternal grand- and great-grandfather. The Celtic root *arg-* (for which see below) forms part of many Celtic words or PINs; but Ausonius’ grandfather figures as the only *Argicius* in ACS 1.207-14, 213. While epigraphical evidence is missing in CIL 12-13, one can further add the *episcopus Antipolitanus* recorded in 524 (CCSL 148A.45.17f.); cf. also the compound name *Argio-talus* (CIL 13.6230). AC

There are two possible etyma for this name.— (1) IE **h₂erǵ-* ‘bright, brilliant’ (IEW 64), cf. G. ἀργός (< **arg-ró-s*), Skt. *árjuna-*, Hitt. *ḫarki-* etc. The Celtic *arg-* was used as a basic name element e.g. in *Argio-talus* (cf. W. *Talorgan*), *Cauo-seni-argii* (KGPN 134). Gaulish derivatives are *argios* ‘white’, ‘?snow’ (DLG 54) and *arganton* ‘silver’, ‘money’ (DLG 53).— (2) IE **h₂reǵh-* ‘to perk, sit up’ (LIV 498: **reǵh-*) in zero grade in **h₂reǵh-ós*, G. ἀρχός ‘chief, guide’, OIr. *arg* ‘warrior, hero, champion’ (LEIA A-87), Gl. *argos* ‘hero, champion’ (DLG 54), cf. PN *Com-argus* (KGPN 57, 134, 178, GPN 184). IE **h₂-* is necessary to account for *arC-* in Celtic, **reǵh-ós* would result in ***rigos*.— In both cases, the derivation would be **argi-ko-s* ‘(one) pertaining to a hero’ or ‘a bright one’, and with a *-io-* suffix a further, patronymic ending is added: *Argi-k-io-s* ‘son of one pertaining to a hero’ or ‘a bright one’. The adjective is perhaps an old *i*-stem, **argi-*, reshaped as a *io*-stem (cf. Thracian Αρζος < **Argios*); **argi-* could also be a compositional (Caland) form of *argos* ‘chief’ (cf. ἀρχι-). But this need not be the case since beside *-ko-*, *-iko-* is a widespread suffix from early times on (P. Russell, *Celtic word formation*, Dublin 1990, 14f.). It would be worth to examine, whether *Acutus* or *Argutus* (for which cf. Kajanto cogn. 249: ‘Mental qualities’: ‘1. Intellect’: ‘keen, ingenious’), had an impact on *Argicius* – or *vice versa*.

In contrast, *Agricius* and similar forms (*Agritius*, *Agretius*, *Agrecius*, *Agroecius*) have to be explained on the basis of Gl. *agro-* ‘battle, slaughter’ (DLG 35, KGPN 119, ACS 1.61f.), cf. OIr. *ár* ‘carnage’ (**agron*), W. *aer*, OBr. *air* ‘massacre’ (**agrā*, LEIA A-82), from IE **h₂erǵ-* (LIV 255f., IEW 4f.); cf. also the PN *Su-agrius* and the tribal name *Ver-agri*. JZ

5. Attusius, -ia (3; [?R-]C): his wife Attusia Lucana Sabina, her father, and one of her sisters. The family probably hailed from Saintes, where Attusia Lucana Talisia was buried (Parent. 21.7f.); moreover, Ausonius inherited the estate *Lucaniacus* which was located near Saintes as well (epigr. 32.7, 15.36, 20a.9, also epist. 2.3, 24.71).

The concentration of *Atuso*-names in Northern Gaul, Northern Italy, and Illyricum suggests Celtic origin, even if the basis is unexplained (cf. Weisgerber *Rhen.* 145). In

Northern Italy, we have evidence for one *Macrius Cornelius Attusa* (CIL 5.4576), *Surus Attuso* (4271), and three *Atusii* (5847f., 6623); CIL 12 only contains *Atto* (646), *Atusa* (5686.104 probably male), *Aturia* (2826), and *Aturenus* (2920). Weisgerber Ub. 248f., Rhen. 141 approaches *Atussia* (CIL 13.4159 Neumagen), *Atusonius* (6554 Jagsthausen), *Attusa* and *Attusilla* (7072) as well as *Aturo* (7754 Niederbiber) to the *At(t)(i)o*-names frequent in the Rhineland (e.g. *Attius* or *Atilius*), distinguishing them from the Roman *nomen gentile* *At(t)ius*. From the index of CIL 13 one may add: *Atusirus* (7067), *Attunsas* (?7149), *Atuanus* (1328), *Attiso* (7551.53), *Atuirus* (1206), *Atusso* (?8238), *Atulla* (4470), and *Atturus Matti f.* (6114). Cf. also the collection in ACS 1.279-81; for *At(t)i*o-names cf. further Alföldy 63, 158f. In a different context, Weisgerber relates *Aturus* to *Aturiacus* (Trier : CIL 13.4931), *Aturia* (Gallia Narbonensis: CIL 12.2826), *Aturenus* (12.2920, 13.4043?), *Atturus* (Neustadt: 13.6114), and the above-mentioned *Aturo* from Niederbieber (13.7754).

However, it has not yet been argued conclusively that all these names have the same origin: some of them will go back to the IE name of the (foster-)father, **atta*, while others might better be explained as Old European *at*-hydronyms (see below for further details). According to the second alternative, Holder (ACS 1.280) and Weisgerber assume that *Aturio(s?)* shares its root with the river *Aturus* (north of the Pyrenees) or with the neighbouring *Aturenenses*; but, given this location, Aquitanian etymology is likewise probable. At any rate, also an Aquitanian father-name (*atta*, cf. Old Basque *aita*) has to be taken into account, for the river as well as for the PN.

Thus the possibility that the ancestors of Ausonius’ father-in-law had moved from the Pyrenees to Saintes and Bordeaux, where they adapted their leading name due to Gallo-Roman influence, deserves consideration. Moreover, the dissemination of records may lend support to such an assumption: apart from the three kinsmen of Ausonius mentioned above, only two further cases are known south of the Loire: *Attusiola* of Bordeaux (CIL 13.662) and *Aturio(s?)* of Saintes (CIL 13.1089=ILA Santones 58),⁵⁰ Hence one is tempted to integrate them into the family tree.

In the former case, the construction of the city wall (270s?) does not provide a cogent *terminus ante quem* for *Attusiola*’s gravestone; the dedication to the *D(is) M(anibus)* (frequent since the 2nd century) and the *ascia* suggest the 3rd or early 4th century, as in CIL 13.705 (same formula: *D. M. et memoriae ...*, see n. 29). At least, direct descentance from Ausonius’ father-in-law is therefore unlikely, all the more because she is missing in the *Parentalia*. Alternatively, one may consider the possibility that she was related to Attius Patera and his son Attius Tiro Delphidius who had moved from Bayeux to Bordeaux in the 320s (see n. 14). The clear indication of their origin in Aus. Prof. 4.7 (also 10.23-38) allows to pass them over in the account of Aquitanian *att*-name bearers.

As to *Aturio(s?)* of Saintes, he is the only (undisputable) bearer of an *Atu*-name of Saintes, where 128 Roman inscriptions have survived. Also the other PNs figuring on the same stone seem to be quite significant: *D. M. / et memor. / Pauli Pau-/ liani fil. / vixit ann. / xiii, dies xxv / Iul. Aturio(s?) / av(u)nc(u)lus / pos. (a. 151/270)*. The combination of *Aturius* and *Paul(ian)us*, which may be repeated in ILA Santones 59 (*At[...]/ L. Pau[...]/ nus [...]*) appears to be resembled in the connection of *Attusius Lucanus*

⁵⁰ GNATVSIUS is unlikely to mean *gn(atu)s Atusius* (982 Périgueux), as is suggested in CIL 13 and accepted by Weisgerber; since their argument is not supported by any parallel, it is more convincing to assume a Celtic PN *Gnatusios* deriving from *gnatos* (‘son’, ‘reknowned’), cf. DLG 153.

Talisius, *Thalassius*, and *Paulinus* in the *stemma Ausonianum*. Admittedly, this hypothesis is somehow speculative, but it is supported by the rarity of the afore-said PNs as well as by the precise geographical information (I am hesitant also to draw on ILA Santones 50 *Lucanus Lucani filius* and 71 *M. Vipstanus Sabinus*, as the names are frequent in Gaul, though singular among the 128 inscriptions from Saintes.). AC

The ultimate base of these names could be IE **atta* ‘father’ which existed alongside **ph₂ter-* ‘father’. According to É. Benveniste (IE language and society, London 1973, 169–171, 368–370), **atta* denoted ‘(foster) father’ but replaced in several languages **ph₂ter-* in the sense of ‘(genetic) father’. Sometimes **atta* is found exclusively or primarily, as in Hitt. *atta*, Goth. *atta* (*fadar* occurs but once), OCS *otīcī* (< **at(t)ikos*), Alb. *atë*. Some show traces of the first, as Lat. *atta*, Hom. G. ἄττα, Skt. *attā* ‘mother’, *attī* ‘elder sister’. OIr. has both with their assumed basic meanings, *ath(a)ir* ‘father’ (< **ph₂tēr*, cf. W. *edrydd* < **atrios* ‘paternal domain, residence’: LEIA A-100) and *aite* ‘foster father’ (< **attio-*: LEIA A-52). Brittonic replaced **ph₂tēr* by **tatos* (MW., MCo., MBr. *tat*) which may be of similar antiquity (cf. Skt. *tatā-*, G. τέττα, Lat. *tata*) or it may be a new onomatopoëtic formation. In Gaulish, *ater-* (< **ph₂ter-*) is clearly attested (DLG 58f.). On the other hand, lots of *att*-based names are found. So it could probably be that **atta* existed in Gaulish as well, which was the basis of PNs like *Ateano*, *Atteanus* (GPN 309: “obscure”), *At(t)ianus* (DAG 132, 136, 176, 182 etc.), *Atto*, *Attios* and the like (ACS 1.272–281, LAGN 88–92). The institution of fosterage is well documented in the ancient Celtic world, and **atta* could have been the Gaulish term for the foster father (see also DLG 59).

A PN based on an *at-* hydronym, as L. Weisgerber thought, is less likely in the light of this evidence but cannot be completely ruled out (on ‘Old European’ hydronymy see below, s.v. *Ausonius*). An Aquitanian-Basque name origin (*atta*, *aita* ‘father’, R.L. Trask, *The history of Basque*, London 1997, 398–403, 399) cannot be excluded either, taking into account the history of the family, but possibly plays a rôle only as a further CN for Gaulish *atta*-names. JZ

6. Ausonius (4; R-C-G): apart from himself, his father, his first son, and his first grandson. Most, if not all, other Ausonii in 5th- and 6th-century Gaul, Italy and Dalmatia were probably descendants of the poet or of his sister Iulia Dryadia. *Hesperius*, the name of his second son, varies the onomastical motif according to its Greek but secondary etymology (‘Roman, Italian’). In sect. II.2, it has been argued that, while several Eastern *Ausonioi* are attested from the 3rd century on, the name of the isolated Gallic bearers seems to be of autochthonic origin.

Various alternatives are possible. Firstly, the basis *aus-* was often used in IE toponyms and hydronyms; e.g., *Ausona* was, among others, the name of Alzonne near Carcassonne, of a river in the region of Limoges, as well as of a stream near Trier. Cf. Krahe 291, 320, Weisgerber Rhen. 328 with reference to *Ausa*, *Ausona*, *Ausova*, *Auser*; further ACS 1.297–99, 3.761 for *Auso*-names such as the Irish river *Ausoba* near Galway (note that Holder considers *Ausa* Iberian and *Ausonius* Greek).⁵¹ Secondly, IE **aus-* (‘ear’, cf. Latin *auris*) played an important rôle in Celtic onomastics as well, cf. *Su-ausia* (‘aux belles oreilles’), *Arausio*, *Ausios*, etc. Thirdly, *aus(i)-* was also productive in Aquitanian, cf. the people of the *Ausi* or *Ausetani* and their capital *Ausona* (Northern Spain), see below for further references. This would also be supported by the

⁵¹ For geographical *cognomina* in general cf. Kajanto Cogn. 43–52 and Fraser (as n. 23).

fact that Iulius Ausonius together with his father, grandfather and great-grandfather hailed from the Aquitanian / Basque city of Bazas = *Vasates* (cf. Aus. Hered., with ch. II.2). Moreover, one may hint at the background of his brother’s name *Contemtus*, which may likewise indicate Aquitanian offspring.

At any rate, *Ausonius* will simply be the derivative in *-io-* (patronymic) to the PN with nasal stem, *Auso* (gen. *Ausonis*), cf. CIL 13,2,1,6858=Carm. epigr. 373, ed. Buecheler 373 with the reading of Ritterling: *Legio*, RE 12.2, 1925, 1329-1829, 1552.10, followed in *Gens* 163f. (Forcellini & de Vith 5.226 and Diehl, ThlL 2.1537 s.v. *Auso* no. 2 relate the name to *Ausona* though). Thus the morphological pattern would show the impact of Gaulish even if the name would be Aquitanian. See below for further references. AC

As a regional reference of Ausonius’ name is evident, several possibilities for etymological explanations must be taken into account, in addition to an assonance to the classical (literary) term *Ausones*, *Ausonii* ‘westerners’, ‘Italians’.— (1) The name may derive from Gl. *aus(i)-* ‘ear’, (IE **aus*, dual **ausī*, IEW 785), cf. OIr. *au* n. (< IE **ausos-*, DLG 62, LEIA A-102). The meaning of **Aus-on-* is ‘one with (prominent) ears’, i.e. one with big ears or one who perceives well. **aus(i)-* is also attested in PNs *Ausios* (DAG 691), *Ausicus* (DAG 805), **Ausākos* in OIr. *óach*, cf. OCo. *erieu* ‘temple’. Compound names include *Su-ausia* ‘with good or pretty ears’ (KGPN 142) and PINs from Celt. **par-ausiā* ‘what is in front of the ears, temple’: *Araus(i)a*, *Arausona*, *Arausio* (Orange, Vaucluse), perhaps also in the PN *Harausoni* (dat., CIL 13,78), cf. OIr. *ara(e)* ‘temple’ (DLG 51).— (2) There may be a connection to a hydronym or (derived from it) a toponym *Ausona* vel sim. which belongs to an ‘Old European’ river name *Ausonā* (cf. ACS 1.299, Krahe 320); similar names are widespread in Europe, as *Ausa*, *Ausava*, *Ausenna*, *Ausent-*, *Auser*, *Ausunda*. H. Krahe (p.291) derives them from a ‘water’-lexeme **aw(e)-* (IEW 78) with s-extension and further suffixes. Note, however, **h₂eus-* ‘to scoop’ (LIV 275f., IEW 90) as a possible base as well. In general, moreover, it may be noted that Krahe’s so-called Old European hydronymy is much disputed. At present, it cannot be decided whether the elements and suffixes or the dissemination of hydronyms can be attributed to IE (as e.g. W.P. Schmid has it) or an ancient Mediterranean or some other kind of Pre-IE nomenclature; see Untermann 1999, 509–518.— (3) Given the Aquitanian descent of the prominent name bearer, a relation to the Aquitanian (and Basque) language may be considered as well. Several derivations are possible: (3a) from **enaut(s)i*, the participle of **inau(t)s*: ‘who (is able to?) speak’, the basis of *ausk-*, which also underlies the self-designation *Euskera*, *Euskadi* (cf. Trask 1997, 320f.); (3b) from *hautsi*, *ausi* ‘dust, ash’ (DGV 3.460-66); also present in PNs as *Ausibia* (DOHV 1.371); (3c) from *auzo*, *aizo* ‘neighbour(hood), inhabitant’, also in the anthroponyms *Auz*, *Eiz* (DGV 3.490-97, DOHV 1.372); (3d) A connection to *(h)au(t)si* ‘to break, to collapse’ (DGV 3.467-74) seems less likely. For an introduction into the linguistic geography of the Pyrenees region cf. Untermann 1995 and Gorrochategui.

A long list of mostly Germanic *Auso*-names (including *Oso*) is introduced with reference to IE **awes* (‘briller’) by Morlet 1.46f., while the toponym *Ausson* (near Reims) is deduced from the PN *Alcius* (3.17). Though a relation to Germanic names seems possible, this is rather improbable in the present case in view of the historical and onomastic context of the *gens Ausoniana*. Moreover, the existence, in Celtic, of a homophonous word ‘aurora’, **aus-* (< IE **h₂éus-os*, LIV 292) is not excluded though

cognates from Insular Celtic show but the base **wōs-ri-* (Mlr. *fáir* ‘sunrise’, W. *gwawr*, IEW 86f.). JZ

7. Avitianus (1; C-L): his brother. One might speculate whether the bronze handle of an iron scraper found near Old Sarum attests another relative of the family: *Ausoni Aviti* (gen.; JRS 47, 1957, 232 no. 25; wrongly referred to as no. 26 and located in Verulamium in AE 1958, 111, RIB II.3, no. 2433.3) is the only *Ausonius* evidenced in Britain.

As for *Avitus*, the influence of Celtic *avito-* (desired, < *avi-*: ‘desire’) is generally accepted (DLG 61, ACS 1.313ff., Schmidt 143, Weisgerber Ub. 73, 249, Lochner-von-Hüttenbach 151), although it is undistinguishable from the Latin adjective *avitus* (< *avus*, ‘grandfather’); but cf. also forms like *Avi-cantus* or *Avo-rix* and the patronymics *Avius* or *Avitius*. However, *Avitianus* is mostly explained either by the mentioned Latin root or by Illyrian influence (ACS 1.315 Latin; KGPN 143, Weisgerber Ub. 209, 249, also Schulze 34 on *Avitus* [Illyrian or Latin], *Avitius* [‘ungeklärt’] and 348 on *Avian(i)us* [Etruscan], Kajanto Cogn. 303f. labels among ‘*cognomina* obtained from relationship’, thus opting for Latin origin).

While the PNs *Avianius*, *Avitianus* or the like borne by Romans will mostly go back to a Latin root (< *avus*, or also < *avere?*), the frequency of *Avito*-names in Gaul strongly suggests Celtic influence: the close Latin parallel will have encouraged the frequent choice of *Avi(-t-ian-)/-o*-names. An obvious case is ILA Santones 60: *D. M. / Petronio Avi-/ tiano, vixit an-/ nis IIII, die C / Senilis et Ave-/ ticcus paren-/ tes f(e)c(erunt)*; *Aveticcus* is *hapax* in ACS 1.313. The explanation is further buttressed by the numerous attestations of *Cupitus*, *Desideratus*, *Desiderius*, *Optatus*, *Speratus*, *Exoratus*, *Expectatus*, and *Elpidius* in Celtic regions, which illustrate the popularity of this motif. Cf. also Kajanto’s list (Cogn. 296f.: ‘expected’, ‘whished’, ‘prayed for’); further Alföldy *ad locos*. Thus there is no need to speculate with Lochner-von-Hüttenbach 153, whether the popularity of *Cupitus* was due to a Gaulish name not yet identified that began with the prefix *Cob-*. And, contrary to Schmidt 143, *Avitiano-mare* (CIL 13.5495) need not be explained as a hybrid Latino-Celtic mixture. AC

The name element *avi-* could be understood as the Gaulish noun *avi-* ‘desire, favour’ (DLG 61, less likely *avo-* ‘descendant’, DLG 60), which is present in other Gl. PNs, as *Avi-cantus* (still W. *Eugan*), *Avia-ricis*, *Ambi-avi*. OBr. *Outham*, W. *Eudaf* require a superlative **awitamos* ‘the most desired’. The IE base of this noun is **h₂eu-* ‘to enjoy’ (LIV 274, IEW 77f., which is different from **h₁euH-* ‘to help, support’, both under one heading in IEW).— Though the parallelism with *avi*-names in Gaulish is convincing, there is also a possible allusion to a Germanic PN with a similar basis, as *AVI(A)* (CIL 13.8339 Cologne) according to H. Reichert (LAGN 108).

There is some additional evidence we can draw upon: From the sanctuary Sources Seine a number of inscriptions on monuments is known, which have been dedicated by the local population. M. Raybould gives the following assessment in her chapter on the epigraphy of the site (in M. Aldhouse Green, *Pilgrims in stone*. Stone images from the Gallo-Roman sanctuary of Fontes Sequanae, Oxford 1999, 33f.): “Archaeological finds at the site need not, of course, be entirely representative of what was offered there, but, the impression is the shrine operated in native Gaulish tradition with a few romanized Celtic families leaving items inscribed in the Roman manner.” These inscriptions show almost exclusively Gaulish PNs, such as *Dagolitos*, *Luceo*, *Matta*, *Nertecomaros*. *Avitus* is regarded a Roman name by the author, but the possibility of a CN is not taken into consideration. JZ

8. Caecilius (1; ?C-L®): maternal grandfather. The wife of Maximinus Thrax was called *Caecilia* Paulina, but the *nomen gentile* was frequent throughout the empire. AC

The name of the *gens Caecilia* (OLat. *Caicilios*) is probably of Etruscan origin and was related to the mythical founder of Praeneste, *Caeculus*, who in turn was thought to be named after the squinting of his eyes because of smoke. So a relationship to *caecus* ‘blind’ was introduced and later confirmed by Varro. Lat. *caecus* (and *caecilia* ‘blind-worm’) derive from IE **kaiko-* (IEW 519f.) which is also present in Skt. *kēkara-* ‘squinting’, Goth. *haihs* ‘one-eyed’ and Celtic, in OIr. *cáech* ‘one-eyed, blind’, W. *coeg* ‘empty, hollow, one-eyed’, MCo. *cuic* ‘squinting, one-eyed’ (LEIA C-6). But this word is, as it seems, not used in onomastics except OIr. *Caechan* ‘the one-eyed’. On the other hand, Gaulish onomastics show the broadly synonymous *ex(s)ops* (< IE **eġh-s* + **h₃ok^w-s*, ‘without eye/sight’; DLG 170f., 169: *ex(s)-*) for ‘blind’ which was probably the basis of a calque in Vulgar Latin, **ab-oculus*, the etymon of French *aveugle* ‘blind’ (Watkins, Ériu 34, 1983, 113–116; REW 3 no. 33 suggests a translation of a Greek medical term ἄπ’ ὀμμάτῳ). Gl. *ops* ‘eye’ itself was productive in PNs *Cun-opus*, *Ven-opis* etc. As *Caec-* could be understood as a term for ‘blind’ in Gaulish, even here an allusion to native onomastics is quite possible. JZ

9. Callippio (1; C-G*): Although Κάλλιππος is very common in the Greek world and even a wide range of derivatives (as Καλλιππίδης) is recorded, there is no further attestation of Καλλιππίων / *Callippio* (or even Καλλίππιος / *Callippius*). Cf. LGPN 1.247, 2.250, 3A.232f.; further L. Dubois in Hornblower & Matthews 41-52 on compounds with -ιππο- (with the critical comments by S. Lambert, Bryn Mawr Classical Review 8.1.22). Given this isolation, a Celtic connection is quite probable. With regard to the professional background of the family, one could tentatively relate it to *epo-callion* and its synonymous *callio-marcos* (‘coltsfoot’), which the medical writer Marcellus of Bordeaux recommends as a remedy against cough: *herba, quae Gallice calliomarcus, Latine equi ungula vocatur* (Med. lib. 16.101=CML V¹ 292.17, DLG 163, 99 ‘pas d’âne’, ‘tussilage’, German ‘Huflattich’).

In this context, also the name of the Gallic *consul* of A.D. 447 *Calepius* (CLRE 447f.) deserves consideration. Holder (ACS 1.695-700, 3.1045 with further *cal*-names) claims a relation to a toponym, cf., among others, *Calepa* (CIL 13.1347: Arnaize near Saint-Ambroix), while he declares *Calepiacum* (Clichy-la-Gareuse) as derivative from *Cal-epius*. Note further the PN *Callipianus* (CIL 3.8743), which may be related to the PIN **Calibiacum* (Calibago, <PN *Calibius*). AC

The name could either be a hellenised variant of the rare PN *Calepius* (ACS 1.695), or of PINs like *Calepa*. The etymology of this name is uncertain, but a relation to the root IE **kal-* ‘hard’, or maybe other PINs as *Calleva* (ACS 1.701f.), seems quite possible.— It would be tempting, however, to refer Callippius to the Gaulish reverse compound noun *epo-callion* and its synonym *callio-marcos* which denote the plant coltsfoot. In Gaulish, it seems to mean “colt’s hoof” similar to the English, if W. Meid (*Heilpflanzen und Heilsprüche. Zeugnisse gallischer Sprache bei Marcellus von Bordeaux*, Innsbruck 1996: 21) is right with the meaning ‘hoof’ of *callio-*. X. Delamarre (DLG 99) assumes two different semantic developments of Celtic **kalio-* / **kallio-* (< **kal-nio-*) ‘hard (skin, callus)’ to Gl. ‘hoof’ and Brittonic ‘testicle’ (W. *caill*, Br. *kell*; cf. Lat. *callum*, Skt. *kiṇaḥ* < **kṛmaḥ*, IEW 523, LEIA C-26, 50, EWAia 3.90). But more homophones seem to exist: A substrate word **calio-*, **caliavo-* ‘stone’ (IEW 523f.) can be reconstructed from Gallo-Romance which ultimately also derives from **kal-*, *caleto-* ‘hard’ (IEW 523f., DLG 98). Furthermore, there is an assonance to Gl.

caliaco- ‘cock’ (DLG 98), perhaps in PNs *Caliaga*, *Caliages*, PINs *Cal(l)iacum* (modern Chailly, Chaillé, Cailly, Caillac etc.).— The other name element is either *epos* ‘horse’ (DLG 163f., IE **(h₁)ek^wo-*) or *marcos* ‘horse’ (DLG 217), a lexeme confined, in IE, to Celtic and Germanic, but perhaps with far-reaching cognates in Asian languages. All lexemes used in onomastics could be used as first or second elements, respective to the meaning of the compound. Some particular preferences can be observed, but even in the case of *māro-* and *rig-* for which Schmidt (KGPN 72, 238) claims a regular end-position, exchange of the order was possible, cf. *Viromarus* and *Marovirus*. Cf. also Höfler 52 on Germanic PNs.

PNs derived from or almost identical with plant names would not be totally unexpected in Gaulish. There is plenty of evidence for tree names (e.g. see above, s.v. *Arborius*), and there are examples for herbs and other plants, as *cano-* ‘reed’ (*Can(i)us*, *Ande-canus*, DLG 103, ACS 2.757), *cremo-* ‘garlic’ (*Cremius*, PIN *Cremona*, DLG 129), *drageno-* ‘thorn’ (*Dragenius*, *Draganes*, DLG 148) etc. JZ

10. *Cataphronia* (1; R-L-G): paternal aunt. See *Contemtus*

11. a) **Censor** (1; ?C-L): the father-in-law of Ausonius’ daughter was called Severus *Censor* Iulianus. The title of the most distinguished republican magistrate was only rarely used as PN in Rome: 3 records are contrasting with 30 attestations of *Censorinus*. Celts appear to have had a predilection for these names: out of a total of 27 entries *Censor* in CIL (according to Kajanto Cogn. 317), Gallia Narbonensis has produced 11, Noricum and Illyricum 3 (+18 derivatives), while the Three Gauls have – apart from Ausonius’ family – 4 *Censores* (13.393? Orléans, 1220 Bourges, 3307 Reims, 13.6779 Mainz) and 34 derivatives to offer.

The *Censor* evidenced in Mainz was *consul II* and flourished in A.D. 262/66, thus being a candidate of the usurper Postumus (cf. also CIL 7.287 Britain, AE 1930.35 Bonn). Jones (PLRE 1.196, followed by Heinzelmann 1982, 577) comments on the *consul*: “His name is Gallic and he may be an ancestor of Severus *Censor* Iulianus”. Although Sivan 1991, 438 n. 16, erroneously dating the consulship to ‘272/6’) remains hesitant in this regard, the praise of his glorious forebears by Ausonius (Parent. 14.1,5, 30.2) and other indicators of 3rd-century imperial connections (see ch. II.3) lend some support to this assumption.

Admittedly, the epigraphic testimony of Bordeaux is not really significant: *Censoria* (CIL 13.882), *Censorina* (586 and 856), and *Censorinus* (687). To be added are further *Censorii* mentioned by the poet: his grandson *Censorius Magnus Ausonius* (the addressee of *Protr.* and *Geneth.*) and *Censorius Atticus Agricius*, a nobleman and professor of Bordeaux (Prof. 14). There was another *Censorius comes* under Theoderic I (ca. 430/448, PLRE 2.280), who could well have been a son of *Censorius Magnus Ausonius*; similar posts are attested for various descendants of Ausonius, cf. *Gens* 161, 166-70, 176f.

No Celtic basis has hitherto been suggested and IEW 566 does not represent a Celtic cognate to the Latin *censere* (< **k^{ens}-* ‘feierlich sprechen’, ‘verkünden’), but the frequency of names as *Censa*, *Censilla*, *Censonia*, *Censori(n)us* in Northern Gaul has already induced Schulze 136 and Weisgerber (Rhen. 266, also p. 111, 140f., 221, 227, Ub. 114, 125, 139, 275) to posit Celtic origin. On the other hand, there certainly was a consciousness of the Latin meaning (republican magistrate) which is still present in many modern languages (cf. only *to censure*). I thus wonder, whether *Censor* induced the choice of the speaking name *Severus*. AC

The predilection for these names in Gaul can be explained in two ways. Firstly, a regional dispersion of a (rare) Roman name, due to an influential person in the period after the conquest. Secondly, a CN of a genuine Gaulish name, either homophonous or synonymous. Complete phonetic identity with a Gaulish PN cannot be expected since in Celtic a consonant cluster *-ns-* is assimilated to *-ss-* (or *-dd-*); e.g. IE **meh₁-ns* ‘month’ (< **meh₁-* ‘to measure’ LIV 424f., IEW 703f.) occurs in the Coligny calendar as MĪΘ, i.e. /mītʰ/ (DLG 226f., RIG 3.425), **en-sedon* (if not **ad-sedon*) shows in Latin *essedum* ‘chariot’, and word final **-vns* (v = vowel) regularly develops to *-v̄s* in Gaulish (K. McCone, Towards a relative chronology of ancient and medieval Celtic sound change, Maynooth 1996, 61f.). Thus a relation to the root from which *Censor* itself is derived, **kēns-/kēms-* ‘to announce’ (LIV 326, IEW 566), would have become **kess-* or **kiss-* (with neutralized [ɪ]). The root in *o*-grade seems to be present in W. **cos* (in *dan-gos* ‘show’, from causative *kōn/ms-éye-*, see S. Schumacher, Historical morphology of the Welsh verbal noun, Maynooth 2000, 220). Other roughly similar sounding lexemes include the common name element *kassi-* as well as *kisi-* in *Cisi-ambos* (name of a vergobret, KGPN 172).— An alternative would be a translation of a Gaulish PN (element). As *censor* means ‘censurer, judge, critic’ in contemporary Latin, the most probable choice is perhaps for *breto-/brit(t)o-* ‘judgement’ (< IE **bh₂-tó-*) in the name of the magistrate *vergo-bretos* and PNs *Brit(t)us*, *Brittius*, *Britto*, *Brittula*, *Britouius Mars*, Βριτο-μαρις, *Britto-marus*, cf. OIr. *brith*, *breth*, W. *bryd* ‘judgement’ (DAG 591, KGPN 155–157, 292, DLG 315, 89 s.v. *britu-*) though some *britto*-names may derive from *briχto-* ‘magic’ (DLG 90).— Another possibility would be a connection with Gl. *Prittius*, Ogam QRITTI (gen., < IE **k₂rtio-* from **k₂er-* ‘make’) ‘poet’, cf. OIr. *creth* ‘craftmanship, poetic art’, W. *prydydd* ‘poet’ (DLG 253 *pritos*, LEIA C-232 f., SOI 111).

JZ

11. b) Censorius (1; ?C-L): grandson of Ausonius and Censor. The patronymic evidently denotes the paternal grandfather.

12. Claudius (1; ?C-L®): paternal uncle. For *Claudia Contemta* cf. ch. II.2. There was in all likelihood no relation to the emperors Claudius Gothicus (268–70, outside Gaul) or M. Claudius Tacitus (275–76); see also ch. II.3.

The manuscript reads *Cl. Contemtus*, which Heinzelmann 1976, 18 n. 32 gives as *Clemens Contemtus*; but *Clemens* is a typical *cognomen*, while *Claudius* is correctly treated as a *nomen gentile* followed by a *cognomen*. This explanation is supported by the fact that *Claudius Contemtus* is not a *Iulius* as his four siblings, so that a combination of two *nomina gentilia* is avoided (however, for exceptions cf., e.g., *C. Valerius Claudius* in CIL 3.8205 or *Clemens Dextrianus* in CIL 13.11757). At any rate, it was quite common to abbreviate the frequent name *Claudius*, whereas it was certainly not in the case of *Clemens*, cf. the indexes of CIL. For a ‘hidden’ Gaulish etymology see below.

AC

Even this traditional Roman name may give an allusion to Gaulish onomastics. There is an element *cluto-*, *clouto-* ‘famous, renowned’ (DLG 119) in PNs like *Aclutius* (< **Ad-clutius*), *Veni-clutius*, *Cluto-rix*, *Clutoiθα*, *Clotus*, but esp. *Cloutius*, *Cloutina*, *Veru-cloetius* (of an ancient type, cf. G. Εὐρυκλειτός, Skt. *Uruśravas-*, EWAia 1.227), also in PIN Κλώτα, i.e. **Cloutā* (> *Clyde* in Scotland, see DLG 119, LHEB 626), all from IE **k₁leu-* ‘to hear’ (LIV 334f., IEW 605–607, LEIA C-124), cf. OIr. *cloth*, W. *clod* ‘reputation’, ‘fame’. As both Lat. *-au-* and Gl. *-ou-* are monophthongised to *-ō-*, the difference between *Claudius* and *Cloutios* is reduced to *-d-* : *-t-* and the ending. JZ

[Clemens]: see *Claudius*.

13. Contemtus (1; R-L*): paternal uncle. The name is no longer taken as misspelled for *Contentus* (the ‘Satisfied’, cf. CIL 13.705), which is not even attested in Gaul. There is rather general agreement now to connect it with his sister’s *cognomen* *Cataphronia*. Thus the verb ‘to contempt’ (καταφρονεῖν / *contemnere*) appears to be the basis of both, cf. ThlL onom. 2.581 s.v. *Contem(p)tus*, Forcellini & de Vit 5.345 s.v. *Cataphronius*, Kajanto Cogn. 287, followed by Green 1991, 311 and Sivan 1993, 185 n. 36. Kajanto Cogn. 70, 287 characterises the names as Christian *nomina humilitatis* (the ‘Despected’) and compares them with the humble name *Stercorius* (derivative from *stercus*, ‘dung’); his first Christian testimony dates from the 5th century, while Solin 1982, 3.1276 offers Christian examples for Rome dating as early as the 3rd century. But the Greek version requires an active interpretation, which would probably have resulted in **Contem(p)tor*, although the Latin participle originally had a neutral diathesis (cf., e.g., *Tacitus*). At any rate, *Cataphronia* (and *Contemtus*?) will therefore mean ‘contemptor’, thus expressing an attitude hardly typically Christian.

The history of the ‘contemptor’-name in Gaul has not yet been sufficiently explained. It has been overlooked so far that the entire evidence for *Contemti* hails from Aquitaine: apart from Ausonius’ uncle, the above-mentioned *Claudia Contemta* (see ch. II.2) is attested on a gravestone in Bordeaux, while Ruricius of Limoges (epist. 2.14, CSEL 21.393.9f.) attests a *Contemtus subdiaconus* around A.D. 500. Ausonius’ aunt is the only *Cataphronia* of the same region known to us, while two *Cataphronii* are recorded for the 6th century, one in Lyon (*Vita Nicetii Lugd.*, MGH SRM 3.522) and another in Antibes (CCSL 148A.45.17f. for A.D. 524). For the latter two Mediterranean influence is thus highly possible, whereas *Contemtus* appears to be of Celtic or Aquitanian origin. This would also explain, why all three attestations are spelled without *p*, as the correct rendering of the participle of *contemnere* would require.

Admittedly, the identification of the root remains uncertain. Facing this difficulty, one may consider alternatively that *Cataphronius* rather than *Contemtus* followed a Celtic compound (the latter could then be classified as C-G-L*): thus the well known element *catu-* ‘battle’ might have been combined with *brunnio-*, *bronnio-*, ‘breast’ (cf. DLG 92, LEIA B-99, IEW 170, cf. OIr. *bruinne*, *brú*, gen. *bronn*, ‘breast’, ‘belly’ in PNs *Su-broni* gen., DAG 111, GPN 113f.) resulting in **katu-bronn-ios* of equally obscure character though. And, in addition, the dissemination of the names in Aquitaine (1 Catafron- : 3 Contemt-), South-Eastern Gaul (2:0) [or (0:0 until the 5th century)], and Rome (6:0) would be rather surprising in this case. AC

A PN like *Contestus* / *Contertos* is phonetically close, and is explained with reference to Latin *contectus* (‘[well] covered, constructed’) and alternatively to *contextus* (‘[well] woven’ in ACS 1.1107f., cf. also KGPN 181), but the change from *teks-* to *tem-* would be unlikely. A prefix *con/m-* is well attested in Gaulish PNs with instrumental, sociative, equative or intensifying meaning (DLG 121f., GPN 183–186, 419, KGPN 61–63, 104ff., 175–182), but *-tem-* poses problems since this element is not recorded at all. If taken as a Celtic base, it could derive from a number of roots:— (1) IE **tem-* ‘to reach’ (LIV 624), attested in G. τέμει ‘arrives’ (Iliad 13.707) and East-Tocharian *tamāt* ‘was born’ only. — (2) IE **temh₁-* ‘to cut’ (LIV 625, IEW 1062f., for **h₁* cf. G. τμη-τός), cf. τέμνω, but MBr. *tamnaid* may be denominative (Joseph, Ériu 33, 1982, 36f.).— (3) IE **temH-* ‘to droop, faint’ (LIV 624, IEW 1063f.), which is according to M. Mayrhofer identical with **temH-* ‘be dark’ (EWAia 1.626), cf. OIr. *temel* ‘darkness’, MBr. *teffal* ‘dark’. Perhaps the river names *Tames-* also belong here

(P. Kitson, Transactions of the Philological Society 94, 1996, 90) if not derived from IE **teh₂-* ‘to melt, thaw’ (LIV 616, IEW 1053). — (4) IE **temp-* ‘strain’, ‘stretch’ (LIV 626, IEW 1064f., variant of **ten-*, cf. W. *tannu*) > Celtic **temφ-* and subsequent loss of *p/φ*, is not attested in this branch but cf. Lith. *tempiù* ‘I stretch’ and nominal derivations in Italic, Germanic and Slavonic.— (5) IE **tepes-mo-* > **tēmmo-* ‘hot’, ‘warm’ (LIV 629f., IEW 1069f., e.g. W. *twym* etc.).

(2–3) are not likely to result in phonetically similar formations since the passive participle, IE **tm̥H-tós*, would result in Gl. **tmātos*. Dental stems from (2–3) in full grade, **temH-to-* would be expected to develop to **temato-* with ‘vocalization’ of the laryngeal between consonants. (5) is already adjectival and the addition of a *to*-suffix seems problematic. Only (1) and (4) would yield **[tæmto-]* as the result of **temto-* (full grade) and **tamto-* (zero grade **tm̥-tó-*), but as mentioned above, neither of them is attested. Given their existence in Gaulish, ‘the one aimed at; the (newly?) born one’ (=1) or ‘the strained or stretched one’ (=4) would make sense, the latter in the light of the distortions of the warrior’s body as described in Celtic literature.

Gl. PNs denoting contempt seem not to be attested or have not been identified yet. As the notion of despise would not be unexpected for the self-representation of the warrior class, one should be careful not to preclude either this possibility or Aquitanian origin. JZ

14. Corinthia (1; ?C-G): maternal grandmother’s first *cognomen*; a patronymic, whose relevance for the family remains uncertain. Several Western Europeans appear to have been called after the famous Greek city. Notwithstanding this, I suspect that the basis *corio-* was responsible for the popularity of such names in Celtic regions, cf., e.g., *Corio* (CIL 3.11597). Cf. OPEL 2,75 for *Corinth(i)us*, ACS 1.1125ff. (‘kriegerschaar’) and KGPN 183 on *corio*-names. Likewise, Latin *Cornelia* might have been used as a variation of such PNs, see ch. II.3 on *Cornelia Supera*. AC

The popularity of this PN in the *Keltiké* can be taken as an argument for its character as a CN, and two or three possibilities can be suggested.— (1) Gl. PNs based on *corios* ‘army’, ‘people in arms’ (DLG 125f., cf. OIr. *cuire*, W. *cordd* [also ‘tribe’, ‘clan’], OBr. *cor-*, from IE **korios*, IEW 615), such as *Corius*, *Coria*, *Corio*, *Coriaca*, *Coriso*, or tribal names *Corio-solites*, *Tri-corii*, *Vo-corii* etc., PINs *Coria*, *Corio-vallum* (ACS 1.1126–1128, KGPN 183f., GPN 339 n. 3; cf. also the vast amount of Grm. *hario*-names listed by Morlet 1.124ff.), cf. also Gl. *corionos* ‘army chief’ (DLG 126, cf. G. κοίρανος).— (2) A further, perhaps even more attractive connection would be to *cor(r)os* ‘dwarf’, ‘small one’ (DLG 126, < **kor-sos* ‘cut’, from IE **(s)ker-* ‘to shear’, ‘scrape’, ‘cut’, LIV 556, IEW 938–940), cf. OIr. *corr* ‘pointed’, ‘unequal’, ‘dwarf’ (LEIA C-211), W. OCo. *cor*, OBr. *corr*. It is abundantly attested in Gaulish onomastics: *Coro-billa*, *Coro-bilius*, *Coro-lamus*, *Coro-mara*, *Coro-nero/us*, *Coro-turetis*, *Coros*, *Correns*, *Corilus*, *Corritia*, *Corisilla*, *Corisso*, *Corobus* etc. (DLG 126). Since *-nt*-formations are known in Gaulish and *Corritia* is phonetically quite similar, *Corint(h)ia* could have been understood in the hypocoristic sense of ‘little one’, perhaps ‘darling’.— (3) Less likely seems a connection to PNs based upon the Gaulish words for ‘horn’. All three ablaut forms of IE **k_{er}-n-* ‘horn, head’ (IEW 574–576) seem to be present in Gaulish onomastics: zero grade **k_{er}-n-* > Celt. **karn-* is the usual form, Gl. *carnon* (DLG 106f., cf. *carnux* ‘trumpet’, DLG 107, in PNs *Carnarus*, *Carnatus*, *Carneolus*, *Carnius*, *Carnicus* etc., ACS 1.791–801), perhaps full grade in *e*, **k_{er}-n-* (rare, in PNs *Cernius*, PIN *Cerniacum*, GN *Cernunnos*, ACS 1.993, if not a variant

*[kærn-] from *Carn-*), and full grade in *o*, **kôr-n-* (in PNs ?*Cornus*, *Cornicus*, *Cornaiius*, tribals names *Cornacates*, *Cornovii*, ACS 1.1129–1132). JZ

15. Decimius (2; C-L): While the first name of Ausonius is only transmitted in the non significant genitive *Decimi*, the form *Decimius* is clearly attested for his son Hesperius. It is also accepted for Ausonius himself, among others, in PLRE 1,140f. no. 6 and by Sivan 1993, 60, while Green 1978, 26/27 remains undecided, as the MSS quoted in PLRE in favour of *Decimius* are indeed not conclusive. Most scholars prefer to call the poet *Decimus*, cf., e.g., Pastorino 15 n. 29, Brandes 4-8 (*Decimus* instead of *Decius*); Stroheker 1948, 150, Heinzelmann 1982, 590 (rejecting *Decimius*).

However, the latter overlook firstly that classical *praenomina* were rarely used in late Roman Gaul (there is not one single case among the 48 names here discussed). Secondly, they fail to account for the fact that *Decimius* was common among prominent Gauls in Late Antiquity while *Decimus* was not. OPEL 2.95 lists (unfortunately without chronological differentiation) 27 *Dec(i)mii* (15 in Gaul), 20 *Dec(i)mi* (7 in Belgica, 1 in Narbonensis), 15 *Dec(i)mini* (12 in Gaul), 1 *Deciminia* (in Belgica), 2 *Dec(i)miani* (1 in Narbonensis), and 4 *Dec(i)millae* (all Gaul); there is more evidence in CIL, particularly in vols. 3, 12 und 13 (Alföldy 81, however, suggests that the Dacian *Decimii* were ‘Italiker’). Drawing on further prosopographical evidence, I suggest that we link up to four other *Decimii* to the family of Ausonius and Hesperius in *Gens* 182-85. Because the Roman *gens Decimia* did not outlive the republic (E. Groag: *Decimius*, RE 4.2, 1901 no. 1-10), a Gaulish origin is to be looked for.⁵²

Indo-Europeanists have already pointed out that *Deccius* is not an alternative spelling of Latin *Decius* (pace Schulze 423), but rather a patronymic to **Deccus*, which Weisgerber Ub. 77f., 175 (cf. also Lochner-von-Hüttenbach 153) regards as abbreviation of the frequent *Decminus* or *Decminius*. The basis is generally approached to Irish *dech-* (‘the best’), but the exact line of derivation remains uncertain, see below. Since *Dec(i)m-ius* remained unchanged throughout generations, it is – as *Arborius* – a good example for the “Neigung zum Festwerden” of patronymics (Weisgerber Ub. 138), while *Magnia* (ch. II.3) and *Veria* (see below) could indeed indicate the father’s name; in the case of *Censorius Magnus Ausonius*, the reference is apparently to the grandfather. AC

Accounting for its frequency and distribution in late Roman Gaul, *Decim(i)us* is likely to be a regionally appreciated Latin name or a CN. In favour of the latter a number of PNs with a first element *dek(k)-* can be pointed out, as e.g. *Decc(i)us*, *Deccavus*, *Deccosus* and the like, as well as a second element *-decae* (DSg.f.: KGPn 189), cf. Ogam -DECCAS (SOI 198). This has been explained on the basis of OIr. *dech* ‘better, best’, probably an ancient noun from IE **deḱ-* ‘be suitable, adapted’ (LEIA D-31, SOI 198, VGKS 2.124, ACS 1.1246, cf. G. δέκομαι, Lat. *decus*, *dignus*, IEW 189f.); the variant *dechmo-* is explained as an analogy to *iarmo-*. *dek(k)-* also resembles phonetically Gl. *decam* ‘ten’ (from IE **deḱm̥*), which, contrary to Latin, was not used in Gaulish anthroponymics as far as we know. The frequent *Decmin(i)us* may be related, too, but the ending poses some problems. A tempting suggestion would be an IE medial participle in *-*mh₁no-* (form after Klingenschmitt). But as this was no longer productive in Celtic and left only a few traces (VGKS 2.408 § 629, K.H. Schmidt, ‘Zur

⁵² Note that several *Decumani* in *Gallia Narbonensis* were called after the *legio decima* (cf. Kajanto Cogn. 74), but this cannot account for the *Decimii* all over the Celtic regions.

Entwicklung indogermanischer Partizipien im Keltischen’, *Balkansko ezikoznanie. Linguistique balkanique* 31, 1988, 25ff.), it is not a plausible solution. An alternative would be a nominal derivation in **-m-n-io-* or **-m̥nā* (VGKS 2.61f. §402,3–403) for *nomina agentis*, *actionis* and adjectives, e.g. OIr. *díl-main* ‘legitimate’, *men-me* ‘sense’, W. *kwyn-uan* ‘moan’. The problem with this is the exact phonetic rendering: *Decmino* requires **-men-*, written in Gl. *-men-/-min-*, but it is *-man-* from the zero grade **-m̥n̥* that is attested, cf. the examples above. In view of the variants in *-miano-*, *-milla-*, *-medo-* etc. (see above), it seems more plausible to separate the suffixes into *-m(o)-* and a second one, *-eno-*, *-iano-*, *-illo-*, *-ino-* etc. The *m*-suffixes are productive in Celtic as adjectival formants, and the second (compound) suffixes are common onomastic endings.— Schulze (cf. his index on p. 607, in particular CIL 9.3494 Q. *Tattio Decumedi f(ilio) Vestino*) claims Latin or Etruscan origin, the latter of which is quite improbable. JZ

16. Dryadia (3; C-G*): his maternal aunt, his sister and the latter’s daughter. *Dryadia* is the female equivalent to the latinised *Arborius* (see above). As no other record of this pseudo-Greek PN is extant, its Gaulish origin is all the more obvious. Noteworthy, however, is a passage in the *Historia Augusta*, 30 (V. Car.) 14.2–15.5: *Dryas quaedam mulier* is said to have prophesied Diocletian’s accession to the throne (A.D. 284) *apud Tungros in Gallia* in around 270. The author wrote in the 390s, not under Diocletian or Constantine, as he purports. Being renowned for everything else than reliability, it is rather dubious that his grandfather had come to know this story by Diocletian himself. But even though the account seems to be fictitious, it is still remarkable, because the *Scriptor Historiae Augustae* is believed to have been an acquaintance (?pupil) of Ausonius and may well have known about the *nomen Dryadiae* altogether with its implications. The most detailed identikit of the *scriptor* has been drawn by T. Honoré: *Law in the Crisis of Empire 379–455 AD*, Oxford 1998, 191–95 (with further literature). AC

The name can be taken both as an assonance as well as a semantic rendering. A phonetic similarity can be seen to *druid-* ‘druid(ess)’ (DLG 149f.) or a derivative **druidia* ‘(female) pertaining to a druid’. This is all the more plausible because in late antique literature, some confusion can be observed between *druidae* ‘druids’ (esp. female ones) and *dryades* (from Greek *δρυάς*) ‘wood nymphs’. Holder (ACS 1.1329f., s.v. *Dryadae*, *Drysadae*) already noted Aurelian. (44.4–5, after Asclepiodotus) and Aurelius Victor (De Caesaribus 4.2: *druidarum* [Schott; *drysadarum* Ms. O, *drysudarum* Ms. P] *famosae superstitiones*). On the rôle of female sorcerers in Gallo-Roman society, see e.g. Lambert’s comments on the plomb du Larzac (LG 160–172). The most plausible explanation of the word ‘druid’ is a compound **d(e)ru-* ‘tree, oak’ and **wid-* ‘know(ing)’, i.e. the one with the knowledge of the tree(s), whereby ‘tree’ either refers to the ‘cosmic tree’ (Delamarre 1999, 32–38) or is a *pars pro toto* for medical and divinatory plants.— The derivation of *Dryadia* is more likely to be sought in a *io*-stem from G. *δρυάς*, *-άδος* than in Gaulish. There are, it is true, *-ad*-suffixes in the Celtic languages (VGKS 2.27–29 refers to Ir. adjectives in *-de* < **(a)d-io-*, and there are verbal nouns and abstract formations in *-ad-*), but clear examples from Gaulish seem to be missing. Hypothetically, though, a Gl. base **dru-ad-iā* ‘pertaining to (an attribute of) a tree’ could have existed. This ‘attribute’ may even be a designation of the nymphs of woods and groves who were an essential part of the ancient Celtic as well as the Mediterranean religion. JZ

17. Euromius (?Euronius) (1; ?R-G*): first son-in-law. Editors are probably right in correcting the transmitted *Euronius* into *Euromius*. The search for any other attestation of either form was a frustrating undertaking, again: Foraboschi 115 offers one single record for Εὔρωμος as PN on a door lintel near Meir in Egypt (SB 8928), while P-B (‘durch Stärke glänzend’) and LGPN 1 explain the same as toponym of Cyrenaica (an inhabitant of the latter was called Εὐρωμεύς). Cf. also the PN Εὐρωμοκλῆς evidenced in Thebes (Greek: LGPN 1). However, *Euromius* rather seems to be a pseudo-Greek name, probably related to the first element of the compound *Euro-rix* (Lyon: CIL 13.2530), see *Regulus* for *-rix*. AC

A base *eur-* has been suggested for Gl. *eurises* ‘dedicants, donators’ (RIG 2/1.170–175) and W. *(hen)-ur-(iad)* ‘senator’ (GPC 2.1853), but the explanation is far from being certain. The suggestions range from a nominal form of the verb *ieuru* ‘dedicavit’, such as participial **pe-por-wes-es* ‘donators (= who hand over *vel sim.*)’, to the tentative base of a comparative *eur-is-* ‘senior’ (see DLG 169). A reduplicated form **pe-por-*, however, cannot account for the element *euro-* in the compound PN *Euro-rix*.— The Εὔρωμος attested in Middle Egypt could even be a name combining G. εὖ ‘good’ and Egyptian *rōmā* ‘man, human’ (Coptic ΡΩΜΕ, ΡΩΜΙ), cf. Εὐάνωρ, Εὐήνωρ with G. ἀνῆρ ‘man’, but this is only a suggestion and does not affect the interpretation of the name *Euromius* in the present context. JZ

18. Eusebius (1; ?C-G): great-grandfather of Veria Liceria, the wife of Ausonius’ nephew. AC

The origin of this name is probably not to be sought in a Celtic context since it is widespread in the Empire and particularly in Italy and the East. But its significance, derived from εὐσεβής ‘pious’, is similar to that of Gaulish names with the elements *devo-* ‘god’ (DLG 142f., ACS 1.1274–1276, KGPN 190f., 194, GPN 191f.: *Devus*, *Devonia*, *Devillius*, *Devo-gnata*, *Sacro-divus*, *Dio-carus* etc., cf. also *dīivio-* ‘divine’, DLG 145), *sacro-* ‘consecrated’, ‘cursed’ (DLG 264f.), *vindo-* ‘white’, ‘brilliant’, ‘holy’ (DLG 320f., see below, *Sanctus*), perhaps *matu-* ‘good’, ‘favorable’ (DLG 221) and the like. Thus, a synonymy with genuine Gaulish names can be clearly observed. JZ

19. Flavius (1; [?C-]L®): husband of his sister-in-law Pudentilla. The *nomen gentile* was a common IN since Constantius I (293–306) and thus became very widespread. See ch. II.3 and cf. CLRE 36–40 on the *nomen Flavii*, further Alföldy 38ff. AC

Flāvus ‘golden or reddish yellow’ resembles common colour terms in Celtic onomastics like **mell(it/in)-* ‘yellow’ (colour of honey, see below, *Melania*) and *roudos* ‘red’ (DLG 263, IEW 872), cf. PNs *Roudius*, *Ande-roudos* etc., which was still popular as PNs in medieval Ireland and Wales, *Ruadh* and *Rhudd*.— There is a remote phonetic similarity to Gl. *blāro-* ‘grey’ (DLG 77f.), which is etymologically related (IE **bhleh₃-* + *-wo-/ro-*, LIV 88, IEW 160, LEW 513f., cf. also Lat. *Flōrus*), cf. OIr. *blár*, W. *blawr* (LEIA B-57) and to the unrelated **blāto-* ‘flower’ (DLG 78, against P. Schrijver probably from **bhleh₃-*, LIV 88, IEW 122, LEIA B-58, cf. OIr. *bláth*, W. *blawd*, OCo. *blodon*), perhaps in PN *Blotu-rix* (DAG 806). JZ

20. Herculanus (1; L®): the son of his sister and of *Pomponius Maximus* was called *Pomponius Maximus Herculanus*. The combination of the *cognomina* seems to recall the emperor *Aurelianus Valerius Maximianus Herculus* (285–310), see ch. II.3. AC

Notwithstanding this, Hercules was a popular god among the Gauls; more than 300 reliefs and more than 250 dedications to him are known. In literary texts, he is a famous culture hero and founder e.g. of Alesia. If Lucianus can be trusted, he is the *Interpretatio Romana* of a native divinity, Ogmios, who is held to be a god of the netherworld and probably also the first human being (Birkhan 1997, 563–570; B. Maier, *Lexikon der keltischen Religion und Kultur*, Stuttgart 1994, 165f.). JZ

21. Hesperius (1; R-C-G-G): second son. See *Ausonius* and ch. II.2.

22. a) Hilaria (1; [?C-]L): maternal aunt. The explanation of this name in Parent. 6 as an *agnomen*, i.e. a name accepted or given later in one’s life, is at least doubtful, because she was called so already *in cunis* (for an interpretation of the poem cf. *Gens* 222 n. 109). A family tradition is therefore more likely, which is further supported by the prosopographical evidence, see b). The name *Hilarus* (or Ἠλαρος) and its derivatives were frequent throughout the empire (cf. Kajanto *Cogn.* 260f. for some statistical information), so that the assonance to Celtic *ill(i)o*-names need not be significant. AC

22. b) Hilarianus (1; [?C-]L): his son Decimius *Hilarianus* Hesperius became *proconsul Africae* 375–76 and *ppo* 376–79. There is conclusive evidence to link Decimius Hilarianus Hilarius *proconsul Africae* 376/78 and *praefectus urbis Romae* 383 to the family of Aemilia Corinthia Maura as well, cf. CIL 8,1219=14398 and CTh 5,1,3 *ad Hilarianum pu.* I still argue that he was *ppo Galliarum* 383 in *Gens* 142 n. 93; however, my latest research on the prefectures lends strong support to the transmitted title, cf. my forthcoming prosopography of the office holders of the emperor Gratian. AC

As /h/ does not have phonemic status in Gaulish, an assonance to the frequent PN element *ill(i)o*- with unknown meaning (DLG 189) is imaginable, e.g. in *Illos*, *Illio/us*, *Illia*, *Illio*, *Ilidius*, *Iliatus*, and compound *Illio-marus*, *Illo-vico* (ACS 2.33–35, KGPN 225, GPN 354–356), cf. also *Hilari-clus* (CIL 11.11575) and *Elari-acus* (ACS 1.1412). *Hilarianus* and *Hilaricius*, together with *Avitus*, are mentioned in a dedication from the sanctuary of the Seine sources (CIL 13.11575) which gives the impression that the shrine operated in native Gaulish tradition (see above s.v. Avitianus). JZ

23. Idalia (1; C-L-G*): cousin through his paternal aunt Iulia Veneria (Parent. 27f.). Her *cognomen* evidently transposes the motif of the Roman goddess *Venus* to the Greek *Aphrodite*, who was famous for her cult places on mount Ida in Cyprus (Verg. *Aen.* 1.681, 693, 5.760 *Venus Idalia*). The name appears to be a spontaneous creation, as an influence by the rare Greek PNs Ἰδάλιος (Egypt, 3rd/2nd cent. B.C.: SB I.3480), Ἰδαλιανός (3rd/4th cent. A.D.: P.Athen. 67), and *Idalius* (Pompeji, ca. 1st cent. B.C./A.D.: CIL 4.4787) is rather improbable. But a possible (onomastic) connection to CIL 13.1322 (Le Berry = Ager Biturigum Cuborum) cannot be ruled out: the complete inscription is given as IDALLVS, whereas the editor admits that the letters are very difficult to read. Thus *Idalius* is not excluded. Cf. also the late attestation of *Cypris* in Dalmatia (CIL 3.1723, Alföldy 184). AC

An assonance to sporadic PNs like *Idallus* or *Idalius* (CIL 13.1322) or the *Idbanæ deae*, river names as *Idanus*, *Idasa*, *Idenna*, *Idonea*, *Idunum* (ACS 2.25–27) can be observed but it is not at all clear if they have a bearing on the PN in question here; cf. further the PN element *iedu*- (ACS 2.27). JZ

24. a) Iulius, -a (6; L®): his father and three of the latter’s siblings; also his sister and his cousin. The frequency of this *nomen gentile* in Gallia Cis- and Transalpina is

undoubtedly due to C. Iulius Caesar, Augustus and Tiberius (58 B.C.-A.D. 37); but these rulers alone cannot explain the continued popularity until the end of antiquity. Of further importance may have been four Severan empresses and princesses (193-235), C. Iulius Verus Maximinus Thrax (235-38), M. Iulius Philippus Arabs (244-49), while its revival in the family of Constantine (two siblings, three children) is probably too late to account for the evidence in the *gens Ausoniana*, unless one follows Kienast in ascribing the *nomen Iulii* also to Constantius Chlorus himself. AC

Weisgerber (Ub. 176f., also 127f.) claims the influence of a similar Celtic basis with regard to its above-average use in the according regions (for the dissemination cf. also Alföldy 31ff. and Mócsy 50ff.). However, *Iulius* and its derivatives probably always refer to the well known Roman gentile name, on which PNs like *Iuliacus*, *Iuliccus*, *Iuliacus*, *Iullicus*, *Iuliniacum* are Gaulish coinings; *Iulio-bona*, *Iulio-briga* (Spain) and *Iulio-magus* (ACS 2.86–88) are even directly connected with the name (and worship) of the Conqueror. At most, one could think of the frequent PN element *ill(i)o-* with unknown meaning (DLG 189), see above s.v. *Hilarianus*, but the assonance here is rather vague. The same holds true for *valos* and *ulatos* ‘sovereign, prince’, especially because the initial *u-* of the last has consonantic value (**wlatos*, cf. PN *Ulatucia/Flatucia*, OIr. *flaith* ‘sovereignty’ < **wlatis*, DLG 323). AC/JZ

24. b) Iulianus (1; L®): the first father-in-law of Ausonius’ daughter, thus no descendant of the above-mentioned *Iulii*. Didius Iulianus was too early (193), the Apostate too late (355-63) to speak of an IN; unimportant 3rd-century usurpers outside Gaul (cf. Kienast 392, 394) are neither taken into account. Its qualification as IN is thus due to the basic form *Iulius*.

25. Latinus (1; C-L®): his first son-in-law was Valerius *Latinus* Euromius. A possible connection to the Gallic usurper M. Cassianus *Latinus* Postumus A.D. 360-69 has already been discussed (see ch. II.3). In both cases, influence of Gaulish *lātis* (cf. OIr. *láith*) (‘hero’) is very probable (cf. ACS 2.150ff. on *Lat*-names; *Latinus* is labeled “teils lat., teils kelt.”), in particular with regard to the dissemination (cf. Lochner-von-Hüttenbach 154 on the frequency in Gaul and Noricum); cf. also compounds such as *Ando-latus* and *Sego-latius*. Might the academic milieu of teachers of Latin have favoured the choice of this name additionally? Although Euromius’ father is not recorded to have been a professor, one could refer to Ausonius’ former *rhetor* (Aus. Prof. 2 on *Latinus Alcimus Alethius*) as well as to his younger friend *Drepanius Latinus Pacatus*, also a rhetorician (Pan. Lat. 2, Aus. praef. 4, Tech. 1). AC

Even such a ‘typically Roman’ name like *Latinus* could have been taken as a CN because of its assonance to Gaulish onomastics. *lātis* ‘hero’ (DLG 197f., cf. OIr. *láith* ‘hero’, ‘warrior’) is known in compound PNs, *Escengo-latis*, *Anextlo-lati-*, *Ando-latius* etc. (KGPN 229, GPN 216 and examples above), and derivative endings *-ino-* etc. are common PN suffixes. JZ

26. Liceria (1; ?C*): wife of his nephew Arborius. Ellis Evans (GPN 360f., with a discussion of possible etymologies in n. 6) comments on *Licnos*: “The name is probably Celtic, but I think that we must concede with Rhys that it is of obscure origin”. Cf. also ACS 1.208 on *Licerius*, though without explicit statement on the origin. Schulze 31 and Alföldy 230f. claim Illyrian origin. But Delamarre plausibly explains *lic(c)a* as ‘pierre plate’, see below. Note that the name *Likinos* frequently figures in a bronze tablet from Contrebia Belaisca (*Botorrita*, near Zaragoza: Beltrán Lloris 142, 144) which predates

70 B.C. Cf. also *Liccus*, *Liccaeus*, *Licontius* etc. in the indexes of CIL 3, 12, 13, although several such names are also attested in Rome. AC

Liceria/-us seem to have the same basis as widespread PNs like *Liccus*, *Licas*, *Licca*, *Licco*, *Licaios*, *Liccaeus*, *Licontius*, *Licinos*, *Licnos*, *Licovius* etc. (ACS 2.206–212). The derivation of the name is uncertain (GPN 360f.), the most convincing one being Delamarre’s etymology (DLG 201). According to him, the etymon is Celtic **(φ)likā* ‘plate’ (perhaps referring to the shape of the face?), cf. the toponym *Are-lica* (Lake Garda), and with expressively reduplicated -cc- Mlr. *lecc* ‘flagstone’, W. *llech* ‘slab’, ‘flag’, ‘slate’ etc. Celtic **(φ)likā* derives from **p_lkā*, the root is IE **plek-* ‘broad’, ‘flat’ (LIV 485 bottom, G. πλάξ, [IEW 831]).— Further examples with a similar reference to materials are e.g. the PNs Ogam OTTINN (?OIr. *othan*) ‘stone’ and IARNI ‘iron’ (SOI 89, 187, 219).— An alternative would be a connection to Gl. *liciati-* or *liđati-* ‘sorcerer working with the script’ (LG 166, DLG 202), *licina*, *lissina* ‘sorcery’. *liciati-* has been linked to Lat. *līcium* ‘thread’, *licinus* ‘bent upwards’, but the IE roots **leik-*, **lek-* ‘bend’ (IEW 669, 673) are problematic (see LIV 411: **lek-* “die Gliedmaßen bewegen [?]”). Pokorny thought of a “Gutturalerweiterung” of **el-*, (*e*)*lei-* ‘bend’ (IEW 309) in Lat. *oblīquus* and *līcium*, perhaps W. *llwyg* ‘balky horse’ (**lei-ko-*), Br. *loeg-rin* ‘to look at s.o. askance’. JZ

27. Lucanus, a (4; ?C-L): first *cognomen* of his wife, father-in-law, sister-in-law, and his *consobrinus*. Lochner-von-Hüttenbach 154 explains its popularity in Celtic regions with reference to names as *Lucco*, *Lucconius*, *Lucterius*; cf. further *Lucius*, *Lucrius*, *Lucullus*. For further *Luc*-names and their dissemination predominantly in Celtic regions cf. Alföldy 232f., ACS 2.278, 300-01, 296, GPN 363, DAG 83, 139, 224, 420 n. XXVII, 874 n. XLIX etc. AC

The etymology of Gl. *Luc(c)*-names is not quite clear because there are at least three possible derivations:— (1) zero grade **luk-* from **leuk-* ‘shine, be brilliant’, which could result in a literal meaning ‘the shining, bright one’.— (2) It could be an IE designation of the lynx, from the same root (cf. W-Grm. **luh-su-*, Lith. *lúšis*), see P. Anreiter (‘Indogermanische Therionyme’, in: P. Anreiter, L. Bartosiewicz, E. Jerem, W. Meid [eds.], *Man and the animal world. in memoriam S. Bökönyi*, Budapest 1998, 591–592).— (3) It could be a metathesized variant of IE **w_lk^wos* ‘wolf’, **luk^wos*, with delabialized **k^w* in Gaulish (as in Brittonic), **lukos*, opposite to Goidelic which still shows Ogam LUQIN ‘little wolf’ (SOI 200, DLG 210 with reference to McCone, Ériu 36, 1985, 171-76: PNs *Olc(án)*, *Lochán*, *Luchar*, OIr. *olc* ‘villain’). Since the wolf has a reputation in Celtic and IE as a symbol of the warrior or persons outside society, the high frequency of *Luc(c)*-names may be seen in this context.

PNs like *Lucotios* and Λουκοτικνός probably must be distinguished from these roots altogether. The most reasonable explanation for these is Celtic **lukot-* ‘mouse’ (cf. W. *llyg*, pl. *llygod*, Ir. *luch*, gen. *lochad*, DLG 210), either again from IE **leuk-* (meaning?) or from IE **pel-* ‘grey’, cf. Lith. *pelė*, Latvian *pele* ‘mouse’. JZ

28. Magnus (3; C-L®): first *cognomen* of Ausonius, his maternal uncle and his first grandson, but not evidenced for his nephew Arborius as commonly held (cf. *Gens* 181f.). While his younger nephew *Maximus* was given the name of his father, the niece *Megentira* might have merged both onomastic lines (see *ad locos*).

Although *Magnus* became an important IN only in mid-/late-4th-century Gaul (M. Magnentius, M. Maximus), various related forms were already used by previous emperors, cf. *Macrinus* (217-18), Severus Alexander (also *Magnus* since ca. 230),

Maximinus Thrax (235-38), Pupienus *Maximus* (238), *Magnia* Urbica (283-85), before superlative forms became more frequent in the tetrarchic period (various *Maximiani* and one *Maxentius*).

But the predilection of *Magnus* in Gaul is probably due to the significance of *māro*- in Celtic compound PNs. Cf. KGPN 238 and GPN 223-28 on *māro*-; Alföldy 235 on the dissemination of *Magnus* and *Macrinus*; Heinzelmänn 1982, 642f. for a selective prosopography of Gauls. In the patronymic *Magnius* Celtic influence is obvious as well, while *Macrinus* and *Macrobius* (in form of a compound) transpose the motif into Greek. While Weisgerber (Rhen. 224, 380, Ub. 181, also Lochner-von-Hüttenbach 155) repeatedly accounts for *Marus*, *Marius* and *Marinus*, he only once states in passing that *Magnus* has a “nicht zu übersehenden einheimischen Einschlag” (Rhen. 224). A look at the regionally specified top-25 list of PNs lends additional support: while neither of these names was fashioned among the Ubii and Treveri, *Marius* (8 ×) as well as *Magnus* (4 ×) are included in the list of the Mediomatrici. AC

Assonance as well as homonymy is present in Gl. *magi(o)*- ‘great’ (DLG 213), in PNs *Magius*, *Magia*, *Maginus*, *Magiononus*, *Magissa*, *Magidius/ia*, PIN *Magio-durum* (now Morre, Doubs), cf. OIr. *maige* ‘great’, *magd(a)e* ‘great, vaste’ (from **magidio*-, LEIA M-10) and in particular, the derivative *maglos*, *magalos* ‘prince’ (DLG 213), in PNs *Magalu* (dat.), *Megal(i)us*, *Maglus*, *Maglocune* (dat.), *Io-maglius*, *Seno-magli* (gen.), OIr. *mál* ‘prince’, ‘chief’, W. composites *Broch-mael*, *Hen-mael*, all from IE **meǵ(h)*- ‘great, big’ (IEW 709). This association is further corroborated by the frequency of the second component of Gl. PNs, *māros* ‘great’, ‘big’, which was used occasionally as a first element as well, e.g. in *Maro-boduos* and the PIN *Maro-budon* (or *Maro-bunon*, Ptol.).

A connection to the neuter *s*-stem *magos* ‘field’ (DLG 214) seems improbable since the noun does occur but in toponyms. A relation to *magus* ‘servant, child’ (DLG 214, LEIA M-70, cf. OIr. *mug*, Co. *maw*, Br. *mao*, W. *meudwy* ‘God’s servant’, from IE **maghu*-, IEW 696), as in PNs *Magus*, *Magusius*, *Magulla*, *Magunia*, *Magunus*, *Magurix*, *Magurius* etc. (ACS 2.386, KGPN 235, GPN 221f.) would be semantically possible but unlikely in view of the formal derivation.— There is also a slight possibility for the existence, in Gaulish, of a lexeme **magnon* ‘stone’ (pl. *magnīā*) which is known from Brittonic, W. *maen* (pl. *mein*), OBr. *main* ‘stone’ (< IE **maǵ-no*- ‘kneaded, formed’ [cf. LIV 421, IEW 696f.]: E. Hamp, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 79, 1974, 158–160, LEIA M-9), on PNs of this kind, see above, *Liceria*. JZ

29. Maura (1; [?C-]L[®]): maternal grandmother. Various reasons can be hypothesised for the choice of this PN. Certainly, the aetiology given in Parent. 5.3f. may simply be followed: *nomen huic iocularis datum, cute fusca quod olim / aequales inter Maura vocata fuit*. But it is not cogent to take the allusion to her dark skin seriously or as the only level of explanation (see n. 34 and *Hilaria*), since the name may have been inherited as well. Both explanations are compatible with the tentative assumption of kinship with the emperor *Aemilius Aemilianus* (see ch. II.3).

Independently from such connections, the motif of darkness played an important rôle in Celtic *dubno*-compounds, most prominently in *Dumnorix*. The basis originally signifies ‘deep’ (< IE **dh(e)ub*-, Germ. *tief*), but also relates to the underworld, which further entails the connotation of ‘darkness’. Cf. IEW 264, 267, DLG 151f.; for several PNs cf. KGPN 199, GPN 74, 196f., LEIA D-167. Onomatologists have already recognised that this theme is frequently hidden behind the pseudo-Roman *cognomina* *Dubius*, *Dubitanus*, and *Dubitatus* (e.g. Weisgerber Ub. 357, Lochner-von-Hüttenbach

154, Alföldy 253 for Italy and all Celtic regions); but the possibility of translating it into *Niger*, *Maurus*, and the like has not yet been considered, although these names were also wide-spread in Celtic regions. The motif of darkness might even be repeated in the name *Melania* (Maura’s granddaughter), at least according to one possible interpretation of the latter’s name.

However, given the various possibilities, it is more cautious to categorise *Maura* as of potential Celtic origin only. AC

Although an assonance of Latin *Maura* in its late pronunciation [ˈmɔːra] to Gl. *māra* ‘great one (f)’ cannot be ruled out, a synonymic relationship is more probable. As *Maura* means ‘the black, dark one’ and is associated with *fuscus* in Parent., the name could also be explained as a CN of the Gl. PN element *dubus* ‘black, dark’ (DLG 152f.: fem. *dubuī* → *dubī(s)*, E. Hamp, *Études celtiques* 25, 1988, 127f.) deriving from IE **dhubh-* present in Gl. river names as *Dubis* (Doubs), **Dubīnā* (*Dheune*) etc., and PNs *Dubn(i)a*, *Dubnacus*, *Dubnorix*, *Cogidubnus*, *Dagodubnus* etc., some also recorded with *-dobno-* (GPN 393). One has to be cautious, however, since an appellation referring to physical appearance such as the colouring of the skin is equally present in Latin and many other onomastic traditions. A further, interesting association pertains to the Gaulish religious sphere. It has been shown that the assonantic word *dub-nos* ‘deep’ from IE **dheub-* (DLG 151f., IEW 267) in all probability refers to the netherworld, particularly in formations like *Dubno-rix* (on coin legends, *Dumnorix* in literary texts), ‘king of the deep (realm = underworld)’, as opposed to *Albio-rix* ‘king of the bright (realm = heaven)’. This is all the more probable because of several other PNs relating to cosmological concepts, see below s.v. *Melania*. JZ

30. Maximus (2; L®): his brother-in-law and the latter’s son were called *Pomponius Maximus (Herculanus)*. The first *cognomen* is therefore not to be explained as a derivation (superlative) from Decimius *Magnus Ausonius*’ name, but is somehow related to the emperor *M. Aurelius Valerius Maximianus Herculus* (see ch. II.3). Cf. also other tetrarchic emperors who did not rule in Gaul though: *Galerius Maximianus*, *Maximinus Daia*, *Maxentius* and his children. But note also the imperial titulature: emperors were *pontifices maximi* since Augustus, and *maximus* frequently qualified titles of victories (such as *Germanicus*) since the 2nd century. Cf. also Alföldy 242: ‘Das häufigste Cognomen im ganzen Römischen Reich’. AC

Unlike the positive *māros* ‘great’, the superlative degree (from **mā-* [?], a Caland variant without *-ro-*) seems not to have been used in Gaulish onomastics, where comparison is often expressed analytically by means of prefixes like *ad-*, *ate-*, *com-*, *ro-*, *ver-* etc. (DLG 31, 57, 121f., 261f., 314, KGPN 60–63). See further above, s.v. *Magnus*. JZ

31. Megentira (1; [?C/?L]-C*): niece of Decimius *Magnus Ausonius*, but also daughter of *Pomponius Maximus*. Peiper takes *Megentira* as a Greek PN modelled after *Magnus* (see under *Arboreus*). It certainly resembles the noun *μεγέθη* (< adj. *μεγᾶς*, Latin *magnus*), and one could further relate it to the hellenised Gaulish PNs *Megethius* (CIL 13.5397) and *Megarus* (CIL 13.3233); but *Megentira* is entirely unparalleled, so it is probably no Greek CN. Holder relates it to *maginti*, cf. ACS 2.529 (unfortunately without discussion) and Morlet 2.72, 3.402–4 for according compounds and derivatives). But alternatively, *magu-* (on which cf. GPN 221f.: ‘youth’, ‘slave vassal’ as in *Magunna*, *Magunus*, *Magunt*) and *magio-* (‘big’, as in *Magius/-a*, *Magissa* etc.) deserve consideration: in the former case, the same motif as in *Aeonia* might be assumed, while

in the latter, it is allowed to speculate, whether the superlative of the paternal line of descent (Maximus) and the positive of the maternal line (Magnus) have been deliberately merged to an equative adjective, see below for further details. AC

The most probable etymology for *Megentira* seems to be a relation to words derived from IE **meg(h)-* ‘great’, ‘big’ (IEW 708f., cf. Skt. *maha(nt)-*, G. μέγα [**meg-η*], Lat. *magnus* etc.). Derivatives with *n*-suffixes are not confined to Latin and Greek, but are also present in Celtic, as Mlr. *maignech* (< **maginiākos*, IEW 709, LEIA M-10) and the Gl. PN *Maginus* (DLG 214, s.v. *magi(o)-*), both show *magin-*. There are different formations as well, e.g. the *mag-io-* just mentioned, and **mag-id-io-* in OIr. *magdae* (LEIA M-58) and Gl. PN *Magidius*. From *magin-*, a Celtic equative form in *-tero-*, originating from an IE distributive category (VGKS 2.118, cf. Ir. *léir* : *léirithir* ‘as sedulous as’), could have been derived, resulting in **mag-in-terā* ‘the bigger one (of two), as big as (someone else)’; cf. G. forms like μέλαντερος + dat. ‘as black as’. This comes very close to the transmitted form, *Megentira*, particularly if the allophonic sound [ɪ] from /e/, written <e, i> before liquids and nasals and [æ] from /a/, written <e, a> in similar contexts (next to nasal [ʔ], cf. K. McCone, *Phonology*, 56f., cf. *Magina* / *Megina*, *Magina* / *Meginensis* ACS 2.377, 529) are taken into account: **[mæɡintira:]* could well be written *Megentira*. Holder’s (ACS 2.529) *magintiis* perhaps also meant to be derivative from *magin-*, see above. JZ

32. Melania (1; C*): his sister (*ca. 310 A.D.). There are only two other *Melaniae* known until the 4th century; the illustrious Christian ascet Melania the Elder from Spain (*ca. 340 A.D.) and her likewise prominent granddaughter (PLRE 1.592f.). Moreover, as reference books on Greek onomastics offer only a few examples for the similar Μελαίνη/Μελαινίς (‘Black’), Celtic influence may even be considered for these, all the more because such a connection seems even to be hinted at in CIL 6.38404: *Gallia Cn. l. Surisca, Gallia C. l. Melaene*. The other two are CIL 6.24552 *Pompeia Melaenis* (see also below on *Pomponius*) and 23097 *Novia Melaenis*. Morlet 2.78 further refers to two 6th-century Gallic bishops called *Melanius* (Duchesne 1.232, 2.340); I cannot decide whether this reflects Celtic or Christian tradition going back to Saint Melania.

Celtic regions offer a variety of *mel*-names, e.g. *Melanio* (CIL 13.1729), *Melausus* (13.11351), ?*Melanasius* (13.4273), *Melenio* (RIB 2.2501.377), *Meliuna/Melluna* (RIB 2.2417.25); one may also add the *cognomen* of the 1st-century Latin geographer *Pomponius Mela* from Tingentera (?Algeciras near Gibraltar); cf. ACS 2.531 and Weisgerber *Rhen.* 144f. (*Melania* is not mentioned). Among the numerous possible etymologies (for which see below), the most attractive for *Melania* seem to be the derivation from ‘dark-coloured’ or ‘honey-coloured’. In the former case, the onomastical theme already attested in her grandmother’s *cognomen Maura* would have been resumed. AC

PNs beginning with *mel(an)-* most likely come from IE **mélit* ‘honey’ (gen. *melnés*, IEW 724), cf. Ir. *mil* (gen. *mela*), W. *mel*, Gl. PNs *Su-meli*, Μελλι-γιννα, *Cat-melus*, *Melito* (KGPN 242, GPN 114f., DLG 224), or its derivatives, respectively. (1) Most probable is *melinos* ‘yellowish’ (W. *melyn*), PNs *Melinus*, *Melina* (DAG 575, DLG 224), perhaps *Melinthus* (CIL 13.4672 Metz). The late antique *Corpus glossariorum latinorum* 5.371.11 (ed. Löwe & Götz; Thes. 107) has *melinus* .i. *color nigrus* ‘i.e. black colour’ which has been rejected on account of its assonance to G. μέλας, but in the light of Skt. *malinā-* ‘dark-coloured, impure’, Lith. *mėlynas* ‘blue’ besides G. μέλας ‘black’, the notion of a filthy (?) dark colour of *melinos*, too, cannot be ruled out. (2)

Another derivative is *meliddos*, *melissos* (DLG 224), *melissi-* ‘sweet, pleasant’, cf. Ir. *milis*, W. *melys*, Gl. PNs *Melissus*, *Meliddius*, *Melissius*, *Mellisus*, *Melledo*, *Melonius*, *Melus* etc. (cf. GPN 115). (3) A third derivative is *melatia*, *melic-* ‘larch tree’ (DLG 224, **mel-* : FEW 6/1.654) in PINs *Meletum*, **Meletium* and PNs *Melicios*, *Melatio*; Ellis Evans (GPN 367 n. 6) compares *Melainus*, *Melus*, and ?*Melatio* in Graufesenque.

Less likely are relations to the verbal root IE **melh₂-* ‘grind’ (LIV 432f., IEW 716f.), cf. OIr. *melid* ‘grinds’ (LEIA M-32), Gl. **mel-* ‘to crush’ (FEW 6/1.653f.), Ir. *mell* ‘destruction’ (**mel-so-*, LEIA M-33) and derivatives in *-*d/-dh-* as **meldos* ‘tender, soft’ (Ir. *meld*, Gl. *Meldius*, Μέλδοι, *Meldi*, LEIA M-33f., Thes. 106f.), as well as to a lexeme **mel-no-*, assimilated to *mello-* ‘round object, (round) hill etc.’, Ir. *me(a)ll* (LEIA M-33), perhaps in Gl. *Mello-dunum*, and *Mello-sedum*, *Mello-bo[dus]* (Thes. 107, with reference to Tabula Peutingeriana IIA1, CIL 13.2801). JZ

33. Minucius (1; ?C-L): husband of Ausonius’ sister-in-law Talisia. There is plenty of evidence in Rome for this *nomen gentile*, although its frequency in Late Antiquity was probably much lower than in earlier centuries, at least according to the poor number of entries in PLRE. With regard to the remarkable combination *Minucius Regulus*, I spontaneously hypothesised that these two names might reflect a Celtic compound denoting ‘underking’, but this concept was not typical of Gaul. In contrast, Gallic ‘kings’ usually commanded small units, while they were subjected to ‘overkings’; cf. the according PNs *Vortigern* ‘over-lord’, *Vertamos* ‘the Uppermost’, *R(h)iotamus* ‘Most Royal’, further Birkhan 1997, 995f. However, the search for an ‘underking’ yielded at least one example: *Advorix* (‘Under-by-king’), cf. KGPN 117, 299f., GPN 288f.

At any rate, the variety of *Minu-*names in Celtic regions suggests to posit a development independent from Latin *Minucius*, cf. *Minua*, *Minno*, *Minius*, *Minicius*, *Minetus*, *Minatius*, *Minusonius*, *Minusilla*, and *Minister* in CIL 13. As they may imply the theme of sweetness (see below), it is tempting to posit that one of *Minucius Regulus*’ ancestors bore the compound PN *Suadurix* (‘sweet king’ or, according to DLG 284, KGPN 273, ‘who is full of sweetness’) or the like. Contrary to this line of the argument, the diminutive *Regulus* rather seems to have been induced by the Latin meaning of *Minucius*. Similarly, the new significance of a CN was influential in the cases of *Ausonius* (cf. *Hesperius*) and *Veneria* (cf. *Idalia*). AC

The original meaning of the Latin PN *Minucius* may have no longer been clearly understood, but the phonetic proximity to Lat. *minuō* ‘to dwindle, decline’ was still recognizable. The Latin derives from the IE adjective **minH-u-* ‘small’ from the root **meiH-* ‘to dwindle, decline’ (LIV 427, IEW 711, LEW 92f.). (1a) Celtic cognates are Co. *minow* ‘diminish’, MBr. *myn-huigenn* ‘inside of the loaf (*mie de pain*)’ (IEW 711), perhaps OIr. *min* though *-i-* is problematic there, but Vendryes thinks positively about **minu-* “aussi en celtique” (LEIA M-52f.). (1b) The homophonous synonym **men-wo-* ‘small’ (IEW 728f.) is better attested in OIr. *menb*, W. *di-fanw* ‘unimportant’, *di-fenwi* ‘to diminish’ (LEIA M-37). Either form may be the base of (some of) the Gl. PNs.— (2) More likely, however, is an assonance to derivatives from the homophonous root IE **meiH-* ‘to mature, prosper’ (LIV 428, IEW 711f., cf. Hitt. *miyari* ‘is born’, ‘mature’ > ‘tender, soft’: Lat. *mītis*, Lith. *míelas*), cf. OIr. *mín*, W. *mwyn* ‘sweet, gentle’ (LEIA M-53). The meaning ‘sweet’ is present in Gaulish *minio-*, *meno-* (DLG 227f.), cf. PNs *Menos*, *Menio*, *Mena*, *Ad-minius*, *Co-minius*, *Min(n)ius*, *Minicius*, *Minicia*, *Minuso*, *Minna*, ?*Su-mena*, *Vi-minus* and PIN *Viminacium* (Spain/Illyricum) (DAG 219, 533, KGPN 243). JZ

34. Namia (1; C*): a sister-in-law of Ausonius was called Namia Pudentilla. Her name is certainly Gaulish, as numerous derivatives and compounds of *Namo*-names reveal: e.g., *Namius*, *Adnamatus*, *Adnam(i)us*, *Namio-rix*, ?Ναμαῖος, *Namo/u*, *Namonius*, *Namerius/ia*, *Namicus*, *Namilius*, *Namilianus*, *Namuso/a*, *Namuto/a*, *Namma*, *Namant(i)us*, *Namanto*, *Nammo*, *Nammius*, *Nammeius*, *Namminus*, *Nammonius*, *Nammavos* etc., cf. ACS 2.674–678, 681f., GPN 234–36, for Gallic *Namati(an)i* cf. Heinzelmänn 654f. At least in the case of *Namia*, the basis could possibly imply the motif of shyness or chastity, which is repeated and transformed into Latin in the second *cognomen Pudentilla*. AC

The etymology is uncertain.— (1) K.H. Schmidt (KGPN 246f.) suggests that *namo*-names are short forms of *namanto*-names (‘enemy’, cf. OIr. *námae*, gen. *námat*, LEIA N-2). This lexeme was seen as related to Lat. *amare* ‘love’ (~ *ne* + *amare*, see DLG 231), which seems, however, not to have any cognates in IE but is regarded as a derivate from baby talk **ama* or from Etruscan [?]. Cf. *Ad-namatus*, *Namant(i)us*, *Namanto* (KGPN 246f., GPN 234f.), which were seen as “in ihrer Bildung durch das Verhältnis *caro-* : *caranto-* beeinflusst” (KGPN 247). Though this is a plausible explanation, the great popularity of these PNs gives a reason to check other possibilities as well.— (2) Holder and Ellis Evans suggest a derivation from IE **nem-* ‘to allot’ (LIV 453, IEW 763), but the universal *-a-* requires zero grade **nṃ-* (> Celtic **nam-*) which is hard to accept in *Nam(i)us*, *Namo* etc. The same applies for the homophonous root **nem-* ‘to incline’ (LIV 453f., IEW 764). But there are several roots with post-vocalic laryngeal **h₂* or **h₃* which could account for **ā* in Celtic.— (3) IE **neh₂-* ‘to become anxious’ (LIV 449, IEW 754), in OIr. *nár* ‘modest, shy, timid’ (**nā-sro-*, LEIA N-3). **nā-mo-* ‘anxious, shy’ (< **h₂noh₃-mo-*) could be an adjectival formation. For other Gl. PNs referring to shame or shyness, see below Pudentilla.— (4) IE **h₂neh₃-* ‘to rebuke’ (LIV 282, IEW 779), cf. OIr. *-antar* ‘is chidden’ (C. Watkins, Ériu 19, 1962, 116–118), would result in Celt. **nā-* in non-final syllables, and *nā-mo-* could again be an adjective, ‘rebuking’, ‘scolding’. Mlr. *anim*, OW. *anamou* (pl.), W. *anaf*, MBr. *anaff* ‘flaw’ may be cognate (< **h₂nḥ₃-m-* ?).— (5) A relation to W. *naf* ‘lord’ remains doubtful (GPN 234).

Ordinal numbers do not seem to be used in Gaulish anthroponymics, such as Gl. *nametos* (from **naumetos*, cf. W. *nawfed*) ‘ninth’ (but see below, Pomponius). JZ

35. Pastor (1; [?C-JL): grandson. Kajanto Cogn. 323 simply classifies as ‘tender of animals’; it is the most common followed by *Asellio*. *Pastor* is not specifically Christian (only 15 out of 54 entries in CIL). The concrete genealogical reason for the choice is in all likelihood to be sought in the family of his unnamed mother. AC

Nothing can be established with certainty in this case. A close phonetic assonance could theoretically be a Gaulish noun **pas-t-* ‘cough’ (IE **k^weh₂s-* ‘cough’, LIV 377, IEW 649), which is attested in W. *pas* ‘cough’ (**k^wh₂s-t-*). A derivative of *pis-* ‘to see’ (from the zero grade of IE **k^wei-s-*, LIV 381f., IEW 637) seems too far-fetched.— Names with the literal meaning of Lat. *pastor*, on the other hand, do not seem to be attested in Gaulish onomastics (such as **-kolio-*, **-polio-* as in Mlr. *búachaill*, W. *bugail* ‘cow herd’, from IE **k^welh₁-* ‘to turn’, ‘move around’, LIV 386–388, IEW 639f., LEIA B-107). Notwithstanding this lack in our records, it would be tempting to consider if some *Pol(lio)-* or even *Col(lio)-*names (*Pol(l)iacus*, *Polinus*, *Polinacus*, *Pollux*, ACS 2.1029f., *Colius*, *Colia*, *Collo*, ACS 1.1066) could possibly be related to the motif

of ‘herdsman’ or ‘guardian’ (cf., however, LEIA C-283 for different meanings of **k^wolu-* > OIr. *cul* ‘cart’, Lat. *colus* ‘distaff’, **k^wolo-* > G. *πόλος* ‘axe’). JZ

36. Paulinus (3; [?C-JL®): the name was quite common among noblemen of Aquitaine, cf. the famous *Pontii Paulini* who gained the consulship in A.D. 325 and 334; their most prominent offspring is Meropius Pontius Paulinus who became proconsul of Campania 380-81 and bishop of Nola in Campania 408/13-31. It is possible that Paulinus, the husband of Ausonius’ niece Megentira, belonged to the same family, but other evidence to confirm this hypothesis is missing; the two names transmitted for their children are not conclusive: *Dryadia* and *Paulinus*. Ausonius’ grandson through his daughter and Thalassius was called *Paulinus* as well (he was born in Pella and bequeathed an autobiography written in A.D. 460, hence *Paulinus of Pella*). For the background of his name see *Talisius*. The name is also attested for *Caecilia Paulina*, the wife of Maximinus Thrax (235-38) and *Aurelia Paulina*, the daughter of Carus, see ch. II.3. AC

In its late pronunciation in particular, [pɔːˈliːnus] which is attested in Gaul in *Polinus*, *Polinacus* (ACS 2.1029) could possibly give a close assonance to a Gaulish lexeme or compositional element (< IE **k^wol-io-*) denoting ‘herdsman’, ‘guardian’ or the like, see above s.v. *Pastor*. JZ

37. Pomponius, -a (3; ?C-L): brother-in-law with an homonymous son; mother-in-law of his daughter. 15 inscriptions with this *nomen gentile* have been gathered in CIL 12 and 13 each, and many more in Rome (4 pages in the index). A possible Celtic background of this Latin *cognomen* might be implied by the frequency of *Pomponi(an)us* and *Pompei(an)us* (hundreds in each of the mentioned CIL-vols.), which Weisgerber (Ub. 182, 212, 233) relates to *pempe* (‘five’); cf. also the *praenomen* *Quintus* or Alföldy 111 on the dissemination of *Pomp*-names. AC

There is an assonance to Gl. *pempe* ‘five’ (DLG 248), which is e.g. known from *pempe-dula* “five-foil” (Dioscorides 4.42: πεντάφυλλον, Ps.-Apuleius 2.32 *quinque-folium*). A by-form *pompe* may have existed, influenced by the neighbouring labio-velar, IE **penk^we* ‘five’ > **k^wenk^we* > *k^wonk^we* > *pompe* (cf. Oscan-Umbrian **pompe*, IEW 808, and OIr. *cóic* whose -o- may be due to a late assimilation or zero grade **k^wṅk^we*, LEIA C-142f.). It may be present in *pompe-te(n)guaios* ‘(knowing) five languages’, attested in a possibly Celtic inscription from Oderzo (*Od 7: Eska & Wallace, Historische Sprachwissenschaft 112, 1999, 122–136). JZ

38. Pudentilla (1; ?C-L): sister-in-law. Diminutive of the much more frequent *Pudens*. The index of CIL 6 collects 126 cases of *Pudens* or derivatives, among which *Pudentilla* figures twice; CIL 12 includes 10, CIL 13 22 such instances, but no single example for *Pudentilla*. AC

Pudens ‘shamefaced, modest’ (and derivatives) is a purely Latin denomination, for *pu-* does not seem to be a possible anlaut in Gaulish. Although **pod-* is present in *Podio*, *Podiolum* (Le Poujol), *Podem(p)niacum* (Polignac, Haute-Loire), and *Podenti(ni)acus* (ACS 2.1021), all of them may be related to the Roman gentile name *Pudentius*.— But the significance of *pudens* is also present in native onomastics, as probably in PNs with *rucco-* ‘shame’, ‘?redness’ (OIr. *ruccae*, DLG 263, KGPN 262) in *Ruca*, *Rucius*, *Rocius*, *Rocco*, *Seno-ruccus*, *Ad-ruci* etc. (cf. also *su-obno-* ‘coward’ KGPN 273) As already mentioned s.v. *Namia*, this name may contain an adjective meaning ‘modest, shy’, so *Namia Pudentilla* may be sort of a bilingual. JZ

39. Regulus (1; C-L): the husband of Ausonius’ sister-in-law Talisia was called *Minucius Regulus*. The first name is identical with the Roman *nomen gentile*, for which see above. The *cognomen* is the diminutive of *rex* (‘king’), which was frequently used in the republican *gens Marcia*. Kajanto Cogn. 316 gives 10 examples for *Rex*, half of which belong to the latter family; but the list of records is incomplete: the indexes of CIL 3 and 6 have 5 entries each, while CIL 1, 5, 9, and 10 are represented with one inscription each. However, compared to the high figures of ‘kingly’ derivatives, *Rex* was rather rare.

At the first sight, no particular regional difference can be stated, as the city of Rome has produced the highest number of such names: *Rex* (5?), *Reginus/-a* (12+8), *Regillus/-a* (24+22), *Regulus* (41, no *Regula*); further the minor variants *Reginius/-a* (2+2), *Reginus/-a* (1+1); *Regilia* (1), *Reginianus/-a* (1+1), *Regnator* (1): thus 132 references to 9 ‘kingly’ names altogether, 88 of which are diminutive (ca. 67%). Similar figures, though on a much lower level, appear in Gallia Narbonensis (CIL 12: 2 *Reginus*, 1 *Regalis*, 1 *Regilla*, 1 *Regillus*, 4 *Regulus*, thus 6 diminutive out of 9 *Reg*-names, 67%), while the Spanish evidence is not significant (CIL 2: *Regenus*, *Regina*, *Regillus*, *Regulus*).

But the Three Gauls, Noricum, and Illyricum show clear distinctions. Firstly, the total of records in CIL 3 and 13 (118) nearly equals the Roman figure (132) and exceeds the number of *Reg*-names in CIL 2 and 12 (13) by far; taking the proportions of transmission into account, an overrepresentation in these two Celtic regions becomes clear. Secondly, the proportions of diminutives differ: there are only 14 out of 63 (ca. 22%) in CIL 13 and 17 out of 55 (ca. 31%) in CIL 3. Thirdly, the number of derivatives outdoes the Roman figure (8) in the Three Gauls (10) and Illyricum/Noricum (16); together they even evidence 20 diverse forms. And while fourthly no single attestation of *Regalis* has been found in Rome, CIL 3 includes 7, CIL 13 even 15 (CIL 7 and 12 have one each).⁵³

Holder (ACS 2.1105) and Kajanto Cogn. 317 tentatively consider Celtic origin only for *Regalis*, but this does not seem to be a sufficient explanation. The popularity of *reg*-names reminds one of the suffix *-rix* which frequently concludes Celtic compound PNs (KGPN 70-77), and the particular predilection of diversifying PNs hints at the same cultural background.

The diminutive *Regulus* has probably been induced by the Latin meaning of the CN *Minucius*, see above. Note also Ps.-Caes. Bell. Afr. 68.4 (cf. RE 15, 1932, 1956 no. 47) where a *C. Minucius Reginus* is attested for 46 B.C. AC

Reg-names clearly have a phonetic as well as a semantic similarity in both Roman and Gaulish cultural traditions. So they are ‘perfect’ CNs which could be understood in the context of the native and intrusive cultures. The frequency of attestations in Celtic

⁵³ In CIL 3 one finds *Reginus/Regenus* (15, see below), *Regalis* (7), *Regulus/-a* (6+1), *Rex* (5), *Rega* (3), *Regillus/Recillus/Regilla* (2+1+1), *Regontius* (2), *Regulianus* (2), *Regulinus* (2), *Regano* (1), *Regebal* (1), *Regens* (1), *Regetius* (1), *Regillianus* (1), *Regulia* (1), *Regi[...]* (1), *Reg(alius?)* (1). CIL 13 includes *Reginus/Regenus/-a* (12+13, see below), *Regalis* (15), *Regulus/-a* (9+2), *Reginius/-a* (6), *Recianus* (1), *Reginianus* (1), *Regillus* (1), *Regiola* (1), *Regiu[la?]* (1), *Regi[...]* (1). Most of the names are classified as *cognomina*, while a few (e.g. *Reginius*, *Regontius*) are considered *nomina (gentilia)*. CIL does not differentiate between *Reginus* and *Regenus*, but cf. ACS 2.1106, 1108-10. Differences in spelling (*c/g*) and gender (*-us/-a*) or fragmentary forms as *Reg-/Regi-* (contrary to *Regiu-*) do not increase the number of name forms. *Rectugenus* (2) has not been accounted for at all. Note that Britain, though being relatively poor in inscriptions, resembles these proportions: *Regina* (RIB 2.2443.9), *Reginus* (2501.54), *Regn.* (2428.15: *Reg(i)n(us)/Regn(ator?)*), *Reg.* (2503.397), *Regillinus* (2503.114), with the latter being another derivative not evidenced in Rome.

regions gives a clear hint at this (see above). The relatively high number of suffixes in Gaul is completely in line with the general Gaulish predilection for derivational and hypocoristic formations (cf. KGPN 41).

If, however, the hypocoristic suffix does not pertain to the name bearer (‘King’ who is familiarly called ‘little King’), but modifies the PN base (‘Little-King’), the prefix Gl. *vo-* ‘under’, ‘sub-’ (DLG 324f., IEW 1106) could be referred to, which is present e.g. in PNs *Vo-conius*, *Vo-cari* (gen.), *Vo-gen(us)*, *Vo-segus*. Most important is in this context *Ad-vo-rix* ‘pertaining to the under-king’ (GPN 288f., KGPN 117, 299f.) which fulfils the notion of a subordinate kinglet. JZ

40. Sabina (1; ?C-L): his wife. The Italian *ethnicon* was a popular *cognomen* in the republic and still in use in the empire. The numerous attestations in Celtic regions (cf. Alföldy 285f.) induced Weisgerber Ub. 95, 131 to assume, though cautiously, a CN, while Holder (ACS 2.1270) had already suggested “vielleicht auch celt(isch)”. Derivation from IE **sab-* (IEW 880: ‘schmecken’, ‘wahrnehmen’) is highly probable; this basis can be found in many names of rivers as well as of beverages, cf., on the one hand, *Sabrina* (today’s *Severn* in Western England, still used as female PN) or *Sabis* (*Sambre* in Belgium), on the other, ?Illyrian *sabaium* ‘beer’, OEngl. *sæp* or Germ. *Saft*. For anthroponyms cf. also *Sabianus*, *Sabiniacus*. AC

The presence of a root *sab-* in Celtic seems likely from numerous attestations in Gaul and Britain of hydro-, anthro- and toponyms such as *Sabis* (*Sambre*, Belgium), *Sabrina* (*Severn*, W. *Hafren*), *Sabiācus* (*Savy*), *Sabiniacum* (*Savigny*, *Savignac*), *Sabatinca* (Noricum) etc. (ACS 2.1262–73). It is, however, not confined to Celtic but perhaps to be seen in the context of the ‘Old European’ hydronymy (cf. e.g. *Sabatis*, a river in Campania, *Sabatia vada*, a wharf in Liguria etc.). The IE root **sab-/sap-* (IEW 880) is now taken to be **seh₁p-* (or **seh_{2/3}p-*, **sHep-*, **sap-*) ‘to perceive (by tasting)’ (LIV 519), attested in Oscian *sipus* ‘knowing’, Lat. *sapiō* ‘know’, OEngl. *af-sōf* ‘perceived’, cf. the examples quoted above. The fluctuation between root-final *-p-* and *-b-* is not yet well understood. The standard explanation is a phonetic alternation in the declension: primary **p* is assimilated to **b* before the dat./instr.pl. ending with **-bh-*. A suffix beginning with laryngeal **h₃* would perhaps produce the same results, cf. E. Hamp’s assertion (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 30, 1972, 35–37) **h₂ep-h₃on-eh₂* > *ab-on-ā* ‘river’ (**h₂ep-* ‘water’) which is, however, not universally accepted. On the other hand, there is evidence of a lexeme **sok^wo-* ‘juice’, ‘resin’ (DLG 268, cf. Weisgerber, Rhen. 208, DAG 79, GPN 467), in PNs *Saqua*, *Saquanoli* (gen., DAG 229), possibly related to *sapa* ‘must’, ‘syrup’ (DAG 220), or *sapo-* ‘?fir’ (DLG 267f.), resp., and maybe *σαπᾶνα* ‘scarlet pimpernel’ (DLG 267 considers Grm. origin) which may also play a rôle. JZ

41. Sanctus (1; ?C-L): husband of Ausonius’ sister-in-law Namia Pudentilla. 16 out of 32 epigraphical attestations included in CIL have been found in the ‘Three Gauls’ (CIL 13), where also the derivative *Sanctinus* is attested; and the evidence has been more than doubled by H.-G. Pflaum: *Scripta varia* II, 373ff. (20 Sancti in Germania Superior, 9 in Aquitania, and 8 in Lugdunensis). A connection of Ausonius’ kinsman to Sanctus, the *consul* 269, remains therefore ‘purely hypothetical’, as Sivan 1991, 438 n. 16 rightly states (pace PLRE 1.810 no. 1). Though being a Latin adjective of ‘moral and social quality’ (Kajanto Cogn. 251f. categorises as ‘chaste, innocent, pure’), *Sanctus* certainly resembled the meaning or sound of a popular Gaulish PN.

Notwithstanding, its identification poses problems. The equally popular *sacro*-names may be considered, all the more with regard to the common IE origin of Celtic/Latin *sacro*- and Latin *sanctus*, cf. KGPN 263, Kajanto Cogn. 211, Lochner-von-Hüttenbach 155, DLG 264f. in general. Most famous was the rebel of A.D. 21, Iulius Sacrovir, cf. Stein: Iulius no. 452, RE 10,1, 1917, 796-98. But the kind of ‘holiness’ that Latin *sacer* (‘belonging to the gods’) and *sanctus* (‘moral’, ‘chaste’) express, differs greatly. Perhaps Gaulish *vindos* (‘white’, ‘brilliant’, also ‘holy’/*sanctus*) was more influential; it was, and still is, wide-spread in Celtic onomastics, cf. *Vindus*, *Vindiacos*, *Vindilla*; *Finn*, *Gwynn*, *Gwen*, cf. KGPN 295f., GPN 386f. AC

The homonym Gl. *sacro*- ‘consecrated’, ‘cursed’ (DLG 264f.) is attested in PNs *Sacro-barii*, *Sacro-bena*, *Sacro-divi*, *Sacro-virus*, *Sacrinus*, *Sacro*, *Sacrillus* etc. (DAG 338, 417, 653, 826, KGPN 263, see also G. Pennaod, *Études indo-européennes* 11, 1992, 89). The IE adjective is **sakro-* (from the verbal root **seh₂(y)-* ‘become satiated’ [LIV 520f.] as IEW 876 and LEW 460 assume), which is unchanged in Gl. and OLat. (later *sacer*); Lat. *sanctus* is the past participle of *sancire* which derives from the same root (with *n*-infix). There are several synonyms in Gl., as *devo-* ‘divine’ (see above, Eusebius) or *vindos* ‘white’, ‘brilliant’, “holy” (DLG 320f., KGPN 295f., GPN 386f., cf. PNs *Vindus*, *Vindiocos*, *Vindilla*, *Aico-vindo*, *Macio-vindi* etc.)— There is also a possible assonance to Gl. *sagro-* ‘firm’, ‘strong’ (DLG 265, from IE **sag-*, cf. OIr. *sár*, W. *haer*, IEW 876f., LEIA S-25f.) in PNs *Ambi-sagrus*, Ogam NETA-SAGRI (gen.) etc. (ACS 2.122, KGPN 264, SOI 115f.). JZ

42. Severus (1; [?C-]L®): the father-in-law of Ausonius’ daughter was called *Severus Censor Iulianus*. This first name (*nomen gentile*?) may have been chosen as a qualification of the Roman magistrate *censor* (see above). But imperial nomenclature might also have influenced the name, although evidence is scarce after the Severan dynasty (193-235): Zonaras 12.18 is the only attestation of *Severus Hostilianus* who could be identical with the Caesar of 250-51 (son of Decentius); *Ulpia Severina* was the wife of Aurelian (270-75) and remained influential still after his death; next comes Fl. Valerius Severus (305-7), who did never rule in Gaul. Weisgerber Ub. 130 is undecided whether the frequency of *Severus* in the region of the *Ubii* is due to the basis *ver-* (see *Veria*) or to the Severan dynasty; the latter explanation is certainly supported by the involvement of the Northern *Severi* in oriental cults. AC

The name *Sēvērus* has long been included in Gaulish toponyms, as **Sēvērācus* (Sévérac), *Severiacus*, *Severiniacum* (ACS 2.1531–33) and shows some resemblance of native PNs and river names *Seva*. An assonance, respective to vowel quantities, to Gl. *vēro-* ‘bent’, ‘wry’ (see below, *Veria*) may also be considered. The first syllable could then, perhaps, be understood as a reflex of Gl. *su-* ‘good’ (DLG 283f.), all the more because the following consonant is *-v-*. The prefix is well attested in PNs, e.g. *Su-ausia*, *Su-carus*, *Su-obnus* etc. The meaning of the assonant name could be something like ‘the well bent / crooked’, ‘very crooked one’.— The feminine equivalent *Severa* is also attested in the Gaulish language, on the magical plomb du Larzac (l. 1b10 *Severa Tertionica*, ll. 1a4, 1b8, 2a9, 2b10f. *Severim Tertioninim* [acc.], LG 160–172). JZ

43. Talisius, -ia (3; C): *Attusius Lucanus Talisius* was Ausonius’ father-in-law; his sister-in-law was called *Attusia Lucana Sabina* accordingly. The family originated in Saintes (see *Atusius*), and if it is right to connect them with *Iul. Aturio(s?)*, they had *Paul(ian)i* among their ancestors; this would once more suggest to link *Thalassius* with the *gens Santonica*, see below.

44. Thalassius (1; C-G): Ausonius’ second son-in-law. His name is attested in a letter to Ausonius (Symm. epist. 1,25: Peiper 225.5 reads *Talassius*, while ACS 2.1707f. remains undecided) and an imperial constitution (transmitted in the fragments CTh 11.30.37, 36.23-25 dating from 30.1.378). Although he is the first *Thalassius* evidenced in Gaul, kinship with Eastern *Thalassioi* (cf. W. Enßlin: *Thalassius*, RE 5A.1, 1934, 1199-1203, PLRE 1.886-9 no. 1-2, 4, 2.1060f. no. 1-3, many more in the unpublished database of the LGPN: all 3rd-6th century) can be excluded, all the more because he is characterised as a Bordelaise landowner (Paul. Pell. Euch., esp. v. 242). Two further references to a *Thalass(i)us* in the epistolar of Symmachus (epist. 5,58 A.D. ?397, 7,84 A.D. 399/400) could well relate to the same family, cf. my discussion in *Gens* 159 n. 149, opposing PLRE 2.1061 *Thalassus* [sic] no. 1.

What has not yet been discussed, is the intricate evidence for Dalmatian *T(h)alas(s)i(i)*. On the one hand, there is sufficient evidence (discussed in *Gens* 168-70) to claim close contacts between the Aquitanian clan and the Adriatic capital Salona, and the combination of relevant names in inscriptions mentioning *Thalassi-* seems to give strong support to the hypothesis at the first sight. On the other hand, there are serious chronological objections to linking them together: all of the relevant individuals were born in the 3rd or the first half of the 4th century. However, to consider them ancestors of Severus Censor Iulianus, Pomponia Urbica and Thalassius would presuppose several generations of close intermarriage connection which are too bold to posit without more conclusive documents. Younger *Thalass(i)i* of Dalmatia are also more likely not to descent from the Gallic clan.⁵⁴

There is no evidence for either *Talisius* or *Thalassius* in Gaul prior to the 4th-century *gens Ausoniana*. However, a certain *Thalassus* is to be mentioned: he taught Latin in early 4th-century Bordeaux (Aus. Prof. 12), but kinship with him is excluded, as Ausonius comments on him: *qua fama aut merito fueris, qua stirpe parentum, / aetas nil de te posterior celebrat* (V. 3f.). Heinzelmann 1982, 702 finally lists the bishop of Angers A.D. 453-61 (transmitted are the variants *Thalassius*, *Thelassius* and *Helassius*: CCSL 148.137.2,4, 148.128, 150.3); Enßlin (RE 4A.2, 1932, 2063 no. 2) first called him *Talassius*, but later (*Thalassius*, RE 5A.1, 1934, 1203 no. 12) considered *Talisius*. For further Gallic *Talassii* (-iae) cf. ACS 2.1707f. (5th-8th cent.); neither of the names has been dealt with by Morlet.

⁵⁴ *Fl. Talasia* died in A.D. 378 after 32 years of marriage (oo *Fl. Terentius* in ca. 347, * ca. 329/30, cf. CIL 3.9507). Another inscription mentions three names all of which could theoretically have been bequeathed by Ausonius’ sons-in-law (CIL 3.2478+8636): *D. M. / Pompon(iae) / Sabinae / def. an. IIII / Flav. Acilie... / et Pomp. Talasiae* / (rest missing); but as descendants of the Bordelaise poet, they would have lived in the (first half of the) 5th century, which is unlikely because of the invocation *D(is) M(anibus)*; note that Alföldy 309 dates the inscription to the late principate. Although all of these names were frequent in Dalmatia, family connections between the persons hitherto mentioned could be tentatively claimed. Fragments from the neighbouring Spalato further seem to link a *gens Sabina* with *C. Roecius Thalass(i?)us* (cf. CIL 3.2325, 2375, 14246). Finally *Cesonius Thalassa* set a gravestone to her husband *C. Curtius Eutychus* in Salona: but *D. M.* as well as the *praenomen* of the deceased rather hint at the 3rd than 5th century; note, however, that the name *Cesonius* is related to *Censor(ius)*, see above. In theory, also the Dalmatian *Valerii Iuliani*, *Valerii Censorini*, and *Valerii Herculi* might be considered in this context, but their names were frequent, and without further prosopographical information, such homonymies are worthless. – The remaining *Thalass(i)i* are probably ancestors of some of the Dalmatians hitherto mentioned (CIL 3.9513: Salona, A.D. 414; 9521, cf. 12860: Salona, A.D. 442/43). No link can finally be claimed for one *Talassus* of Adria (Northern Italy: CIL 5.2323), one *Talasia L. l. Dasca* of Terni (central Italy: CIL 11.4307), or *Talassa*, the wife (?) or *Maros* (?) who lived on Mallorca (CIL 2.3685 *D. M. Maro Talassa*).

Given the isolation of the Greek PN in Gaul, but also its closeness to the basis *talo-* (< **talū-*: ‘forehead’) which was highly productive in Celtic compounds, it appears to be a CN for *Talisius* (see below). The rarity of both in 4th-century Gaul encourages to suggest kinship between Ausonius’ father- and son-in-law. This hypothesis is also supported in respect of *Thalassius*’ son *Paulinus* (see *Attusius*) AC

Talisius, *Talasius* and perhaps hellenised, *Thalassius*, could be taken as CNs in two respects.— (1) Both forms of the name show a close phonetic assonance to Gl. *talū-*, (*talamon-*), later also *talo-* ‘front, surface’ (DLG 288f., from IE **telH-* ‘plane surface’, IEW 1061, LEIA T-180–182), Celtic **t̪lhu-* > **talū-*, OIr. *t(a)ul* ‘protuberance, projecting part’, W. *tal* ‘forehead, front’, cf. PNs *Talio*, *Talius*, *Tallius*, *Talorus*, *Talonius*, *Talo-rix*, *Argio-talus*, *Axro-talus*, *Carro-talus*, *Danno-tali* gen., *Dubno-talus*, *Kassitalos* (ACS 2.1706–1712, KGPN 274, GPN 259–261).— (2) *Thalass(i)us*, and less similar, *Talasius*, *Talisius*, may also be translated names, referring to the Gl. PN element *mori* ‘sea’ (DLG 229, LEIA M-73), cf. OIr. *muir* (**mori*), W. *môr* ‘sea’, in PNs *Mori-tasqus*, *Mori-rix*, *Mori-camulus*, *Mori-vassus*, *Mori-tex* (KGPN 245, GPN 232f., DAG 905). JZ

45. Urbica (1; ?C-L®): Pomponia Urbica was the first mother-in-law of Ausonius’ daughter. For various possible imperial connections see ch. II.3. Although *urb*-names are widespread throughout the empire, it is likely that the Celtic *orbio*-names (‘heir’) influenced the choice in Gaul: **Orb-ik-os* would be a feasible derivation of a PN, all the more with regard to the social significance of legitimate heritage. AC

There is a clear assonance to Gl. *orb-*, *orbios* ‘heir’ (DLG 243, IE **orbhos* ‘lacking parent(s)’, sim. Goth. *arbja* ‘heir’, IEW 781f.), cf. OIr. *orb*, *comarbe* ‘heir’, *orbe* [< **orbion*] ‘heritage’ (LEIA O-27) which is a frequent theme of PNs, *Orbius*, *Orbia*, *Orbissa*, *Orbici* gen., *Orbio-talus*, *An-orbos* etc. (ACS 2.863–866, KGPN 252, GPN 238f.). Delamarre (DLG 243) notes the confusion between the Lat. PN *Urbanus* and Gl. **Orbanos* in the PIN **Urbaniacus*, *Orbaniacos* (Orbigny) which shows the phonetic proximity; on *o/u*-vocalism cf. GPN 393 (*dubno-/dobno-*) or KGPN 94 (*Adruno/Adrono*).— Schmidt and Ellis Evans also think of a reference of *urbi-* to “IE **werb(h)-* ‘to turn’” which is now taken to be **werg-* ‘to throw’ (or **werp-* ‘to turn’, LIV 689, 690, IEW [1153], 1156).— Less likely, though not impossible, is a reference to occasional Gl. PNs with themes of settlement (Lat. *urbicus* ‘belonging to the city, civic’): *Bounis*, *Bounia*, *Bonisia*, *Bonicus* (*bona*, *bouno-* ‘residence’, DLG 82, 84), *Ande-dunis*, (Mars) *Dunatis* (*dunon* ‘fortified place’, DLG 154–156), *Ratinus*, (Dea) *Ratis* (*rate*, *ratis* ‘rampart, fort’, DLG 254; *Ratulla* etc. may be from *rato-* ‘bliss, luck’, Ir. *rath*, W. *rhad*, KGPN 256f., cf. GPN 240f.: “multiple origin”), *Ambi-trebius* (*treb-* ‘residence’, DLG 301). JZ

46. Valerius (1; ?C-L®): first name of Ausonius’ first son-in-law. The old *nomen gentile* remained in use, but was particularly widespread since the second half of the 3rd century, no doubt because of the emperors P. Licinius *Valerianus* (253–60) (whose grand-son was called P. Licinius Cornelius *Valerianus*), C. Aurelius *Valerius* Diocletianus (284–305), Aurelianus *Valerius* Maximianus (285–310) and his co-rulers as well as successors Fl. *Valerius* Constantius (293–306) and Fl. *Valerius* Constantinus (306–37). Cf. also emperors as C. Messius Quintus Traianus Decius *Valerinus* (249–51) and his brother C. Decius *Valeri(?an)us*, P. Licinius *Valerianus* (253–60), his grandson Saloninus *Valerianus*(?) (Caesar 258–60).

Notwithstanding this, the closeness to the Celtic noun *valos* (‘ruler, prince’) which can be found in several compound PNs (see below) may further account for the popularity of *Valerius* particularly among Spanish and Gaulish aristocrats, cf. PLRE 1.937ff., 2.1141, Heinzelmann 709f., Prud. Perist. 4.77ff. on the *sacerdotum domus infulata Valeriorum* of Caesaraugusta and Perist. 11 to bishop Valerius of Calagurris; further references in Morlet 2.115. In which cases the homonymy was based on kinship cannot be decided here; but note the 3rd-century inscription from Tarraco mentioning *L. Valerius Latinus Barcinonen* (sic: CIL 2.4264). AC

Valerius could be a CN in two respects.— (1) It has an assonance to Gaulish names in *valos* ‘sovereign’, ‘prince’ (DLG 306), cf. PNs *Ate-valos*, *An-valis*, *Bo-valus*, Κατ-ουαλος, *Nerto-valo/us*, *Lano-valus*, *Marto-valo/us* etc. (KGPN 284, GPN 269–271), still present in Ir. PNs, e.g. *Conall* (< **Cuno-valos*), *Domnall* (< **Dubno-valos*). The concept of *valos* is closely related, in Celtic, to sovereignty and the land, cf. *vlati(s)*, OIr. *flaith* ‘sovereignty’, W. *gwlad* ‘land’. Etymologically, it is cognate to Lat. *valeō* ‘be strong’, Goth. *waldan* ‘dominate’, Lith. *valdyti* ‘govern’ (LIV 617, IEW 1112).— (2) Due to the Latin derivation of *Valerius* from *valēre*, the name could be a reflex of Gaulish PNs with elements meaning ‘strong’, in particular the common *nerto-* ‘force, strength’ (DLG 235, from IE **h₂ner-* ‘male, virile’), cf. Ir. *nert*, W.Co. *nerth*, e.g. again *Nerto-valo/us* and *Nerto-maros*, Mlr. *nert-mar*, W. *nerth-fawr* (KGPN 249). JZ

47. Veneria (1; ?C-L): sister of Ausonius’ father. The name is found all over the Latin speaking world, cf. CIL 6 for plenty of evidence for Rome; also Alföldy 134 (*nomen gentile*) and 323 (*cognomen*). CIL 13 gives 13 examples including one *Veneria* for Northern and Western Gaul, with only one single attestation for Bordeaux (876): *D. M. / Memoriae / Veneriae / (ascia) / d. an. XXV*. The date (2nd/4th century) and the age of death pretty well suit Ausonius’ aunt, since she died early in the 4th century as an unmarried mother of a child; see under *Idalia* and cf. *Gens* 125f. for more details.

For Celtic regions, one can hypothesise an autochthonic influence on *ven*-names in spite of their dissemination throughout the empire, cf., e.g., ACS 3.159 (on the PIN *Venerius*, one near Milan: CIL 5.5804, with reference to ten similar toponyms) and Weisgerber Ub. 101, 181; in contrast, Morlet 2.115f. 3.202f. mostly posits Latin bases. AC

Though names with the element *ven-* can be explained on the basis of different IE languages, native Celtic influence is most probable in several cases. In Gaulish onomastics, the following lexemes have been recognized: (1) *veni-*, sometimes *vini-* ‘clan, family, lineage’ (< IE **wen(i)-*, DLG 313, from the root **wenH-* ‘become fond of’, LIV 682f., as distinguished from **wen-* ‘to overcome, win’, LIV 680, undifferentiated in IEW 1146f.), cf. OIr. *fine* (< **weniā*), OBr. *guen* ‘race, family’, as in PNs *Venia*, *Venilla*, *Veniala*, *Venidius*, *Veninia*, *Venisa*, *Venisamus*, *Veni-carus*, *Vini-carus*, *Veniclutius* etc. (ACS 3.168–171, 351–354, KGPN 289f., GPN 277–279); (2) *venicos* ‘member of the clan’ (DLG 313), cf. *Venica*, *Venicia* (GPN 278); (3) *venet-* ‘relatives, friends, merchants’ (DLG 312f. with abundant references), esp. in *Veneti*, *Venetes*, Οὐνετοί, and PINs **Veneto-ialon*, *Venetoni-magus*. (A further root, IE **wenh₁-* ‘to put’, LIV 683, is doubtful.) *Veneria* may also contain *veni-* because /i/ often becomes centralized [ɪ] next to /r/, which in turn can be written <i, e>. *Vennus*, *Venna*, *Vennacius* etc. (ACS 3.171–173) fit very well into the onomastical scheme as forms with hypocoristic doubling (lengthening) of consonants. JZ

48. Veria (1; C®): wife of Ausonius’ nephew Arborius. It is unlikely that the IN *Verus* borne by Marcus Aelius Aurelius *Verus* and his brother (161-80/69), and later by C. Iulius *Verus* Maximinus (‘Thrax’, 235-38) were influential in this context. Weisgerber Ub. 101, 128f., 466, Rhen. 380f., 476 and Lochner-von-Hüttenbach 156 realise that anthroponyms and toponyms beginning with *ver-* were frequent in Celtic regions, cf. *Vera*, *Veratius*, *Veranus*, *Verinus*, *Verecundus*, whereas Morlet 2.116, 3.203f. only accounts for Latin bases of *vero*-names. It is telling that there is only a single attestation of a *Verius* in Rome (CIL 6.2548.11): *Verius Felix* was one of the heirs to Sanctinius Probinus who hailed from the Batavi. In contrast, CIL 12 counts 5 *Verii* and one *Veria*; CIL 13 refers to two *Verii*. AC

PNs beginning with *Ver-* have several counterparts in Gaulish onomastics. Most likely is the resemblance to the base *veru-* ‘?large’ (DLG 317, from IE **wer(H)u-*, IEW 1165, cf. G. εὐρύς), cf. PNs *Veruco*, *Verullia*, *Veruccius*, *Lama-verus*, *Veru-cloetius* (ACS 3.228–240).— Holder (ACS 3.240) thought of **vēros* ‘true’ as “vielleicht auch celtisch” (the genuine form is *vīros*), and he may be right as next to /r/, the vowels /e/ and /i/ tend to merge in [ɪ] and are often indistinguishable in writing.— Less likely is a suggestion by Schmidt to draw upon *vēro-* ‘bent, wry’ (KGPN 293), from IE **wei(ə)-* (IEW 1120–1122) which is now taken to be **wieh₁-* ‘to wrap, infold’ (LIV 695, cf. OIr. *-fen* ‘to fence’), formations with *-r-* include Ir. *fíar*, W. *gŵyr*, Br. *gwar* ‘bent’ etc. In the first and third cases, a short name is to be considered, **‘one with large / crooked ...’*.— The common assonance to the prefix *ver-* from IE **uper-* ‘over, super-’ which was often used in Gaulish, e.g. *Ver-cingeto-rix* lit. ‘Super-warrior-king’, cannot apply here as there is no element it could be prefixed to. Because of the partial merger of /e/ and /i/, there is also a rough similarity to *vīro-* ‘man’ (cf. OIr. *fir*, W. *gwr*) from IE **vi(H)-ro-* which could have a bearing on *vero*-names as well. JZ

Appendix II: Multicultural Influences on the Choice of PNs: a Statistical Overview

Omitting more than a dozen persons for whom kinship is claimed mainly on onomastic grounds, 43 individuals are clearly recorded for the *gens Ausoniana* and its side branches; they are attested to have borne 86 PNs in sum, or 51 different forms of PNs, or 48 different basic PNs respectively. The figures following the names in the subsequent list give the number of individual name bearers. C=Celtic, G=Greek, L=Latin, R=Regional, probably Celtic or Aquitanian, ®=imperial name, *very rare name, partly untypical formation. Indications with question mark (=‘probably ...’) are considered in the statistics, whereas those in square brackets (=‘might be ...’) are not. Dash (—) means ‘not considered’, whereas hyphen (–) indicates ‘no example has been found’.

Conspectus over the PNs attested in the *gens Ausoniana*

1. Aemilius, -ia 6 [?C-]L®	24. b) Iulianus 1 L®
2. Aeonius, -ius? 1 [2?] C-G*	25. Latinus 1 C-L®
3. Arborius 5 C-L*	26. Liceria 1 ?C*
4. Argicius 2 C	27. Lucanus, a 4 ?C-L
5. Attusius, -ia 3 [?R-]C	28. Magnus 3 C-L®
6. Ausonius 4 R-C-G	29. Maura 1 [?C-]L[®]
7. Avitianus 1 C-L	30. Maximus 2 L®
8. Caecilius 1 ?C-L®	31. Megentira 1 [?R/?L]-C*
9. Callippio 1 C-G*	32. Melania 1 C*
10. Cataphronia 1 R-L-G	33. Minucius 1 ?C-L
11. a) Censor 1 ?C-L	34. Namia 1 C*
11. b) Censorius 1 ?C-L	35. Pastor 1 [?C-]L
12. Claudius 1 ?C-L®	36. Paulinus 3 [?C-]L®
13. Contemtus 1 R-L*	37. Pomponius, a 3 ?C-L
14. Corinthia 1 ?C-G	38. Pudentilla 1 ?C-L
15. Decimius 2 C-L	39. Regulus 1 C-L
16. Dryadia 3 C-G*	40. Sabina 1 ?C-L
17. Euromius [?Euronius] 1 ?R-G*	41. Sanctus 1 ?C-L
18. Eusebius 1 ?C-G	42. Severus 1 [?C-]L®
19. Flavius 1 [?C-]L®	43. Talisius, -ia 3 C
20. Herculanus 1 L®	44. Thalassius 1 C-G
21. Hesperius 1 R-C-G-G	45. Urbica 1 ?C-L®
22. a) Hilaria 1 [?C-]L	46. Valerius 1 ?C-L®
22. b) Hilarianus 1 [?C-]L	47. Veneria 1 ?C-L
23. Idalia 1 C-L-G*	48. Veria 1 C®.
24. a) Iulius, -ia 6 L®	

Table A: Analysis of PNs According to the Individual Records

Language	First Sight	Untypical Formation	CNs: Influence of			INs:			CNs (excl. INs)
			Latin	Greek	Celtic / Regional	Total	Kinship?	CNs	
Latin	57=66%	6	—	—	32=56% ^a	29	up to 18	8=28% ^b	24=86%
Greek	16=19%	7	(2) ^c	—	16=100%	—	—	—	16=100%
Celtic or Regional	13=15%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total of PNs:	86 =100%		Total of CNs (incl. INs):		48 of 73 =66%		Total of CNs (excl. INs):		40 of 44 =91%

Table B: Analysis of PNs According to the Different PNs Recorded

Language	First Sight	Untypical Formation	CNs: Influence of			INs:			CNs (excl. INs)
			Latin	Greek	Celtic / Regional	Total	Kinship?	CNs	
Latin	32=63%	2	—	—	20=63% ^a	13	up to 8	6=46% ^b	14=74%
Greek	11=22%	5	(2) ^c	—	11=100%	—	—	—	11=100%
Celtic or Regional	8=17%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total of PNs:	51 =100%		Total of CNs (incl. INs):		31 of 43 =72%		Total of CNs (excl. INs):		25 of 30 =83%

Table C: Analysis of PNs According to the Different Basic PNs Recorded

Language	First Sight	Untypical Formation	CNs: Influence of			INs:			CNs (excl. INs)
			Latin	Greek	Celtic / Regional	Total	Kinship?	CNs	
Latin	29=60%	2	—	—	19=66% ^a	13	up to 8	6=28% ^b	13=81%
Greek	11=23%	5	(2) ^c	—	11=100%	—	—	—	11=100%
Celtic or Regional	8=17%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total of PNs:	48 =100%		Total of CNs (incl. INs):		30 of 40 =75%		Total of CNs (excl. INs):		24 of 27 =89%

^a Percentage refers to all Latin PNs.^b Percentage refers to all INs.^c Both cases are C-L-G (Cataphronia, Idalia).

Appendix III: Select Bibliography

1. The Works of Ausonius: Some Editions, Translations, and Commentaries

- Alvar Ezquerro, A.: *Ausonius*, Obras, 2 vols., Madrid 1990.
 Bajoni, M.G.: *D. Magno Ausonio*, Professori a Bordeaux, Florence 1996.
 Corpet, E.F.: *Oeuvres complètes d’Ausone*, Paris 1842/43.
 Coşkun, A.: *Historisch-philologischer Kommentar zur Gratiarum actio des Decimius Magnus Ausonius*, Diss. Trier 1999; revised version to be published in ca. 2005.
 Evelyn White, H.G.: *Ausonius*, 2 vols., London & Cambridge/ Mass. 1921.
 Green, R.P.H.: *The Works of Ausonius*, Oxford 1991.
 Green, R.P.H.: *Decimi Magni Ausonii Opera*, Oxford 1999.
 Jasinski, M.: *Ausone, Oeuvres en vers et en prose*, 2 Bde., Paris 1934/35.
 Lolli, M.: *D.M. Ausonius, Parentalia*, Brussels 1997.
 Pastorino, A.: *Opere di Decimo Magno Ausonio*, Turin 1971.
 Peiper, R.: *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis Opuscula*, Leipzig 1886, repr. Darmstadt 1976.
 Prete, S.: *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis Opuscula*, Leipzig 1978.
 Schenkl, K.: *D. Magni Ausonii Opuscula*, Berlin 1881 (MGH AA 5.2).

2. Works on Ausonius and His Family

- Brandes, W.: *Ausoniarum quaestionum specimen primum*, Diss. Leipzig 1876.
 Coşkun, A.: *Die gens Ausoniana an der Macht. Untersuchungen zu Decimius Magnus Ausonius und seiner Familie*, Oxford 2002 (=Prosopographica et Genealogica 8). (*Gens*)
 Étienne, R.: *Bordeaux antique*, Bordeaux 1962.
 Étienne, R.: *La démographie de la famille d’Ausone*, *Annales de démographie historique* 1964, 15-25.
 Étienne, R. & Desgraves, L. & Prete, S.: *Ausone, humaniste aquitain*, Bordeaux 1986 (=Revue d’histoire du livre n.s. 46); p. 1-90: Étienne: *Ausone ou les ambitions d’un notable aquitain*.
 Favez, Ch.: *Une famille gallo-romaine au IV^e siècle*, MH 3, 1946, 118-31; German translation by J. Schwind in: *Ausonius*, ed. by M.J. Lossau, Darmstadt 1991, 11-33.
 Green, R.P.H.: *Prosopographical Notes on the Family and Friends of Ausonius*, BICS 25, 1978, 19-27.
 Hopkins, M.K.: *Social Mobility in the Later Roman Empire. The Evidence of Ausonius*, CQ 11, 1961, 239-49.
 Jouai, L.A.A.: *De Magistraat Ausonius*, Diss. Nijmegen 1938.
 Sivan, H.: *A Late Gallic Branch of the Acilii Glabrones? Notes on Ausonius’ Professores 24* (Peiper), *Mnemosyne* 44, 1991, 435-39.
 Sivan, H.: *Ausonius of Bordeaux. Genesis of a Gallic Aristocracy*, London & New York 1993.

3. Late Antique Prosopographies / Works on Gallic Prosopography

- Bagnall, R.S. et al. (eds.): *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta 1987. (CLRE)
 Duchesne, L.M.: *Les fastes épiscopaux de l’ancienne Gaule*, 3 vols., Paris 1907-15.
 Heinzelmann, M.: *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien. Zur Kontinuität römischer Führungsschichten vom 4. bis zum 7. Jh.*, Zürich 1976.
 Heinzelmann, M.: *Gallische Prosopographie 260-527*, *Francia* 10, 1982, 531-718.
 Kuhoff, W.: *Studien zur zivilen senatorischen Laufbahn im 4. Jahrhundert n.Chr.*, Frankfurt/M. 1983.
 Mathisen, R.W.: *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul*, Washington/D.C. 1989.
 Mathisen, R.W.: *Studies in the History, Literature and Society of Late Antiquity*, Amsterdam 1991.
 Mathisen, R.W.: *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul*, Austin 1993.
 Matthews, J.F.: *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364-425*, Oxford 1975.
 Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften, rev. by G. Wissowa *et al.*, Stuttgart 1894-. (RE)
 Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, part I: *Prosopographie de l’Afrique chrétienne (303-533)*, ed. by A. Mandouze, Paris 1982; part II: *Prosopographie de l’Italie chrétienne (313-604)*, ed. by Ch. & L. Pietri, 2 vols., Rome 1999/2000. (PCBE)
 Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, Cambridge, vol. 1, ed. by A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale & J. Morris, 1971, vols. 2 und 3, ed. by J.R. Martindale, 1980/92. (PLRE)
 Stroheker, K.F.: *Der senatorische Adel im spätantiken Gallien*, Tübingen 1948.
 van Dam, R.: *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul*, Berkely 1985.

4. (Further) Works on Celtic, Greek and Roman Onomastics and Etymology

- Alföldy, G.: Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia, Heidelberg 1969.
 Beiträge zur Namenforschung, Heidelberg, Bd. 1-16, 1949-65; Neue Folge, Bd. 1ff., 1966ff. (BzN)
 Billy, P.H.: Thesaurus linguae Gallicae, Hildesheim 1993. (Thes.)
 de Querxeta, J.: Diccionario onomástico y heráldico vasco, vol. 1, Bilbao 1970. (DOHV)
 Delamarre, X.: Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise, Paris ²2003. (DLG)
 Dondin-Payre, M. & Raepsaet-Charlier, M.-Th. (eds.): Noms, identités culturelles et romanisation sous le haut empire, Brussels 2001.
 Ellis Evans, D.: Gaulish Personal Names, Oxford 1967. (GPN)
 Ernout, A. & Meillet, A.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine, Paris ⁴1979. (E-M)
 Foraboschi, D.: Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum, Milan 1967-71.
 Forcellini, Ae.: Lexicon totius latinitatis, vol. 1-6; 3rd ed. by V. de Vit with addition of vols. 7-10: Onomasticon totius latinitatis, 1858-87; 4th ed. in 6 vols. (Onomasticon = vols. 5-6), Padua 1864-26; repr. Bologna 1965.
 Frisk, H.: Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, 3 vols., Heidelberg ¹1960-79, vol. 3 with additions, ³1991.
 Geuenich, D., Haubrichs, W. & Jarnut, J.: ‘Nomen et gens’. Zur historischen Aussagekraft frühmittelalterlicher Personennamen, Berlin 1997.
 Geuenich, D., Haubrichs, W. & Jarnut, J.: Sprachliche, soziale und politische Aspekte der Personennamen des 3. bis 8. Jahrhunderts. Vorstellung des interdisziplinären Projekts ‘Nomen et gens’, Onoma 34, 1999, 91-99 (with bibliography p. 97-99).
 Geuenich, D., Haubrichs, W. & Jarnut, J.: Person und Name, Berlin 2000.
 Gorrochategui, J.: Basque Names, HzO 1, 1995, no. 109, 738-56.
 Greule, A. & W. Müller, ‘Keltische Resistenzgebiete in der Germania und der Romania’, Onoma 36, 2001, 245-25.
 Haas, W.: Personennamen in mehrsprachigen Ländern und Regionen: Schweiz, HzO 2, 1996, no. 189, 1232-41.
 Haubrichs, W.: Romanen an Rhein und Mosel. Onomastische Reflexionen, in: Deutsche Sprache in Raum und Zeit, Fs. Peter Wiesinger, ed. by P. Ernst & F. Patocka, Wien 1998, 379-413.
 Haubrichs: see Geuenich.
 Hengst, K.: Sprachkontakt im Wortschatz. Dargestellt an Eigennamen, Leipzig 1984.
 Höfler, O.: Über die Grenzen semasiologischer Personennamenforschung, in: FS Dietrich Kralik, Horn 1954, 26-53.
 Holder, A.Th.: Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz, 3 vols., Leipzig 1896-1913. (ACS)
 Hornblower, S. & Matthews, E. (edd.): Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence, Oxford 2001 (=Proceedings of the British Academy 104).
 Jarnut: see Geuenich.
 Kajanto, I.: The Latin Cognomina, Helsinki 1965.
 Kajanto, I.: Supernomina. A Study in Latin Epigraphy, Helsinki 1966.
 Kalwerckämper, H.: Namen im Sprachaustausch: Namenübersetzung, HzO 2, 1996, 158, 1018-25.
 Kohlheim, V.: Die christliche Namengebung, HzO 2, 1996, no. 163, 1048-57.
 Kohlheim, V.: Fremde Rufnamen, HzO 2, 1996, no. 183, 1203-7.
 Krahe, H.: Die Struktur der alteuropäischen Hydronomie, Mainz 1963 (=AWLM 1962, 5).
 Kühn, I.: Decknamen. Zur Pragmatik von inoffiziellen Personenbenennungen, HzO 1, 1995, no. 77, 515-20.
 Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, ed. by P. Fraser & E. Matthews, vols. 1-3B, Oxford 1987-2000. (LGPN)
 Lochner-von-Hüttenbach, F.: Die antiken Personennamen aus Ig bei Ljubljana, Situla 8, 1965, 15-45.
 Lochner-von-Hüttenbach, F.: Zu Decknamen keltischer Herkunft im Ostalpenraum, in: Akten der 13. Österreichischen Linguistentagung, ed. by Chr. Zinko, Graz 1988.
 Lötscher, A.: Der Name als lexikalische Einheit: Denotation und Konnotation, HzO 1, 1995, 448-57.
 Lőrincz, B. & F. Redő: Onomasticon provinciarum Europae Latinarum, vol. 1, Budapest 1994; vols. 2-4, Vienna 1999/2000/2002. (OPEL)
 Masson, O.: Onomastica Graeca selecta, Paris 1990.
 Masson, O.: Les noms propres d’homme en grec ancien, HzO 1, 1995, no. 102, 706-10.
 Meister, Karl: Lateinisch-griechische Eigennamen, Leipzig 1916.
 Michelena, L.: Diccionario general vasco. Orotariko euskal hiztegia, vol. 3, Bilbao 1989. (DGV)
 Mócsy, A.: Beiträge zur Namenstatistik, Budapest 1985 (=Diss. Pann.3.3).
 Morlet, M.-Th.: Les noms de personne sur le territoire de l’ancienne Gaule du VI^e au XII^e siècle, 3 vols., Paris 1971/72/85.
 Morlicchio, E.: Personennamen in mehrsprachigen Ländern und Regionen: Italien, HzO 2, 1996, no. 190, 1241-47.

- Namenforschung: ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik = Name Studies: an International Handbook on Onomastic Sciences, ed. by E. Eichler, G. Hilty, H. Löffler & H. Steger, Berlin & New York 1995-96 (=Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 11). (HzO)
- Onoma, Louvaine 1, 1950; latest vol.: 36, 2001.
- Pape, W.: Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen, revised by G.E. Benseler, Braunschweig ³1911 (repr. Graz 1959). (P-B)
- Personennamen und Identität. Namegebung und Namegebrauch als Anzeiger individueller Bestimmung und gruppenbezogener Zuordnung. ed. by R. Härtel, Graz 1997.
- Preisigke, F.: Namenbuch, Heidelberg 1922.
- Pokorny, Julius: Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, 2 vols., Bern 1959/69, ⁵1972. (IEW)
- Rix, H.: Römische Personennamen, HzO 1, 1995, no. 106, S. 724-32.
- Rix, H. et al.: Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben, Wiesbaden, ²2001. (LIV)
- Rizakis, A.D. (ed.): Roman Onomastics in the Greek East. Social and Political Aspects, Athens 1996 (=Meletema 21).
- Salway, B.: What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700, JRS 84, 1994, 124-45.
- Scherer, A.: Die keltisch-germanischen Namengleichungen, in: Corolla Linguistica, FS Ferdinand Sommer, Wiesbaden 1955, 199-210.
- Schmidt, K.H.: Die Komposition in gallischen Personennamen, ZCP 26, 1957, 33-301. (KGPN)
- Schmidt, K.H.: Keltische Namen, HzO 1, 1995, no. 111, 762-74.
- Schulze, W.: Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen, Berlin 1933.
- Seibicke, W.: Traditionen der Vornamengebung. Motivationen, Vorbilder, Moden: Germanisch, HzO 2, 1996, no. 184, 1207-14.
- Solin, H.: Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom, 3 vols., Berlin 1982 (=CIL *auctuarium*).
- Solin, H.: Namen im Alten Rom, HzO 2, 1996, no. 162, 1041-48.
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Leipzig (temporarily Stuttgart) 1900-: vols. 1-2 (A-B) include names, while names beginning with C/D are collected in a separate vol.; the onomasticon is not continued. (ThL)
- Tiefenbach, H.: Älteste germanische Namen der Völkerwanderungszeit in lateinischen und griechischen Quellen, HzO 1, 1995, no. 112, 774-78.
- Tiefenbach, H.: Geschichte und Entwicklung der Vornamen am Beispiel eines Sprach- und Kulturbereiches, HzO 2, 1996, no. 182, 1198-1202.
- Trask, R.L.: The History of Basque, London 1997.
- Untermann, J.: Die venetischen Personennamen, Wiesbaden 1961.
- Untermann, J.: Die vorrömischen Namen in Hispanien und Aquitanien, HzO 1, 1995, no. 108, 738-46.
- Untermann, J.: ‘Alteuropäisch’ in Hispanien, in: E. Eggers, J. Becker, J. Udolph, D. Weber (eds.), *Floriolum Linguisticum*. FS W.P. Schmid, Frankfurt/Main etc. 1999, 509-518.
- Vendryes, J. et al.: *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien*, Dublin & Paris 1959-. (LEIA)
- Vetters, H.: Die Personennamen vom Magdalensberg, in: Beiträge zur älteren europäischen Kulturgeschichte, vol. 3, Klagenfurt 1954, 32-45.
- Walde, A. & Hofmann, J.B.: Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, 2 vols., Heidelberg ⁵1982. (LEW)
- Walther, H.: Namen und Geschichte, HzO 2, 1996, no. 260, 1665-84.
- Weis, B.: Les patronymes dans les domaines linguistiques limitrophes. Les traductions humanistes des patronymes, HzO 2, 1996, no. 197, 1289-93.
- Weisgerber, J.L.: Die Sprache der Festlandkelten, Berichte der römisch-germanischen Kommission 1931 (repr. in Weisgerber Rhen. 11-85).
- Weisgerber, J.L.: Die Namen der Ubier, Cologne 1968. (Weisgerber Ub.)
- Weisgerber, (J.) L.: Rhenania Germano-Celtica. Gesammelte Abhandlungen, ed. by J. Knobloch & R. Schützeichel, Bonn 1969. (Weisgerber Rhen.)
- Whatmouth, J.: Dialects of Ancient Gaul, Cambridge/Mass. 1970. (DAG)

5. A Few Works on Celtic and Druidic Traditions (Mainly) in Roman Gaul

- aan te Wiel, C.: The Celtic Word for ‘Druid’, paper on the 11th Congress of Celtic Studies, University College Cork 1999 (unpublished).
- Beltrán Lloris, F.: Writing, Language and Society: Iberians, Celts and Romans in Northeastern Spain in the 2nd & 1st Centuries BC, BICS 43, 1999, 131-51.
- Birkhan, H.: Die Kelten. Versuch einer Gesamtdarstellung ihrer Kultur, Vienna 1997.
- Chastagnol, A.: Considérations sur les gentiles des pègrins naturalisés romains dans les Gaules et les provinces des Alpes (1993), in: La Gaule romaine et le droit latin, Lyon 1995, 155-65.
- Delamarre, X.: Cosmologie indo-européenne, ‘Rois du Monde’ celtiques et le nom des druides, Historische Sprachforschung 112, 1999, 32-38.

- Drinkwater, J.F., Roman Gaul. the three provinces, 58 BC–AD 260, London 1983.
 Gourevitch, D.: Présence de la médecine rationnelle gréco-romaine en Gaule, in: La médecine en Gaule, ed. by A. Pelletier, Paris 1985, 65–88.
 Loicq, J.: Les Druides dans l’ancienne société celtique, Folia Electronica Classica 1, 2001 (<http://bcs.fltr.ucl.ac.be/FE/01/Druides.html>).
 Rankin, H.D.: Celts and the Classical World, Beckenham (Kent) 1987.
 Rousselle, A.: La sage-femme et le thaumaturge dans la Gaule tardive, in: La médecine en Gaule, ed. by A. Pelletier, Paris 1985, 241–51.
 Webster, J.: At the End of the World. Druidic and Other Revitalization Movements in Post-Conquest Gaul and Britain, Britannia 30, 1999, 1–20.

6. List of Abbreviations

For abbreviations of journals cf. L’Année philologique; for the works of Ausonius cf. *Gens* 257.

- ACS = A.T. Holder: Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz, 3 vols., Leipzig 1896–1913.
 AE = Année Épigraphique, Paris 1888–.
 Alb. = Albanian.
 Avest. = Avestic.
 Br. = Breton.
 CI = Codex Iustinianus, ed. by P. Krüger, Berlin 1877.
 CIL = Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum, ed. by the Academia Borussica, Berlin 1862–.
 CLRE = R.S. Bagnall et al. (eds.): Consuls of the Later Roman Empire, Atlanta 1987.
 CN = Cover name, *Deckname*.
 Co. = Cornish.
 CTh = Codex Theodosianus, ed. by Th. Mommsen, Berlin 1904/5.
 DAG = J. Whatmough: The dialects of ancient Gaul. Prolegomena and records of the dialects, Cambridge/Mass. 1970.
 DGV = L. Michelena: Diccionario General Vasco. Orotariko Euskal Hiztegia, vol. 3: Ase-Bapuru, Bilbao 1989.
 DLG = X. Delamarre: Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise, Paris ²2003.
 DOHV = J. de Querexeta: Diccionario onomastico y heraldico vasco, vol. 1, Bilbao 1970.
 E-M = A. Ernout & A. Meillet: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine, Paris ⁴1979.
 EWAia = M. Mayrhofer: Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen, 2 vols., Heidelberg 1986–1996.
 FEW = W. von Wartburg (ed.): Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. eine Darstellung des gallo-romanischen Sprachschatzes, 14 vols., Bonn 1948–1961 (and later additions).
 Fr. = French.
 G. = Greek.
Gens = A. Coşkun: Die *gens Ausoniana* an der Macht. Untersuchungen zu Decimius Magnus Ausonius und seiner Familie, Oxford 2002.
 Germ. = German.
 Gl. = Gaulish.
 GPC = Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru. A Dictionary of the Welsh Language. 3 vol., Cardiff 1950–.
 GPN = D. Ellis Evans, Gaulish Personal Names. A Study of Some Continental Celtic Formations, Oxford 1967.
 Grm. = Germanic.
 Hitt = Hittite.
 Hom.G. = Homeric Greek.
 HzO = Namenforschung: ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik, ed. by E. Eichler, G. Hilty, H. Löffler & H. Steger, Berlin & New York 1995–96.
 IEW = J. Pokorny: Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, 2 vol., Bern 1959–1969.
 ILS = Inscriptiones Latinae selectae, ed. by H. Dessau.
 IN = Imperial name.
 KGPN = K.H. Schmidt: Die Komposition in gallischen Personennamen, ZCP 26, Tübingen 1957, 33–301 (also published separately).
 LAGN = H. Reichert: Thesaurus Palaeogermanicus I/1: Lexikon der altgermanischen Namen, Text. Vienna 1987.
 LEIA = J. Vendryes: Lexique étymologique de l’irlandais ancien. 7 vols. Dublin & Paris 1959–.
 LEW = A. Walde, J.B. Hofmann: Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, 2 vols., Heidelberg ⁵1982.

- LG = P.-Y. Lambert, *La langue gauloise. description linguistique, commentaire d’inscriptions choisies*, Paris 1994 (later eds.: 1995; 1997; in print).
- LHEB = K.H. Jackson, *Language and History in Early Britain*, Edinburgh 1953 (repr. Dublin 1994).
- LIV = H. Rix & M. Kümmel: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden ²2001.
- MBr. = Middle Breton.
- MCo. = Middle Cornish.
- Messap. = Messapic.
- MGH = *Monumenta Germaniae historica*: AA = *Auctores antiquissimi*, Berlin 1876–; *Sript. rer. Mer.* = *Scripta rerum Merovingicarum*, Hannover 1885–.
- MIr = Middle Irish.
- OBre. = Old Breton.
- OCor. = Old Cornish.
- OCS = Old Church Slavonic.
- OEngl. = Old English (Anglo-Saxon).
- OIr = Old Irish.
- OLat. = Old Latin.
- OPEL = B. Lőrincz & F. Redő: *Onomasticon provinciarum Europae Latinarum*, 4 vols., Budapest (vol. 1) / Vienna (vols. 2-4) 1994-2002.
- P-B = W. Pape: *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, revised by G.E. Benseler, Braunschweig ³1911 (repr. Graz 1959).
- PCBE = *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, part I: *Prosopographie de l’Afrique chrétienne* (303-533), ed. by A. Mandouze, Paris 1982; part II: *Prosopographie de l’Italie chrétienne* (313-604), ed. by Ch. & L. Pietri, 2 vols., Rome 1999/2000.
- PLN = Place name.
- PLRE = *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Cambridge, vol. 1, ed. by A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale & J. Morris, 1971, vols. 2 und 3, ed. by J.R. Martindale, 1980/92.
- PN = Personal name.
- RE = *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften*, rev. by G. Wissowa, Stuttgart 1894–.
- REW = W. Meyer-Lübke: *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg ⁶1992.
- RIB = *The Roman inscriptions of Britain*, ed. by R.G. Collingwood & R.P. Wright, 10 vols., Oxford; Gloucester 1965/1983–1995.
- RIG 2/1 = *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises*. vol. 2. fasc. 1: *Les textes gallo-étrusques. Les textes gallo-latins sur pierre*, (gen.ed. P.-M. Duval), Paris 1988.
- RIG 3 = *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises*. vol. 3: *Les calendriers* (Coligny, villards d’Heria), (gen.ed. P.-M. Duval), Paris 1986.
- Skt. = Sanskrit.
- SOI = S. Ziegler: *Die Sprache der altirischen Ogam-Inschriften*, Göttingen 1994.
- Thes. = P.H. Billy: *Thesaurus linguae Gallicae*, Hildesheim 1993.
- ThlL = *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, Leipzig (temporarily Stuttgart) 1900–.
- VGKS = H. Pedersen: *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, 2 vols., Göttingen 1909/13.
- W = Welsh.