CITIES AND FOUNDERS IN ANTIQUITY

Commemorative naming may seem a straightforward matter to us, in an age when maps of the world, and particularly those parts of it settled by Europeans since the Renaissance, are so thickly bestrewn with the names of monarchs, lords, generals, explorers, scholars and the like, but to name a city after a person would no doubt have seemed surprising to Romans of the early republic, and the Greeks too came late to the idea. The growth of the practice in the ancient world can to some extent be traced, and from the patterns of occurrence of such names and from certain details of their formation some notion may be deduced of what they conveyed to contemporaries - direct evidence for this being sadly deficient. Even if questions cannot be fully answered, they may at least be raised and complexities suggested that go beyond the apparently simple fact of a city being named after someone.

Places may, of course, get their name from a personal name not by any definite act of naming but rather from mere reference within a community: 'John's house' may be identified as such locally, though it may have been named and be known to the Post Office as 'The Laurels'. Thus in France, for instance, countless place-names in *-ac*, *-é*, *-y*, etc. continue earlier forms in *-(i)acum* derived from family names and once indicating family estates. Such labels will not be considered here, attention being turned rather to those names that may be supposed to have been formally given to or adopted by a town or city.[1]

---

[1] It is interesting to note that names derived from personal names seem not to have been given to natural features - mountains, rivers, etc. - by the Greeks and Romans. (Exceptions are the parts of the Alps that came to be distinguished as the *Alpes Cottiae* and

That importance might be attached by the Greeks to the naming of a city at its foundation is suggested by an episode in the *Birds* of Aristophanes: Pisthetaerus has persuaded the birds to join him in building a new city, and they ask him what is to be done; 'First,' he replies, 'give a grand and glorious name to the city, and after that make sacrifice to the gods' (809 ff.) - the name chosen in this instance is *Nephelokokkugia* 'Cloud-cuckoo city'. How names were chosen for real cities founded by Greeks in the early historical period is not known,[2] but they are certainly not all grand and glorious. There is no shortage of examples, for from the eighth century BC onwards numerous colonies were founded on the shores of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea and were given names of various kinds: an original local name might be retained, or a name might be imported from the homeland, or a city might be named after a nearby river or some characteristic feature of the region (e.g. *Selinous* 'abounding in celery'), or after a deity, as in the many instances of *Apollōnia*, *Herakleia*, *Poseidōnia* (Risch 1965: 195ff.). In practice the names conform roughly to the pattern outlined by Plato, who, in discussing the establishment of an ideal city, treats the matter of the name only in an unconcerned aside (*Laws* 704a), supposing that the newly founded city will take its name from the conditions of settlement, from some locality, or from the name of a river or local deity. It will be noticed that the list of possibilities does not include the name of the founder, and this too is true to early Greek practice. This is the more remarkable for the fact that the name of the founder of a city would be known, remembered and revered, and he would be the object of a cult within the city after his death; but there are no clear examples (*pace* Malkin 1985) of early Greek city names derived from the names of founders.

In striking contrast, many older cities, whose origins were no longer known, do have eponymous 'founders' - assigned to them in retrospect: for instance, the heroes *Kamiros*, *Ialusos* and *Lindos* correspond to the three main cities of ancient Rhodes (Pindar, *Ol.* 7.73 ff.), and *Sikuōn* (Hesiod, fr. 224 M-W) is associated with the city of the same name that seems originally to have been so called

---

Alpes Iluiae, but these are very much sub-divisions of a mountain chain known as *Alpes*.) This may reflect a feeling that rivers, etc. would have names that needed only to be discovered, while a new city would naturally need a name to be given to it, but it also suggests a political rather than purely commemorative connotation for such names.

I have restricted the discussion in this paper to the Graeco-Roman world, but the phenomenon of eponymous foundations is of course to be encountered in other ancient societies: for some interesting examples from Iran see Klingenschmitt 1980.

[2] In the *Birds*, Pisthetaerus thinks up the name and the birds agree to it, which may well mirror actual practice, with the colonists approving the choice of the founder; so Hagnon, sent out from Athens as the designated founder, named Amphipolis (Thucydides 4.102.3).

from the excellence of its cucumbers. These 'founders' are incorporated into the Greek mythological system - so *Kamiros* and his brothers are sons of Helios and Rhodes, *Sikuōn* the son of Erechtheus - and the tradition of inventing them seems to be of some antiquity, since already in Homer the family tree of the royal house of Troy includes *Ilos* and *Dardanos*, with obvious reference to *Ilios* and *Dardaniē*, alternative names of the city.

Given this relationship between city and mythical 'founder', it is perhaps not altogether surprising to find an instance of a city actually named for such a figure (Risch 1965: 200): *Marōneia* was the name given to a city founded from Chios in the seventh century BC in the Ismarus region of Thrace, and it seems to derive from *Marōn*, the name in Homer of a priest of Apollo, dwelling near Ismarus, who gave to Odysseus the wine with which he later made Polyphemus drunk (*Od.* 9.196); this Maron was subsequently, by natural association, identified as a son or grandson of Dionysus, and as a suitable local hero adopted by the colonists as their founder.

All of this indicates that a mythical hero was an acceptable eponym, but a living person was not; a founder might receive heroic honours after his death, but at the time of the foundation his status must still have been such as to preclude his name being given to the city. It may be supposed then that the change abruptly introduced by Philip II of Macedon in the mid-fourth century BC would have come as something of a shock to the Greek world. In 357 Philip founded *Philippoi*: the name is startling for its association with a living person, and also puzzling in formation, being just the plural of the personal name - the exact significance intended can only be guessed at, perhaps 'Philip and his people'. There followed several cities with the name *Philippou polis* 'City of Philip', more readily understood but equally without precedent. City names containing the element *polis* 'city' seem only to have become well established in the preceding century, and those consisting of the syntagm genitive + *polis* are essentially to be found earlier only in Greek names given to Egyptian cities, so *Hēliou polis* 'City of the sun', *Krokodeilōn polis* 'City of crocodiles', etc. (Risch 1965: 200 f.); but the use of a man's name in such a formation is something quite new. Yet no contemporary Greek comment has survived to enable us to judge how outlandish this may have seemed, and only speculation is possible as to why Philip should have felt it appropriate to impose his own name on his foundations in this way: certainly a monarch with wide dominions may allow himself a licence not readily granted within the confines of a city-state.[3]

Alexander followed the examples of his father with *Aleksandrou polis* in Thrace, but it was the foundation of *Aleksandreia* in Egypt in 332/1 (the first of many cities of this name that Alexander was to establish throughout his empire) that introduced a new type of name, which was widely used over the next few centuries. The formation may be revealing, if Risch (1965: 201 f.) is right in his explanation of its origin: he argues that the most likely model

---

[3] For discussion of this question see Malkin 1985.

for the name in *-eia* would be *Khairōneia* in Boeotia - the site of an important battle in 338 that secured the Macedonian domination of Greece and in which Alexander himself took part; *Khairōneia* had long been associated with an eponymous founder-hero *Khairōn*, son of Apollo; the name *Aleksandreia* would thus be tantamount to a claim to heroic status, and it is doubtless no accident that it was at this time that Alexander visited the oracle at Ammon, where he was hailed as the son of Zeus.[4]

Aleksandreia set the pattern for the successor states, in which the cult of the ruler assumed increasing importance, and the names of Hellenistic monarchs served as the base for many a *Kassandreia*, *Attaleia*, *Seleukeia*, *Antiokheia*, *Lusimakheia*, etc.; in due course cities also came to be named after the wives, mothers or daughters of rulers, giving *Laodikeia*, *Eurudikeia*, *Arsinoeia*, etc.[5] These names were conferred upon new cities and also upon older ones that were refounded - a process that no doubt involved some sort of reorganization and provided a convenient opportunity for a change of name. Names of this kind were frequently changed, as cities came under the sway of different rulers, which in itself indicates that the names retained significance in proclaiming the association of a city with a particular dynasty. That honour was at the same time bestowed upon the eponym was no doubt a consideration, especially in the case of members of the family, but this can only have been true to a limited extent when the names were so rarely specific - a *Seleukeia*, for instance, might have been named for any *Seleukos*. More specific are the formations from royal titles, so that an *Epiphaneia*, for example, may be assumed to be a foundation of Antiochus IV Epiphanes of Cilicia. A further example (though the formation is with a different suffix, for no obvious reason) is *Eupatoria*, named for Mithridates Eupator of Pontus and still unfinished when that monarch was defeated in 63 BC by Pompey, who refounded the city as *Magnopolis*, and so ushered in a new era of city naming in the Greek world under Roman auspices.

Among the early Romans there seems to have been no tradition of naming towns for persons. Roman expansion within Italy was accompanied by the founding of a number of colonies, but for the foundations of the early republic existing local names were used or else

---

[4] Risch points out that the ethnic corresponding to *Aleksandreia* is *Aleksandreus* 'a citizen of Alexandria', whereas normally a place-name in *-eia* would have a corresponding ethnic in *-eiōtes* or *-eieus*; there are a few *-eia/-eus* combinations, e.g. *Mantineia* in Arcadia with ethnic *Mantineus*, where it is probable that the ethnic is in fact the base for the derived place-name, but there are in general very few old examples - the best being *Khairōneia* with *Khairōneus*.

[5] Women's names could also be given to cities without alteration; this seems to have been particularly common in the case of Ptolemaic foundations - so *Arsinoē*, *Berenikē*.

abstract names of good omen, as *Copia* 'Plenty'. Even the instances of mythical eponymous founders to be encountered in Roman literature (*Romulus* for Rome being the most familiar) are likely to be the product of Greek influences. The names of persons could be attached to roads (e.g. *via Flaminia*) or buildings (e.g. *pons Aemilius*) or military camps (e.g. *castra Claudiana*, and even to markets that became the nuclei of later towns (e.g. *forum Aurelium*), but these examples belong essentially within the sphere of reference labels as indications of the person responsible for construction; the naming of a town, and thereby its inhabitants, after an individual would be quite a different matter, and there is no evidence for the practice in early times.

In the second century BC, however, there are instances of towns in Spain being named after Roman commanders: *Graccurris* in the Ebro valley was founded in 178 by Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, and *Brutobriga*, known only from coins and of uncertain location, is probably to be associated with D. Iunius Brutus, who was campaigning in Spain in the years following 138. These names are formed in accordance with native rather than Roman patterns: *-urris* recurs as an element in Iberian place-names that cannot be further analysed because of the obscurity that still surrounds this language; *-briga*, on the other hand, is recognizable as a Celtic form, with an Indo-European etymology, which appears as the second element of a number of place-names in Spain and seems originally to have meant something like 'fortified height'.

These Celtic *-briga* names are compounds, of the same type as those found in Gaul and Britain with second elements such as *-magus* 'field' or *-dunum* 'fort'. The first elements of these names are not always clear, but there are examples with an adjective (e.g. *Noviodunum* 'New fort'), a noun (e.g. *Blatomagus* 'Field of flowers', *Carrodunum* 'Chariot fort'), or more rarely a divine name (e.g. *Camulodunum* 'Fort of Camulos'); there are no certain examples with a personal name as the first element, although there is some ambiguity in cases where an adjective is found which is also attested as a personal name, so that *Cambodunum*, for instance, may be either 'Crooked fort' or 'Fort of Cambos'.[6] Yet it is hard to see how *Brutobriga* could have been formed without a Celtic or Latin model: might the fact that *brutus* existed as an adjective as well as a name have helped?

Both *Brutobriga* and *Graccurris* are built on the *cognomina* (*Brutus* and *Gracchus*) rather than the *gentilicia* (*Iunius* and *Sempronius*) of the Romans concerned. At this period a Roman would have a *gentilicium*, an inherited family name, and a *praenomen* (as here *D(ecimus)* and *Ti(berius)*) to distinguish him as an individual; he might but need not have a cognomen, which would have begun as a form of nickname for an individual but often became part of the family name, to be passed on through the generations. For official purposes, the *praenomen* and *gentilicium* made up a man's name, the *cognomen* having no recognized status - in early inscriptions, for instance, the names of consuls are given without mention of their

---

[6] See Dottin 1920: 85 ff. for further examples.

cognomen, if they had one. Perhaps the fact, already signalled by the formations in *-briga* and *-urris*, that these towns were built for natives made the choice of this part of the founders' names more suitable - the foundations would thus have been personal rather than formally Roman and official. It is surely significant that when the same D. Iunius Brutus founded a town for demobilized troops he followed the traditional Roman pattern and named it *Valentia* 'Strength'.

A few years later, in 122 BC, *Aquae Sextiae* (Aix-en-Provence) was founded by C. Sextius Calvinus, probably as a garrison rather than a colony, and here the *gentilicium* is used, attached to *Aquae* 'waters' in a formation of a familiar Roman kind (cf. *forum Aurelium*, etc. above), with the important difference that this name may be assumed to have been definitely given to the town, so that the type has been extended in use from reference to naming. A further extension brought true colonies into the system: the first example would seem to be *Mariana* on Corsica, if it was indeed established by C. Marius in the early first century. Not much later, after 82 BC, a colony for veterans was established at Pompeii by L. Cornelius Sulla, and this he named *Colonia Veneria Cornelia*, after the goddess Venus and himself.[7] The association of a person's name with a colony, a settlement officially established by the Roman state, is a new development, and is to be seen in the context of the disorders of the period, when armies were increasingly looking to their commanders to provide for them, and when personal loyalties so created might offer a basis of support for a military commander in any bid for power.

For Sulla's colony at Pompeii, *Cornelia* was essentially an additional title rather than the actual name. Such 'honorific' additions became more frequent, especially under Julius Caesar, so that several towns (of whatever status) had *Iulia* as part of their title. (*Iulia* was also bestowed as a title, beside *Augusta*, by Augustus and his immediate successors, and it is not always possible to know whom it commemorates.) That the practice was more widespread in the last years of the republic than surviving names might indicate, and that a significance beyond a mere historical record of foundation was attached to it, is suggested by examples of titles that have clearly been replaced or allowed to disappear. Lugdunum (Lyons), for instance, became a Roman colony in 43 BC as *Copia Felix Munatia*, bearing the name of L. Munatius Plancus, but in the next century it appears as *Copia Claudia Augusta Lugdunum*, with imperial titles substituted. Similarly Celsa in Spain, founded in 48/7 BC, issued coins as *Col(onia) Vic(trix) Iul(ia) Lep(ida)*, apparently with reference both to Caesar and to M. Aemilius Lepidus, but under Augustus it is simply *Colonia Victrix Iulia Celsa*.

Augusta is found not only as an extra title but also as the principal name of towns; cf. *Augusta Praetoria* (Aosta), *Augusta*

---

[7] There is a further question to consider in connection with the use either of the *gentilicium* as such in the feminine (so *Cornelia*) or an adjective derived from it (so *Mariana*), but I cannot discuss it here; see Meister 1916: 81ff.

Suessionum (Soissons), *Caesaraugusta* (Zaragoza), etc. Towns built for native peoples in the western provinces, however, provide further examples of Celtic compounds; cf. *Caesarobriga*, *Iuliobriga*, *Augustobriga* (all in Spain), *Caesaromagus* (near Chelmsford), *Iuliomagus Andevacorum* (Angers), *Augustodunum* (Autun), etc. Thus a pattern was set for later emperors and later dynasties.[8]

Some interesting subtleties of usage have been observed (Galsterer-Kröll 1972: 50 ff.). It seems that in honorific titles the combination of *gentilicium* and *cognomen* (e.g. *Iulia Augusta*, *Ulpia Traiana*, *Aelia Hadriana*) is typically reserved for colonies and *municipia*, that is communities of a status that gave certain rights of citizenship, whereas other towns might have one or the other but not both. Even then some distinctions may be made: under Hadrian, for instance, *Aelia* is reserved for colonies and *municipia*, while Trajan seems to have followed a geographical criterion, allowing *Ulpia* in the western provinces but in the east only for Heraclea Salbace, the home town of his doctor.

No doubt, as the last example suggests, these titles were conferred as a mark of favour, rather as certain English towns have been granted the status of Royal Borough, and as Bognor became Bognor Regis in 1929 after George V had stayed there for a period of convalescence. There is a record (Dio 54.23.7 f.) of Augustus in 15 BC allowing the title *Augusta* 'as a mark of honour' to Paphos on Cyprus. (It is interesting to note that this was done by a decree of the senate. Dio contrasts this with the practice of his own day, some two centuries later, when he claims that towns just adopted what titles they pleased - which is hard to believe.) Paphos seems to have been granted the title in connection with help afforded by the emperor after an earthquake. The system was thus of mutual benefit, as towns achieved a mark of distinction, while emperors built up loyalties and advertised their munificence. So when Puteoli in Italy was raised to the rank of colony by Nero (Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.27), it took a title from his name at the same time; in this case the association was short-lived - a few years later the town is attested as *Colonia Flavia Augusta*, with Nero's name discarded in favour of the *gentilicium* of Vespasian. As in the Hellenistic world, such replacement of names and titles is an indication that they were perceived as having a commemorative function. To this end Commodus, in 190 AD, renamed Rome with his own full name as *Colonia Lucia Antoniniana Commodiana*, which duly appeared on coins but is otherwise attested only in the accounts of historians, where it may be cited (*SHA*, *Commodus* 8.6) as a clear sign of his *dementia*: immortality through names can be dearly bought.

Nero too had sought to achieve lasting fame by the use of his name, converting the month of April, for instance, to *mensis Neroneus*, and it is alleged (Suetonius, *Nero* 55) that he intended to change the name of Rome to *Neropolis*. That this should be a Greek formation may be ascribed to Nero's penchant for Greek culture,

---

[8] A full collection of the evidence is provided by Galsterer-Kröll 1972.

but the choice of this type of name should also be seen in the context of developments in the Greek-speaking east, where Roman supremacy was accompanied by a shift in place-name formation.

It was noted above that Pompey renamed Mithridates' *Eupatoria* as *Magnopolis*. Pompey had taken the title *Magnus* 'the Great', and thus the city was named after him; he also founded or refounded several cities with the name *Pompeiopolis*.[9] Not that all Pompey's foundations bore his name - he was responsible for *Diospolis* 'City of Zeus', *Nikopolis* 'City of Victory', and others - but he was clearly not averse to the idea. The local Greek tradition was no doubt the main factor, but it may also be noted that he had earlier served in Spain, where there were Roman examples to hand, and indeed it may be that he was the Pompeius after whom *Pompaelo* (Pamplona) was named - the name is an indigenous formation, probably equivalent to 'City of Pompey'.[10]

From the Greek point of view, the novelty of Pompey's practice lies in the reversion to names containing *polis*. (It seems that these names in the Roman period were often formed as compounds rather than syntagms of the *Philippou polis* type, which has been blamed on Roman failure to appreciate the relationship between city name and ethnic, which would indeed regularly have been a compound, as *Philippopolites* 'citizen of *Philippou polis*'; be that as it may, it is the Latin form of such names that will be quoted hereafter.) City names in *polis* are attested throughout the Hellenistic period, but with accompanying adjectives or divine names, not the names of rulers, for which the *-eia* formation was used. It must be supposed that the adoption of *-polis* in preference to *-eia* was deliberate: presumably the dynastic associations of the *-eia* names and their aura of ruler-cult made the type unsuitable for a Roman general, however ambitious.[11]

---

[9] Pompey also founded a *Megalopolis* (Strabo 12.3.37), which might be interpreted as a Greek version of *Magnopolis* (*megalo-* is 'great') - see Galsterer-Kröll 1972: 52, but could just reflect the size of the refounded and reorganized city, into which other towns were incorporated.

[10] '... as it were *Pompeiopolis*', Strabo 3.4.10. On the name *Pompaelo* see Untermann 1976.

[11] In 83 BC, L. Licinius Murena founded a city in Cappadocia, according to Memnon - *FGrH* 434F.26(1), and the name of this is given as *Ekineia*; Reinach's emendation to *Likineia* is widely accepted (though perhaps one might have expected *Likinieia*), and this would be a direct imitation of the Hellenistic names. That Licinius Murena was capable of giving his name to a city is a probable conclusion from the appearance of *Mourēnioi*, citizens of an Asia Minor town that apparently bore the Roman's cognomen, in the first century AD (Habicht 1975: 74).

A handful of examples may be assigned to the next few decades. Tarsus adopted the name *Iuliopolis* in 42 BC (Dio 47.26.2) out of regard for Caesar and his heir. In Rough Cilicia, given by Antony to Cleopatra, *Titiopolis* and *Domitiopolis* seem to have been named for M. Titius and L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, two supporters of Antony (Jones 1971: 208). These names were not replaced,[12] but *Antoniopolis* in Asia became innocuous *Tripolis*, presumably after the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra at Actium in 31 BC, though interestingly an official document a hundred years later still gives both names (Habicht 1975: 83 f.); there may well have been other cities named after Antony that were renamed without leaving any such traces.[13]

From the time of Augustus such names become very common - *Iulipolis*, *Sebastopolis* (*Sebastos* is the Greek version of *Augustus*), *Claudiopolis*, *Flaviopolis*, *Traianopolis*, *Hadrianopolis*, etc., through to the most famous of all, *Constantinopolis*, and beyond into the Byzantine period.[14] (There is even an isolated instance in the west: *Gratianopolis* - Grenoble - a fourth-century foundation.) This type effectively replaces *-eia*, but not quite without exception. *Kaisareia* (Latin *Caesarea*) occurs a number of times, but typically as the name of a foundation in honour of Augustus by some local monarch - as Herod in Palestine - and here the continuity with Hellenistic practice is evident: perhaps the emperor felt able to accept from others a distinction that he would be reluctant to claim for himself. Once the name became established it did to some extent spread: it is found, for instance, as the title of several cities in Asia in connection with benefits received from Tiberius after an earthquake in 17 AD (Galsterer-Kröll 1972: 49). There was also a *Sebasteia*, but its location is disputed and the circumstances that might justify its unusual name unknown; similarly unexplained is the single instance of *Hadrianeia*. *Neroneia*, on the other hand, confirms the special status of the type, for this was the name given to the Armenian capital Artaxata in 66 AD by Tiridates when he had been installed on the throne by Nero. In these circumstances, Nero's proposal to call Rome *Neropolis* begins to look almost modest.

---

[12] Jones (1971: 439) points out that Titius and Domitius Ahenobarbus had defected to Octavian before Actium, so that there was no occasion for their names to be removed as a mark of disgrace.

[13] Eumeneia in Asia seems to have acquired a title based on the name of Antony's wife, Fulvia, to judge from some coin legends (Galsterer-Kröll 1972: 131 no. 429).

[14] The type enjoyed a certain vogue in Russia in the eighteenth century, as part of a general fashion for Greek names: see Schütz 1980: 117 f.

With a name like *Neroneia* it is particularly clear that a compliment is being paid to the emperor, but where a *-polis* name is given to a city more directly under the emperor's control, or an imperial title is bestowed, it seems that honour is equally being conferred on the city and a special connection with the emperor recognized. This allows imperial propaganda and civic pride to go hand in hand: Tarsus by the 240s had accumulated an impressive array of honorifics - *Hadriana*, *Commodiana*, *Severiana*, *Antoniniana*, *Macriniana*, *Alexandriniana*, *Gordiana*.[15]

The complimentary and commemorative function of such names is perhaps more overt when it is not the emperor himself whose name is used. Herod Antipas, for instance, refounded Betharamphtha as *Livias* in honour of Livia, the wife of Augustus, again very much in the Hellenistic tradition; similarly *Plotinopolis* in Thrace was named for the wife of Trajan. It is more remarkable to find one such instance in the west, where there was no long tradition to justify it, and furthermore involving a colony, all of which may account for the unsympathetic presentation of the facts by Tacitus (*Ann.* 12.27): in 50 AD, Agrippina, the wife of Claudius, as a demonstration of her power, secured the foundation of a colony bearing her name at her birth-place, Cologne - the *Colonia Agrippina* or *Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium*.

A true memorial is found when a name commemorates a death. Selinus in Cilicia, where Trajan died in 117 AD, was renamed *Traianopolis*; Halala in Cappadocia was renamed *Faustinopolis* after the death there in 176 AD of Faustina, the wife of Marcus Aurelius; *Antinoopolis* in Egypt preserved the name of Hadrian's lover, drowned in the Nile - or so it was given out - in 130 AD.

Disconcertingly different is the case of *Hadrianotherae* (literally perhaps 'Hadrian's hunt'), which is said to commemorate a successful hunt in which Hadrian killed a bear (*SHA*, *Hadrian* 20. 13): the bear's head that appears on local coins has been held to confirm the story (Jones 1971: 89). With this plunge into semi-legend it becomes clear how difficult it is fully to assess these names and to grasp what resonance they may have had for contemporaries, for any too grand a notion of imperial values carried and propagated by city names, with only emperors and their families eligible as eponyms, must falter before the sheer triviality of *Hadrianotherae* - and even if the story is doubted now, it is to be remembered that it found credence with the Romans.

The ancient world offers many puzzles that lack of evidence may render insoluble, but at least in the case of city names closer scrutiny can allow some progress. Attention to the form and distribution of names affords some clues to Greek and Roman attitudes, but above all suggests how complex the matter can be. It is never enough just to state that a city was named after someone.

J.H.W. PENNEY

---

[15] See Glasterer-Kröll 1972: 56 and 136 no. 495.

REFERENCES

DOTTIN, G. 1920. *La Langue gauloise*, Paris (reprinted Geneva: Slatkine Reprints 1980).

GALSTERER-KRÖLL, B. 1972. 'Untersuchungen zu den Beinamen der Städte des Imperium Romanum', *Epigraphische Studien*, Vol. IX, pp. 44-145.

HABICHT, C. 1975. 'New Evidence On the Province of Asia', *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. LXV, pp. 64-91.

JONES, A.H.M. 1971. *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (2nd edn.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KLINGENSCHMITT, G. 1980. 'Die iranischen Ortsnamen', in *Erlanger Ortsnamen-Kolloquium: Ortsnamen als Ausdruck von Kultur und Herrschaft*, Beiheft 18 to *Beiträge zur Namenforschung*, pp. 19-25.

MALKIN, I. 1985. 'What's In a Name? The Eponymous Founders of Greek Colonies', *Athenaeum*, Vol. LXIII, pp. 114-30.

MEISTER, K. 1916. *Lateinisch-griechische Eigennamen, Heft I: Altitalische und römische Eigennamen*, Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

RISCH, E. 1965. 'Ein Gang durch die Geschichte der griechischen Ortsnamen', *Museum Helveticum*, Vol. XXII, pp. 193-205 (reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 1981, pp. 145-57).

SCHÜTZ, J. 1980. 'Ortsnamen in Russland', in *Erlanger Ortsnamen-Kolloquium: Ortsnamen als Ausdruck von Kultur und Herrschaft*, Beiheft 18 to *Beiträge zur Namenforschung*, pp. 115-18.

UNTERMANN, J. 1976. 'Pompaelo', *Beiträge zur Namenforschung*, Vol. XI, pp. 121-35.