

## STRAY NOTES ON ROMAN NAMES IN GREEK DOCUMENTS

Kostas Buraselis

**ABSTRACT:** Three notes on the interpretation of some Roman name forms in Greek documents are assembled here. First, the function and significance of the “Spurii filiation”, i.e. the addition of “Spurii filius (sp. f.) = Σπο(υ)ρίου υἱός” in names of children produced from an *iniustum matrimonium* is examined on the basis of an inscription from Lesbos (*IG* XII 2.382-383) and other documents. The second note concerns the use of certain abbreviation forms for the usual filiation with the father’s praenomen in Roman names as they appear in Greek inscriptions from Lesbos. Finally, the possible connection of Roman names including both the praenomen *Marcus* and the gentilicium *Aurelius* (*Marci Aurelii*) not only with grants of citizenship under Marcus Aurelius and Commodus but also with the *Constitutio Antoniniana* is re-asserted against some recent views (cf. *SEG* 39 [1989] 1858) and supported with further evidence from Greek documents.

The notes assembled here are actually by-products of my first, intermittent efforts to collect and study the Roman name material from some eastern Aegean islands (Lesbos, Chios and Samos)<sup>1</sup>. They might claim a modest but autonomous value and I thought they would fit into the framework of this colloquium.

I. An inscription from Mytilene (*IG* XII 2, 382) is part of a funerary monument<sup>2</sup> for some bearers of Roman names. Two of these names are fully and one partly preserved. The three persons had been honoured with crowns by the *demos* of Mytilene: the typical mention “ὁ δᾶμος” in a crown stays above each one’s funerary inscription<sup>3</sup> (of the usual type χρηστὲ χαῖρε).

The two first persons are men: Γναῖος Πομπήιος Σπορίου (according to *IG*) υἱὸς Νέστωρ and Γναῖος Πομπήιος Σπορίου (acc. to *IG*) υἱὸς Ἡδύλος. The name of the third person is only partly preserved but it begins with the letters ΠΟΜ, so that it seems only reasonable to restore the name of a female member of the same family, a Pompeia, as usually without a praenomen.

At first sight there is nothing peculiar in all this: the two brothers (as we shall see), apparently sons of a *Spurius* (praenomen)<sup>4</sup> in the typical Roman filiation form, expressed here in Greek, have been buried with a female relative, perhaps a sister. Therefore the restoration in *IG* is: Πομπ[ηία Σπορί]/ου [θυγάτηρ/- - - -].

O. Salomies<sup>5</sup> in his thorough study of Roman praenomina has then touched on this inscription

and promoted its understanding: By setting it among similar evidence from Latin and Greek inscriptions and pointing to the fact that neither of the two brothers bears the praenomen *Spurius* (they are both *Cnaei*), as one would have expected if this had been the actual praenomen of their father<sup>6</sup>, he rightly concluded that this must be an example of the typical filiation form for *spurii*(-ae), i.e. illegi-

1. Of course, there have already been pioneer studies of this material: Th. Sarikakis, “Ἡ χορήγησις ρωμαϊκῆς πολιτείας εἰς τοὺς Χίους”, *EEThess* 11 (1969) 169-208; the same has presented the main results of a similar work for Lesbos at the 8th Int. Congress of Epigraphy (Athens 1982), still unpublished; W. Transier, *Samiaka. Epigraphische Studien zur Geschichte von Samos in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit* (Diss. Mannheim 1985) 149-154.

2. Cf. below on *IG* XII 2, 384.

3. The usage of these public crowns represented on gravestones has been repeatedly signalized and its local distribution (epicentre: Ionia) studied by L. Robert: s. mainly *RPh* 18 (1944) 45 (= *OM* III, 1411) and *Berytus* 16 (1966) 9-10 n. 28 (= *OM* VII, 641-642) with further references to all his relevant publications; he collected the Lesbian material in *REA* 62 (1960) 284/5<sup>9</sup>. Cf. also M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca* II (Roma 1969) 175f.

4. In the Indices of *IG* XII 2 (p. 147) this *Spurius* is mistakenly catalogued as a gentilicium.

5. *Die römischen Vornamen. Studien zur römischen Namengebung*, Comm. Human. Litt., 82 (Helsinki 1987) 50-55 (here: 54<sup>119</sup>).

6. No further sons of this father seem to have existed: cf. the epigramme mentioned below.

timate children (“uneheliche Kinder” in his own, and the current, terminology)<sup>7</sup>.

Now, I think that while this main result may be regarded as certain, a closer study of this inscription and parallel evidence could help us understand somewhat better the legal and social position of these people and the consequent significance of their filiation form.

As Salomies’ discussion of the *Spurii* and *spurii* has also clearly shown, a distinct uncertainty has always attached to the meaning of the label “*spurii filius*”. The most probable derivation of the word, attested by Plutarch<sup>8</sup>, from the abbreviation for *sine patre filius* (S.P.F.) and its consequent, consciously erroneous assimilation with the almost identically abbreviated praenomen *Spurius*, i.e. in the form *SP.F.*, has resulted in the same praenomen’s coming gradually out of use during the first cent. B.C. To name someone “son of a *Spurius* (= *spurius*)” was then initially and quite conceivably a way to invent some passable filiation form for someone whose real father was unknown. The next phase of the development is more difficult to grasp in all its aspects: these are the cases where the word (and the filiation form) should have assumed the broader significance: “illegitimate child”, i.e. irrespectively of the fact whether the latter’s father was known or not.

First of all, the notion “illegitimate child” is not absolutely correct: for one could be the child e.g. of a marriage between *peregrini* or a permanent relationship between slaves, being so, of course, only “illegitimate” as far as Roman law was concerned<sup>9</sup>. The practical implications are clear: such a status was, under certain circumstances, synonymous with the non-possession of Roman citizenship by the children. We shall see later some relevant cases.

A second, related point is also important: how often was a *spurius* father really unknown? And if his identity was known at least in some cases, as it would be only natural to suppose, what was the exact significance of his name being hidden under the anonymous “*spurii filius(-a)*” form? In this respect the Mytilene inscription contributes some more evidence. For on another part of the same funerary monument (*IG XII 2,383*, re-edited by

Peek, *GV* 2023) we have an elegant epigramme for Nestor and Hedylos, here expressly mentioned as brothers, buried in the same grave with their aged father: “ΧΘ[ών αὖ]τα κα[τ]έχει τύμβος θ’ ὁδε δύσμορα τέκνα/καὶ πατέρος λυπρὴν γηρά-λέην τε τρίχα” (ll. 1-2). We may conclude that their father’s identity was exactly known, although his name, like that of the mother, is not mentioned in the epigramme<sup>10</sup>. Theoretically then, the filiation form “*spurii filius*” could have been omitted or replaced by the real one, as these children were

7. A selection of further, mainly recent bibliography analysing or touching on the problem of *spurii filii/ae* from the viewpoint of onomastics and social history: H. Solin, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom I* (Helsinki 1971) 124-125; G. Fabre, *Libertus* (Rome 1981) 175-176; P.R.C. Weaver, “The status of Children in Mixed Marriages”, in B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome* (Ithaca/N. York 1986) 145ff. (esp. 158); B. Rawson, “*Spurii* and the Roman View of Illegitimacy”, *Antichthon* 23 (1989) 10-41; S. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* (Oxford 1991) 317f.

8. *Quaestiones Romanae*, 103 (*Moralia* 288 E-F). C f. Gaius, *Inst.*, I. 64: “...*quales* (: like the children from *nefariae atque incestae nuptiae*) *sunt ii quos mater vulgo concepit; nam et ii patrem habere non intelleguntur, cum is et incertus sit; unde solent spurii filii appellari, vel e graeca voce quasi sporade concepti, vel quasi sine patre filii*” and the ancient lexicographic testimonies cited by Salomies (n. 5) 51 in the original.

9. Rawson’s (n. 7) valuable study of the *spurii* has now correctly grasped the difference between the modern and the Roman concept of “illegitimacy” (esp. p. 11). But she did not extend her study into including Greek evidence of the imperial period and, beyond suggesting that Roman illegitimacy has never been “a vital factor in social relations or social aspirations” (p. 37, cf. pp. 28-29 for limitations of this), i.e. in a discriminating sense, she did not consider the possibility that the “sp. f.” could also present other positive aspects for the “illegitimate” than the mere proclamation of free birth (cf. below). Cf. also Weaver’s study (n. 7).

10. There is also no hint at the existence of other children that could have mitigated the mother’s grief. One may notice that especially slave parents seem to have been mentioned by name only exceptionally and rather in later times among the Greek funerary epigrammes according to H. Raffenner, *Sklaven und Freigelassene. Eine soziologische Studie auf der Grundlage des griechischen Grabepigramms* (Innsbruck 1977) 78f.

not, in the original sense, ἀπάτορες, “fatherless”<sup>11</sup>. Which was then the practical purpose in preferring to use it?

To answer this question it would help to consider here first the evidence on: (a) examples of a Roman name form in Greek including a filiation formula where a Greek name takes the place of a typical Roman praenomen, and (b) cases where a person appears with the filiation *spurii filius(-a)*, while his actual father is also named in the same context (inscription).

It is not difficult to find out that the not numerous examples of (a) seem mainly to concern members of higher social strata that have acquired the Roman citizenship in the Greek part of the empire. In Mytilene itself we meet (*IG* XII 2, 549) the lifelong priest of the *Augusti* and all the other gods and goddesses Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον Λέοντος ὕιον, Κυρεῖνα, Δάμαρχον (honoured by Μάρκος Καίσιος, Μάρκω ὕιος, Παλατεῖνα, Κουάρτος). Although the relevant passage is partly restored, the same name pattern must be recognized in *IG* XII 2, 656 where another member of the local aristocracy, the famous Potamon’s son Diaphenes is honoured: ....Γαῖω Κλαυδίω, Ποτάμωνο[ς ὕω] Διαφένη. A similar social status is explicit or implicit in the following cases: *IG* IV 590, an honorary monument of Argos for the Helladarch T. Στατίλιον Λαμπρίου ὕον Τιμοκράτη Μεμμιανόν, Περσέος καὶ Διοσκούρων ἀπόγονον...(cf. *IG* IV 1<sup>2</sup>, 665); *SEG* 16 (1959) 258, another honorary monument of Argos for the three brothers Γν. Πομπήιον Κλεοσθένους υἱόν Διόδοτον, ...Κλεοσθένη, ...Καλλέα<sup>13</sup>, on whose important family cf. M. Mitsos, *Ἀργολικὴ προσωπογραφία* (Athens 1952) 107; *IG* IV 997, where Samos honours Γάιον Ἰούλιον Σωσιγένης υἱόν Ἀμυνίαν, τὸν καλούμενον Ἰσοκράτη, an Epicurean philosopher and benefactor of the city; *F. Delphes* III 4.113 with Delphian honours T. Φλαυῖω [Θ]εοδότου υἱ[ῶ] Κυρεῖνα Θέωνι Στ[α]τιανῶ Ῥωσεί κιθαρωδῶ (that such a man could also be a distinguished person shows *IG* IV 591, with the same filiation form).

These examples prove that the Roman name pattern in Greek could copy the Latin one but at the same time use the Greek patronymic as a substitute for a Latin praenomen inside the filiation

formula. This obviously did not result in any diminution of the bearer’s social position, which was an important one any way: it rather reflected the insistence of such people on inserting into their new name form some basic indication of their Greek family tree (irrespective of whether the Roman citizenship of the family extended as far back or not) while externally keeping by the standard Roman name type.

I was able to trace cases of (b) only in the rich material of funerary inscriptions contained in *CIL* VI. This evidence seems then to imply that when the real father of a “*spurii filius*” is named in the context of the same inscription (e.g. as one of the dedicants), he was either a freedman himself by that time (e.g. 8148, 14310, 15007, 20171, probably also *ib.* I<sup>2</sup>, 1315) or an imperial slave (e.g. *ib.* VI, 15114, 29513)<sup>14</sup>. To estimate this properly we should recall that a “*spurii filius(-a)*” was automatically an “*ingenuus(-a)*” as he/she was the child of a woman free or freed at the latest by the time of its birth (s. below)<sup>15</sup>. So we may think that the mention of a real father who was still an ordinary slave

11. On the ἀπάτορες in Roman Egypt, a term and institution quite similar in essence and development with the proper Roman *spuriis*, the penetrating analysis by H.C. Youtie, “ΑΠΑΤΟΡΕΣ: Law vs. Custom in Roman Egypt”, in *Le monde grec. Hommages à Cl. Préaux* (Bruxelles 1975) 723-740. But he seems to have underestimated how important the original, literal meaning of the word: “without a (known) father” remained in documents and literary texts as e.g. in the basic testimony of Plutarch (n. 8 above) where it certainly does not have the wider significance “without a legal father” (Youtie, 730).

12. On the history, social standing and connections of these *Statilii*: A.J.S. Spawforth, *ABSA* 80 (1995) 248ff.

13. On the “Greek filiation form” of these brothers and the cithara-player from Delphi cited below cf. G. Daux, “L’onomastique romaine d’expression grecque”, in *L’Onomastique latine*, Colloques int. du C.N.R.S., 564 (Paris 1977) 410-411.

14. For discussion of these and similar cases cf. Salomies (n. 5) 55 and Rawson (n. 7) esp. 31-36.

15. How privileged the position of a *sp. f.* regarding the *civitas Romana* was, may also emerge from a comparison with the standards of marriages between Romans and *peregrini*: e.g. a Roman mother without *conubium* would have never been able to pass on her Roman citizenship to her children. Cf. Rawson (n. 7) 12.

would have been probably detrimental to the social position and appearance of a “*spurii filius/a*”<sup>16</sup>. This kind of “*ingenuus/a*” would have good prestige reasons to conceal such an impertinent extraction. If one considers the human and social background of *spurii*, the use of a Greek name inside *their* traditional Roman filiation formula would have been, a fortiori, unthinkable; above all, it would have highlighted the above extraction, betrayed most often by the use of a further non-Roman name<sup>17</sup>. In this and other respects the strict adherence to a name form looking as Roman as possible was absolutely preferable: only so the legal and social rights symbolized by the Roman name of such an individual must have seemed guaranteed. One should either be officially the son of a notional Roman father<sup>18</sup> or run the risk of having his position as Roman citizen (*ingenuus*) disputed. Of course, this was much more valid in a local society accustomed to the standard Roman name practice as this was obviously the case with Lesbos (cf. below).

Another point of importance regarding this “paternal anonymity” could have to do with the exact age of “*spurii filii/ae*” and their consequent legal status. Let us begin with an *epikrisis* text from Antonine Egypt (*FIRA* III, 6: 148 A.D.). The person whose identity is examined here bears the name Γάιος Ἰούλιος [Σπ]ουρίου υἱὸς Διογένης. The document shows he was the son of a freed-woman: she had born him and his twin sister Ἰουλίᾳ Σπουρίου θυγάτηρ Ἰσαίου on the same year of her manumission and given them her own, i.e. her *patronus*’, Roman name (in the son’s case all *tria nomina*).

The fact that the children were born by a mother who was already a Roman citizen did bear on their own possession of Roman citizenship. The texts of the Roman jurists, especially an important passage in Gaius (I. 89), make clear that: “...*hi qui illegitime concipiuntur statim sumunt ex eo tempore quo nascuntur; itaque si ex libera nascuntur, liberi fiunt...*”. It was consequently critical to ascertain (or not) the exact circumstances of a birth, especially the date. In this case the age of the son had been left blank by the petition writer and completed by the examining authority later: “twenty years”, i.e. the correct interval between the time of the *epikrisis* and the date of the mother’s

manumission and child-birth. If the son (and the daughter) had been born earlier, while their mother was still a slave, they would have not become Roman citizens. Of course, it goes without saying that the exact age of the children, for which private attestations of their birth were here adduced, may have been a question that could be slightly but decisively manipulated<sup>19</sup>. The exact mention of the real father in this or similar documents may have then simply made things more difficult, as e.g. a long-standing family relation could possibly

16. Perhaps already to his legal one: one should namely consider here the additional uncertainty in the position of a *spurii filius* after the —partly temporary— restrictions of the *SC Claudianum* (52 A.D.) on the birth of free children from a free/freed mother and a slave father. On this *senatus consultum* and the subsequent Roman law practice in relevant cases, cf. W.W. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery* (Cambridge 1908, repr. 1970) 397-399, 412-413; Weaver (n. 7), 150 ff.; A. Watson, *Roman Slave Law* (Baltimore/London 1987) 10-13; El. Herrmann-Otto, *Ex ancilla natus. Untersuchungen zu den “hausgeborenen” Sklaven und Sklavinnen im Westen des römischen Kaiserreiches*, *Forschungen zur ant. Sklaverei* 24 (Stuttgart 1994) 24-33.

17. Cf. Solin’s (n. 7), 122ff. detailed demonstration of the relevant significance of Greek cognomina in the two first centuries of the empire.

18. The above remarks show, of course, that this was not merely a legal question.

19. An important fact bearing on this point is that the official registration of *spuri* in the Roman empire does not antedate Marcus Aurelius’ reign. On the system and the defects of Roman birth registration: F. Schulz, “Roman Registers of Births and Birth Certificates”, *JRS* 32 (1942) 78-91 & *ibid.* 33 (1943) 55-64; J.F. Gardner, “Proofs of Status in the Roman World”, *BICS* 33 (1986) 1-14. On the special, intriguing case of Petronia Sp.f. Iusta of Herculaneum cf. also P.R.C. Weaver, “Children of Freedmen (and Freedwomen)”, in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome* (Canberra/Oxford 1991) 166ff. (esp. 166-172). On the cognate problem of age-rounding: A. Mócsy, “Die Unkenntnis des Lebensalters im Römischen Reich”, *AAntHung* 14 (1966) 387-421; R.P. Duncan-Jones, “Age-rounding, Illiteracy and Social Differentiation in the Roman Empire”, *Chiron* 7 (1977) 333-353.

have openly contradicted such a timely birth as the desirable status of the children imposed<sup>20</sup>.

Therefore, one may ask oneself again whether the “spurii filiation” veiled in comfortable anonymity the exact parentage of relatively new and low Romans, here interested just in their acquisition of Roman citizenship. That such a phenomenon was very usual among freedmen is easy to understand and verified by Salomies’ detection of several cases of this filiation form in freedmen’s—more exactly: freedwomen’s—milieu (cf. also above). The case of the Mytilene inscription does not seem to be different: not only do the two cognomina, Nestor and especially Hedylos, look like ex-slaves’ names<sup>21</sup> but a further inscription (*IG* XII 2, 384) seems to come from the same family monument and refers to another *mors immatura* with the name Γν. Πομπήιος Βένυστος (*Venustus*), again a probable freedman name<sup>22</sup>.

Two more points strengthen this view: (a) the combination of praenomen + gentilicium: *Cn. Pompeius* seems to suggest a connection of these people either with Pompey himself or with one of the local families, like that of the famous Theophanes and his descendants, who ultimately owed their Roman citizenship to Pompey and possessed their own *familiae* of slaves<sup>23</sup>; (b) the name of the woman on the inscription, Pompeia, does not need to be that of a sister of Nestor and Hedylos, for some reason unattested in the concomitant first epigramme. It could also be the name of the two sons’ mother, buried later in the same monument, who could then be mentioned as a Πομπήια Γναί]ου etc. It is exactly such a concentration of a female and one or more male names, where the gentilicium of the mother is given to the children, that Salomies observed as characteristic of many cases (as above) where the “spurii filiation” appears.

To sum up, it might be in some respect an advantage to be/remain of spurious origin. In the case of the Mytilene context, starting-point and conclusion of these thoughts on *spurii*, the advantage seems to be further indicated by the existence of some parallel cases<sup>24</sup> of Roman *ingenui*’s funerary monuments (with Greek inscriptions) who lacked neither the usual Roman filiation formula nor the honorary crown of the Mytilenaeans, a clear sign of some social recognition.

II. My second note concerns what we could almost call a pure technicality. Serapheim Charitonidis has edited in his posthumous, invaluable *Συμπλήρωμα* of Lesbian inscriptions (1968) a catalogue of young persons (males)<sup>25</sup>. Sixteen out of the thirty three fully or partly preserved names are Roman. One of them is edited in the form (l. 10): Λ(ούκιος) Γράττιος Λ.). Charitonidis<sup>26</sup> commented on it: “The symbol .) should be most probably understood as Γρατίου υἱός, i.e. “father’s name the same” in the writing of Roman names, in other words the equivalent of the symbol) for Greek names...”. Although he does not cite it here<sup>27</sup>, he may have been influenced in this opinion by Paton

20. The main person interested in these children’s status, apart from the mother and the onomastically invisible father, must have been the patronus of the mother. The legal exigencies must have been much more comfortably satisfied, if he was also the real father. For cases of a patronus and father of *sp. f.* cf. Rawson (n. 7) 35–36.

21. Cf. J. Baumgart, *Die römischen Sklavennamen* (Diss. Breslau 1936) 21f. (names suggesting, i.a., the agreeable, pleasant character of a slave), 55 (Nestor as a usual slave name of mythological origin); O. Pergreffi, “Ricerche epigrafiche sui liberti (I)”, *Epigraphica* 2 (1940) 316 also distinguishes a category of slave names referring to such qualities (“alla giocondità”, “all’ amore del piacere e dell’ eleganza o vice versa”); H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom. Ein Namenbuch*, II (Berlin 1982) s.vv. *Hedylus* (cf. also *Hedylio*, *Hedylo*, *Hedistus*, *Hediste*), Nestor: many of the listed cases belong to slaves or freedmen (-women).

22. This name takes the third place in frequency among those of the same category listed in Baumgart, o.c. (n. 21), 21.

23. Cf. J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l’Orient hellénique* (Paris 1919) 94; L. Robert, *REA* 62 (1960) 280.

24. *IG* XII 2, 378 (2); 381.10ff.

25. S. Charitonidis, *Αἱ ἐπιγραφαὶ τῆς Λέσβου. Συμπλήρωμα*, Βυβλ. Ἀρχαιολ. Ἑταιρείας 60 (Athens 1968) no. 18 (pp. 19–21). One of the persons listed is fifteen years old (l. 6), while four others (ll. 4, 18, 28, 32) are mentioned as orphans. Some sort of local *alimenta* programme? Cf. *IG* XII 2, 86 and 87. There are no imperial gentilicia in the extant parts of these catalogues.

26. (n. 25) p. 20.

27. He simply cited as an example for the use of the “Greek names symbol” *IG* XII 2 Suppl. 20= *Συμπλήρωμα* 17, B 6.

in *IG XII 2*, 111, l. 3, where the homonymic sign (without a foregoing point!) between the gentilicium and cognomen of M. Θωρηνός Καπίτων is analysed in parentheses as: M. Θωρηνοῦ υἱός<sup>28</sup>. Indeed, I know of one certain case where the homonymic sign refers to a gentilicium but this is an Athenian ephebic catalogue (*IG II-III 2* 2237, Severan age) where the use of the sign is anyway exaggerated: it is used even after the *demotikon*<sup>29</sup>. It is clear that some homonymic sign for the Roman gentilicium would betray a fundamental misunderstanding of the Roman name system, something that would be especially intriguing on Lesbos (s. below).

However, the main fact in the case of this Grattius' Greek name form is that a clear *labda* precedes the alleged "Roman names homonymic sign". So the only natural reading and interpretation I can think of is that we have here the abbreviation of Lucius (praenomen) as Λ', followed by the usual Greek homonymic sign to denote what the abbreviation "f." (= *filius*) would do in the well-known filiation form of Roman names (in Latin).

What may hold our interest here is the variety of ways in which this filiation form has been expressed on Lesbos, often used alternatively in the same inscription. Of course, there is the written out form where the filiation appears unabbreviated (or with only the praenomen abbreviated), either after the gentilicium as end of the name or between gentilicium and cognomen<sup>30</sup>. Then we find the discussed form, for which one can adduce further examples from this and other inscriptions of Lesbos<sup>31</sup>. The development, tachygraphically quite intelligible, must have then been to retain what Charitonidis understood as a "Roman names homonymic sign" (·) alone to denote the filiation in the cases where the praenomen of father and son was the same. This is exemplified by many cases in the catalogue we started from<sup>32</sup>. A further simplifying development seems then to have left the mere homonymic sign, i.e. the right semicircle without a foregoing point, to symbolize the identity of son's and father's praenomen<sup>33</sup>. This is the case of M. Θωρηνός mentioned before and many other names in the long ephebic catalogue *IG XII Suppl.* 690 (age of Agrippina I or II)<sup>34</sup>. Nevertheless, at least some such examples in the latter may actually

belong to the previous category, as the edition includes the disquieting notice: "*Interpunctionis notas modo conspicuas modo evanidas consulto negleximus*"<sup>35</sup>.

The conclusion from these technical remarks can bear on the image of Roman Lesbos: not a society surprisingly (for what we know otherwise<sup>36</sup>) ignorant of Roman onomastic mode and signifi-

28. Θωρηνός seems to be the Greek equivalent either of Thorius or some gentilicium of Etruscan origin (Thormena in acc.): cf. W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin 1904) 98.

29. *ibid.*, e.g. ll. 15, 17, 135.

30. E.g.: Charitonidis, *op. cit.* (n. 25), l. 23; *IG XII 2*, 88, ll. 2, 4, 5, 8-12, 14, 16-20, 22-24; *ibid.* Suppl. 690, ll. 18, 32-34, 36, 38-41, 44, 48-50, 51-52.

31. Charitonidis, *op. cit.* (n. 25), ll. 5, 21; *ibid.*, pp. 17-8 (*IG XII Suppl.* 20<sup>2</sup>) B 13 where the inexplicable symbol ⤿ may be corrected with the aid of pl. 5 to M.) so that the whole name was M. Κασσέλλιος M.) 'Ροῦφος. Another case may have been *IG XII 2*, 86, l. 3, if we restore Καπί[των] and not Καπί[τωνος]; the sign Ϸ is a variation form of the semicircle (cf. *IG XII 2*, 87, comm.).

32. Charitonidis, *op. cit.* (n. 25), ll. 11, 15-17, 19, 22, probably also 32 where I would recognize a point before the homonymic sign on pl. 6, so that the whole entry should be read as M. Οὐαλέριος .) ὀρφανός.

33. This final form of the development has been already properly interpreted (without knowledge of Charitonidis' material) by R. Körner, *Die Abkürzung der Homonymität in griechischen Inschriften*, *SB Akad. Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen...* (Berlin 1961. 2) 66-67 (cf. 102 on the relatively rich variety in expressing homonymy on Lesbos).

34. A useful indication as regards the date may be the absence of *Claudii* among the Roman gentilicia. Cf. L. Robert, *REA* 62 (1960) 296ff. inclined to prefer Agrippina II.

35. For the sake of completeness one should notice two further, rare variations of expressing homonymy in the Roman filiation formula on Lesbos: (a) in *IG XII 2*, 111 it is also expressed just by the abbreviated praenomen (first letter and elaborate point following), i.e. without υἱός after it, (b) in *IG XII 2*, 85, l. 8 we have a mention of Γ. Ϸ Τυτίω Ζωσίμω where the homonymic sign most probably (and quite logically for Greek standards) helps express the filiation formula in direct combination with the abbreviated praenomen of the Roman name.

36. Cf. Hatzfeld (n. 23), 90-95; L. Robert (n. 34), 279ff., 300.

cance but rather a provincial Greek capacity to adapt traditional local symbols to express shortly and unmistakably an ingredient of imported and expanding onomastic habits.

III. The final note brings me again to the question of *Marci Aurelii*, i.e. the bearers of Roman names including this combination of praenomen and gentilicium. I have tried in the past<sup>37</sup> to explain the reasons and cite the main relevant evidence for the view that these names can be associated *either* with grants of citizenship under the later Antonines (Marcus Aurelius and Commodus) *or* with Caracalla and his Edict. I had used to this effect the localised observations of many colleagues as Simone Follet's<sup>38</sup> on Athens, Antony Spawforth's<sup>39</sup> on Sparta and Bernard Holtheide's<sup>40</sup> on the name material from the Provincia Asia.

In the meantime the older thesis —e.g. a lifelong belief of such a great scholar as L. Robert<sup>41</sup>— that namely a *Marcus Aurelius* should owe his Roman citizenship personally or ultimately *only to the later Antonines* seems still to find some adherent and be echoed in specialised periodicals (as the *SEG*)<sup>42</sup>, so that a re-examination of the case with the addition of some further evidence may be useful.

The general point should be clear: after his fictitious adoption into the Antonines Septimius Severus' first son, Bassianus (Caracalla), received the name of M. Aurelius Antoninus, i.e. exactly the name of the philosopher-emperor as whose homonymous grand-child he should appear. Therefore any person owing his Roman citizenship to Caracalla was theoretically entitled to use not only the gentilicium but also the praenomen of this emperor, becoming thus a *Marcus Aurelius*. Of course, we know that many of the new citizens of the *Constitutio* and their descendants gave up, out of ignorance or disinterest resulting from the *Aurelii* inflation, the praenomen *Marcus*, being simply called with the gentilicium *Aurelius* (often abbreviated) and their distinctive cognomen (with possible additions). Nevertheless, what some or even many have done does not need to be what all *Aurelii* named so in the Severan age would have preferred to do.

Some specific cases may strengthen these remarks. As the most recent statement of the theory

that the Roman citizenship of *Marci Aurelii* goes back exclusively to the Antonine period seems to be that in an article by Dimitris Samsaris<sup>43</sup> on the results of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* in Macedonia, we may begin with an example from Thessaloniki. In the well-known list of victors at the Pythia (252 A.D.)<sup>44</sup> we find nineteen persons out of which fifteen are *Aurelii*. The latter consist of seven *Marci Aurelii* (Μ. Αὐρ.+cognomen ± signum), seven (simple) *Aurelii* (Αὐρ.+cognomen, no praenomen) and one person who appears once (l. 19) as Αὐρ. Εὐάρεστος Σμυρναῖος καὶ Ἀθηναῖος and once (l. 21) as Μ. Αὐρ. Εὐάρεστος Σμυρναῖος καὶ Ἀθην(αῖος).

While the overwhelming number of *Aurelii* in a document of 252 is almost typical, the even distribution of *Aurelii* themselves into the two categories mentioned (with/without the praenomen *Marcus*) would be hard to explain, if one wished to trace all *Marci Aurelii* back to some Antonine grant of citizenship. For nowhere in Macedonia (or elsewhere) do we have such a massive representation even of *Marci Aurelii* before the *Constitutio Antoniniana*.

37. *Θεῖα δωρεά. Studies on the Policy of the Severans and the Constitutio Antoniniana* [in Greek with an English summary] (Athens 1989) 123ff., 164.

38. *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle. Études chronologiques et prosopographiques* (Paris 1976) esp. 92-95.

39. "Notes on the Third Century AD in Spartan Epigraphy", *ABSA* 79 (1984) 263ff. (esp. 263-273).

40. *Römische Bürgerrechtspolitik und römische Neubürger in der Provinz Asia* (Freiburg 1983) 117f.

41. *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris 1938) 57; *A travers l'Asie Mineure*, B.E.F.A.R. 239 (Paris 1980) 429, n. 17.

42. *SEG* 39 (1989) 1858: "...He (: Samsaris, s. below) focuses on Αὐρηλίοι on the assumption that Μάρκοι Αὐρηλίοι are more likely to have been enfranchised under Marcus Aurelius or Commodus".

43. "Ἐφαρμογή καὶ συνέπειες τοῦ Διατάγματος τοῦ Καρακάλλα (*Constitutio Antoniniana*) στὴ Μακεδονία", *Ἀφιέρωμα εἰς τὸν Κωνσταντῖνον Βαβουσιανόν, Α'* (Thessaloniki 1989) 339-353 (esp. 340).

44. *IG X* 2 1, 38.

However, the appearance of Aurelios Euarestos “Smyrnaean and Athenian” once without and then with the praenomen *Marcus* in the same list seems to me even more explicit. This does not seem to be an actual mistake of the stone-cutter: it rather shows that the addition of the praenomen in these cases depended on the onomastic taste of each person, so that the stone-cutter did not violate any onomastic rules: he simply felt that an *Aurelius* could be more fully named *M. Aurelius*, whether this was the habit of the “interested” person or not<sup>45</sup>. L. Robert had noticed this flaw in his view of *Marci Aurelii* but thought he could neglect it as resulting from sheer inadvertence of the stone-cutter<sup>46</sup>. But this “inattention des scribes” (would it not be better to call it: “négligence occasionelle des scribes”?) seems no less revealing. One should add here that similar phenomena (appearance of an *Aurelius* with or without the praenomen *Marcus*) had been already observed by S. Follet in the Athenian inscriptions and similarly led her to detect there preoccupations of style and search not for a chronological but rather for a deeper sociological explanation<sup>47</sup>. The degree a person was conscious or not of Roman traditions, the importance he attributed to his bearing all *tria nomina* and similar factors must have been the reason for the parallel existence of at least some *Marci Aurelii* and “bare” *Aurelii*, both of Severan origin<sup>48</sup>.

Two further cases where some *Marci Aurelii* have been independently connected with a grant of citizenship under Caracalla can be mentioned here:

a) In his useful dissertation on Hellenistic and Roman Samos of 1985 Werner Transier<sup>49</sup> has discussed the case of a Samian board of five strategoi of Roman imperial date: they appear there collectively as Μάρκοι Αὐτοῦ(ῆ)λαιοι. One could think first, of course, of an Antonine date but Transier has rightly called attention to the fact that during the reign of Septimius Severus even a known *archiprytanis* and head of such a collegium of generals on Samos did not possess the Roman citizenship. The conclusion would then seem only reasonable that such a general possession of Roman citizenship (with the gentilicium *Aurelius* in a preponderant position) even at the higher level of Samian society should not antedate the *Constitutio Antoniniana*.

b) A recently (1991) edited *Oxyrhynchus papyrus*, *P. Oxy.* LVIII. 3920, has enriched our knowledge about a hierophant named Markos Aurelios Apollonios and induced the editor, J. R. Rea, to revise his view regarding the age in which this Apollonios lived as well as the origin of his Roman citizenship. While a previously known testimony for this person (*P. Oxy.* XXXVI. 2782) had seemed to suggest an Antonine date, we know now that his activity in *P. Oxy.* 3920 postdated an *epikrisis* falling into the period 206–211, so that a connection of his Roman citizenship and name with the *Constitutio Antoniniana* seems more probable. The social level of this Apollonios seems to agree very well with the use of his full Roman name, as Rea has already noticed here<sup>50</sup> and Hagedorn analysed in a special, basic article of 1979<sup>51</sup>, but this only means again that no Severan *Aurelius* was in any way

45. There are now some further, interesting cases of alternating usage in naming the same person an *Aurelius* / *M. Aurelius*: s. the epigraphic material from Lycia in D. French (ed.), *Studies in the History and Topography of Lycia and Pisidia in memoriam A.S. Hall* (Oxford 1994), e.g. p. 17 (no. 7).

46. L. Robert, *A travers* (n. 41).

47. S. Follet (n. 38) 95 with n. 3.

48. The detection of a possible “local style” as regards the use of the gentilicium *Aurelius* with/without the praenomen *Marcus* seems also possible: in *IG VII* 1776, an agonistic inscription of the *Kaisareia Sebasteia Mouseia* at Thespiiai, all *Aurelii* of local (Thespian) origin, i.e. four magistrates and a victor, appear without the praenomen *Marcus* (or anyone else), while all other *Aurelii* are victors of various external origins and *Marci Aurelii*. Both the praenomen and the gentilicium in question are always abbreviated (M. Αὐτοῦ). It would be obviously unwise to suppose that all *Aurelii* of Thespiiai were products of the Severan while all external competitors of the Antonine age. A factor of local familiarity and “onomastic economy” has been rather at work. Cf. on this inscription Christel Müller’s remarks in the same volume.

49. (n. 1) 103. The inscription discussed has been published by V. Theophanidis, *AD* 9 (1924/5 [publ. 1927]) 102–103.

50. *P. Oxy.* LVIII (1991) p. 17.

51. D. Hagedorn, “*Marci Aurelii* in Ägypten nach der *Constitutio Antoniniana*”, *BASP* 16 (1979) 47–59.



barred from bearing the praenomen *Marcus*. Whether he did so systematically or not, depended on aspects of his personality and status as well as the circumstances under which his name appeared each time.

Once more, the principles to be used in attributing certain Roman name forms to periods or single emperors are not so clear-cut as one might like them to be. But onomastics reflect exactly the complex picture of historical development and society, this basic truth we should keep in mind during and after this colloquium.

K. Buraselis  
University of Athens  
Dpt. of History & Archaeology

*Addendum:* I see now that my communication at the Colloquium has been kindly summarised but partly misunderstood by Ch. Müller (and M. Corbier) in *Topoi* 4 (1994) 414: the attentive reader of original and epitome will notice the difference.