

## NAMES IN *-POR* AND SLAVE NAMING IN REPUBLICAN ROME

In Quintilian and Festus we read that slaves were, in some antique age, known simply by a derivation from their masters' names; thus Marcipor from Marcus, Lucipor from Lucius, and so on. The practice is also mentioned by Pliny and the grammarians Probus and Priscian.<sup>1</sup> The *-por* element has been explained as *puer*, undergoing syncope and passing from an *-o-* to a consonantal stem in the third declension. It is attached to the genitive of the master's praenomen, the long final syllable of which has, in some cases at least, been shortened.<sup>2</sup> Many have accepted this reconstruction.<sup>3</sup> It has also been noted that Varro bewailed some sort of change in the form or nature of slaves' names, a change which it is easy to identify as the desuetude of these names in *-por*.<sup>4</sup>

As Mommsen observed, names like this are hardly names at all; more like labels.<sup>5</sup> They certainly have a beguilingly archaic flavour that sits well with the legal conception of slaves as property. But the same historian regretted the absence of a useful explanation of their origin and usage.<sup>6</sup> This absence persists today. It will be argued here that this is because there is really no salvaging the standard account of these (in practice, very rare) names, to which scholars have nonetheless generally, if at times uncertainly, clung.

<sup>1</sup> Quint. 1.4.26; Festus 306L; Plin. *HN* 33.26; Probus, *GL* 4.16; Priscian, *GL* 3.26.

<sup>2</sup> W. Lindsay, *The Latin Language* (Oxford, 1894), 183; F. Neue and C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1902), 266–7; A. Walde and J.B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1940), 2.382; A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*<sup>4</sup> (Paris, 1959–66), 543; F. Bader, *La Formation des composés nominaux du Latin* (Paris, 1962), 316; M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Leumann-Hofman-Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* 1: Munich, 1977), 134 §142d; T. Lindner, *Lateinischer Komposita. Morphologie, historische und lexikalische Studien* (Innsbruck, 2002), 228–9. The nom. pl. *Marcipores* and *Lucipores* are given by Pliny loc. cit., the gen. sing. *Quintiporis* by Varro ap. Non. Marc. 168L, and the dat. sing. *Naepori* by epigraphy (see below).

<sup>3</sup> J. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben des Römer* (Leipzig, 1886), 19; A. Oxé, 'Zur älteren Nomenklatur der römischen Sklaven', *Rh. Mus.* 59 (1904), 108–40 at 108; E. Fraenkel, s.v. 'Namenwesen', *RE* 16.1665; M.I. Finley, *Aspects of Antiquity*<sup>2</sup> (London, 1971), 155; H. Solin, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom* (Helsinki, 1971), 92–3. This is just a selection. The only firm doubter has been R. Lazzaroni, 'Contatti di lingue e di culture nell'Italia antica: i nomi servili in *-por*', *RAL* 8th ser. 34 (1979), 143–8. A more non-committal view is implied by H. Rix, 'Römische Personennamen', in edd. var., *Namenforschung / Name Studies / Les noms propres* (Berlin, 1996), 1.724–32 at 731: 'Ein Kuriosum ist der seltene und noch in der Republik aufgegebene Typ von (Pseudo-) Komposita aus dem Patronuspraenomen und *puer* in der Bedeutung "Sklave".'

<sup>4</sup> Varro, *Ling.* 9.22: 'quotus quisque iam seruos habet priscis nominibus?' For the link, cf. e.g. J.-P. Cèbe, *Varron. Satires Ménippées* (Collection de l'École Française de Rome 9: Rome, 1985), 7.1225–6.

<sup>5</sup> Th. Mommsen, *Römische Staatstrecht*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1887), 3. 201 n. 3, treating names in *-por* as informal designations for officially nameless slaves.

<sup>6</sup> Mommsen (n. 5), 201 n. 3: 'Die Sitte ... jedoch eine brauchbare Erklärung nicht überliefert'.

## ATTESTATIONS, LITERARY AND EPIGRAPHIC

A few instances of names in *-por* in use are known from ancient texts. The earliest seems to be the Marcipor Oppii who played the Tyrian pipes at a public performance of Plautus' *Stichus* in 200 B.C.<sup>7</sup> A comic poet called Quintipor Clodius is twice referred to in that form by Varro, whose contemporary he has been held to be.<sup>8</sup> The battered remnants of the fugitive slaves led by Crixus escaped into Lucania under the command of a certain Publipor.<sup>9</sup> The status of these individuals is not stated explicitly by the sources, but (especially in the first and last cases) it seems reasonable to hold that they were slaves or freedmen. The form 'Quintipor Clodius' is easily and naturally explained as an inversion, with cognomen prefixed to the nomen and thereby reflecting the fact that it had been the playwright's personal name in slavery. But uncertainty about the precise status of these men and their full names precludes further comment, at least for the time being. Even less open to immediate analysis is the fact that one of Varro's Menippean Satires was entitled *Marcipor* – but to this we shall return.<sup>10</sup>

Epigraphic evidence for the usage of these names is also rare, though it does exist.<sup>11</sup> The five clearest cases are all, quite certainly, the cognomina of freedmen:

<i>CIL</i> 1 <sup>2</sup> .996	P. Cornelius P. I. Gaipor
<i>CIL</i> 1 <sup>2</sup> .1263 ( <i>ILS</i> 4405, <i>ILLRP</i> 159)	A. Caecili A. I. Olipor(is)
<i>CIL</i> 1 <sup>2</sup> .1342	.....] L. I. Naepori
<i>CIL</i> 1 <sup>2</sup> .1358 ( <i>ILS</i> 7822, <i>ILLRP</i> 913)	M. Pinari. P. I. Marpor
<i>CIL</i> 1 <sup>2</sup> .2046 ( <i>ILS</i> 7283)	C. Socconius C. I. Olipor

'Naepor' and 'Marpor' are explicable as syncopated forms of (*G*)*naei-por* and *Marci-por* respectively. By contrast, the long *i* recorded in the second instance seems to confirm that the leading element is the genitive of *Olus* (= *Aulus*).<sup>12</sup>

Two other examples from Latin epigraphy should be mentioned, though neither is particularly helpful. An inscribed gem in the British Museum, apparently showing an actor, reads *Quintipor Cocidei*; no more amenable to interpretation than the examples

<sup>7</sup> Didascalion in the Codex Ambrosianus of Plautus, fo. 681v. See F. Ritschel, *Parerga zu Plautus und Terenz* (Berlin, 1845), 1.249–80. The 'lost comedy' of Plautus called *Marcipor* referred to by D.C. Swanson, *The Names in Roman Verse* (Madison, 1967), 199, is presumably a misunderstanding of this or of Varro's Menippean satire of that name (on which see below).

<sup>8</sup> Non. Marc. 168, 719L; cf. M. Schuster s.v., *RE* 35, 1269.

<sup>9</sup> Sall. *Hist.* 3.99M.

<sup>10</sup> Non. Marc. 451.6L (*Sat. Men.*, ed. R. Astbury, 46).

<sup>11</sup> See the brief discussion of A.E. Gordon, *Illustrated Guide to Latin Epigraphy* (Berkeley, 1983), 25–6. Possibly relevant, if they can be explained as misspellings, but ultimately unhelpful: *CIL* 6.8757, *Neapolis corinthiarum*; 10.8042.69 (tegula, Eboli), *Luipor Ploti*. Note also 11.6695.65 (Modena Museum): amphora stamp reading *nae por*, treated by M.H. Callender, *Roman Amphorae, with index of stamps* (Oxford, 1965), 213, no. 1370.17, as one of a class of potters' stamps incorporating reference to a *portus* or warehouse. A number of Dressel 1A amphorae stamped *NAEPOR* have been reported from a wreck near Marseilles (La Ciotat 3): Giuliano Volpe, *Secondo convegno di archeologia subacquea AIASub, Rosignano Marittimo, 7–9 Sept. 2001* <<http://www.archeosub.it/aiaesub/rosignan.htm>> accessed 18 Jan. 2008.

<sup>12</sup> The long *i* is visible in the photograph reproduced by G. Paci, 'Iscrizione tardo-repubblicana di Roma ritrovata al Museo di Fiesole', *Epigraphica* 38 (1976), 120–5 at 122. Gordon (n. 11), 26, offers in explanation 'word accent with enclitic *-por*'. See below for discussion of vowel quantities.

known from literature.<sup>13</sup> It is perhaps an inversion – a freedman’s cognomen followed by a gentilicium (Cocideius) in abbreviated form – or a slave name followed by the same gentilicium in the genitive in reference to his master.<sup>14</sup>

More wordy, but equally obscure, is *CIL* 9.2818 from Samnite Aufidena: *P. Rubrio Latino Sicinius P. por patrono suo*. The word *patrono* (as opposed to *domino*) makes it clear that the dedicator, Sicinius P(ubli)por, was free. But the client’s nomen ‘Sicinius’, a rare but attested gentilicium,<sup>15</sup> would seem to suggest that he was not the freedman of this particular patron; we can therefore draw no firm conclusion from the apparent match between the patron’s praenomen ‘Publius’ and the client’s designation ‘Publi-por’ – which in its abbreviated form does not look like a cognomen. The inscription is obscure and best left alone in the present context.

Nonetheless, excepting these last two cases, the epigraphic evidence is important. It is widely accepted that, on receiving freedom, a slave would take his master’s nomen (and, from the Late Republic onwards, the master’s praenomen too)<sup>16</sup> while retaining the single name he had borne in slavery as his new cognomen. In this the freed slave resembles the newly enfranchised citizen, the cognomen generally being relied on as preserving the sole name used by each in his previous existence, and – common sense would seem to suggest – retaining its earlier function as his true personal name.<sup>17</sup> We may reasonably conclude that the instances of cognomina in *-por* from *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> given above represent slave names retained after manumission. If so, they are tantamount to proof of the use of such names by slaves.

This does not get us very far, however, for reasons already hinted. With one exception the patrons indicated in the extended onomastic formulae listed above are not those suggested by the cognomina themselves. Thus Gaipor’s patron was a Publius, Naepor’s a Lucius. (Interestingly, the exception – Olipor/Aulus – is the one instance where the long *-i* of the purported genitive case is marked.) This mismatch between patron and freedman might just show that the freedmen concerned had had more than one master, their cognomina originating from the earliest.<sup>18</sup> If so, however, we are surely seeing in these inscriptions – at most – the dog-end of an earlier practice, one in which the logic and system of ancient usage has been abandoned. These designations are personal names, kept for life, rather than labels that depended automatically on the master’s praenomen.

<sup>13</sup> *Catalogue of Engraved Gems and Cameos in the British Museum*<sup>2</sup> (London, 1926), 234 no. 2290. A better image is in A. Furtwängler, *Die antiken Gemmen* (Leipzig, 1900) 1, pl. 26 no. 39; description *ibid.* 2.131. It appears to show the head of a young male with a female mask pushed back on top of his head.

<sup>14</sup> For the nomina *Cocidius/-eius* and *Caucidius/-eius*, see W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Darmstadt, 1904), 213, 348, 441, with H. Solin and O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum* (Hildesheim, 1988), 51, 58.

<sup>15</sup> Schulze (n. 14), 231, lists instances of this and other possibly related names starting with Sicinius Tuscus or Sabinus, cos. 487 B.C. Less probably, a cognomen, perhaps a form of the Greek name Σικω(ν)ος, but this is also relatively rare; four examples in *LGPN* (vol. 1: one; vol. 2: three), all 5th to 1st c. B.C.

<sup>16</sup> O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen* (Helsinki, 1987), 232–8.

<sup>17</sup> See for instance B. Salway, ‘What’s in a name? A survey of Roman onomastic practice from c. 700 B.C. to c. A.D. 700’, *JRS* 84 (1994), 124–45 at 128. Accordingly H. Solin, *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen. Ein Namenbuch* (Stuttgart, 1996), collects the individual names of slaves and the cognomina of *liberti* alike. There are recorded exceptions to the practice, such as the learned slave Passicles who on being freed took the more genteel cognomen Pansa (Suet., *Gram.* 18); but their exceptionality is generally unquestioned.

<sup>18</sup> Thus Fraenkel (n. 3), 1665.

Inscriptions cannot, of course, take us back to the period that interests us. That three of the five listed above are from the Late Republic is clear from the fact that they have the same praenomina as their patrons. That all five are from the first century is obvious from the simple fact that they have cognomina at all<sup>19</sup> – without which they would be of no interest to us. The cognomina of freedmen recorded epigraphically cannot, in short, tell us about the names of slaves in the Early and Mid Republic. And for their own age, these ones are clearly untypical; A. Caecilius Olipor, for instance, is listed together with two *coliberti*, who are not other Olipores but an Alexander and an Asia, names typical of the Late Republican and Imperial periods.

Before moving on from the epigraphic evidence one must note two late Etruscan inscriptions from the area of Clusium naming members of the *lautni* class: *CIE* 955 (= *CIL* 11.2175) *nepur papasla lavt(n)i*;<sup>20</sup> and *CIE* 2994 *neipur l marales*.<sup>21</sup> The *lautni* are usually understood as a category of family dependents equivalent in some way to *liberti* or slaves. They frequently bear non-Etruscan individual names. After 90 B.C. and the extension of Roman citizenship to the cities of Etruria the style used for *lautni* becomes more regular and more closely modelled on that of Roman *liberti*, while the word *lautni* itself was doubtless now more narrowly used to reflect the new equivalence.<sup>22</sup> The two cited cases seem to show an individual name used in one case with a gentilicium in the nominative (*papasla*) and once with a gentilicium in the genitive, referring to the patron (*marales*). Editors have generally accepted that the name in question is an Etruscanized version of the Latin ‘Naepor’,<sup>23</sup> though as has been pointed out the form implies that it was a late borrowing and independent of the longer-standing use of the praenomen Gnaeus in the form *cneve* with its derived gentilicium *cnevna* / *cneuna*.<sup>24</sup>

These two items are just as difficult to make use of as the Latin epigraphy discussed before them. In neither case do we know the praenomen of the *lautni*’s patron or owner, though there is evidence that the praenomen *nae* was used not only in the same area as the findspot of *CIE* 955 but by a family with the same gentilicium as the family in whose tomb that inscription was found.<sup>25</sup> This is significant because the form *nae* appears to represent a later borrowing from Latin Gnaeus than the longer-established *cneve* mentioned above, and as such is not widespread in Etruscan epigraphy. However, for this to be relevant one needs to posit that the *-por* suffix

<sup>19</sup> Salomies (n. 16), 230–1; M. Cèbeillac-Gervasoni, ‘Le cognomen des affranchis: quelques remarques de chronologie’, *Annales Latini Montium Arvernorum* 16 (1989), 89–103.

<sup>20</sup> ‘Ossuarium fictile’ from Chianciano; alternative readings given in *CIE*. The name *papasla* is represented by the nomen *Papirius* in Latin inscriptions from the same tomb. This man’s wife or daughter *thanna naeipurs* is named (in Latin letters) on another, *CIE* 956 = *CIL* 11.2174.

<sup>21</sup> ‘Tegula sepulcralis’, inscribed in the Latin alphabet. For the gentilicium *marale* see Schulze (n. 14), 360.

<sup>22</sup> H. Rix, *Das etruskische Cognomen* (Wiesbaden, 1965), 356–72. On the *lautni* class, see J. Heurgon, ‘Classes et ordres chez les Etrusques’, in *Colloque CNRS Caen 1969* (Paris, 1970), 29–41, M. Torelli, ‘L’esclavage en Etrurie’, in *Actes du Colloque Besançon 1973* (Paris, 1976), 101–13.

<sup>23</sup> The identification seems to be accepted by Rix (n. 22), 364, listing *ne(i)pur* among Latin names borne as individual names by *lautni*. The alternative (*Naepor* as a Latin borrowing from Etruscan *neipur*) recommended itself to Ernout-Millet (n. 2), 543.

<sup>24</sup> Schulze (n. 14), 332 n. 1; *SE* 48 (1980), 369. Following Schulze, Fraenkel (n. 3) takes this late borrowing as suggesting the recent status of all names in *-por*; cf. also Walde-Hofmann (n. 2), 382.

<sup>25</sup> *SE* (n. 24), 369 (= *Rivista di Epigrafia Etrusca* 1.62): ossuarium from Chianciano inscribed *nae papasa vilinal*. Only one other case known: *CIE* 978.

somehow became absorbed as a productive element in Etruscan slave onomastics, preserving its sense and intelligibility despite the completely alien linguistic context. It seems much more likely that *lautni* called *ne(i)pur*, like those with Etruscianized versions of names like Diphilus, Antiochus and Eucles, simply bore individual names of foreign origin without particular regard for their lexical sense.

### FASHIONS IN SLAVE NAMES

So what gave rise to the tale that names in *-por* had once been the norm? Pliny furnishes the answer, dealing obliquely with a point that might occur to anyone, modern or ancient, who considers the traditional account. Would things not have been rather confusing, even in a moderately sized *familia*, if all the slaves had the same name?<sup>26</sup> No: Pliny's point is that the *antiqui* led such a simple, unadorned existence that they only had one slave each. It was his own contemporaries, with their battalions of slaves, who not only had to guard against these thronging alien masses but to employ a *nomenclator* to identify them all by name.<sup>27</sup>

So the *antiqui* had only one slave per household. Does this really resolve the practicality question? Probably not. Roman conservatism with regard to praenomina would have ensured that confusion would still arise in the forum or anywhere else where slaves from different households met. If the practicality of names in *-por* as identifiers had been an issue, it would have been insufficient for them to function merely within the household; the world was larger than that, even for a slave. And if there ever really was a period in which a quota of one slave per *familia* was the norm, was it likely, to be frank, that reliable onomastic information could have come down from that epoch? The likelihood, in fact, is that Pliny's account transmits not a reliable historical account of the origin of slave names in *-por*, but rather the motive for the later belief that they had existed. The moral that it imparts, about the sumptuary restraint of early Romans, is too common, too charged a theme for it to play an innocent role here.<sup>28</sup>

Festus adduces the information about antique slave names without commenting on the economic picture that it implied, though Quintilian's language implies an element of nostalgia for the passing of a venerable, once widespread practice.<sup>29</sup> Something not dissimilar can be said of Varro (if he is indeed referring to the topic in hand): change in fashion with regard to possessions parallels change in the words by

<sup>26</sup> Gordon (n. 11), 26. Talmudic stories of Rabban Gamaliel and his slaves, always called *Tabi* or *Tabita* (cf. particularly Talmud Yerushalmi *Nid.* 1, 5. 49b) are surely to be understood in the context of exemplary literature and not used as evidence of how the first-century A.D. patriarch actually named his slaves, as by Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity* (Oxford, 2005), 49. Some confusion, perhaps, was courted by the collector Sir Thomas Phillipps, Bt., of Middle Hill (1792–1872), who liked to ‘surround himself’ with servants (and others such as tenants) who shared his surname; A.N.L. Munby, *Portrait of an Obsession* (London, 1967), 262 n. 1.

<sup>27</sup> *HN* 33.26: ‘hoc profecere mancipiorum legiones, in domo turba externa ac iam seruorum quoque causa nomenclator adhibendus. aliter apud antiquos singuli Marcipores Luciporesque dominorum gentiles omnem uictum in promiscuo habebant, nec ulla domi a domesticis custodia opus erat.’

<sup>28</sup> See for instance W.V. Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome* (Oxford, 1979), 264–5, note XI. On the paucity of slaves, Dion. Hal. 19.15.1; Val. Max. 4.3.6, 4.5; Frontin. 4.3.3. Varro, *Ling.* 8.10, refers to a household with only one slave needing only one slave name; but this is a step in a linguistic argument, not the memory of an earlier phase in economic history, still less an oblique reference to names in *-por*.

<sup>29</sup> ‘In seruis iam intercidit illud genus quod ducebatur a domino, unde Marcipores Publiporesque’.

which those possessions are known; just as in the design of crockery and furniture, fashion rules, so – Varro argues – slaves' names and even the words used for items of clothing and jewellery change over time. The motif of sumptuary change is still present.

There is evidence that fashions in slave names did change in the course of the late Republic. The earlier forms were not names in *-por*, however, but simple Italian names found outside Rome (and occasionally there as well) as praenomina or single names. Aulus Gellius mentions a slave by the name of Statius, and explains (*NA* 4.20.12–13):

Statius autem seruire nomen fuit. plerique apud ueteres serui eo nomine fuerunt. Caecilius quoque, ille comoediarum poeta inclutus, seruus fuit et propterea nomen habuit Statius. sed postea uersum est quasi in cognomentum, appellatusque est Caecilius Statius.

The sources bear out Gellius. Quintus Cicero, for one, had a slave called Statius,<sup>30</sup> and down to the end of the first century A.D. the urban epigraphy of Rome provides sixteen examples of freedmen with the cognomen Statius, and five cases of freedwomen called Stasia; there is only one case (slightly doubtful, it must be added) of a freed Statius thereafter.<sup>31</sup> Strikingly, Statius was a widespread praenomen outside the city and far from unknown even within it.<sup>32</sup> Like other praenomina in *-ius* it gave rise to a set of derived nomina gentilicia (Statilius, Statinius, Stateius); but it also crops up in that role itself, in underived form.<sup>33</sup> Statius was not, in short, a name restricted to slaves.

Another name that was clearly in the same category was Salvius. Again a widespread praenomen in Italy, and not that rare at Rome, where it also appeared as a nomen gentilicium (most prominently in the case of Salvius Otho, the *princeps* of 69),<sup>34</sup> it was a very popular name indeed for slaves in the republican period. The first leader of the slave revolt of 104 B.C. in Sicily was a Salvius (though he soon redesignated himself Tryphon)<sup>35</sup> and Caesar and Atticus both had slaves called Salvius.<sup>36</sup> Those urban inscriptions that can be dated with reasonable security before A.D. 100 produce 117 like-named freedmen – as well as 76 freedwomen called Salvia.<sup>37</sup> Of the remaining 21 Salvii and 13 Salviae of freed status from urban epigraphy, it is highly likely that the majority were also from the early imperial period. Unlike Statius, Salvius and Salvia also spawned a range of diminutive forms that continue to show up as freedmen's cognomina long after the disuse of their simple progenitor forms: Salvianus, Salvillus (and Salvilla), and – possibly – Salvitto.<sup>38</sup> In having long-lasting diminutive forms Salvius resembled certain standard praenomina: Lucius, Marcus and Quintus, for instance, while occurring occasionally as slave names in their underived form, survive much more often as diminutives such as Lucias, Marcellus, Marcio, Quintio.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>30</sup> *RE* 3A.2215 (no. 2).

<sup>31</sup> Solin (n. 17), 6.

<sup>32</sup> Salomies (n. 16), 90–1.

<sup>33</sup> Schulze (n. 14), 236–7; Solin and Salomies (n. 14), 176.

<sup>34</sup> Salomies (n. 16), 88–90; Schulze, 93, 472. There was also a related female praenomen Saluta, used occasionally as a slave name: Schulze, 472, Solin (n. 17), 11.

<sup>35</sup> Diod. Sic. 36, 4, 4.

<sup>36</sup> *RE* 1A.2022 (nos. 4 and 5).

<sup>37</sup> Solin (n. 17), 7–10. There is even a Salvia ♂. Salvia: *CIL* 6.25842.

<sup>38</sup> Solin (n. 17), 10–11. I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki, 1965), 177.

<sup>39</sup> Solin (n. 17), 3–6.

A few further possible cases can be identified: the Oscan praenomen Paccius,<sup>40</sup> recorded as the name of one of Cato the Elder's slaves,<sup>41</sup> and as the cognomen of a freedman *thurarius* well known from epigraphy, perhaps an Oriental, if his claim to have belonged to the household of Mithridates is to be believed;<sup>42</sup> Papius, another Oscan name, found as the cognomen of several freedmen including one manumitted by a Domitius Ahenobarbus,<sup>43</sup> though it might in some cases be a Greek or Asiatic name,<sup>44</sup> itself found in derived form as a Roman slave name;<sup>45</sup> the Latin praenomen Licinus, usually assumed to be the name at the root of the gentilicium Licinius,<sup>46</sup> perhaps overlapping with an identical name of Celtic origin.<sup>47</sup> All these names are found as slave names or freedmen's cognomina, but not after the first century A.D.

It would be impossible to demonstrate that Varro was referring to names like this. There is, however, a fair likelihood. They were still used to a certain extent in his day, but they were already on the wane, retreating before the tide of Greek and graecizing names that were to characterize slave onomastics until the end of the Roman era. The ground already yielded was certainly enough to permit a traditionally minded antiquarian to speak of the change in fashion as all but accomplished. Nor was it only antiquarians who observed the process. Cicero – whose own slaves, and those of his friends, were practically all named in accordance with the new fashion – could stigmatize a Greek name as servile when the need arose.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Salomies (n. 16), 83–4.

<sup>41</sup> Plut. *Cat. mai.* 10.6.

<sup>42</sup> Ego sum L. Lutatius | Paccius thurarius | de familia rege (sic) Mitridatis: *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.1334a (*ILLRP* 817), cf. 6.27728. See S. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen in the Late Republic* (Oxford, 1969), 267; G. Fabre, *Libertus: patrons et affranchis à Rome* (Rome, 1981), 342. J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'orient hellénistique* (Paris, 1919), 135–6, saw him as an Italian merchant. It is not wholly impossible that he was making a genealogical claim (*familia = gens*). His own freedmen conformed to a later standard: Seleucus, Pamphilus, Tryphon, Philotas (1<sup>2</sup>.1334b).

<sup>43</sup> L. Domitius Ahenob. 1. Papius: *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.1995 (*ILLRP* 915). Five cases in Solin (n. 17), 7; among the *magistri* at Minturnae is a Papius with a prominent apex over the *a* (*CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>, 2690).

<sup>44</sup> For Πάπος, Πάππος, Παπίας etc. in the Hellenistic Aegean, see *LGN* 1.360; in Asia Minor, see L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (Prague, 1964), 406–12 §1199. Sextus Pompey's freedman and skipper Demochares (Dio 49.8.2) was apparently also called Παπίας (App. *B Civ* 5.104); suggestions that he was a Papius Demochares are rightly rejected by Münzer, *RE* 18 (3), s.v. 'Papias' no. 1, notwithstanding *CIL* 3.14625 (*ILS* 8893), Narona: Imp. Caesari Diui f. | Sicilia recepta C. Papius Celsus | M. Papius Kanus fratres. Louis Robert suggested a possible cross-cultural *Lallname* lurking here: *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine* (Paris, 1963), 348.

<sup>45</sup> Paapia Atiedi L. s.: *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.1817 (*ILS* 3817), Alba Fucens; to be understood as a Latinized form of Παπίας, *RE* 18.3 s.v. 'Papia(s)'. Cicero had a slave of the same name (*Fam.* 16.24.2). Solin (n. 17), 608, lists other examples and other forms.

<sup>46</sup> On the praenomen, Salomies (n. 16), 33, weighing up Latin and Etruscan origins; six examples in Solin, 7; three at Minturnae (*CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.2699, 2703, 2705). Caesar seems to have had two freedmen of the name (*RE* s.v. 'Licinus' nos. 1, 5), and Cicero mentions a learned slave Licinus belonging to Aesopus the actor (*Q. fr.* 1.2.14; *RE* s.v. 'Licinus' no. 3). The tendency of the name to become *Licinius* in the MSS suggests that the slave of C. Gracchus recorded as Licinius (Cic. *De or.* 3.60.225; Plut., *Ti. Gracch.* 2 (Λικίνιον); Gell. *NA* 1.11.13; Quint. 1.10.27) may in fact have been a Licinus, though *RE* s.v. 'Licinius' no. 5 treats him as a freedman of Gracchus' widow Licinia universally referred to by his gentilicium – which seems unlikely given his station.

<sup>47</sup> Münzer, *RE* s.v. 'Licinus', argues for a Celtic origin for (one strand of) the slave name, citing its incidence in northern Italy, Caesar's freedmen (both Gaulish), and A. Holder, *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz* (Leipzig, 1913), 2.210–11, s.v. 'Licnos'. D.E. Evans, *Gaulish Personal Names* (Oxford, 1967), 359–60, is diffident.

<sup>48</sup> On Chrysgonous, *illud nomen aureum: Rosc. Am.* 124. See Fabre (n. 42), 107 n. 118; Solin (n. 3), 51.

ORIGIN OF THE NAMES IN *-POR*: TRADITIONAL ACCOUNTS

We return to our main question. Names in *-por* were rare, and certainly never the general phenomenon our sources imply, but they do seem to have been used on occasion. Can we accept the analysis given of them above, namely [master's praenomen] + *por* (< *puer*)? There is a formal non-Latin onomastic parallel incorporating a word for 'slave', in Christian Greek names from Later Antiquity such as Theodoulos and Christodoulos<sup>49</sup> (a class that may have developed under influence of the venerable Semitic tradition of names in *'abd-* + divine name, represented today most visibly by Abdullah and the unlimited class of Abdul names).<sup>50</sup> These theophoric analogies, however, while providing a partial parallel for the proposed Latin compound, are of little help in explaining how or why it might have come about in the first place; to answer these questions we need to consider it in its own linguistic context and role.

Formally the name in *-por* as traditionally analysed is certainly of a class common in Latin, namely that of the determinative compounds, with the determining element preceding the base noun. In some instances, such as *agricultura* (*agricultor* etc.) or *senatusconsultum*, both elements are nouns, with the first displaying the genitive case ending that would be expected in free, uncompounded syntactic use of the two elements in the same relationship. Case compounds of this sort (called 'artificial compounds' by Grimm) are well represented in Latin and slave names in *-por* have usually been understood as belonging to their number.<sup>51</sup> Does this analysis withstand close examination? In this section I look at the component elements in turn and together.

At the outset the analysis looks hopeful. Certainly if a slave were to be denominated solely by reference to his master's name, it is quite possible that the latter's praenomen would have been the name segment employed. It was, after all, the reference point for a man's descendants (*M. f. C. n.* and the like), and indeed his freedmen and slaves (*M. l.*; *M. s.*). This, at any rate, applied in the formal context of epigraphy and there is some slight evidence that it could be the slave's point of reference in non-epigraphic contexts too: thus Cicero related, in direct speech, a slave of the triumvir Antony answering the question *Quis tu?* with the words *a Marco tabellarius* (*Phil.* 2.77). Taken together with the numerous epigraphic cases from the principate in which slaves and freedmen refer to or address their deceased masters by praenomen (often abbreviated) with the epithet *noster*, this evidence has suggested to some that the master's praenomen was the principal name for use within and – as far as was possible while avoiding confusion – without the household.<sup>52</sup> The argument is far from conclusive, and in particular risks muddying the issue with evidence from

<sup>49</sup> Statistics from *LGPN* are as follows: Θεοδοῦλος, -α, -η 42 (vol. 1, six; 2, eight; 3a, 26; 3b, three; 4, 15; most are late antique, though vol. 4 has some early cases from Macedonia, Thrace and Scythia); Χριστοδοῦλος 3 (vol. 1, one; 3a, one; 4, one; none earlier than the fifth century A.D.).

<sup>50</sup> Several West Semitic names in *abdi-* ('*bd-*') appear logographically in Akkadian cuneiform in the Amarna tablets of the 14th century B.C.: R.S. Hess, *Amarna Personal Names* (Winona Lake, 1993), 7–17. For equivalents in Hebrew see M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen in Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Stuttgart, 1928), 137–9. In Islam, '*abd*' can conventionally be combined with any of the ninety-nine most beautiful names of God; A. Schimmel, *Islamic Names* (Edinburgh, 1989), 26–8.

<sup>51</sup> Thus Leumann (n. 2), 398–9, §338; Lindner (n. 2), 228–9.

<sup>52</sup> Salomies (n. 16), 267–9.

much wider, and themselves rather obscure socio-linguistic areas, such as the valedictory conventions of tombstone epigraphy; but for the sake of argument it can stand.

What some scholars have found more problematic is a point already alluded to, namely the vowel quantities of recorded instances of the element. The genitive case ought to form a long *-i* which is not in fact seen except in one instance (the 'Olīpor' of *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.1263); in other examples we do not know the length of the syllable, but the fact that in some instances (Marpor, (G)naepor) the inflexional syllable has been syncopeated entirely suggests it was, in some instances at least, short.<sup>53</sup> Such explanations as have been offered generally invoke some shift of stress consequent upon the composition of the master's praenomen with the word for slave, perhaps first arising as a term of address in the vocative.<sup>54</sup> The argument seems to be that stress on the second element drew stress, and with it quantity, away from the first.

Is this a satisfactory theory? It has not been subjected to close critical examination, but it is certainly worth looking in detail at what it implies. An initial point is that any role ascribed to the vocative cannot be expected to account for unusual stress movements; the unverbated form, whatever case it was initially used in, must be expected to have followed normal stress patterns of the time. The pattern that the theory apparently presupposes is, in fact, that of newer Latin, whereby stress was not bound to the initial syllable but settled on the penultimate one or (where the penult was short) the antepenultimate. The theory also seems to require that at the time of the changes the second theme *-por* was polysyllabic: not merely an unsyncopeated *puer* but a trisyllabic preform such as *\*pouero(s)*, or its vocative *\*pouere*.<sup>55</sup> Otherwise the newer Latin pattern would have left the stress on the long genitive case *-i* of the primary element: thus, using bold type to indicate stress, *Marcīpor* (long penult) or *\*Marcīpuer* (short penult). The only form that works would be *\*Marcīpouere* from which, by the theory, would develop *\*Marcīpouere*. In the sequel, post-tonic syncope of the secondary element, combined with the loss of the archaic last syllable, would result in the recorded form *Marcīpor*, in which stress has reverted to the initial; this would in turn enable the further post-tonic syncope necessary to produce *Marpor*.

Such a many-staged developmental prehistory comes as a surprise, especially if it is all required to have unfolded in the period after the Latin stress accent shift. It cannot be discounted on these grounds alone, of course. More difficult is the specific point that it depends so much on a lost trisyllabic preform of *-por* still in productive compositional use after the shift in Latin stress patterns. We will look at this point in greater detail shortly, but suffice it to say here that the trisyllable's absence from the record is impressively complete.<sup>56</sup> And more difficult still is the central claim of this theory: that changing stress patterns might have affected vowel quantity within the compound. Why would the emphasis accorded the leading syllable of the second element result in a shortening of the genitive case ending of the first element?

One parallel has been offered: the compounded subordinating conjunction *siquidem*, recorded in verse with a short first syllable in contrast to the long vowel of

<sup>53</sup> G. Meiser, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt, 1998), 135, inexplicably writes as if these names in general show a long internal *-i*. On the post-tonic short-syllable syncope in Marpor and (G)naepor see Lindsay (n. 2), 185.

<sup>54</sup> Walde-Hofmann (n. 2), 382 ('zunächst im Vok. Kontrahiert *Mārcīpor*, dann Kürzung des *i* durch Tonanschluß'), Bader (n. 2), 316 ('à partir du vocatif'), Lindner (n. 2), 228–9.

<sup>55</sup> For this form see below, with n. 60.

<sup>56</sup> See n. 61 below.

monosyllabic *sī* and its other compounds.<sup>57</sup> Though this does demonstrate that long vowels could in certain compounded situations shorten, it is not, perhaps, very persuasive in the current context. The nature of the compound in question is very different: its two component parts are certainly not of similar length respectively to the elements in the slave name; nor is it a case compound and the originally long *-i-* of the first element was not the case marker of a second-declension noun in the genitive. Though the shortening may well be connected with the placing of stress on the penult of the second, and rather more bulky, element, it is not clear that this replicates the proposed stress shift in the names in *-por*, or indeed makes that stress shift any more likely. Finally, the dactylic instances of short *-i-* in *siquidem* need to be weighed against many others where the expected quantities appear – often written as two words in modern texts, but relevant nonetheless.

But a significant point that hangs over this debate is that explanations for a short internal *-i-* in a determinative compound would, in normal circumstances, be viewed as unnecessary. Lindner has indicated the difficulty of distinguishing, without firm metrical evidence for syllable weight, between case compounds incorporating a true second-declension genitive form, and the much more common class of compound that has a second-declension noun in first place and a short non-inflexional *-i-*,<sup>58</sup> such as would derive from simple unstressed weakening of the first element's thematic vowel. Thus Cicero's *ludimagister* (*Nat. D.* 1.72), for instance, gives no indication of vowel quantity, and has to be set beside cases like *uicomagister* elsewhere, where the internal *-o-* is clearly the thematic vowel of the first element. It is clear that in the vast majority of cases the internal *-i-* in determinative compounds is not in fact inflexional at all, even in origin. The fact is that a ditheme constructed from a praenomen form + another element such as a derivation from *puer* or its preform might well show a short internal *-i-* arising from an unstressed thematic vowel. Accounts of how the same phenomenon might have arisen from a stress-led shortening of a genitive case ending perhaps reflect a desire to salvage the ancient account of the origin of these names, whereby the genitive form of the determining element is a prerequisite, notwithstanding the fact that the evidence is against it. An explanation had to be produced for a phenomenon that would in most circumstances excite no comment. However the resulting accounts are not only unconvincing but unnecessary. And if the internal *-i-* is just a weakened thematic vowel it sanctions no conclusions about the semantic role of the primary theme in the compound.

There are likewise difficulties in accepting the traditional analysis of the second element in the compound. Concerns over its phonetic development have already been noted. Although the majority of scholars writing on the subject have accepted the link, no acceptable account has been offered for the phonology of a proposed change from *puer* to *-por*. It is by no means a trivial development, especially since it resulted in a change of declension and (according to the ancient grammarians) in a form with unusual characteristics: the last *-o-* of names in *-por* remained resolutely short even in oblique cases, unlike that of most masculine nouns in *-or*.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Walde-Hofmann (n. 2), 382, Lindner (n. 2), 228–9. *OLD*, s.v.: 'first syllable often short in comedy and regularly so in dactylic verse.' Examples are *Ov. Met.* 10.104; 11.219; *Am.* 3.7.17.

<sup>58</sup> Lindner (n. 2), 32 (debatably referring to the internal vowel as a 'linking morpheme'); cf. Bader (n. 2), 298. Bader, ch. 16, classes case compounds as 'juxtaposés', categorized according to the case of the first element.

<sup>59</sup> Neue-Wagener (n. 2), 266–7, quoting Priscian, *GL* 2.236.10, and Probus, *GL* 4.16.18.

One account offered by several scholars relies on the idea that *puer* was itself a syncopated form of a lost *\*pouero-*,<sup>60</sup> and hypothesizes that *-por* was a separate development from this preform. Others, even though accepting the proposed *\*pouero-* at first, later came to doubt it and regard the slight evidence for it as unconvincing.<sup>61</sup> August Zimmerman argued that the process took place under the influence of Greek and Thracian slave names in *-p(h)or(os)* and *-por(is)*, the latter also bringing about the change in declension from second to third.<sup>62</sup> This suggestion, which can be entertained whatever one's belief about the early form of later *puer*, has met with some approval and certainly cannot be discounted.<sup>63</sup>

The question remains unsettled; but even if one accepts that syncope of an early *\*pouero-* may be the best account yet offered, legitimate doubts might none the less remain regarding the choice of this particular word. Would a form of the referentially imprecise *puer* be a likely word to use for 'slave' in this context? Though a frequent term of address for slaves,<sup>64</sup> *puer* crops up only rarely as a term of reference; compared with the much more precise *tabellarius* encountered above, for instance, it is intrinsically vague, and introduces a degree of ambiguity that would have been avoided by alternative words such as *seruus* or *uerna*, both of which were used together with master's praenomen in servile onomastic formulae as recorded in epigraphy.

The force of this point can be deflected to a certain extent by reverting to the suggestion that names in *-por* originated in the vocative. When applied to a physically present addressee, all intrinsic ambiguity in the sense of *puer* would be made good by the context.

Is it likely, however, that slaves were ever addressed in this way, as '(Slave)boy of Gaius' and the like? The usage at first recalls Greek, with the vocative *παῖ* combined with a personal name in the genitive. But the study of Greek forms of address carried out by Eleanor Dickey shows that this occurs almost exclusively with *παῖ* in its radical sense of 'child' or 'son', combined with father's name in the genitive as a patronymic. This frequent usage contrasts with a single case where the addressee is a slave and the name in the genitive that of his master: ὁ παῖ Μένωνος, 'O slave of Meno', in Plato.<sup>65</sup> Eleanor Dickey herself comments: 'The address seems inherently prone to misinterpretation, given the widespread use of *παῖ* in patronymics, and I have no evidence of similar use elsewhere.'<sup>66</sup> If a personal name was appended to servile *παῖ*, it was far more likely to be that of the slave himself, in the vocative.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Not quite lost, if *CIL* 3 p. 962 no 27.2 = Bücheler, *CE* 34.2 is accepted. F. Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*<sup>3</sup> (Heidelberg, 1914), 160; Walde-Hofmann (n. 2), 382.

<sup>61</sup> F. Solmsen, 'Zur griechischen Wortforschung', *IF* 31 (1912–13), 470–85 at 476–8; cf. Leumann (n. 2), 134 §142d with 135 §143b ('Pseudo-historisch ist vermutlich *poueri...*').

<sup>62</sup> 'Die Endung *-por* in *Gaior*, *Lucipor* etc.', *ALL* 12 (1902), 281–2; 'Die Endung *-por* in *Gaior*, *Lucipor* etc.', *IF* 15 (1903–4), 121–2.

<sup>63</sup> Solmsen (n. 61), 478; Fraenkel (n. 2), 1665. Lazzeroni (n. 3) went a stage further, arguing that all slave names in *-por* were formed by faulty analogy with a Thracian name *Marpor*, misunderstood by Romans as <*Marci-puer*. He cites no convincing evidence for Thracian *Marpor*.

<sup>64</sup> E. Dickey, *Latin Forms of Address from Plautus to Apuleius* (Oxford, 2002), 194–5.

<sup>65</sup> *Meno* 85B6.

<sup>66</sup> *Greek Forms of Address from Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford, 1996), 71, 267.

<sup>67</sup> Lucian *Pisc.* 39 (παῖ Συλλογισμέ) and frequently in comedy, e.g. Men. *Aspis* 305 (Δᾶε παῖ), *Sam.* 189 (Παρμένων παῖ, Παρμένων), 358 (παῖ, Παρμένων), *Dys.* 401 and 551 (παῖ Γέτα), 959 (παῖ Δόναξ), Ar. *Plut.* 624 (παῖ Καρίων), *Pax* 255 (παῖ παῖ Κυδομέ).

If we turn to Latin, the material assembled by the same scholar gives even less reason to believe that slaves were ever addressed with vocative *puer* or *por* and the name of their master in the genitive; *puer* seems only to have been used alone, whether one was addressing a slave, or a boy or youth.<sup>68</sup> It may be pertinent to note that the Latin equivalent to the Greek patronymic address formula of  $\pi\alpha\hat{\iota}$  + [father's name] is itself rare and has a distinctly poetic character. Usually formed with *gnate* (or *gnata*) rather than *puer* (*puella*) or indeed *fili* (*filia*), it may in fact have been to some extent quite consciously Greek.<sup>69</sup> This may mean that there was little risk of the misinterpretation that might have arisen in Greek by addressing slaves in an analogous way; but it also suggests that in general Latin did not make wide use of forms of address with the structure [noun in the vocative] + [qualifier consisting of a personal name in the genitive].

The material in question comes, of course, from a relatively restricted period and context, namely literary texts from the Mid to Late Republic onwards. Eleanor Dickey's conclusions on these points cannot necessarily be assumed to apply, say, to an earlier, non-literary context. One case she cites, relating (like the one under examination) to the use of a kinship term in a transferred sense together with a name, suggests that caution needs to be exercised. Noting the widespread use of *pater* as a term of address to divinities, she refers to the case of  $I\ddot{u}p(p)iter$ , where the term in question has actually fused with the vocative of the God's name (< \**Dyeu pater*, represented directly in Greek by the frequent poetic address  $Z\epsilon\hat{\upsilon} \pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\rho$ ).<sup>70</sup> However, in listing her own data regarding the use of Latin *pater* as a term of respectful address to gods, she comments that it is generally used alone, i.e. without a name or other qualifier in apposition to it.<sup>71</sup> This might suggest that with regard to the combination of proper nouns with appellatives in the vocative, at least, the literary material is not of good evidential value for the way that names might have been constructed out of fossilized modes of address in a remoter, non-literary context. Names like *Gaipor* and *Publipor* might, like  $I\ddot{u}p(p)iter$ , record a lost mode of address.

This is quite possible in itself, but whether it really assists the traditional analysis of the compound names in *-por* as [master's name in genitive] + *por* (< *puer* or its preform) is another question entirely. At the very best it is an argument that the lack of support for that analysis from the literary evidence on modes of address should not be regarded as fatal.

#### ORIGINS OF THE NAMES IN *-POR*: AN ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL

It is not obvious that these discussions have advanced us very far. All the attempts made at explaining names in *-por* up to now have a certain resemblance to a favourite tactic of folk etymology, that of explaining proper nouns non-onomastically, that is to say as fossilized usages of ordinary language. This goes further than merely identifying the lexeme that lies at the root of a personal name; it is an attempt to reconstruct the circumstances – the singularly specific circumstances – in which a

<sup>68</sup> Dickey (n. 64), 191–5.

<sup>69</sup> Dickey (n. 64), 110–12.

<sup>70</sup> Dickey (n. 64), 121 (with n. 17); Bader (n. 2), 296. For  $Z\epsilon\hat{\upsilon} \pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\rho$ , cf. for instance Hom. *Il.* 1.503. On double-vocative pairings in divine and other names in Greek, Latin and IE generally, see G. E. Dunkel, 'On the short vowel in the name  $\text{Ἡρακλῆς}$ ', *Mus. Helv.* 55 (1998), 76–83.

<sup>71</sup> Dickey (n. 64), 348.

name might have ‘come into being’, as it were, without there being any intention to bestow a name in the first place.<sup>72</sup> This is a naive approach, not inappropriately in this case since it derives from an earlier naivety of believing in a world where Romans had only one slave each and therefore did not bother to name them.

So a new approach should be tried. The divine name compound Iup(p)iter and its parallel cases point the way, as does some of the other evidence considered. The majority of Latin compound nouns are determinative, as described above, whether ‘true’ or ‘case’ compounds. Other sorts exist, however. One relatively rare type in Latin is the copulative compound, in which two elements work together to identify the referent by coordination, rather than subordinately. Frequently cited examples are *gallo-graeci* or *celt-iberi* or *tunico-pallium*, though there are scholars who class some of these, at least, as determinatives.<sup>73</sup> Semantically similar to compounds of this sort, and sometimes difficult to distinguish from them, are juxtapositions – simple chainings together of two nouns in apposition. Iup(p)iter, Diespiter, Ianuspater and Marspiter belong to this class.<sup>74</sup> The first element in each case is a proper name for the referent, while the second is a descriptive noun originally placed in apposition to it, later fusing and in three of the cited cases undergoing a sound change as a result. What if the slave names in *-por* were to be analysed in one of these two ways? We saw above that, according to Eleanor Dickey’s research, when a Greek slave was addressed as *παῖς* with a proper name, the latter was almost always that of the slave himself. Could it be that a name like Marcipor should be analysed not as ‘Marcus’ boy’ but ‘the boy Marcus’?

At first sight this seems a radical proposal. The standard male praenomina of the Roman republic are generally regarded as the preserve of free citizens, tantamount to a badge of liberty. German scholars write tellingly of ‘Bürgerpränomina’. But in the course of this paper we have already seen that the onomastic *apartheid* that is often supposed to have operated with regard to slaves and free in the Roman world can be exaggerated. In the Mid and even the Late Republic, many slaves in Rome bore names that were used as praenomina by the free inhabitants of Italy: Statius, Salvius, Paccius. Many of those free Italians migrated to Rome voluntarily, or found themselves unenslaved subjects of the Romans, so that their names cannot easily be segregated as ‘foreign’. Slaves also bore diminutive or derived versions of the Romans’ own praenomina: Marcellus, Quintio, Lucias. There does seem, it is true, to have been a general avoidance of allowing slaves to bear the classic male Roman praenomina in underived form, at least in the Late Republic and Early Empire, though as noted above the occasional servile Lucius, Quintus or Marcus does appear, along with the odd Manius, Titus and Decimus, particularly from the Flavian and Antonine periods on. These instances, though rare, cannot be dismissed completely. There is also the evidence of female slave names: there were plenty of slave girls called Quinta, for instance, a name which was not only a direct, underived equivalent of a common male praenomen but was also borne by free women as an individual cognomen, something

<sup>72</sup> See now J.M. Anderson, *The Grammar of Names* (Oxford, 2007), 85–7. In Latin, cf. for instance Festus (Paulus) 201L: *Opiter* < ‘obitu patris’ or ‘quod auum *ob patrem* habeat’; Plin. *HN* 7.45: ‘Agrippas ut aegre partos’.

<sup>73</sup> M. Fruyt, ‘Le statut des composés nominaux dans le lexique latin’, in C. Moussy (ed.), *La composition et la préverbation en Latin (Lingua Latina 8)*: Paris, 2005), 29–53 at 32 n. 10.

<sup>74</sup> Leumann (n. 2), 384 §333iB; Bader (n. 2), 296; eadem, ‘Fondements syntaxiques de la composition nominale’, in Moussy (n. 73), 11–28 at 21; Lindner (n. 2), 227–8.

very close to a praenomen and indeed frequently prefixed to the nomen in a way that made it practically indistinguishable from a praenomen.<sup>75</sup>

Even after the general change in character and origin of most Roman slave names, it is easy to exaggerate the extent to which they were transparently servile. The use of Greek names for slaves would not necessarily distinguish them neatly from free Greeks living in the Roman world, unless specifically servile names were chosen. The evidence in fact suggests that the Greek names borne by the slaves of the Romans were not as a mass the same as those borne by those of the Greeks;<sup>76</sup> in fact, some of them rather resembled the sorts of names that free Greeks willingly bestowed on their children. Then whatever their origin and character, they tended to proliferate and spread among the population, just like all widely used names will. The same applies to those Latin names we find given to slaves. During the principate, it has been suggested, 'in everyday address many Roman slaves and ex-slaves may have been onomastically indistinguishable from their free-born peers'.<sup>77</sup>

This situation might be thought to have arisen simply from the fact that Rome was full of ex-slaves and their children, some of whom at any rate bore their parents' names: this is possibly true, and the general spread of 'Hermes' and 'Eros', for instance, two names not historically used by Greeks either for themselves or for their slaves, might confirm this picture.<sup>78</sup> But this observation does not undermine or deflect the point that is being made: while there were some slave names that bespoke servility more or less clearly, there were others that did not, and there was no clear-cut distinction between the onomastic repertoires from which slave and free were respectively named.

For what it is worth, this reconstruction parallels what is known about other slave-owning societies. While it is true, for instance, that certain types of name were especially common as slave names in Attica (such as ethnics like Lydos and Syros),<sup>79</sup> they were not necessarily restricted to that function, and there were other slave names that were found as the names of free and even freeborn.<sup>80</sup> Regarding the cities of the ancient near east in the neo-Babylonian period, Dandamaev has written 'The bulk of the slaves ... bore Babylonian names essentially indistinguishable from the names of free persons'.<sup>81</sup> The individual names borne by Etruscan *lautni* exhibit a mixture of

<sup>75</sup> Solin (n. 17), 5 (14 cases, all early to Mid Imperial). M. Kajava, *Roman Female Praenomina* (Rome, 1994), 65–6: four or five instances of Q(uinta) as praenomen, all Early Imperial.

<sup>76</sup> H. Solin, 'Griechische und römische Sklavennamen. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung', in H. Bellen and H. Heinen (edd.), *Fünfzig Jahre Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei an der Mainzer Akademie 1950–2000. Miscellanea zum Jubiläum* (Stuttgart, 2001), 307–30.

<sup>77</sup> J. Bodet, review of Solin (n. 17), *BMCR* 2003.01.03. Bodet calculated that of the ten most common slave names (male and female) in Solin's onomasticon, six were in fact Latin, and these six also appeared among the eighteen most common Latin cognomina in general use.

<sup>78</sup> Bodet (n. 77), pointing out that according to Solin's figures the three most common Greek slave names in Rome (Hermes, Eros and Onesimus) are also the three commonest Greek names there in general.

<sup>79</sup> P.M. Fraser, 'Ethnics as personal names', in E. Matthews and S. Hornblower (edd.), *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence* (Oxford, 2000), 149–57 at 151.

<sup>80</sup> C. Fragiadakis, *Die attischen Sklavennamen* (Diss., Mannheim, 1986), esp. 62–6, noting on 62 that 'Die Feststellung der sozialen Standes [on onomastic criteria] ... ist aus Mangel bestimmter Personalien ... in vielen Fällen ziemlich schwierig.' See also the remarks of Louis Robert, 'L'onomastique grecque', in *Actes du VII<sup>e</sup> Congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine Costanza 1977* (Bucharest and Paris, 1979), 31–42 at 37–8 = *Opera minora selecta* (Amsterdam, 1989), 685–96 at 691–2 = *Choix d'écrits* (Paris, 2007), 145–56 at 151–2.

<sup>81</sup> M.A. Dandamaev, *Slavery in Babylonia from Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great (626–331 BC)* (DeKalb, 1984), 402. For some differences in slave/free name repertoires see H.D. Baker,

foreign items (Greek, Latin, other Italic), but also not infrequently standard male and female praenomina as borne by their patrons, and diminutive forms of these: thus we find *arnθ* and both *larθ* and *larθia*, as well as hypocoristics such as *arnziu*, *velu* (< *vel*) and the female *θanicu* (< *θannaevil* and the like), all names that could be borne by contemporary Etruscans of full (non-*lautni*) status.<sup>82</sup> Similarly the slaves of English-speaking slave owners in the Caribbean and North America in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries often bore names derived from West African originals (Quashey, Cuffey, Sambo) and these names rapidly acquired a strong connotation of servile status; but around this nucleus was a broad class of standard British forenames, often in diminutive form, such as Betty, Jack, Thomas, Will.<sup>83</sup> These names were shared by slaves and slave owners. What distinguished owners and slaves onomastically was not the sort of individual name they possessed, but the entire onomastic context in which those names were set: owners also had surnames, they were accorded prefix titles of respect such as ‘Mr’ or ‘Mrs’, they could alternate between hypocoristic and full forms at will – quite apart from the wider sociolinguistic setting by which the status of speaker, addressee or third party could be rendered transparently obvious.

Comparative evidence of this sort cannot, of course, compel any positive conclusion about Roman usages in regard to slaves. But it does show that slave-owning societies, however infrangible the social and legal divide they mark out between enslaved and free, do not need to respect a similarly strict distinction between the personal names used by these two groups.

Returning to the case of the names in *-por*, there is in fact a little positive evidence in favour of the analysis proposed here. In his entry on ‘Quintipor’, Festus (306L) stated that some derived it not from the master’s praenomen but *a numero natorum ex ancilla quinto loco*. By this account, Quintipor is presented as a name referring entirely to the slave himself, with the same lexical origin as was usually ascribed to the free praenomen Quintus, to which it therefore stood in relation as a kind of hypocoristic – a specifically servile form of hypocoristic that would not offend any tendency to regard underived praenomina as more appropriate to free citizens.<sup>84</sup> The lexical reference of the etymology need not, of course, be any more relevant to the continuing usage of the hypocoristic than it was in the case of the basic form. In fact we need not waste time over the etymology at all; what is significant is that here we have

‘Degrees of freedom: slavery in mid-first millennium BC Babylonia’, *World Archaeology* 33 (2001), 18–26 at 22.

<sup>82</sup> Rix (n. 22), 364–5, with references; cf. 370–1. See above, n. 22, for sources on interpreting the status of the *lautni*.

<sup>83</sup> J. Inscoc, ‘Carolina slave names: an index to acculturation’, *Journal of Southern History* 49 (1983), 527–54; C.A. Cody, ‘“There was no Absalom on the Ball plantations”: Slave-naming practices in the South Carolina low country’, *American Historical Review* 92 (1987), 563–96; J.S. Handler and J. Jacoby, ‘Slave names and naming in Barbados 1650–1830’, *William & Mary Quarterly* 53 (1996), 685–728. A significantly different interpretation of the evidence is given by T. Burnand, ‘Slave naming patterns: onomastics and the taxonomy of race in eighteenth-century Jamaica’, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 31 (2001), 325–46; but even here the prevalence of hypocoristic forms of European names used by the slave owners is emphasized (this being argued to establish a condescending racial distinction).

<sup>84</sup> Apparently accepted by Rix (n. 22), 370, giving *Quinctio* and *Quintipor* as ‘Deminutiv-formen von Bürgerpraenomina’ borne by slaves, in a passage drawing broad similarities between Roman slave names and Etruscan *lautni* names. Rix seems alone in having picked this up, though he does not refer to Festus. See n. 3 above for the same scholar’s more recently expressed views.

evidence of a minority tradition that presented one of the names in *-por* as a relatively straightforward personal name, independent of any necessary link with a master's praenomen.

The case of Iūp(p)iter also provides possible further parallels, specifically relating to internal development and the context in which univerbation took place. If the secondary theme *-por* is accepted as a syncopated form of *puer* (or, less unlikely, of an earlier form of *puer*), it certainly seems not dissimilar to what has happened in the case of the divine name, where the fusing of the second element has produced a sound change. In this case the development *pater* > *-piter* is equivalent to those attested in compounds of *capio* (*excipio*, *percipio*) and *facio* (*efficio*, *perficio*), where the sound change was induced by the early Latin system which bound stress to the initial syllable. Later on, of course, the stress returned to the antepenultimate syllable (*percipio* > *percipio*), but the previously weakened vowel retained its shape. This process is not so visible in the case of the *-piter* compounds simply because the smaller number of syllables limited the movement of stress, but it is clearly the same one.

This possible parallelism can contribute to a useful account of the stress patterns in the *-por* compounds. On the hypothesis currently entertained we no longer need to draft that account (as was done above) so as to explain a shortening of the first element's supposed genitive case ending – something no such account can satisfactorily do. It does not need to start with the secondary element retaining trisyllabic form under the stress system of post-archaic Latin. The univerbation, and any syncope undergone by the secondary *-por* element, can be dated early or late in accordance with other evidence.

Retaining for the sake of argument the debatable preform *\*pouero(s)* as a starting point, one can propose some such developmental prehistory for the names in *-por* as this:

1. Uncompounded juxtaposition: *Marco(s) \*pouero(s)*.
2. Univerbation: *\*Marcopouero(s)*.
3. Weakening of thematic vowel: *\*Marcipouero(s)*.
4. Return of stress to antepenultimate syllable: *\*Marcipouero(s)*.
5. Syncope of post-tonic and loss of final syllable: *Marcipor*.
6. Optional further stage of syncope: *Marpor*.

This is still a multi-stage development, though it does not have to be squeezed into any particular period either before or after the Latin stress accent shift. Evidently the order of some of the stages proposed is very debatable – though this flexibility might be seen as a virtue of the proposal – and more significantly the development of *-por* from a preform of *puer* must remain decidedly moot. But the same difficulty afflicts the traditional account and this proposal, lacking the difficulty of the supposed genitive case ending, does seem to represent a plausible alternative working hypothesis.

It may still remain to be considered whether the use of the vocative played any part in creation of the proposed slave-name compound. As with the traditional account, one has to reject any specific role for the vocative in the movement of stress; stress accent and resulting sound changes in any compound, once univerbation has taken place, must be assumed to have followed general patterns. This applies as much to the *-por* compounds as to the *-piter* ones.

But case, or the linguistic context that dictated case, might still have had some part in the initial creation of the compound. Most have accepted that Iūp(p)iter seems to

preserve a vocative, and this would imply origin in the context of prayer.<sup>85</sup> It may well have been that context in which univerbation took place, with emphasis being accorded to the name rather than the descriptive epithet ‘father’, appended purely as a ritual or honorific predicate. In speaking of Jove rather than addressing him there would be less reason to append *pater* without special significance, in which case it would be stressed separately, being treated as a word in its own right. By this account, if true, Marspiter is likely to have originated in the vocative, while the second element of Ianuspater, if it is a reliable form, confirms what is indicated by the first, namely that it had some other origin – perhaps not really meriting treatment as a single word. Diespiter, by contrast, would need to be explained as a sort of back-formation from, or at any rate as influenced by, earlier forms of Iūp(p)iter.<sup>86</sup>

There is a possible parallel here. The slave designation *puer*, as remarked above, is semantically imprecise and potentially misleading in certain contexts, and functions more naturally as a term of address than of reference. As a term of address appended to a name, however, its role is supportive; it could be characterized as little more than a status marker, especially when used with a name of the sort also borne by free citizens. Such a context might just favour univerbation slightly more than juxtaposition in other cases. On this basis it is possible – no more than that – that vocative case pairings such as \**Marce pouere* had an important role in the early development of the names under examination.

Divine names in *-piter* therefore provide a useful model both for the general semantic structure of the names in *-por*, and – perhaps – for the context in which composition occurred. The precise formal model could be either the juxtapositional one of the divine names, or that of the relatively rare copulative compounds. The drawback with the former model, if pressed too closely, is that it might reopen the question of the grammatical form of the leading element. In particular, if the juxtaposition is posited as first occurring in a term of address, the question might arise of how one gets to the short internal *-i-* from the vocative case endings of *-o* stem names like Marcus and Quintus and *-io* stem ones like Lucius and Publius; the long *-i* vocative of the latter would replicate precisely the long *-i* genitive which was the starting point for the traditional derivation of these names.<sup>87</sup> A copulative model, however, or a copulative model influenced by the juxtapositional one, would mean that their form need not be treated as preserving (even at some remove) the

<sup>85</sup> Lindner (n. 2), 227, with earlier references.

<sup>86</sup> Diespiter: Plaut. *Capt.* 909, *Poen.* 740, 870, Hor. *Carm.* 1.34.5 etc. (rendered ‘Dispiter’ and interpreted as a name for Pluto by Lactant. *Div. inst.* 1.14.5). Ianuspater (perhaps not decisively univerbated): Gell. *NA* 5.12.5. Marspiter: Varro, *Ling.* 8.33, cf. 9.75 (‘Maspiter’). The reference at Festus 152L to †*Ma(r)spedis* ‘in precatione suoetaurilium’ might well indicate that *Marspiter* began as a term of address. Cf. Bader (n. 2), 296. The small *peperino* column from the *clivus palatinus* reading simply *Marspiter* (*CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.970, *ILS* 3145) presumably presents a nominative, though *Remureine* on another column in the same group of four (*CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.971, *ILS* 2985) may point to the vocative; but it has long been accepted that this quartet was at the least reworked in the Early Empire (Lommatzch, *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.971.: ‘non verae antiquitatis sed affectae’). For the vocative *Iane* cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.20, Liv. 8.9.5 (a prayer starting ‘Iane, Iuppiter, Mars pater ...’). On accentuation within double vocative compound names, see Dunkel (n. 70), 79–83.

<sup>87</sup> See Eleanor Dickey, ‘*O Egregie Grammaticae*: the vocative problems of Latin words ending in *-ius*’, *CQ* 50 (2000), 548–62, for the genuine age of the long *-i* vocative of *-io* stem nouns, which is likely to date back to Proto-Italic. The fact is that we have no indication of the length of the internal syllable in the single preserved written-out instance of *Publipor*, while *Lucipor* is known only as an example of the type of name given in prose writers.

morphology that would characterize free, uncompounded modes of address. The internal *-i-* could easily be a standard weakened second-declension thematic vowel.<sup>88</sup>

Certainty is extremely unlikely to be gained in these matters. Whether or not compounds in *-por* were first used in the vocative, or their formation was favoured by early use in that case, their form may owe something to juxtaposition and something to copulative composition. There is in fact no need to go in search of the folk etymologist's prize of the specific circumstances in which a name was used for the first time.

A final point remains. If the names in *-por* are compounds formed on the basis of names used by, or potentially used by, slaves themselves rather than their masters, why do surviving examples preserve only the 'Bürgerpränomina' such as Marcus, Gaius and so on? Why is there no \*Salvipor or \*Licinipor, or any example preserving a popular and early-attested Greek slave name such as \*Alexandripor? It cannot be proposed that there was ever a time in which *all* slaves bore what later came to be considered standard free-citizen praenomina or derivations therefrom. The answer is surely a simple one. In those cases where a slave *did* bear as his single name a name also widely found as a free citizen's praenomen, it was far more likely that the status marker that became *-por* would be added. It might occasionally have been added in other cases too, but without any regularity and without coming close to the status of a univerted compound. There may not have been onomastic *apartheid* between slave and free, but that does not mean that social distinctions had no influence over the way names were used.

#### VARRO'S MARCIPOR

Before closing, I wish to return to Varro's obscure Menippean satire entitled *Marcipor*, and consider whether the explanation for names in *-por* offered here might shed any light on the title.

A strange fiction was formerly maintained by certain distinguished scholars regarding the *Marcipor* and two other works in the same cycle, the *Bimarcus* and the *Marcopolis*. They were held to be hostile compositions, directed at the freedman grammarian and satirist Marcus Sevius Nicanor. So strong was Varro's animus against this humble rival that it was he who brought about the freedman's ultimate exile to Sardinia, *ob infamiam quandam* as Suetonius puts it (*Gram.* 5).<sup>89</sup> The freedman will have been not Sevius but Seius, a clerk in the service of Varro's friend Marcus Seius (aed. 74). Furthermore, he was also the poet recorded in the tradition as 'Sueius', author of certain works on avicultural themes, previously thought identical to his patron, the aedile.<sup>90</sup> His offence will have been to emulate too closely and too specifically Varro's own wide array of interests and abilities, an unwarrantable impertinence in a freedman.

<sup>88</sup> Another formal parallel might be seen in the determinative compounds *equifer*, *caprifer* ('wild horse', 'wild goat', cf. also *ouifer* 'wild sheep'), held unusual for having the determinative element in second place: Lindsay (n. 2), 361. Bader (n. 2), 324 (with n. 52 for earlier references) and Lindner (n. 2), 37, favour a calque on the type *ἑπιπαιγος*.

<sup>89</sup> F. Della Corte, 'Marco Seio Nicanore, grammatico e poeta', *Rivista di Filologia* n.s. 13 (1935), 240–3; J. Collart, 'Une victime de Varron: Marcus Nicanor', *Mélanges Ernout* (Paris, 1940), 75–87.

<sup>90</sup> Schanz-Hosius (1927), 271 §92; Morel, *Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1927), 54; followed by Kent in his Loeb edition of the *De Lingua Latina* (1938), p. 357.

Adduced in support of this tale were the only surviving lines of Nicanor's *satira*, which Suetonius (*Gram.* 5) recorded as evidence that the grammarian had been *duplici cognomine*:

Seuius Nicanor Marci libertus negabit:  
Seuius † post huius idem ac Marcus docebit.

What does this mean? The simplest explanation was spotted by Gronovius in the seventeenth century who read *Postumianus* in the second line; this approach was followed by Bergk who read *Postumus* and more recently by Courtney who reverted to Gronovius' suggestion. As Courtney puts it, the contrast of the last words in each line (*negabit / docebit*) calls for a similar contrast at the start, an onomastic contrast between the two cognomina that Seuius bore. Therefore the garbled words must conceal a cognomen. One way that a freedman might acquire two cognomina (Courtney calls it 'the most natural way') was to bear a secondary name indicating the gentilicium of an earlier owner than the one who actually manumitted him. Such names would conventionally terminate in *-ianus*, hence *Postumianus*.<sup>91</sup> Thus, it is argued, the poet is joking that if you were to ask him a question as 'Nicanor', a common Greek cognomen indicative of freedman status, he will refuse to answer; if, however, you use the less transparent 'Postumianus' he will deign to reply.

For scholars who identified Nicanor with Seius and saw him as Varro's rival and target, the favoured emendations, and punctuation, were those of R.P. Robinson's 1925 Paris edition:

Seuius Nicanor Marci libertus; negabit  
Seuius Nicanor Pothus idem; at Marcus docebit.

'Pothus' will have been a name given to Nicanor by Varro in derision, referring to the freedman's yearning desire for advancement. Here Nicanor brandishes it back at Varro and declares himself proud of his rank.<sup>92</sup> A curious and tortuous reconstruction, which even if true Suetonius could be forgiven for overlooking entirely; Nicanor's 'double cognomen' was just Varro's joke about the supposed hybrid quality of a freedman who had attained prominence in the liberal *artes*, or at any rate in two of them. The conclusion was that Varro's choice of the title *Bimarcus* was an unkind reference to this hybridity; while *Marcipor* was a blunt and emphatic way of proclaiming him to be definitively 'Marci libertus' after all.<sup>93</sup> The part taken by the *Marcopolis* in the trilogy was obscure but doubtless equally caustic.

The idea that two, or possibly three, of Varro's satires were composed against a lowly freedman rival has long since been dispensed with.<sup>94</sup> Between Lucilius and Persius Roman satirists poked almost as much fun, be it melancholy or jovial, at themselves as at others. Thus the simpler reconstruction of these lines of Nicanor explains them in terms of the standard satirical ploy of gentle self-mockery.<sup>95</sup> The

<sup>91</sup> E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993), 144, citing as a parallel T. Caesius Priscillae l. Hermes Postumianus from *CIL* 6.13979.

<sup>92</sup> Della Corte (n. 89), 242, suggesting (obscurely) some reference or assonance in the choice of 'Pothus' to the *-por* element in the old-style slave name.

<sup>93</sup> Collart (n. 89), 81, rejecting Della Corte's earlier idea that the title *Bimarcus* indicated a target consisting of two Marci, i.e. Nicanor and his patron, the aedile of 73.

<sup>94</sup> J.-P. Cèbe (n. 6) 2.208–11, 7.1225–6; J. Christes, *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom* (Wiesbaden, 1979), 15–17.

<sup>95</sup> Courtney (n. 91), 144, describing Nicanor as 'like Horace in his *Satires*, so willing to admit his faults'.

work of Marcus Varro, flavoured as it was with *hilaritas* and *iucunditas*,<sup>96</sup> was probably similarly motivated, and the natural way to interpret the three titles built on the praenomen Marcus is that they are reflexive, however much the verses grouped under them also satirized the way of the world.

This general idea has recently been given specific interpretation in the case of the *Marcopolis*. As Emily Gowers has noted, this work has usually been seen as in part at least a parody of Plato's *Republic*, deploying customary bodily metaphors for the city. But this is satire, so the 'hierarchy of subject and metaphor' will typically be reversed; Varro will have been describing himself as a city, or at any rate working from his own sorry state out to that of the world at large rather than particularizing the general. 'Marcopolis' comes to mean not 'the city of Varro' but 'Varro the city'.<sup>97</sup>

A similarly reflexive and satirical point of departure is likely to apply in the case of the *Bimarcus* and the *Marcipor*. Reflexive interpretations of *Marcipor* have been offered before, it is true, but they have been rather hampered by the traditional understanding of these names as referring to a slave by way of his master's praenomen; hence untenable proposals that the ending in *-por* seen here may, in contrast to everything else known or believed about such names, refer not to slavery but youth.<sup>98</sup> If, on the other hand, one accepted the obvious servile reference of the name, it would not really seem an effective satirical way for Marcus Varro to target himself directly, since it would draw attention away from what would be intended to stand at the centre. Whether Varro cast himself as the master or as the slave, on the old interpretation a name like *Marcipor* creates a subsidiary relationship and introduces a second person.<sup>99</sup> On the new view proposed it is no more and no less than a typically servile equivalent of the name Marcus, chosen to focus attention on the satirically self-abasing figure of the author himself: 'Varro the slave'.

## CONCLUSION

The chief argument of this article is simply this: the notion that slaves were ever generally, or even widely, known by names automatically derived from their masters' praenomina is false. Names in *-por* did exist but they were exceptionally rare in the historical period and there is no real reason to believe that they were ever much more common. Varro's nostalgia for the passing of another sort of slave name seems to have been redirected towards the names in *-por* by Pliny and Quintilian, whence it entered the mainstream grammarian tradition.

The traditional derivation of these names from a master's praenomen has a strong flavour of popular etymology about it, which the testimony of Festus (the earliest surviving source for it) does not dispel. It is not impossible that the one instance of a long internal *-i* ('*Olipor*': *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.1263, always assuming the reliability of the form) implies that the popular etymology was fed back into the Late Republican usage of these names as an effective element in their phonetic development; this is the one

<sup>96</sup> Cic. *Acad. post.* 1.8: 'quadam hilaritate conspersimus ... iucunditate quadam ad legendum inuitati'.

<sup>97</sup> 'The anatomy of Rome from Capitol to Cloaca', *JRS* 85 (1995), 23–32 at 27.

<sup>98</sup> E. Norden, 'In Varronis saturas menippeas observationes selectae', *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1966), 1; E. Bolisani, *Varrone menippeo* (Padua, 1936), 156–7. In his edition of the *Saturae Menippeae* (Rostock, 2000), 2.476, Werner Krenkel translates *Marcipor* as 'Marcus-Bursche', which is ambiguous.

<sup>99</sup> Cèbe (n. 6), 7.1226–7, chooses this option, identifying Varro with the slave owner, thereby apparently accepting some other party as the slave, and protagonist of the satire.

recorded instance where the freedman's patron actually bore the praenomen implied by the freedman's cognomen. However, modern accounts offered in detailed support of the traditional derivation fail to stand up on examination and I argue an alternative derivation, which seems to fit Roman and other slave-naming practices rather better. According to this idea, names in *-por* are archaic and specifically servile compounds of standard Roman given names; they might be characterized as servile diminutive compounds, and compared formally with ritual divine name compounds such as *Iū(p)iter*. Like those divine names, their formal appearance may be influenced by early usage in the vocative, but it is impossible and unnecessary to decide whether they are to be classed as true copulative compounds or fused vocative case juxtapositions. They may also have been influenced by Illyrian and Greek slave names in *-por(is)* and *-p(h)or(os)* respectively. At any rate by the Early Imperial period they had lost what little currency they had once had, and were widely misunderstood – though only a generation or two before, Varro had felt able to poke fun at himself by using such a name in its original sense. But perhaps even in his day the reference had been somewhat obscure.<sup>100</sup>

*College of Arms, London*

CLIVE CHEESMAN  
rougedragon@college-of-arms.gov.uk

<sup>100</sup> I am very grateful to Michael Crawford, Simon Pulleyn and above all Anna Morpurgo Davies who have made extremely valuable comments on drafts of this paper; without them it would have been much worse. I also wish to thank Paolo Vaciago for his assistance, and *CQ*'s anonymous reader for pertinent observations. Obviously all the faults and deficiencies of this version are my responsibility and mine alone.