

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. LV



HELSINKI 2021

ARCTOS – ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

Arctos has been published since 1954, annually from vol. 8 (1974). *Arctos* welcomes submissions dealing with any aspect of classical antiquity, and the reception of ancient cultures in mediaeval times and beyond. *Arctos* presents research articles and short notes in the fields of Greek and Latin languages, literatures, ancient history, philosophy, religions, archaeology, art, and society. Each volume also contains reviews of recent books. The website is at www.journal.fi/arctos.

Publisher:

Klassillis-filologinen yhdistys – Klassisk-filologiska föreningen (The Classical Association of Finland), c/o House of Science and Letters, Kirkkokatu 6, FI – 00170 Helsinki, Finland.

Editors:

Martti Leiwo (*Editor-in-Chief*), Minna Vesa (*Executive Editor and Secretary, Review Editor*).

Editorial Advisory Board:

Øivind Andersen, Therese Fuhrer, Michel Gras, Gerd Haverling, Richard Hunter, Maijastina Kahlos, Mika Kajava, Jari Pakkanen, Pauliina Remes, Olli Salomies, Heikki Solin, Antero Tammisto, Kaius Tuori, Jyri Vaahtera, Marja Vierros

Correspondence regarding the submission of articles and general enquiries should be addressed to the Executive Editor and Secretary at the following address (e-mail: arctos-secretary@helsinki.fi).

Correspondence regarding book reviews should be addressed to the Review Editor at the following address (e-mail: arctos-reviews@helsinki.fi)

Note to Contributors:

Submissions, written in English, French, German, Italian, or Latin, should be sent by e-mail to the Executive Editor and Secretary (at arctos-secretary@helsinki.fi). The submissions should be sent in two copies; one text version (DOCX/RTF) and one PDF version. The e-mail should also contain the name, affiliation and postal address of the author and the title of the article. Further guidelines can be found at www.journal.fi/arctos/guidelines1.

Requests for Exchange:

Exchange Centre for Scientific Literature, Snellmaninkatu 13, FI – 00170 Helsinki, Finland.

– e-mail: exchange.centre@tsv.fi

Sale:

Bookstore Tiedekirja, Snellmaninkatu 13, FI – 00170 Helsinki, Finland.

– Tel. +358 9 635 177, fax +358 9 635 017, internet: www.tiedekirja.fi.

ISSN 0570-734X (print)

ISSN 2814-855X (online)

Layout by Vesa Vahtikari

Printed by Grano Oy, Vaasa

INDEX

	SILVIA GAZZOLI	<i>Marmorare, incrustare: Lessico tecnico nell'epigrafia dell'Italia Romana</i>	9
	THOMAS J. GOESSENS	<i>Another Spanish Alienum in Canterbury? New Insights on RIB 2324</i>	33
	KYLE HELMS	<i>An Unread Safaitic Graffito from Pompeii</i>	51
	WOLFGANG HÜBNER	<i>Ketos und Kepheus bei Arat. 629–652,</i>	55
	LASSI JAKOLA	<i>Corpses, Living Bodies and Stuffs: Pre-Platonic Concepts of σώμα</i>	85
	URPO KANTOLA	<i>Miszellen zu römischen Namen in griechischen Inschriften und Papyri</i>	127
	ABUZER KIZIL, LINDA TALATAS AND DIDIER LAROCHE	<i>Honorific Statue Base for the Demos of the Mylaseans at Euromos</i>	133
	MARIA PANAGIOTOPOULOU	<i>The Children of Hephaestus: Some Thoughts on the Female Power over Patriarchal Masculinity</i>	143
	LEENA PIETILÄ-CASTRÉN	<i>Forgotten and Unknown – Classical Bronzes from the National Museum of Finland</i>	159
	OLLI SALOMIES	<i>A Group of Romans in Ephesus in 35 BC</i>	193
	KIRSI SIMPANEN	<i>The Symbolism behind the Draco Standard</i>	221
	HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta Epigraphica 331–334</i>	247
	HEIKO ULLRICH	<i>Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Echtheit und Stellung von Lucr. 1,136–148</i>	255
	EEVA-MARIA VIITANEN	<i>Pompeian Electoral Notices on Houses and in Neighborhoods? Re-Appraisal of the Spatial Relationships of Candidates and Supporters</i>	281



MANFREDI ZANIN

The Domitii Ahenobarbi in the Second Century BCE

319

De novis libris iudicia

337

Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum

441

Libri nobis missi

445

Index scriptorum

457

A GROUP OF ROMANS IN EPHESUS IN 35 BC*

OLLI SALOMIES

An interesting Latin inscription from Ephesus, in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford since 1866 but managing to stay practically unnoticed, was finally published in 2019 by the prominent epigraphist Alison Cooley.¹ The text, inscribed on a fairly large marble block (49 x 174 x 22 cm.) and in many parts extremely worn, consists of a heading – the consular date – at the top left, and a list of names, all of the Roman type with nomina and (except for one man, see n. 15) cognomina (tribes are, however, not mentioned), inscribed in nine columns. The publication is accompanied by a succinct commentary in which the persons mentioned in the text are tentatively identified, following a suggestion of N. Purcell during a seminar in Oxford (p. 449), as members of a *conventus* of Italian *negotiatores* based in Ephesus or at least in Asia. This observation is followed by an onomastic analysis of the nomina of which many “fit well into a *negotiator* milieu derived from Delos and/or Campania” (p. 450). This is obviously an important observation, but my impression is that a detail or two could be added

* Warm thanks are due to Professor Cooley who was kind enough to answer my questions regarding the reading of some passages and sent me photos that are more easily readable than those in the original publication. My thanks are also due to the two anonymous referees.

¹ In C. F. Noreña & N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *From Document to History: Epigraphic Insights into the Greco-Roman World*, Leiden – Boston 2019, 435–454. Cf. the presentation of the inscription, also by Professor Cooley but not identical with the publication and with some additional observations, in the Ashmolean Latin Inscriptions Project (https://latininscriptions.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/xml/AN_1896-1908_G_1188.xml), cited in what follows as “AshLI 175”. Greek epigraphical publications will be quoted in accordance with the *List of Abbreviations of Editions and Works of Reference for Alphabetic Greek Epigraphy* available at the AIEGL site (<https://aiegl.org/grepiabbr.html>), Latin inscriptions mainly following the list of abbreviations in recent volumes of the *Année épigraphique*. For the abbreviated title *Les italiens* see n. 38.

to the commentary. Hence, the aim of this article is to offer some additional observations, especially, but not exclusively, on the nomina.

I would like to start with the consular date, not all of whose letters are fully legible and the reading of which is thus “offered with all due caution” (p. 439) as follows: *Sex(to) [P]o[mpeio] / [L(ucio)] Co[rnificio] / [c]o(n)[s(ulibus)]*. However, in the photo the name of the first consul in l. 1 can in my view be read as *SEX·POM* and the nomen of the second in l. 2 in any case begins with *CO*.² Moreover, as the names in the name list imply that the inscription must be Augustan at the latest, there can be no doubt that Cooley is correct in identifying the date as 35 BC. This is the only year before AD 14 when a consul with a name beginning with *Sex(tus) Pom-* was in office, suitably with a colleague with a nomen beginning with *Co-*, namely Sex. Pompeius (a relative of Pompey the Great) and L. Cornificius. The fact that the order of the consuls in this text is Sex. Pompeius, L. Cornificius is interesting, for the reverse order is more common. As one can see from the compilation of A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII 1, Roma 1947, 508f., the order Cornificius, Pompeius is used by Cassius Dio in the index of book 49, by the Chronograph of AD 354, in the *fasti Hydatiani*, in the *Chronicon Paschale* and, to move on to epigraphical sources, in an inscription from Ithaca set up by an *ungentarius de Sacra via* (*ILLRP* 826). In inscriptions published after 1947, the same order, Cornificius followed by Pompeius, is used in the *fasti* of Tauromenium (*AE* 1991, 894), in those of Alba Fucens (*AE* 2017, 372, c = *CIL* IX 7873) and in an inscription from Samothrace recording *mystae* (*ILLRP* 1271b = N. M. Dimitrova, *Theoroi and Initiates in Samothrace: The Epigraphical Evidence*, Princeton 2008, no. 80).³ The order Pompeius, Cornificius is in addition to the new inscription from Ephesus used only in the *fasti magistratuum vici* (*Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII 1, p. 283) and in the consular list in Cassiodorus (both sources cited by Degrassi p. 508f.).⁴ This variation in the order of the consuls (not observable

² In the photo at AshLI 175 the second consul’s praenomen *L.* also seems reasonably visible.

³ Cf. also the date on an amphora *ILLRP* 1185 = *CIL* IV 9313 *L. Cornuff(icio) co(n)s(ule)*, where the mention of just one consul points to the use of a consular list in which Cornificius was named as the first consul, as it is generally the name of the *second* consul that is dropped when the name of only one consul is used.

⁴ The inscription also adduced by Degrassi on p. 509, with only the filiation of the second consul being preserved ([ἐπὶ --- καὶ ---]ου Λευκίου υἱοῦ ὑπάτων; now republished as J. Reynolds & K. T. Erim, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, London 1982 no. 8) must surely be referred to 39 rather than to 35 BC. Cf. now A. Raggi & P. Buongiorno, *Il senatus consultum de Plarasensibus et Aphrodisiensibus del 39*

in the case of some other years in this period)⁵ indicates that the precedence of the consuls may have varied from month to month. However, as none of the consular dates of 35 BC is accompanied by an exact date to the day, it does not seem to be possible to say more. The date 35 BC – in Latin epigraphy an “early” date – having been settled, it is perhaps not altogether pointless to stress the fact that the text contains some “archaic” features, namely Greek [Y] being rendered with Latin <V> (*Alupus* in col. 7 (T)2,⁶ *Phila[r]gur(us)* in col. 6 (S)8, *Sune[-]* in col. 6 (S)9), [X] being rendered with <XS> (*Alexsa* in col. 5 (M)3 and in col. 7 (T)3), and *Vinucius* instead of *Vinicius* in col. 7 (V)2. Moreover, surprisingly many of the freedmen have a praenomen differing from that of their patrons, a phenomenon which became rare after about the 80s BC (cf. below). Finally, among the nine freeborn men there is one who does not have a cognomen (cf. n. 15) – although one would perhaps expect to find even more in 35 BC.

Let us now move on to the individuals mentioned in the list. In columns 1–7, the men are enumerated in the roughly alphabetical order of their nomina. As large parts of the inscribed text are not legible, we now find in this section of the inscription only nomina beginning with the letters A (col. 1 and 2), C (col. 3), G H I (col. 4), M N (col. 5), R S (col. 6), and T V (col. 7), nomina beginning with the letters B D E F L O P Q thus being missing.⁷ Column 8 seems an addition of sorts, containing as it does, as far as they are legible, nomina beginning with the letters C F M T. (There is also a ninth column, of which only some letters are legible.) As far as I can see, altogether 59 persons are mentioned whose nomina can be identified. These include on the one hand those cases in which the nomina are fragmentary, but can be plausibly restored, *Aponius* (n. 18), *Caesennius* (n. 30), *Cassius* (n. 31), *Graecinius* (n. 11), *Rutilius* (n. 20), and on

a. C. (Acta senatus B7), Stuttgart 2020, 89f.

⁵ Cf. A. Drummond, *Athenaeum* 56 (1978) 80f. on the order of the consuls in the period 100–31 BC.

⁶ As the lines have not been numbered by Cooley, I have added my own numbering: “col. 7 (T)2” means that a particular name can be read in column 7, in the second line of the names beginning with a T. In the case of columns with only names beginning with the same letter I quote the names e.g. as follows: “col. 3, 17” (thus C. Cusinius L. I. Iaso).

⁷ But in col. 6 we find, after a section which must have contained nomina beginning with a P, the heading QR which is followed before the next heading S by only two names, the second of which having a nomen beginning with the letter R (*R[---]lius*, surely *R[uti]lius*, cf. below n. 20); the nomen of [----] *lius* [.] *l. Athatho*, named first, thus probably began with a Q.

the other the Servilii, whose nomen was inscribed only twice, but was then not repeated (cf. n. 21; I have not considered the probably similar, but not altogether certain, cases in nn. 23, 25, 26). As some nomina are attested more than once, the total number of different nomina is 43. Moreover, there are ten men whose nomenclature has been preserved only in part but who, because of the mention of a patron, can be ascertained as freedmen (e.g., *C. [--]nius L. l. Eros*, col. 3 (C)14).⁸ All names are of the Roman type (as contrasted with the Greek); almost all include either a filiation or a mention of the ex-patron. In only three cases is this information inexplicably missing (cf. below). The 59 fully preserved names and the ten freedmen with fragmentary nomina can be divided into the following three groups:

– <i>ingenui</i>		9
– freedmen	35 + 10	45
– <i>incerti</i>		<u>15</u>
<u>Total</u>		<u>69</u>

I have classified as *incerti* persons in the case of whom the indication of father/patron has either not been indicated (cf. above) or has not been preserved.

I shall move on to an examination of the nomina in a moment. Before that, I would like to offer some observations on other aspects of the nomenclature of the *ingenui* on the one hand and of the freedmen on the other. The list of the nine freeborn men, of whom four appear in col. 5 and three in col. 8, is as follows (in a corrected alphabetical order), with some comments and a few modifications added:

– [L.]⁹ Annius L. f. [--]donus (?)¹⁰ (col. 1 (A)1)

⁸ In this paper, I will consider only those persons whose nomina have been preserved or who can be identified as freedmen. In the inscription, there are traces of many further names, sometimes with the cognomen preserved.

⁹ [L.] Cooley in the printed edition. At AshLI 175 she writes the “praenomen could be L.”

¹⁰ Cooley suggests [He]donus both in the printed edition and at AshLI 175 (“cognomen could be [HE]DONVS”), but this restoration, producing a name that is more than suspect, does not seem acceptable. (For an explanation of *Edonus* in the probably 3rd-century inscription *CIL X 8100 = Inscr. It. III 1, 156 [D(is)] M(anibus) Helvio Edono col(legium) dendrof(ororum) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)* see H. Solin, *Zu lukanischen Inschriften*, Helsinki 1981, 41, who suggests that the name could

- M. G[raeci]nius (?)¹¹ M. f. Rufus (col. 4 (G)6)
- L. Marcius L. f. Pri[-2-]¹² (col. 8, 5)
- C. Minucius C. f. P[i]ca¹³ (col. 8, 3)
- M. Minucius M. f. Rufus (col. 5 (M)6)
- L. Munatius P. f. Plancus (col. 5 (M)4)
- L. Mundicius L. f. Spica¹⁴ (col. 8, 4)
- C. Nessinius C. f. Lupus (col. 5 (N)1)
- C. Nonius C. f.¹⁵ (col. 5 (N)3)

be understood as an incorrect rendering of *Hedonius*, a name of the late type with the suffix *-ius*, attested in three inscriptions). In a private correspondence, Solin wonders whether one could read [--]*dorus*, but in the photo I seem to be able to discern *NVS* or perhaps even *ONVS*, and Professor Cooley assures me that this is in fact the correct reading; she wonders whether one could think of a stonemason's error.

¹¹ The reading of the nomen was published as *G[- c.5 -]nius*; I suggest *G[raeci]nius*, as this restoration corresponds to the traces of the nomen and because *Graecinius* is a nomen found, if not in Asia so far, at least in Macedonia (cf. below n. 74).

¹² There does not seem to be a suitable cognomen of only five letters beginning with *Pri-* (I would not consider *Prior*, for which see I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, 294), and it thus seems necessary to assume that more than just two letters are missing; the cognomen could have been *Primus* or *Priscus*.

¹³ *P[-]ca* Cooley. The name was surely *Pica* (in fact, the upper part of the *I* seems to be legible in the photo). This is a rare cognomen most attestations (though note *PIR*² P 403) of which (Kajanto [n. 12] p. 332; add *PIR*² C 31, an equestrian from Verona from apparently the Claudian period, and *AE* 1973, 135 from Cales) seem earlyish, late Republican or early imperial. The man from Cales is called L. Minutius L. f. Pica, but *Minutius* is of course not identical with *Minucius*.

¹⁴ The cognomen of this man is interesting inasmuch as it was mainly attested for women, and mainly in Africa (Kajanto [n. 12] p. 337). The only inscriptions mentioning men with this cognomen adduced by Kajanto are *CIL* VI 13239 (with a questionmark; but this could be Aur(elia), rather than Aur(elius), Spica) and *ILAlg.* I 1904 *Spica Barechal(i)s f(i)lius pius* ...). However, there are now (in addition to the inscription from Ephesus) two better attestations of the male cognomen, namely C. Corcilius L. f. Cla. Spica, *Illvir i(ure) d(icundo) q(uinquennalis) Bervae*, *AE* 1997, 494 = 2013, 484 from Forum Sempronii, and M. Fabius Spica, tribune of the third cohort of praetorians, mentioned in inscriptions of his freedmen and a freedwoman from Rome (R. Friggeri, in M. Barbera [ed.], *Museo Nazionale Romano. La collezione Gorga* Roma 1999, 164–6). In any case, this is clearly a very rare cognomen and a new attestation of it is thus most welcome.

¹⁵ The reading of this line is rendered in the printed edition as *C. Nonius C. f. [-- c.10 --]*, but the text is easily readable at this point and in the photo one can see no traces of letters; clearly the man did not have a cognomen. In fact, finding a man without a cognomen in a group of freeborn men in 35 BC is precisely what one would expect. At AshLI 175 the reading is in fact *C. Nonius C. f.*

Thus, only L. Munatius Plancus has a praenomen which is not identical with that of his father. This is interesting, for in 35 BC one would perhaps expect more than just one freeborn man in a group of nine to have had a praenomen different from that of his father. But what is more striking in this small group is that two of the men have names that seem to imitate those of Roman nobles. That we find here a Minucius Rufus, recalling several Republican Minucii Rufi including the consuls of 221, 197 and 110 BC (see *RE* Minucius no. 48–58), may be due to chance. However, there can be no doubt that the cognomen of L. Munatius Plancus somehow refers to the senatorial Munatii Planci (*RE* Munatius 26–32), the most famous of whom was the homonymous man who was consul in 42 BC. But it seems impossible to decide whether this man was a distant relative of the senatorial family, originating from Tibur,¹⁶ or whether he should be seen as a plain Munatius who had usurped the senator's cognomen.¹⁷

As for the freedmen, here is a list of those with a nomen that has been preserved, with the nomina in the correct alphabetical order:

- A. Aemilius A. l. Philippus (col. 1 (A)10)
- Q. Aninius Q. l. Amphio (col. 2, 10)
- M. An[to]nius M. l. [P]elo[ps] (col. 1 (A)2)
- M. [A]p[on?]ius¹⁸ M. l. Glauca (col. 2, 9)
- Cn. Atinius Cn. l. [– c.5 –] (col. 2, 5)
- C. Audius C. l. Phileros (col. 2, 7; for the reading of the nomen, cf. below at n. 54)
- L. Aufidius L. l. Zoilus (col. 2, 11)
- Q. Caeciliu[s]¹⁹ M. l. [–c. 4–]us (col. 3, 12)

¹⁶ Thus Acro and Porphyrio on Horace, *Odes* 1.7; cf. R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford – New York 1939, 92 with n. 2. The praenomen *Publius* (cf. this Plancus' father) is not found among the Munatii Planci we know of.

¹⁷ For this onomastic phenomenon see H. Solin, in G. Angeli Bertinelli & A. Donati (eds.), *Varia epigraphica. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale di Epigrafia. Bertinoro, 8-10 giugno 2000* (Epigrafia e antichità 17), Faenza 2001, 411–427; Id., in *In amicitia per Renato Badali. Una giornata di studi lunedì 8 giugno 2015*, Viterbo 2015, 16–40.

¹⁸ The nomen is published as if one letter were missing at the beginning and two in the middle. At AshLI 175, Cooley plausibly suggests the restoration [A]p[on]ius, as this is nomen attested in Asia Minor (cf. below nn. 51, 52).

¹⁹ C. Cae[–7–] C. l. Artas (col. 3, 15) could also be a Caecilius – or perhaps a Caesennius (see below at n. 56).

- Q. Caecilius Q. l. [-2?-]ius (col. 3, 18)
- C. Curti[us] C. l. [-]er[--3--]enes (col. 3, 9)
- C. Cusinius L. l. Iaso (col. 3, 17)
- P. Gr[an]ius P. l. Rufion (col. 4 (G)4)
- C. Heredius C. l. Nicephor(us) (col. 4 (H)1)
- M. Hostius M. l. Bithus (col. 4 (H)2)
- C. Iulius C. l. Epaphroditus (col. 4 (I)1)
- C. Mannaius C. l. [S]phaerus (col. 5 (M)4)
- C. Minucius C. l. Alex[c. 3] (col. 5 (M)5)
- A. Mucius A. l. Alexsa (col. 5 (M)6)
- L. Mundicius L. l. Isidorus (col. 5 (M)8)
- D. Naevius D. l. [---] (col. 5 (N)5)
- Q. Nerius Q. l. Menophilus (col. 5 (N)2)
- L. Numitorius L. l. Nicia (col. 5 (N)4)
- Q. R[uti]lius²⁰ Q. l. Zabina (col. 6 (QR)2)
- P. S[erv]ilius P. l. Dama (col. 6 (S)1)
- P. Servilius P. l. Philogenes (col. 6 (S)2)
- P. (Servilius)²¹ P. l. Licinus (col. 6 (S)3)
- M. (Servilius) P. l. Menodotus (col. 6 (S)4)

²⁰ *R[-c. 4-]lius* Cooley, but *R[uti]lius* seems a restoration that is more than probable, as this nomen is often attested in the Greek East.

²¹ The names of the men in ll. 3–9 in the section of the names beginning with an S are published as (e.g.) “P. [---] P. l. Licinus” by Cooley. However, the photo indicates that in these lines the nomen was not inscribed, only a blank space being left between the praenomen and the indication of the patron. Professor Cooley tells me *per epist.* that this does in fact seem to be the case. We are thus dealing with a phenomenon especially common in inscriptions of Aquileia (see C. Zaccaria, *AAAd* 35 [1989] 133–49), but also attested elsewhere (e.g. *CIL* VI 9933. 37820 = I² 1398. 1413; *AE* 2014, 287 from Telleneae, cf. *Arctos* 48 [2014] 322f.; *CIL* IX 3187 = I² 1794 from Laverna [in l. 5]; *CIL* IX 4556 = I² 1890 from Nursia; cf. S. Orlandi, *Scienze dell'Antichità* 25:3 [2019] 196), namely that a nomen repeated in successive lines is inscribed only once, the blank space in the following lines meaning that it has to be supplied from a preceding line where it was in fact inscribed. In this case we find two Servilii, freedmen of Publii, and then seven other freedmen of Publii (surely we can assume that also in the case of the man in line (S)7 the mention of whose patron has not been preserved). The logical conclusion is, then, that these men are all Servilii and probably freedmen of the same P. Servilius. (In enumerating the Servilii, I have used the same order as that used in the text.) For possibly similar omissions of the nomen in cases where the same nomen was repeated see below nn. 23, 25 and 26.

- P. (Servilius) P. I. Apollonius (col. 6 (S)5)
- [-] (Servilius) P. I. Astragalus (col. 6 (S)6)
- D. (Servilius) [P. I.] Salvius (col. 6 (S)7)
- P. (Servilius) P. I. Phila[r]gur(us) (col. 6 (S)8)
- P. (Servilius) P. I. Sune[-]e[---] (col. 6 (S)9)
- L. Terentius L. I. Alexsa (col. 7 (T)3)
- P. Titius P. I. Sabbio (col. 7 (T)4)
- C. Tuscenius C. I. Alupus (col. 7 (T)2)
- D. Volumnius P. I. Epaph<r>odit(us) (col. 7 (V)1)

In this group we have 35 men, the cognomen of whom has been preserved at least in part in 31 cases.

In addition to these persons, the following men whose nomina remain uncertain can be identified as freedmen:

- [.] A[- c.5-] L. I. <P>amphilus²² (col. 1 (A)4)
- D. [--] D. I. Damas (col. 1 (A)9)
- [---] ius Q. I. [--] (col. 2, 6)
- C. [-c.7-]²³ C. I. Lache[s]²⁴ (col. 3, 10)

²² *Amphilus* Cooley, although that name does not exist, and it thus seems that the stonecutter has inadvertently omitted a letter (cf. *Epaph<r>odit(us)* in col. 7 (V)1).

²³ In the original publication, the nomen is rendered as “[-c.7-]” and thus as missing and to be restored in the edition. However, from the photo it seems to emerge that the space to be occupied by the nomen was in fact left blank, and Professor Cooley tells me that this may in fact be the case. That would mean that this man had the same nomen as the man in the previous line, and thus the nomen was not repeated (cf. the *Servilii*, above n. 21 and nn. 25 and 26). The number of missing letters is given as “c.7”, suitably in view of the fact that the man in the previous line has the nomen *Curti[us]*. Note also that this man, too, is called Gaius and is the freedman of one Gaius.

²⁴ In the original publication, the reading of the cognomen was rendered as *Iac[-c.4-]* (which should probably be *Iac[chus]*). But Professor Cooley now thinks that the reading of this line after the space left blank (cf. previous note) should be *CL* (the indication of the patron), then possibly a letter or a blank space (cf. below) followed by *IAC* and then *HE* (very faint), and, moreover, that the *I* could perhaps also be *L*. Now in the photo kindly sent to me by Professor Cooley the reading does seem to be *LACHE[-]*, and this inevitably leads to *Lache[s]* as this person's cognomen. Between the indication of the patron and the cognomen, there is, as observed by Cooley, either a blank space or the trace of a letter that could in theory just have been a small *A*. There does not, however, seem to be a name that would begin with one letter, either an *A* or some other letter, followed by either *IACHE* or *LACHE*.

- C. [--]nius L. I. Eros (col. 3, 14)
- C. Cae[--7--] C. I. Artas (col. 3, 15)
- C. [-c.6-]²⁵ C. I. Terpnus (col. 4 (I)2)
- C. [---]ius C. I. Apollodor(us) (col. 5 (M)2)
- C. [---]²⁶ C. I. Heracleo (col. 5 (M)3)
- [---]ius [-] I. Agatho (col. 6 (QR)1).

In this group of ten men we find nine whose cognomina can be ascertained and seven of whom both their own praenomina and those of their patrons have been preserved.

As for the cognomina of the freedmen in both groups, we thus have 31 + 9 = 40 men with a cognomen that can be identified. In only three cases (7.5 %) do we find Latin cognomina, namely in those of P. Gr[an]ius P. I. Rufion (col. 4 (G)3; note the Hellenizing suffix), P. (Servilius) P. I. Licinus (col. 6 (S)3), and D. (Servilius) [P. I.] Salvius (col. 6 (S)7). On the other hand, the three Latin

Thus it is surely preferable to assume that this space was never inscribed and that the possible trace of a letter is simply due to the attrition of the stone. Note also that if there had been a letter, it would have been conspicuously smaller than the letters preceding and following it.

²⁵ According to the photograph, the space between the praenomen and the indication *C L* of the patron may have been left blank. It thus seems possible – and Professor Cooley in her message agrees – that we have here another case of a nomen that was left uninscribed in order to avoid repeating it (cf. nn. 21, 23, 26). Six letters appear to be missing, and so this man may well have been a Iulius like the man called C. Iulius C. I. Epaphroditus in the previous line.

²⁶ Here, too, the space for the nomen seems at first sight to have been left blank (cf. nn. 21, 23, 25), in which case this man would have had the same nomen (beginning with the letter *M*) as the man in the previous line, C. [---]ius C. I. Apollodor(us). However, Professor Cooley tells me (and this is confirmed by the photo) that one can in fact discern a “shallowly cut” *S* before *C L*, although this letter would have been cut a bit lower than the other letters in this line, and, moreover, that before the *S* there seems to be a horizontal bar, “in alignment with the rest & of a similar depth of cutting” that could be part of a *T*. Accordingly, she is “less certain” that the space for the nomen was left blank in this particular line. But if the second letter before the end of the nomen was a *T*, the last letter obviously could not have been an *S*. If we assume that the trace of what seems to be an *S* is due to chance and that the nomen ended with a *T* followed by another letter, that would leave us with a nomen ending in either *-te* (cf. *Pabate Virucate* etc.) or *-to* (cf. *Sediato Sueto* etc.). Here, however, we are in the middle of letters beginning with an *M*, and no name beginning with *M* and ending with *-te* or *-to* is known. The question of this man’s nomen must thus be left open; to be honest, frankly, I am prepared to believe that the traces of the letters *T* and *S* (?) are both just due to the attrition of the stone and that the space for the nomen was indeed left blank.

cognomina *Licinus Rufio Salvius* fit very well into the normal repertory of Latin cognomina of freedmen in this period.²⁷

But perhaps more interesting than the presence of a number of Latin cognomina among these freedmen are their praenomina. Roughly before the time of Sulla, freedmen often did not have a cognomen at all, and very often had praenomina that differed from those of their patrons. After the early first century BC, not having a cognomen became extremely rare, whereas one can still occasionally find sporadic instances of freedmen with praenomina differing from those of their patrons, although these cases seem to disappear approximately by the end of the Augustan period.²⁸ Now in this list we find the following freedmen who have a praenomen that differs from that of their patrons:

- Q. Caeciliu[s] M. l. [–c. 4–]us (col. 3, 12)
- C. Cusinius L. l. Iaso (col. 3, 17)
- M. (Servilius) P. l. Menodotus (col. 6 (S)4)
- D. (Servilius) [P. l.] Salvius (col. 6 (S)7)
- D. Volumnius P. l. Epaph<r>odit(us) (col. 7 (V)1)
- C. [–]nius L. l. Eros (col. 3, 14)

In the two groups, there are altogether $35 + 7 = 42$ freedmen whose praenomina can be compared with those of their patrons. No less than six freedmen, around 14% of the total, have a different praenomen, and seeing that Triumviral and Augustan instances of differing praenomina of freedmen and patrons are a small minority, that is somewhat more than one would expect to find in an inscription of 35 BC (note that only one man in the group of nine freeborn men has a praenomen that is not identical with that of his father). In this respect, then, the Ephesus list would seem to reflect the onomastic habits of an earlier period.

Finally, there is a group of fifteen *incerti* consisting of persons whose nomen is at least partly legible, but whose legal status – freeborn or freedman

²⁷ Cf. H. Solin, *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen* I, Stuttgart 1996, 7 (*Licinus*), 7–9 (*Salvius*), 56 (*Rufio*); Id., in N. Duval (ed.), *Onomastique Latine*, Paris 1977, 123 (*Licinus*) and 132 (*Salvius*).

²⁸ See O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen*, Helsinki 1987, 229–241, with a list of inscriptions that are, or at least seem to be, later than the end of the Republic (most of them seem Triumviral or Augustan), on p. 233–236 (add e.g. *AE* 2018, 699 from Clusium).

– remains uncertain. In this group, we find the following persons (in the alphabetical order of their nomina):

- M. Albius M. [. Pin?]darus²⁹ (col. 2, 7)
- D. Anisius Diogenes (col. 1 (A)8)
- L. Cae[se]nnius³⁰ [-c.8-] (col. 3, 11)
- C. Cas[sius?³¹ ----] (col. 8, 2)
- L. Clodius [-2-] Cris[p]us (col. 3, 13)
- [.] Cor[ne]lius L. [.] Aristo (col. 3, 16)
- M. Falcidius Ruf[us] (col. 8, 3)
- A. Granius A. [.] Asp[a]sius (col. 4 (G)1)
- C. Gavius [--- c.11? --] (col. 4 (G)5)
- L. Gavius [-2-] H[il]arus (col. 4 (G)7)
- A. Stlaccius [- c. 9 -] (col. 6 (S)11)
- L. Terentius [vac.4] Rufus (col. 7 (T)1)
- M. Tonniu[s ----] (col. 8, 7)
- Q. Vettienus [-c.9-] (col. 7 (V)4)
- Ap. Vinucius *vac.* [-c.3-]A[-3-] (col. 7 (V)2)

In this group, the uncertainty about the legal status of the enumerated persons in most cases comes from the fact that the indication of the father or patron cannot be read. In three cases, however, this indication is missing because it has inexplicably not been inscribed. In the case of D. Anisius Diogenes and M. Falcidius Ruf[us], the nomen is immediately followed by the cognomen, but in the case of L. Terentius Rufus, a *vacat* of about four letters has been left between the two. This seems to mean that the stonecutter was for some reason unsure of what he was expected to inscribe here.³²

²⁹ The restoration is suggested by Cooley at AshLI 175. Πίνδαρος/*Pindarus* is by far the most common name ending in *-δαρος* and is surely the most plausible restoration.

³⁰ Published as *Cae[-2-]nnius*, the nomen can surely be restored as *Cae[se]nnius* (cf. below at n. 56).

³¹ This restoration seems more probable than *Cas[tricius]* because a C. Cassius is attested in Ephesus (SEG 34,1085) and because *Gaius* is in any case a common praenomen of Cassii. In addition, a space of c.13 letters is said to be available for the rest of the nomen after *Cas-*, an indication of the father or patron and the cognomen. The restoration *Cas[tricius]*, however, leaves only four letters for the cognomen (unlikely, though not of course impossible).

³² In the case of Ap. Vinucius, what follows after the nomen was published as “[vac.2]”, which could

In this group, the cognomina of eight persons have been preserved: four persons have a Greek cognomen,³³ three a Latin one,³⁴ and the cognomen of L. Gavius [--] H[il]arius can be classified as either Latin or Greek. *Crispus* and *Rufus* were cognomina with an upper-class ring, and the three men with these cognomina were probably freeborn. *Hilarus*, on the other hand, was a cognomen mainly attested for freedmen and slaves,³⁵ and so this man, and probably the four men with Greek cognomina, would have been freedmen. In this group, then, the relation of freeborn to freedmen would seem to be 3:5. Of great interest is the fact that one of the men has the praenomen *Appius*, a praenomen used especially by the main branch (later using the cognomen *Pulcher*) of the patrician Claudii and characteristic of this *gens*. It is also sometimes found in other families, including a number of Claudii, who were probably not descendants of Republican patricians but were keen on imitating them.³⁶ Relevant in this particular case is the fact that this praenomen is also occasionally found in the Greek East. In my study quoted in n. 36, I registered (p. 22) Appii in the following *gentes* settled in the East during the period between the late Republic and Augustus: Aufidii, Flamini, Saufei, Sextilii and Sulfii.³⁷ This Vinucius (who is also the first Appius Vinucius/Vinicius ever) can now be added to this little group.

Let us now have a quick look at the relation of the number of freeborn men to that of freedmen in this inscription. In the first group discussed above, that of freeborn Romans, there were nine men; in the second group of freedmen, there were altogether 45 men. If we add to these numbers the men in the group of *incerti*, namely the three men who were probably freeborn and the five men who were probably freedmen (cf. above), we arrive at the following numbers:

mean that this would be a similar case, but looking at the photo I cannot help but see the faint trace of the letter A (possibly A[p. f.]?) not too far to the right of the nomen.

³³ M. Albius M. [Pin?][darus]; D. Anisius Diogenes; [.] Cor[ne]lius L. [.] Aristo; A. Granius A. [.] Asp[er]sius.

³⁴ L. Clodius [--] Cris[p]us; L. Terentius Rufus; M. Falcidius Ruf[us].

³⁵ Cf. Kajanto (n. 12) p. 260.

³⁶ *Die römischen Vornamen* (n. 28) 21–24.

³⁷ For Appii in the East during the Empire see *Die römischen Vornamen* (n. 28) p. 24 (Arellii, Didii and of course Claudii; add Ἀππ[ι]ος Ἄννιος Φοῦσκος in *I. Anazarbos* 120 (AD 90).

– freeborn men:	12
– freedmen:	<u>50</u>
	62

Only about one fifth of the men (exactly 19.35%) whose nomenclature has been preserved were thus freeborn, about four fifths being freedmen. The number of freedmen seems strikingly high if one considers that we seem to be dealing with the members of a *conventus* of *negotiatores* (cf. the suggestion of N. Purcell, mentioned above), in general a most respected body of men whom one would assume to be for the most part freeborn. However, freedmen are in fact often attested as *negotiatores* in the East³⁸ and Ephesus in the 30s BC may well have offered a special attraction for them.³⁹

In the Ephesus list, there are altogether 43 nomina that can be identified. I shall now move on to an examination, especially, but not exclusively, from the point of view of their distribution in the East, of some of the more interesting nomina (in some cases interesting combinations of nomina and praenomina). I omit, however, some common nomina which in any case appear in about every list of Roman names and which thus cannot be commented upon in a useful way. All the following nomina are attested in Ephesus by inscriptions other than the new list. Most of them are also found on Delos (an asterisk is attached to those nomina which are not found there): *Annius Antonius Aufidius Caecilius *Cassius Clodius Cornelius *Gavius *Iulius Marcius Minucius Nonius Rutilius Servilius*⁴⁰

³⁸ Freedman *negotiatores* datable to the late second and the first century BC are recorded J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'orient hellénique*, Paris 1919, 383–7, 390–2, 399; these are all Latin inscriptions, as Greek inscriptions do not yet specify the status (freeborn ~ freedman) of persons in this period. Many, if not most, of the men, enumerated by Hatzfeld p. 383–406, especially those with a Greek cognomen, will have been freedmen. For Delos cf. the lists by J.-L. Ferrary, C. Hasenohr, M.-Th. Le Dinahet, in C. Müller & C. Hasenohr (eds.), *Les Italiens dans le monde grec (BCH Suppl. 41)*, Athènes 2002, 183–239 (cited in what follows as *Les italiens*). I have not yet been able to see C. Hasenohr, *Les Italiens à Délos*, Athènes 2021.

³⁹ Roman businessmen who settled in Ephesus in the late Republican / early Imperial period are mentioned in several inscriptions from Ephesus (*I.Ephesus* 409. 646. 658. 2058. 3019. 3025).

⁴⁰ As there are several Servilii who are all either Publii themselves or at least freedmen of Publii, one suspects that their presence is somehow due to the proconsulate of Asia of P. Servilius Isauricus in 46–44 (cf. R. Zucca, in S. Antolini & al. (eds.), *Giornata di studi per Lidio Gasperini*, Tivoli – Roma 2010, 33).

and **Terentius*. I shall examine the more interesting nomina one by one, proceeding in alphabetical order.

– A. Aemilius A. l. Philippus (col. 1 (A)10). The combination of the praenomen *Aulus* with *Aemilius* is rare but, interestingly, it is also attested elsewhere in Asia Minor, in Miletus and Priene.⁴¹ As for a possible connection with Delos, Aemilii are attested on the island, although not with the praenomen *Aulus* (*Les italiens* 186 nos. 1–9). But since merchants on Delos are often thought to have originated from somewhere in Campania, it may be not be pointless to refer to the existence of a certain A. Aemi(lius) Aem(iliae) l. in an inscription from Puteoli dated normally to the period 120–80 BC, *CIL* X 1589 = I² 1618 = G. Camodeca, EDR167220. However, it is (in addition to Rome itself) in Tarracina where one finds more than just one Aulus Aemilius.⁴²

– M. Albius M. [Pin?]darus (col. 2, 7). The descendants of this person may well have settled in Ephesus, for the only other M. Albi one finds in Asia Minor, where there are some scattered attestations of this nomen, are precisely in Ephesus (*I. Ephesus* 47, l. 66, from the time of Commodus; 974, l. 23, an inscription mentioning Aurelii).⁴³

– Q. Aninius Q. l. Amphio (col. 2, 10): the nomen *Aninius* may leave the impression of being in general rare, but in fact it is not that uncommon and is also attested in the East, especially in Macedonia in Dyrrachium, Dion and Philippi (with the praenomina *L.* and *P.*)⁴⁴ and in Asia Minor, with three

⁴¹ Miletus: Ἀῦλος Αἰμίλιος Λαίλιος, *I.Milet* VI 2 (1998) no. 485; Priene: Ἀῦλος Αἰμίλιος Σέξτου Ζώσιμος, the recipient of various honours in the city in about the middle of the 1st c. BC, *I. Priene* 112. 113. 114 = *I. Priene B - M* 68. 69. 70. However, the fact that this man, although an Aulus himself, is the son, or perhaps rather a freedman, of one Sextus, obviously makes him less interesting in this context. (In AD 14, there were Sex. Aemilii at Thebes or Thespieae, *CIL* III 7301 = *I. Thespies* 425.)

⁴² A. Aemilii in Tarracina and its vicinity: *CIL* X 6305 (the same man in 6306. 8398). 6343. 8287 (Circeii); EDR176303.

⁴³ Otherwise there is only Μάρκος Ἄλβιος Ἀμφίων at Athens (*IG* II/III² 7685 = O. W. von Moock, *Die figürlichen Grabstelen Attikas* (1998) 186 no. 530).

⁴⁴ Cf. also Γάιος Ἄνινιου in Leucas (*IG* IX 1²: 1374); a C. Aninius is mentioned in an inscription from Same in Cephallenia (*IG* IX 12, 1547 = *AE* 2001, 1788), but as a centurion in the funerary inscription of a soldier of the 4th legion *Scythica* stationed in Syria. Although it is said in the commentary in *IG*

attestations in Pergamum, in each case combined with the praenomen *L.*⁴⁵ There are also attestations from Cyzicus and from other Asian regions.⁴⁶ However, this person seems to be the only Aninius in the East with the praenomen *Quintus*.⁴⁷

– D. Anisius Diogenes (col. 1 (A)8). The nomen of this man is not perfectly clear in the photo, but between the *A* and *ISIVS* one can see two vertical lines, and there seems to be no other possibility than interpreting them as representing the letter *N*.⁴⁸ If the correct reading is in fact *Anisius*, we may be dealing with only the second attestation of this nomen (as such plausible)⁴⁹ in the Roman world.⁵⁰

– M. [A]p[on?]ius M. I. Glauca (col. 2, 9). The nomen *Aponius* (assuming that the restoration – cf. n. 18 – is correct), sometimes written *Apponius* Ἀππώνιος, is not very common in the East, but there are scattered attestations

that this centurion could be the father of the man in Leucas, I do not think he could somehow be relevant, for it is hard to imagine why, or how, the soldier, a man from Verona, could have brought his centurion with him from Syria to Cephallenia. The centurion is mentioned in the inscription only because the soldier's unit was the *centuria* of this particular centurion.

⁴⁵ *I.Pergamon* 374 (AD 129/138); *ibid.* 485 (dated to the early first c. AD), ll. 8 and 19; *IGR* IV 386 (AD 109/110).

⁴⁶ *AM* 26 (1901) 121-4, B, l. 67 (Cyzicus, 117/138); *MAMA* I 12 cf. *SEG* 6, 368; *REG* 3 (1890) 72 no. 29 cf. *MAMA* I 430, and *MAMA* VII 282 (Amorium, with the praenomen P).

⁴⁷ For Q. Aninii in Italy and Africa see *CIL* VI 1161 and EDR000661 (Rome); *CIL* IX 4203 (Amiternum); *CIL* XI 1624 (Florentia). *AE* 1987, 375 (Tarquinii); *CIL* VIII 15925.

⁴⁸ Nomina beginning with *A* and with one or at the most two letters preceding the ending *-isius*, i.e. *Acisius*, *Acrisius*, *Albisius*, *Alfisius*, *Alvisius*, *Annisius*, *Apisius*, *Aquisius*, *Arisius*, *Athisius* and *Atisius*, clearly do not come into the question.

⁴⁹ The nomen *Anilius* is attested, and the relation of *Anisius* to *Anilius* would be the same as (e.g.) that of *Petisius* to *Petilius*.

⁵⁰ In the *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum* (21994) I register *Anisius*, quoting NSA 1940, 367 from Ariminum (an inscription also registered by G. A. Mansuelli, *Epigraphica* 2 [1940] 180 no. 3b), where the reading is *Anisia* (with *I longa*). However, this attestation is not altogether certain, for something may be missing both at the beginning and at the end. Note, however, also *Anisianus* in *CAG* 67:1 (*Le Bas Rhin*, 2000) 251.

here and there especially in Galatia and Lycaonia.⁵¹ In the area of the province of *Asia*, an attestation has only recently emerged in Alabanda.⁵²

– Cn. Atinius Cn. l. [– c.5 –] (col. 2, 5). This nomen is (in addition to the new attestation) found once, combined with the praenomen *A.*, in Ephesus in an inscription clearly much later than this one (*I.Ephesos* 1636 = *I.Asia Mixed* 29). Otherwise the attestations of this nomen come from Galatia and Cilicia, with several instances at Anazarbos.⁵³ But what is especially interesting in the nomenclature of this freedman is that this seems to be the first attestation ever of the nomen *Atinius* being combined with the praenomen *Gnaeus*. Certainly, I have not been able to trace any other instance of this combination.

– C. Audius C. l. Phileros (col. 2, 7). At AshLI 175, Cooley observes that the nomen could also be read as *Aveius*. The original reading *Audius* however, certainly seems preferable, as this nomen, attested on Delos and in early inscriptions from Asia,⁵⁴ fits well into the *negotiator* milieu of the late Republican/Augustan period. It is also later attested both in Ephesus (*I.Ephesos* 1602 (i) 3, a man with the same praenomen C.; *ibid.* 1687 (1) i 6, an earlyish inscription; *ibid.* 3308) and elsewhere in Asia.⁵⁵ If the reading were *Aveius*, this would be the first attestation of this nomen in the Greek East.

– L. Cae[se]nnius [–c.8–] (col. 3, 11). As far as I can see, *Caesennius* is the only nomen attested in the East beginning with *Cae-* and ending in *-nnius* and with two letters missing in the middle, and in my opinion this is the most probable restoration. However, it must be admitted that (in addition to this particular attestation) the nomen is attested in Asia Minor almost exclusively

⁵¹ E.g. *SEG* 34, 1401; *MAMA* VIII 94 and 327; E. N. Lane, *Corpus monumentorum religionis dei Menis* IV, Leiden 1978, no. 133.

⁵² Ἀπὼνια Ἐβοδία *I.Nordkarien* 231.

⁵³ See *IGR* III 1484 and *MAMA* VIII 30 (Lystra); *I.Westkilikien Rep.* 112 Hamaxia no. 32; *I.Anazarbos* 294. 301. 399. 497. 639.

⁵⁴ Delos: *Les italiens* p. 188-9 Audius 1-10 (with the praenomina *A. L. M. M'. P.*); early inscriptions elsewhere: e.g. *I.Cos Segre* EF 429 and EF 738 (for a later instance from Cos see *ibid.* ED 228 = *IG* XII 4, 2, 473, l. 16); *SEG* 27, 719 (Halicarnassus).

⁵⁵ E.g. *I.Smyrna* 788; *I.Milet* VI 3, 1098; *I.Hadrianoi Hadrianeia* 5.

in Pisidian Antioch, where it is very common.⁵⁶ On the other hand, there are Caesennii in mainland Greece.⁵⁷

– C. Curti[us] C. l. [-er[--3--]]enes (col. 3, 9). This is a nomen that is fairly common in the Greek East both in Greece and Macedonia and in Asia Minor not only in the province of Asia but also e.g. in Galatia and Pamphylia. As for Ephesus itself, there are several instances of this nomen, the man in *I.Ephesos* 47, l. 45 (from the time of Commodus) also being a Gaius.⁵⁸

– C. Cusinius L. l. Iaso (col. 3, 17). In the case of this nomen there are also several other instances in Ephesus, the praenomen always being *Lucius*.⁵⁹ Otherwise, there are attestations of this nomen in Asia Minor only once in Blaundos and once in Pisidian Antioch (although we may in this case be dealing with a Roman magistrate).⁶⁰ One of the Ephesian Cusinii is known to have a member of the tribe *Velina* (n. 59). As *Velina* is not a common tribe and *Cusinius* not a very common nomen, this is a useful fact. First, it seems more than probable that the Ephesian Cusinii are somehow connected with the Italian Cusinii with the same tribe, represented in our sources by a senator of the triumviral or early Augustan period, buried in Tusculum near Rome, and by his homonymous father.⁶¹ Because of the tribe, these Cusinii will have moved to the vicinity of the capital from somewhere else. In Italy, the *Velina* tribe is attested

⁵⁶ Cf. *Arctos* 40 (2006) 104 with n. 74. For the inscription of T. Caesennius Septimius Gellius Flavonianus Lollius, see M. Christol, *Epigraphica* 82 (2020) 58–66; for the inscription of Καίσενια Ἐρμιόνη (*JRS* 2 [1912] 168), see H. Bru, *JES* 4 (2021) 146 n. 11. For the attestation of the cognomen Καίσενη[νιανός] in (apparently) Iconium see *I.Claros mémoires* 268–270 no. 39.

⁵⁷ *CIL* III 7273 (Corinth); *IG* VII 3194. 3222 (Orchomenus); *SEG* 29, 452 (Thespieae, with the cognomen Καλύμνιος). Cf. *IG* IV 835 c (Troezen, a man with Καίσενηνιος as his cognomen).

⁵⁸ *I.Ephesos* 1004. 1034 (Q). 2245 (P); *AE* 1993, 1462; 2013, 1530.

⁵⁹ *I.Ephesos* 660B. 660C. 801. 2246a. 2551β. 3335; Λεύκιος Κουσίσιος Λευκίου υἱός Οὐέλεια, a local dignitary of the Claudian period, *I.Ephesos* 716 and 4119 and elsewhere (cf. F. Kirbihler, *JÖAI* 74 [2005] 151–73).

⁶⁰ Blaundos: *IGR* IV 720 = F. von Saldern, in A. Filges (ed.), *Blaundos. Berichte zur Erforschung einer Kleinstadt im lydisch-phrygischen Grenzgebiet* (*IF* 48), Tübingen 2006, 340–2 no. 30A–C; Antioch: *AE* 1941, 144 (cf. *PIR*² C 1628).

⁶¹ *CIL* XIV 2604 = *ILS* 965 M. *Cusinius M. f. Vel. aed(ilis) pl(ebis), aerario praef(ectus), pr(aetor); M. Cusinius [.] f. Vel. pater (...)*.

in addition to Aquileia and some minor sites in regions II and VII mainly in the cities of Picenum.⁶² Besides the two Cusinii in Tusculum, there are no Italian Cusinii in the *Velina* tribe. However, there are two Cusinii in Picenum who do not mention their tribes but who are attested in cities whose inhabitants were inscribed in this tribe. These are C. Cusinius Natalis in Falerio (*CIL* IX 6417 = *AE* 2007, 471) and C. Cusinius Cyphaerus in a place called Montefano between Ricina and Auximum, the inhabitants of both cities being in the *Velina* tribe (*CIL* IX 5817). One could thus suggest that the *ultima origo* of the Cusinii in Ephesus was somewhere in Picenum.⁶³

The inscription from Falerio includes a poem from which it appears that the *u* in *Cusinius* was short. This means that the name could be expected to have been rendered as *Cosinius*/Κοσίνιος in Republican or early Imperial inscriptions, and in fact we do find not only Cusinii but also Cosinii (Cosinnii)⁶⁴ in Ephesus – with the tribe *Velina* (*AE* 1993, 1489 = *SEG* 43, 825, the praenomen being *Lucius*). Because of the tribe it seems certain that we must add these Cosinii to the Ephesian Cusinii. But the existence in Ephesus of Cusinii/Cosinii takes us to another *gens* attested in the East, namely the Cossinii with the nomen normally written with a double *s*. This nomen has an interesting distribution in the Eastern lands already in the Republican period, for we find early instances of it on Delos⁶⁵ but also e. g. in Epirus, Leucas and Athens.⁶⁶ But it is on Cos where we find a concentration of Cossinii.⁶⁷ The Cusinii/Cosinii and the Cossinii

⁶² W. Kubitschek, *Imperium Romanum tributim discriptum*, Pragae – Vindobonae 1889, 272. (In the otherwise useful survey of the distribution of tribes in Italy by F. Luciani in D. Faoro [ed.], *L'amministrazione dell'Italia romana*, Firenze 2018, 177–179, the tribes beginning with *V* have for some reason been omitted.)

⁶³ Cf. H. Devijver, in P. Freeman & D. Kennedy (eds.), *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, Oxford 1986, 121 no. 37.

⁶⁴ For this orthography see my observations in *Arctos* 41 (2007) 59–74.

⁶⁵ *Les italiens* p. 193 nos. 1–2.

⁶⁶ Epirus: L. P. Eberle & E. Le Quéré, *JRS* 107 (2017) 30; Leucas: *CIL* III 574 = *IG* IX 1² 1451; Athens: *IG* II/III² 11898a (surely to be dated “s. I a.” rather than “s. I p.”; for the Cossinii in Athens in general, see S. Byrne, *Roman Citizens of Athens*, Leuven 2003, 213 Cossinius 1–4).

⁶⁷ Cf. O. T. Láng, in M. Mayer i Olivé, G. Baratta & A. Guzmán Almagro (eds.), *XII Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae. Provinciae Imperii Romani inscriptionibus descriptae*, Barcelona 2007, 824f.

are sometimes treated as members of the same *gens*.⁶⁸ However, the Cusinii in Ephesus normally write their name with a *u* and with one *s*, whereas the Cossinii on Cos write their name with an *o* and a double *s*.⁶⁹ Moreover, the fact that we find Cusinii/Cosinii with the tribe *Velina* only in Ephesus seems to indicate that we should keep the Cusinii/Cosinii of Ephesus and the Coan Cossinii apart. As for the Cossinii, the *ultima origo* of many of those attested in the East may have been Puteoli or Campania in general, a region normally thought of as having furnished the East with the largest numbers of *negotiatores*. As evidence, a man attested on Leucas (n. 66) calls himself *Puteolanus*, and a man on Cos has the Campanian tribe *Falerna* (*AE* 2008, 1323); and there are many Cossinii in Puteoli and in Campania.⁷⁰ On the other hand, a Cossinius in Dyrrachium has the cognomen *Spoletinus*,⁷¹ and Cossinii, some of them locally prominent, are attested throughout Italy.⁷² The ancestors of the Cossinii attested in the East may well have come from several places around Italy.

– M. Falcidius Ruf[us] (col. 8, 3). This seems to be only the second inscription in the East mentioning Falcidii, the first also being from Ephesus but clearly much later.⁷³

– M. G[raeci]nius (?) M. f. Rufus (col. 4 (G)6). Five letters are said to be missing between the first letter *G* and the ending *NIVS*, and I have suggested the above restoration in n. 11, as *Graecinius*, attested in Macedonian cities,⁷⁴ seems

⁶⁸ E. g. F. Kirbihler, *Des Grecs et des Italiens à Éphèse*, Bordeaux 2016, 296.

⁶⁹ But note Κοσινία Καλιρόη in *I.Cos Segre* EV 5, in an inscription that has been carelessly inscribed.

⁷⁰ See G. Camodeca, *Puteoli romana: Istituzioni e società*. Saggi, Napoli 2018, 106, 471.

⁷¹ *AE* 2009, 1245 = *LIA* Albanien 183.

⁷² Note especially L. Cossinius L. f. L. [n. Cu]rvus, pontifex and edile at Asculum (*CIL* IX 5196 = *AE* 2000, 467 of late Republican date); L. Cossinius from Tibur, father of a knight, Cic. *Balb.* 53, and Cossinia L. f., a Vestal Virgin also from Tibur, *AE* 1931, 78 = *Inscr. It.* IV 1, 213. These Cossinii are clearly the subject of F. Boanelli, *La Gens Cossinia di Tivoli (II a. C. – I d. C.)*, Tivoli 2020 (non vidi).

⁷³ *I.Ephesos* 972 (an inscription mentioning both Aurelii and M. Aurelii), ll. 18–20 (Φαλκίδιος Ἐπίγονος, γραμματεὺς γερουσίας and his son Φαλκίδιος Ζώσιμος).

⁷⁴ See *I.Philippes* II 1 nos. 56 (= *AE* 1952, 215) and 168; *IG* X 2, 1, 244 (Thessalonica); *AE* 2001, 1781 = *SEG* 51, 789 (Amphipolis. In the last two instances the name is spelled Γρακείνιος and Γρεκίνιος).

to be the only suitable nomen for which there are other attestations in the East.⁷⁵

– A. Granii A. [.] Asp[a]sius (col. 4 (G)3), P. Gr[an]ius P. I. Rufion (col. 4 (G)4). The nomen *Granius* is attested throughout the East and is very common on Delos and Cos. The attestations in Ephesus are of particular interest mainly because previously only one Ephesian Granii was known, Λεύκιος Γράνιος Καπίτων, α κούρης and ἱεροκῆρυξ (*I. Ephesos* 1002).⁷⁶ Moreover, the praenomina of these Granii, *Aulus* and *Publius*, indicate that they are somehow connected with the earlyish Granii attested on Delos and then on Cos and other islands and cities in W. Asia Minor. Both praenomina are attested for Granii on Delos⁷⁷ and Cos, where *Publius* is by far the most common praenomen of the Granii and where we also find at least one *Aulus Granii*.⁷⁸

– C. Heredius C. I. Nicephor(us) (col. 4 (H)1). This is a rare nomen for which there is only one other attestation in the East, in Patrae.⁷⁹ Otherwise, this nomen is attested once for an early veteran in Naronia in Dalmatia with the tribe *Palatina* and a few times in Italy and Africa.⁸⁰

– M. Hostius M. I. Bithus (col. 4 (H)2). This nomen was already attested in Ephesus, though in inscriptions of later date and without mentioning

⁷⁵ If one could reduce the five missing letters to four, one could perhaps also consider *Gargonius*, a nomen attested in Aezani (*MAMA* IX 274), but also in Ephesus via the cognomen of Caninia Gargonilla (*I. Ephesos* 892; M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial*, Leuven 1987, no. 188), derived from *Gargonius*.

⁷⁶ Cf. Kirbihler (n. 68) 303 no. 95, with the date “30–50”. The author does not mention the two Granii in the new inscription, although he normally refers to nomina attested in the new inscription, communicated to him in advance of the publication by A. Cooley (p. 275f.).

⁷⁷ See the list of Granii at *Les italiens* 198f. no. 1–18.

⁷⁸ For P. Granii cf. e.g. *I. Cos Segre* EF 357. 392. 405. 496. 620. 691. 784 (c); *IG XII* 4, 1, 365; *IG XII* 4, 4, 1517; etc. (there are P. Granii also e.g. in Miletus and Mylasa). For an A. Granii on Cos see *I. Cos Segre* EF 278, and for another on Samos *IG XII* 6, 1, 189 (approximately Augustan).

⁷⁹ Rizakis, *Achaïe* II no. 95: Heredia Attice (A. D. Rizakis & S. Zoumbaki, *Roman Peloponnese I* [Meletemata 31], Athens 2001, 78 no. 129).

⁸⁰ Naronia: *CIL* III 1813 (praenomen *M.*). Italy: *CIL* VI 19298; IX 7972 (Alba Fucens, *L.*); XI 5906 (Iguvium, the daughter of an *A.*). Africa: *CIL* VIII 1459 (*Q.*). 26032 (*C., L.*); *Mourir à Dougga* 486 (*C.*). 487. 488. ?489.

praenomina.⁸¹ One also finds scattered instances of it at other sites in Asia Minor, namely in an early Latin inscription at Alexandria Troas, in Philadelphia, and, to move a little to the East, at Amastris in Pontus.⁸² This nomen is also attested in Macedonia in Thessalonica and Dion, the praenomen always being *Gaius*.⁸³

– C. Mannaius C. I. [S]phaerus (col. 5 (M)4). The reading of the nomen seems certain. This is clearly an archaic spelling of *Mannaeus*,⁸⁴ and is an extremely rare nomen. It is, however, attested in Asia Minor in Pisidian Antioch in the case of Q. Mannaeus P. f. Ser., centurion of the legion *V G(allica)*, obviously one of the early settlers in the colony (*AE* 1998, 1389). The only other persons with this nomen are the owner of a slave in Rome in AD 69 (*Lucrio Mannaei*, *CIL* VI 155) and another C. Mannaeus, the brother of a soldier whose name has been broken off in an inscription from Iader in Dalmatia (<http://lupa.at/23216> = EDCS-63400215). The nomen *Manneius*, attested in Asia Minor in Apamea in Phrygia and in Thyatira, may be etymologically related but has a different suffix and should not be used to illustrate *Mannaeus*.

– A. Mucius A. I. Alexsa (col. 5 (M)6): this nomen does not appear in inscriptions from Delos (or at least not in those that have been published so far), but there are interesting early attestations of it in NW Asia in the colony of Parium and in Cyzicus (also an *Aulus*).⁸⁵ There are also traces of it in an earlyish inscription from Erythrae, where this nomen is apparently used as a

⁸¹ Ὅστιος Μητροόδωρος *I.Ephesos* 982 and 1135 (a prytanis); *ibid.* 2122 (two male and two female Hostii). Cf. Kirbihler (n. 68) 306 no. 105, who suggests a first-century AD date for them all (I would not exclude a later date).

⁸² Alexandria: Q. Hostius Q. f. An[i. (the tribe of Alexandria) P]ollio (*AE* 2011, 1293); Philadelphia: *TAM* V 3, 1489f. (A.); Amastris: *SEG* 35, 1330.

⁸³ Thessalonica: *IG* X 2, 1, 386bis. 1275. 1372. Dion: *SEG* 34, 623 = *AE* 1998, 1203.

⁸⁴ As for the origin of this nomen, according to A. Valvo, in G. Urso (ed.), *Tra oriente e occidente* (2007) 156, this name is “di origine ital. centro-meridionale (con molta prob. etrusca, meno probabilmente laziale o campana)” (however, this does not seem very helpful or illuminating).

⁸⁵ Parium: *RPC* I 2253. 2253A (reverse: [] *Poblici(us)*, *P. Muci(us) IIIIvir(i) i(ure) d(icundo) quinq(uennales)*). 2254. 2254A (otherwise *Muc(ius)*; see <https://rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/coins/1/+2253-2253A-2254-2254A>); the coins are dated “c. 45 BC (?)” in *RPC*. Cyzicus: *I.Kyzikos* I 194 (Ἀῶλε Μούκιε Μουκίου νιῒ Ἐρμιόδωρε, χαίρει).

cognomen.⁸⁶ One wonders whether these attestations could indicate that this particular nomen spread to Asia via (say) Macedonia rather than Delos.⁸⁷ As for Ephesus, there are also some later attestations of the nomen (*I.Ephesos* 1010, praenomen *L.*; 1191; 1687 (9) 1).

– *L. Munatius P. f. Plancus* (col. 5 (M)4). Whatever the explanation of the cognomen (see above at n. 16), this man joins a group of more or less early *Munatii* on Delos (*Les italiens* 203 no. 1) and in coastal Asia.⁸⁸ In the imperial period, this nomen is well attested in Ephesus, the praenomina found in combination with it being *Gnaeus* and *Lucius*.⁸⁹

– *L. Mundicius L. l. Isidorus* (col. 5 (M)8); *L. Mundicius L. f. Spica* (col. 8, 4). The distribution of this nomen in the East is striking, for there are several attestations of it on Delos (*Les italiens* 203 no. 1-7; *AE*, 2001, 1797), which would make one expect to find *Mundicii* in the larger area of the eastern Aegean from about the mid-first century onwards. But in fact the nomen seems to be attested only in Ephesus, where we find it, spelled Μονδ[ίκιος], in the earlyish inscription *I.Ephesos* 443 (Λεύκιος Μονδ[ίκιος] Λευκίου Ἀριστι[—]). It is also found in lists of Kouretes dating from the late first and the late second century mentioning several generations of persons called surprisingly either simply Μουνδίκιος⁹⁰ or Λυσίμαχος Μουνδίκιος.⁹¹ This dearth of *Mundicii* on the Aegean islands other than Delos and in Asia Minor is partly compensated for by the fact that

⁸⁶ *I.Erythrai Klazomenai* 414 Κόιντε Λόλλιε Μούκιε γυμνασίαρχε, χαίρε.

⁸⁷ In assessing the presence of early *Mucii* in Asia one should, however, perhaps also take into account the famous proconsulate of Asia of *Q. Mucius Scaevola* (consul 95 BC) in the nineties (cf. *M.-C. Ferriès & F. Delrieux*, in *N. Barrandon & F. Kirbihler* [eds.], *Les gouverneurs et les provinciaux sous la république romaine*, Rennes 2011, 207–230; *J.-L. Ferrary*, *Athenaeum* 100 [2012] 157–79).

⁸⁸ *I.Cos Segre* EF 708 (daughter of an *Aulus*); *SEG* II 629 (Teos, [—]ς Μουνάτ[ι]ε χρηστὲ χαίρε); *I.Iasos* 278, l. 5 (Λεύκιος Μουνάτιος Μάρκου υἱός; about Augustan); *I.Mus. Denizli* no. 77 (funerary inscription, apparently metrical, of uncertain origin addressing the deceased as [--- Μ]ουνάτιε, dated to the second or third century).

⁸⁹ *J.-L. Ferrary*, in *I.Claros mémoires* p. 590 with n. 8.

⁹⁰ E. g. *I.Ephesos* 105. 1017. 1018. 1019.

⁹¹ E.g. *I.Ephesos* 1033 (Λυσίμαχος γ τοῦ Λευκίου Μουνδίκιος); 1034 (Λυσίμαχος (Λυσιμάχου) Μουνδίκιος). Cf. *D. Knibbe*, *Der Staatsmarkt. Die Inschriften des Prytaneions (Forschungen in Ephesos IX/1/1)*, Wien 1981, 116f. (cf. 100 n. 185).

this nomen is well attested in Athens⁹² and is also found in various cities in Macedonia.⁹³

– D. Naevius D. I. [---] (col. 5 (N)5): this nomen, not uncommon and attested on Delos (*Les italiens* 203f. no. 1-6), is also found in later inscriptions from or near Ephesus (*I.Ephesos* 20, l. 49 from AD 54/59, praenomen *P.*; 3867, Q.; *AE* 1998, 1344a, L.). What is interesting about this freedman and his patron is that they have the praenomen *Decimus*, for as far as I can see, this is the first instance ever of a Naevius with this particular praenomen.

– Q. Nerius Q. I. Menophilus (col. 5 (N)2). In the Greek East, this nomen is attested on Delos (*Les italiens* 204 nos. 1–5, praenomina C. M. P.), but otherwise only on Samos⁹⁴ and (in addition to the new attestation) in Ephesus,⁹⁵ the praenomen in each case being *Quintus*.

– C. Nessinius C. f. Lupus (col. 5 (N)1). This must be the same nomen as that of Λ(ούκιος) Νεσσήνιος Ἀπολλινάριος, honoured (no title being mentioned) in Ephesus, *I.Ephesos* 699 (*AE* 1975, 793). He, again, is surely identical with Nesennius (sic) Apollinaris, a third-century jurist and disciple of Iulius Paulus, mentioned several times in the *Digest* and because of the inscription perhaps of Ephesian origin (*PIR*² N 71). The same nomen is also found in Pergamum and, spelled Νεσήνιος, in Mylasa (also a *Gaius*).⁹⁶ This is one of the very few

⁹² M. Woloch, *Roman Citizenship and the Athenian Elite A.D. 96–161*, Amsterdam 1970, 75–77 nos. 1–6; J. S. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens* 12, Toronto 2003, 473f. nos. 660605–660630; S. G. Byrne, *Roman Citizens of Athens*, Leuven 2003, 372f. nos. 1–8.

⁹³ See A. B. Tataki, *The Roman Presence in Macedonia* (Meletemata 46), Athens 2006, 321 nos. 1–5 (add *AE* 2012, 1330, Stobi), cf. the cognomen of Λ. Κορνήλιος [Μου]νδικιανός Κρόκος from Stobi, *ibid.* 193 no. 27 (*I.Claros mémoires* 451f. no. 176, dated 165/165 or 165/166). The cognomen should of course not be restored as [?Οὐ]νδικιανός (thus Ferrary, cf. [? *Vi*]ndicianus in the commentary), and certainly not because “Mundicianus in not included in Solin–Salomies” (Tataki). Cognomina with the suffix *-ianus* can of course be derived from all nomina in *-ius*, and if *Mundicius* is attested one would in any case expect to find the cognomen *Mundicianus* somewhere.

⁹⁴ *IGR* IV 965 = *IG* XII 6, 2, 571.

⁹⁵ *I.Ephesos* 1032, 14f.; 2293. The nomen of the Hadrianic magistrate M. Νερ. Λονγίνος in Hadrianoutherae (*RPC* III 1624f.) was probably Νερ(άριος) rather than Νέρ(τος).

⁹⁶ Pergamum: *MDAIA* 27 (1902) 137 no. 168; Mylasa: *AE* 2018, 1639.

Roman nomina for which there do not seem to be attestations outside the Greek East. *Nessenius* was probably the correct spelling. For the variation *Nessenius* ~ *Nessinius*, cf. perhaps *Tetrinius* ~ *Τετρήνιος* in the early inscription AE 1997, 1354 (Thessalonica).

– L. Numitorius L. l. Nicia (col. 5 (N)4). This nomen, attested once in a Latin inscription from Delos,⁹⁷ is found only very rarely in the Greek East, in Greek inscriptions always spelled Νεμετώριος.⁹⁸ We find the nomen in Athens, Kibyra and (apparently) Nicomedia, and it is used as a cognomen at Mytilene on Lesbos.⁹⁹ In Ephesus this is thus the first attestation.

– A. Stlaccius [- c. 9 -] (col. 6 (S)11). Found already on Delos (*Les italiens* 217 no. 1–8), this nomen is attested in Ephesus and in several other places around the province of Asia. In Sardes it is also a cognomen.¹⁰⁰ Stlaccii with the praenomen *Aulus* are extremely rare; in addition to some A. Stlaccii in Rome there is interestingly one in Puteoli, the city normally seen as one of the main suppliers of Roman *negotiatores* to the East.¹⁰¹ Some of the Stlaccii of Puteoli or Campania in general may have moved not to the East but to the South, for there are several persons with the nomen Σταλάκκιος (surely another

⁹⁷ CIL I² 2257 = *I.Délos* 1803 C. Numitorius A. l. and A. Numitorius C. l. (*Les italiens* 205 nos. 1–2).

⁹⁸ Cf. the spelling Νεμέτωρ for Numitor, the brother of Amulius (e.g. Dion. Hal. 1,71,4f.; 76, 1–3, etc.; Diodorus 8 fr. 4 [ed. A. Cohen-Skalli; *Les Belles Lettres*]), and e.g. Νεμέριος for *Numerius*. Interestingly, the name *Numitorius*/*Νεμετώριος* is spelled this way not only in inscriptions of private persons, but already in the list of senators in the *senatus consultum de agro Pergameno* (Sherk, *RDGE* 63–73 no.12, cf. p. 70 n. 29) of 129 or 101 BC (cf. now C. Rosillo-López, *Historia* 70 [2021] 405f.). This indicates that this was seen by the person who translated the text as the correct Greek orthography of the name.

⁹⁹ Athens: *IG* II/III² 5322 (Κόντος Νεμετώριος [Α]μμώνιος Ἀθμονεύς); Kibyra: *SEG* 17, 699 = *I.Kibyra* I 345 (T); Nicomedia: unpublished inscription mentioning a certain Numitorius Acutianus (*TAM* IV 1, 200, commentary); Mytilene: *IG* XII Suppl. 690 (Α. Τωράνιος Α. υἱός Νεμετώριος).

¹⁰⁰ Ephesus: *I.Ephesos* 999A and 2517 cf. H. Engelmann, *ZPE* 126 (1999) 164. Elsewhere in Asia Minor: see M. Haake, in E. Schwertheim (ed.), *Studien zum antiken Kleinasien* VII, Bonn 2011, 150f.; cf. J.-H. Römhild, *ibid.* 165 (the inscription *I.Smyrna* 480 is surely identical with *I.Illion* 181). *Stlaccius* may have been difficult to pronounce for Greeks, for the nomina Σταλάκιος (*I.Rhénée* 184) and Στάλιος (*I.Smyrna* 479) are surely versions of *Stlaccius*. Cf. Σταλάκκιος, n. 102.

¹⁰¹ Rome: CIL VI 14190. 26872. 26874; Puteoli: *CIL* X 2245.

attempt at *Stlaccius*) in Cyrene – one of them with the praenomen *Aulus*.¹⁰²

– M. Tonniu[s ----] (col. 8, 7). This nomen¹⁰³ is interesting inasmuch as it may be one of the earliest nomina found in Asia Minor as there is a mention of a Τόννιος among the οἰκονόμοι at Magnesia on the Maeander in an inscription dated to the beginning of the second century BC (*I.Magnesia* 94 = *I.Priene B - M* 403, [το]ῦς δὲ οἰκονόμους το]ῦς μετὰ Τόννιον ὑπηρε[τῆ]σαι ...). According to Louis Robert, the name is “Ionian” (“ionien”),¹⁰⁴ but one should perhaps also consider the possibility of interpreting it as an Italic name, a trace of early Italian immigration. If that were the case, one could go on to assume that the new Tonnius in Ephesus could be a descendant of the οἰκονόμος in Magnesia, not far from Ephesus. The other instances of the nomen *Tonnius* in Asia (all with the praenomen *Lucius*), from Erythrae and Smyrna, are not, or do not seem to be, earlier than the second century.¹⁰⁵ The only other *Marcus* Tonnius I have been able to trace anywhere is a certain M. Tonnius M. I. Tertius in an inscription from Rome (*CIL* VI 6102).

– C. Tuscenius C. I. Alupus (col. 7 (T)2). This nomen was attested in the East between the late second century BC and the time of Augustus on Delos (*CIL* I² 2240 = *ID* 1773, M. Tuscenius L. f. Nobilior; Τσοσκήνιος in the Greek version), somewhere in Asia in the middle of the first century,¹⁰⁶ and on Samos in AD 6/7 (*IG* XII 6, 1, 190), the man also being a Gaius. The new Tuscenius from Ephesus thus fits well into the series of attestations of this extremely rare nomen¹⁰⁷ in the East.

¹⁰² E.g. *SEG* 20, 742, col. I, l. 40; *AE* 2003, 1884 (but note *ibid.* 1883 and *SEG* 9, 8 no. II [Augustan] for *Stlaccii*); cf. *SEG* 9, 376 and 377 (Ptolemais). Α(ύ)λος Σταλάκκιος Ἀφροδείσιος; *AE* 1995, 1632, l. 24 (cf. l. 49 for another Σταλάκκιος).

¹⁰³ Which is not to be identified with *Tonneius/Tοννήιος*, attested on Samos (*IG* XII 6.2, 695) and in Egypt (Hatzfeld [n. 38] p. 176); *-ius/-ιος* and *-eius/-ήιος* are different suffixes.

¹⁰⁴ Robert, *OMS* V (1989) 446.

¹⁰⁵ *I.Smyrna* 705 and 771; Erythrae: *AE* 1980, 862 = *SEG* 30, 1331 (reign of Caracalla). Note also Τόννιος (attested for three members of the delegation, all with the praenomen Δ(έκ(ι)μος), from Parium at Claros in AD 145/6, *I.Claros mémoires* 340f. no. 90), but this is surely a different name.

¹⁰⁶ See Hatzfeld (n. 38) p. 127, based on *Cic. Q. fr.* 1.1.19 and 1.2.6.

¹⁰⁷ Other attestations of this nomen are: *PIR*² O 64; R 18; T 417 cf. EDR171068, 171074, 171075; *CIL* X 3699 (Cumae, AD 251; praenomen C.).

– Q. Vettienus [---] (col. 7 (V)4). This nomen is also attested in an earlyish inscription from Cyzicus (*SEG* 33,1059), the funerary inscription of a certain Αὔλος Βετιήνος set up by this man's sons Λόνγος and Πολλίων. However, *Vet(t)ienus* is a variant of *Vettenus*, a nomen attested at Eretria on Euboea (*IG* XII 9, 852, Γάιος Οὔεττήνος Κέρδων and his wife or freedwoman with the same nomen) and in Aramea in Bithynia (*SEG* 66, 1374, Μάρκος Βεττήνος Πάταικος). Note also Λ. Κορνήλιος Οὔεττηνιανός in Sardis in the time of Caracalla (*IGR* IV 1527 = *Sardis* 7 [1932] 80 no. 75) and Βεττηνιανοί elsewhere in Lydia (*TAM* V 1, 608 and 671).

– Ap. Vinucius [---] (col. 7 (V)2). In addition to the new attestation from Ephesus, this nomen is attested once on Delos and, from about the time of Augustus onwards, in Smyrna.¹⁰⁸ The form used is always Οὐνίκιος, not Οὐνιούκιος, The use of the archaizing form *Vinucius* is of some interest especially as the form *Vinucius*, although attested, is much rarer than the parallel form *Vinicium* – a scenario that can be contrasted with the pair *Minucius/Minicius*, where the two forms are attested in about equal numbers.¹⁰⁹

– D. Volumnius P. I. Epaphrodit(us) (col. 7 (V)1). For this nomen, not attested on Delos (but not uncommon in Pisidian Antioch and known also in other places in Galatia) there are very few attestations in the area of the province of Asia. Two inscriptions, one from Cyzicus and the other from Smyrna, seem fairly early. Otherwise, there is only one other, albeit uncertain and late, instance from Cyzicus and a Βολουμνια[νός] at Erythrae.¹¹⁰ As for the praenomen *Decimus*, this freedman seems to be the first D. Volumnius attested in the Roman world.

¹⁰⁸ *I.Delos* 2857 (*Les italiens* 221 no. 1); *I.Smyrna* 358. 702. 707. 721. Some, if not all, of the *Vinicium* in Smyrna may have something to do with one of the Augustan proconsuls of Asia called *Vinicium* (see *PIR*² V 654-656).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. the number of instances of *Vinucius/Vinicium* and *Minucius/Minicius* in the Claus-Slaby database: *Vinucius* : *Vinicium* 20 : 238; *Minucius* : *Minicius* 349 : 353.

¹¹⁰ *Cyzicus*: *I.Kyzikos* I 177 (dated to the first century BC), Κόιντε Βουλούμνιε χαίρε (for the other uncertain instance see *I.Kyzikos* I 121). *Smyrna*: *I.Smyrna* 329 (Τερτία Βουλουμνία). *Erythrae*: *I.Erythrai Klazomenai* 413, [Λευ]κίου Κοσσου[τίου] Βολουμνια[νοῦ].

In this article, my object was simply to comment upon the names, mainly the nomina, of the men mentioned in the inscription, my focus being on other attestations of the same names in the Greek East. To conclude, let me offer two observations of a more general nature on the background of the men. First, there is the question of whether the men in the inscription are recent immigrants or descendants of earlier settlers in Ephesus or in the East in general. This is obviously a question for which there are no certain answers. However, my impression is that many of the men seem to have arrived fairly recently in the East. This impression is based on the observation that several features of the nomenclature found in the inscription seem to match what one would expect to find in Italy in the same period. This goes especially for the cognomina of the freeborn men including the *incerti* with Latin cognomina. Both *Pica* and *Spica* are cognomina one would not expect to find outside Italy, and except for the mysterious cognomen [--]donus (?) the rest of the cognomina, especially *Crispus*, *Lupus* and *Rufus* (two instances among the certainly freeborn and another two among the *incerti*), would fit perfectly into the mid-first century BC milieu of *domi nobiles*. One also wonders how a Munatius established in the East could have picked up the idea of giving his son the cognomen *Plancus*. In the case of the freedmen, things are not that clear, but at least the three Latin cognomina *Licinus*, *Rufio* and *Salvius* could easily be expected to appear in lists of Italian freedmen in the same period. The fact that so many of the freedmen do not have the praenomina of their patrons may also possibly indicate that these men could be recent immigrants rather than freedmen of persons long since established in the East.

On the other hand, there are also names which seem to indicate that some of the men may have belonged to *gentes* that earlier resided on Delos, an observation already stressed by Cooley. Most of the common nomina listed above at n. 40 are attested on Delos in the second and early first centuries BC, but, these being common names, that does not necessary mean much. Instead, the presence in the list of less common nomina pointing to Delos, such as *Audius*, *Granius*, *Mundicius*, *Nerius*, *Stlaccius* and *Tuscenius*, is clearly significant. Moreover, as the majority of the *gentes* on Delos are, as pointed out by Cooley, normally considered to have originated from the commercial centre of Puteoli and from Campania in general, this must mean that many of the men in the list have a Campanian background. It is thus no wonder that one finds the rare

combination *Aulus Aemilius* both in the list and in Puteoli (above at n. 41). There are, however, also names which seem to indicate a background somewhere else in Italy. Above at n. 63 I suggested that the Cusinii with the tribe *Velina* may have come from somewhere in Picenum, and even the Aemilii with the *praenomen Aulus* could perhaps be attributed to Tarracina in S. Latium rather than to Puteoli (ibid.). As for Delos, it is, as mentioned above, normally considered that Delos, an important centre of trade from the early second century to the early first century and with a significant congregation of Italian *negotiatores*, was the main point of arrival for Italians heading for the East, and that members of this Italian community on Delos later, after the decline of Delos in the early first century, scattered throughout the Aegean. Having said that, one surely cannot exclude the idea that Italians on their way to the East could have taken other routes than via Delos.¹¹¹ Hence, in conclusion, I would like to point out that the attestations of some names in the list could be taken to imply that bearers of these names may have arrived at Ephesus via other routes; cf. e.g. *Aninius* (above at n. 44) and *Mucius*, attested not on Delos but in early inscriptions from NW Asia, partly combined with the same *praenomen Aulus* (above at n. 85).

University of Helsinki

¹¹¹ Cf. my observations on “immigrants not passing through Delos” in M. Mayer i Olivé, G. Baratta & A. Guzmán Almagro (eds.), *Acta XII congressus internationalis epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae*, Barcelona 2007, 1277f.