STRAY NOTES ON ROMAN NAMES
IN GREEK DOCUMENTS
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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 υίος” 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). 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 monument2 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 “ό δάμος” in a crown stays above each one’s funerary inscription3 (of the usual type χρηστέ χαίρε).

The two first persons are men: Γναίος Πομπήιος Σπορίου (according to IG) υίος Νέστωρ and Γναίος Πομπήιος Σπορίου (acc. to IG) υίος Ηδύλος. 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)4 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: Πομπήια Σπορίου θυγάτηρ/ - - .

O. Salomies5 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 father6, 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, “Η χορήγησις ρωμαϊκής πολιτείας εις 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 VIII, 641-642) with further references to all his relevant publications; he collected the Lesbian material in REA 62 (1960) 284/5. 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.


6. No further sons of this father seem to have existed: cf. the epigramme mentioned below.
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timate children ("uneheliche Kinder" in his own, and the current, terminology).

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 filiius". The most probable derivation of the word, attested by Plutarch, 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 "illegimate" as far as Roman law was concerned. 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: "Ἀθόν αὐτα κοιτέξει τύμβος Ἁ’ ὁδε δύσμορα τέκνα καὶ πατέρος λυπήν γηρα-λέντε τοῖς" (II. 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. Theoretically then, the filiation form "spurii filius" could have been omitted or replaced by the real one, as these children were...
not, in the original sense, ἀπάτορες, “fatherless”\(^{11}\). 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 Τιμίων Κλεοθέου Λέωντος ύτον, Κυρείνα, Δάμαρχον (honoured by Μάρκος Κάισαρ, Μόρκω ύτον, Παλατείνα, Κούστος). Although the relevant passage is partly restored, the same name pattern must be recognized in IG XI 2, 656 where another member of the local aristocracy, the famous Potamon’s son Diaphenes is honoured: ....Γάιον Κλαυδίω, Ποτάμωνος ύτον Διαφένη. A similar social status is explicit or implicit in the following cases: IG IV 590, an honorary monument of Argos for the Helladarch Τ. Στατίους Δαμαρχον (honoured by Μάρκος Κάισαρ, Κλεοσθένους υίον Διόδοτον, ...Κλεοσθένη, ...Καλλέα\(^{13}\), on whose important family cf. M. Mitsos, "Ἀργολικὴ προσωπογραφία (Athens 1952) 107; IGR IV 997, where Samos honours Γάιον Τιμίων Σοφιστέους ύτον ‘Αμνίαν, τόν καλώσειν Ίσιοχάτη, an Epicurean philosopher and benefactor of the city; F. Delphes III 4.113 with Delphian honours Τ. Φλοουσ [Θησείου νυν] Κυρείνα Θεοίν το[σ]ιτατών ισιοχάτη Ποταμοκράτη, ΠερίΔιαφένη. A similar social status is explicit or implicit in the following cases: IG IV 591, with the same filiation form. 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. P. 1315) or an imperial slave (e.g. ib. VI, 15114, 29513)\(^{14}\). To estimate this properly we should recall that a “spurii filius(-a)” was automatically an “ingenues(-a)” as he/she was the child of a woman free or freed at the latest by the time of its birth (s. below)\(^{15}\). 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 spurii, the penetrating analysis by H.C. Youtie, "ΑΠΑΤΟΡΕΣ: Law vs. Custom in Roman Egypt", in Le monde grec. Hommages à C. 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 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).


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". This kind of "ingenuus/a" would have good prestige most often by the use of a further non-Roman have highlighted the above extraction, betrayed 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. 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 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 Γάους Ἰουλίος [Σπουριόθυγός Διογένης. The document shows he was the son of a freedwoman: she had born him and his twin sister Ἰουλία Σπουρίου θυγάτηρ Ίσαιος 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 (1.89), make clear that: "...hi qui illegitime concipiantur statum sumunt ex eo tempore quo nasceuntur; itaque si ex libera nascuntur, liberi fiant...". 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. 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


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.

have openly contradicted such a timely birth as the desirable status of the children imposed. 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 but a further inscription (IG XII2, 384) seems to come from the same family monument and refers to another mors immatura with the name Γνοάου. The Mytilene inscription does not seem 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 ultimately owned their Roman citizenship and possessed their own familiae of slaves; (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 Πομπηία Βένυτος, (Venustus), again a probable freedman name.

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; (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 Πομπηία Βένυτος, (Venustus), again a probable freedman name.

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 of Roman ingenui's funerary monuments (with Greek inscriptions) who lacked neither the usual Roman filiation formula nor the honorary crown of the Mytileneans, 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). Sixteen out of the thirty three fully or partly preserved names are Roman. One of them is edited in the form (I.10): Λούκιος Γραττίος Λ. Charitonidis commented on this: "The symbol ) should be most probably understood as Γραττίου 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, he may have been influenced in this opinion by Paton...
in *IG XII 2, 111, l. 3*, where the homonymic sign (without a foregoing point!) between the gentilicium and cognomen of Μ. Θωρηνός Καπίτων is analysed in parentheses as: Μ. Ἐσκήλιος Πηρίζος. Indeed, I know of one certain case where the homonymic sign refers to a gentilicium but this is an Athenian ephthic catalogue (*IG II–III 2 2237*, Severan age) where the use of the sign is anyway exaggerated: it is used even after the “*demotikon*”.

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. Then we find the discussed form, for which one can adduce further examples from this and other inscriptions of Lesbos. 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. 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. This is the case of M. Θωρηνός mentioned before and many other names in the long ephthic catalogue *IG XII Suppl. 690* (age of Agrippina I or II). 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*”.

The conclusion from these technical remarks can bear on the image of Roman Lesbos: not a society surprisingly (for what we know otherwise) ignorant of Roman onomastic mode and signifiers. 

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

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

30. E.g.: Charitonidis, *op. cit. (n. 25)*, II. 23; *IG XII 2, 88*, II. 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)*, II. 5, 21; *ibid., pp. 17-8 (IG XII Suppl. 20)* B13 where the inexplicable symbol χ) may be corrected with the aid of pl. 5 to M.) so that the whole name was M. Κασκέλλιος Μ.) Ἐρώτος. Another case may have been *IG XII 2, 86, l. 3* if we restore Κατίτους and not Κατίτους; the sign 9 is a variation form of the semicircle (cf. *IG XII 2, 87*, comm.).

32. Charitonidis, *op. cit. (n. 25)*, II. 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. Ὀσάλλος Ὀρφανός.

33. This final form of the development has been already properly interpreted (without knowledge of Charitonidis’ material) by R. Körner. The 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 ιοίς after it, (b) in *IG XII 2, 85, l. 8* we have a mention of Γ. 9 Τιτίω 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\textsuperscript{37} 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\textsuperscript{38} on Athens, Antony Spawforth's\textsuperscript{39} on Sparta and Bernard Holtheide's\textsuperscript{40} 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\textsuperscript{41} — that 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)\textsuperscript{42}, 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\textsuperscript{43} 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.)\textsuperscript{44} we find nineteen persons out of which fifteen are Aurelii. The latter consist of seven Marci Aurelii (Μ. Αύρ.+cognomen ± signum), seven (simple) Aurelii (Α.Αυρ.+cognomen, no praenomen) and one person who appears once (l. 19) as Αύρ. Ευάρεστος Σιμωνάιος και Ἀθηνάιος and once (l. 21) as Μ. Αύρ. Ευάρεστος Σιμωνάιος και Ἀθηναίος.

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.

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle. Etudes chronologiques et prosopographiques} (Paris 1976) esp. 92-95.
\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Römische Bürgerrechtspolitik und römische Neubürger in der Provinz Asia} (Freiburg 1983) 117f.
\textsuperscript{42} SEG 39 (1989) 1858: "...He (Samsaris, s. below) focuses on Αὐρήλιοι on the assumption that Μάρκοι Αὐρήλιοι are more likely to have been enfranchised under Marcus Aurelius or Commodus".
\textsuperscript{43} "Εφαρμογή και συνέπειες του Διατάγματος τού Καρακάλλα (Constitutio Antoniniana) στη Μακεδονία", 'Αρμόδια εἰς τὸν Κοσμοτάτους Βαρβώνο και ά' (Thessaloniki 1989) 339-353 (esp. 340).
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{IGX} 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. 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. 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 already been 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. The degree a person was conscious of or not of Roman traditions, the importance he attributed to his hearing all tria nomina and similar led to there preoccupations of style and search not for a chronological but rather for a deeper sociological explanation. The degree a person was conscious of or not of Roman traditions, the importance he attributed to his hearing 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.

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 has discussed the case of a Samian board of five strategoi of Roman imperial date: they appear there collectively as Μάρκοι Αύρ(ήλιοι). 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.

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 Thespiai, 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. Αύρ.). It would be obviously unwise to suppose that all Aurelii of Thespiai 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. Theophaneidis, AD9 (1924/S [publ. 1927]) 102-103.


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.