

NOMINA GERMANORUM EX PROVINCIA DACIA

RADA VARGA*, MIHAI SĂSĂRMAN**

Abstract: The current paper is an analysis of the Germanic names during the Principate. The study was originated by the great difficulty – almost impossibility – that we have faced in identifying the Germanic names in Roman Dacia. Beginning from the abstract and general label of “Celts-Germanic” names, we will subsequently try to distinguish the particular Germanic names and to investigate if we have or have not a proper German onomastical presence in Dacia. The presentation aims at searching for the onomastical “traces” of these ethnical groups in Dacia.

Keywords: Roman Dacia, onomastics, *Germani*.

The current paper has its origins in the difficulties faced when trying to identify and implicitly analyze the Germanic names in the Roman Dacia^{***}. Concerning this area of classical onomastics, the methodological necessities identified are structured on two levels: the upper one implies the general need for identification and cataloguing of the Germanic names recorded by ancient sources, within and beyond the Empire’s *limes*, while the lower one regards the use of the same research steps for the case of Dacia, thus generating the inevitable comparison between this province’s realities and the Empire’s.

Our paper shall begin with some theoretical considerations on the identity of the Germanic tribes within the Empire¹, followed by a few linguistic details and ending with a series of analyses undertaken on Dacia, in order to establish how the Germans can be defined for its provincial environment. On behalf of the latter, we intend to offer some statistical considerations, as well as an onomastical perspective of the Germanic civilian milieu and the Germanic military units of the Danubian province. In order to preserve a certain methodological coherence, we

* Centre for Roman Studies, *Babeş-Bolyai* University, Cluj-Napoca; e-mail: radavarga@gmail.com.

** *Babeş-Bolyai* University, Cluj-Napoca; e-mail: mihai.sasarman@ubbcluj.ro.

*** An initial version of this paper was originally delivered at the *Locus in fabula* conference, held in Bucharest, in September 2010. The subsequent research process was partially supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research, CNCS-UEFISCDI, project number PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0096.

¹ Of course, the literature on ethnicity, identity, their connections to language and cultural manifestations in the Roman empire is vast. As well, the literature concerning certain Germanic groups. Our ambition is not to stress upon the whole bibliography, to discuss and argue all the ideas advanced over time.

will limit the chronological interval to the Principate period, with its roots in the early stages of the forming of the Gaulish and Germanic provinces. Thus, the late Germanic populations that interacted with the Roman Empire and their onomastics have been considered an improper term for analogies.

The language and the onomastics (as a particular aspect) of the Germanic tribes are not very well known. Many of their linguistic patterns seem to overwrite Celtic ones and numerous names from Rhineland appear frequently in undeniably Celtic areas. This reality leads to a series of gaps, inevitably occurring in the study of the Germanic anthroponomy during the Principate. Its roots go deep, their complexity revealing and stressing upon important data concerning the cultural identity² of these populations. Investigating the origins of the Germanic provinces could be a valuable key to understanding of the subsequent Germanic inhabitants of the Roman Empire. One should note that a large part of what will later become the provinces of Germania Superior and Germania Inferior were occupied, even before Caesar's expeditions, by Gallic tribes. Rome gained their fidelity quite easily during the post-Caesar period³. The truth is that many aspects remain entangled for the modern researcher and the reality of the distinction between two large groups, Celts and Germans, is dim. Besides tribal-level differences, we cannot state with certainty that Caesar encountered two fundamentally different cultures. Nevertheless, the Roman civilization quickly levelled the tribal differences and disagreements, assimilating them in only one generation. It also gave form and meaning to the self-denominations of *Galli* and *Germani*, even if we consider that they were not as preeminent in the past⁴. The Germanic peoples who were attested in the Imperial provinces of the 2nd and 3rd centuries (including the ones from Dacia), are actually inhabitants of the two *Germaniae* – a mixture between the ethnic and cultural Germanic substratum and the Gallic additions and influences⁵.

But what exactly does *Germanus* mean for today's scholar⁶? Are we talking about a whole group of populations, over a long period of time, from the *Cimbri* and the *Teutones*, up to the Franks? Is it about a group united by a mainly similar spirituality, which is largely no more than assumed today and an up-to-a-point coherent material culture? The historiography is by no means lacking – but it is not overly extensive either⁷. What must be noted, and will be discussed later on more extensively,

² On the Germanic „identity”, but mostly on ancient and modern views upon it, see Lund 1998.

³ Tac. *Ger.* XXIX 1.

⁴ Lund 1998 for a general image on the concept of *Germani* and during antiquity.

⁵ Caes. *Gal.* II 4; Lund 1998, 49 explicitly reinforces the idea that Caesar created the concept of a Germanic population.

⁶ Hachmann 1971, 12.

⁷ For some historiographical overviews, see Lund 1998 (centred around the ancient sources and their reception); Roymans 2004 (as the monograph of the construction of the Batavians' identity); Zugravu 2007 (especially for the historiography concerning Germans in Late Antiquity); Derks, Roymans 2009 (offering a very useful methodological introduction, an insight on certain ethnic constructs and two studies focused on Germanic peoples: Derks 2009 and Roymans 2009).

is the change of focus which occurred in the last decades, shifting from the political history regarding the interactions of the tribes with the Empire, to the acculturation phenomena that inevitably took place in time and affected both sides.

And what did *Germanus* mean for Rome, for the citizens of the capital and for the educated inhabitants of the provinces? Depending on the circumstances and the chronological moment, the term would probably apply to both the inhabitant of one of the two *Germaniae*, citizen or at least inhabitant of the Empire, as well as to the “savage”, threatening Germans that lived on the northern side of the Rhine. On the evolution in time of the notion of *Germanus* – *Germania* in the eyes of the Roman public opinion, we should remark that Caesar was the first to clearly state that the *Cimbri* and *Teutones* were of Germanic, not Celtic, origins⁸. Caesar also tried to emphasize on the Rhine as a natural frontier, separating the “milder” Celtic culture of the Gauls from the rougher realities of its Germanic neighbours. If the realities that Caesar found in the Rhine area were truly so different on the north/south border of the river, is hard or even impossible to say.

In this context, before entering the field of onomastics, we find ourselves compelled to detail the question of identity and “nationality” in the Roman Empire⁹. On this matter, the history of Rome seems to be the perfect opposite of the European modern colonialism. Rome brings with it the disappearance of local “nationalisms”, silencing with its extensive power and culture (which seem to fascinate and satisfy on the long run¹⁰) the many ethnical groups conquered¹¹. These groups would have been perceived by the Romans from a cultural, rather than a racial perspective, easing the process of acculturation. Inheriting a Greek sociological pattern, the Romans were accustomed to a *climatic view* of populations¹², according to which the people of the North, the Germanic groups in our particular case, are pictured as rather rudimentary, narrow minded and with a taste for violence. This seems to be a general, but not singular, pattern of perceiving the North men. Tacitus introduces more complex Germanic peoples – or perhaps just lesser known ones to their analyst; the people beyond the border embodied for the Roman senator both virtue unaltered by civilization and cruel, lascivious, untamed savagery¹³.

But these are not the Germanic inhabitants that one encounters within the Empire. The latter are rather to be associated with the *Ubi* from Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium¹⁴, which during the Batavian uprising of Iulius Civilis were

⁸ Caes. *Gal.* I 33.

⁹ Walbank 1972, 145.

¹⁰ Woolf 1998, 14 sqq, on the mechanisms of cultural change, focused on the particular case of Gaul.

¹¹ For an interesting opinion on the functioning and structures of Roman imperialism, see Revell 2009, 191-193.

¹² Walbank 1972, 157.

¹³ Lund 1988, 55 underlines the “strange and foreign” features that the described “ethnic group” presented for the Roman author.

¹⁴ Tac. *Hist.* IV 65.

defining themselves as Roman citizens, not as members of a Germanic tribe. Regarding the same events, it should also be noted the name under which the Batavian leader entered history; we can safely assume that his Roman name was not the one he used during the rebellion, but is still the only one the Roman historiography retained. So we can infer that in the Roman Empire, to share the same *gens*, *natio*, *lingua* constituted strong bonds, but, as Cicero had already noticed a century before the Batavian rebellion, the sharing of *civitas* – and even the aspiration to *civitas* – generated much stronger connections¹⁵.

Later on, for Aelius Aristides, *Romani* are all the inhabitants of the Empire, regardless their origins and juridical status¹⁶. This integration can be interpreted from a double perspective. Historiographically, as we have already stated, the interest shown for various population groups, partially opposed to the “great history”, written and more importantly generated by Rome and very familiar as perspective for a long time, grew constantly¹⁷. Nico Roymans’ book¹⁸ on the Batavian identity in the early Principate is an example for such approaches, but not the only one of its kind. Historical and anthropological data is used by the author in his attempt of reconstructing the forging of the Batavians’ identity as a border population. The association of epigraphy, history, archaeology and sometimes ethnography leads to conclusions that can somehow be regarded as “sociological” on the Batavian elite, its cultural links with the lower social, economical and juridical strata, the reasons of its religious preferences etc. It is, generally and on a more reduced scale, such an approach that we aim at through our paper, for the Germanic population of Dacia, hoping to best use the major reliable sources we have for this realm: the epigraphs.

Before getting to the Dacian realities, in the end of the first part of the paper, we will try to process certain linguistic information regarding the onomastical identification of some Germanic tribes.

The Batavians, maybe the most “notorious” Germanic group of the Roman imperial army, came from *Insula Batavorum* (in the Rhine Delta)¹⁹ and beginning with the year 12 B. C. formed a *civitas stipendiaria* of the Roman Empire. Pre-Latin inscriptions have not been found and thus, in order to trace the Batavian language, the only remaining clues are the anthroponyms. Names of divinities, such as *Magusanus*, *Hludana*, *Sandraudiga*, *Vagdavercustis*, *Harimella* and *Dea Hurstrga*, or personal names such as *Vabusoa*, *Lobbonus*, *Cobba*, *Chariovalda*, *Hnaudifridus* and *Fledimella*²⁰ are certainly Germanic and most probably Batavian. *Cannanefates* come from the West of *Insula Batavorum* and Tacitus writes about

¹⁵ Walbank 1972, 168.

¹⁶ Aristid. *Or.* LXIII; Walbank 1972, 166.

¹⁷ Walbank 1972, 155.

¹⁸ Roymans 2004.

¹⁹ Tac. *Ger.* XXIX.

²⁰ Neuman 1983, 1067.

them: *origine, lingua, virtute par Batavis*²¹. We only know a handful of their names, as are *Brinno* and *Gannascus*.

Germani cisrhenani lived on the left side of the Rhine, organized in tribes: *Condrusi, Eburones, Caeroesi, Paemani qui uno nomine Germani appellantur*²². Caesar makes a clear distinction between this Germanic groups and the *Belgae: Germani qui cis Rhenum incolunt*²³. Some of their personal names can be found in the useful, though insufficient article *Zum Namengut der Germani cisrhenani*, gathered and published by Leo Weisgerber in 1945²⁴. The mentioned researcher interestingly underlines a particularity of the Germanic anthroponyms: the frequency of a double consonant in the suffix, for example: *Friatto, Gangusso, Haldacco, Nev(i)tto, Vervecco*. The same type of construction can be found at the *Remi* and the *Treveri*, in names such as *Taluppa, Frontaccus, Andrecco, Bihotarris*.

Going beyond these general remarks regarding identity in the Roman Empire and the possibilities of linguistically identifying the Germans, we wish to focus on some interesting pieces of information, even though they may not prove very edifying for the provincial realities of Dacia. As difficult as they are to interpret inside the boundaries of a coherent linguistic demonstration, the data offered by the tablet of Baudecet²⁵ are of indisputable value. A number of words with certain Germanic etymology can be identified within it²⁶. On the tablet, we have an interesting mixture of Celtic, Germanic and Latin elements, which probably reflects the languages spoken by the population living in this area of Gallia Belgica and (we can assume) by some of those who lived in the two *Germaniae*.

Names such as the one of goddess *Viradectis* (in its form also attested in Bretagne), or personal names such as *Velmada Gangussonis filia, Leubasna Florentini filia, Haldacco* husband of *Lubainis, Freio* and *Friatto*, appear frequently and constantly among the *Tungri*. What amazed the specialists about the Baudecet tablet was the use of the Gallic language in the middle of the Roman period, in a region indicated by the material culture to be deeply Romanized. The tablet is part of a constant (although discontinuous) tradition²⁷, consisting of written Gallic-language testimonies, produced during the Roman period. Same observations can be made about the Germanic dialects, whose characteristics and use probably never disappeared during the Roman period, though they were present in “corrupt” forms, different from the ones used by the Germans across the Rhine, and despite the little, inconsistent and often equivocal written evidences left behind.

Having outlined some of the general facts concerning the Germanic inhabitants of the Empire, we shall focus from this point forward on the particular

²¹ Tac. *Hist.* IV 15.

²² Caes. *Gal.* II 4.

²³ Caes. *Gal.* II 3.

²⁴ Weisgerber 1945.

²⁵ Plumier-Torfs *et alii* 1993.

²⁶ Plumier-Torfs *et alii* 1993, 812.

²⁷ Plumier-Torfs *et alii* 1993, 824.

case of Dacia, insisting upon its onomastical realities, correlated with any other information that the sources offer. Our goal is to extract what the sources can tell us about the Germans of this province, their cultural identity and religious environment, their social life and status. One of the main stakes of the investigation is to establish exactly what makes the Germans identifiable as such in Dacia and if those identity marks are the imprint of a larger web or just particularities of each single case.

A detail must be constantly kept in mind: the Germanic names are often mistaken with the Celtic ones. The syntagma imposed by Adrian Husar (but also used before him) of “Celtic-Germanic” names does not seem adequate, because it refers to a vague reality and is wilfully ambiguous. Nevertheless, it cannot be entirely eliminated or replaced, at least for the moment. As we have already suggested, there are at least two factors that drive the Gallic (Celtic) and Germanic etymologies to the point of being easily mistakable: one consists of the overlapping of a Celtic population over the Germanic one in the pre-Roman period, in the area of the future *Germaniae*²⁸ and the uncertain distinctiveness of the border Germanic tribes of the Caesar era. The other is a methodological flaw, due to the very lacunose knowledge of the Germanic language, generating the difficulty of defining a clear etymology.

The epigraphic analysis we intend to undertake for Dacia will follow various aspects, in order to reach relevant conclusions. First, we will sketch a general image of the Germanic name bearers from this province, offering and discussing a few examples amongst them. Beyond mere onomastics, we shall try to identify the cultural manifestation patterns and their implications (such as the choice for the child name inside the family onomastic frame) where sources allow it. Onomastics and the information it offers will be correlated with alternate details in order to present the reader with an image of the Germans from Dacia as complete as it can be at this point of the research. Such details are the ones regarding the worshipped deities, the military units our subjects served in or can be linked to, and any other personal data we are able to find on them. An onomastical explanation should be also offered before entering the subject: beyond their strict etymology, the names can also have a certain “ethnic load”. By this we understand the preponderance of one name or onomastical family in a particular area, its overlap of a certain substratum and the possibility of associating it with specific provinces and populations, even if the etymology recommends it as being Latin. Such names are comparable with the so-called “military names”, although in the case of the latter their origins and reasons of use remain strongly debatable.

Dacia’s inscriptions offer us a relatively vast series of Celtic extraction names. Some of these distinguish themselves by their apparent and possible Germanic etymology, by their presence in the *Germaniae*, or by other details that could place them in the area of Germanic onomastics. In Dacia, there are about

²⁸ Caes. *Gal.* II 4; Tac., *Ger.* XXVIII.

60 epigraphically attested names suspected of having Germanic origins or connections. Certainly, the percentage of these names – about 3% of the persons epigraphically attested in Dacia – remains a small one. These names are very different from each other, various in nature and significance. We shall further on present a few of the most interesting and relevant cases. We have chosen these particular not necessarily for constructing a coherent demonstration or supporting a pre-conceived idea, but because of their diversity and of the large view they can offer on the Dacian picture.

Aelius Talanus (IDR III/5, 450), bearer of an imperial *nomen* and implied *praenomen*, has a *cognomen* of presumably Germanic origin, present in *Gallia Belgica*, but not in the two *Germaniae*²⁹. His name was found on a list from *Apulum*, probably containing veterans of the legio XIII Gemina.

Bellinus (IDR III/1, 35) dedicates a votive altar to *Iupiter Optimus Maximus*. He bears a *cognomen* of Celtic sonority, but easily assignable to a Germanic origin³⁰. This name appears in *Gallia Belgica*, *Gallia Narbonensis* (very interestingly, in a Greek inscription³¹) and in the two *Germaniae*³², which strengthens the idea of its Germanic roots. Bellinus is the slave of *T(itus) I(ulius) S(aturninus) conductor publici portorii*³³.

An interesting name, due to its repetitiveness, is Bubalus³⁴, a name with arguably Celtic roots. It appears in at least three inscriptions in Dacia (IDR III/1, 31; IDR III/2, 394; IDR III/5, 147), all of them belonging to citizens. The name is attested in the Germanic provinces but also in Italy, Dalmatia and *Gallia Belgica*³⁵, which places it in the category of customary names throughout the Empire, lacking any value as ethnical and/or regional indicator³⁶.

C(aius) Iul(ius) Sennianus (IDR II 329) dedicates an altar to *Iupiter Optimus Maximus defensor et tutator*. He bears imperial *praenomen* and *nomen gentile*, together with a *cognomen* of likely Germanic origin – Latinized with the suffix – *ianus* added to the root Sennius³⁷. The double consonant is to be noted. The name Sennianus appears in Dacia, *Gallia Belgica*, *Gallia Narbonensis*, Aquitania³⁸ and in the two *Germaniae*³⁹. Sennianus dedicates together with his wife, Iulia Rufina, the woman bearing the same *nomen gentile* as her husband and a Latin *cognomen*.

Procula Batava (IDR III/1, 168) is an interesting case – resembling in some ways to those of Aurelius Batavus⁴⁰ (IDR III/5, 451) and Carantius

²⁹ Delamarre 2007, 257; OPEL IV 106.

³⁰ Holder 1896-1914 I 390; Kakosche 2006-2008, vol. I, 167.

³¹ Delamarre 2007, 51

³² OPEL I 286.

³³ For the extensive bibliography on T. I. Saturninus, see Mihăilescu-Bîrliba 2010.

³⁴ Neumann 1983, 1072 sqq.

³⁵ OPEL I 324; Delamarre 2007, 69.

³⁶ Kakosche 2006-2008, vol. I, 184 lists it with the Greek form as well.

³⁷ Holder 1896-1914 II 1479.

³⁸ In this former case, we are dealing with a pottery stamp from Lezoux (Rogers 1981, 234).

³⁹ OPEL IV 67; Delamarre 2007, 241

⁴⁰ The name is written *BATAVS* on stone; for *Batavus*, see also Sitzmann, Grünzweig 2008, 55-59.

Germanus⁴¹ (IDR III/2, 427). She bears a Latin personal name⁴², together with an ethnonym that clearly indicates ethnic origins. The ethnonym *Batava*, *-us* does not play the role of a *cognomen*, as it was frequently assumed by researchers⁴³. Analogies for such ethnonymes are present in Dacia for other populations as well. An example is the Semitic name *Zacca Pallaei f. Syrus*⁴⁴, where we have a Semitic personal name⁴⁵ and a patronymic of the same origin⁴⁶. The *ethnicon* Syrus strengthens and confirms the origin of the person.

In addition, with this inscription there could also be the case of a bad epigraph completion⁴⁷. We know for a fact that unlike men, women did not bear *tria nomina*, they were given a single name after which generally followed the filiations⁴⁸. This custom was in use mainly during the Republic, in the age of the Principate women bearing different *cognomina*, the feminine onomastics became somehow more labile and difficult to put into patterns⁴⁹. Subsequently, a plausible completion for this inscription would be:

D M
Procu[la Proc(uli)?⁵⁰ f(ilia)]
Batava [vixit an]
ni(s) XXVI A[.]

For this pattern of names, there are analogies in Dacia, such as *Cotu Successi f(ilia) cives Norica* (IDR III/4, 91). This reconstruction of the inscription does not change the reason why we have chosen to mention this name, of a self-proclaimed Batavian woman. It is worth noticing for these names and for the few others offered as analogies in connection to it, is the fact that all these characters try to explicitly conserve their initial cultural luggage and state their origins and place inside the web of the imperial structures: even when bearing Roman names.

Tullio Vegeti filius Tungrus (Eck 2011) is a special case among the ones listed here, as it comes from a military diploma. The character was a soldier of *cohors I Hispanorum*⁵¹, released from duty through an imperial constitution of the

⁴¹ Sitzmann, Grünzweig 2008, 147-152.

⁴² Kajanto 1965, 177.

⁴³ See the comment in IDR III/1, 168; Ardevan 2006, 124-125 considers that the name is more likely Proculeia.

⁴⁴ RGZM I 22; Dana 2007 for detailed comments on the diploma.

⁴⁵ Wuthnow 1930, 49.

⁴⁶ Wuthnow 1930, 93.

⁴⁷ Though the virtual dimensions of the inscription allow it, the IDR reconstruction of the text does not take into consideration the possible existence of a patronymic.

⁴⁸ Davis Chase 1897, 160 sqq.

⁴⁹ Salway 1994, 127.

⁵⁰ The father's name is given here as an example. It is a high probability for this to be the genuine name, but the option is not compulsory the only possible one.

⁵¹ Petolescu 2002, 111.

year 123. Besides the *ethicon* that speaks for itself, the personal name is highly interesting. Tullio seems not to be connected to the Roman *gentilicium* Tullius⁵², as it is a totally different name, of probable Germanic extraction. It has been registered on inscriptions from *Gallia Belgica* and *Pannonia Superior*⁵³, as well as *Germania Inferior*⁵⁴ and *Britannia*⁵⁵. The case of *Britannia* – more exactly of *Vindolanda* – is relevant because here the name Tullio is associated explicitly with the *cohors* of *Tungri* stationed here⁵⁶. The soldier's wife bears Celtic name, patronymic and *ethnicon*, Ammaiona⁵⁷ Aeconis filia Eravisca, whereas the children have Roman "military" names: Ferox, Vernus and Viator.

Vencona Severina (IDR III/2, 360) dedicates an altar to a god whose name was not preserved. She bears a *nomen gentile* of Celtic resonances⁵⁸, which appears in *Gallia Belgica* and in the two *Germaniae*⁵⁹, in both masculine and feminine forms. Her *cognomen* is Latin and derives from a *nomen gentile*⁶⁰.

A different group of characters are the ones that, though bearing names of different origins and etymologies, explicitly mention a descent from the German provinces. Thus, we have Iulius Secundus (IDR III/3, 263), *explorator*, on whose funerary stone is mentioned *domo Agrippina*, or the commander of (probably) the *cohors I Ulpia Brittonum*⁶¹ in 133, whose name was not preserved on a military diploma (RMD IV 248), but whose *origo* was Noviomagus. We won't stress upon these characters as, though they indicate Germanic presences in Dacia, their onomastical contribution is not by far remarkable. Even so, mentioning them seemed important in order to offer a larger picture on the provincial situation.

In the second part of our case study concerning Dacia, we will analyse statistical data obtained from the study of the prosopography of the Germanic military units stationed in the province⁶²: *ala I Batavorum milliaria*⁶³, *ala I Tungrorum Frontoniana*⁶⁴, *cohors I Batavorum milliaria*⁶⁵, *cohors I Cannanefatium*⁶⁶, *cohors I*

⁵² Eck 2011, 239.

⁵³ OPEL IV 132.

⁵⁴ AE 1969/1970, 445a; AE 1974, 455; Eck 2011, 239.

⁵⁵ Tab. Vindol. 184; Tab. Vindol. 312.

⁵⁶ Birley 2002, 100

⁵⁷ Holder 1896-1914 III 129-130; OPEL I 96; Nomenclator, 16, all three for names with the same root, as neither of them lists this exact onomastic form.

⁵⁸ Holder 1896-1914, III 157.

⁵⁹ OPEL IV 153; Delamarre 2007, 282.

⁶⁰ Kajanto 1965, 257.

⁶¹ Gudea 1995.

⁶² Another potentially interesting case is that of the troops dispatched to Dacia from *Germania Inferior* after 106 (Matei-Popescu, Țentea 2006). Without denying the fact that they most probably brought soldiers of German origin into Dacia, we lack onomastic clues and thus we have decided not to include these troops on this list.

⁶³ Petolescu 2002, 64-65.

⁶⁴ Petolescu 2002, 78-80.

⁶⁵ Petolescu 2002, 83-84.

⁶⁶ Petolescu 2002, 95.

*Ubiorum*⁶⁷, *numerus Germanorum (Germanicianorum) exploratorum*⁶⁸. No name is attested for *cohors I Cannanefatium*. We have taken into account the names of the soldiers, the veterans, but also their closely related ones, present in their epigraphs (family and heirs).

The statistical situation of the names extracted from the (theoretically) Germanic units of Dacia comes as mildly disorienting. Without making a clear distinction between Celtic and Germanic names: necessarily and somehow unfortunately remaining at the syntagma of “Celtic-Germanic”; we have a ratio of 23% Celtic anthroponyms. The percentage is not necessarily low, 58% of the names having Italic origins. It is a fact that Italic names prevail in Dacia in any given category or social structure, except the singular case of the Alburnus Maior ethnical community. The prefects and the tribunes together, represent approximately 24% of the whole number of names. The methodological correctness of including them in the present statistic is debatable, because they held temporary command positions both in the units and the province. Also, they are Roman citizens, with a higher social status than the majority of Dacia’s inhabitants. Even though it is interesting to see the ethnical origin of their *cognomina* and to relate it to the unit they were commanding. The Celtic name⁶⁹ of the tribune Galleo (Tettienus) Bellicus (IDR I 19; PME T 15) from *cohors I Batavorum milliaria*, and especially the very rare Celtic name⁷⁰ of the prefect C. Iulius Apigianus (CIL III 788; PME I 22) from *ala I Tungrorum Frontoniana* should be underlined⁷¹. The latter dedicates to Epona, a Celtic deity most certainly worshiped in Germanic milieus. In his case there is a real possibility of having a commander with Germanic (ethnical and/or territorial) origin which serves in Dacia, leading a unit composed of *Tungri*.

As in the case of the general situation, the number of Germanic anthroponyms remains low in the army, a situation that makes the relevance of the final percentages quite relative. What needs to be stressed upon is that most of the “Celtic-Germanic” names related to military units from Dacia are rarely attested elsewhere. They can be associated with some Germanic background, or we can at least affirm positively their distancing from the usual Celtic (mainly from the Gallic area) onomastics⁷².

Regarding the type of analyzed monuments, even if we are to ignore the prefects’ monuments (due to their mainly official character), a pleiad of funerary monuments remains. These were raised for soldiers by comrades and/or heirs, and

⁶⁷ Petolescu 2002, 124-125.

⁶⁸ Petolescu 2002, 131.

⁶⁹ OPEL I 285.

⁷⁰ The name is not mentioned in OPEL and Nomenclator.

⁷¹ Nemeti 2010, 401

⁷² Evans 1967, 41 sqq.

few of them by members of the family; soldiers' dedications for dead family members are rare. This preponderance of monuments raised by comrades is a feature of Dacia, presenting a notable discrepancy with the situation of the whole Empire⁷³. Compared to the other provinces, where in the 2nd century most of the epitaphs were raised by the auxiliary soldiers' wives and children, in Dacia we find a slight preponderance of the comrades and heirs, with the parity of about 7 to 8 between heirs-erected monuments and monuments erected by wife or children. Related to family dedications, we should note the cosmopolitan character of some families, or at least of their cultural background.

To Cittius Ioivai, whose name is rare and of clear "Celtic-Germanic" etymology, homage was being paid by his brother, Iustus (CIL III 807). One could say that Iustus can be placed among those "military names" previously mentioned, but even if we consider it so, the name remains beyond any doubt Latin. The discrepancy with his father's and the brother's name is obvious. Also, some names are certainly Celtic, being attested in the *Galliae*, but not in the *Germaniae*; such names are those of Apon[ius]⁷⁴, *eques alae I Tungrorum Frontoniana* (CIL III 801), and of his children, who dedicated the monument: L. Aponia and Lelius⁷⁵. Another interesting case is the one of Iulius Secundus (IDR III/3, 263) who bears an imperial *nomen gentile* and a Latin *cognomen*, but proclaims Germanic origins, although onomastics would make us think otherwise. Secundus is *explorator* in the *numerus exploratorum Germanicianorum* and he indicates as his *domus colonia Ara Augusta Agrippinensium*⁷⁶. By his name, we assume Secundus was a Roman citizen; even so he joined the *exploratores*, not a legion, from reasons unknown to us, but most probably of practical nature. This could be an additional proof for his Germanic origin.

Another aspect worthy of being mentioned is the religious one. The identification of Germanic deities worshipped during the classical period of the Empire, but beyond its borders, is, sadly, obscure and doubtful. Cults such as the one of *Matres* or *Badones*, together with the assimilation of the local cults to the official pantheon⁷⁷, are signs of integration into the Roman civilization, but tell us far too little about the general Germanic religiosity and even less about the presence of this religious manifestations in Dacia⁷⁸.

⁷³ For comparison, see Roxan 1989 for the whole Empire and Phang 2001, 153 for the Danubian provinces.

⁷⁴ OPEL I 147.

⁷⁵ This name does not appear in this identical form in the onomastical catalogues: Lelius and a feminine form of Leia in OPEL III 22 and Nomenclator 161.

⁷⁶ Nemeth 1997, 105-106; Petolescu 2002, 131.

⁷⁷ Walbank 1972, 162.

⁷⁸ Macrea 1948, though useful and synthetic, pays its due to the period during which it was written. In a more recent book, A. Husar underlines the minimal presence of the German spiritual elements, compared to the Celtic ones (Husar 1999, 212-213). The same idea is implied by S. Nemeti (Nemeti 2005, 129-164), who acknowledges the preponderance of Celtic deities for the so-called Celto-Germanic dedicators.

In order to offer some examples, we will mention Sextia Augustina (IDR III/5, 37), who dedicates an altar *Badonib(us) reginis*. *Badones* were Celtic collective deities⁷⁹, also worshiped in the Germanic world⁸⁰. The name of Augustina is clearly Latin, but her possible Germanic origin is not to be neglected. Another god whose Germanic (not Celtic, or others) roots are certain was *Hercules Magusanus*. From the three epigraphs dedicated to him, two belong to Roman citizens, bearers of Latin names, and one to Aurelius Tato *stator alae II Pannoniorum* (ILD 590) and bearer of a probably Celtic name⁸¹. For this god, *Magusanus* could be an initial name, not an epithet⁸², being associated to Hercules from yet unknown reasons.

Concerning the gods to whom the superior officers of the Germanic *auxilia* dedicate (we have already mentioned the complete lack of votive epigraphs for the lower ranks), it should be outlined the presence of only official, Latin gods, withholding pronounced, well-known protecting features for the military. The fact is explainable on two levels: the prefects could not have had many affinities with the (supposed) Germanic gods worshiped by their men, but the military gods of the Empire were being worshiped in any kind of units; on the other hand, the number of such epigraphs in Dacia is very low, which implies serious lacks in our knowledge and keeps intact the possibility of future revealing inscriptions dedicated to Germanic or “Celtic-Germanic” gods by higher rank officers.

Even if this particular study cannot offer answers to questions long debated upon, nor can it bring forth a catalogue of Germanic names from Dacia, as their identification is highly problematic, we believe in its utility for the unitary discussion on this class of names, at the scale of province Dacia.

In conclusion, a few general details concerning the Germanic onomastics should be pointed out. Beyond a series of particular features, that seems to define and circumscribe it, one must notice that the North Rhineland onomastics is actually little known, while the South Rhineland onomastics is intertwined with the Celtic linguistic and population contribution. In Dacia, we have found a couple of very rare names, with Celtic resemblance, some of them solely attested the two *Germaniae* and Gallia Belgica. Although, many characters from the Germanic *auxilia* bear Celtic names, suggesting they might have been currently used in Germanic milieus. Regarding the cultural background and the (self) defining of identity, for the assumed Germanics of Dacia, we also have other cultural indicators, besides the onomastical ones. We often note indicators of *domus*, which clearly state a Germanic origin, despite de name’s etymology. There are gods, such as Hercules Magusanus, who indicate a religious milieu impregnated by Germanic influences, faith, and practices. Above all these, the indicators of Germanic origins

⁷⁹ Nemeti 2005, 130.

⁸⁰ Husar 1999, 222-223.

⁸¹ Holder 1896-1914 II 1752.

⁸² Nemeti 2005, 138.

in Dacia are few, diluted and often equivocal. Sometimes, a certain Germanic identity in Dacia can be perceived, but only in particular given cases, not for a group. All these in one, we might assert that the Germanic names from Dacia, etymologically and culturally alike, indicate a population well assimilated, sometimes displaying original cultural features, but mainly showing itself as carrier of the Roman culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Aristid. <i>Or.</i> | P. Aelius Aristides, <i>Orationes</i> (ed. W. Dindorf), Hildesheim, 1964. |
| Caes. <i>Gal.</i> | C. Iulius Caesar, <i>Commentarii de Bello Gallico</i> (ed. O. Schönberger), Düsseldorf, 2008. |
| Tac. <i>Ger.</i> | P. Cornelius Tacitus, <i>De origine et situ Germanorum</i> (ed. E. Fehrle, R. Hünnerkopf), Heidelberg, 1959. |
| Tac. <i>Hist.</i> | P. Cornelius Tacitus, <i>Historiae</i> (ed. C. Damon), Cambridge, 2003. |
| AE | <i>L'Année Épigraphique</i> , Paris, 1888-. |
| CIL | <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i> , Berlin, 1863-. |
| IDR | <i>Inscriptiones Daciae Romanae</i> , București – Paris, 1975-. |
| RGZM | B. Pferdehirt, <i>Römische Militärdiplome und Erlassungsurkunden in der Sammlung des Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseums</i> , Mainz, 2004. |
| RMD | M. Roxan, P. Holder, <i>Roman military diplomas, I-V</i> , London, 1978-2006. |
| ILD | C. C. Petolescu, <i>Inscriptii latine din Dacia</i> , București, 2005. |
| Tab. Vindol. | A. Bowman, D. Thomas: <i>Vindolanda: the Latin writing tablets</i> , London. 1983-2003. |
| Ardevan 2006 | R. Ardevan, <i>Römische Bürger Lateinischer Abstammung in Dakien</i> , Hungarian Polis Studies, 3, Debrecen, 2006, 117-133. |
| Dana 2007 | D. Dana, <i>Traditions onomastiques, brassages et mobilité de populations d'après un diplôme militaire pour la Dacie Supérieur de 123 (RGZM 22)</i> , ActaMN, 41-42, I, 2004-2005 (2007), 69-74. |
| Davis Chase 1897 | G. Davis Chase, <i>The origin of Roman Praenomina</i> , Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 8, 1897, 103-184. |
| Delamarre 2007 | X. Delamarre, <i>Nomina Celtica Antiqua Selecta Inscriptionum (Noms de personnes celtiques dans l'épigraphie classique)</i> , Paris, 2007. |
| Derks 2009 | T. Derks, <i>Ethnic identity in the Roman frontier. The epigraphy of Batavi and other Lower Rhine tribes</i> . In Derks, Roymans 2009, 239-282. |
| Derks, Roymans 2009 | T. Derks, N. Roymans (ed.), <i>The Role of power and tradition. Ethnic constructs in Antiquity</i> , Amsterdam, 2009. |

- Eck 2011 W. Eck, *Drei Konstitutionem im Jahr 123 für Truppen von Dacia Porolissensis unter dem Präsidialprokurator Livius Gratus*, ZPE, 176, 2011, 234-242.
- Evans 1967 E. Evans, *Gaulish personal Names. A Study of some Continental Celtic Formations*, Oxford, 1967.
- Gudea 1995 N. Gudea, *Despre fragmente de diplome militare „revăzute” sau nou descoperite la Porolissum*, ActaMP, 1995, 19, 72-88.
- Hachmann 1971 R. Hachmann, *Les Germains*, Genève – Paris – Munich, 1971.
- Holder 1896-1914 A. Holder *Alt-Celtischer Sprachsatz*, vol. I, II, III, Leipzig 1896-1914.
- Husar 1999 A. Husar, *Celți și germanici în Dacia Romană*, Cluj-Napoca, 1999.
- Kajanto 1965 I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki, 1965.
- Kakosche 2006-2008 A. Kakosche, *Die Personennamen in den zwei germanischen Provinzen : ein Katalog*, Leidorf, vol. I-III, 2006-2008.
- Lund 1988 A. A. Lund (ed.), *P. Cornelius Tacitus, Germania*, Heidelberg, 1988.
- Lund 1998 A. A. Lund, *Die ersten Germanen. Ethnizität und Ethnogenese*, Heidelberg, 1998.
- Macrea 1948 M. Macrea, *Culte germanice în Dacia*, AISC, 5, 1944-1948, 219-263.
- Matei-Popescu, Țentea 2006 F. Matei-Popescu, O. Țentea 2006, *Trupele auxiliare din Germania Inferior și expedițiile dacice ale împăratului Traian*, BHAUT, 7, 2006, 56-65.
- Mihăilescu-Bîrliba 2010 L. Mihăilescu-Bîrliba, *L'inscription de T. Iulius Saturninus à Diernaet l'affermage du publicum portorii Illyrici*, SAA, 16, 2010, 145-152.
- Nemeth 1997 E. Nemeth, *Die Numeri in Römischen Heer Dakiens*, Eph.Nap., 7, 1997, 101-116.
- Nemeti 2010 S. Nemeti, *Society and religion in Ilișua (Dacia)*, Classica et Christiana, 5, 2, 2010, 395-433.
- Nemeti 2005 S. Nemeti, *Sincretismul religios în Dacia romană*, Cluj-Napoca, 2005.
- Neumann 1983 G. Neumann, *Die Sprachverhältnisse in den germanische Provinzen des Römischen Reiches*, ANRW, II 29.2, 1983, 1061-1088.
- Nomenclator A. Mócsy, R. Feldmann, E. Marton, M. Szilágy, *Nomenclator*, Dissertationes Pannonicae, III, 1, Budapest, 1983.
- OPEL B. Lőrincz, F. Redö, *Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum*, vol. I, Budapest, 1994, II-IV, Wien, 1999-2002.
- Oswald 1983 F. Oswald, *Index des estampilles sur sigillée*, Avignon, 1983.
- Petolescu 2002 C. C. Petolescu, *Auxilia Daciae*, București, 2002.
- Phang 2001 S. E. Phang, *The marriage of Roman soldiers (13 B. C. – A. D. 235). Law and family in the imperial army*, Leiden – Boston - Köln, 2001

- Plumier-Torfs *et alii* 1993 S. Plumier-Torfs, J. Plumier, Br. Galsterer, J. Untermann, K. H. Schmidt, P. de Bernardo Stempel, M-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, *La plaquette en or inscrite de Baudacet (Gembloux, Belgique): découverte, édition, commentaire*, Latomus, 52, 4, 1993, 797-835.
- PME H. Devijver, *Prosopographia militiarum equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum*; Leuven I (1976), II (1977), III (1980), IV (= Supplementum I) 1987, V (= Supplementum II) 1993.
- Revell 2009 L. Revell, *Roman imperialism and local identities*, Cambridge, 2009.
- Rogers 1981 G. B. Rogers, *Marbled samian from Fréjus (Var)*. In: A. C. Anderson and A. S. Anderson, *Roman Pottery research in Britain and North-West Europe. Papers presented to Graham Webster*, BAR. International series, 123, Oxford, 1981, p. 257-64.
- Roymans 2004 N. Roymans, *Ethnic Identity and Imperial Power, The Batavians in the Early Roman Empire*, Amsterdam, 2004.
- Roymans 2009 N. Roymans, *Hercules and the construction of a Batavian identity in the context of the Roman empire*. In: Derks, Roymans 2009, 219-238.
- Roxan 1989 M. M. Roxan, *Women on the frontiers*. In: V. A. Maxfield, M. J. Dobson, *Roman Frontier Studies. Proceedings of the XVth International Congress on Roman Frontier Studies*, Exeter, 1989, 462-467.
- Salway 1994 B. Salway, *What's in a name? A survey of Roman onomastic practice from c. 700 BC to AD 700*, JRS, 84, 1994, 124-145.
- Sitzmann, Grünzweig 2008 A. Sitzmann, F. E. Grünzweig, *Die altgermanischen Ethnonyme. Ein Handbuch zu ihrer Etymologie*, Wien, 2008.
- Walbank 1972 F. W. Walbank, *Nationality as a Factor in Roman History*, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 76, 1972, 145-168.
- Weisgerber 1945 L. Weisgerber, *Namengut der Germani cisrhenani*, Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein, 155-156, 1945, 35-61.
- Woolf 1998 G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman*, Cambridge, 1998.
- Wuthnow 1930 H. Wuthnow, *Die semitischen Menschennamen auf griechischen Inschriften und Papyri des vorderen Orients*, Leipzig, 1930.
- Zugravu 2007 N. Zugravu, *Germanicii și Roma. Noi abordări istoriografice*, în L. Leuștean, P. Zahariuc, D. C. Măță (ed.), *In honorem Ioan Ciupercă. Studii de istorie a românilor și relațiilor internaționale*, Iași, 2007, 491-503.

ABREVIERI

- AARMSI – Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice, București
ActaMN – Acta Musei Napocensis, Cluj
Acta MP – Acta Musei Porolisensis, Zalău
AEM – Archäologisch-Epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn, Viena
AISC – Anuarul Institutului de Studii Clasice, Cluj
AJAH – American Journal of Ancient History, Cambridge, Mass
ANRW – *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, Berlin-New York
AnzeigerSBWien (SAWW) – Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Viena
Apulum – Apulum. Acta Musei Apulensis, Alba Iulia
ArchKorr – Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt, Mainz
ArhMed – Arheologia Medievală, Reșița
ArhMold – Arheologia Moldovei, Iași-București
ArheologijaSofia – Arheologija. Organ na Arheologičeskija Institut i Muzej, Sofia
BCMI – Buletinul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice, București
BCCȘ – Buletinul Cercurilor Științifice Studentești, Alba Iulia
BMI – Buletinul Monumentelor Istorice, București
BSNR – Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române, București
CAB – Cercetări Arheologice în București, București
CAMNI – Cercetări Arheologice, Muzeul de Istorie al R. S. România/Muzeul Național de Istorie a României, București
CCA – Cronica Cercetărilor Arheologice din România, București
CCDJ – Cultură și Civilizație la Dunărea de Jos, Călărași
Dacia – Dacia. Recherches et Découvertes Archéologiques en Roumanie, București
Dacia N. S. – Dacia. Revue d'Archéologie et d'Histoire Ancienne, Nouvelle Série, București
EphemNap – Ephemeris Napocensis, Cluj-Napoca
Glotta – Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache, Göttingen
GodišnikSeverna – Godišnik na Muzeite ot Severna Bălgarija, Veliko Tărnovo
HSCPh – Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Harvard
IzvestijaBAD – Izvestija na Bălgarskoto Arheologičesko Družestvo, Sofia
IzvestijaSeverozapadna – Izvestija na muzeite v Severozapadna Bălgarija, Sofia
IzvestijaSofia – Izvestija na Arheologičeskija Institut, Sofia
IzvestijaVarna – Izvestija na Narodnija Muzej (Izvestija na Varnenskoto Arheologičesko Družestvo), Varna
MCA – Materiale și Cercetări Arheologice, București
MatIstMuzBuc – Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie, București
MittDAI, RömAbt – Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung
PBF – Prähistorische Bronzefunde, München-Stuttgart
RadVM - Rad Vojvodjanskih Muzeja, Novi Sad
RazPr – Razkopki i Proučvanija, Sofia
REA – Revue des Études Anciennes, Bordeaux
RÉSEE – Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes, București
SCIV(A) – Studii și Cercetări de Istorie Veche și Arheologie, București
StCl – Studii Clasice, București
UPA – Universitätsforschungen zur Prähistorische Archäologie, Bonn
SCIVA, tomul 63, nr. 1-2, București, 2012, p. 195-196

Paideuma

Author: Universität Frankfurt am Main. Frobenius-Institut.; Deutsche Gesellschaft für Kulturmorphologie.; Frobenius-Gesellschaft.

Publisher: Frankfurt am Main : Forschungsinstitut für Kulturmorphologie an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Leipzig : Otto Harrassowitz Bamberg : Bamberger Verlagshaus Meisenbach & Co. Leipzig : Otto Harrassowitz Wiesbaden : Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart : W. Kohlhammer 1938-

AnzeigerSBWien (SAWW) – Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Viena

AJAH – American Journal of Ancient History, Cambridge, Mass

HSCPh – Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Harvard