

THE NAME ELEMENT *BRK* IN LATIN EPIGRAPHICAL SOURCES

Karel JONGELING - Leiden

In several Phoenician, Punic and Neo-Punic texts the name or name element *brk* is attested. The following table is an overview, based on the work of Benz on personal names in Phoenician and Punic,¹ and that of the present author on names in Neo-Punic texts.²

1 <i>brk</i>	P	¹ 25	NP	² 6	
2 <i>bryk</i>	NP	1			
3 <i>brkt</i>	P	1	NP	3	
4 <i>brk't</i>	NP	1			
5 <i>brk</i> + n.d.	Ph	2	P	8	NP 17
6 <i>brkt</i> + n.d.	Ph	1	NP	1	
7 <i>bry</i> ³	P	2			
8 <i>brk'</i>	P	2			
9 n.d. + <i>brk</i>	P	2 ⁴			

Notes to table 1

¹ P = Punic, NP = Neo-Punic, Ph = Phoenician

² The number indicates the total of attestations.

³ For the inclusion of *bry* a hypocoristic of *brk* or *brkb'*, compare for instance Benz p. 291.

⁴ Both attestations in the same text.

¹ F.L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions* (Studia Pohl, 8) Rome 1972.

² K. Jongeling, *Names in Neo-Punic Inscriptions*, diss., Groningen 1984.

Vicino Oriente, 7 (1988)

Although it is interesting to note that only a few examples stem from Phoenician texts, an explanation of this phenomenon lies outside the scope of this study. We are mainly concerned here with the vocalization of this name/name element and the grammatical explanation based thereon. It is obvious that the vocalization cannot be deduced from the material in table 1. The isolated *bryk* proves that there must have been a form of the name *brk* realised with a vowel /i/ in the second syllable. The name *brkʔt* shows that the feminine ending has been realised with a back vowel in certain instances. -ʔ and -ʔ can be explained as hypocoristic endings, resp. /-i/ and /-o/. We will try to explain these names, basing our investigation on the material from Latin epigraphical sources from North Africa.

All the names from Latin epigraphical sources that contain this name/name element are listed in an appendix to this article, together with some comment on individual texts where this seemed appropriate. In the main part of the study we only quote names and statistics, without references.

The various names are classified according to their different vowel patterns, as these are the best indications of the grammatical forms underlying these names (see table 3). Before we discuss these vowel patterns, however, we will make some short remarks on the representation of the third root consonant.

The following representations of this third root consonant are attested, see table 2.

	A ¹			B			C						D				E	A'		D'		total
	1 ²	3		1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	4	1	2	1	4	
<i>c</i>				39	11	27	9	7	3	10	1	5	7	1	13	2				2	1	141
<i>ch</i>	3			2		4	1					2 ⁶										12
<i>g</i>	1			2	13 ⁷		1	2 ¹⁰		1				1				2				29
					3 ⁸			2 ¹¹														
<i>h</i>				9		3	1	2			2 ¹²									1		18
<i>k</i>																		1				1
<i>cc</i>						3																3
<i>hh</i>						1																1
<i>∅</i>				3	7		3			1												13
total 4				129						53					24		1		3		4	218

Notes to table 2

1 Classification according to the following vowel patterns, A = a - a, B = a - i/e, C = i/e - i/e, D = u/o - u/o, E = ê - ô, A' = a - ø, D' = u - ø.

2 These numbers indicate the construction of the name, 1 = name without extensions, apart from Latin case endings based on a nominative case without ending, thus for instance both *baric* and *baricis* (gen.) are counted under this heading, 2 = combined with the nomen dei *-bal*, 3 = extended with a Latin nominal ending, 4 = extended with the fem. ending *-t*, 5 = extended with the ending *-t*, followed by *-bal*, 6 = extended with *-t*, followed by a Latin nominal ending.

3 In *barical*, with loss of the following labial.

4 In the consonant cluster *-cth-*.

5 In the consonant cluster *-cth-*, the Greek parallel βουρχθ shows that both *c* and *t* are aspirated.

6 The names *birichi* and *berechi* are read resp. *biricht* and *berecht*.

7 In the consonant cluster *-gb-*.

8 In the consonant cluster *-bg-*.

9 In the name *barigal*, with the loss of the following labial.

10 Compare note⁷.

11 Compare note⁸.

12 Representation of the feminine ending **-at* instead of **-t*, corresponding with the ending *-ṭ* in *brkṭt*.

In the first place we note that the more usual representation of original *kaf* is by *c* (141 out of 218 instances, that is 64.7%). In three instances *kaf* is rendered by *-cc-* (1.4%). This means that in 66.1% of the names the original **-k(-)* is represented by a grapheme indicating /k/. In 23 names original **-k-* is represented by *-g-* in direct contact with /b/ of the name element *-bal = b^cl*, a sound shift to be expected when a voiced consonant and a voiceless one come into contact. It should be noted however, that even under these circumstances 21 examples of /k/ (represented by *c*) are to be found. Combining the 23 cases of *-g- < /k/* in direct contact with /b/ (that is 10.6% of the total of 218 names) with those of /k/ rendered by *c* or *cc*, we find that in 167 names (that is 76.6%) the representation of original /k/ may easily be explained.

ch possibly indicates an aspirated consonant related to /k/, i.e. /k^h/. It should be noted that there are just 12 examples (that is 5.5%), and we cannot be sure that *ch* indicates the features of aspiration characterizing the pronunciation of the West-Semitic tenuis. It just seems possible that *ch* was used to indicate a realisation of the original *kaf* as a spirant, /χ/, but the examples adduced by Friedrich and Röllig rather point to the first explanation.³ If original **-k-* was occasionally rendered by a spirant, it seems more likely that the names in which original **-k-* is represented by *h* or *hh* are reflections of this pronunciation; the 19 examples of this kind are 8.7% of the total of names considered. Whether the 13 instances in which **-k-* is represented by *ø* should be considered as

³ J. Friedrich - W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik* (Analecta Orientalia, 46), Roma 1970, p. 16.

the result of a development /k/ > /χ/ > /h/ > /ø/, is difficult to judge, but even when we take the examples of -ch-, -h-, -hh- and -ø- together, only 20.2% of the names in our collection might be explained by spirantisation.

A renewed investigation of the realisation of the non-emphatic voiced stops /b, d, g/, the non-emphatic voiceless stops /p, t, k/ and the relation of /t, k/ to the emphatic stops /t̤, k̤/, seems to be worthwhile. Such an investigation should not only make a distinction between attestations in the Poenulus (most of the examples quoted by Friedrich and Röllig are from this single text) and material from inscriptions found in North Africa. Also in these texts from North Africa several distinctions have to be made. The so-called Latino-Libyan (or rather Latino-Punic) texts from Tripolitania should be studied apart from the onomastic material supplied by the main body of inscriptions from Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. They seem to represent an orthography of a peculiar kind, distinct from the normal Latin usage. It is not improbable that close investigation will also show distinctions in orthography, that reflect different pronunciations, among the Latin texts from Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco.⁴

The other question that arises from the group of names derived from the root *BRK* is how these different name forms should be analysed from a grammatical viewpoint. Because such an analysis is based on the different vowel patterns found in the various names, we first give a summary of the collection of names according to their vowel patterns see table 3.

⁴ Compare e.g. A. Acquati, *Il vocalismo latino-volgare nelle iscrizioni africane*: ACME, 24 (1971), pp. 155-184, on diverging pronunciation.

The Name Element *BRK*

A ¹ a - a: 1 ² 3	1 3	a - a: 4 1.8 %	4 1.8 %	A ⁻¹ 4 1.8 %
B a - i: 1 2 3 a - e: 2	56 33 42 ³ 1	a - i: 131 57.5 %	132 57.9 %	B- 132 57.9 %
C i - i: 1 2 3 4 5 6 e - i: 1 2 4 e - e: 1 2 4 6 ae - e: 2	7 5 2 7 ⁴ 1 1 2 ⁵ 1 2 ⁶ 5 7 7 9 ⁷ 1	i - i: 23 10.1 %	57 25.0 %	C- 30 13.2 % Ct ¹ 27 11.8 % e - i: 5 2.2 % e - e: 28 12.3 % ae - e: 1 0.4 %
D u - u: 2 3 o - u: 1 o - o: 1 3 4	1 4 1 7 13 ⁸ 2	u - u: 5 2.2 %	28 12.3 %	D- 26 11.4 % Dt 2 0.9 %
E ə - ə: 4	1	ə - ə: 1 0.4 %	1 0.4 %	Et 1 0.4 %
A' a - ø: 1 2	1 2	a - ø: 3 1.3 %	3 1.3 %	A'- 3 1.3 %
D' u - ø: 1 4	2 1	u - ø: 3 1.3 %	3 1.3 %	D'- 2 0.9 % D't 1 0.4 %
total of vocalised examples:		228	100 %	
total of examples without -t		197	86.4 %	
total of examples with -t		31	13.6 %	

TABLE 3

Notes to table 3

- 1 The capitals indicate the different vowel patterns, a capital followed by a dash (e.g. A-) indicates the names of the type mentioned, not followed by the fem. ending, a capital + t indicates the names of the type mentioned with the fem. ending.
- 2 See table 2, note 2.
- 3 Counting *baricf* sub 3, and leaving *barin* aside.
- 4 Including the names *birihut*, *birici* and *birichi*.
- 5 Also including the name *peric*.
- 6 Including the name *reict*.
- 7 Including the names *berecthf?* and *berecf*.
- 8 Also counting *borof* and *borocf*.

Some of these vocalization patterns are rather common, B, C and D account for 217 names, that is 95.2% of the total collection. Other patterns are only found in one or a few names. Some of these rarer patterns may easily be accounted for, namely A', because it seems extremely probable that the vocalization pattern /a - ø/ is only a variant of the pattern /a - i/, as one can see by the loss of /i/ that is attested elsewhere (compare for instance *baldir*, variant of *baliddir*⁵), at least in unstressed syllables, thus explaining *bargbal(is)*, i.e. /bàrikbá'l/ > /bàrikbál/ > /barkbál/ > /bargbál/ ('- indicating primary, and -' indicating secondary stress). Because a development /barík/ > /bárk/ is less probable, we might ask whether it is possible to read -IC instead of -K; when the name *bark* is genuine, this form of the name /barik/ points to an accentuation on the first syllable, although not to be expected in Punic, possible through adaptation to the Latin stress conditions. D' can be conveniently explained as a variant of the vowel pattern /u - u/, if we again assume influence of the stress pattern normal in Latin, where the main stress in disyllabic words rests on the first syllable. E may be explained, either as a reduced form of C or D, or as a variant of one of these with a deviating realisation of the vowel (/ü/ versus /u/, or /i/ versus /i/). Another possibility is to explain *byrycth* as an orthographical variant of an unattested *biricth*, but this seems less probable.⁶

Another small section in our collection shows the vowel pattern /a - a/. These names call for a few observations. There is the strange co-occurrence of *barag* and *boroc* (*CECILIA BARAG* resp. *CAECILIA BOROC*) in the same inscription, but in parts that date from different times, where we must assume that both names were pronounced in a similar way. Perhaps /a/ in the dialect of the speaker responsible for the spelling of the part of the inscription in which *barag* occurs was so near /ò/, that he felt himself able to use the grapheme *a* to indicate the /ò/-sound in *boroc*. Comparable use of *a* can be found in e.g. Middle Dutch, as written in the eastern provinces of the Netherlands, where historical /a/ tended to an actual pronunciation /ò/, and where, as a result, /o/ could be re-

⁵ Compare on this name e.g. K. Jongeling, *Vowel assimilation in Punic*. "Jaarbericht 'Ex Oriente Lux'", 29 (1985-1986, appeared 1987), pp. 124-132, see p. 129 f.

⁶ For *y* indicating /ò/ compare e.g. Jongeling, cit.; compare however also Friedrich and Röllig, *Grammatik*, p. 34.

The Name Element *BRK*

ical /ā/ tended to an actual pronunciation /ō/, and where, as a result, /ō/ could be represented by *a* (cfr. *God* (/got/) = nom. sing. 'God', *Gades* (/gōdes/) = gen. sing. 'God's'). Our inclination is to explain the name *barahi* in the same way, assuming that the *i* should be read as *t*, thus *barahi* = /bōrōht/, a variant of *boroct* (for *ht* representing the third root consonant of *BRK* followed by the fem. ending *-t*, cfr. *birhtina*); for the names *baracho(nis)* and *barachianus*, see below.

This leaves us now with the three main categories B, C and D. Benz explains the names of category B (vowel pattern /a - i/) as containing the imperative of the pi^cel.⁷ It is the only imperative form in names accepted by him,⁸ and connected to the use of the pi^cel of *BRK* in the closing formula of many votive texts. As this last mentioned element of the votive formula is not clear in all instances, we must look at these expressions first. Only orthographical variants of the normal forms, in which no indication of the vowels is given, are of any use; for these variants, see table 4.

1 $b^c rk'$ in the formulae	a) $\check{s}m' ql' b^c rk'$ ⁹⁾
	b) $\check{s}^c m' 't q\omega l' b^c rk'$ ¹⁰⁾
	c) $\check{s}^c m' 't ql' \omega b^c rk'$ ¹¹⁾
	d) $t\check{s}^c m' ql' \omega b^c rk'$ ¹²⁾
2 $br^c k'$ in the formula	e) $br^c k' \omega \check{s}m\omega ql'$ ¹³⁾
3 $b\check{h}rk'$ in the formula	f) $b\check{h}rk' \omega \check{s}m\check{h} ql'h'$ ¹⁴⁾
4 βαραχω in the formula	g) σαμω κουλω βαραχω ¹⁵⁾

⁷ Benz, *Personal Names*, p. 216.

⁸ *Idem*, p. 217.

⁹ NP 110, compare J.-B. Chabot, *Punica XVII*, 1.

¹⁰ NP 43, compare *id.*, XII, 10.

¹¹ *Punica XIV*, 7.

¹² P. Berthier - R. Charlier, *Le sanctuaire Punique d'El-Hofra*, Paris 1952-1955, n. 161.

¹³ NP 85, compare Chabot, *Punica XI*, 31.

¹⁴ RES 340.

¹⁵ Berthier - Charlier, *El-Hofra*, Gr. n. 4.

When in all instances given in table 4 the form of the root *BRK* is the same, a pronunciation /barako/ must be postulated. The *ʿ* and *h* in the examples under a-d and f point to /a/ in the first syllable, and *ʿ* in the example under e points to /a/ in the second syllable. This pronunciation is in accordance with the transcription under g in Greek script. Friedrich and Röllig explain this form as a qal perfect 3 p. sing.,¹⁶ agreeing with the form of the root *SMʿ* in most instances (the forms under a-c, e and g point to the pronunciation /samo/, i.e. qal perf. 3 p. sing; *smh* might be explained as a variant /sama/ of the same verbal form; *ʿsmʿ* under d is an anomalous form, which needs separate treatment). But they maintain that also a piʿel form is attested, namely *ibarcu* in the *Poenulus*,¹⁷ a form corresponding to Hebrew *yǝbārǝkū*. This explanation is also accepted by Sznycer in his commentary on the Punic texts in the *Poenulus*.¹⁸ However, on this point some problems remain, as Sznycer correctly remarks. The form *ibarcu* is not attested as such, but is the result of an emendation of the text which reads *ibarul* on this point. Furthermore, the *e* in the reconstructed form is the only example of original *kaf* represented by *e* in this text; in all other instances *kaf* is represented by *ch*.¹⁹ Therefore we hesitate to accept *ibarcu* as definite proof of the existence of piʿel-forms of *BRK*,²⁰ although, of course, this does not mean that no piʿel forms can be found in the personal names under discussion. The names *baracho(nis)* and *barachianus* may perhaps be adduced as further proof of the existence of qal forms of this root, in this case of the type *qatal (see below). Both names can be explained as hypocoristica consisting of a form qal perf. 3 sing. m. extended by a Latin nominal ending.

The names of category B (vowel pattern /a - i/) most probably contain a verbal form of which the deity occurring in the name is the subject, at least when the absence of names with vowel pattern /a - i/ followed by the feminine ending *-T*, may be explained in this way. Apart from the imperative piʿel, mentioned above, the only verbal form that might be represented by /barik/ is qal perf. 3 sing. m., when the verb in question is of the type *kabid. The relation between the piʿel-forms of *BRK* and the qal passive participle is still under discussion, therefore the possibility of the existence of a qal of the type *kabid in connection with the root *BRK*, should not be ruled out a priori. This would leave us with two names of perfectly normal formation, namely a verbal form in the perfect, with or without a subject following. There is, of course, the difficulty that original */-i-/ in the

¹⁶ Friedrich - Röllig, *Grammatik*, p. 67, n. 1.

¹⁷ Line 931.

¹⁸ M. Sznycer, *Les passages Puniques en transcription Latine dans le "Poenulus" de Plaute*, Paris 1967 (Etudes et Commentaires, 65), p. 59.

¹⁹ For another solution, compare for instance P. Schröder, *Die Phönizische Sprache*, Halle 1869, pp. 289f., 306.

²⁰ Friedrich and Röllig quote this form several times, without mentioning its hypothetical character, cfr. *Grammatik*, p. 16 (as an example of the use of *e* to represent Punic /k/ l), 32, 34, 57, 66f., which seems not to be correct.

syllable bearing the main stress remains /-i-/, although a development /-i-/ > /-e-/ was perhaps to be expected in accordance with the remarks of Friedrich and Röllig in their grammar.²¹ This problem, however, remains the same when *baric* is explained as an imperative of the pi'el. Probably the rule stated by Friedrich and Röllig is less rigid than they suppose, compare for example, apart from αβδηλιμοσ mentioned by them (that supposes that η represents /ē/, which is a highly uncertain interpretation) the following names from Latin sources, *abdilim*,²² *methunilim*,²³ *mythumilim*,²⁴ *muthunilim*,²⁵ and, when they should be

- 1 original *-T*, in combination with the preceding *K*, represented by
- a) *-ct* in *birict* (cf. also *birici*), *birictbal*, *berict* (*rerict*), *berect*, *boroct*, *burct*, compare also *berecte*, *berectina*;
 - b) *-cht* possibly in *birichi*, *berechi* (see for both these names, list s.v.);
 - c) *-ht* in *birihtina*;
 - d) *-cht* in *byrycth*, and compare also *berecthf* (see list of names s.v.);
 - e) *-gt* in *berregt*;
 - f) *-t* in *beret*;
- 2 original *-AT*, which developed to /-ut/ (/ -at/ > /-ā́t/ > /-ṓt/ > /-ut/), represented by
- g) *-ut* in *birihut* (compare also [bi]ricut).

²¹ Friedrich - Röllig, *Grammatik*, p. 31.

²² "Karthago", 10 (1959), p. 94.

²³ CIL, VIII, 12322.

²⁴ IRT, 873.

²⁵ CIL, VIII, 10525, cfr. also *mutthunilim* CIL, VIII, 23904.

explained as forms of the pi'el perfect of the root *MGN*,²⁶ also *miggin*,²⁷ *miccin*,²⁸ *migin*²⁹ and *meggin*.³⁰

The most important difference between the categories B on the one hand and the categories C and D on the other, is that in C and D, extension of the name element derived from the root *BRK* with the feminine ending *-AT* occurs. This leads to the supposition that these names consist of, or are construed with, a nominal derivation of the root *BRK*.

The feminine ending occurs in two different forms, compare table 5.

The type of name mentioned under g) corresponds, of course, with the Neo-Punic name *brkʔt*, where ʔ indicates /-o-/ or, possibly, /-u-/. Friedrich and Röllig, in their grammar, maintain that original /a/ develops to /ō/ in stressed syllables, whereas original /ā/ in many instances develops to /u/.³¹ Although not too much weight should be attached to one name, the occurrence of *birihut* indicates that, at least in some cases, also original /a/ may be represented by /u/. The same vowel in the same situation is found in another name namely *arisut*,³² *arisuth*,³³ *arrisut*,³⁴ representations of the name ʔršt.

The names of category D are most easily explained as containing the qal passive participle, in which the vowel of the first syllable has changed from original /a/ to /o/ or /u/ as a result of vowel assimilation. If correct, there is a very close correspondence between these names and the Hebrew name *bārūk*.³⁵ However, a problem is that, apart from the names of this type with feminine ending, also the names *burucbal*, *boruc*, *boroc*, which have no feminine ending, are used for females. More striking still, within category D, we have not yet found a single name used for a man. This may be explained as an accidental development, but it seems more appropriate to suppose that, as for example the name ʔršt, the names in this category consist of or are constructed from two nouns, one masculine, and one feminine, that need not necessarily correspond in gender with the sex of the bearer of the name. One might suppose an original base *barak > /barāk/ > /barōk/ > /borōk/, and, with feminine ending *-T* and vocalization in analogy to the masculine form, /borokt/. The same nominal base is to be found in Hebrew *bārākā*.

²⁶ Compare Benz. *Personal Names*, p. 339, and Jongeling, *Names*, p. 39.

²⁷ CIL, VIII, 10686, ILA, I, 2965.

²⁸ CIL, VIII, 27825b.

²⁹ "Augustinianum", 16 (1976), p. 553, nr. 69.

³⁰ BAC, 1936-1937, p. 217.

³¹ Friedrich - Röllig, *Grammatik*, p. 28ff., 106f.

³² BAC, 1946-1949, p. 180

³³ CIL, VIII, 22688 = IRT, 239, IRT, 850.

³⁴ IRT, 754, VII.

³⁵ For the vowel assimilation, compare the article mentioned in note 5.

The Name Element *BRK*

The names of category C may be explained in the same way, supposing an original nominal base *b^wrik. In this case too, we have to fall back on the idea of vowel assimilation to explain the vowel in the first syllable of this name or name element.³⁶

ABBREVIATIONS

- ACME = "Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Milano"
AE = "L'Année Epigraphique"
BAC = "Bulletin Archéologique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques"
CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin 1863 sgg.
ILA = St. Gsell, *Inscriptions Latines d'Algérie*, I, Paris 1922, H.G. Pflaum, *ibid.*, II/1, II/2, Paris 1957.
ILAf = R. Cagnat, A. Merlin - L. Chatelain, *Inscriptions Latines d'Afrique*, Paris 1923.
ILT = A. Merlin, *Inscriptions Latines de la Tunisie*, Paris 1944.
IRT = J.M. Reynolds - J.B. Ward Perkins, *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, London 1952.
NP + number, compare list of Neo-Punic inscriptions in e.g. K. Jongeling (see note 2), p. xxviii f.
Punica = J.-B. Chabot in: JA, 11/7 (1916) - JA, 11/11, Paris 1918.
RES = *Répertoire d'Épigraphie Sémitique*, Paris 1900 sgg.

³⁶ Compared with hebrew *bṣrēkā* "kneeling", one must assume a different meaning for Punic *b rik(t), but the words are not related, perhaps.

APPENDIX

The names containing forms of the root *BRK* from classical sources, grouped according to the vowels they exhibit (central back vowel *a*, back vowels *u* and *o*, front vowels *i* and *e*).

A central back vowel in both syllables. a - a

<i>barag</i>	see <i>boroc</i>
<i>barahi</i>	CIL, VIII, 10882 = ILA, II, 222: <i>IVLIA·C / BARAHI / V·A·LXX</i>
<i>baracho</i>	BAC, 1946-1949, p. 683
<i>barachonis</i> (gen.)	CIL, VIII, 23397a
<i>barachianus</i>	ILT, 499

B central back vowel in the first syllable and front vowel in the second one. a - i

<i>baric</i>	CIL, I, 755 = VIII, 10525
	CIL, VIII, 2564 b 26
	4730
	5034 (uncertain)
	5585 = ILA, II, 5635
	10686
	10923 = 20463
	16977, for the reading see ILA, I, 659
	17033
	17063
	17067
	17085
	18068 B 17, 33
	27444
	28019
ILA, II, 4856	
6103	
6340: <i>D M S / IVLIVS / BARICCE /</i> <i>VICCI ANIS / XXXVI</i> , read in l. 3: <i>BARIC C F(i)lius?</i>	
"Karthago", 8, 78	
<i>baricis</i> (gen.)	CIL, VIII, 8743
	10475, 27
	11965
	16899
	16999
	17005
	17568
	18656
	22632, 45
	23399

The Name Element *BRK*

	26931
	27619
	"Karthago", 8, 78
<i>cf. baric[is]</i>	CIL, VIII, 4920 + p. 1630: <i>D M S FESTA ZA[B]O[NIS]</i> <i>(uxor) BARIC[IS] FIL: PIA</i>
<i>barici (dat.)</i>	CIL, VIII, 4366 21484
	ILA, II, 6980
<i>baricem (acc.)</i>	ILAf. 82
<i>barice (abl.)</i>	CIL, VIII, 20516
<i>barich</i>	CIL, VIII, 27600
<i>barichis (gen.)</i>	CIL, VIII, 16996 = ILA, I, 599 17018 = ILA, I, 720
<i>barig</i>	ILA, II, 4938 (an earlier edition gave: <i>BARIC</i>) AE, 1976, 724
<i>barih</i>	CIL, VIII, 11941 11971 27821
	ILA, I, 2440 2607 2608
	AE, 1946, 47
<i>barihis (gen.)</i>	CIL, VIII, 27600 27819
<i>barhic</i>	CIL, VIII, 19141 = ILA, II, 6554
<i>bari</i>	CIL, VIII, 5318 = ILA, I, 227 8748 = 20500: <i>D M S F BARI VIXIT A NIS</i> etc. 17086
<i>baricca</i>	CIL, VIII, 15946
<i>baricha</i>	CIL, VIII, 27548 (division of words uncertain)
<i>bariha</i>	CIL, VIII, 15740 15754 (<i>BARIII = BARIHA?</i>) 16307
<i>cf. laricha</i>	CIL, VIII, 16847, lapsus pro <i>baricha?</i> thus CIL a.1.
<i>baricas</i>	CIL, VIII, 4501: <i>D M S C· IVLIVS VICTOR VIXIT ANIS</i> <i>LXXXV MEMORIE BA RICAS</i>
<i>barihhas</i>	CIL, VIII, 27540
<i>baricio</i>	CIL, VIII, 2564 c 96 3248 3434 4080 4081 14937 17548 = ILA, I, 369

	ILA, II,	4948	
		4972	
		6990	
		6991	
cfr.	<i>bar[i]cio</i>	CIL, VIII,	15596
	<i>[b]aricio</i>	CIL, VIII,	6818
			27083
	<i>baricio[nis]</i> (gen.)	CIL, VIII,	8770:
	<i>baric[i]o[nis]</i> (gen.)	CIL, VIII,	5034 + p. 1630 = ILA, I, 1733; or
			read: <i>BARIC[HIO]NIS</i>
	<i>[b]a[ri]cioni[s]</i> (gen.)	CIL, VIII,	16977 = ILA, I, 659
<i>baricioni</i> (dat.)		CIL, VIII,	3707:
		BAC, 1932-1933,	p. 176
<i>baricione</i> (abl.)		CIL, VIII,	17258 = ILA, I, 951
<i>bariccio</i>		CIL, VIII,	20364
		ILA, II,	4917
<i>barichio</i>		CIL, VIII,	5132 = ILA, I, 1435
<i>barichionis</i> (gen.)		IRT,	672
<i>barici[</i>		CIL, VIII,	11459:] <i>CRIVS BARICII</i>]] <i>ANIS</i>
			24621
<i>baric[</i>		ILA, II,	6878: <i>D M S HAELIVS BARIC</i>
<i>bari[</i>		CIL, VIII,	27660
<i>baricus</i>		ILA, II,	2278
<i>barici</i> (gen.)		AE, 1937,	152
<i>bariciolus</i>		CIL, VIII,	14917
<i>baricissus</i>		AE, 1968,	562
cfr. <i>bariricis</i> (gen.)		ILT,	577: <i>FELIX BARIRICIS</i> , lapsus for: <i>FELIX BARICIS</i> ?
cfr. possibly also:	<i>barin</i>	CIL, VIII,	20501: <i>D M</i> <i>FADIA</i> <i>BARIN</i> <i>NIS LXX</i> <i>VI</i>
	<i>baria</i>	"Libyca", 2,	375
<i>baricbal</i>		CIL, VIII,	4990
			16932 = ILA, I, 596
			16933 = ILA, I, 597 (Gsell's edition reads: <i>barigbal</i>)
			17305 (uncertain)
		IRT,	828
		"Karthago", 8,	77
			78
<i>baricbalis</i> (gen.)		CIL, VIII,	5311
		ILAF,	76

The Name Element *BRK*

- barigbal* "Karthago", 8, 78
 CIL, VIII, 9085
 9086 (bis)
 12074
 23867 (bis, once probably
barigbal/[is], gen.)
- barighalis (gen.)* ILT, 506
 AE, 1949, 46
 CIL, VIII, 16989 = ILA, I, 671
 23872
- cfr. *barigbal[is? (gen.)* CIL, VIII, 23113
barighali (gen.) ILA, I, 1862: *D·M·S / ROGATVS / BARIGBALI· / PVA
 XXX / HSE; Gsell reads barigbali(s).*
- baribgal* Leglay, I, 118
baribgalis (gen.) CIL, VIII, 16858
baribgelis (gen.) CIL, VIII, 15785
baribal CIL, VIII, 9442
 16712
 23731
- baribalis (gen.)* ILA, I, 2880
 ILA, I, 728
barical CIL, VIII, 16774, for the reading see ILA, I, 1128
barigal CIL, VIII, 16769
barisal ILA, I, 1436, cfr. Gsell's remark: in inscriptions
 from Africa *G* often looks like *S*.
- balibal* CIL, VIII, 16931 = ILA, I, 595
balibalis (gen.) CIL, VIII, 16931 = ILA, I, 595
barigbalius ILT, 246

and with the front vowel in the second syllable represented by - e
barecbalis (gen.) CIL, VIII, 15799

cfr. also the following names showing the loss of the second vowel
bark CIL, VIII, 14466: *OCTAVIVS BARK*
bargbal BAC, 1950, p. 61
bargbalis BAC, 1932-1933, p. 204
 cfr. possibly also *bar* CIL, VIII, 16996: *D M S / BARZAZ|BVLLI / VIXSIT* etc., cfr.
 however the earlier reading of Reboud:
D M S / BARIA / BVLLI / etc.; possibly to
 be explained as *BAR(ic) ZABVLLI (filius)*,
 cfr. however also CIL, VIII, 17022:
SATVRNI| NA·BARB / F·ZABVLV / S V·A·
 etc. (or read perhaps *BARK* pro *BARB* ?)
 CIL, VIII, 16926: .. *AVRELIVS· BA|R· F QVI ET MVS|A·*
V·A· LXXXI etc.; *BAR* pro *BAR(icis)* ?

C two front vowels, i - i

<i>biric</i>	(m)	CIL, VIII, 17022 ILA, I, 714 (uncertain)
	(f)	CIL, VIII, 6845: <i>JETINIA BIRIC</i> 6892: <i>IVLIA Q FIL IA BIRICVS </i> <i>A XXXIII HSE,</i> i.e. <i>IVLIA Q FILIA (quae et)</i> <i>BIRIC V(ix)S(it)</i> <i>A(nnis) etc.</i>
<i>birich</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 27559:
<i>birichi</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 16035: <i>D M S GRANIA BIRICHI </i> <i>VIXIT etc., or rather to be read</i> <i>BIRICHT pro BIRICHI ?</i>
<i>biricia</i> (f)		ILA, II, 3656
<i>biricius</i> (m)		AE, 1946, 47
<i>hiri</i> (f);		CIL, VIII, 16977 = ILA, I, 659: <i>DMS IVLIA BIRI </i> <i>FELICIS·FI., etc.</i>
		ILA, I, 4004
<i>birichal</i> (f);		CIL, VIII, 16932, for this reading cfr. ILA, I, 596 AE, 1935, 34 = BAC, 1934, p. x
<i>birichalis</i> (gen.)		CIL, VIII, 27495
<i>birihbal</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 16034
<i>bilibgal</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 6077
<i>birict</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 17019 = ILA, I, 721 17222: <i>BIRICT BICIS· F· P·V·AN LI H·S</i>
		ILA, I, 760
cfr. <i>birici</i>		CIL, VIII, 15733: <i>D M S C· BIRICI VA LXXXX HSE,</i> pro <i>BIRICI</i> read probably <i>BIRICT</i>
<i>birictbal</i>		CIL, VIII, 5392 = ILA, I, 337
<i>birihut</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 4850 = 17140 = ILA, I, 1992: <i>CAELIA BIRIHVT</i> 16768 = ILA, I, 1115: <i>COTTIA BIRIHVT</i>
cfr. <i>Jricut</i>		CIL, VIII, 16955, for the reading <i>[BI]RICVT (?)</i> , cfr. ILA, I, 655
<i>birihutina</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 27604: <i>CECILIA BIRIHUTINA</i>

and with the first front vowel represented by e

<i>beric</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 23241: <i>STABERIA BERIC</i>
cfr. <i>peric</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 6232: <i>IVLIA PERIC</i> , read possibly <i>BERIC</i> , cfr. however also <i>ibid.</i> p. 1836: <i>potius</i> <i>[BI]RIC vel [B]ER[E]C[T]</i> .
<i>berict</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 4924 = ILA, I, 1582: <i>BERICT SEINI F.</i>
cfr. <i>rerict</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 7518 + p. 1848: <i>IVLIA RERICT</i>
<i>berihbal</i> (f)		CIL, VIII, 27547

The Name Element *BRK*

both front vowels represented by e

	CIL, VIII, 17017 = ILA, I, 722	
<i>berec</i>	CIL, VIII, 8746	
<i>bereci</i> (gen.)	25960: <i>FAVSTINA GEMELI BERECI FILIA</i>	
<i>berechi</i> (f. dat.)	CIL, VIII, 1662, for the reading see 15914, <i>D M S / AEMILIAE / BERECHI</i> etc.; or read rather <i>BERECHT</i> ?	
	AE, 1968, 569: <i>D M S / M·MAXI/MI BERE/GIS VA / LXVI</i>	
<i>beregis</i>		
	BAC, 1936-1937, 217	
<i>bereh</i>	CIL, VIII, 8732 = 20499: <i>DONATA QVE VIXIT AN LXI IVL BERECT NEPOS AN III MVIIVN GVDDVS</i>	
<i>berect</i> (f)		
	25507	
	27601	
	27713	
	CIL, VIII, 27529	
<i>berecte</i> (f)	CIL, VIII, 27714: <i>P VLLAENIA BERECTHE</i>	
<i>berecthe</i> (f)	CIL, VIII, 2300 = 17737: <i>IVLIA BERREGT</i>	
<i>berregt</i> (f)	CIL, VIII, 17065 = ILA, I, 775	
<i>beret</i>	CIL, VIII, 3680	
<i>berectina</i> (f)	15805	
	27498	
<i>cf. berec[t]ina</i> (f)	CIL, VIII, 15972	
<i>cf. berecthf</i> (f)	CIL, VIII, 15774: <i>D M S / CORNE/LIA BE/RECT/HF []X[] / A LXXXX / H S E</i> ; read in l. 5 possibly <i>-INA V.</i> , or <i>PIA V.</i> ; in the last case the name should be included under <i>berect</i>	
<i>berethina</i> (f)	CIL, VIII, 15758	
<i>cf. possibly berec</i> (f) in	CIL, VIII, 16125:	<i>MAP</i>
	to be explained as:	<i>BERECAE</i>
	<i>MAŔCIA] / BEREC[T] /</i>	<i>PIA TEC]V</i>
	<i>[INA]TECV/SA VI[XIT]..</i>	<i>SA VI[</i>
	or: <i>MAŔCIA] / BEREC[TH] /</i>	
	<i>PIA TECV/SA ?</i> thus CIL a.l., or read: <i>MAŔCIAE] /</i>	
	<i>BERECAE / PIA TEC (?) V(ix)/S(it) A(mnis) VI ?</i>	
<i>berecbal</i>	CIL, VIII, 513: <i>BERECB/AL YVRI / VIXIT·AN· / H·S·E·</i>	
	27740: <i>BERECB/AL·FAV·F / P·V·A·XX / V·H·S·E·</i>	
<i>berecbal</i> (f)	CIL, VIII, 16934	
	17293	
	27507	
<i>beregbal</i> (f)	ILA, II, 7050: <i>IVLIA BEREGBAL</i>	
<i>beregbal</i> (f);	CIL, VIII, 23870	

cfr. also the following name in which the first vowel is represented by ae
baeregbal AE, 1968, 562 *D M S / BAERE G/BAL*
BARICIS/SUS F P.V.A. etc. thus AE, 1968, =
baeregbal or *baeregbal* ??

and cfr. possibly the following name, exhibiting loss of the first vowel
bricia ILA, II, 3829 (and possibly *bret* RAF, 80, 319)

D two rounded back vowels, u - u
burucbal (f) CIL, VIII, 19715
burucia (f) ILA, II, 4394
 6134: *IVLIA BVRVCIA*
burugia (f) ILA, II, 4416: *MINVCIA BVRVGIA*
burucosa (f) "Libyca", 3, p. 319

the first back vowel being represented by o
boruc (f) ILA, II, 402:

both back vowels represented by o
boroc (f) CIL, VIII, 8413: *CAECILIA BOROC*, elsewhere in the same
 text mentioned as *CECILIA BARAG*

9851 = Altava, 44
 10851 = ILA, II, 5447: *IVLIA BOROC*
 17273 = ILA, I, 546
 ILA, II, 4837: *D M S / ANTISTIA / MVSTEOLI /*
FIL·BOROC / V.A. etc.
 5778: *PVBLICIA·P.F. BOROC*
 cfr. *bo[r]oc* ILA, II, 5663: *I]VLIA | []FL BO|[R]OC V A*
borocia (f) CIL, VIII, 5432 + p. 1659 = ILA, I, 374: *IVLIA BOROCIA*
 5446 + p. 1659 = ILA, I, 506:
BOROCIA HONORATI
 19026 = ILA, II, 5655:
IVLIA BOROCIA

ILA, II, 4703
 4766
 5433
 5611
 5924
 6017
 6311
 cfr. *borof*(f) CIL, VIII, 5571 = 18874 = ILA, II, 4959:
 to be completed to *BOROC*
 or *BOROCIA*
 ILT, 1147

DIA BORO
VIXIT A XVI
H S E

The Name Element *BRK*

cf. *boroc* (f)

ILA, II,

5007:

D M
CAECIL
BOROC
C · M

probably to be completed to:
D M S | CAECILIA |
BOROCIA ...

boroct (f)

CIL, VIII,

28011:

BOROCT SACERA

ILA, II,

4815

perhaps to be explained as shortened forms of this type of name are

burh (m)

CIL, VIII, 27537

burct

ILA, II, 5311

cf. possibly *burc* (m), *burcai* (gen.) in CIL, VIII, 4897 = ILA, I, 1386

E both vowels reduced to / ∂ /

byrycth - $\beta\upsilon\rho\upsilon\chi\theta$ (f) CIL, VIII, 16 = IRT, 655