

PAPERS AND MONOGRAPHS OF THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS VOL. VII

THE GREEK EAST IN THE ROMAN CONTEXT
PROCEEDINGS OF A COLLOQUIUM
ORGANISED BY
THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS
May 21 and 22, 1999

Edited by Olli Salomies

HELSINKI 2001

© Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö (Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens) 2001

ISSN 1237-2684
ISBN 951-98806-0-7

Printed in Finland by Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy, Vammala 2001

Cover: Statue base honouring M. Vettulenus Civica Barbarus (see p. 175, n. 208).
American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations. Inv. no. I 4922.

Contents

Bengt E. Thomasson	
The Eastern Roman Provinces till Diocletian. A Rapid Survey	1
Christopher Jones	
Memories of the Roman Republic in the Greek East	11
Jean-Louis Ferrary	
Rome et la géographie de l'hellénisme: réflexions sur "hellènes" et "panhellènes" dans les inscriptions d'époque romaine	19
A. D. Rizakis	
La constitution des élites municipales dans les colonies romaines de la province d'Achaïe	37
Maria Kantiréa	
Remarques sur le culte de la <i>domus Augusta</i> en Achaïe de la mort d' Auguste à Néron	51
Kostas Buraselis	
Two Notes on Theophanes' Descendants	61
Mika Kajava	
Vesta and Athens	71
Simone Follet & Dina Peppas Delmousou	
Les dedicaces chorégiques d'époque flavienne et antonine à Athènes	95
Petros Themelis	
Roman Messene. The Gymnasium	119
Maurice Sartre	
Romains et Italiens en Syrie: Contribution à l'histoire de la première province romaine de Syrie	127
Olli Salomies	
Honorific Inscriptions for Roman Senators in the Greek East during the Empire. Some Aspects (with Special Reference to Cursus Inscriptions)	141
Heikki Solin	
Latin Cognomina in the Greek East	189
Index	
1. Persons	203
2. Greek personal names	205
3. Latin personal names	206
4. Geographical names	206
5. Inscriptions and papyri	209
6. Selected topics	217
Plates	219
Maps	229

Latin Cognomina in the Greek East*

Heikki Solin

Greek personal names in Rome form a clearly defined group, the significance of which goes far beyond the ethnic importance of the Greek element in Rome, representing, indeed, a central motif in the topic of "Hellenism in Italy". This group of names has been intensively studied for a long time, and its basic historical and social significance has now been clarified. By contrast, the use of Latin and Roman names in the Greek East has yet to receive the attention it deserves, being treated so far in a rather slapdash way, in spite of its clear significance for the study of Romanization and of the Latin element in the Greek half of the Mediterranean.¹

In this article, I will discuss the spread of Latin cognomina in the Greek East, the question of the sources of their use and the popularity of those names forming a top-ten list of Latin cognomina in the Greek-speaking world, on their morphological specificities, and on other interesting emerging questions. I have a project to write a history of the Latin cognomen in the Greek East, a project hardly begun. So I cannot yet offer you anything but some modest first observations, very vague observations.

Let us begin by asking what is a cognomen in a Greek surrounding. Such a question is not without relevance. In a Latin milieu you would probably consider, in the Imperial period, every single name as a cognomen, including those names which morphologically are either praenomina or gentile names, for we know that these names could also be used as individual names, that is to say names to be considered as cognomina. If Roman slaves bore names like *Marcus* or *Quintus* or *Titus*,² these cannot be regarded as praenomina; they have lost their original function and become individual names of those slaves, given by their masters, and if the slave was manumitted, his or her individual name became the cognomen in his or her new nomenclature. In a similar way, a gentile name could act as the individual name of a person, as we can see, once again, in servile nomenclature. *Annius*, *Domitius*, *Licinius* as slave names bear witness in an eloquent way to their use as individual names.³ By the way, this use of gentile names as cognomina is not confined to servile nomenclature, but appears in other juristic categories, too. This custom of the use of gentile names as authentic cognomina has not yet received a comprehensive study.

Also in the Greek world such names could be used in an identical way. But it is not always easy to distinguish, in the case of a gentile name used as a single name,

* I would like to thank, in addition to the organizers and participants of the colloquium, especially Klaus Hallof and Jaime Curbera from the office of the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin for their kindness. Margot Stout Whiting and Antony Spawforth have improved my English expression.

¹ But things are now improving; see, e. g., the volume *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East. Social and Political Aspects. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Roman Onomastics, Athens, 7-9 September 1993*, edited by A. D. Rizakis (*Meletemata* 21), Athens 1996, and the present volume, too. And other work done by Greek colleagues as well as by members of the Finnish school could be mentioned.

² These kinds of slave names are collected in my *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen. Ein Namenbuch (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei, Beiheft 2)*, Stuttgart 1996, 3-11.

³ Cf. H. Solin, *Arctos* 16 (1982) 168 = Id., *Analecta epigraphica*, Roma 1998, 133; for their use as slave names *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen* (see the previous note) 16-20.

whether it was really a gentile name or whether it was used as an individual name. Sometimes the decision is easy. There can be no doubt that the centurion called Κορνήλιος in the book of Acts was a Roman citizen belonging to the *gens* Cornelia. On the other hand, it is completely certain that the evangelist Mark was not a Roman citizen and his name *Marcus* was thus an individual name, given to him for a reason unknown to us. The same is true for Saint Luke, whose name is a new coinage formed with the Greek hypocoristic suffix -ᾱς from the common Latin praenomen *Lucius*. Even though in the mid-first century AD the cognomen had already become the individual name of a Roman citizen, it is easily conceivable that the centurion Cornelius - who surely must have had a cognomen - was known by his gentile name only - by the way, this was also possible in Rome and in the West in general. In contrast, we do not know Saint Paul's gentile name - even though he must have had one as a Roman citizen - nor his praenomen. One of the main reasons why Roman citizens so easily appear in a Greek context with only one name is that the Greeks themselves had, in their own nomenclature, only one name - this Greek pattern has contributed, among others, to the fact that Roman nomenclature during Late Antiquity was reduced to only one name. But I would still like to stress that this practice of calling a Roman citizen by only one name is not confined to the Greek area, although much more commonly used there; it can be observed also in Roman inscriptions. What is true is that when only one name is used, it is normally the cognomen in Roman inscriptions; the gentile name, sometimes also the praenomen, can be chosen, but normally only in special circumstances, as in verse inscriptions for metrical reasons.

I will approach my subject by choosing three samples from the Greek East. The first are the Latin names attested for Athenians. The second are those names attested for the inhabitants of Central Greece including Thessaly. The third are the inscriptions contained in the two Lydian fascicles hitherto published in the admirable corpus by Peter Herrmann in *Tituli Asiae Minoris* V.⁴ The names of the first two groups are collected from the corresponding volumes of the British Academy *Lexicon of Greek personal names*, devoted to Attica, and to Central Greece respectively.⁵ Of the names comprised in the two volumes, I have omitted only those which are clearly used as gentilicia. These are taken into consideration by the authors of the Attic volume in cases where the cognomen of the name-bearer is lacking - in my mind a questionable decision (if you omit from the *Lexicon*, say, all the individuals bearing the gentile name Κλώδιος and provided with a cognomen,⁶ why should you include only a Μάρκος Κλώδιος [*IG* II² 1757 = *Ath.Ag.* XV 286, 51] or a Π. Κλώδιος [ib. l. 28], as do the authors?).

The starting point is a list of the most popular Latin cognomina listed in Kajanto's classic *Latin Cognomina*.⁷ Let us first take up the Athenian case and begin by giving the top-ten list on the basis of Kajanto's calculations - or, more exactly, the top-eighteen list; in the right column are listed the corresponding figures from the Athenian material in numerical order:

⁴ *Tituli Asiae Minoris*, vol. V. *Tituli Lydiae*, fasc. I: *Regio septentrionalis ad orientem vergens*; fasc. II: *Regio septentrionalis ad occidentem vergens*, Vindobonae 1981-1989.

⁵ *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. II: *Attica*, edited by M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne, Oxford 1994; vol. III B: *Central Greece from the Megarid to Thessaly*, edited by P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, Oxford 2000.

⁶ E. g. *IG* II² 1796 Κλώδιος 'Αντίοχος; 2239 Κλώδ(ιος) 'Ονήσιμος; 12112 Κλωδία Γαίου Μηνο[---].

⁷ I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965.

Kajanto		Athenians
1) Felix	3716	6
2) Secundus	2684	40
3) Saturninus	2615	11
4) Fortunatus	2516	3
5) Primus	2397	95
6) Maximus	2362	37
7) Ianuarius	2007	4
8) Rufus	1829	72
9) Severus	1738	5
10) Victor	1699	4
11) Sabinus	1452	18
12) Proculus	1366	(25)
13) Faustus	1279	25
14) Priscus	1269	6
15) Hilarus	1196	(46)
16) Crescens	1045	3
17) Tertius	1042	11
18) Vitalis	1028	4

These names have more than a thousand examples each.

The corresponding frequency list of the names among the Athenian population follows; in the right column are listed the corresponding numbers from Kajanto (feminine forms are tacitly included):

Athenians		Kajanto
1) Πρῖμος	95	2397
2) Γάιος	74	104
3) Ροῦφος	72	1829
4) Μάρκος	70	209
5) Πόπλιος	65	18
6) Σεκοῦνδος	40	2684
7) Μάξιμος	37	2362
8) Φίρμος	27	596
9) Αὔλος	26	7
10) Βάσσος	26	-
11) Μαρκιανός	25	561
12) Φαῦστος	25	1279
13) Κόιντος	24	478
14) Λούκιος	23	217
15) Πωλλίων	23	132
16) Δέκμος	22	64

These names have more than twenty examples each in the Athenian name material. I provide summarily the figures for names showing ten to twenty attestations: 'Ιουλιανός 19; 'Ρουφίνος 19; Σαβῖνος 18; Μουσώνιος 17; Μάρκελλος 15; Μάγνος 14; Κορνήλιος 13; Σέξτος 12; Κλήμης 11; Κορνηλιανός 11; Σατορνῖλος Σατορνῖνος 11; Τέρτιος 11; Τίτος 11; Γναῖος 10; 'Ιούλιος 10; Πῶλλα 10 (1 time written Πόλλα; the name Παῦλ(λ)ος Παῦλ(λ)α has to be kept apart).

We have here at our disposal a valuable collection of material for the study of the dissemination of Latin names in Athens, and even though one should be aware of the dangers in using statistics of this kind, some conclusions can be drawn. However, one should bear in mind that a cautious attitude towards the numbers is necessary, especially if the name in question does not belong to the popular ones.

The two lists are, in many respects, revealing and require some further considerations. As one can see at once, there are considerable differences between them. But whereas the most popular Latin names among Athenians are also normally well known in the Roman world in general, many names from Kajanto's list have not been accepted by the Athenians with great enthusiasm.

But before entering into the interpretation, just a few introductory remarks on the individual figures are necessary. I have also taken into consideration the feminine forms of the single names, if existing, but not suffix formations (on these see below); so the frequency numbers of e.g. *Rufus* comprise also *Rufa*, but not, for example, *Rufinus* -a. As for Kajanto's top list, the corresponding frequencies from the Athenian material for *Proculus* and *Hilarus* cannot be calculated exactly, as the attestations can also belong to the authentic Greek names Πρόκλος and Ἰλαρος; for this reason I have put the frequency numbers of the two names in brackets and will come back to the case of these two names in due course. On the same occasion I will also discuss some popular Athenian names, which were felt in Rome to be Latin, but which in Athens must primarily be regarded as Greek, the most evident example of them being Ἀττικός. As for the Athenians' top list, the corresponding frequency number for Βάσσιος -α from Latin sources is missing from Kajanto's lists, as he did not consider *Bassus* Latin - a very questionable decision. We have indeed to do with a Latin cognomen. I have calculated for *Bassus* / *Bassa* roughly 575 attestations from *CIL* and the other sources used by Kajanto. - In the following, "no." refers to the numbers of the entries of individual names in the *LGNP*.

And now to the interpretation of the two lists. I begin by referring to the surprising phenomenon of the deep abyss between the general and Athenian figures perceptible in a few cases. It is striking that the most popular of all Latin cognomina, *Felix*, which stands at the top of Kajanto's list in splendid isolation, is quite rare in the Attic material (all the attestations date from the II cent. AD), as is also *Fortunatus*, the fourth name in Kajanto's ranking. (Instead, in Central Greece, in Boeotia and Thessaly, Φορτουνάτος -α is attested 10 times, whereas Φήλιξ drags clearly behind with its 4 attestations.) It is further noteworthy that no derivatives of *Felix* are attested in Athens, in spite of the great popularity of some of them in Rome.⁸ To explain this is not easy, but some reasons could be adduced. I refer first to euphonic ones: perhaps the phonetic impression of *Fortunatus* was not pleasant (note that there are no popular names in Greek beginning by Φορτ-); on the other hand, *Felix* could easily be confused in the Imperial period with Greek names in Φίλο-, but as it was, morphologically, not a Greek formation, it was avoided. But more likely the main reasons are to be sought in semantics and chronology. Both names belong to the category of wish-names and have their Greek equivalents in the very popular names Εὐτύχης and the like, including formations like Εὐδαίμων, Εὐήμερος and others. When the Athenians resorted to this category of names, they preferred formations in their own language. But this is not alone sufficient to explain the small number of the Athenian attestations of these names, as is shown by other names such as *Primus* or *Secundus* that are popular both in general and in Athens, even though they too had their equivalents in the Greek anthroponymy in Πρῶτος and Δεύτερος; but whereas the first was an old coinage in Greek onomastics and somewhat widespread in the Greek world, and also in Athens (since the IV cent. BC), Δεύτερος only came into use in the Roman period and has probably to be regarded as a translation of the highly popular cognomen *Secundus*, well known since the Republican period, also from various parts of the Greek world;⁹ but

⁸ But note Φορτουνατίων IG II² 13011 (II cent. AD).

⁹ See H. Solin, apud O. Masson, *ZPE* 119 (1997) 69.

in Athens Δεύτερος is virtually unknown.¹⁰ So, after all, the semantic aspect might have played a certain role. But still more important is the chronology: whereas *Primus* and *Secundus* are old coinages, *Felix* and *Fortunatus* come into common use only in the Imperial period (and note that the semantically closely related wish-name *Faustus* became somehow popular in Athens because, as a cognomen, it was a Republican coinage in Rome). Both *Primus* and *Secundus* are frequently attested in Republican inscriptions, whereas there are only sporadic instances of *Felix* and *Fortunatus* in the Republican period.¹¹ The dissemination of the numerical cognomina (or in the Athenian case, the single names) was still facilitated by the fact that this name category was in general a popular one.

The other cases, where the abyss between the general and the Athenian figures is striking, might also be, at least partly, explained by chronology: the popular cognomina *Ianuarius*, *Severus*, *Victor*, *Crescens*, *Vitalis* come into use only in the Imperial period in Rome (of these, only *Crescens* and *Severus* are occasionally attested in Republican inscriptions).¹² As to *Ianuarius*, one could add that the use of month names as personal names is very rare in Greece, and this is true both for Greek and Latin coinages.¹³ In the case of *Victor* and *Crescens*, we must not forget the morphological aspect: -ωρ and -ηνς are not normal Greek endings.¹⁴ There remains the case of *Priscus* which is attested only six times in Athens. It was already a popular senatorial cognomen in Republican times and is attested in Republican inscriptions among the ordinary people with a certain frequency. Why it could not find its way into the hearts of the Athenians, can only be guessed; perhaps Πρίμος had already conquered the available terrain.

A specific case is made up by *Saturninus*, the bronze medalist in Kajanto's list, attested in Athens between the I-III cent. AD nine times in the form Σατορνίλος and twice in the authentic Latin form Σατορνίνος. The slight popularity of the name in Athens might perhaps not surprise, in spite of its great success in Rome since the Republican period among all classes (but note that it was especially widespread in Roman Africa, which reduces a bit the significance of the deep abyss between Latin and Athenian figures). Probably the name did not sound modern to Athenians' ears, its sound was maybe not pleasant (note the common dissimilation in Σατορνίλος). Besides, *Saturninus* did not mean anything to Greeks, as the god was known to them as Kronos, but Kronos has left only insignificant traces in the Greek anthroponymy, and in Athens none.¹⁵

¹⁰ There is a somewhat obscure attestation on a vase dated to c. 510 BC (ABV 367 no. 89) running ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΣ and explained by the editors and in *LGPV* II 102 as Δευτέρης. But cf. O. Masson, *ZPE* 119 (1997) 68.

¹¹ See H. Solin, 'Die innere Chronologie des römischen Cognomens', in: *L'onomastique latine*, Paris 1977, 105ff. *Felix* appears four times in Republican inscriptions, and *Fortunatus* one time.

¹² See H. Solin, op. cit. 114 and 133. For both *Crescens* and *Severus* only one attestation in Republican inscriptions.

¹³ Bechtel, *Historische Personennamen des Griechischen*, Halle 1917, 523ff. mentions a few cases, but these also relate to names of festivities. As to Latin month names, besides the four attestations of 'Ιανουάριος, there is no other instance of a Latin month name used as a personal name in Athens. By the way, of the four attestations of 'Ιανουάριος, two are somewhat uncertain, as written 'Ιανάριος or 'Ιανάρις; however, they seem to reproduce this name.

¹⁴ But note -άνωρ and -ήνωρ.

¹⁵ Bechtel *HPN* 529 mentions only one name, Κρόνιος. In *LGPV* II, there are two names listed with one instance of each, Κρονίδης and Κρόνιος, but both fragmentary with very uncertain restitutions. I do not understand why the *LGPV* quotes these and other fragmentary cases without a question mark, if the restitutions are uncertain.

Kronos was not worshipped anywhere in the Greek world, and this is the main reason for its relative rarity (Κρόνιος, which appears with some frequency in the Ionian cities of Asia Minor, is not a theophoric name, but a calendaric one, deriving from the month name Κρονίων); the only region where names deriving from Kronos attained great popularity is Egypt, but here Kronos is a translation of the Egyptian god Geb.¹⁶ The same picture is also encountered elsewhere in the Greek world.¹⁷ In Central Greece, only one instance of Σαρτορνίλος (sic), from Demetrias (Imperial period), one from Crete, and one Σαρτορνίος from Cyrenaica. In Asia Minor, the name was a bit more in use,¹⁸ which is partly perhaps due to the great popularity of the name among soldiers.¹⁹

Let us examine more closely the top of the Athenians' list. One aspect emerges clearly. Most of the commonly used Latin praenomina are very well represented in the ranking. Γάιος, Μάρκος, Πόπλιος, Αὔλος, Κόιντος, Λούκιος, Δέκιμος are eloquent witnesses of this. All figure among the 16 most popular Latin names in Athens. Not very much behind come Σέξτος (12 times attested in Athens), Τίτος (11 times), Γναίος (10 times) and Μάνιος (9 times). However, Νεμέριος (6 attestations) and Τιβέριος (3 attestations) did not achieve the same popularity. *Numerius* was never a very popular praenomen in Latin, and *Tiberius* became, with the Claudian Emperors, fashionable only during the first century AD, a fact that explains its reduced use in Athens, as will be seen. Closely related to them are the numeric cognomina Πρίμος and Σεκοῦνδος (also Τέρτιος -α is well represented in Athens with 11 attestations), which, strictly speaking, do not represent the core of common praenomina, but are, at least in women's nomenclature, old praenomina. Πῶλλα was also an old female praenomen, 10 times attested in Athens.²⁰

Two conclusions easily follow. Latin praenomina became normally fashionable in Athenian nomenclature, irrespective of their popularity in Rome, no matter whether as real praenomina or praenomina in cognominal function. And the advance of the name in question must have begun in Republican times; otherwise it did not have such chance to gain popularity in Athens. This rule knows only one exception, Μαρκιανός, the attestations of which all belong to the II and III cent. AD (with one female name-bearer in the IV cent. AD). This was so also in Rome - there are hardly any instances earlier than Augustus, except a freedman of Cicero (Cic. Att. 12.17).²¹ But Μάρκος was, since Republican times, a popular name in Athens, so that the dissemination of a derivative of it during the Imperial period in Athenian nomenclature is very understandable, the suffixal formations being a characteristic feature in the onomastics of the advanced Imperial

¹⁶ Cf. L. Robert, *Actes du VII^e Congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine* (Constanta 1977), Bucuresti 1979, 39f. = his *Opera minora selecta* VI, Amsterdam 1989, 693f.

¹⁷ LGPN III A records seven cases, five of them with -ῖλ-, two with -ῖν-.

¹⁸ In TAM IV two times; in TAM V five attestations with one Σατοῦρνα. In MAMA c. 12 times; at Ephesus c. 20 attestations; a stephanephoros from Miletus: I. Didyma p. 102f.; Ὀφέλλιος Σαρτορνίλος Μιλήσιος IG II² 2026, 56.

¹⁹ L. R. Dean, *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions*, Diss. Princeton 1916, 62. 273-278.

²⁰ As to its dissemination in the Greek East, see now M. Kajava, *Roman Female Praenomina*, Rome 1994, 56-59, 176-181.

²¹ Quint. inst. 6, 3, 95 mentions a Marcianus from the time of Augustus. Quite early also CIL VI 17544.

period. A similar case is offered by Μάρκελλος (15 attestations in Athens) with the important difference that *Marcellus* was a widespread cognomen already in the Republican period. Note also that *Marcianus* was popular as senatorial cognomen. (To be sure, a few other popular names in Athens are also attested only during the Empire, such as Μάξιμος, Φίρμος and Φαῦστος, but they all were Republican coinages in Rome, so that their absence in the Republican name material of Athens can be a matter of chance.) The second conclusion you can draw is that the popularity of a given Latin praenomen in Athenian nomenclature does not necessarily relate to its popularity in Rome. That Γάιος, Μάρκος and Πόπλιος lead the way (but note that *Publius* never became a popular cognomen in Rome), is no wonder, but the greater popularity of Αὔλος in respect to Κόιντος and Λούκιος does not depend on its popularity on its home ground, for *Aulus* was not among the commonest praenomina and its use as a cognomen was quite limited, whereas *Lucius* and *Quintus*, besides being among the commonest praenomina, also became very popular cognomina in Rome. One reason for the popularity of Αὔλος in Athens can be that the name could be perceived as a Greek one; the pre-Roman anthroponymy knows names such as Αὐλίσκος and Αὐλίων.²²

But let us have a closer look at the qualities and chronology of these names. Πρίμος forms a slight exception to the chronology of the list of names, as most of its Athenian attestations come from the II-III centuries AD; one case (no 38 of *LGPNI*) is dated to III/I BC, and a few cases to the I cent. AD. The explanation is that *Primus*, even if it was in use in the Republican period, was not among the really fashionable cognomina; and note that a good deal of the Republican attestations belong to slaves or freedmen, a fact that did not favour its dissemination in Greek nomenclature. In general, it was characteristic of the lower strata until the Imperial period - no senators are known before Augustus.²³ And as it was not a praenomen either, its only chance to spread into the Greek nomenclature was through persons bearing it as a cognomen, and as long as it had a servile flavour, its advance into Greek nomenclature proved rather difficult. - Πρίμος shows very few derivatives in use in Athens: only Πρίμιλλα and Πριμίων (each attested once from the Imperial period); Πριμιγένης with Πριμιγένεια and Πρίσκος with Πρισκιανός are not derivatives, but independent formations.

Γάιος: attested in Athenian nomenclature since the II cent. BC with a certain frequency (nos. 1, 2, 8, 9 of *LGPNI* are dated generally to this century, no. 12 to c. 155 BC, nos. 36, 42 and 43 to 123/2 BC, no. 44 to 119/8 BC; nos. 3, 10, 11, 13-16, 19, 27-29, 37, 46, 48, 49 date from the I cent. BC), but the bulk of the examples belong to the two first centuries of the Christian era, with a few latecomers from the III century. The derivative Γαιανός is clearly a later coinage in Athens (4 attestations from the II-III cent. AD, one of Γαιανή from late antiquity). The Greeks first got acquainted with *Gaius* as a pure praenomen; in the II cent. BC, from which the earliest Athenian attestations date, the praenomen was still perceived as the basic name of a Roman citizen, so that the Greeks could easily borrow *Gaius* as an individual name for their own nomenclature. Because in the Roman West *Gaius* came into use as a cognomen only in the Imperial period (it is not attested with certainty in the Republican period),²⁴ the popularity of Γάιος in the Greek nomenclature cannot derive primarily from the Latin cognomen *Gaius*, but derives directly from the praenomen, as stated above. Only in the later periods is a direct dependence on

²² Bechtel, *HPN* 604.

²³ The earliest cases are: P. Alf(---) Primus (*PIR*² A 515 = Wiseman, *New Men* 279 no. 521, early Augustan if not late Republican); M. Primus (*PIR*² P 946, Augustan); Q. Caecina Primus, consul suffectus AD 53 (*AE* 1977, 18).

²⁴ In *CIL* I² 2008, read C. Vensius C. f. Caius, the cognomen seems to be rather *Canus* or *Cavus*; cf. p. 1074.

the cognomen *Gaius* conceivable in individual cases, after *Gaius* had become fashionable as a cognomen.

The same is true also for the other Latin praenomina gaining territory in Athens. *Marcus* is perhaps a still better example: not attested with certainty as a cognomen in the Republican period, it became popular in the Empire and is attested with much greater intensity than *Gaius*. In Athens, it likewise invaded the citizens' nomenclature in the Republican period, as shown by numerous attestations from the pre-Christian era (no. 26 from c. 62 BC, no. 5 from c. 50-40 BC, nos. 13, 27, 29, 30 from the I cent. BC, no. 20 from c. 21/0 BC, no. 35 from c. 14/13 BC, no. 36 from c. 13/12 BC). The rest dates from the I-III centuries. As to its derivatives, *Μαρκιανός* has already been referred to, as also *Μαρκελλος* (15 attestations dating from the II-III centuries); add *Μαρκελλίνος* (four times from the II-VI centuries). Instead, *Μάρκιος* -ία (attested three times from the II-III centuries) seems to represent the gentile name *Marcus*.

Exactly the same picture is offered by *Πόπλιος*, with the only difference that *Publius* never became fashionable as a cognomen in the Roman West: it is intensively attested in Athens during the Republican period after 107/6 BC (no. 36). Even though less impressively attested in Athens, *Κόιντος* and *Λούκιος* show a similar history, except that the latter appears for the first time in Athens only during the I cent. AD. A more or less similar picture is still offered by *Δέκιμος*: attested only occasionally as a cognomen in Republican Rome, it came in vogue in Athens in the II/I cent. BC; in Imperial Rome it was clearly a less fashionable cognomen than *Quintus* and *Lucius*. And lastly *Αὔλος*, scarcely attested in the Roman West as a cognomen, but fashionable in Athens, where it is attested after 106/5 BC (no. 1); however, it fell out of use at the end of the pre-Christian era. Surely *Αὔλος* has invaded the Athenian nomenclature in the same way as the other common praenomina, but why it fell out of use is more difficult to explain; one reason has been given above.

A few words still about the remaining names. The popularity of *Rufus* is easy to explain. Extremely common in Rome and Italy since the late Republican period (older examples are less common),²⁵ it penetrated into the Athenian nomenclature about the middle of the I cent. BC, to remain a popular name throughout the Empire until the early III cent. AD, with a couple of later attestations.²⁶ Note that *Rufus* was common among inhabitants of various parts of Italy which spawned immigrants to the Greek East; thus it came to the East with Italian settlers. It might still be added that of the derivatives, *Ρουφίνος* -α is quite common in Athens with 19 attestations, but unlike *Rufinus*, which is known in the nomenclature of both senators and common people in Republican times, it appears in Athens only from the II cent. AD.

Then *Μάξιμος* and *Φίρμος*, both common in the II-III cent. AD, the former showing sporadic attestations from the I cent. AD. In Rome, *Maximus* had been a popular upper-class cognomen since the Republican period, both names being discretely attested among the common people before Augustus; during the Empire too, *Maximus* was much more in vogue, but in Athens the popularity of both names was more or less equal.

Two names still remain. The popularity of *Βάσσος* in Athens follows the normal rules: a popular cognomen, attested in Rome since the Republican period, as also in Athens. It is difficult to say whether the Oriental or, more precisely, Semitic name has contributed to its popularity in Athens;²⁷ note that other common Semitic names like *Malchio* or *Martha* are unknown in Athens. The history of *Βάσσος* in Athenian

²⁵ See Kajanto, *Latin Cognomina* 229. Solin, in: *L'onomastique latine* 132.

²⁶ No. 71 from 235/6 AD, no. 56 from 255/6 AD, no. 60 from the fourth cent. AD.

²⁷ On the Semitic name see G. Ryckmans, *Les noms propres sud-sémitiques* I, Louvain 1934, 53; H. Solin, in: *ANRW* II 29 (1983) 641.

nomenclature does not seem to speak in favour of a stronger Semitic influence. And to finish, Πωλλίων had a history in Athens similar to Βάσσος, only that it was less widespread in Rome, but note that it was quite a popular Republican cognomen both in upper-class onomastics and in that of the common people. (Πῶλλα, too, was popular in the Greek East.)

Back to Kajanto's top list. *Proculus* and *Hilarus* are both very common Latin cognomina. They are also popular in Athens. They also represent authentic Greek names, and so it is difficult to say to what extent their popularity in Athens is due to the corresponding Latin names. The chronology could speak in favour of a certain Latin influence, for both Πρόκλος and Ἰλαρος are in vogue during the Empire (of the former, there is one solitary instance from the I cent. BC, but otherwise its attestations date from I-III cent. AD, and those of Ἰλαρος from II-III). Morphologically, Πρόκλος relates to the good and old Greek name Προκλῆς (especially in vogue among the Athenians) as Πάτροκλος to Πατροκλῆς, but as Πρόκλος does not seem to be a very old coinage in Greek onomastics, it might after all be a borrowing from Latin. The fact that the name is always written with -κλ-, does not speak against Latin derivation, for *Proclus* is quite a common form in Latin,²⁸ and then the influence of the pure Greek name Προκλῆς contributed to the establishment of this spelling in Greek onomastics. Ἰλαρος in its turn is also used mainly during the Empire (it is absent in Bechtel), whereas there are other formations of the same name family known as early as the classical period, e. g. Ἰλάρων and Ἰλαρίων, attested in Athens from the V cent. BC onwards; even Ἰλάρᾱ, the feminine pendant of Ἰλαρος, begins its advance in Athens during the III cent. BC.

The same question can be posed regarding Λεύκιος (116 attestations in Athens) and Πείσων. Λεύκιος could also represent *Lucius* (as is well-known, this praenomen was rendered in early Greek texts by Λεύκιος, and only later by Λούκιος), and precisely for that reason Λεύκιος, as an individual name, could partly have been given as a Latin name. Apart from a couple of very old name-bearers (no. 86 from the V cent. BC and no. 87 from c. 367-330 BC), the history of Λεύκιος in Athens shows the same characteristic features as the common praenomina - becoming popular in Athenian onomastics during the Republic and expanding in use in the Empire. In other words, the 'physiognomy' of Λεύκιος in Athenian nomenclature is much the same as that of e. g. Γάιος. As to Πείσων (attested in Athens 6 times), it occurs from the V cent. BC (no. 1 dates from the V cent. BC, no. 2 from the IV cent. BC, nos. 3, 5 from the II cent. BC); the two remaining cases date from the Imperial period, and one of them shows the spelling Πίσ-. It is well known that the cognomen of the Calpurnii is often written in Greek inscriptions, as well as in the manuscripts of e. g. Dio, in the form Πείσων; on the other hand, the Greek name Πείσων could no doubt be rendered in an inscription of the Imperial period with Πίσων. To conclude, it is impossible to distinguish whether the attestations at least from the Imperial period, and perhaps also those from the II cent. BC, belong to the Greek or to the Latin name. But I would not hesitate to declare as Latin the derivative Πεισωνιανός IG II² 3167 cf. p. 349 from the II-III cent. AD, as well as Πεισωνεῖνος TAM V 1010 (Thyatira),²⁹ IGRR IV 1567. 1571 (Teos).

To finish with one further example. *Atticus* was a very popular cognomen (attested 387 times according to Kajanto's lists) and has to be regarded for well-known reasons as a Latin name. But what about the Athenian attestations of Ἀττικός, derived from the

²⁸ To take just one example, *Proclus* appears in CIL VI some 52 times against *Proculus* round 150 times.

²⁹ It is true that the name is fragmentary: Πεισωνεῖ[νος], but there no reason to suspect the integration and see here a Greek name-form Πεισωνεῖδης, as did the editores principes Keil and Premierstein, *Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien* (Denkschr. Ak. Wien 54, 2, 1911) 33 no. 62.

ethnic?³⁰ This name, occurring 179 times in Athens, came into vogue during the Imperial period; I know only one earlier attestation (no. 147 from the II cent. BC).³¹ It is quite possible that in individual cases the name-givers had in mind a prominent Roman provided with this name. The geographical names were not very much in vogue among Athenians; if 'Αθήναιος was popular in Athens (147 attestations), it depends much on the name of the goddess,³² who was an extraordinarily fertile name-source in Athenian name-giving, as is shown by the great popularity of 'Αθηνόδωρος (165 attestations), which can only refer to the goddess. When geographical names came into vogue, there are special reasons for it; the explosive increase of the popularity of 'Ελευσίνιος - with 97 attestations from the beginning of the Imperial period - is due to the popularity of the Eleusinian cults. So it would indeed be very seductive to connect the popularity of 'Αττικός with some famous Roman name-bearers and with the positive cultural connotations inherent in it both in Greek and even more in Latin. This idea could receive support from the fact that 'Αττικός also became popular in other parts of the Greek world: *LGP* I records it 9 times, mostly from the islands and imperial period; III A 38 times, all from the imperial period, except *SEG* XXX 1119 (Segesta, IV/III cent. BC); III B 5 times, of which 2 in Boeotia, 3 in Larisa, all from the imperial period. Moving to Asia Minor, we find it in Lydia as covered by *TAM* V five times with 'Αττικιανός 1x; at Ephesus there are four attestations; from Miletus four: *IG* II² 1996, 166, 186, 2024, 82, 9438; (all imperial period), with a Γρανία 'Αττίκιλλα *I. Milet* 176. We find suffixal formations also on the Greek mainland: in Athens 'Αττικία 2 times (both imperial), 'Αττικίων 5 times (all imperial); 'Αττίκιλλα 3 times in Sicily and Italy (all imperial), 'Αττίκων in Sicily (one time, I cent. AD); 'Αττικίων two times in Boeotia (imperial).

And finally two observations on the names showing fewer than 20 attestations. The popularity of the Latin gentile name *Musonius* in Athens with 17 attestations (which date from the II cent. AD onwards) could be a surprise; no other Roman gentile name is attested (as an individual name) with such a great number, as next comes 'Ιούλιος with 10 attestations. This must have been an Athenian peculiarity and requires an explanation. Could it have something to do with C. Musonius Rufus, the philosopher who taught in Greek and had many Greek students? He was also very famous in the Greek world, as is shown by the story of how people came from everywhere to hear him when banished to Gyaros in the Cyclades.³³ He circulates in the ancient literature often with the name (C.) Musonius, and it is not inconceivable that the dissemination of Μουσώνιος in Athenian onomastics is due to some popularity of the philosopher in Athenian intellectual circles; an analogous case would be 'Αττικός, dealt with above. As an additional factor to explain the popularity of Μουσώνιος could be adduced the possible association with the Muses (there also exists in Greek a personal name Μούσων, but morphologically the Athenian name can hardly be a derivative of it; this is precluded by the chronology, as -ιος would represent a late suffix).³⁴ Μουσώνιος spreads further in the Later Roman Empire; it is

³⁰ For the sense of the ethnic 'Αττικός and its relation to 'Αθηναίος see W. Dittenberger, *Hermes* 41 (1906) 213-219; 42 (1907) 10-27.

³¹ No. 136 from *IG* II² 2356, 59 ['Α]ττικό[ς] is integrated and remains uncertain.

³² In fact, 'Αθήναιος has to be taken as a theophoric name and accentuated in this way, not 'Αθηναίος; cf. J. Bingen, *CE* 48 (1973) 197 (but I would write an eventual personal name to be derived from the ethnic also 'Αθήναιος). Bechtel, *HPN* quotes 'Αθήναιος on two occasions, as a theophoric name (p. 526) and as a geographical one (p. 536). On the spreading of the name in Egypt, we have recently been provided with a complete list by A. Martin, *Anc. Soc.* 20 (1989) 169-184.

³³ Philostr. *VA* 7, 16.

³⁴ Pape - Benseler translated it downright as "Kunstmann"!

attested as the name of several officers and bishops (*PLRE* I 612-614 nos 1-3, II 769 nos 1-3, III 906 nos 1-2; *RE* XVI 897 nos. 3-19; note also Musonianus *PLRE* I 611).

The other case, with which I would like to conclude the discussion on the Athenian section, concerns Μάγνος in *IG* II² 3780, 2, normally regarded as an Athenian or a Greek of unknown provenience of the II cent. BC. (Note also a Μάγνα of Italic extraction in Larisa in the I cent. BC: *SEG* XXIX 557.) It is highly surprising to find such an early instance of this name in Greece as *Magnus* was a characteristic name of the advanced Imperial period. It appears in the Republican period only as an additional cognomen of the consul of 148 BC and of Cn. Pompeius and his sons; add a T. Roscius Magnus, known from Cicero's *Pro Roscio*. The consul of 148 BC Sp. Postumius Albinus Magnus could have been one of the ten legati sent in 146 BC as a member of the commission to settle the affairs of Greece after Mummius' campaign (but this is all but certain),³⁵ and on such an occasion the Athenians could have become acquainted with the name *Magnus*, even though this remains quite uncertain, as *Magnus* must have been only a secondary component in his name. But our Μάγνος has recently been identified by P. Veyne with the consul of 148 himself.³⁶ This remains quite hypothetical, for *Magnus*, as stated above, was such a secondary component in the name of the consul, that it is not easy to see why the Athenians should have chosen only that name to honour, even if indirectly, Sp. Postumius Albinus Magnus.³⁷ The wording of the epigram does not favour the identification with Postumius Albinus, either. If this Μάγνος was an Athenian, or at least a Greek, we have here a highly remarkable case of the Athenian use, if only occasional, of a Latin cognomen hardly in use at that time in Roman onomastics; the source may have been the positive connotation of the word *magnus*, perhaps conceived as a sort of title. Whether Postumius Albinus Magnus played any role in making this name known in Athens so that it would be used in local name-giving remains, to be sure, very hypothetical.

What were the sources for the use of Latin cognomina by the Athenians? First and foremost, naturally the commonest Latin cognomina as such, but not all of them, as we have seen. The striking popularity of the Latin praenomina in Athenian onomastics since the Republican period is due to the fact that the Greeks of the older periods designated the Romans only by the praenomen,³⁸ so that the take-over of this category of names was easy in Greek surroundings, that is to say, the change in their use from praenomen to cognomen was much easier in Greece than in the Roman West. Famous individual Romans might also have played a role in the dissemination of Latin names in Athens, even though we do not have many clear examples of that. Perhaps Ἀττικὸς came in vogue partly by virtue of famous name-bearers, more certainly Μουσώνιος did; surely the case is true for Νέπων, which appears in Athens and also in Asia Minor and in Syria (for a very early attestation from Boeotia, see the following section), but is extremely rare in the Roman West outside the Claudian imperial family. Its use in the Greek East must be seen

³⁵ See Fr. Münzer, *RE* XX 930 with an excellent discussion; cf. also Id., *ibid.* 905f.

³⁶ *Historia* 35 (1986) 112f.

³⁷ Veyne seems to think that Μάγνος was chosen to distinguish him from the other Postumius Albinus member of the commission, the consul in 151 A. Postumius Albinus, who was probably the head of the commission, but the elder Albinus had, as it seems, no individual cognomen. And did the commission really remain such a long time in Athens that 1) Magnus found time to procure himself an Athenian doctor; 2) that the Athenians got acquainted with Magnus' whole name to such an extent that they were able to use just this name to designate the man? In that period it would have probably been deprecatory to designate an official legate of the commission by his secondary cognomen.

³⁸ This phenomenon is treated extensively by O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen*, Helsinki 1987, 270ff.

in the light of Nero's popularity in Greece. Mostly the Greeks became acquainted with these names through Italian immigrants (or Greeks spending time in Italy), and many of them then became rooted in the Athenian onomastic customs. Slaves and popular Latin slave-names do not seem to have played any role in this process.

* *

*

Central Greece from the Megarid to Thessaly. I begin by giving similar frequency lists of the Latin names attested in these regions.

Kajanto		Central Greece
1) Felix	3716	4
2) Secundus	2684	10
3) Saturninus	2615	1
4) Fortunatus	2516	10
5) Primus	2397	30
6) Maximus	2362	8
7) Ianuarius	2007	-
8) Rufus	1829	18
9) Severus	1738	2
10) Victor	1699	-
11) Sabinus	1452	2
12) Proculus	1366	(5)
13) Faustus	1279	6
14) Priscus	1269	-
15) Hilarus	1196	(9)
16) Crescens	1045	-
17) Tertius	1042	-
18) Vitalis	1028	1
Central Greece		Kajanto
1) Πρίμος	30	2397
2) Μάρκος	22	209
3) Κόιντος	20	478
4) Ρούφος	18	1829
5) Γάιος	17	104
6) Πόπλιος	16	18
7) Δέκμος	10	64
8) Λούκιος	10	217
9) Σεκοῦνδος	10	2684
10) Φορτουνᾶτος	10	2516
[11] Ἰλαρος	9	1196]
12) Μάξιμος	8	2362

The number of individuals appearing in this area is much lower than that of the Athenians; in *LGN* II, the total number was 62,360, whereas the volume dedicated to Central Greece (III B) contains 43,454 persons. But even against this background, the percentual share of Latin names in the regions covered by *LGN* III B is clearly lower than in Athens; it is true that I have not compiled comprehensive statistics, but if you glance at the list of the Latin names, it is difficult not to note the explicit inferiority of Latin onomastic attestations in Central Greece in proportion to Attica. For this reason, because of the scantiness of the statistical basis, I abstain from a thorough interpretation of the lists.

The top names are much the same as in Athens, though not exactly. The only name among the top of the list from Central Greece which is absent from the list of fashionable Latin names in Athens is Φορτουνᾶτος, but that might be accidental. What we see clearly is that in Central Greece, too, the Latin praenomina form a prominent group, and apart from Αὔλος,³⁹ they are all present in great numbers, including the numerical cognomina Πρῆμος, which also maintains here the first place, and Σεκοῦνδος (written also Σακ- and -όνδ-). What is different from the state of affairs in Athens is that the attestations from the Republican times are, even in regard to the use of the praenomina, very few in numbers. It is difficult to say whether this is due to the smaller amount of epigraphic material or to the fact that, on average, Latin names invaded Central Greece later than Attica. Against this background it is interesting to draw attention to a surprisingly old attestation of the Italic praenomen and Latin cognomen *Nero*: IG VII 2823, 13 (Hyettos, from c. 190-175 BC) Νέρων (the reading is certain and there is no other plausible explanation for the name).⁴⁰ But how has this name landed in Hyettos? Either it arrived with some Italic immigrants or it was borrowed from the name of a Claudius Nero who had connections with the region. We know, for example, of Ap. Claudius Nero (*RE* 245) that he was legate of Flamininus in Greece in 197 BC, and of Ti. Claudius Nero (*RE* 251) that he travelled to Greek cities in the islands and Asia Minor in 172 BC. Who knows whether either of them or some other prominent representative of the Claudii Neroni could have acted as an onomastic model for the Hyettian family (our Νέρων was the father of a Καλλικλίδας). - In Boeotian Thebes we meet a Νῶνος, who gives us - mirabile dictu - the first incontestable example of the Latin cognomen *Nonus*.⁴¹

* *

*

And now to Lydia and the corpus of Peter Herrmann. Here too, I begin by reproducing the two lists.

Kajanto		Lydia
1) Felix	3716	-
2) Secundus	2684	17
3) Saturninus	2615	5
4) Fortunatus	2516	1
5) Primus	2397	12
6) Maximus	2362	5
7) Ianuarius	2007	-
8) Rufus	1829	10
9) Severus	1738	3
10) Victor	1699	-
11) Sabinus	1452	2
12) Proculus	1366	(9)
13) Faustus	1279	3
14) Priscus	1269	2
15) Hilarus	1196	-
16) Crescens	1045	2

³⁹ Αὔλος knows only two attestations, one from Lebadeia (I cent. AD), and one from Halai in Opuntian Lokris (I cent. AD).

⁴⁰ I have been able to consult a squeeze in the archive of the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, made by K. Hallof whom I would like to thank for checking with me the reading of the squeeze.

⁴¹ See H. Solin, *Arctos* 34 (2000) 156.

17) Tertius	1042	3
18) Vitalis	1028	-
Lydia		Kajanto
1) 'Ιουλιανός	50	800
2) Λούκιος	31 + Λεύκιος 5 = 36	217
3) Μᾶρκος	30	209
4) 'Ιούλιος	29	-
5) Γάιος	24	104
6) Πόπλιος	19	18
7) Βάσσο	17	(575)
8) Σεκοῦνδος	17	2684
9) Παῦλ(λ)ος	16	447
10) 'Αντωνῖνος	12	143
11) Πρεῖμος	12	2397
12) Αἰλιανός	11	195
13) Μαρκιανός	10	561
14) 'Ροῦφος	10	1829
15) Παυλῖνος	8	463
16) Πωλλίων	6	132
17) Φαυστῖνος	6	475

Here one notes a certain difference to the two previous samples, a difference due primarily to chronological and socio-historical factors. For example, the popularity of the names provided with the suffix *-ianus* or *-inus* has to be connected with the later date of the sources on average. But, on the other hand, the old Roman praenomina are there, as are *Primus* and *Secundus*. Another characteristic feature (which Lydia shares with Athens and Central Greece) is the slight representation of the most popular wish-names e. g. *Felix* or *Fortunatus*, which is not easy to explain, all the more as these names come in vogue in a somewhat later period, contemporaneously with the rise of the number of the inscriptions in the advanced Imperial period. It seems that, in Asia Minor as well in Greece, those Latin names, having once invaded the Greek anthroponymy, also remained popular in the advanced Imperial period. As for socio-historical factors, one could think, for example, about an influence of soldiers' nomenclature, but this is not possible, as shown by the fact that many name-categories lacking in the Lydian sample are on the top of the most popular cognomina of soldiers; once again, *Felix*.⁴²

⁴² See Dean, op. cit. (n. 19) 61. 178-184.