

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. L

---

2016

## INDEX

	MICHEL ABERSON	<i>Sicile, 10–100 av. J.-C. : "Varius" et "Salvius", hommes libres ou esclaves en révolte ?</i>	9
	CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>Abschied von einer römischen "Tänzerin" in Germania Inferior. Bemerkungen zur Identität von Polla Matidia aus Asciburgium</i>	21
	GIOVANBATTISTA GALDI	<i>Alcune considerazioni sull'uso di incipio nel latino imperiale e tardo</i>	35
	THOMAS GOESSENS	<i>"Titulum non Repperi": The Identification of an Alienum in Canterbury. With a Missing Inscription from Mérida (RIB 2328* = CIL II 585)</i>	59
	MIKA KAJAVA	<i>A Note on the Dedication N.I.Olympia 33B</i>	73
	URPO KANTOLA & TUOMO NUORLUOTO	<i>Female Tria Nomina and Social Standing in Late Republican and Early Imperial Periods</i>	79
	STEPHEN O'CONNOR	<i>Some Observations on Pay for Athenian Military Forces at Potidaea (432–430/29 B.C.) and in Sicily (415–413 B.C.)</i>	107
	LOUKAS PAPADIMITROPOULOS	<i>Sappho's "Tithonus Poem": The Solace of Immortality</i>	125
	OLLI SALOMIES	<i>The Nomenclature of the Poet Ausonius</i>	133
	HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta Epigraphica 312–318</i>	143
	HAROLD TARRANT	<i>Removing the Inserenda</i>	177
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>		187
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>		263
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>		267
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>		272

## FEMALE *TRIA NOMINA* AND SOCIAL STANDING IN LATE REPUBLICAN AND EARLY IMPERIAL PERIODS

URPO KANTOLA & TUOMO NUORLUOTO

### Present study<sup>1</sup>

After the establishment of the cognomen, the *tria nomina* became the archetypal name form of a Roman male citizen of the early imperial period.<sup>2</sup> However, female nomenclatures of this type were never usual. In his seminal work on female praenomina, M. Kajava has shown that the female praenomen was a well attested, even if rather uncommon, feature in women's nomenclature.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, even fewer women are recorded with both a praenomen and a cognomen. Kajava has observed this phenomenon, too, but left room for a more systematic analysis. In addition, some illustrative cases have been published since, particularly from Kos. The aim of this paper is to discuss the female *tria nomina* cases in light of available (mostly) epigraphic evidence, which provides us with a

---

<sup>1</sup> Nuorluoto has been mainly responsible for gathering the Latin material, and Kantola for the Greek, but the analysis results from joint effort. We express our thanks to Samuel Douglas for improving our English, to Anna-Maria Wilskman for comments on the iconography, and to one of the anonymous referees who supplied us with very useful critique. Naturally, though, we retain all responsibility for every error and misinterpretation. Kantola, for his part, owes thanks to the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the foundation Emil Aaltosen Säätiö for financial support, and to the Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des DAI in Munich, which provided him with very favourable working conditions. Nuorluoto, for his part, wishes to express his gratitude to the department of Alte Geschichte, Uni. zu Köln, particularly professors Walter Ameling and Werner Eck, whose hospitality was of great benefit to this work.

<sup>2</sup> In literature, too, it was associated with free status, e.g. Iuv. *Sat.* 5, 127 and Quint. *inst.* 7, 3, 27.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. M. Kajava *Roman Female Praenomina: Studies in the Nomenclature of Roman Women*, Rome 1994.

total of 75 attestations, and see what can be said of them. Do they imply something of the social standing of their bearer? What exactly should be thought of a woman with a Latin praenomen and a Greek cognomen? Are there regional or geographical differences? Furthermore, why were freedwomen sometimes given praenomina in the first place when they virtually always had their former slave name as their diacritic cognomen?

Chronologically this survey focuses on the transitional period, during which the main individualising element of the Roman nomenclature gradually shifted from the praenomen to the cognomen, i.e. roughly the first centuries BCE and CE.<sup>4</sup> The words "late republican and early imperial" will be used throughout the paper to refer to this particular time span. No geographical limitations are set but the Latin and Greek materials are discussed in separate chapters. This is due to a sharp distinction between certain onomastic practices of the Latin West and the Greek East. First, whereas in a western Latin speaking environment Greek names often became connected to a servile status or origin, Greek personal names in the East, though occurring with Roman slaves and freedmen as well, naturally continued in full use among the locals of every social stratum even in cases of Romanisation. Second, a large amount of evidence written in Greek shows greater variation and even confusion in how Roman nomenclatures were recorded, particularly as regards the choice, position and order of different elements. This indicates a different, sometimes lacking, understanding of the complex Roman name system as it was in Italy.

In defining what is to be included or excluded in the material, we have, in principal, decided to follow the datings, inasmuch as they seem sensible, provided by the source publications. In case a dating is our own, it will be made clear. Dating inscriptions is naturally not always a simple matter, and even more rarely so with epitaphs, which constitute virtually the whole<sup>5</sup> of our present material. It is often based on archaeological and/or palaeographical analyses, with consideration of onomastics, which mostly give at best only rough estimates. As for the latter, there is a certain risk of circular reasoning when there is, for instance,

<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, after this period, there is something of a shift in the status of Greek cognomina, as they start to appear more and more in senatorial nomenclatures, too.

<sup>5</sup> The rare exceptions are an Attic list of ἐπανιστάι (#61), two Koan grave boundary inscriptions that both mention the same woman (#4; see below p. 94), and a solitary papyrus, which contributes to this study no more than as a number in statistics (#65).

an attempt to date an inscription to an early period simply due to, say, the lack of a cognomen. Only in very few cases (such as the materials of Praeneste and Delos) are we fortunate enough to have a sufficient archaeological or historical context to define a certain *terminus ante quem*. Such cases that can only vaguely be dated as, say, "imperial", i.e. possibly pertaining to any of the first two or three centuries CE, are omitted from the current discussion (with the exception of those Latin cases where freedwomen seem to have different praenomina than their patrons: see below).

As for the social historical analysis of the women under discussion, some methodological issues ought to be pointed out. One of the key elements in a Roman nomenclature to define a person's juridical status is naturally the filiation or indication of patronage, which immediately reveals whether a person was freeborn or enfranchised (e.g. *L(uci) filia*) vs. *L(uci) liberta*). In the Greek material, however, this marker often remains obscure, as the name of the father or patron is usually only given in plain genitive with no precise indication of the relation or, even more often, no such genitive attribute is mentioned at all. Thus in many cases, the Latin material can offer more solid a basis for an accurate social analysis. On the other hand, praenomina in Latin sources, unlike in Greek ones, were often abbreviated, which sometimes causes troubles in interpreting whether an individual letter stands for a female first name, or something completely different.

Regarding the quantity of the material, the meagre figures themselves do not suffice to provide us with much statistically relevant data. All female *tria nomina* cases from our period known to us are listed in the Appendix, at the end of this paper.<sup>6</sup> Only those cases that are uncertain or otherwise require more detailed observation are discussed separately. These will be referred to with "[Appendix number]", and their publication references, locations and dates are given in the Appendix, unless needed directly in the discussion.

---

<sup>6</sup> Also such nomenclatures are taken into account, which, instead of exhibiting a cognomen proper, represent the style ἡ καὶ (or ἡ ἐπικαλούμενη vel sim.) + agnomen. This is due to the fact that such names, expressed in Greek, would likely have appeared as cognomina in Latin (cf. Kajanto, *Supernomina. A Study in Latin Epigraphy*, Helsinki 1966, 6–7), given the original nature of the cognomen as an additional name, so to speak, and this should more or less apply to the transitional period when the cognomen was still consolidating its role.

## Latin West

In the Latin West, there seem to be at least 19 cases<sup>7</sup> of late republican and early imperial women with the *tria nomina*. The number is significantly higher in the Greek East, where the use of female praenomina continued longer after the establishment of personal cognomina.<sup>8</sup> Remarkably, 10 out of these 19 Latin cases can certainly be identified as freedwomen (they have the indication *l(iberta)* in their nomenclature), whereas only five women are clearly freeborn (revealed by the filiation), and four of somewhat uncertain status, although at least one or two of them are likely to have a servile origin. The uncertain cases will now be discussed.

#11 *L. Catellia Dionysia sibi et suis*. It is well known that the use of a Greek cognomen, even at a relatively early stage, does not necessarily have to mean that the person in question was a former slave.<sup>9</sup> This, however, seems to be particularly the case with inscriptions from Greek territories, whereas our Dionysia is recorded in Aesernia in the heartlands of Samnium. Freeborn women in the Latin West seem to have carried almost exclusively Latin names, and therefore it may be concluded that this woman was probably a *liberta* rather than freeborn.

#48: *L. Otronia Plautia* (Praeneste). The presence of *L(ucia)* has been disputed,<sup>10</sup> though judging by the picture provided in *SupplIt* I 583, there indeed seems to be an 'L', which is difficult to interpret in any other way than as a female praenomen. *Plautia* also requires some deliberation. Should it be taken for a cognomen, i.e. a feminine form of *Plautus*, or is it rather a nomen, perhaps

<sup>7</sup> *CIL* VIII 18963 = *ILAlg* II, 5045 (Thibilis) is erroneously read in *CIL* (Bernelle) as *Q. Callucia | Purina Lucif.*, thus giving the impression that the inscription records a woman with *tria nomina*. A more correct rereading can be acquired following Gsell in *ILAlg*: *Q. Cal|purn[us] | Lucia Lucif. Pa|*. This case has thus been omitted from this survey.

<sup>8</sup> For discussion on the reasons of this, see Kajava (above n. 3) 217.

<sup>9</sup> See e.g. H. Solin, "Sul consolidarsi del cognome nell'età repubblicana al di fuori della classe senatoria e dei liberti", in *Epigrafia: Actes du colloque en mémoire de Attilio Degrossi*, Rome 1991, p. 186–187, and Kajava (above n. 3) 104 with further references.

<sup>10</sup> See e.g. Kajava (above n. 3) 43; Vaglieri in *NSA* 1907, 25; R. Wachter, *Allateinische Inschriften*, Bonn 1987, 126 n. 315.

used adjectively as a gamonym? The former seems more likely, as the latter style is not attested in Praeneste besides an archaic case,<sup>11</sup> whereas the usual way of indicating the husband was clearly with plain genitive, as in the case of another *Otronia*, i.e. *L. Otronia Epulei (uxor)* (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 233a).<sup>12</sup> It is hard to say anything precise about Plautia's social standing. The use of a Latin cognomen does not have to mean that she was a freeborn woman; freedwomen, too, sometimes had "good" Latin names.<sup>13</sup>

#18 *Maxsuma Domitia Caeseriana*. The interpretation of this inscription, carved on a funerary vase, has caused some troubles. A letter 'M' can clearly be read in the end, after *Caeseriana* (whose last two letters *-na-* are joined together in a nexus), and several solutions have been offered.<sup>14</sup> M. Lejeune's hypothesis of two women, the name of the deceased being in accusative *Caeserianam*,<sup>15</sup> seems unlikely, as one would rather expect a dative than an accusative, and to use a bare cognomen to refer to the deceased seems implausible at this early stage. One potential explanation could be the one offered by J. Untermann, namely that the inscriber simply made an error.<sup>16</sup> Another possibility is that the final 'M' is an abbreviation, standing perhaps for *m(ater)* (or something else), in which case we would either have two different women, the other one (somewhat unconvincingly) being referred to without a nomen, or (perhaps more convincingly) one woman with a nomenclature consisting of three names.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>11</sup> *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 561, *Dindia Macolnia*, "the wife of Magulnius", inscribed on the lid of the so-called cista Ficoroni, possibly from the 4th century BCE.

<sup>12</sup> The following cases, for instance, are known from Praeneste: *Curtia Rosci* (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 143); *Numitoria M. Op(pi) Albi* (207); *Samiaria M. f. Minor Q(uinti)* (271); *Saufeia C. f. Tondi* (290); *Sehia L. Op(pi)* (293); *Servia M. f. Cinsi uxor* (300); *Sextia Rosci* (301); *Tap(p)ia Q. Vestori* (311).

<sup>13</sup> For a comprehensive catalogue of Latin names used by slaves and freedmen, see H. Solin, *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen: ein Namenbuch*, Stuttgart 1996, in particular part 1, "Lateinische Namen".

<sup>14</sup> Well summarised in *Suppllt* XV 91.

<sup>15</sup> M. Lejeune, *Ateste a l'heure de la romanisation*, Firenze 1978, 68; 81.

<sup>16</sup> Although Untermann's interpretation of the suffix *-iana* as an indication of dependence or servitude (*Caeseriana* thus corresponding to *Caeseri l.*) seems odd at the least, as one would not expect the patron to have a different nomen. J. Untermann, *Die venetischen Personennamen*, Wiesbaden 1961, 50.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *Suppllt* XV, 91 (p. 255). Such forms as *m(atri)* or *m(arito)* (suggested by G. B. Pellegrini and A. L. Prosdomici, *La lingua venetica*, Padova 1967, 251) are well out of question, as it would be

However the case may be, no solid interpretation of the inscription can be offered.<sup>18</sup>

**#8:** *Tertia Boelfia --?* *Salvia*. Although no indication of patronage is given, it seems quite plausible to assert that this woman was a *liberta*. Her cognomen *Salvia* was a typical name among slaves and ex-slaves,<sup>19</sup> and she is mentioned together with a *T. Bo[el]ius O. l. Epa[gathus]*, a freedman, who shares the same nomen with her.

**#38:** *Polla Matidia Sp. f. Olumphia*. The identity and name of this woman has been the subject of a good deal of scholarly dispute. Particularly interesting, from the point of view of this paper, is what stands between *Matidia* and *Olumphia*. The original reading *Sp. f.* was later emended to *sibe* by H. von Petrikovits, followed also by Kajava.<sup>20</sup> However, in a most recent contribution, based on autopsy, C. Bruun argues convincingly for the original reading *Sp. f.*<sup>21</sup>

---

rather peculiar to completely omit the name of the deceased from his/her own funerary inscription.

<sup>18</sup> In fact, since the text seems to be circling around the vase, one could speculate on whether the text makes a "full" round and the mystery 'M' could, in fact, be standing at the beginning rather than at the end of the inscription (\**MMaxsuma*). Alas, the pictures provided in *SupplIt* do not show well enough the beginning and the end of the inscription to confirm or discard this possibility. Moreover, there is one more possible, yet problematic, interpretation, not taken into account by previous research. A close look at what seems to be the last 'A' of *Caeseriana*, does not interestingly reveal any traces of a cross-line, which, in turn, could suggest that the name should perhaps be read *Caeseria* (thus a nomen), after which there would not only be one 'M' but two of them. A female nomenclature consisting of a praenomen and two nomina is out of the question in the republican time (for some statistical analysis of Roman nomenclature patterns, see e.g. P. Gallivan, "The Nomenclature Patterns of the Roman Upper Classes in the Early Empire: A Statistical Analysis", *Antichthon* 26, 1992; though concerning primarily the onomastic habits of the upper classes, it gives a rough idea of Roman nomenclature patterns in general), and therefore we would, after all, have two women, a *Maxsuma Domitia* and a *Caeseria*, the role of the latter perhaps being clarified with the double 'M' (unless *Caeseria* stands for a gamonym, "the wife of Caeserius"). Whatever the abbreviation *m. m.* would stand for, then, remains obscure to say the very least, and to our knowledge is without parallels.

<sup>19</sup> The catalogue of I. Kajanto (*Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, 177) gives the following figures for the use of the cognomen *Salvius/a*: in *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>, 27 men and 9 women, almost all of which slaves or freed; from imperial times 149 freeborn men vs. 156 sl./fr., 90 freeborn women vs. 110 sl./fr.

<sup>20</sup> H. von Petrikovits, "Lixae", in *Roman Frontier Studies 1979: papers presented to the 12th international congress of Roman frontier studies* (W. S. Hanson – L. J. F. Keppie eds.), Oxford 1980, 1031. Cf. also Kajava (above n. 3), 55.

<sup>21</sup> C. Bruun, "Abschied von einer römischen 'Tänzerin' in Germania Inferior. Bemerkungen zur



There seems to be no reason to doubt this interpretation.

We are thus dealing with a freeborn woman of presumably illegitimate birth.<sup>22</sup> Despite her being freeborn, it seems likely that she was born to a servile or peregrine parent (hence the illegitimate status). Her bearing of a Greek cognomen could well reflect this, and, on the other hand, the Latin praenomen may have been chosen to give the nomenclature a more Roman flavour.

Freedwomen seem to dominate the Latin material. If we take the above mentioned *L. Catellia Dionysia* and *Tertia Boel[ia] Salvia* for freedwomen, we have *libertae* representing 12 out of 19 cases (vs. five *ingenuae* and two *incertae*). This is a striking figure when compared to the Greek material where very few women can clearly be identified as manumitted slaves. Interestingly, too, all freedwomen, except for one (#27) come from Italy, whereas all freeborn cases are from Latin speaking provinces, i.e. outside of Italy, except for the case of *Secunda Titia T. f. Vesconia* (#66 from Clusium), in whose case certain Etruscan influence may be detected.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, in one of these cases, i.e. #56 (*ILN* I, 155 = *AE* 1971, 244 (Narbo): *S(exta) Satia Sext(i) f. Maxsuma*), the existence of the qualifying marker *f(ilia)* is not entirely clear, at least judging by the picture provided in the edition. However the paucity of freeborn women in our Latin material is clear, in comparison to freedwomen (though, when dealing with such little material, one cannot completely rule out the possibility of accident of survival). Why were freedwomen, then, sometimes given praenomina, when they practically always already had a cognomen?<sup>24</sup> Since the praenomen in these

---

Identität von Polla Matidia aus Asciburgium", in the present volume of *Arctos* L, 21–33.

<sup>22</sup> See K. Buraselis, "Stray notes on Roman names in Greek documents", in A. Rizakis (ed.) *Roman onomastics in the Greek East. Social and political aspects* (Meletemata 21), Athens 1996, 55–59, with further bibliography.

<sup>23</sup> As for the use of the Etruscan name *vescu*, see H. Rix, *Das etruskische Cognomen*, Wiesbaden 1963, 139–140; 316; 359, especially as regards the name combinations *tite vescu* and *titi(a) vesconia* (nomen + cognomen).

<sup>24</sup> There are next to no cases of freedwomen with a praenomen but no cognomen. To our knowledge, only two possible attestations are known from our time period: *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 1330 (Rome) records several *libertae*, among whom a *Marta Postumia M. l.* and a *Salvia Servia M. l.* The latter's *Salvia* is attested as a praenomen Kajava (above n. 3) 69, but *Marta* is not: in his discussion of *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 1109, Kajava (*ibid.* 45) refers to this case as an inverted cognomen. However, all other four freedwomen in 1330 are attested with a cognomen after the nomen; it seems thus rather unlikely that we are dealing with inverted cognomina here. Dated by Wachter (1987, 519 n. 544) simply as "kaiserzeitlich" but cannot

cases surely did not have a diacritic, individualising, function, perhaps the reason is rather a social one: it was to emphasize the newly acquired, free Roman status by giving a female nomenclature with a Greek cognomen a bit more a Roman flavour. Still, this practice was by no means common in comparison to the usual onomastic pattern of freedwomen with a Roman nomen, the indication of patronage, and the (often Greek) cognomen – and, besides, there are cases with respectable Latin cognomina as well.<sup>25</sup> One possibility is that some families in Italy or elsewhere simply had their own, proud onomastic traditions, say, giving first names to all free members of the *familia*. There is, however, no real evidence to back this, as in most cases no other *libertae* are mentioned, and even if they are, they do not seem to have a praenomen.<sup>26</sup> At all events, the idea does not seem impossible but the evidence is too scarce to make any solid conclusions in support or against it.

Furthermore, we seem to have several cases where the praenomen of the freedwoman seems to be different from that of her patron. Since the repertoire of female praenomina in general was somewhat different from that of men, the use of such typically female names as *Paulla/Polla* would not seem that peculiar, especially in the earlier times; take for instance **#59** *Paulla Sergia Cn. Cn. I. C(h)rysis*, or **#9** *Polla Caspe.[---] C. I. Erotis*.<sup>27</sup> But when a patron was called, say,

---

be very late (cf. also Kajava *ibid.* 69). *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 1837 = *ILLRP* 971 (Trebula Mutuesca) records a *Quarta Senenia C. I.* as well as a *Posilla Senenia Quart. f.*, a freeborn woman (whose father was perhaps a Senenius Quartus or a Quartus Senenius; the filiation is reconstructed in the *EDCS* as *Quart(ae) filia*), which seems highly improbable). Dated to the mid-first century BCE by Buonocore ("Sui *CLE* repubblicani della regio IV Augusta", in *Die metrischen Inschriften der römischen Republik*, Berlin - New York 2007, 219). One needs to note that in many cases where a freedwoman is attested with a name preceding her nomen, it is more likely that the name is an inverted cognomen rather than a praenomen (take for instance *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 2210 (Aquileia) *Grata Plotia Cn. I.*; 1476 (Praeneste) *Euclesis Cestia Q. I.*; 2041 (Perusia) *Hastia Alfa L. I.*; 1772 (Ortona) *Pampila Anaia P. I.*). See also *IK* 39, 101, below p. 90.

<sup>25</sup> **#17** *Ser. Cornelia Ser. I. Sabina*, the *nutrix* and *mammula* of Ser. Cornelius Dolabella, and **#12** *Sep. Cincia L. I. Lepida*, see below.

<sup>26</sup> So at least in **#29** *L(ucia) Lallia L. I. Salvia* and *Lallia L. I. Soteris*; **#15** *D(ecima) Colia D. I. Theo* and *Colia D. I. Nice*; **#6** *Sex. Avidia Sex. I. Prima* and *Avidiae Sex. I. Faustae*. See also below the Φλαυίαί on p. 89, but cf. **#57–58** and **#69–70** who have the same praenomina.

<sup>27</sup> In fact, of all the 14 cases of our material, which record the qualifying marker *f(ilia)* or *l(iberta)*, eight cases present a female nomenclature where the praenomen is the same as that of the father/patron, whereas it differs in six cases. In the latter group, most women have a typical female name

*Publius* and his freedwoman *Lucia*, one may find it somewhat puzzling. How exactly should we interpret these cases? In order to give an answer, one needs to take a closer look at them. Kajava gives a list of 19 cases of freedwomen from the imperial time who are recorded with a praenomen, six of which seem to have a different praenomen from that of their patron.<sup>28</sup> At first the number seems relatively large, but a closer look reveals that all these cases are far from being clear:

*AE* 1998, 316 = *SupplIt* XVI, 29 = *CIL* X 745\* (Aletrium): *C. Tuccia T. l. Salvia* et *L. Spuria L. l. Calliste*. The inscription, only preserved in codices, was originally regarded false but later confirmed authentic by the discovery of a parallel cippus (*SupplIt* XVI, 28). It seems that, after all, neither one of the female nomenclatures features a praenomen (and even the indication *T. l.* in *Salvia*'s nomenclature is somewhat obscure), thus the names are presented in *AE* and *SupplIt* simply as *Tuccia ((mulieris)) l. Salvia* and *Spuria L. l. Calliste*.

*CIL* VI 28156: [---] *L. Valeria P. ((mulieris)) l.* [---]. This inscription, likewise, is only preserved in codices and the presence of the female praenomen is somewhat dubious, although by no means impossible. The inscription seems to be fragmentary, but it is highly possible that the woman, given her being a freedwoman, had a cognomen.

*CIL* XII 4588 = 5093 (Narbo): *L. Rinnia P. l. [P]rima* and (probably) her freedwoman *L. Rinnia Primae l. Aucta*. The cognomen of *[P]rima* appears in *CIL* as *Ruma*, but the suggested emendation *[P]r<sup>r</sup>i'ma* seems to us a far better alternative. It is not clear whether her filiation should really be read *P. f.* and not *L. f.* No picture of the inscription is provided but the matter could perhaps be verified if the stone still *extat in museo lapidario* (of Narbonne).

*CIL* III 9364 (Salonae): *M. Titia Gly{c}cenna*, former slave of L. Titius Lucundus to whom she set up the monument. *Glycenna*'s praenomen, indeed, seems to be different from that of her patron, but perhaps the 'M' preceding her nomen is not a praenomen at all but rather an abbreviation of, say, *m(onumentum)* (thus suggested in the *EDCS*<sup>29</sup>). This could very well be the case, as the word

---

(*Paulla/Polla, Secunda, Tertia*) to which there is no common male equivalent, in one case the patron seems to be a woman (#46 *Tertia Oppia Mus Murtae l.*), and in one case it is somewhat uncertain whether the woman even has a praenomen (#12 *Sep. Cincia L. l. Lepida*, see below).

<sup>28</sup> Kajava (above n. 3) 228.

<sup>29</sup> I.e. *Epigraphische Datenbank Clauss-Slaby*.

*monumentum* is often abbreviated simply as 'M', and it would here function well as the object for *fecit*.

*ILBulg 323* (Novae): *P. Ael[li]a M. I. Severa*. The editor notes here that "*initium male legi*", which of course leaves some reasonable doubt over the matter of whether she really had the praenomen *P(ublia)* or not. Unfortunately no picture is available.

**#12:** *Sep. Cinciae L. I. Lepidae*. It is possible that she really had the praenomen *Sep(timia)* despite her patron being called *Lucius*, but it could also be thought that perhaps *Sep.* is not a part of her nomenclature but rather an abbreviation of, say, *sep(ulcrum)* (thus suggested in the *EDCS*). The fact that her name is given in genitive makes this interpretation possible. However, abbreviations of this type are not common (at least to our knowledge) and therefore the possibility that she was, indeed, called *Sep(timia)* should not be refuted.

## Greek East

Unlike often in the Latin material discussed above, the early imperial Greek sources still presented the praenomina typically in a non-abbreviated form and, besides, nearly all female praenomina occurring in Greek are those that are more often written in full in Latin, too (such as *Paulla/Polla*, *Tertia* etc.). Thus the difficulty lies usually not in deciding whether there is a praenomen or not, but in the Greek expressions of genitive attributes in Roman nomenclatures which often lack precise definers, equivalent to *f(i)lius/-a* or *l(ib)ertus/-a*, and render the status difficult to interpret; from the 56 cases of our material no more than seven show a clear definition: six times *θυγάτηρ*, and one single time *ἀπελευθέρα*. Twelve women have an unqualified genitive attribute consisting of a plain male praenomen (e.g. *Ποπλίου*), and 37 have none at all. Within the latter two groups other clues for status need to be searched for. In a sharp contrast to the Latin attestations, from the nomenclatures in Greek showing further elements than only plain a *tria nomina*, the most suggest a freeborn rather than enfranchised status. Let us examine first the freedwomen, seven in total, appearing in five inscriptions.

An inscription from Larisa, **#31** records the only definite freedwoman: *Μαρκία Λουκία Ζωσίμη Ἀφροδεισίου ἀπελευθέρα*, dated to the 1st c. CE.

The importance of this case is, however, somewhat diminished by its peculiarity, rendering it less comparable to the rest of the Greek material. The praenomen is the female version of the patron's, which in the East of our period is paralleled only by #23 (same date and Thessalian, too; see below), and unlike all others, the patron is mentioned exceptionally by a Greek cognomen instead of his praenomen.<sup>30</sup> In this view, and of the spelling λου-,<sup>31</sup> one wonders if the date could be later.<sup>32</sup>

As for other two inscriptions and possibly a third one, all from Kos and recording two women, the identification is based on having a Greek cognomen and lacking a qualifier of the genitive attribute, whereas another person mentioned has the genitive attribute qualified with υἱός: #57–58 Πῶλλα Σηία ἢ Ποπλίου Πυθιάς, Πῶλλα Σηία ἢ Ποπλίου Τρύφαινα, and two men with similar nomenclature including a Greek cognomen appear beside a Πόπλιος Σήιος ὁ Ποπλίου υἱός Φλακκίων carrying a Latin cognomen, whereas in #69–70 Τερτία Ὀμβρική Λευκίου Μεγίστη and Τερτία Ὀμβρική Λευκίου Παμφίλα contrast with a Λεύκιος Ὀμβρικός Λευκίου υἱός showing no cognomen.<sup>33</sup>

In the third inscription, #22 Τερτία Φλαυία Δέκμου Νίκη appears together with Φλαυία Δέκμου Νικομήδ[εια], Δέκμος Φλάυιος Δέκμ[ου ---], and Δέκμος Φλάυιος Σέξ[του υἱός?] Διονύσιος. If one of the men did indeed have the word υἱός after Δέκμ[ου] or Σέξ[του],<sup>34</sup> the women would be most probably enfranchised. Curiously Νικομήδεια's nomenclature doesn't show a praenomen: should this distinguish Νίκη's status from hers? This could be perhaps

<sup>30</sup> TAM II,2 438 (c. 96 CE; cf. *LGPN* Vb s.v. 37) records a similar indication of patronage on L. 11/12 Πακόνιος Εὐφρό[σ]υ[ν]ος ἀπελευθέρως Μόσχου, whose patron is Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Πακωνιανὸς Μόσχος, apparently the natural son of Πόπλιος Πακόνιος Ἑρμείας ὁ καὶ Ἡ[θ]ικός Ῥόδιος καὶ Παταρ[ε]ύς and not yet adopted at the time of manumission.

<sup>31</sup> See below n. 39.

<sup>32</sup> B. Helly ("Les italiens en Thessalie au IIe et au Ier s. a. J.-C.", in *Les "bourgeoisies" municipales italiennes aux IIe et Ier siècles av. J.-C.* Centre Jean Bérard, Institut Français de Naples, 7-10 décembre 1981, Paris 1983, 369; cf. 366) suggests the 1st c. BCE / early imperial period, although the various typological grounds presented by him do not seem compelling to exclude a later date. Kajava (above n. 3, 228) lists this one under imperial cases without further notice.

<sup>33</sup> Kajava (above n. 3) 82. Cf. the other way around in *IG* XII,6,2 710 (early imperial): Πῶλλα Αὐλία Δέκμου θυγάτηρ beside a Δέκμος Αὐλιος Δέκμου Διονύσιος.

<sup>34</sup> In the former's case he would then not have had a cognomen. The latter's cognomen is written on the next line, leaving the missing space after Σέξ[ rather long for Σέξ[του] only.

more probable if both men lacked the word *υῖός*. However, even then the status would remain inconclusive, because three Latin inscriptions attest two enfranchised women, one with and the other without a praenomen.<sup>35</sup>

The nomenclatures of a married couple in one more inscription, #39 Πρεῖμα Μεττία Εὐταξία, γυνὴ δὲ Ποπλίου Μεττίου νεωτέρου suggest that this P. Mettius, lacking an actual cognomen himself and obviously a freeborn citizen, might have married his freedwoman, who bears the same nomen and a Greek cognomen.

It is worth of mentioning here that, as already noted above, there are near to no attestations of freedwomen with a praenomen but lacking a cognomen, the only possible case being a Τερτία Κρασσικία in *IK* 39, 101 (Prusa ad Olympum, 1st c. CE), who is *θεραπετὴ καὶ ἀπελευθέρᾳ* of a Κρίσπα Κρασσικία. However, both names being well known as cognomina, these could be such, appearing in an inversed order.<sup>36</sup>

Evidence pointing to a freeborn status comes forward considerably more often. From the six certain cases with the word *θυγάτηρ* two women from perhaps 1st c. CE carry a Latin cognomen: one, #42, is recorded in genitive as [–] ἡς Μουνατίας | [A]ϋλλου θυγατρὸς Πωλλίτιης, where the first element seems a probable praenomen,<sup>37</sup> and the other is #23 Λουκία (Γελλία) Ἰγγένουα, who is *θυγάτηρ* of Λούκιος Γέλλιος and Καλπουρνία Ἰγγένουα, and the other of two Greek cases with father's and daughter's praenomina corresponding. Interestingly, three out of the other four with a Greek name have it as an agnomen marked with a *ἡ καὶ* (or similar) formula:

#43 Σακόνδα Νων(ί)α ἡ καὶ Ἐλπὶς Γαίου θυγάτηρ Ῥωμαία, γυνὴ δὲ Αὔλου Γρανίου, whose husband apparently was free-born as well;

<sup>35</sup> #6, #15, #29, see above n. 26.

<sup>36</sup> See above n. 24, although this must not necessarily be the case here (cf. Kajava (above n. 3) 87).

<sup>37</sup> The squeeze in Berlin in the *IG* archive, as seen by Kantola, shows the latter two lines beginning at the same vertical level, and if the same applies to the first line, as is probable, the first word is missing four letters. This would be probably [Πώλλ]ης, which is by far the most widespread female praenomen in the East (see below p. 93), and also occurs with all the other three *Munatiae* with a praenomen (see below n. 54). Furthermore, the praenomen appears with genitive in both *-ας* and *-ης*, but here the latter option excludes *Tertia* and others ending with *-ia* (always *-ίας*) and probably *Prima*, whose only known genitive in *-ης* is from Rome and a considerably later period (and thus, unsurprisingly, appearing as a cognomen; *IGUR* II 672). Other possibilities attested in the East are far less common: *Secunda*, and even rarer *Quinta* and *Rufa*.

**#10** [Π]ῶλλα Καστρικία Αὔλου θυγάτηρ ἡ ἐπικαλουμένη Θεανώ{ι}; **#50** Πρῆμα Πακουία Ποπλίου θυγάτηρ ἅ καὶ Δαλιάς with the non-*koine* article (appears in genitive τᾶς) in the local manner.

The one without ἡ καὶ is **#7** with a peculiar and problematic nomenclature Τερτία Βαβυλλία Ποπλίου καὶ ΠΟΛΑΣ Λαοδίκη θυγάτηρ: the element after καὶ might refer to a mother named Πόλα as a part of the filiation, or belong to the name of another woman, Πολὰς Λαοδίκη θυγάτηρ, in the nominative, either lacking a nomen or having it not mentioned.<sup>38</sup> The former seems more probable in light that the formula χρηστή χάρις is in singular.

Proceeding to other cases that lack clear indication of status, no woman with a Latin cognomen, which would suggest a freeborn status, may be placed with sufficient probability within our time period.<sup>39</sup> No more than the remaining cognomina do the genitive attributes consisting of a male praenomen without a qualifier (e.g. plain Ποπλίου) give any clue, as they could be followed by θυγάτηρ as well as by ἀπελευθέρρα. As an exception though, two women, **#49** and **#63**, appear with filiation Σπορίου, which has been showed to indicate that they probably were daughters of freedwomen but themselves born free.<sup>40</sup> However, certain ethnonyms and gamonyms, in addition to the Πρεῖμα Μεττία mentioned above, provide us with some hints.

<sup>38</sup> For commentary on the name, see Kajava (above n. 3) 58. In addition, one could speculate with the faint possibilities that either ἡ was omitted before καὶ (but this would result, not at all less oddly, in having a Greek cognomen after the agnomen), or that ΚΑΠΠΟΛΑΣ would be the father's cognomen, a rare *Caepola* (cf. Kajanto (n. 19) 335) which, here, would have been written erroneously (\*Καιπόλας should be the nominative, with genitive in presumably -α or alternatively -ου); the existence of a sigma, though, does not seem completely certain either in *IG*'s diplomatic edition or on the Berlin squeezes.

<sup>39</sup> Three cases which seem to come the closest are *IK* 40, 1042 Τι(βερία) Κλαυδία Φουλβιανή (uncertain origin, 1st/early 2nd c. CE, or more probably not earlier than the second half of the 1st c. CE because of the Claudian "imperial" name), *BCH* 47, 1923, 381 nr. 10 + *SEG* IV 575 Πουπλία Ρουτιλία Πῶλλα (Notion, 1st/2nd c. CE Kajava (above n. 3) 187), and *IG* XII,4,3 2897 Λουκία Τουρηλία Φορτουνάτα (Kos, 2nd c. CE (Hallos), or perhaps earlier?). The female praenomina in question, counterparts of typical male praenomina, mostly feature in later sources in the Greek East. Besides, all three nomenclatures show spellings that suggest an imperial date (Λουκία (not Λευ-); ου for a short vowel in Φουλβ- (not e.g. Φολου-), Ρουτ- (not Ροτ-), and especially Πουπλία (not Ποπ-)), although spellings may not be considered a compelling grounds for dating (see e.g. **#23** above).

<sup>40</sup> See above n. 22.

Athenian citizenship seems to have been granted to freedmen very rarely: the only known case is a freedman of Antonia Maior.<sup>41</sup> Thus it looks quite probable that the three (or probably four) women showing affiliation to an Athenian *phyle* were free by birth. The fully preserved one, #33, has an Athenian husband as well, and a curious nomenclature: *tria nomina* with a Greek cognomen followed by ἡ καὶ and her *phyle*. This might lead one to speculate if the Greek name and ἡ καὶ were written in wrong order, but three less preserved cases with extant female praenomina (#60, #71, #75), and one without<sup>42</sup> apparently show the same manner, too. This must, then, be interpreted as an Athenian peculiarity,<sup>43</sup> although the reason behind this avoids clarity: oddly enough, the cognomen and *phyle* affiliation as agnomen seem to be the paralleled elements.<sup>44</sup> One woman (#37) has a similar nomenclature but without ἡ καὶ.<sup>45</sup> Apart from these, three women (#30, #32, #51) are not given a *phyle* but have an Athenian husband; seen that the Athenians were more exclusive in granting citizenship, it may be somewhat plausible they would have hesitated marrying freedwomen, too.

The husband of #47 mentioned by the sole name Πόπλιος, the ones of #36 and #54 having *tria nomina* with a Greek cognomen as well, and those of

<sup>41</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 7091; see S. G. Byrne, *Roman citizens of Athens* (Studia hellenistica 40), Leuven 2003, 65–66 s.v. *Antonius* 16. One may note, however, that in this bilingual inscription only the Latin version (*M. Antonius Antoniae Drusi l. Tertius*) displays the enfranchised status, whereas the Greek counterpart (Μάρκος Αντώνιος Τέρτιος Παιανιεύς) could, on its own, belong to a freeborn citizen as well. Thus the possibility cannot be excluded that some similar Greek-only nomenclatures could belong to freedmen in Athens, too.

<sup>42</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 5172 (58/9 CE) l. 4 [---]λία Ειρήνη ἡ καὶ ἐξ Ἀθμονέων Ἐπικράτους Ἀθμονέως γυν[ή]: it remains open if she could have had a praenomen, too.

<sup>43</sup> Apart from the Attic ones mentioned, the searchable data included in *PHI* database (Sept. 6th, 2016) did not show other cases of agnomina with other elements paralleled than Greek (or other) individual names or Roman praenomina or cognomina; of course, two ethnics may be paralleled but then it is naturally no agnomen. Moreover, male names attested in Attica show only these typical cases of ὁ καὶ (*vel sim.*).

<sup>44</sup> This gives the strange impression that e.g. this woman would have been referred to as Πῶλλα Μαικία Λαυδίκη in one context and as Πῶλλα Μαικία ἐξ Οἴου in some other. Another option could be that the interchangeable elements were P+N(+C?) and C+*phyle* (i.e. Πῶλλα Μαικία (Λαυδίκη) and Λαυδίκη ἐξ Οἴου).

<sup>45</sup> In one further case without a female praenomen, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 5540 Πομπηία Εἰσιὰς Γαίου Πομπηίου ἢ θυγάτηρ ἡ καὶ ἐξ Ἀλιμουσίων, Ἰ Διονυσίου τοῦ Διογένους Ἰταίου ἢ γυνή, the Greek cognomen has been placed before the filiation which is then followed by the *phyle*-agnomen.



#40 and #55 referred to with a single Greek name remain unhelpful here. On Kos, #67 Πῶλλα Τυλλία Νικόπολις appears beside a freeborn Greek Θέων Ἀμφικλέους; in addition there is a separate reference to another man called Γάϊος Τυλλιανός.<sup>46</sup> The first man looks likely to be her husband, perhaps indicating that his wife was free by birth too, but this is unsure, as is the nature of her relation to the other man. #47, however, and two other women without gamonyms, #26 and #34, carry the ethnonym Ῥωμαία. This occurs on the one hand with people of any status originating from the *Urbs* itself, and on the other hand with Roman citizens from any localities,<sup>47</sup> and especially in the latter sense Ῥωμαία may be regarded as a further means for more recent, non-Italic citizens to emphasize Roman self-identification, since the citizenship already would have been transparent from the nomenclature.

Regarding this, the matter of the peculiar distribution of female praenomina in the Greek East requires a closer look. Counting all attestations in both *duo* and *tria nomina* from our approximate time period, *Polla* with 81 attestations covers more than half of the total of 157 cases (nearly all in Greek), followed by *Tertia* with 32 cases, whereas the third most attested, *Secunda*, appears in no more than 11 sources.<sup>48</sup> Thus, as already observed by Kajava (n. 3, 102), the female praenomina vary significantly less in the Greek East; within our *tria nomina*, the proportion of *Tertia* remains at 20%, and that of *Polla* increases slightly from 52% to 57% at the expense of the rarer praenomina. Why these two were selected with such a frequency remains quite unsure, but this onomastic habit, starkly differing from the usage in the West (and Latin-speaking

<sup>46</sup> Γαίου Τυλλιανοῦ, ζῆ. | Πῶλλας Τυλλίας | Νικοπόλεως, | Θέωνος τοῦ | Ἀμφικλέους, | ζώντων. *Tullianus* is a known nomen and acts here as such, since a patronym should have the preceding article τοῦ, as in the Greek man's patronym. The nomen might suggest some connection to the woman, but this remains completely speculative. On the same stone, one reads also Σακόνδας Καισελίας | ζώσης, which has been identified as a separate inscription; if this woman has a connection to the others in the first place, even less can be said of their relation.

<sup>47</sup> H. Solin, "Appunti sull'onomastica romana a Delo", in Coarelli–Musti–Solin (eds.), *Delo e l'Italia: raccolta di studi* (Opuscula Instituti Romani Finlandiae 2), Roma 1983, 113–117.

<sup>48</sup> The figures are approximate and derive from Kantola's (still incomplete) dissertation material, *EDCS* and *Trismegistos* searches and exstant *LGP*N volumes: despite some possible inaccuracies, the general picture is apparent. One may note the considerably higher numbers than Kajava's (above n. 3): this is mainly due to the more recent publications of Koan funerary inscriptions, which contain a great plenty of Romans.

colonies?<sup>49</sup>), suggests that it occurred more with newer citizens of non-Italic origin or freedwomen rather than with Western freeborn immigrants<sup>50</sup>. This, on its own right, combines with the dissimilar patterns of using the female *tria nomina* in Italy and elsewhere; nevertheless, the possibility may not be excluded that some of these women were foreigners from Rome or Italy and/or were enfranchised.

The remainder of the 25 women referred to only with a plain *tria nomina* offers scarcely anything to fathom their status. One woman attested on Kos, #4 Τερτία Αὐδία Δωροθέα, appears on three inscriptions, two of which are grave boundary stones of a *thiasos* reading ὄρος θιάσου Τύχης Ἀφροδίτης τῶν σὺν Τερτία Αὐδία Δωροθέα, and the third one is a gravestone only bearing her name in genitive. That she appears in more than one inscription and is connected to a *thiasos* points toward a certain importance in her society, but this could have been possible for a freedwoman.<sup>51</sup> For the remaining cases, there seems to be little more than the grave monuments themselves. They, on the other hand, are indecisive too: an outstanding grave stele does indeed show the wealth of the one who erected it but, as it is well known, sometimes Roman ex-slaves earned a considerable fortune; furthermore, monuments could be inscribed only much later or reused and would thus give even less solid information about the deceased mentioned in the inscription.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>49</sup> The evidence from these is only negative, though.

<sup>50</sup> That is at least first generation immigrants; later generations may have become more "Hellenised" or adapted their name patterns to the surrounding social environment.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. one other inscription connected to Koan θιασοί, *IG XII,4,3 2809*, recording a Τερτία Κορ-[v] ηλία (l. 4–5), and regrettably broken γραμματεούσης | Πάλλας 'Σεξ'-Ιτελίας τᾶ[ς] | [– – –] (l. 5–8), where ΤΑ[ could be something else as well, seen that γραμματεούσης has the *koiné* genitive ending -ης instead of -ας.

<sup>52</sup> Several funerary monuments include reliefs, which could inform of the deceased and her family: #5, #25, #39, #43, #47, #49, #53, #63, #64, and #68 (#23 apparently has one, but was published without illustration; the one of #75 has been lost). However, the iconographies here are rather generic, and do not seem to provide us with relevant new information. At least with #39 and #49 the inscriptions are considered to be of a later date than the reliefs (see the editors' commentaries).

### Combined interpretation

The following general features may be drawn from the material discussed above and presented in the appendix:

Out of the 19 Latin attestations of *tria nomina*, all in separate inscriptions, 10 belong to freedwomen against five freeborn ones, and four are uncertain. Furthermore, we may assume that at least two women belonging to the last group were probably enfranchised (#8 and #11, above), which lifts the total number of freedwomen in Latin sources to 12. Still, the division seems to relate to geography: with one exception (#27) all freedwomen are attested in Italy whereas four freeborn women are from elsewhere, and the one remaining ties in with a local Etruscan tradition. In comparison, the Greek material is considerably larger with 56 women in 54 sources (inscriptions except for one papyrus), but troublesome to interpret: among these, six women are undisputably freeborn, against five certain (in three inscriptions) and two probable freedwomen; furthermore, 14 cases give various clues that point towards free rather than servile origin, but the status of 29 women must remain undecided. Firstly, the obvious conclusion is that the female *tria nomina* was evidently more widespread in the Greek East, and secondly, especially if the most of the evidence from there suggesting a freeborn status holds true, there seems to be a conspicuous difference in social distribution of the *tria nomina* between the East and the West. As a further dissimilarity, the Greek material shows a great frequency of *Polla*, followed by *Tertia*, but only isolate cases of other praenomina, and the only one with the same praenomen as her patron's is possibly from a later period; on the other hand these are attested in the Latin material, and only four *libertae* (but no freeborns) are called *Polla* or *Tertia*.

In course of the early imperial period, female praenomina, just like their male counterparts, lost much of their original onomastic purpose when used alongside cognomina – and thus eventually became superfluous. As the cognomen seems to have been the diacritic name element in all our *tria nomina* cases, the praenomen was likely included for some other reason: perhaps to underline one's identification as a Roman, to distinguish one's free-born status, or to carry a family's onomastic tradition of certain praenomina? Be that as it may, as name giving was not a regulated practice, in the regions with more recent Roman influence there may have been a different (or even confused) understanding of

the Roman name system as it was in Italy, and likewise the possibility cannot be excluded that a praenomen may have been added without any particular purpose but simply because it pleased one.

Female praenomina were, in some cases, certainly used to differentiate the nomenclature of a freeborn woman from freedwomen. This is evident in some cases without female *tria nomina* (where the praenomen thus acts in the diacritic function), e.g. a Roman grave monument for several freeborn and manumitted *Caecilii* (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 1263), including *Caecili{li}a A. et Cn. I. Asia* and *Polla Caecilia Spuri f.*, and a Koan gravestone, only published in the recent *IG* volume (XII,4,3 1464; 1st c. BCE / early imp.), where Σηΐα Ζωσίμη appears as mother of Πῶλλα Σηΐα Γάϊου Θυγάτηρ: the latter's nomenclature could belong to any freeborn woman of these times, but the former's contrasting elements, i.e. a Greek cognomen and lack of filiation, imply servile origin. In a comparable manner Πῶλλα Οὐηρατία Αὔλου Οὐηρατίου Νικηφόρου {θ}θυγάτηρ in *IG* XII,4,3 2875 (1st c. CE) has no cognomen whereas the father – possibly a freedman because of this contrast – has a Greek one.

Since our *tria nomina* cases mostly appear alone without other women mentioned, one may speculate if female praenomina were sometimes used to a similar effect. However, Kajava (above n. 3, 105) has suggested, concerning (primarily freeborn) women in the East, that the most common female praenomina, such as *Paulla/Polla* and *Tertia*, continued to be employed in order to give a Roman label to a female nomenclature with a Greek cognomen. In the sense of social distinction, this underlining of a Roman identity does not fall far from the use of diacritic female praenomina, which itself clearly indicated a Roman status, beside the use the ethnonym Πρωμαία, or a filiation written fully with θυγάτηρ. Similar reasons may lie behind the use of a praenomen with a Latin cognomen; the five examples, one attested in Greek, all appear in areas of more recent "Romanising" influence, and on that account adding a praenomen to the nomenclature may be due to similar reasons. Even though many of the women with *tria nomina* hardly belonged to a very modest social stratum – at least in terms of wealth, indicated by their monuments – , the name patterns often seem to differ from those who are clearly identifiable as members of the traditional local elites with Roman citizenship. These are frequently attested using a Greek cognomen, and a Greek name in filiation, thus showing up their prestigious kinship and status in the local context; moreover, their citizenship

mostly originates from leading Roman figures.<sup>53</sup> On the other hand, in our Greek material, only one relatively late case (**#13**) shows a so-called imperial name.

Nevertheless, even if the female praenomen in *tria nomina* may well have been used for further distinction of one's freeborn Roman status, this certainly cannot be made to a general assumption even in the East, since freedwomen with praenomina were not unknown, after all. In general, the use of praenomina with freedwomen elude explanation more effectively. In the Latin cases the enfranchised status is mostly explicit, but could a freedwoman have strived to make a more emphatic difference between the former and current status? Or could there perhaps have been a family tradition for certain praenomina involved, which would have been extended to the family's freedwomen as well? Some *gentes* may indicate preference for certain praenomina, but the numbers are low, and especially in case of more common nomina connections between people with the same nomen are not to be fully counted on; besides, as discussed above, only *Polla* and *Tertia* were more common praenomina in the East, and thus variation, if any, is shown mostly between these two names.<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, among the rare sources with more than one woman, the *Avidiae*, *Coliae*, *Lalliae*, and *Φλαυΐαι* (in **#6**, **#15**, **#22** and **#29**) show that freedwomen of the same family could appear one with and the other without a praenomen in the same inscription. If there lie some conscious choices behind this particular practice, these three cases do not present enough to grasp them.

<sup>53</sup> To name a few from late of 1st c. BCE to mid 1st c. CE: representing well-known families are e.g. 'Ιουλίαι Νοσσίς Θεωπ[όμου θυγάτηρ] (*IK* 41, 53; *LGN* Vb 2); Κλαυδία Ξενοφάντος θυγάτηρ 'Ηδεΐα (*IG* XII,4,2 960 A & B; *LGN* I 7); 'Ιουλίαι Παντιμία Λάκωνος θυγάτηρ (*IG* V,2 542; *LGN* IIIa 3); and from otherwise unknown families e.g. 'Ιουλίαι Θεοφίλο[υ] θυγάτηρ 'Επιάνασσα (*IK* 41, 86; *LGN* Vb s.v.); 'Ιουλίαι Κλεονείκη Φιλοδήμου θυγάτηρ (*IG* X,2,1 97; *LGN* IV 7). For a provincial nomenclature in the West, compare the Hispanic **#28**.

<sup>54</sup> For same praenomina in a family, see for instance, above **#57–58** Πῶλλαϊ Σηΐται and **#69–70** Τερτίαι Ὀμβρικήαι. Among the *gentes* best attested with praenomina in the East, *Tertia* occurs with *Clodiae* in 3 out of 3 cases, whereas *Polla* with *Flaminiae* in 6 out of 7, *Graniae* 4/4, *Serviliae* 3/4, *Valeriae* 5/8, and *Munatiae* 3/4 (the fourth, **#42** [-]η, is fairly probably *Polla*, too; see above n. 37); in addition, *Corneliae* have 4 *Pollae* and 1 *Tertia* out of 6, and four *Maeciae* show 2 cases of both *Polla* and *Tertia*.

Lastly, from the Greek sources recording freedwomen, beside two stray cases from Larisa and unknown origin (#31, #39), three inscriptions (with five cases: #22, #57–58 and #69–70) come from the rich material of Kos. As the most copious Attic cases show no indication to enfranchised status, one may wonder if this relates to regionally differing onomastic practices,<sup>55</sup> but the low figures and possibility to accident of survival leave this a mere speculation. Furthermore, one may note that the evidence in Greek mainly derives from these two, together with Delos: these are, regarding the late republican period and early imperial period, locations where Romans generally are attested in large numbers. In contrast, some areas known to have been abundant with Romans, such as many cities of Asia Minor, provide us with only a scarce number of female *tria nomina*, and female praenomina in general,<sup>56</sup> but the surviving epigraphic evidence largely dates from not earlier than the 1st c. CE. Again, this could rise from onomastic differences related to geography (or to certain *gentes* operating in certain areas), but an other option is that our material, vaguely datable for the most, leans rather towards the 1st c. BCE or early 1st c. CE than the mid–late 1st c. CE.

## Summary

The onomastic practices of using female *tria nomina* are divisible to three groups: Italy, other Latin West, and the Greek East. In the latter two, *tria nomina* seem to appear primarily with women free by birth, perhaps citizens of local extraction (though it is less likely that they belonged to traditional local elites) or descendants of freedmen. One must, however, bear in mind that the Latin cases are very scarce, and in the majority of Greek attestations the status evades definition; moreover, a handful of freedwomen are known as well. Yet the motives for a freeborn woman to have both praenomen and cognomen are – even if

<sup>55</sup> The place of attestation of a person is not automatically to be considered the place of origin, but in a number of our Attic cases the local connection is evident from the *phyle*.

<sup>56</sup> Byzantium and Ephesos show a handful of attestations, but the rest are scattered in various localities, and none are known, for example, from Pergamon (except for a *Tertia Lollia*, wife of a proconsul, in *IPergamon* III, 18). In Egypt too, with ample evidence of Romans (naturally) from Augustan period onward, early female praenomina remain very exceptional. Yet again, accident of survival is a possibility not to be ruled out.

rarely transparent – more conceivable: distinction from freedwomen, emphasizing one's Roman identity, or both. In Italy, *tria nomina* are rare and occur primarily with freedwomen, and the motive for this onomastic practice cannot be pinned down, no more here than with freedwomen of other regions. In addition to this, in all groups family-specific traditions of preferring certain female praenomina and other, more indistinct reasons may have influenced the onomastic practices.

*University of Helsinki, University of Uppsala*

### **Appendix: List of women with *tria nomina* until the end of 1st c. CE**

The names are given in alphabetical order of the nomina, and as recorded in the source. Names of husbands and other persons directly mentioned in the name formula are included, when extant. The cases not mentioned above in the discussion are marked with an asterisk. The abbreviation c(entury) has been omitted in the list, but is implicit from the ordinal numbers. At the end there are two uncertain or dubious cases left out of discussion, a table of geographical provenance of the sources, and a list of other inscriptions mentioned in the discussion. The list contains references to prosopographic works; references to *LPGN* I and II have been replaced with ones to Ferrary's *et aliorum* list<sup>57</sup> for De-

los and to Byrne (n. 41) for Attica, when possible. In alphabetical order, the names Όμβρία and Όμβρικήα have been placed under U instead of O, and Βετιληνή under V instead of B, without any particular intention to comment on their interpretation.

- 1\* Πώλλα Αγνατία Νεκόπολις  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 10566. Attica.  
1st BCE /early imp.  
(Byrne (n.41) Agnatus 1)
- 2\* Πώλλα Άρελλία [...]κλέα  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 10736. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Arellius 1 )
- 3\* [Π]ώλλα Άτελλία Μελιτίνη  
IK 20, 60. Kalchedon.  
1st BCE /early imp.  
(LGN Va 1)
- 4 Τερτία Αύδία Δωροθέα  
IG XII,4,3 2798, 2799 and 2952. Kos.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(LGN I 3)

<sup>57</sup> J.-L. Ferrary – Cl. Hasenohr – M.-Th. Le Dinahet, "Annexe : Liste des Italiens de Délos", in Ch. Müller – Cl. Hasenohr (éds.), *Les italiens*

*dans le monde grec. IIe siècle av. J.-C. - Ier siècle ap. J.-C.* (BCH Suppl. 41), Athènes – Paris 2002, 183–239.

- 5\* Τερτία Αύφιδία Ἀρίστιον  
EAD XXX 85. Rhencia.  
Late 2nd / early 1st BCE.  
(Ferrary et al. (n. 57) Aufidii 11)
- 6 Sex. Avidia Sex. I. Prima  
CIL XI 4249. Interamna Nahars.  
1st c. BCE/CE.<sup>58</sup>
- 7 Τερτία Βαβυλλία Ποπλίου  
καὶ ΠΟΛΑΣ Λαοδίκη θυγάτηρ<sup>59</sup>  
IG XII,5 93. Naxos.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(LGPN I 6)
- 8 Tertia Boel[ia --?] Salvia  
CIL IX 4375. Ager Amiterninus.  
Late rep.
- 9 Polla Caspe.[---] C. I. Erotis<sup>60</sup>  
CIL IX 4341. Amiternum.  
1st BCE/CE.
- 10 [Π]ῶλλα Καστρικία Αὔλου θυγάτηρ  
ἢ ἐπικαλουμένη Θεανῶ{ι}  
IG XII,4,3 1744. Kos.  
1st BCE.
- 11 L. Catellia Dionysia  
CIL IX 2710. Aesernia.  
1st CE.<sup>61</sup>
- 12 Sep. Cinciae L. I. Lepidae  
CIL V 2599. Ateste.  
Early 1st CE.
- 13\* Τι(βερία) Κλαυδία Εὐοδία  
IG XII,4,3 1846. Kos.  
41–100 CE.<sup>62</sup>
- 14\* Τερτία Κλωδία Ζωσάριον  
IG XII,4,3 2831. Kos.  
1st BCE / early imp.
- 15 D. Colia D. I. Theo  
CIL VI 16002. Rome.  
Early imp.  
(Solin<sup>63</sup> p. 441)
- 16\* Πῶλλα Κορηλία Λαΐς  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 11937/8. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Cornelius 37)
- 17 Ser. Corneliae Ser. I. Sabinae  
CIL VI 16450 (= ILS 8532). Rome.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. *SupplIt* XIX, p. 78; the grounds given suggest mid 1st c. BCE, but a somewhat later date cannot be excluded.

<sup>59</sup> For the interpretation, see discussion above p. 91.

<sup>60</sup> Originally this was interpreted by Mommsen as a gentile name, Pollacasp[ena?] (hence also in Solin – Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum*, Hildesheim 1994<sup>2</sup>), belonging to a binominal nomenclature. Kajava (n. 3, 53), on the other hand, argued for separation of Polla as a praenomen from the fragmentary nomen Caspe[- -]. This interpretation, in turn, has recently been challenged by Buonocore (*Epigraphica* 78 (2016), 365–366; no photo) who, after an autopsy, found the reading Pollacasp[en[- -]] more convincing. His argument is based on the absence of an "interpuncto" between Polla and Caspe[---], whereas such a marker was carved between the other onomastic elements. In our view, however, this alone can hardly be taken as serious proof against Kajava's interpretation. Since the nomen Pollacasp[enus] (or the like) is otherwise unknown, it may not be used

as an argument either. For us it seems more convincing to assume that we are after all dealing with a praenomen and a nomen (the precise reading of the latter would profit from a photograph)."

<sup>61</sup> M. Buonocore, *Molise. Repertorio delle iscrizioni latine. Vol. 2. Aesernia*, Campobasso 2003, nr. 115.

<sup>62</sup> 1st c. CE Hallof (*IG*), but a date anterior to Claudius is improbable.

<sup>63</sup> H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom*, Berlin – New York 2003<sup>2</sup>.



- Late 1st CE (or early 2nd?).<sup>64</sup>  
(Solon (n. 13) 37)
- 18 Maxsuma Domitia Caeseriana {m(?)}  
CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2813. Ateste.  
Late 2nd / early 1st BCE.
- 19\* Κοιντία Φλαμενία Θεούδιον  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 11674a. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Flaminius 5)
- 20\* [Πῶλ]λα Φλαμενία Ἀμ[μῶν]ία  
AM 67, 1942, 171 nr. 360. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Flaminius 4)
- 21\* Πῶλλα Φλαμενία Πυθιάς  
SEMA 2365. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Flaminius 6)
- 22 Τερτία Φλαυία Δέκμου Νίκη  
IG XII,4,3 1664,I. Kos.  
1st BCE/CE.<sup>65</sup>
- 23 Λουκία Ἰγγένοια ἡ ἑαυτῶν<sup>66</sup>  
θυγάτηρ  
SEG XL 481. Malloia.  
1st CE?<sup>67</sup>
- 24\* Πῶλλα Γεμενία Φιλόκαλον  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 10992/3. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Gemenius 1)
- 25\* Πῶλλα Γρανία Ἀμμία  
EAD XXX 20. Rheneia.  
Late 2nd / early 1st BCE.  
(Ferrary et al. (n. 57) Granii 18)
- 26\* Τερτία Ἰρρία Βερενίκη  
IG XII,9 854. Euboea.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(LGPN I 10)
- 27 Ti. Iulia Ti. Iuli Diviciaci l. Smertuca  
BRGK 17, 1927, 71 nr. 216.  
Mogontiacum.  
1st CE.
- 28\* C. Iulia Bovana Triti f.  
CIL II 666. Villamesias.  
Early 1st CE.<sup>68</sup>
- 29 L. Lallia L. I. Salvia  
AE 1982, 145. Tusculum.  
1st CE.
- 30 Πῶλλα Λικιννία Ἐρμιόνη,  
Στράτωνος Κυδαθηnéως γυνή  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 11331. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Licinnius 28)
- 31 Μαρκία Λουκία Ζωσίμη  
Ἀφροδεισίου ἀπελευθέρρα  
SEG XXV 687. Larisa. 1st CE?<sup>69</sup>  
(LGPN IIIb 27)
- 32 Πῶλλα Μαικία Ἐυδάμα, Δωροθέου  
Ἀναγυρασίου γύνη  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 5623. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Maecius 5)

<sup>64</sup> She was the *nutrix* of Ser. Cornelius Dolabella Metilianus (*cos.* 113 CE; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1350). Although the inscription might even be from the early 2nd c., it may be concluded that she must have lived most of her life during the 1st c.

<sup>65</sup> Kajava (above n. 3) 82. Hallof (*IG*) dates this to the latter half of the 1st c. CE but gives no arguments for this. An earlier date should be conceivable as well, especially as these are not T. Flavii.

<sup>66</sup> Refers to Λούκιος Γέλλιος and Καλπουρνια Ἰγγένοια; thus the daughter must have been a Roman citizen and had a nomen (likely Gellia). Presumably because of this, she has been left out of *LGPN* IIIb. See also *SEG* XLIII 289.

<sup>67</sup> Undated, but since the father lacks a

cognomen, the date should not be later than early imperial, and on the other hand not an earlier date is suggested by the spellings λου- and καλπου- (see above n. 39).

<sup>68</sup> *AE* 1991, 978; cf. *HEp* 4, 1994, nr. 259.

<sup>69</sup> See above p. 88–89.

- 33 Πῶλλα Μαικία Λαυδίκη ἡ καὶ ἐξ  
Οἴου, Λευκίου ἐξ Οἴου γυνή  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 6997. Attica.  
1st BCE/CE.<sup>70</sup>  
(Byrne (n. 41) Maecius 2)
- 34 Τερτία Μαικία Ποπλίου  
Ῥωμαία Διοδώρα  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 10157. Attica.  
1st BCE.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Maecius 6)
- 35\* Τερτία Μαικία Ποσίδεον  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 12769. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Maecius 4)
- 36 Πῶλλα Μαμιλία Κοίντου  
Κλεοπάτρα, Μάρκου Ἰουνίου  
Τρύφωνος γυνή  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 12030. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Mamilius 1)
- 37 Λο(υκία) Μαρί(α) Ἀθην<sup>ν</sup> ἔκ  
Φαληρέων, [γυ]νὴ Ἐπικτήτου  
Μελιτέως  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 7592. Attica.  
1st CE?<sup>71</sup>  
(Byrne (n. 41) Marius 1)
- 38 Polla Matidia Sp. f. Olumphia  
CIL XIII 12075. Asciburgium.  
Augustan / early 1st CE.<sup>72</sup>
- 39 Πρεῖμα Μεττία Εὐταξία,  
γυνὴ δὲ Ποπλίου Μεττίου νεωτέρου  
IG IV<sup>2</sup>,2 939. (unknown origin).  
1st BCE / early imp.
- 40 Πῶλλα Μουνατία Ἐλένη,  
Θεοφίλου γυνή  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 11253. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Munatius 6)
- 41\* Πῶλλα Μουνατία Ἡράκλεια  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 6596. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Munatius 7)
- 42 [---]η Μουνατία [Α]ῦλου  
θυγάτηρ Πωλλίττα  
IG XII,4,3 1385. Kos.  
Early imp.<sup>73</sup>  
(LGPN I 1)
- 43 Σακόνδα Νων(ί)α ἡ καὶ Ἐλπῖς  
Γαίου θυγάτηρ Ῥωμαία, γυνὴ δὲ  
Αὔλου Γρανίου  
EAD XXX 52. Rheneia.  
Late 2nd / early 1st BCE.  
(Ferrary et al. (n. 57) Nonii 4)
- 44\* [Π]ῶλλα Ὀκταία Αὐγή  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 10906. Attica  
Aug. / 1st CE.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Octavius 12)
- 45 Πῶλλα Ὀφελλία Γαίου Ῥωμαία  
Ζωσίμη  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 10161. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Ofellius/Ofillius 8)
- 46 Tertia Oppia Mus Murtae I.  
SupplIt IX 141. Ager Amiterninus.  
1st CE.
- 47 Τερτία Ὠραρία Ποπλίου Ῥωμ[αία],  
γ[υνη] δὲ Ποπλίου, Τρυφέρα  
EAD XXX 58. Rheneia.  
Late 2nd BCE.  
(LGPN I 7)
- 48 L. Otronia Plautia  
CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2468. Praeneste.  
Before 82 BCE.<sup>74</sup>

<sup>73</sup> Our date (grounds: praenomen); 2nd c. CE  
Hollof (IG).

<sup>74</sup> The foundation of Sulla's colony in 82  
BCE sets a *terminus ante quem* for the cippus  
inscriptions of Praeneste's old cemetery.

<sup>70</sup> Kajava (above n. 3) 56.

<sup>71</sup> See above n. 39.

<sup>72</sup> See above p. 84.

- 49 Πῶλλα Πακωνία Σπορίου Γλυκῆα  
IK 58, 192. Byzantion.  
1st BCE / early imp.<sup>75</sup>  
(LGPN IV 3)
- 50 Πρῆμα Πακουία Ποπλίου θυγάτηρ ἄ  
καὶ Δαλιάς  
IK 41, 415. Knidos.  
Augustan.  
(LGPN Vb 2)
- 51 Σακόνδα Παπειρία Ζοσίμη,  
Εὐβούλου Ἀναγυρασίου γυνή  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 5628. Attica.  
Late 1st BCE / early 1st CE.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Papirius 1)
- 52\* A. Paxaea A. I. Nardis  
CIL VI 36058 (= ILS 8088). Rome.  
1st CE.  
(Solon (n. 62) p. 1182)
- 53\* Πῶλλα Περιλία Ἰσιδότη  
IK 23, 493. Smyrna.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(LGPN Va 2)
- 54 Πῶλλα Κοιντία Ποπλίου Συμμαχία  
Ῥωμαία, Ποπλίου Κοιντίου  
Πλούτου γυνή  
SEG XXXII 308. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Quintius 5)
- 55 Πῶλ[λα] Κοιντ[ιλία?] Ἀσκληπ[ιά]ς,  
Ἀπολλοφ[άνου] γυνή  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 11883a. Attica.  
Aug. / 1st CE.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Quintius 3)
- 56 Σ(εστα?) Satia Sext(i) f. Maxsuma  
coniux  
ILN 1, 155 = AE 1971, 244.  
Forum Iulii. Early imp.
- 57 Πῶλλα Σηία ἢ Ποπλίου Πυθιάς  
IG XII,4,3 1293. Kos.  
1st BCE.
- 58 Πῶλλα Σηία ἢ Ποπλίου Τρύφαινα  
IG XII,4,3 1293. Kos.  
1st BCE.
- 59 Paulla Sergia Cn.Cn. I. C(h)rysis  
CIL I<sup>2</sup> 3021. Rome.  
Late rep.  
(Solon (n. 62) p. 1226)
- 60 [Π]ῶλλα Σερου[ειλία ---]  
τιον ἢ καὶ Σ.[---]  
Ag. XVII 967. Attica.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Servilius 5)
- 61\* Πῶλλα Σερ[ο]υιλία Ἀντιοχίς  
SEG LIV 235. Attica.  
Mid 1st BCE.  
(seangb.org s.v. Ἀντιοχίς<sup>76</sup>)
- 62\* Κοῖντα Στατία Ἐπιγόνη  
IG IX,2 837. Larisa.  
1st BCE?  
(LGPN IIIb 3)
- 63 Τερτία Στερτινία Σπορίου  
Ἀλεξάνδρα  
EAD XXX 161. Rheneia.  
Late 2nd / early 1st BCE.  
(Ferrary et al. (n. 57) Stertinius 13)
- 64\* Πῶλλα Σταλακία Χαρίτιν  
EAD XXX 184. Rheneia.  
Late 2nd / early 1st BCE.  
(Ferrary et al. (n. 57) Stlaccii 6)

<sup>75</sup> As with many other grave stelae from Byzantion, Lajtar (IK) follows the date given in N. Firatlı & L. Robert, *Les stèles funéraires de Byzance gréco-romaine*, Paris 1964, which is based on the typology of the reliefs. Often, however, the Roman onomastic features occurring in these stelae suggest somewhat later periods; the inscriptions may be added later (see above p. 95 with n. 52).

<sup>76</sup> Πῶλλα Σερουιλία and Ἀντιοχίς appear on succeeding lines and interpreted here as a separate person. However, the Greek name has been cut indented by a space of two letters, unlike all other names listed; therefore it likely belongs together with the previous line.

- 65 Νεμερί'α<sup>1</sup> Στλακκία ...[..]σα<sup>77</sup>  
PSI 10, 1099. Oxyrhynchos  
6/5 BCE.  
(trismegistos.org/person/261619)
- 66 Secunda Titia T. f. Vesconia  
CIL XI 2216. Etruria.  
1st BCE/CE.
- 67 Πώλλα Τυλλία Νικόπολις  
IG XII,4,3 1529,I. Kos.  
Latter half of 1st BCE.
- 68\* Πώλλα Όμβρία Κληοδόξη  
IG XII,4,3 2911. Kos.  
1st CE.
- 69 Τερτία Όμβρική Λευκίου Μεγίστη  
IG XII,4,3 1291,I. Kos.  
1st BCE.  
(LGPN I 13)
- 70 Τερτία Όμβρική Λευκίου Παμφίλα  
IG XII,4,3 1291,II. Kos.  
1st BCE.  
(LGPN I 1)
- 71 Πώλλα Ούα[λερία ---]  
ή καὶ ἐκ Χο[---]  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 12382. Attica.  
1st BCE/CE.<sup>78</sup>  
(Byrne (n. 41) Valerius 4)
- 72\* G. Valeria G. f. Valentina  
ILBulg 75 = AE 1975, 295. Oescus.  
69–79 CE.
- 73\* Πώλλα Βετιλινὴ Βουλαρχίς  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 10977. Attica.  
Aug. / 1st CE.  
(Byrne (n. 41) Betilienus 1)

<sup>77</sup> This is the only Greek case of this female praenomen predating the 2nd c. CE, and was missed by Kajava. The name appears in the dative, and the last letter of the praenomen was corrected to alpha from omicron by the scribe. The cognomen is unrecognisable; as it ends with ]σηι, one could think of e.g. a seven-letter Greek name with -ουσα.

<sup>78</sup> Kajava (above n. 3) 57.

- 74\* Πόλλα Ουεττηνὴ Ζωσίμη  
IG XII,9 852. Euboea.  
1st BCE / early imp.  
(LGPN I 23)
- 75 Πώλλ[α ---] Φιλου[μένη ---] ἐκ  
Σημαχ[ιδῶν? ---] Σημαχ[ίδου γυνή?]  
IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 7389. Attica.  
1st BCE/CE.<sup>79</sup>  
(LGPN II 30)

#### Uncertain cases not discussed above

- 1) Πώλλα Ρωμαία Τρύφαινα  
A. Maiuri, Nuova silloge epigrafica  
di Rodi e Cos, Firenze 1925, nr. 346.  
Rhodes. 1st CE. (LGPN I 9)

To Kajava (n. 3, 59), "it seems as if the nomen (and the filiation) were dropped", which is possible. On the other hand, Romaeus is a nomen attested in the West, and perhaps in an epitaph from Rheneia as well (EAD XXX 150; cf. Ferrary et al. (n. 57), 212 with note 56).

- 2) Ροῦφα ἢ καὶ Σώτειρα  
IC II v,44. Axos.  
Augustan / 1st CE. (LGPN I 1)

She appears as daughter of Ροῦφα Οὐεντίλια and niece of Ροῦφος Οὐεντίλιος Θαμυρίων. Her nomen could have been omitted, but it is equally possible that she did not possess Roman citizenship. In any case, though, it is interesting that she had a Greek agnomen and her uncle had a Greek cognomen, whereas the mother had duo nomina only.

<sup>79</sup> Kajava (above n. 3) 56

**Table of provenances of the source material**

Rome	4	Attica	26
Latium	2	Thessaly	3
Samnium	5	Moesia inferior	1
Etruria	1	Delos	6
Venetia et Histria	2	Kos	10
Hispania	1	Other Aegean islands	6
Gallia	1	Asia Minor	4
Germania	2	Egypt	1

**The following other inscriptions were mentioned in the discussion:**

BCH 47, 1923, 381 nr. 10 + SEG IV 575	EAD XXX	150
CIL I <sup>2</sup> 233a	IG II/III <sup>2</sup>	5172
143		5540
207		7091
271	IG V,2	542
290	IG X,2,1	97
293	IG XII,4,2	960 A, B
300	IG XII,4,3	1464
301		2809
311		2875
561		2897
1109	IG XII,6,2	710
1263	IGUR II	672
1330	IK 39	101
1476	IK 40	1042
1772	IK 41	53
1837		86
2041	ILBulg	323
2210	IPergamon III	18
CIL III 9364	SupplIt XVI	28
CIL VI 28156		29
CIL VIII 18963 = ILAlg II, 5045	TAM II	2 438
CIL XII 4588 = 5093		