

## ANCIENT ONOMASTICS: PERSPECTIVES AND PROBLEMS

Heikki Solin

**ABSTRACT:** The importance of the collaboration between historians and philologists in onomastic studies is being stressed. We also owe important findings to the new more linguistically-oriented direction of onomastics, which has introduced a more historical and geographical approach into onomastic thinking.

Some considerations of questions which are controversial or require further attention are offered. In the field of Greek onomastics the need for a new Onomasticon of Greek Names and a new issue of Bechtel's classic "Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit" was stressed, as well as the need for a comprehensive treatment of Greek slave names. On the Roman side, a similar need for lexicographical compilations was pointed out, as well as a new comprehensive treatment of the Roman name-system. The latter part of the article is dedicated to questions concerning the interrelationship between Greek and Roman onomastics.

My first duty is to thank our Greek friends, not least Athanasios Rizakis, not only for the honour they have accorded to me by asking me to give this opening lecture, but also for all their efforts in preparing the programme of this conference and in gathering together here a large number of leading experts. I am sure we shall work very well together during the next few days, which will be the occasion for many interesting papers. Our thanks also go to the Finnish Institute at Athens, which, from the very beginning, has participated in the preparation of the colloquium and given much help with the practical arrangements.

If I begin by saying that ancient onomastics has made great advances in, let us say, the post-war period, you might reply that the same is true for many other branches of classical scholarship. And you would be right, for there are few disciplines in the field of *Altertumswissenschaft* that can be accused of lying fallow. It is, however, still true to say that onomastic studies have progressed enormously during the last few decades. In my view the principal reason for this is that, in the study of ancient personal names, historians and philologists have finally begun to work together, and this collaboration has given a new impetus to the research on ancient onomastics. This research requires a thoroughly interdisciplinary approach, and it is only in recent decades that we have learned that a true understanding of onomastic processes is impossible without a profound knowledge of

both philological and historical methodology and achievements. So, without exaggeration, we can say that the discovery of the crucial importance of combining history and philology in onomastic studies has had an extremely beneficial effect on the development of our discipline. And, as a gathering of philologists and historians, we may, I think, expect lasting results from the lively and animated dialogue that I anticipate over the next few days.

But there are also other reasons why onomastic research is nowadays so flourishing. Until quite recently a real barrier to progress in onomastic studies has been the lack of certain indispensable research tools such as dictionaries or indexes of epigraphical publications. To take just two examples, we did not enjoy the use of any comprehensive modern lexicon of Greek personal names until the first volume of the British Academy *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* saw the light of day in 1987. This was a major event and has immensely facilitated Greek onomastic research. I shall in due course come back to this memorable publication. On the Latin side one can point to Kajanto's *Latin Cognomina* of 1965, a classic in its own right, where for the first time —*mirabile dictu!*— the Latin cognomina were collected and interpreted morphologically and semantically. In addition, we now have the long-overdue publication of the *Index cognominum* of the sixth volume of *CIL*, the volume dedicated to Rome, where the richness of

Latin onomastic documentation reveals itself best. The mere lack of this index volume has for decades prevented comprehensive analyses of problems in Roman onomastics. The lack of such lexicographical compilations or indexes also explains the difficulty experienced in finding useful viewpoints from which the somewhat banal evidence of names becomes interesting. But today, the business of checking the distribution and frequency of Roman names, once very laborious and still requiring diligence and accuracy, has gradually become easier, thanks to the above-mentioned indexes and to some extent also to the Finnish School; and the compendium of Mócsy and his team also deserves mention. But for gentilicia Schulze is still needed; so too, for tribes, Kubitschek.

However, not only the completion of such indexes, but also the progress of epigraphical science in general, has brought great advances in the study of onomastics. Inscriptions are the central source-material in onomastic research and this is the reason why onomastic and epigraphic studies are so closely related. In fact, an onomatologist would not even consider pursuing his studies without at all times taking this main source into account; and as the inscriptions are full of names—in fact these form the main part of normal epigraphic texts—the epigrapher is continuously forced to pose onomastic questions. So the epigraphers and onomatologists cannot escape each other. This symbiosis also explains, at least in part, the birth of the Finnish onomastic school, the origins of which go back to the foundation of the Finnish Institute at Rome. For many reasons it was quite natural that the new institute of a country impoverished by the Second World War would not undertake expensive archaeological excavations, but would, rather, invest in the study of source-material which would not incur excessive costs. And as most of the Finnish classical scholars of the first post-war generation were classical philologists, it is more than understandable that in the milieu of our Roman institute a special interest in onomastic questions grew. At first this interest was more philologically oriented, but later it expanded in a more historical direction. It would be no exaggeration to say that our onomastic research forms a distinctive contribution of Finland to modern classical scholarship.

The title of our conference is “Colloquium on Roman Onomastics: Social and Political Aspects”. This indicates an emphasis on historical aspects, but I am sure that much of our discussion too will be about the philological interpretation of names. And as we are in the centre of Hellenic civilization, it is self-evident that Greek onomastics will play an important role in our colloquium, even though mostly connected with the presence of Roman power or at least of Italic elements.

To begin my reflections, I should first like to sketch a picture of current trends in ancient onomastics, and then focus on some central problems.

Today in our field three different and overlapping approaches can be discerned<sup>1</sup>. Firstly, there are purely philological attempts to collect, arrange and explain material, according to etymological principles, and, when this is done, the semasiological arrangement plays a great role. Classics in this field are, e. g., the works by Friedrich Bechtel and Iiro Kajanto. Furthermore, we owe important findings to the new more linguistically-oriented direction of onomastics, which has introduced a more historical and geographical approach into onomastic thinking. As to the study of the onomastic material of the Western Mediterranean, this approach has been developed and applied above all by the Tübingen school of Hans Krahe, by scholars like Helmut Rix, Carlo de Simone, Jürgen Untermann and Ulrich Schmoll<sup>2</sup>. As to the Eastern part, the works of Ladislav Zgusta on the names of Asia Minor can be mentioned<sup>3</sup>. Whereas the great pioneers in this field like Wilhelm Schulze had, in the tradition of conventional Indo-European linguistics, subjected personal names (and also toponyms) without onomastic context and chronological fixing to etymological artistry and far-

1. Some outlines are traced in H. Solin, “Probleme der römischen Namenforschung,” *BNF5* (1970) 276 ff.

2. Some of their work mentioned in Solin, *BNF5* (1970) 276ff.

3. Esp. *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (Prag 1964); further *Neue Beiträge zur kleinasiatischen Anthroponymie* (Prag 1970). Especially valuable are also the numerous studies by L. Robert; in particular see his *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie-Mineure gréco-romaine I* (Paris 1963).

reaching linguistic deductions, the new orientation has taken the opposite direction. One should first lay down the documentation locally and chronologically before proceeding to a synthesis. This method, which refrains as far as possible from giving a semantic meaning to the names studied, has in fact introduced a new chapter into the onomastic study of the Mediterranean area. It is especially suited to the investigation of older, pre-classical conditions, say, in Italy, in the western provinces and also in Asia Minor. This does not exclude the fact that in historically clearer periods, as in the Empire, in the larger cities and in well-defined areas one can achieve good results by applying an etymological approach. But a global and undifferentiated etymologizing should today be considered an outdated method. Personally, I am of the opinion that the two approaches, the old philological and the new historico-linguistic ones, do not exclude, but complement each other. One cannot but agree that Kajanto's treatment of the Latin cognomina is completely justified—in its essence it shows a sound basis<sup>4</sup>. The same I hope holds true for my studies on Greek names in the Roman world.

Thirdly, in recent years personal names have been the subject of a lively interest on the part of ancient historians, who have detected in onomastics an important instrument for studying the political and socio-economic history of Antiquity. It is, however, self-evident that interpretative onomastics must also pay a great deal of attention to the historian's research. In general one has to emphasize that the use and history of names are connected with social and political, rather than with merely linguistic, factors. Furthermore, in modern onomastics there are works which are not easy to label as either historical or philological studies. One example would be Salomies' fundamental study on Roman praenomina<sup>5</sup>, a masterly combination of philological analysis and historical outlook, accompanied by a rare mastery of the wide source-material.

Ancient onomastics is a subject which requires careful reflection rather than learned abstraction. For this reason I shall now dedicate the rest of my considerations to some concrete examples of questions which are controversial or at any rate require further attention. Let us begin with Greek issues.

Perhaps the most urgent need is for a new Onomasticon of Greek names and a new issue of Bechtel's classic *Historische Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*<sup>6</sup>. As to the former, we all know that the well-known Pape-Benseler dictionary was most uncritical and completely insufficient even on publication<sup>7</sup>. But it was not until recently that a new Onomasticon of Greek names (and only personal names) was undertaken. The large-scale project has been realized by the British Academy; of the five-volume enterprise the first two volumes have appeared<sup>8</sup>. The first volume contains the names of the Aegean Islands, Cyprus and Cyrenaica, rather a strange combination, which has no historical justification. The alphabetical arrangement of the material shows that the underlying rationale is prosopographical rather than linguistic; to my mind not an entirely happy decision. The first volume has been criticized from various standpoints, by Olivier Masson and Rüdiger Schmitt in their reviews, for example<sup>9</sup>. But in spite of such criticism, we have here a reference work of primary importance, and for that we should be very grateful indeed to its creators.

Friedrich Bechtel's *Historische Personennamen des Griechischen* came out in 1917. It is the only comprehensive philological treatment of Greek personal names. It has become a classic, and its

4. I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Comm. Hum. Litt. Soc. Sc. Fenn. 36, 2 (Helsinki 1965, repr. Rome 1982). That there still is gap between classical philologists and Indo-European linguists, is shown by some critical reviews of Kajanto's book written by representatives of the Tübingen school (e.g. M. Glück, *Kratylos* 13 [1968] 127-137), who clearly have not been able to recognize the great innovative feature of his work.

5. O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen. Studien zur römischen Namengebung*, Comm. Hum. Litt. Soc. Sc. Fenn. 82 (Helsinki 1987).

6. Halle 1917.

7. W. Pape, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, 3. Aufl., bearbeitet von G. E. Benseler, I-II (Braunschweig 1863-1870).

8. P.M. Fraser-E. Matthews, *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names I* (Oxford 1987). Vol. II, covering Attica, was published in July 1994.

9. O. Masson, *Gnomon* 62 (1990) 97-103; R. Schmitt, *Kratylos* 23 (1988) 277-280.

great merits cannot be denied; for decades it has been the starting-point for any studies in the field of Greek name-formation. On the other hand, it has become obvious that Bechtel has for a long time been hopelessly antiquated, in respect both to material completeness and to the philological interpretation of the individual names. So, we need a comprehensive new Bechtel, where the onomastic material of the Imperial period, omitted in Bechtel, can also be taken into account. For the realization of such a new Bechtel, Olivier Masson, more than any other living scholar, has contributed greatly to a better understanding of the formation and meaning of Greek personal names, primarily by shorter contributions, many of which are now collected in his *Onomastica Graeca selecta*<sup>10</sup>. Another great name in the study of Greek personal names is Louis Robert, the indisputable archegete of Greek epigraphy in the post-war period. He has above all taught us to understand names as being embedded in the surrounding society and as providing an insight into political ideology.

Apart from the completion of the British Academy's Onomasticon and a new Bechtel, what challenges are there in the field of Greek onomastics? Above all, I would say, further studies on the social and political relevance of names. To take one example, a comprehensive study of Greek slave names is a great desideratum. The recent compilation by Linda Collins Reilly is insufficient, incomplete and uncritical, and has many faults<sup>11</sup>. In this connection, it would be worthwhile to establish to what extent there were exclusive slave-names at all. For example, Bechtel and his generation often spoke about *Hetärennamen*, connecting them with slave names (Bechtel in his book on Attic female names often stamps a woman with the label "Hetäre oder Sklavin")<sup>12</sup>, but such female names do not seem to be classified exclusively as hetaira names at all—see for example the warnings of Louis Robert<sup>13</sup>. We also need studies of the regional and chronological differences between personal names in the various parts of the Greek world. As to the interchange between Greek and Roman onomastics, I shall come back to this in due course.

Let us move on to the Roman world. Here the need for intensive research work in many sectors

is even more obvious, for in the study of Roman onomastics the interdependence of historical, political and social action and the use and formation of personal names is very intricate and its study full of pitfalls. But let me begin this Roman section too with complaints about the need for comprehensive dictionaries and other tools. I said earlier that the publication during the last decades of epigraphical indexes (here I refer not only to the index cognominum of *CIL VI*, but also to the completion of the *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae*, which means that we now finally have available the material from the Christian inscriptions of Rome) and other studies, such as the monographs of Kajanto or Salomies, have enormously promoted and facilitated Roman onomastic research. But despite this intensive work, there are many gaps to be filled. The Onomasticon of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* stopped during the First World War with the letter D. The work on this Onomasticon should be resumed, but that does not seem likely in the near future. The office in Munich wants first to bring the dictionary proper to a conclusion. Another great desideratum is a new Schulze. Schulze's work on gentile names is brilliant and a landmark in classical studies (and by the way often misunderstood), but, in the spirit of contemporary Indo-European philology, it is conceived as a pioneering linguistic work and pays less attention to the geographical and social distribution of the names<sup>14</sup>. So what we need is a

10. I-II, Paris 1990.

11. L.C. Reilly, *Slaves in Ancient Greece. Slaves from Greek Manumission Inscriptions* (Chicago 1978); further see Ch. Fragiadakis, *Die attischen Sklavennamen von der spätarchaischen Epoche bis in die römische Kaiserzeit* (Diss. Mannheim 1986). A short introduction: O. Masson, "Les noms des esclaves dans la Grèce antique", *Actes du colloque 1971 sur l'esclavage*, Ann. littér. de l'Univ. de Besançon, Centre de recherche d'histoire ancienne 6 (Paris 1973) 9-23 = *Onomastica Graeca Selecta* 147-161.

12. F. Bechtel, *Die attischen Frauennamen nach ihrem Systeme dargestellt* (Göttingen 1902).

13. See, e.g., *Actes du VIIe Congrès International d'épigraphie grecque et latine*, Constanza 1977 (Bucuresti - Paris 1979) 36f.

14. W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin 1904); last reprint with addenda by O. Salomies (Hildesheim 1991).

comprehensive treatment of the diffusion and social distribution of gentile names. The work of Mócsy and his team was a beginning, even though their *Nomenclator* bristles with errors of every kind, and should be used with utmost caution<sup>15</sup>. It is to be hoped that the continuators of Mócsy's work in Budapest, Barnabas Lőrincz and others, who are preparing an entirely new compendium of Mócsy's work perform their task more skilfully; if so, we would have a tool of primary importance in the Hungarians' new compendium. A third complaint: for tribes, we still have to use Kubitschek. As you know, some years ago the late Giovanni Forni published vol. III 1 of his magnum opus *Le tribù romane*<sup>16</sup>, a rather less interesting volume; the work is unlikely to be brought to completion, which is a great pity.

But let us now move on to actual problems in Roman onomastics. I begin with the crucial question about the origin of the Latin name system, an unsolved and perhaps insoluble problem. As it is an interesting phenomenon both historically and linguistically, I shall dwell on it briefly.

The great achievement of the "Roman-Central-Italic" name system was the introduction of a gentile name, a hereditary family name. This brought many advantages. Firstly, it made possible the onomastic subdivision of individuals in a given society, which is useful especially in larger communities. Secondly, it allowed the labelling of all persons of the same (paternal) descent, a development with important implications, for example, in matters of law. Let us now have a look at what we can deduce about the history of the Latin name system.

The Romans were an Indo-European people. A comparative study of the nomenclature of different Indo-European languages shows that the characteristic Indo-European name form was a single name, an individual name. Thus it is in Greek, in Sanskrit, in German, in Celtic and so on. But in historical times the Romans had a very different name system: Gaius Iulius Caesar, Marcus Tullius Cicero. A Roman male citizen had three names, *tria nomina*, the praenomen, the nomen or nomen gentilicium, and the cognomen. The last mentioned element was often lacking in the Republican period: Marcus Antonius, and even in the early Imperial period: Lucius Vitellius.

It is, however, probable that originally the Romans used only a single name. The evidence is both direct and indirect. The "*Incerti auctoris liber de praenominibus*", whose author has recently been identified as a C. Titius, quotes Varro, who argues that *simplicia nomina* had been in use in ancient Italy. Varro drew this conclusion from mythological nomenclature: Romulus, Remus, Faustulus. The same author refers to other scholars who had quoted mythological names such as Rea Silvia, Silvius Numitor, etc. But legends apart, we have an authentic document from the seventh century B.C., the fibula Praenestina: *Manios med fhefhaked Numasioi* (I believe in the authenticity of the fibula, which has often been regarded as a fake over the last fifteen years). To quote indirect evidence, one could argue that as an Indo-European people the Italics must have inherited the Indo-European system of a single name, the more so if the Italic and Celtic languages are, as often argued, more closely related to each other, even though this remains quite uncertain.

This onomastic system did not survive into historical times. It was swept away by a revolution in the form of the Latin name, the adoption of the gentile name. We cannot say exactly when the gentile name came into use; I shall come back to this question. The course of the innovation may have been as follows. Patronymics provided the point of departure. In Latin, the patronymic seems to have been derived from the name of the father by adding the suffix *-ius*. Thus "Quintus, son of Marcus" was expressed by \**Quintus Marcus*. The name *Marcus* was by nature an adjective, suggesting "belonging to Marcus". At some unspecified time these ephemeral patronymics changed into permanent ones, which suggested membership of a large gens. Now, it is certain that the origin of the Roman name system must be sought in the hereditary gentile name, and more specifically in

15. A. Mócsy-R. Feldmann-E. Marton-M. Szilágyi, *Nomenclator provinciarum Europae Latinarum et Galliae Cisalpinæ cum indice inverso*, Diss. Pann. ser. III 1 (Budapest 1983).

16. G. Forni, *Le tribù romane*, III 1: *Le pseudo-tribù* (Roma 1985).

these patronymics, as the most gentile names of the peoples of Central Italy were patronymics. The pre-classical existence of adjectival patronymics in Latin can be deduced from their appearance in other Indo-European languages—to take a Greek example, Τελαμώνιος Αἴας, a usage which also seems to be attested in some Italic inscriptions and even in Latin itself (from literary sources we know of cases such as *Hostus Hostilius* or *Numa Marcius Marci filius*). And then the great question: when, where and how did the change-over from patronymic to gentile system take place? I have no clear answer to give to these questions, but I think that this change-over began to take place around 700 B.C. somewhere between the lower Tiber and the Tyrrhenian Sea, that is to say in the area of interaction between the Etruscans, Sabelians and Latins. The social and linguistic requisites would have been offered, I believe, by the Italics with the role which they allotted to the *pater familias*.

The idea of the linguistic priority of the Italic is further supported by the feminine motion in the gentile name in the Etruscan: fem. *Tarxna-i*; masc. *Tarxna*, which is only explicable as an imitation of an Italic rule, as Etruscan does not have any genus of adjectives. On the other hand, the Etruscans may have carried out the concrete change-over through a reinterpretation of the complicated Italic patronymic system. In addition, by the synoecism of villages into new cities in the 9th/8th century the Etruscans may have created the economic prerequisites for the change-over. The date of the establishment of the gentile name system cannot be deduced directly from the sources, but the indirect criteria are quite unequivocal: a) in many Etruscan and in a few Italic inscriptions of the 7th century many persons are recorded by only one name; b) in binominal cases the lexical variation of the first names is much greater in the 7th century than in the 6th and subsequent centuries, but in any case is smaller than that of the second names, which are thus not patronymics any more (if they were, the lexical variation should be equal for both names). We can say, therefore, that the gentile name system was established in Rome around the end of the 7th century. Soon after the establishment of the new system, other gentile name types came

into use; not all the gentilicia recorded for the first republican period are former patronymics. Many of them are of Etruscan origin, as for example names ending with -na: *Perperna*, *Caecina*<sup>17</sup>. Thus both the Italic peoples and the Etruscans contributed to a process of universal importance: for it was here, in the Mediterranean area, that a system of hereditary names was first created, of a kind still in use today.

Next, I shall deal with a closely related question: the emergence of the cognomen. We cannot tell with certainty when the cognomen first came into use; in any case for many centuries it was a characteristic of Roman aristocrats. The consular *Fasti Capitolini* record cognomina from very early on: L. Valerius M. f. Volusi n. Potitus 483 B.C. And surely cognomina were included in the lost parts of the *Fasti Capitolini*, containing the first years of Roman Republic: no doubt the name of the first consul of 509 B.C. was inscribed as L. Iunius M. f.-n. Brutus. Now, beyond the issue of the overall reliability of the *Fasti Capitolini*, especial doubt attaches to the cognomina attributed to fifth- and fourth-century consuls. In fact, most scholars argue that the cognomina in the nomenclature of the early magistrates are later inventions<sup>18</sup>. I must confess, I cannot share the predominantly negative judgement of current scholarship. I shall show in another connection that a good many of the Early Republican cognomina are sound—but naturally not all of them; there are indeed interpolations, too, especially among the double cognomina and some very early plebeian cognomina like *Augurinus*<sup>19</sup>. But I think that the early cognomina of the patrician gentes are for the most part authentic. They were found in the original list as early as the

17. For these questions, see H. Rix, "Römische Personennamen", in *Namenforschung* I 1 (Berlin 1995) 724-732.

18. See, e.g., statements in the authoritative *Cambridge Ancient History* such as by R. M. Ogilvie - A. Drummond (*CAH* VII 2, 14 n. 22) or by A. Drummond (*CAH* VII 2, 628).

19. This cognomen was attached to the first plebeian augurs, C. Genucius and M. Minucius Faesus, 300 B.C., but later added to the names of earlier *Genucii* and *Minucii*, even the patrician ones, recorded in the *Fasti Capitolini*

end of the third century B.C. At that time there was no scholar in ancient Rome able to invent *all* these cognomina, many of which were unknown or rare in later periods, e. g. *Fusus*, *Lanatus*, *Pulvillus*, *Structus*, *Tricipitinus*, *Tricostus*, *Vibulanus*, all from the period before 460 B.C. This would give a very early date for the appearance of the cognomen. At any rate, the first authentic document is—or was until recently—the sepulchre of the Scipiones outside the porta Capena in Rome. Its earliest sarcophagus bears the inscription *L. Cornelio Cn. f. Scipio*. Because he was consul in 298 B.C., he must have been born c. 340 B.C. The origin of the cognomen is obscure. But it cannot be excluded that our man, the first person buried in the family sepulchre, was the founder of the family. It is also difficult to decide whether *Scipio* was a name given in childhood or later in life. But the fact that he had an individual cognomen too, *Barbatus*, recorded in the elogium added to the epitaph, supports the first possibility. But now we know of an even earlier document. In the fifties a late fourth-century sarcophagus was found, the text of which reads: *P. Cornelio P. f. Scapola pontifex max.* (*CIL* 12 2835). And it is not to be excluded that future discoveries may bring to light still earlier examples.

Now, the cognomina were for long unofficial surnames, even though the degree of their unofficial character could vary. If, as late as the second century B.C., they were omitted in official documents, especially in laws and senatorial decrees, that still does not show that their use was limited to the family circle. For, in official documents, the omission of the cognomen can result from an epigraphic habit of maintaining uniformity in, say, consular datings; i.e., because many plebeian consuls and other magistrates did not bear cognomina at all, the cognomen was also omitted even when it existed. I know that this suggestion is new, but there are parallels in other types of inscriptions e.g. from the Augustan period<sup>20</sup>. It is simply impossible to say how “official” or “unofficial” the early cognomina were. For one type we can trace their development: originally cognomina like *Capitolinus*, *Collatinus*, *Esquilinus*, *Maluginensis*, etc. were simply indications of origin, but, if they are authentic, they must soon have become an integral part of the name.

In many respects, the origin and development of the Latin name system are central questions in Roman studies. But there are other important questions, too. I cannot enumerate them here exhaustively. If I end my Roman section by recording some recent Finnish contributions, either published or in preparation, I do it not to stress our strength in this field, but to show how many important questions are still waiting to be clarified. Olli Salomies has recently published a book on Roman adoptive nomenclature<sup>21</sup>. Mika Kajava is finishing his magnum opus on the nomenclature of Roman upper-class women<sup>22</sup>, and Christer Bruun is completing a major study of the origin and meaning of the pejorative cognomina of the Republican aristocracy. I myself have almost finished a book on the Roman senatorial onomastics and am preparing an introduction to ancient onomastics.

I should like to direct my final comments to the interrelationship between Greek and Roman onomastics.

between 451-396 and 497-305, respectively. Cfr. Th. Mommsen's observations in his classical article, “Die römischen Eigennamen der republikanischen und augusteischen Zeit”, in *Römische Forschungen* 1<sup>2</sup> (Berlin 1864) 65-68.

20. To take just one example, the long laterculus *CIL* III 6627 = *ILS* 2483 (Coptos) from the Augustan period offers a high number of legionary and auxiliary soldiers none of whom bears a cognomen (instead, the names of the centurions can be expressed through a cognomen). Now, Mommsen and others concluded that these soldiers were not allowed to bear a cognomen, but this explanation is surely wrong; all the soldiers are named without a cognomen for the sake of uniformity: as many had no cognomen, it was also omitted in the names of those who did, to render the lists uniform. Cfr. *Klio* 71 (1989) 293.

21. O. Salomies, *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire*, Comm. Hum. Litt. Soc. Sc. Fenn. 97 (Helsinki 1992).

22. Its first volume has now come out: *Roman Female Praenomina. Studies in the Nomenclature of Roman Women*, *Acta IFR* 14 (Rome 1995).

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<sup>23</sup>. 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. The reappraisal of this subsection of ancient onomastics offers a wide field of research, one with room for both Hellenists and Latinists. Great Hellenists, like Louis Robert, have recognized the need for thorough surveys of this onomastic material, and now our Greek friends at the Κέντρον are producing important regional studies of Roman nomina in Greek lands. We have here a wide field both for philological observations and for socio-historical and demographical investigations.

Now I would like to illustrate briefly how manifold the problems can be.

1) Firstly, the morphological data. Here we are dealing above all with innovations taking place in the Greek East, such as the formation of new names by adding Greek productive suffixes to purely Latin stems. A classic example is -ᾶς (Λουκᾶς, Ποπλᾶς). This suffix was very productive, being even used in Rome in a purely Latin environment. In spite of its typically hypocoristic character it also appears as a normal onomastic suffix, and that is the reason why new formations of this type should not to be rejected out of hand and replaced without good reason by more normal forms in -us /-ος<sup>24</sup>. This suffix was especially productive in Late Antiquity: for example, you find in the three volumes of the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire many surprising coinages with -ᾶς from Latin names, like Ἰουστινᾶς, Πητρωνᾶς, Τριβουνᾶς. Another example of a Greek suffix attached to a Latin stem would be a female name Lucias which I am inclined to explain as a derivative from Lucius with the Greek feminine suffix -ᾶς<sup>25</sup>.

2) Secondly, the name system and its peculiar features in Greek surroundings. Here there is much

work to be done. Concerning this topic there is a transition of learned observation stretching from Posidonius and Plutarch down to Hatzfeld, Robert, and Rizakis and his colleagues; but as it will be the subject of papers later, I won't pursue it further now. When Flamininus was addressed by the Greeks with the sole name of Titus, this was in conformity with the practice of the time —but later Roman praenomina, if unusual ones, could seem so strange to the Greeks that they reinterpreted them as cognomina. It is significant that the name of Potitus Valerius Messalla, cos. suff. in 29 B.C., who in all contemporary sources appears with the highly unusual praenomen Potitus, appears in an inscription from Didyma in the form Messalla Potitus<sup>26</sup>. Those who erected the inscription probably regarded the praenomen Potitus as so out of the ordinary that they placed it as if it were another cognomen; presumably they had scant knowledge of aristocratic Roman praenomina.

3) Closely linked with (2) is the question of the social and geographical origin of the name-bearers. Here we have to distinguish between Romans or Italics settled in the East and their Hellenized descendants; provincial Greeks with Roman citizenship; and any Orientals who bore a Latin name in lieu of a Greek or local one. Such a name could be a praenomen (e.g. *Marcus*, St. Mark), a

23. See Solin, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom I*, Comm. Hum. Litt. Soc. Sc. Fenn. 48 (Helsinki 1971) 121-158.

24. To take just one example, the name form Κανδιᾶς in ἀμνησθή — inscription from Mount Karmel should not be suppressed and changed, as A. Rehm, *Philologus* 94 (1941) 16, into Κάνδιδος or Κανδιᾶτος. *Candidus* is a common cognomen and has generated a number of derivatives, to which *Candidas* would suit well, whereas *Candidatus* is not known as personal name at all. Moreover, Κανδιᾶς is attested as a name: *CIL* 873 from Berytus.

25. Attested several times in Roman inscriptions: *CIL* VI 10931, 11155, 12024, 26841. Contrary to my *Namenbuch* p. 609, where I argued for a derivation from the *ethnikon* Lycius, I now consider it a latin formation, because of the constant spelling with -u- (notre also Λουκιᾶς Moretti *IGUR* 751); in fact, in Roman onomastics there are no occurrences of the name *Lycias*.

26. *I. Didyma* 147.



gentilicium (e.g. *Iunia*, a woman —not a man!— in the Pauline community in Rome), or a cognomen (e.g. *Rufus*). The origin of this interesting usage is not yet fully clarified. Delos is very important in this respect; but I won't linger on this matter here, as I have touched elsewhere on the names of the Delian Italians<sup>27</sup>. Moreover, during this colloquium we shall hear at least one paper about Delos.

4) Some Latin names seem to have come back from the East in Hellenized form. In the Latin sources we often meet, in Rome and elsewhere in Italy, the name form *Marcion* instead of *Marcio*<sup>28</sup>, and I suspect that we are dealing with a name which has come back from the East provided with the Greek suffix *-ίων*. To take another example, if the cognomen *Rufus* is sometimes written in Latin inscriptions of the West with *ph* instead of *f*, this may reflect a Greek spelling; as is well-known, *Rufus* was also a very popular name in the East<sup>29</sup>.

5) There seem to have been a few Latin names that are more common in the Greek East than in the West, such as *Nero* and *Drusus*. For obvious reasons, *Nero* is extremely rare in the Roman West outside the Claudian imperial family, but it appears, e. g., in Athenian ephebic lists, and also in Asia Minor and in Syria. Its popularity in Greece must be seen in the light of *Nero*'s popularity in Greece<sup>30</sup>. Thus we are dealing with so called "political" name-giving. Another example is *Serenus*, which is very common in Egypt and gave rise to suffix-formations like *Serhnéskow*<sup>31</sup>. Since the name clearly cannot be Egyptian, we must be dealing with the interesting phenomenon of a purely

Latin name-family acquiring a wider currency in Egypt. I have no clear explanation for this strange fact.

It is this interrelation between Greece and Rome as reflected in name-giving and name-use that is the central focus of our colloquium. I am sure there will be stimulating papers and fruitful discussions to follow: certainly the programme promises excitement. I shall now give the floor to the first speakers, who, I am sure, are most eagerly awaited. After all, it is *they* whom you have come to hear.

H. Solin  
Institutum Classicum  
Universitas Helsingiensis

27. H. Solin, "Appunti sull'onomastica romana a Delo", in *Delo e l'Italia, Opuscula Instituti Romani Finlandiae* 2 (1982) 101-117.

28. E.g. *CIL* VI 975 VI, 34. 10183. 16885. 22036.

29. E.g. *CIL* XII 8343 = *I.Köln* 303 with good photo, where *Ruphus* appears as the cognomen of a choraulos from Mylasa, so that *ph* is more than understandable; see *Arctos* 10 (1976) 88f. *Ruphinianus* in *CIL* VI 1, 7624 as the cognomen of a freedman where oriental extraction cannot be excluded.

30. On *Nero* in Greece cf. recently A. Spawforth, "Symbol of Unity? The Persian-Wars Tradition in the Roman Empire", in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford 1994) 233-237.

31. *P. Giss. Univ. Bibl.* 49-53. SB 9543. *P. Teb.* 288. 339. For other derivatives from *Serenus*, see Solin-Salomies, *Repertorium nominum et cognominum Latinorum* (Hildesheim - Zürich - New York 1988) 401.