

ROMAN NAMES IN THE PELOPONNESE

A. D. RIZAKIS, S. ZOUMBAKI: *Roman Peloponnese I. Roman Personal Names in their Social Context (Achaia, Arcadia, Argolis, Corinthia and Eleia)*. With the collaboration of M. Kantirea. (Meletemata 31.) Pp. 643, map. Athens: Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity, National Hellenic Research Foundation/Paris: Diffusion de Bocard, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 960-7905-13-X.

This handsome volume from the Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity in Athens is the first of a planned three, the second doing the same job for Roman personal names from Messenia and Laconia, the third offering specialist studies based on the material in the first two volumes. The project was conceived in 1989, and a preliminary conference in Athens in 1993 led to the publication of *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East* (Athens 1996), edited by the project-leader Athanassios Rizakis, and giving a good idea of the value to historians of Greek lands under Roman rule of the onomastic material collected here.

This first volume collects, from the primary sources for each region (mainly inscriptions), those individuals whose personal names are partly or wholly Roman. The overlap with the Oxford-based *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* is limited, since this last systematically records Roman names only when an individual with the *tria nomina* of a Roman citizen bears a Greek *cognomen*. As well as local non-Romans (*peregrini*) with a Roman personal name and locals with the apparent nomenclature of Roman citizens (the bulk of the entries), outsiders are included, not just other provincials but also members of the Roman governing class (but not the imperial dynasties). The timespan covers the second century B.C. to 'the period after Constantine' (p. 41), defined in effect as early-Christian times up to and including the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. (e.g. p. 56 no. 21).

As for presentation, entries are grouped regionally, with the result that some individuals are split over more than one entry (e.g. Plutarch's Epidaurian friend Gnaeus Cornelius Pulcher, who turns up, with cross-references, under both 'Argolis' and 'Corinthia', since inscriptions relating to him have been found in both Epidaurus and Corinth). Headwords are in Greek capitals, but commentary is in English. The individual's name as it appears in the Greek or Latin original(s) is usually cited; many inscriptions are quoted extensively or in full (without translation). Thus a typical entry gives the individual's name; details of the inscribed stone(s) on which it appears, including date; part or all of the actual text(s); and epigraphic and prosopographical remarks. Unpublished inscriptions are sometimes drawn on (for Patrae, e.g.), and published readings have been extensively checked by autopsy. There are twenty-one genealogical tables (three of them modern variants of the tortuous stemma of Herodes Atticus).

The individual entries in the main are of high quality in terms of the exactitude of their handling of the source-material and their scholarly commentary. As an onomastic and prosopographical tool, this volume will become a standard reference work. There is to be an electronic version, taking account of the inevitable corrections or additions which the project-leader candidly anticipates (p. 11). With which in mind, three small observations are offered:

p. 194, no. 137: the restoration in an Epidaurian inscription (by W. Peek) of the gentilicium (assuming she had one) of the wife of the Spartan dynast Eurycles as

[*Ioulia*] is a guess—a not unreasonable one arguably, on the assumption that she was enfranchised with her husband in the same grant—but it is entirely unsupported by any ancient evidence, and should not be allowed to harden (as yet) into ‘fact’;

p. 196, no. 141: ‘Idrieus’ is a personal name, famously borne by an earlier Carian, the brother of Mausolus, who is presumably being recalled in the nomenclature of this member of Antonine Mylasa’s élite;

p. 458, no. 453: Atticus, father of Herodes, is now known from a military diploma to have held a first (and only?) consulate only under Hadrian, as clarified in A. R. Birley’s 1997 paper in *ZPE* (cited here).

There are some (mainly trivial) slips in the English. These are far outweighed by the generous decision to publish the material in English (rather than modern Greek) in the first place. The authors and their collaborators have done an invaluable service in imposing order on the great scatter of onomastic data for these regions of the Peloponnese. The project when complete looks set to transform the value of onomastics for studies of Roman rule in the region. The next two volumes are eagerly awaited.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

A. J. S. SPAWFORTH

GREEK POLEIS ONCE AGAIN

T. H. NIELSEN (ed.): *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 6.* (*Historia Einzelschriften* 162.) Pp. 294, maps, ills, pl. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002. Paper, €64. ISBN: 3-515-08102-X.

Yet another book by the Copenhagen Polis Centre (=CPC) has appeared! This is the sixth volume of *Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre* that is issued parallel to *Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre*. Although the extremely productive CPC project, a brainchild of Mogens Herman Hansen, is getting close to its completion, this is not its last volume. Of the centre’s final publications, the first one, a comparative study of thirty attested city-state cultures in the world history, has already appeared (cf. *CR* 51 [2001], 312–14; recently followed by a supplementary volume: M. H. Hansen [ed.], *A Comparative Study of Six City-State Cultures* [Copenhagen, 2002]). The second final publication, a comprehensive inventory of all Greek *poleis* of archaic and classical date attested in contemporary sources, will soon be available from the Oxford University Press. Furthermore another two volumes with general studies on the *polis* are in preparation for the two series of the centre. How, then, is Nielsen’s present volume to be judged, and what is its overall contribution to the CPC project?

According to Hansen, the *polis* was a type of state. No matter how self-evident this may seem, it is far from generally accepted. Moshe Berent has, for instance, compared the *polis* with the anthropological concept of a stateless society in contrast to the modern state as described in 1651 by Thomas Hobbes. In the present volume, Hansen argues against Berent, criticizing him for doing this instead of matching it with the anthropologists’ own view of what a state is. Furthermore, in order to emphasize the similarities between the *polis* and the state as conceived by Hobbes, Hansen collects all sources showing that the Greeks did not simply identify the *polis* with its citizens, as

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved