

## CONVENTIONS OF NAMING IN CICERO

The degrees of formality into which speech can be graded are in no sphere more obvious than in expressions of address and third-person reference. Methods of naming vary according to many factors: the formality of the circumstances in which naming takes place, the nature of the subject under discussion, and the ages, sex, and relative status of the speaker and addressee. Conventions of naming sometimes reflect the rigidity or otherwise of social divisions. In some societies or circles address between superior and subordinate is non-reciprocal: the speaker with the greater prestige will adopt one form of address, the subordinate another. In other societies when unequals address each other both may use the same formal method of address: the difference of prestige is not explicitly acknowledged.

Speakers may sometimes be uncertain about the method of naming which is appropriate in a particular case. A subordinate, for example, may feel that his acquaintance with a superior in age or rank is intimate enough to justify his using a reciprocal address, but lack of assurance may prevent him from doing so. His response to the uncertainty may be to avoid names altogether. 'No-naming' arises not only from uncertainty of this type, but also from hostility or, paradoxically, great intimacy: while the frequent use of names may reflect a speaker's desire to ingratiate himself with the addressee, conversely intimates may consider naming unnecessary.

I shall be concerned here with the practice of Cicero. The great variety of his works allows us to make generalizations about the conventions in use at the time. Soon after Cicero certain changes in the conventions occurred. The imperial period will not be dealt with at all.

### SINGLE AND DOUBLE NAMES

Roman citizens possessed at least two and often three (or indeed more) names (Juv. 5.127, Quint. 7.3.27). All three names were employed only in highly formal circumstances (such as in official documents—note *Phil.* 5.41, *Fam.* 8.8.5—and the heading of formal letters: e.g. *Fam.* 5.1, 5.2, 15.1, 15.2 (see below, p.147); note that at *Leg. Agr.* 2.53 Cicero alleges that P. Seruilius Rullus is about to send a letter to Pompey in which the latter will not be accorded his third name), mostly in third-person reference, but occasionally also in the vocative (*Rosc. Com.* 3 *C. Fanni Chaerea*).

In most formal contexts two names were employed, either *praenomen* + *nomen* or *praenomen* + *cognomen* (on the difference between the two styles, see below).<sup>1</sup> Informal reference was by single name, either *nomen* or *cognomen*, or, as a mark of intimacy or contempt, *praenomen* (see below, p.161).

<sup>1</sup> At the end of the Republic address by *nomen* + *cognomen* was coming into vogue, but examples in Cicero are few. See W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1904), pp.489 ff.; H. L. Axtell, 'Men's names in the writings

of Cicero', *CP* 10 (1915), 392 ff. Axtell's article is useful particularly as a collection of evidence, but I am frequently in disagreement with his interpretation of the evidence.

Cicero explicitly reveals his attitude to the use of two names in two places. At *Fam.* 7.32.1 he remarks to P. Volumnius Eutrapelus that on receiving a letter familiarly (*familiariter*) giving the *nomen* *Volumnius* without a *praenomen* (*sine praenomine*) he was at first uncertain who the sender was. And at *Dom.* 22 he states that Clodius' alleged receipt of a letter addressed *Caesar Pulchro*, with *cognomina* only used, was claimed by Clodius as a sign of his intimacy with Caesar ('litteras in contione recitasti quas tibi a C. Caesare missas diceris "CAESAR PVLCHRO", cum etiam es argumentatus amoris esse hoc signum, quod cognominibus tantum uteretur . . .'). It can be inferred from the first passage that in the second it was not the *cognomina* in themselves which were considered familiar in tone, but the fact that they were not accompanied by *praenomina*.

In the most formal speeches, particularly those before the senate and popular assembly, double names are usually used both in the vocative and in third-person reference. In the *Imp. Pomp.*, for example, all vocatives are double names (52, 56 *Q. Hortensi*, 69 *C. Manili*), and third-person reference is largely by two names also. In the dozens of places where Pompey is mentioned in the speech, *Cn. Pompeius* is invariable (except at 46, where *Pompeius* occurs once in very close proximity to two examples of *Cn. Pompeius*). In the *Red. Sen.*, a speech in an elaborate style in which Cicero was strictly abiding by convention, there are forty-two examples of reference by two names (often with an accompanying honorific expression: e.g. 5, 8, 19, 25), and one of a double-name vocative (16), but only four cases of reference by single name. In three places the referent is Catiline (10, 12, 33), who throughout the speeches is habitually given one name only as a mark of contempt,<sup>2</sup> and once (10) it is Catiline's henchman Cethegus. Similarly in a formal speech to the popular assembly (*Red. Quir.*) there are thirty examples of reference by two names, one of reference by three names, but only two of reference by one name. Marius is ascribed only his *nomen* at 10, but he had just been named by *praenomen* + *nomen*. And at 13 Catiline receives his *cognomen* only. Honorific expressions are again constantly employed.

In the *Philippics*, however, both the speeches delivered to the senate and those to the people, less attention is paid to the conventions. Single names occur repeatedly. Cicero may have felt that the gravity of the political situation justified a disregard of polite observances.

The conventions of the lawcourts differed from those of the senate. Sustained double naming is not usual, except in address of the *iudex*. The opponents of Cicero's clients are usually given only one name (compare Cicero's use of a single name in reference to his political opponent Catiline in senatorial speeches), and a sort of camaraderie among advocates seems to have led to the practice of referring to opposing counsel by single name only. Cicero's clients are usually called by two names early in a speech, but by one later; single names predominate, but less markedly than when the reference is to an opponent.

In the *Quinct.* the *iudex* C. Aquilius Gallus is always addressed as *C. Aquili* (twenty-eight times; cf. 54, 80). By contrast the opposing advocate Q. Hortensius, who was considerably older and at the time more distinguished than

<sup>2</sup> It is worth emphasizing that even in formal speeches the target of an attack was often not honoured by double name reference. In *Leg. Agr.* 1, for example,

P. Serullius Rullus is referred to by two names at 21, but otherwise by one (14, 16, 22 twice, 23).

Cicero, is addressed as *Hortensi* (35, 45; compare Cicero's use of *Q. Hortensi* in a different type of speech, the *Imp. Pomp.*, seen above), and he is also usually referred to by one name (34, 63, 72, 80).

Some other *iudices* addressed by two names are M. Cato (*Mil.* 44), C. Piso (*Rosc. Com.* 7, 21, 22, 51), Cn. Domitius (*Cael.* 32), and Q. Naso (*Cluent.* 147).

In the *Rab. Perd.* the prosecutor T. Labienus is called *T. Labiene* at 6, but thereafter *Labiene* (11, 17, 19, 28, 30). In the *S. Rosc.* C. Erucius is addressed as *C. Eruci* at 38, but he too then receives one name only (43, 44, 45, 50, 61, 72, etc.). Other prosecutors (or opposing advocates) addressed by one name only (or predominantly) include Q. Aelius Tubero in the *Lig.* (*Tubero*: 2, 8, 9, 10), M. Iuuentius Laterensis in the *Planc.* (*Laterensis*: 6, 7, 9, 14, 16, 17, 23, 31, etc.), P. Valerius Triarius in the *Scaur.* (*Triarius*: 7, 10, 14, 23, 28), Q. Hortensius in the *Verrines* (e.g. 1.27, 36, 99, 151, 152, 2.24), and L. Manlius Torquatus in the *Sull.* (*Torquatus*: 5, 8, 11, 20, 21, 33, 34, etc.; *L. Torquate* occurs at 3).

Sometimes the distinction of the prosecutor, or Cicero's familiarity with him, or some other factor, seems to have motivated a more frequent use of two names. One of the prosecutors in the *Cael.*, L. Sempronius Atratinus, was perhaps as young as seventeen at the time.<sup>3</sup> He receives his *cognomen* only (2, 7 twice). On the other hand L. Herennius Balbus, who was a friend of Cicero, sometimes receives two names (25, 49, 56). The different ages of the prosecutors may have prompted Cicero to adopt different methods of reference.

In the *Mur.* the prosecutors M. Porcius Cato and Ser. Sulpicius Rufus are each addressed a number of times by two names (3, 7, 13, 15, 16, 83), perhaps because of their status. But as usual the use of single names predominates.

Of Cicero's clients, Milo in the *Mil.* is six times referred to as *T. Annius*, but over 100 times as *Milo*. But in the senate and before the people he was regularly called *T. Annius* (on Cicero's manner of naming Milo, see below, p.155). So in the *Cael.* Caelius is called *M. Caelius* eighteen times, but *Caelius* thirty-eight times. In the *Sull.* Sulla is called *P. Sulla* thirty times, but *Sulla* forty-one. In the *Lig.* *Ligarius* occurs fourteen times, *Q. Ligarius* eight times. And the comedian Q. Roscius is almost always named by single name in the *Rosc. Com.* The practice adopted in the *Marc.*, which was spoken before the senate rather than in court, provides a good illustration of the differing convention obtaining there: Marcellus is always referred to as *M. Marcellus* (seven times).

One speech in which a client is habitually referred to by two names is the *S. Rosc.* But in this case the brothers T. Roscii played an important part, and clarity often demanded the use of *praenomina*.

The letters also display variations of practice, dealing as they do with such widely divergent topics.

In the headings, for instance, one, two, or three names are used, both of the sender and addressee, depending on the formality of the letter. Cicero calls himself *M. Tullius M. F. Cicero* in the highly formal letter to Metellus Celer (*Fam.* 5.2), in letters to the senate (*Fam.* 15.1, 15.2), and in the formal letter which he sent to Pompey (*Fam.* 5.7). In this last letter Pompey receives the same style of address (*Cn. Pompeio Magno Imperatori*). At the other extreme in the scale of formality are the letters to Atticus, to his brother Quintus, and to his freedman Tiro, in all of which single names are invariably used. The same style is followed in Caelius' letters to Cicero (*Fam.* 8.1–17), in Cicero's to

<sup>3</sup> See R. G. Austin, *M. Tulli Ciceronis, pro M. Caelio oratio*<sup>3</sup> (Oxford, 1960), p.154.

Varro (*Fam.* 9.1–8), and in the correspondence between Cicero and Plancus (*Fam.* 10.1–24). On the other hand in the letters which Cicero sent to his intimate young friend C. Trebatius Testa (*Fam.* 7.6–22) Trebatius is seventeen times addressed by single name, never by two names, yet Cicero refers to himself three times as *M. Cicero*. The non-reciprocal styles may have been due to Cicero's consciousness of the greater respect due to him as the older man.

Headings with two names are common in letters of formal tone and in those addressed to personages with whom Cicero's relationship was not intimate. The aristocrat Appius Claudius Pulcher is addressed eleven times as *Appius Pulcher* in *Fam.* 3, but only once as *Appius*. Cicero on the other hand calls himself *Cicero* eleven times, but *M. Cicero* only twice. The discrepancy may reflect Cicero's recognition that his status was lower than that of the addressee, and perhaps also his desire to ingratiate himself: he was reluctant to deprive Appius of the deferential two-name address, but in calling himself *Cicero* he was inviting Appius to put the relationship on a less formal footing by employing the unaccompanied *cognomen* in reply. Other letters with two-name headings are those between Cicero and Pompey found at *Att.* 8.11 a–d, and those to Cato (*Fam.* 15.3–6). When writing to the young aristocrat Curio in *Fam.* 2 Cicero uses *M. Cicero* of himself five times, and Curio is addressed six times as *C. Curio*. Single names occur only three times. A formal letter of commendation (*Fam.* 13.6) to a man whom he scarcely knew begins *M. Cicero Q. Valerio Q. F. Orcae*. The recipient is paid the compliment of a full address, whereas Cicero avoids pomposity by giving himself two instead of three names. The absence of reciprocity is clearly intended as a mark of deference to Orca.

Single-name vocatives are the norm throughout the letters (see below, p.154), though in a few places two names are used for obvious reasons. In renewing an old acquaintance Cicero employs the vocative *P. Sitti* at *Fam.* 5.17.2. He himself receives the formal *M. Tulli* (on which see below, p.157) from Cassius at *Fam.* 12.13.2. And Atticus is addressed as *T. Pomponi* in a solemn appeal at *Att.* 3.19.3 (cf. *Att.* 4.2.5 *mi T. Pomponi*).

The style of third-person reference adopted in the letters was determined partly by the formality of the letter and of the particular context within the letter, and partly by Cicero's relationship with the addressee. If the relationship was close, third parties were highly likely to be mentioned by one name only. If it were more distant two-name reference was more common.

In the letters to Atticus Cicero usually makes use of single names. So in the first letter of the first book there are twenty-seven single names, but only six double names. At *Att.* 1.14 single names predominate by 33:1 (the context is senatorial), at 4.2 by 13:1, and at 4.3 by 31:4.

But Cicero's practice changes perceptibly when (for example) he writes in *Fam.* 3 to Appius Claudius Pulcher, with whom his relationship was uneasy. The two styles of reference are about as frequent as each other. Single names are used about twenty-two times (I omit a few cases of reference to freedmen by single names), double names twenty-four times.

So in the rather formal correspondence between Cicero and Pompey at *Att.* 8.11 a–d double names are proportionately far more common than in the letters to Atticus. In 11 a (Pompey) double names are preferred by 3:1, and in 11 b (Cicero) by 5:2. In 11 d (Cicero) there are four examples of each of the two forms of reference.

One category of letters in which two-name reference was the norm are letters

(or passages) of commendation: e.g. *Fam.* 2.14, 3.1.3, 6.8.3, 12.24.3, 13.6a, 13.8.1, 13.9.3, 13.16.1. Three-name reference is also found in such contexts: e.g. 13.13, 13.14.1.

In legalistic and official passages reference by two names is again frequent. A case in point is the description of senatorial proceedings at *Fam.* 1.9.7 (to Lentulus Spinther; the personages named are often mentioned elsewhere by one name only). Cf. e.g. *Q.Fr.* 3.1.15.

Finally, two names were of course often used for clarity: e.g. *Q.Fr.* 2.3.1 *C. Cato* (as distinct from *M. Cato*), *Q.Fr.* 2.8.2 *P. Crassus* (as distinct from the triumvir); or alternatively when the referent was unknown to the addressee (strictly most letters of commendation belong in this general category): e.g. *Att.* 1.18.4.

#### COGNOMINA

*Cognomina*, being mostly semantically transparent, were sometimes felt to carry prestige (among flattering *cognomina* may be noted, for instance, *Magnus* and *Felix*) or stigma simply because of their meaning or structure. None of the *tria nomina* attracts such frequent comment in Latin writers. Those who considered a *cognomen* to be undignified might seek to suppress it. Augustus, for example, had been given the *cognomen* *Thurinus* at birth, but because it possessed unfavourable associations he rejected it. Nevertheless he was taunted with the name by Antony (Suet. *Aug.* 7.1–2). One of Piso's *cognomina*, *Caesoninus*, was also stigmatized, to judge by Cicero's insulting references to it (*Pis.* 14, 27, *Red. Sen.* 13, *Prou. Cons.* 7).

But it was not usual for a member of the upper classes to reject a *cognomen* (for those who did in the late Republic, see below, p.152), whatever its sense or associations, even if political opponents might sometimes seize upon its unflattering meaning (as is done by Cicero at *Phil.* 3.16). Cicero, according to Plutarch (*Cic.* 1.3), was advised by some to drop his undignified *cognomen*, but he refused. The reason, as we shall see, was that to be named by *cognomen* in upper-class circles was a mark of acceptance in those circles. To be named by *nomen* was for the most part to be relegated to lower status. Hence on the one hand we hear of *M. Vipsanius Agrippa* attempting to suppress his *nomen* (*Sen. Contr.* 2.4.13 'Vipsanius Agrippa fuerat; at Vipsani nomen quasi argumentum paternae humilitatis sustulerat et *M. Agrippa* dicebatur'), and on the other of *C. Staienus* aspiring to be addressed by the *cognomen* *Paetus* (*Cic. Cluent.* 72). Cicero fastidiously sticks to the *nomen* to downgrade the man.

*Cognomina*, the last of the three names to become established,<sup>4</sup> seem first to have been employed by the aristocracy.<sup>5</sup> In keeping with their original character as nicknames they were probably slow to be accepted in formal contexts. In early Republican official documents naming is usually by means of *praenomen* + *nomen* rather than *praenomen* + *cognomen*. Later, however, *cognomina* are given either as well as or even instead of *nomina*. In the *S.C. de Bac.* all the personages named are referred to by *praenomen* + *nomen* (cf. the *Lex Agraria*); but in the document quoted by Caelius at *Fam.* 8.8.5 ff. *cognomina* are usually used, both instead of and in addition to *nomina*.

<sup>4</sup> See I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki, 1965), p.19.

<sup>5</sup> Kajanto, loc. cit.

The aristocratic origin of *cognomina* partly explains the special prestige which they enjoyed in the late Republic.<sup>6</sup> Most of the leading nobles of the Ciceronian period (with a few notable exceptions discussed below, p.152) seem to have eschewed the use of their *nomina*, except in the highly formal contexts in which all three names were used. In formal contexts they were both referred to and addressed by *praenomen + cognomen*, and in less formal circumstances by *cognomen* alone. Men further down the social scale, though they might possess a *cognomen*, were usually named formally by *praenomen + nomen*, and less formally by *nomen* alone. This was certainly the case when they were named by a superior; and there is also some evidence that non-aristocrats made use of *nomina* among themselves in preference to *cognomina* (see below, p.158).

Nevertheless some fluctuations are to be seen between the use of *nomina* and *cognomina* in application to lesser personages. These are to be explained in various ways (see below, p.154 for the evidence and further discussion).

A man with social pretensions might aspire to be named in the upper-class manner in circumstances requiring the use of two names. The non-prestigious form of reference *praenomen + nomen* might stick with him in the most formal contexts, but if he had moved up the social scale he might be treated as a peer by some aristocrats at least and accorded *praenomen + cognomen* in formal situations which fell short of the most exalted. Indeed even in highly formal contexts he might be quite haphazardly named both by *praenomen + nomen* and *praenomen + cognomen*; the choice would depend on the attitude of the speaker (see below, p.157 on the case of Cicero). The type of fluctuation with which we are dealing here was obviously due to the social mobility and aspirations which existed at Rome as in most societies.

In contexts demanding the use of a single name only it was common for a man of non-aristocratic background to be named by his *cognomen* as a sort of informal admission to membership of the highest social class. Formal admission to this class, however, might well be withheld: hence various persons in the pages of Cicero are either named by *cognomen* alone, if the context is non-formal, or by *praenomen + nomen*, in more formal contexts (see below, p.154).

It will be seen that the formality or otherwise of the context, and the status of the addressee, were not the only determinants of the manner of address: another factor was the feeling of the speaker towards the addressee. Two nobles might differ in their attitude to a man (such as a *nouus homo*) who had risen in social standing, and this difference in attitude might be reflected in the form of address adopted.

The fluctuations mentioned above arose when social intercourse took place between one man of high and another of lower status. Fluctuations were also typical when the intercourse was between two men of social pretensions who did not belong to the highest class. Each might sometimes acknowledge the other's aspirations by using the *cognomen*; but at other times pretensions might be put aside and the *nomen* (or indeed *praenomen*, if the relationship was intimate) employed. Such fluctuations occurred in the relationship between Cicero and Atticus (see below, p.159).

Similarly a man who had risen socially might usually be referred to in society at large by his *cognomen* once his new status had been accepted, whereas

<sup>6</sup> For some remarks on *cognomina* and their use by the aristocracy in the late Republic, see R. Syme, 'Imperator Caesar.

A study in nomenclature', *Historia* 7 (1958), 172 ff.

within the intimacy of his own family, where social pretences need not be kept up, he might continue to be named by his *nomen* (or *praenomen*). Cicero is again a case in point (see below, p.158).

*Cognomina* were both ancestral and personal. A personal *cognomen* could take some time to achieve wide acceptance, and for this reason a change in the naming of certain persons took place over a period (see below, p.000 on Lentulus Spinther and pp.152 ff. on Atticus and Pompey).

Other factors of less importance sometimes caused variations. A man usually referred to by *nomen* could on occasions be named by *cognomen* to distinguish him from another member of his family. The brothers T. Roscius Magnus and T. Roscius Capito, the enemies of Cicero's client in the *S. Rosc.*, are called respectively (T.) *Roscius* and *Capito* for the sake of clarity (see below, p.156).

In the next two sections some evidence is collected concerning the naming of nobles and lesser personages.

#### NOBLES

Sulla is always referred to formally as *L. Sulla*, never as *L. Cornelius*. But his personal *cognomen* *Felix* (see Vell. Pat. 2.27.5)<sup>7</sup> was slow to establish itself. It was not used of him by Cicero, though allusion is made to his *felicitas* at *S. Rosc.* 22, 136.

The *nomen* *Caecilius* was not in use in reference to members of the aristocratic family Caecilii Metelli. Formally in the speeches Cicero employed *praenomen* + *Metellus*, or sometimes *praenomen* + *Metellus* + *agnomen*. For *praenomen* + *Metellus*, see e.g. *Dom.* 7 (= Nepos; cf. 13, 70, 87, *Pis.* 35), *Dom.* 123 (= Q. Metellus Creticus; the names are in the vocative), *Pis.* 8 (= Celer; cf. *Cat.* 1.19, *Cael.* 34, 59, *Sull.* 65), *Pis.* 20 (= Numidicus). For the fuller style see e.g. *Red. Sen.* 37 (Q. Metellus Nepos), *Arch.* 6 (Q. Metellus Numidicus), *Balb.* 50, *Sull.* 70 (Q. Metellus Pius). The formal letter which Cicero wrote to Metellus Celer (*Fam.* 5.2) is addressed to *Q. Metello Q. F. Celeri*, a style which Metellus gave himself in the letter to Cicero (*Fam.* 5.1).

In the letters Cicero usually employs *Metellus* alone. In the letters to Atticus this *cognomen* is used six times of Celer and seven times of Nepos. Alternatively an *agnomen* alone is sometimes used (e.g. *Nepos* at *Att.* 2.5.2), or *Metellus* + *agnomen* (e.g. *Metellus Nepos* at *Att.* 2.12.2, *Metellus Numidicus* at *Att.* 1.16.4).

Q. Metellus Celer at *Fam.* 5.1.1 calls his brother Metellus Nepos simply *Metellus*, and this name is adopted by Cicero in reply (*Fam.* 5.2.8–9).

In formal speeches P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, cos. 57, is named by *praenomen* + *cognomen* (*Lentulus*). For the vocative *P. Lentule*, see *Dom.* 30, 70; for third-person reference, see e.g. *Red. Sen.* 5, 8, 9, 27, 28, *Quir.* 11, 15, 18, *Dom.* 7, *Pis.* 34, 35, 50, 80.

In the letters which Cicero sent to him he is twice addressed as *Lentule* (*Fam.* 1.9.4, 17). He is called *Lentulus* in the third person seven times in the letters *ad Fam.*, and fifteen times in those to Atticus. Twice in the letters he is referred to as *P. Lentulus*: at *Fam.* 3.7.5, in a letter to Appius Claudius Pulcher (we have already seen that Cicero often uses double names when writing to this man); and at *Fam.* 13.48, in a letter of commendation.

Lentulus had taken the personal *cognomen* *Spinther* (Val. Max. 9.14.4, Plin. *Nat.* 7.54, Quint. 6.3.57). Cicero does not use this name of Lentulus himself, but

<sup>7</sup> On this *cognomen*, see J. P. V. D. Balsdon, 'Sulla Felix', *JRS* 41 (1951), 1 ff.

he calls his son *Spinther* at *Att.* 12.52.2 and 13.10.3, and *Lentulus Spinther* at *Att.* 14.11.2. Here is another illustration of the slowness with which a personal *cognomen* might gain acceptance. Caesar, however, was prepared to call the father *Lentulus Spinther* (*Ciu.* 1.15.3, 1.22.1). Obviously the tastes and fastidiousness of individuals varied in this matter.

Caesar is constantly named formally as *C. Caesar*. This form of vocative occurs ten times in the *Marc.* (a senatorial speech), and also in the *Lig.* (1) and *Deiot.* (1, 4, 6, 16, 34, 43).

In third-person reference *C. Caesar* is so frequent in the speeches that it scarcely requires illustration (see e.g. *Cat.* 4.7, *Dom.* 39, 40, *Vat.* 15, 22, 38, *Pis.* 79, 80, 81, *Planc.* 93, *Mil.* 66). Caesar names himself thus in a quotation at *Suet. Iul.* 30.4.

There are just two exceptional places in Cicero where Caesar is called *C. Iulius* (*Prou. Cons.* 39, *Har. Resp.* 43).

There follows a list of nobles who are named by *praenomen* + *cognomen* in Cicero when two names are required (the examples given are very selective): *M'. Acilius Glabrio*, cos. 67 (*Verr. act. prim.* 4, 29, 41, 51), *M. Aemilii Lepidi*, coss. 78, 46 (*Balb.* 34, *Mil.* 13, *Phil.* 5.40, 13.7, 13.8, 13.10, 13.15), *M. Aemilius Scaurus*, cos. 115 (*Dom.* 50), *C. Aurelius Cotta*, cos. 75 (*Pis.* 62), *L. Aurelius Cotta*, cos. 65 (*Dom.* 68, 84), *C. Claudius Marcellus*, cos. 50 (*Att.* 10.12.3, 10.13.2, 10.15.2), *M. Claudius Marcellus*, cos. 51 (*Att.* 8.3.3, 8.12a.4), *Cn. Cornelius Dolabella*, pr. 81 (*Pis.* 44), *P. Cornelius Dolabella*, son-in-law of Cicero (*Fam.* 8.4.1, in a letter of Caelius), *D. Iunius Brutus* (*Phil.* 5.36), *M. Iunius Brutus* (*Fam.* 3.4.2, 7.22, *Brut.* 10), *M. Iuuentius Laterensis*, pr. 51 (*Planc.* 2, *Att.* 2.24.3), *L. Licinius Crassus*, cos. 95 (*Dom.* 50, *Pis.* 62, *Arch.* 6), *M. Licinius Crassus Diues*, the *triumvir* (*Balb.* 17, 50, 64), *P. Licinius Crassus*, cos. 97 (*Tusc.* 5.55), *P. Licinius Crassus*, son of *triumvir* (*Fam.* 13.16.1), the *Licinii Luculli* (see especially *Arch.*, *pass.*; cf. *Imp. Pomp.* 5, 10, 20, *Dom.* 132, *Pis.* 44, *Mil.* 73), *M. Liuius Drusus*, tr. pl. 91 (*Dom.* 41, 50, *Rab. Post.* 16, *Mil.* 16), *Q. Lutatii Catuli*, coss. 102, 78 (*Imp. Pomp.* 51, 59, 63, 66, *Cat.* 3.24, *Cael.* 59, *Red. Sen.* 9, *Dom.* 102, 113, 137), *L. Marcius Philippus*, cos. 91 (*Mur.* 36, *Dom.* 84, *Brut.* 166), *C. Papirius Carbo*, cos. 120 (*Mil.* 8), *M. Pupius Piso*, cos. 61 (*Pis.* 62), *C. Scribonius Curio*, tr. pl. 50 (*Fam.* 2.2. tit.).

Only a small group of nobles avoided the use of their *cognomina*. *C. Cassius Longinus*, the assassin of Caesar, and other members of the family are referred to by *nomen* rather than *cognomen* throughout Cicero, though at *Bell. Alex.* 50.1 and in a few other places in that work *Longinus* is used of *Q. Cassius Longinus*.

*L. Domitius Ahenobarbus*, cos. 54, and his son *Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus*, cos. 32 (on the *cognomen* see *Suet. Nero* 1.1) were called *Domitius*, though at *Caes. Ciu.* 1.15.6 the new method of naming *Domitius Ahenobarbus* is used (cf. *L. Domitius* at 23.2, 56.1). For *L. Domitius* see e.g. *Att.* 1.1.3, 2.24.3, 8.1.3, and for the vocative *L. Domiti* see *Mil.* 22. *L. Domitius* is the style of address employed in the heading of Pompey's letters at *Att.* 8.12 b–d. For *Cn. Domitius*, see *Deiot.* 31. The single name *Domitius* is constant in the letters.

*Q. Hortensius* is rarely attributed his *cognomen Hortalus* (but see *Att.* 2.25.1, 4.15.4). For *Q. Hortensius* see e.g. *Quinct.* 8, *Imp. Pomp.* 51, 66, *Mil.* 37.

*P. Seruilius Vatia Isauricus*, cos. 79, and his son *P. Seruilius Isauricus*, cos. 48, 41, were habitually called *Seruilius* or, formally, *P. Seruilius*. The *cognomina*



were not used. A good example of formal naming is found in an official senatorial context at *Phil.* 7.27: 'quibus de rebus refers, P. Seruilio adsentior' (for the formula, which was undoubtedly used in the senate, see *Att.* 7.7.7). For P. *Seruilius* see further *Imp. Pomp.* 68, *Red. Sen.* 25, *Dom.* 43, 123 (voc.), 132, *Att.* 1.19.9 (the modern style *Seruilius Isauricus* occurs at Suet. *Iul.* 3).

Appius Claudius Pulcher does not strictly belong here, since he was often styled by *cognomen* like the other nobles above. But one feature of his nomenclature is worth noting, for it will be relevant below. Though he is frequently named *Appius Pulcher* (e.g. *Fam.* 3.2.tit., 3.3.tit., etc.), when single names only were required he was constantly called *Appius* in contexts by no means intimate (e.g. *Att.* 2.22.2, 3.17.1, 4.2.3). He seems to have employed his rare and aristocratic *praenomen* as others might employ a *cognomen*.<sup>8</sup> His brother P. Clodius, however, was named formally by *praenomen* + *nomen* (e.g. *Att.* 1.12.3, 1.13.3, 1.16.4), or informally by *nomen* alone (examples abound in the letters to Atticus). He probably preferred his *nomen* to the *cognomen* partly because the style was less aristocratic, and partly because the pronunciation which he chose for it advertised 'popular' sympathies. On the other hand he once claimed to have received a letter from Caesar addressed to him as *Pulcher* (*Dom.* 22; see above, p.146). This would suggest that he might occasionally receive his *cognomen* from aristocrats, even if he liked to be known by his *nomen* instead.

Another possessor of an unusual and aristocratic *praenomen* was Seruius Sulpicius Rufus, cos. 51. He too is usually named in the third person by his *praenomen* as if it were a *cognomen* (e.g. *Mur.* 9, 10, 21, *Att.* 7.3.3, 7.17.3, 9.18.2, 9.19.2, *Fam.* 4.1.1).<sup>9</sup> Occasionally he is given his *nomen* alone (*Mur.* 24, 30, *Att.* 5.21.9), or *praenomen* + *nomen* (*Mur.* 7, 15, *Deiot.* 32, *Att.* 2.5.2). He does not appear to have been referred to by his *cognomen* (which was extremely common at the time).<sup>10</sup>

The earlier list of nobles named by *praenomen* + *cognomen* is certainly not exhaustive, and that of nobles styled by *praenomen* + *nomen* could also probably be extended slightly. But it is clear that the majority of nobles were known by their *cognomina* rather than *nomina*. Except in the case of Clodius it is not possible to say why a few of them avoided their *cognomina*.

I conclude this section with some remarks about vocatives. It has been noticed above from time to time that men of high status were not only referred to but also addressed in formal situations by *praenomen* + *cognomen*. This fact is worth stressing. It will be seen below that Cicero was addressed in the senate as *M. Tulli* (p.157), though he calls himself and is often called by others *M. Cicero*. At first sight it might seem that the formal method of address was by *praenomen* + *nomen*, even though the formal method of reference was by *praenomen* + *cognomen*. But Cicero was a special case, as we shall see (some parallels will be given). Distinguished men of the type discussed above were addressed formally just as they were referred to in the third person: if they avoided the use of their *cognomina*, they were addressed by *praenomen* + *nomen*; otherwise *praenomen* + *cognomen* were used.

The following list of examples (some of which have been given above) is by

<sup>8</sup> See Syme, p.173, on this *praenomen*.

<sup>9</sup> Syme, loc. cit.

<sup>10</sup> See T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet*

and other Roman Essays (Leicester, 1974), pp.107 f.

no means exhaustive: *Quinct.* 54 *M. Marcelle*, 80 *L. Philippe*, *S. Rosc.* 77 *P. Scipio*, *Mur.* 3, 83 *M. Cato*, *Sull.* 3 *L. Torquate*, *Flacc.* 85 *L. Luculle*, *Dom.* 30, 70, 75 *P. Lentule*, 113, 114 *Q. Catule*, 123 *Q. Metelle*, *P. Scipio*, *Har. Resp.* 22 *Cn. Lentule*, *Sest.* 101 *M. Scaure*, *Pis.* 58 *Q. Metelle*, *C. Curio*, *Mil.* 44 *M. Cato*, *Marc.* 2, 4, 7 *C. Caesar*, *Lig.* 1 *C. Caesar*, *Deiot.* 1, 4, 6, 34 *C. Caesar*, *Phil.* 1. 31 *P. Dolabella*, 3.27 *C. Caesar*, 8.28 *L. Piso*, *L. Philippe*, 11.20 *L. Caesar*, 13.10 *M. Lepide*.

Those addressed by *praenomen* + *nomen* are usually the special cases discussed above: e.g. *P. Seruili* (*Dom.* 123, *Pis.* 58, *Phil.* 12.5, 14.23), *L. Domiti* (*Mil.* 22), *Q. Hortensi* (*Imp. Pomp.* 52, 56).

#### LESSER MEN

The impression should not be given that nobles alone possessed or had the right to employ *cognomina*. It is true that many non-nobles in Cicero either did not have *cognomina* or at least were not named by them. But the pages of Cicero are also full of characters of less than the highest status who are named by *cognomina*. It is the formal method of naming by the two names *praenomen* + *cognomen* which was rarely accorded to those of low status in upper-class society.<sup>11</sup>

We have already pointed to the curious mixture of reciprocal and non-reciprocal systems of naming in the late Republic (p.150). In formal situations reciprocity of address was not the rule in intercourse between a noble or a man of high status on the one hand and a lesser man. The former would expect to be addressed by *praenomen* + *cognomen*, but in return the latter would usually be named by *praenomen* + *nomen*. Cicero was addressed in the senate by *praenomen* + *nomen* (see below, p.157), but in addressing men of prestige in formal circumstances he himself used *praenomen* + *cognomen* (see above). On the other hand a concession was sometimes made to solidarity when the context was less formal: a *cognomen* without *praenomen* might be used by the superior, just as he would receive a *cognomen*. In the letters of Cicero, where the requirements of informality caused single rather than double names to be employed as a rule in the vocative, it is usually *cognomina* which are used, whatever the relative status of writer and recipient. In the letters *ad Fam.* there are some sixty-eight examples of vocatives of *cognomina*, compared with only ten of *nomina*. In most of the latter cases the addressee either did not have or did not use a *cognomen* (11.3.1 *Antoni*, 11.29.3 *Oppi*, 12.1.1 *Cassi*, 12.21, 12.25.2, 12.27, 12.29.3, 12.30.3 *Cornifici*, 15.20.2 *Treboni*; cf. 7.20.2 *Trebat*, = *C. Trebatius Testa*).

There follow some examples from Cicero of men considered by him to be of subordinate status who are named formally by *praenomen* + *nomen*, but less formally by *cognomen* as a mark of solidarity.

There is a contrast between the method of naming Caelius used in the formality of the speech *Cael.*, and that used in the letters. In the speech he is at first referred to by *praenomen* + *nomen* (e.g. 3), and later by *nomen* alone (see

<sup>11</sup> Occasional real or apparent counter-examples could of course be cited; it is their comparative frequency which must be taken into account. It is worth stressing

that if a non-*nobilis* is named in this way he may have been ascending, or may have ascended, the social scale.

above, p.147). But in the letters he is accorded his *cognomen Rufus* in the vocative (*Fam.* 2.9.3, 2.10.4, 2.12.2). It is of note that Caelius did not venture to refer to himself as *Rufus* in writing to the older man Cicero, though he always uses Cicero's *cognomen* (see the address of *Fam.* 8.1–17, and the vocatives at 8.13.2, 8.16.1, 8.16.5). Caelius' recognition of his inferior status prevented him from openly claiming for himself the *cognomen*.

Milo was named by Cicero in the senate and popular assembly as *T. Annius* (*Red. Sen.* 19, 30, *Quir.* 15, *Har. Resp.* 6 twice), as too in formal contexts a few times in the *Mil.* (1, 6, 77 twice, 83, 100). Elsewhere in the speech, however, Cicero lapses into the cognomen *Milo*, as we have noted (p.147). But *T. Milo* is never admitted.

In the *Cael.* one of the prosecutors, L. Herennius Balbus, with whom Cicero was on friendly terms (25), is named both by *praenomen* + *nomen* (25, 49, 56) and by *cognomen* alone (27, 53). Again address by *praenomen* + *cognomen* is avoided. The old belief that there were two men to be distinguished in the speech<sup>12</sup> rested on a lack of familiarity with the two types of address coexisting at the time.

The equestrian C. Rabirius Postumus is first referred to in the *Rab. Post.* as *C. Rabirius* (1), but later he is called *Postumus*, both in the third person (4, 5, 10, 11) and in the vocative (45 twice, 47). *C. Postumus* does not occur.

In the *Arch.* the Greek Archias, who had been adopted by a Roman, is called either *A. Licinius* (1, 4, 9) or *Archias* (4).

P. Attius Varus, a man of undistinguished family, is in the *Lig.* alternately named *P. Attius* (5; cf. *Att.* 7.13a.3) and *Varus* (5, 22, 27). For the same alternation, see (e.g.) *Caes. Ciu.* 2.23.3, 2.25.1.

In the *Philippics* the senator Q. Fufius Calenus, cos. 47, whose background was not aristocratic, and with whom Cicero's relations were uneasy, is called either *Q. Fufius* (8.16, 18, 10.5, 11.15, 12.4; cf. *Att.* 9.5.1) or *Calenus* (8.12, 15, 19, 10.3, 6, 12.3, 4), but never *Q. Calenus*. In the letters to Atticus Cicero does not even pay him the compliment of reference by *cognomen* alone, but usually calls him *Fufius* (1.14.1, 1.14.5, 1.14.6, 1.16.2, 2.18.1, 11.15.2, 11.16.2; cf. *Phil.* 11.15). There is one example of *Calenus* in the letters (*Att.* 16.11.1). Here is a case where Cicero was apparently hesitant about going so far in downgrading a senator in public as to refer to him by *nomen* alone, yet unwilling to up-grade him by using his *praenomen* and *cognomen* together.

Cicero's client in the *Cluent.*, A. Cluentius Habitus, who was of distinguished but provincial family, is referred to variously as *A. Cluentius* (3, 7, 9, 18, etc.), *Habitus* (12, 26, 43, 44, etc.), *A. Cluentius Habitus* (11) or finally *Cluentius* (10 twice, 11). He is not called *A. Habitus* even once, despite the great frequency with which he is named.

The *cognomen* of the Spaniard L. Cornelius Balbus was rigorously avoided by Cicero in public in the speech *Balb.*, where the man is named either *L. Cornelius* (1 twice, 5, etc.) or *Cornelius* (4, 6, etc.). Convention apparently allowed that a distinguished Italian provincial (Cluentius) might be conceded his *cognomen* on its own, whereas that form of naming was likely in public to be withheld from a foreigner. In private, however, Cicero habitually referred to him as *Balbus*. The *cognomen* is very common in the letters (e.g. *Att.* 7.3.11, 7.4.2, 7.7.6, 8.2.1, 8.9a.2, 9.5.3, 9.7.3). Moreover at the head of the letters

<sup>12</sup> See Austin, p.156.

which Balbus sent to Cicero (*Att.* 8.15a, 9.7 b, 9.13 a) he names himself by *cognomen* (an indication of social aspirations not paraded, for example, by Caelius in his letters to Cicero: see above, p.155). *L. Balbus* does not seem to occur in Cicero.

T. Ampius Balbus, pr. 59, is called *T. Ampius* at *Fam.* 1.3.2 and 2.16.3 (he is given all three names at *Fam.* 13.70), whereas he is addressed as *mi Balbe* at *Fam.* 6.12.1. *T. Balbus* is avoided.

Finally, Cicero's opponent in the *Rosc. Com.*, C. Fannius Chaerea, is occasionally attributed his *cognomen* alone (1, 19, 45), presumably as a concession to the solidarity among advocates mentioned above (p.146), but when he is referred to by two names it is the *praenomen* and *nomen* which are used (2, 9). *C. Chaerea* does not occur.

There is an impressive consistency about Cicero's usage in all of these cases. Not once does he employ *praenomen* + *cognomen* of any of the eleven men concerned, none of whom was of the highest class. The *cognomen* is often used on its own, either because Cicero felt a genuine solidarity with the referent, or because convention required that he make a public display of such solidarity (Calenus, Chaerea). We have seen that informal naming in public and that in private were not always uniform. The foreigner Cornelius Balbus, to whom Cicero was favourable, was allowed his *cognomen* in private but only his *nomen* in public, whereas the senator Calenus, to whom Cicero was unfavourable, was given his *cognomen* in public but only his *nomen* in private. The attitude of the speaker to the referent was therefore only one of the determinants of the name selected. Lip-service also had to be paid to certain public prejudices. Clearly senators as a class enjoyed higher public prestige than foreigners, whatever their individual qualities, and it was unacceptable in public to downgrade the one class in nomenclature and to up-grade the other.

For one reason or another then Cicero sometimes employed the *cognomen* in reference to all of the above men. But it was also open to a member of the upper classes to avoid the use of the *cognomen* entirely when speaking of inferiors whose relative status he wished to emphasize, or with whom he had no desire or need to express solidarity, or whose position was so low that any expression of solidarity might be considered undignified. Address would then be by *nomen* alone, or formally by *praenomen* + *nomen*. In numerous places Cicero can be seen to be avoiding the *cognomen*. We have already noticed (p.149) an example: Staienus in the *Cluent.* is never permitted his *cognomen*, despite his desire to be addressed thus. Some further examples follow.

When identifying someone Cicero sometimes refrains from attaching the *cognomen* to the *nomen* in a three-name reference, and instead almost denies it the status of a *cognomen* by stating it in a relative clause. The brothers T. Roscii, for instance, the enemies of Cicero's client in the *S. Rosc.*, are described as follows: 17 'nam duo isti sunt T. Roscii, quorum alteri Capitoni cognomen est, iste qui adest Magnus uocatur, homines eius modi'. To distinguish between them Cicero employed an economical system of reference which permitted him to avoid *cognomina* as much as possible, and the complimentary *Magnus* entirely. Magnus, who was present in court, is always called *T. Roscius* (the *praenomen* was required to set him apart from Cicero's client) (e.g. 21, 24, 77, 98). His brother is called *T. Roscius Capito* (26, 96) or more simply *Capito* (21, 98, 99, 100). The respectful *T. Capito* is avoided, with the exception of an example at 19 (perhaps the *praenomen* is an interpolation?).

Another man whose *cognomen* is relegated to a relative clause is Sex. Clodius Phormio at *Caec.* 27: 'argentarius Sex. Clodius cui cognomen est Phormio'.

In the *Diu. Caec.* the prospective prosecutor of Verres, Q. Caecilius Niger, a Sicilian by birth, is called either *Q. Caecilius* (e.g. 4, 12, 20) or *Caecilius* (e.g. 22, 27, 31, 32). He does not receive his *cognomen*.

The different nomenclature appropriate to men of high and those of lower status is nowhere clearer than in the speeches against Verres. Nobles as usual are named formally by *praenomen* + *cognomen* (e.g. *Act. Prim.* 4, 3.123, 209, 212, 4.37), unless they belonged to the group who did not use *cognomina* (Q. Hortensius is mentioned particularly often). On the other hand the numerous *equites Romani* and other citizens of no distinction who crop up are almost without exception ascribed *praenomen* + *nomen*. It does not matter for our purposes whether or not they possessed *cognomina*. If they did not, clearly they contrast with nobles, the majority of whom did. If some of them did have *cognomina* (as is likely), then Cicero chose to omit them. There follows a list of *equites* named thus: *Act. Prim.* 30 M. Crepereius, 1.14 L. Flavius, 128 Cn. Fannius, 137 C. Mustius, 2.69 Q. Minucius, 71 M. Petilius, 107 C. Claudius, 119 Cn. Sertius, M. Modius, 176 L. Canuleius, 182 L. Vibius, 3.36 Q. Septicius, 60 C. Matrinius, 61 Q. Lollius, 63 M. Lollius, 135 P. Scandilius, 4.37 M. Coelius, 42 Cn. Calidius, 46 L. Papinius, 58 L. Titius, 5.74 M. Annius, 147 L. Suettius, 161 L. Raecius, 163 C. Numitorius. For an *eques* whose *cognomen* is mentioned (but only in a three-name reference), see 3.166 *P. Vettius Chilo*.

This list is not exhaustive. It consists mainly of those who are given the epithet *eques Romanus*. Many citizens of non-equestrian rank are also named in the same way.

#### SOME SPECIAL CASES

##### *Cicero*

In the senate Cicero was addressed as *M. Tulli* and perhaps sometimes referred to as *M. Tullius*. At *Att.* 7.3.5 he imagines himself as being asked to vote in the senate; it is the *praenomen* + *nomen* which are used: 'illud ipsum quod ais, "quid fiet cum erit dictum DIC, M. TVLLI?"—*σύντρομα*, "CN. POMPEIO ADSENTIOR"' (cf. 7.1.4, 7.7.7, 9.5.2). This is also the form of address used in a letter of formal tone from Cassius to Cicero at *Fam.* 12.13.2, by Catullus at 49.2 ('disertissime Romuli nepotum,/quot sunt quotque fuere, Marce Tulli'), and in a passionate speech put into the mouth of Milo at *Mil.* 94. Cf. ps. -Sall. *Epist. in Cic.* 1 *M. Tulli*.

In the senatorial speech which Sallust gave to Caesar in the *Cat.* there is a reference to *M. Tullius* (51.35), though elsewhere in narrative Sallust calls him *Cicero* (e.g. 26.1, 28.1, 28.2, 36.3). Note too *Cat.* 24.1 'consules declarantur M. Tullius et C. Antonius' (cf. Varr. *Ling.* 8.10 'consul fuit Tullius et Antonius'). Cicero refers to himself as *M. Tullius* once in an early speech: *Verr.* 4.79 'cur tuum munus sustineo, cur M. Tullius P. Africani monumenta requirit?'. The *nomen* also occurs in legalistic terminology at *Dom.* 44: 'VELITIS IVBEATIS VT M. TVLLIVS IN CIVITATE NE SIT BONAQVE EIVS VT MEA SINT' (cf. 47, 50 for quotations from the same bill, both containing *praenomen* + *nomen*).

Yet with the exception of the special passages above and the early passage from the *Verrines* Cicero usually formally names himself *M. Cicero*. In the

address of formal letters to the senate, aristocrats, or others he either used all three names, as in the letters to Q. Metellus Celer (*Fam.* 5.2), Pompey (*Fam.* 5.7), and the senate (*Fam.* 15.1, 15.2), or else *praenomen* + *cognomen*, as in the formal *commendationes* at (e.g.) *Fam.* 13.6, 40, 42, 43, 58, 59, 60, some of the letters to Appius Claudius Pulcher (*Fam.* 3.2, 3.6), the letters to Pompey at *Att.* 8.11 b, 11 d, the deliberately official-sounding addresses (containing titles as well as names) of certain letters to Caelius (*Fam.* 2.9–15), the letters to Seruius Sulpicius (*Fam.* 4.1–4, 6), and those to Cato (*Fam.* 15.3–6).

The apparent inconsistency between the senatorial style and the formal style used by Cicero himself is easy to explain. Cicero, a *nouus homo*, must have been formally styled *M. Tullius* by his superiors when he first entered public life, and this form of address remained with him in the senate. As he rose in prestige he obviously aspired to the more aristocratic formal designation *M. Cicero*, though content at first with the *nomen* (as the example from the Verrines indicates). His aspiration is apparently alluded to by Plutarch, who states (*Cic.* 1.3) that εἰπεῖν ὡς ἀγωνιέται τὸν Κικέρωνα τῶν Σκαύρων καὶ τῶν Κάτλων ἐνδοξότερον ἀποδείξει.

The prestige which Cicero attached to the name *M. Cicero* can be glimpsed at *Fam.* 5.15. When L. Lucceius wrote to Cicero he addressed him as *M. Tullius* (5.14), but Cicero in reply up-graded himself to *M. Cicero*. He seems to have achieved his ambition in upper-class circles. For the most part in the letters he is addressed formally as *M. Cicero* (note e.g. *Att.* 8.11 a, c from Pompey) or informally as *Cicero*.

We have already seen (p. 154) that address by *praenomen* + *cognomen* was very common in the senate. There is no evidence that a noble such as Caesar would have been addressed as *C. Iuli* in the senate but *C. Caesar* elsewhere. Cicero is a special case in that he sought to change his name as he moved up the social scale.

Within the intimacy of his family a man who has risen socially in his lifetime may well relax his pretensions. Though Cicero used his unaccompanied *cognomen* when writing informally to members of the upper classes, he employed his *nomen* to members of his own family (when not using the more intimate *praenomen*). He refers to himself as *Tullius* twenty-three times in *Fam.* 14 in the letters to his wife Terentia and his children, and twenty times in *Fam.* 16 in the letters to his freedman Tiro. It may be inferred that before he rose in status he was called *Tullius* by his peers: otherwise we would have expected him to use *Cicero* to his wife. It would seem then that the *cognomen* was not only withheld from lesser men by nobles, but was also not common in informal intercourse between equals of non-aristocratic families. The regular use of *cognomina* was therefore a mark of aristocratic society rather than of reciprocal address between equals of other classes.

Though Cicero usually names the son of his brother Q. Tullius Cicero by *praenomen Quintus* (e.g. *Q. Fr.* 2.6.2, *Fam.* 14.14.2, *Att.* 6.7.1, 10.7.3, 11.10.1, 14.13.5, 15.3.2), he refers to his own son almost exclusively as *Cicero* rather than by *praenomen* (e.g. *Q. Fr.* 1.3.10, 3.4.6, 3.6.2, *Att.* 1.18.1, 2.2.1, 2.7.5, 2.15.4, 4.18.5, 6.2.10). A particularly striking example is found at *Fam.* 14.14, where Cicero and his son write to Terentia and Tullia. Cicero as usual in these letters calls himself *Tullius*, but his son is called *Cicero*: 'Tullius Terentiae et pater Tulliae . . . et Cicero matri optimae . . .' Within the letters of this book the son is often named thus (e.g. 1.6, 4.3, 4.6, 5.1, 7.3).

The apparent absence of informality is at first sight puzzling, especially since the *praenomen* is used of the nephew. But by his tenure of the consulship Cicero knew that he had ennobled his son, and he was zealous to employ as often as possible the *cognomen* which that ennoblement entitled the boy to expect. His use of the *cognomen* reflects the new man's determination to exploit to the full a privilege which he had won for his family.

### *Atticus*

The case of Atticus is similar to that of Cicero. Atticus was the son of an *eques*, though he mixed with nobles. It is possible that he was sensitive about his origins (see *Nep. Att.* 1.3 for a story of rivalry between Atticus and certain fellow pupils who were nobles).

Atticus was adopted by his uncle Q. Caecilius in his will, and he took the name Q. Caecilius Pomponianus Atticus (see *Varr. Rust.* 2.2.2, *Nep. Att.* 5.1).<sup>13</sup> Cicero addresses him thus at the start of *Att.* 3.20, but otherwise disregards the new name.<sup>14</sup> It is probable that Atticus scarcely used it.

As to Cicero, the formal style of address to Atticus would, in his early days at least, have consisted of *praenomen* + *nomen*. Note the senatorial form of reference used by Cicero at *Att.* 7.7.7: '“DIC, M. TVLLI”. adsentior Cn. Pompeio, id est T. Pomponio'; and the equally formal expression 'te oro et obsecro, T. Pomponi' at *Att.* 3.19.3.

In the early letters to Atticus (books 1–5, written roughly between 65 and 50) Cicero invariably addressed him in the vocative by the *nomen Pomponi* (eight times: 3.4, 3.9.2, 3.15.7, 3.19.3, 3.22.3, 3.23.2, 4.2.5, 4.18.2), with the exception of one example of the *praenomen Tite* (2.16.3). However in the letters of the later books (6–16, covering the period 50–44) Cicero switched to the *cognomen Atticus*, which occurs in the vocative some twenty-two times (6.1.20, 6.2.8, 6.2.9, 6.6.4, 8.11.3, 9.6.7, 10.8.6, 12.3.1, 12.19.4, 12.23.1, 13.31.4, 13.38.2, 14.12.1, 14.16.3, 14.17.5, 14.20.3, 15.20.2, 16.2.2, 16.6.2, 16.7.3, 16.10.2, 16.15.5). In these books *Tite* is used at 9.6.5 (cf. 16.3.1, 16.11.3; and for *Titus* in third-person reference in Greek characters, see 2.9.4, 2.12.4), but *Pomponi* is avoided, even though, as we have seen, the reference to T. Pomponius in the senatorial style belongs to this period.

The change to *Attice* no doubt reflects on the one hand Cicero's sensitivity to the prestige of the *cognomen*, and his desire to dignify his friend. On the other hand it is also likely that for the same reasons Atticus liked to be known by his *cognomen*. *Nepos* in his life of Atticus usually refers to him as *Atticus*, though a few times early in the life he calls him *Pomponius*.

Atticus had long since adopted his complimentary *cognomen* (he moved to Athens in 83). But for fifteen years (from 65) Cicero only employed it in the third-person address of his letters, where it is invariable (there are certain letters in this early period which begin with the third-person address *Cicero Attico*, but within contain direct address by *nomen*). A new *cognomen* took some time to establish itself fully, as we have pointed out already. Clearly there was a period during which Cicero was embarrassed about using the *cognomen*

<sup>13</sup> See D. R. Shackleton-Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* ii (Cambridge, 1965), 156.

<sup>14</sup> See Shackleton-Bailey, *op. cit.* 158, 207.

directly to Atticus, perhaps partly because of its newness, partly because it was so overtly flattering. But once he got over his hesitancy he used the new name almost without exception. New *cognomina* undoubtedly presented a particular problem for Cicero, as we shall see further below from his remarks about Pompey's *cognomen Magnus*. Much as he might wish to use such a name, he found difficulty in bringing himself to do so. The threat posed by names, and the expedients (such as 'no-naming') adopted to avoid embarrassment, are familiar to linguists in differing forms in many societies. It is characteristic that once an individual forces himself to use a name which formerly possessed for him a taboo character, he may thereafter use it incessantly. Cicero rarely addresses Atticus by name in the early books of the letters, but after he adopted the *cognomen* vocatives became common.

In references to Atticus in other letters the same change in nomenclature also occurs. In the early letters *ad Fam.* (before 50) *Pomponius* or *T. Pomponius* is the standard form of reference (5.4.1, 5.5.1, 5.5.2, 5.5.3). Later, however, *Atticus* is always used (6.10.1, 7.30.2, 9.1.1, 9.4, 9.26.1, 11.29.1, 11.29.3, 13.17.1, 13.18.1, 13.18.2, 13.23.1, 16.23.2; cf. 13.1.5 *Pomponius Atticus*). But when writing to his wife Terentia, with whom, as we have seen, social pretences need not be kept up and might even seem intolerable, Cicero always called Atticus *Pomponius* (*Fam.* 14.5.2, 14.10, 14.14.2, 14.19). The *nomen* is also always used in the letters to Cicero's brother (1.3.8, 1.4.2, 2.3.7, 2.5.3, 2.10.2, 2.11.2), but these are all relatively early.

### *Pompey*

Pompey was of course superior to Cicero and Atticus in status, in that he was technically a *nobilis*. But he did not make use of his father's *cognomen Strabo*, and he was not always in possession of a *cognomen* himself. The various styles of naming which he receives in Cicero further illustrate the slowness of *cognomina* to win recognition, especially if they were flattering, and the desire of their possessors to be accorded them.

Pompey was known formally in the senate as *Cn. Pompeius*, examples of which appellation abound in Cicero. Here it is sufficient to refer to the senatorial context at *Att.* 7.3.5 (quoted above, p.157). In 81 he adopted the *cognomen Magnus*, and it is obvious that he wished this name to be used. So in the letters preserved as *Att.* 8.11 a–d between Pompey and Cicero, Pompey called himself *Cn. Magnus* in the aristocratic style (the same style is used in his letters to C. Marcellus, L. Lentulus, and L. Domitius preserved as *Att.* 8.12 a–d). Cicero was forced to return the address (*Att.* 8.11 b, d), though it was his habit to use the *praenomen* + *nomen* of Pompey in formal contexts elsewhere. He refers to the letters as *epistulae Pompei* rather than *epistulae Magni* at *Att.* 8.11.6. Here we see illustrated the difference between what Pompey would like to have been called, and what he was actually called in all but the most artificial situations.

Cicero was of course alive to the prestige which Pompey attached to the *cognomen*. At *Leg. Agr.* 2.53 he rebukes Rullus for his alleged desire to deprive Pompey of his *cognomen*. And in 59 he wrote to Atticus that *Magnus* was now well enough established to be used: *Att.* 2.13.2 'quanto in odio noster amicus Magnus! cuius cognomen una cum Crassi Diuitis cognomine consenescit'. But



this statement can virtually be taken as an admission of Cicero's self-consciousness in employing the *cognomen*, especially when seen in the light of his persistent use of *praenomen* + *nomen* when two names were required. A few times at this period, when his support for Pompey was at its most fervent, Cicero does indeed use *Magnus* (*Att.* 1.16.11, 1.16.12, 1.20.5, 2.13.2, *Arch.* 24), but not in conjunction with the *praenomen*. Moreover the name is scarcely used after 59, except in a few special contexts. At *Att.* 6.1.25 Pompey is called *Magnus Pompeius*, but there he is contrasted with Pompeius Vindillus. And at *Att.* 12.11 the new style *nomen* + *cognomen* is used. The example of *Magnus* at *Leg.* 2.6, being in a philosophical work, is of no great significance. Cf. *Mil.* 68.

After *Pompeius*, the most common single name which Cicero accords Pompey is the *praenomen* *Gnaeus* (which was used also by Atticus: see the quotations of his words at *Att.* 9.10.4–6). But whether Pompey would have been addressed in this intimate way to his face by Cicero is open to doubt. Those who would like to be on intimate terms with a superior will sometimes imply the closeness of their relationship by the casual dropping of an intimate name when speaking to third parties. But in direct confrontation with the object of their admiration they may be more respectful. Cicero is very formal in the few extant letters to Pompey. On the other hand it is possible that their relationship went through various phases: a period of intimacy may have been followed by a period of greater remoteness. For a use by Pompey of *Marcus* in application to Cicero when he was speaking to Quintus Cicero, see *Fam.* 1.9.9.

*Gnaeus* first turns up in the letters to Atticus at much the same time as *Magnus* (at 2.16.2, in 59). Later it is especially common in books 6–9 (50–49), when Cicero constantly expresses his hopes of and disappointments with Pompey.

#### PRAENOMINA

The *praenomen* was the most intimate of the *tria nomina*.<sup>15</sup> It was mainly used within the family and between close friends.

Cicero and his brother Quintus named each other by *praenomen*. Quintus addresses Cicero as *mi Marce* at *Fam.* 16.16.1, and at 16.26.1 in a letter to Tiro he refers to him as *Marcus*. The letters between the brothers are addressed either *Quintus Marco* (*Fam.* 16.16) or the reverse (e.g. *Q.Fr.* 1.1–4). Examples of the *praenomen* *Quintus* abound in the letters to Atticus (e.g. 1.5.2, 1.5.8, 1.15.1, 1.17.1, 2.4.2).

Cicero addresses his son as *Marce* at *Off.* 1.1 and 1.15, though he usually called him *Cicero*, as we have seen (p.158). Further evidence for the use of the *praenomen* within the family is found at *de Orat.* 2.249, where a mother is said to have addressed her son in this style: 'nam quod Sp. Caruilio grauiter claudicanti ex uulnere ob rem publicam accepto et ob eam causam uerecundanti in publicum prodire mater dixit "quin prodis, mi Spuri".'

Cicero and Atticus undoubtedly made frequent use of *praenomina* to each other in private conversation. The vocative *Tite* occurs at *Att.* 2.16.3 and 9.6.5 (cf. 16.3.1, 16.11.3) and at *Brut.* 292 (see also *Att.* 2.9.4, 2.12.4 for examples of *Titus* in the third person in Greek characters), and is also particularly common in the *Leg.*,<sup>16</sup> where Cicero, his brother Quintus, and Atticus are

<sup>15</sup> See Axtell, pp.398 ff. for some useful remarks on the use of *praenomina*.      asserting that Cicero used *Tite* only four times.

<sup>16</sup> Axtell (p.398) was mistaken in

imagined as conversing. *Praenomina* are used constantly (for *Quinte*, see e.g. 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.12, 1.18, 1.57, 2.7, 2.9, 3.12, 3.23; and for *Tite*, see 1.4, 1.5, 1.37, 2.34, 2.58 twice, 3.19, 3.33). It is however noticeable that Cicero refrains from putting his own *praenomen* into the mouths of the other interlocutors, no doubt because of the common delicacy which deters a man from mentioning his own most intimate name. Quintus is often made to call him *frater* (e.g. 1.5, 1.52, 1.56, 2.8, 2.11, 2.17, 2.43, 3.12, 3.19, 3.28, 3.34), while on the other hand Cicero always names Quintus.

In the letters *ad Fam.* the only *praenomen* used in direct address, with the exception of a few special cases e.g. *Serui*, is at 12.25.5 *mi Quinte* (Cornificius).<sup>17</sup> In the third person in the letters to Atticus Cicero often refers to Atticus' close friends Sex. Peducaei (father and son) as *Sextus* (e.g. 7.14.3, 10.1.1, 10.1a, 12.50, 15.7, 16.15.4 twice), probably because that was what Atticus himself called the pair. Cicero need not have been on familiar terms with them himself.

Brutus is referred to as *Decimus* at *Att.* 15.10 in a letter in which he is well spoken of, and at *Att.* 15.29.1.

We have discussed above the use of *Gnaeus* in reference to Pompey. In the letters to Atticus *Sextus* is often used of Sextus Pompey, perhaps to distinguish him from his father (e.g. 14.8.2, 14.13.2, 15.21.3, 15.22.1, 15.29.1, 16.1.4, 16.4.1). For the requirements of clarity as a factor motivating the use of a *praenomen*, see *Phil.* 7.3, 10.15, 13.4, *Att.* 1.18.4.

*Praenomina* were also used with contemptuous tone.<sup>18</sup> Cicero went through a phase in his correspondence with Atticus when he referred to his enemy Clodius as *Publius* (2.7.3, 2.8.1, 2.12.1 twice, 2.12.2, 2.15.2, 2.19.4, 2.22.4, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.7.2, 4.15.4 twice). In the speeches also the same use of *praenomina* sometimes occurs: *Quinct.* 38, 40 *Sexte* (= Sex. Naeuius), *Caec.* 102 *Sexte* (= Sex. Aebutius), *Dom.* 47 *Sexte* (= Sex. Clodius), *Mil.* 33 *Sexte* (= Sex. Clodius); note too *de Orat.* 2.286 'cum C. Cento prodisset et satis contumeliose "quid fers, Cinciole?" quaesisset, "ut emas", inquit "Gai, si uti uelis".'

The only other men named by *praenomina* with any frequency in Cicero are those with special aristocratic names. We have already mentioned Appius and Seruius. To these can be added Faustus (Sulla), the son of Sulla, whose *praenomen* was based on his father's *cognomen* (see e.g. *Cluent.* 94, *Leg. Agr.* 1.12, *Sull.* 54–5).<sup>19</sup>

#### VOCATIVES WITH AND WITHOUT *MI*

In the senate, assembly, and courts vocatives, whether of single or double names, were unaccompanied by *mi*. The same was true in scholastic debate: in Cicero's philosophical works *mi* is rare, even if the disputants were on familiar terms and made use of the familiar *praenomen* (as in the *Leg.*).

On the other hand in private letters (and no doubt conversation) *mi* was as a rule attached to vocatives. Of some eighty-seven vocatives in the letters *ad Fam.*, for instance, sixty-five are accompanied by *mi*; and in letters to particular intimates the proportion of examples with *mi* was even higher. Avoidance of

<sup>17</sup> On the context see Axtell, p.398.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Axtell, pp.399 f.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Syme, p.173. *Faustus* was an

ancient *praenomen* which had been revived: see Balsdon, *JRS* 41 (1951), 2 f.

*mi* imparted distance, or indicated respect. So in a letter of hostile tone which Brutus and Cassius sent to Antony it is the unaccompanied *Antoni* which is used (*Fam.* 11.3.1). And though Cicero employed the *mi*-form to Caelius (see below), he was addressed in return simply as *Cicero* (*Fam.* 8.13.2, 8.16.1, 8.16.5, *Att.* 10.9a.1). The discrepancy in age and the subordinate status of Caelius may account for the young man's choice of a non-reciprocal style, though it is possible that the particular contexts demanded a show of formality. Caelius' practice contrasts with the more familiar tones of another young man, Dolabella (*Fam.* 9.9.1, 9.9.3). Dolabella was related to Cicero by marriage, and he also writes as a self-assured aristocrat.

A relatively formal tone is also struck by the letters between Cicero and M. Iunius Brutus (*ad Brut.*). *Brute* is the normal form of address used by Cicero (18:3), and this style is reciprocated (7:1). Cicero also avoids *mi* when writing to the noble Seruius Sulpicius (*Fam.* 4.1.1, 4.5.4, 4.6.1), and the conspicuously aristocratic C. Scribonius Curio, despite his youth, is twice addressed as *Curio* (*Fam.* 2.6.1, 2.7.2), and only once as *mi Curio* (2.7.4).

In the letters to Atticus, Tiro, and Terentia, on the other hand, the possessive is usually attached. In those to Atticus *Pomponi* is unaccompanied at 3.15.7, *Attice* is unaccompanied at 6.2.8 and 12.23.1, and the formal address *T. Pomponi* is used at 3.19.3. *Mi Attice* occurs eighteen times, *mi Pomponi* five times, and *mi T. Pomponi*, *mi Tite*, *noster Tite*, and *noster Attice* once each. At 6.2.9 *Attice* is accompanied by *dulcissime*. When writing to his freedman Tiro Cicero employed *mi Tiro* (or *noster Tiro*) thirteen times (*Fam.* 16.1.2, 3.2 twice, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 twice, 7, 9.4 twice, 10.1, 20, 22.2), but *Tiro* (unaccompanied) never. For *mea Terentia*, see *Fam.* 14.1.5, 2.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.5, 4.6.

Other intimates who receive the *mi*-form of address are his old friend Paetus (seven times at *Fam.* 9.15–25), and certain younger men with whom his relationship was close: Caelius (*Fam.* 2.9.3, 10.4, 12.2), Trebatius Testa (7.13.1, 20.2, 21), and his son-in-law Dolabella (9.14.1, 14.4, 14.8).

#### AVOIDANCE OF NAMES

It was mentioned earlier (p.145) that lack of assurance in one's relations with a superior, or hostility towards an equal, an inferior or a superior may sometimes be reflected in the avoidance of names altogether. 'No-naming' plays an important part in the letters of Cicero.

An excellent example of the habit is found in the letters to Appius Claudius Pulcher (*Fam.* 3). Cicero never addresses him directly, though thirteen letters are extant. Similarly the letters to Pompey are notable for no-naming, though Cicero referred to him behind his back by *praenomen*. The frosty letters between the aristocratic Metelli (Celer and Nepos) and Cicero (*Fam.* 5.1–4) contain no vocatives. And Cicero was similarly distant when writing to Cato (*Fam.* 15.3–6).

After Cicero became estranged from his wife he ceased addressing her in the vocative. In the first four letters of *Fam.* 14 the intimate form of address *mea Terentia* is common, but in letters 6–24, which also often begin with the highly formal expression *si uales, bene est, ego ualeo*,<sup>20</sup> Cicero does not name her.

<sup>20</sup> Despite Seneca's claim (*Epist.* 15.1) that it was the custom up to his time to

begin a letter with the words 'si uales, bene est, ego ualeo', this formula is rarely found

A young man may refrain from naming an elder. This tendency may explain a characteristic of the correspondence between Cicero and D. Brutus (*Fam.* 11.4 ff.). Brutus is named by Cicero constantly (*mi Brute*: 11.14.1, 15.2, 16.3, 17.2, 18.1, 21.1, 21.4; *Brute*: 11.14.1, 16.3, 21.3, 24.1; the less intimate address is usually employed immediately after the *mi*-form), but Brutus does not reply in kind. He uses a vocative only once (11.13.1), and it is not accompanied by *mi*. There seems to be a similarity between the practice of Brutus and that of Caelius in their letters to Cicero.

No-naming of the type which arises from great intimacy (see above, p.145) is perhaps to be seen in the letters to Atticus, though an additional influence may have been on the one hand Cicero's desire to avoid the non-aristocratic *nomen*, and on the other his embarrassment about using the *cognomen* (see above, p.000). Whatever the reason, vocatives are far more numerous in the letters *ad Fam.* (for statistics see above, p.162) than in those to Atticus. Indeed in various books of the *ad Att.* no vocatives occur at all (1, 5, 7, 11). With these letters should be compared the much shorter and more mannered correspondence between Cicero and M. Brutus. In the latter there are twenty-nine vocatives, compared with only thirty-two in the whole body of the letters to Atticus.

No-naming can also be illustrated from the speeches. Cicero sometimes avoids naming an enemy explicitly, even though he might speak about him at some length. At *Sest.* 15 ff., for example, he discusses Clodius, Gabinius, and Piso in succession without naming any of them.

If avoidance of names reflects hostility, naming may reflect an attempt at ingratiation. So Vatinius, who had been the butt of an invective by Cicero, uses the familiar form of address (with *mi*) twice (*Fam.* 5.10 a 2, 10 b), but Cicero does not reciprocate. At *Fam.* 7.29.1–2 Curius uses a series of intimate terms of address to Cicero which are not returned. Curius was a friend of Atticus. His choice of vocatives may have been intended to imply mutual membership of a clique.

### CONCLUSIONS

The factors determining the form of address which a speaker might adopt were in a sense two-dimensional (see, however, above, p.150). On the one hand the formality of the context played a part: the following degrees of formality can be distinguished:

highly formal	three names
formal	two names
informal	one name
intimate	<i>mi</i> + one name
	<i>praenomen</i> , with or without <i>mi</i>

in the letters of Cicero. It occurs (whether in its basic form or slightly modified) mainly at the head of highly formal letters, such as *Fam.* 5.1 (Metellus Celer's letter to Cicero), 5.2 (Cicero's reply), 5.7 (a formal letter to Pompey), 10.35 (from Lepidus to the senate and people), 11.3 (from Brutus and Cassius to Antony), 12.15 (from

Lentulus to the senate and people), 13.6 (a letter of commendation), 15.1 and 15.2 (letters to the senate), *Att.* 8.11c (a formal note from Pompey to Cicero). Yet Cicero uses the formula in some ten letters to his wife from 49 B.C. onwards (*Fam.* 14.8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24). In doing so he was clearly delivering a rebuff.

On the other hand the social status of the referent acted in conjunction with the formality of the situation. In formal address the two names usually used of members of the upper classes (*praenomen* + *cognomen*) differed from those used of men of lower status (*praenomen* + *nomen*). Similarly in informal intercourse a *cognomen* was usually applied to those of high status, a *nomen* to those of lower.

Of the two intimate forms of address, that by *praenomen* was used only within closed circles (the family, small cliques of mutual friends).

We have seen that in formal contexts the system of naming operating between unequals was non-reciprocal. Nobles as a rule received their *praenomen* + *cognomen*, but usually did not concede them to subordinates. On the other hand in informal contexts nobles might express solidarity with an inferior by making use of his *cognomen*.

A study of nomenclature throws new light on aspects of social aspirations in the late Republic. *Noui homines* attached value to address by *cognomen*, because that form of address (particularly if the *cognomen* were preceded by the *praenomen*) was an additional mark of membership of the highest social class. Those with social ambitions might be expected to change the names which they employed as they rose in status.

Much attention has been devoted to inversion of *cognomen* and *nomen* (e.g. *Balbus Cornelius*), a phenomenon which starts to appear in the late Republic and becomes more common later.<sup>21</sup> But it is usually not noted that the first oddity of such nomenclature, when it is compared with the predominating Republican practice, is the juxtaposition of the two names without an accompanying *praenomen*. The order of the two elements is of only secondary interest.

The employment together of *nomen* and *cognomen* can be seen as a neutralization of the two socially distinct forms of two name address. It is in effect a conflation of address by *praenomen* + *cognomen* and that by *praenomen* + *nomen*. This conflation would be most likely to occur in the first instance in application to men whose status was ambiguous. We have seen in the case of Cicero that those who were not unequivocally aristocratic but who had risen socially might be accorded both types of two name address (*M. Tullius* and *M. Cicero*). The speaker was spared the need to make a choice when elements of both forms were used in combination. It is interesting to find that it is indeed persons of less than the highest class who are named by Cicero in the new style.<sup>22</sup>

Of the pair *nomen* and *cognomen*, the latter was the more 'personal' name. Often indeed *cognomina* were assumed by or given to particular individuals in the manner of nicknames. The *cognomen* therefore had something of the character of a personal *praenomen*.<sup>23</sup> It was obviously for this reason that, once address by *nomen* and *cognomen* had come into vogue, the order *cognomen* + *nomen* gradually established itself: the *cognomen* took the place of

<sup>21</sup> See Axtell, pp.392 ff., Syme, pp.172, 174, Shackleton-Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* i (Cambridge, 1965), 402, T. P. Wiseman, 'Pulcher Claudius', *HSCP* 74 (1970), 207 ff., especially 211 f.

<sup>22</sup> See especially Shackleton-Bailey, loc. cit.; cf. Syme, p.172.

<sup>23</sup> See Axtell, p.396, Syme, p.173 f. The close relationship between *praenomen* and *cognomen* is shown by Sulla's attribution to his son of a *praenomen* (*Faustus*) based on his own *cognomen* *Felix* (cf. Syme, p.173).

the *praenomen*. At the time of Cicero usage was in a state of transition: both orders are equally common.

*University of Manchester*

J. N. ADAMS

I am very grateful to Dr. J. Briscoe and  
Professor H. D. Jocelyn for numerous

detailed comments on a draft of this  
article.