

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. LVI



HELSINKI 2022

## ARCTOS – ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

*Arctos* has been published since 1954, annually from vol. 8 (1974). The Editorial Board of *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 [journal.fi/arctos](http://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, 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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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 [journal.fi/arctos/guidelines1](http://journal.fi/arctos/guidelines1).

### *Requests for Exchange:*

Exchange Centre for Scientific Literature, Kirkkokatu 6, FI – 00170 Helsinki, Finland.

– e-mail: [exchange.centre@tsv.fi](mailto:exchange.centre@tsv.fi).

### *Sale:*

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

– Tel. +358 9 635 177, email: [tiedekirja@tsv.fi](mailto:tiedekirja@tsv.fi), internet: [www.tiedekirja.fi](http://www.tiedekirja.fi).

ISSN 0570–734X (print)

ISSN 2814-855X (online)

Layout by Vesa Vahtikari

Printed by Grano Oy, Vaasa

## INDEX

	MAXWELL HARDY	<i>Ovid's Public Poetry: Tristia 5,1,23–4</i>	9
	PAUL HOSLE	<i>An 'Ars Poetica' Acrostic in a Poem of Alberto Mussato</i>	27
	ILKKA KUIVALAINEN	<i>From Affection to Violence: The Treatment of Animals in Pompeian Sculpture</i>	33
	TUOMO NUORLUOTO	<i>An Unpublished Latin Inscription from Castelnuovo di Porto Including a New Nomen with the Suffix -aienus</i>	57
	WŁODZIMIERZ OLSZANIEC	<i>A Corruption in Ciris 530?</i>	65
	LEENA PIETILÄ-CASTRÉN	<i>A Note on a Helmeted Marble Head in a Finnish Art Museum</i>	69
	OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Latin Cognomina in -illianus (Addendum) and Nomina in -inus</i>	83
	HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta Epigraphica 341–343</i>	101
	JYRI VAAHTERA	<i>Bibulus and the Hieromenia (ἱερομηνία) of 59 BC</i>	111
	JAMIE VESTERINEN	<i>Generals' Dreams before Battle: An overview of a Recurring Motif in Ancient Historiography (4<sup>th</sup> c. BC – 3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD)</i>	127
		<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	189
		<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	255
		<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	259
		<i>Index scriptorum</i>	267

## LATIN COGNOMINA IN *-ILLIANUS* (ADDENDUM) AND NOMINA IN *-INUS*

OLLI SALOMIES\*

Building on an earlier study, I offer here are some further observations on Latin cognomina ending in *-illianus*. These cognomina should be understood as derived from female cognomina ending in *-illa*, rather than family names (nomina) in *-ilius*. The second section is devoted to analysing the small and poorly understood subgroup of Latin nomina ending in *-inus*, whose unfamiliarity regularly leads to instances being unrecognized and/or emended away by editors.

### 1. Cognomina in *-illianus*

In *Arctos* 53 (2019) 185–209, I discussed Latin cognomina ending in *-illianus*, observing that those cognomina that cannot be derived from nomina ending in *-illius* (e.g. *Popillianus* < *Popillius*) must in most cases have been derived from female cognomina ending in *-illa*. These endings were derived for their part either from nomina or from cognomina and in some cases also from praenomina, for instance *Drusilla* and *Priscilla* from the cognomina *Drusus* and *Priscus*, but *Cloatilla* and *Plotilla* from the nomina *Cloatius* and *Plotius*.<sup>1</sup>

---

\* Thanks are due to the two anonymous referees for a number of very helpful observations and corrections.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my observations in W. Eck – M. Heil (eds.), *Prosopographie des Römischen Kaiserreichs: Ertrag und Perspektiven* (2017) 127f. For cognomina in *-illa* derived from praenomina, see T. Nuorluoto, *Roman Female Cognomina: Studies in the Nomenclature of Roman Women* (2021) 71–78 (with instances on p. 77f. of *Lucillae* and *Quintillae*, who were daughters of men with the praenomina *Lucius* and *Quintus*; cf. \**Titilla*, surely derived from *Titus*, a yet unattested cognomen that can be reconstructed on the basis of the cognomen *Titillianus*, *Arctos* 53 [2019] 203).

In the same article I also observed that names that because of their etymology should have the suffix *-illianus* have sometimes been written negligently with just one *l*.<sup>2</sup> In this note I add some cognomina attested only as ending in *-ilianus* but which must have been derived from female cognomina in *-illa* and which thus should have been rendered as ending in *-illianus*. After that, I use this occasion to point out in this context the interest of cognomina ending in *-ullianus*.

\**Blaesillianus*. The correct form of the second cognomen of L. Silius Plautius Haterianus Blaesianus of Lepcis Magna, attested in *IRT* 635 and probably identical with the senator L. Silius Plautius Haterianus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 466, based on *SEG* 18, 740 cf. *AE* 1960, 200b from Cyrenae, AD 165/169; add *AE* 1997, 1586 from Lepcis), must surely have been \**Blaesillianus*. This is the case on the one hand because the name cannot be derived from the nomen \**Blaesilius*, not attested, and on the other because Aquilia Blaesilla, honoured in *IRT* 632 by her son Q. Plautius Haterianus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 465), must have been this man's grandmother, as Blaesilla's son Haterianus is clearly Silius Plautius Haterianus' father.<sup>3</sup>

\**Certillianus*. *Certilianus*, the cognomen of Deccius Certilianus, the son of Deccius Fruendus, decurion of Cologne, and the brother of Deccia Materna (*AE* 1935, 102 = *I.Köln*<sup>2</sup> 291, where it is dated to the third century) surely derives, as already suggested as a possibility by Kajanto,<sup>4</sup> from \**Certilla* rather than from \**Certilius*. Both names are unattested, but \**Certilla*, derived from the common cognomen *Certus*, is a perfectly plausible formation of a type for which there are numerous parallels (cf. *Drusilla Priscilla* etc.); the correct orthography of the cognomen should thus no doubt be \**Certillianus*.

\**Martilliana*. This is probably the correct form of *Martiliana*, the name of a Christian *virgo* attested in an inscription from Theveste in Africa (*CIL* VIII 27915 = *ILAlg.* I 3430 = *ILCV* 1702). This name seems to have been derived from *Martilla*, itself derived from the nomen *Martius*, which is in fact attested exactly

<sup>2</sup> Cf. e.g. p. 200 for *Quintillianus* (from *Quintilla*) sometimes written *Quintilianus* (as if from *Quintilius*). On p. 191, I should have mentioned *Flaccilianus* in *AE* 1985, 257 (*Ex officio(na) lul(i) Flacciliani* on a lead *fistula* from the Civitas Aravorum in Lusitania), surely to be understood as *Flaccillianus*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf., in addition to the *PIR* articles, M. Torelli, *Rend. Linc.* 28 (1973) 385f. (with stemma); M. Corbier, in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* (*Tituli* 5, 1982) 725.

<sup>4</sup> I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (1965) 254 (cited in the following as "Kajanto").

in Theveste for a certain Martia Cestia (*CIL* VIII 1960 = *ILAlg.* I 3318). There are several instances of the cognomen *Martilla* in African inscriptions.<sup>5</sup> It should be noted, however, that the nomen *Martilius*, previously not known, is now perhaps attested in a recently published late and vulgar inscription from Puteoli.<sup>6</sup>

\**Naevillianus* (?). The cognomen Naevilianus (with one *I*) is attested only once, for a certain P. Craexius P. f. Fab. Naevilianus Senior from Brixia, an equestrian (*CIL* V 4417 and 4700 = *Inscr. It.* X 5, 210 and 511).<sup>7</sup> In the *Repertorium* I suggested that the cognomen could be a derivative of an otherwise unattested nomen \**Naevilius*.<sup>8</sup> However, I. Kajanto does not mention this cognomen in his list of cognomina derived with the suffix *-ianus* from nomina p. 139–160, but registers it on p. 169 as if derived from, or at least somehow in relation to, the cognomen Naevilla (itself derived with the diminutive suffix from the nomen Naevius).<sup>9</sup> Seeing that not a single instance of the putative nomen \**Naevilius* has ever turned up anywhere, he may well have been right. Should this be the case, the correct form of the name would obviously be *Naevillianus*.<sup>10</sup> Gregori (n. 7) p. 127f. lists six instances of the nomen Naevius in Brixia, and there is thus no problem in postulating the existence of the cognomen Naevilla in Brixia.

<sup>5</sup> The index of cognomina in *CIL* VIII lists the inscriptions 3655 (“*Martilia*”, surely to be understood as *Martilla*, as in EDCS-21600249), 7501 (*Martila*), 20126; add *ILAlg.* I 3689; II 1, 2004. 2912. 3902; EDCS-76000027 (Thamugadi). The index of nomina in *CIL* VIII registers (p. 47) five instances of the nomen *Martius*.

<sup>6</sup> See U. Soldovieri, *Puteoli Cumae Misenum: Rivista di Studi* 1 (2021) 171f. = G. Camodeca, EDR181423 (with the suggested date 251/320) = EDCS-81500041, *Martilia Eusaevia* (sic), the wife of a certain Larcus Gaenialis (sic). Soldovieri (followed by both EDR and EDCS) does not in fact read *Martiliae* but *Martillae*, and the photo attached to the publication does seem to indicate that the third letter from the end would be an *L* rather than an *I*. But in late inscriptions, the letters *I* and *L* are often quite similar, and the reading *Martiliae* thus does not seem impossible. Moreover, a combination of nomen and cognomen would in any case seem more natural than a combination of two cognomina.

<sup>7</sup> G. L. Gregori, *Brescia romana: Ricerche di prosopografia e storia sociale* I (1990) 85 no. A, 89, 001.

<sup>8</sup> H. Solin – O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum* (1988 and <sup>2</sup>1994) p. 124. In the following this book is cited as “*Repertorium*”.

<sup>9</sup> Kajanto p. 169; note Naevia Naevilla, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 21.

<sup>10</sup> *Naevillianus* is in fact the form used by Gregori (n. 7) vol. II (2000) p. 84 in his list of cognomina derived from praenomina, nomina and other cognomina, but this is apparently an error, as the form used in the index p. 440 is *Naevilianus* with just one *I*.

\**Probillianus*: this must be the correct form of the cognomen written as *Probilianus* in two late inscriptions, *ILCV* 2157 = *ICVR* IV 10953 and *CIL* IX 2584 from Bovianum Undecimanorum (cf. the addenda on p. 1039 with the observation that the letter forms indicate the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD).<sup>11</sup> The name cannot have been derived from a nomen \**Probilius*, which is not attested, but must derive from the female cognomen *Probilla*.<sup>12</sup>

\**Quietillianus*: in the list of the members of the *ordo corporatorum lenunculariorum* in Ostia from AD 192, *CIL* XIV 251, the second to last name is (in col. 8, line 36) that of a certain *C. Mezaeus Qu(i)etilianus*.<sup>13</sup> As a nomen \**Quietilius* does not exist, the cognomen must have been derived from the female cognomen *Quietilla*<sup>14</sup> and the correct form should thus be *Quietillianus*.

I would like to conclude this section with an observation on female cognomina ending in *-ulla*, for which see Nuorluoto (n. 1) 88–92 (cf. on “irregular” forms in general p. 110–113). Like the cognomina ending in *-illa*, the names in *-ulla* are also derived from nomina, from other cognomina, and from praenomina. However, the derivation of the names in *-ulla* is sometimes unorthodox, for we find cognomina such as *Hispulla*, clearly derived from the cognomen *Hispo*, where the correct form would have been \**Hisponulla*, and *Semprulla* which may have been derived from *Sempronius* (one would expect \**Sempronulla*). But some of the names in *-ulla* have been derived in the same way as the names in *-illa*, and thus one finds both *Terentilla* and *Terentulla* (for this cognomen see Nuorluoto 90 n. 263 and below n. 16). On the other hand, only *Treulla* is attested (*CIL* IX 6746, *Trebia N. f. Treulla*; Nuorluoto p. 91), not also \**Trebilla*, which as such would be perfectly plausible. In any case, if cognomina in *-ianus* could be derived from female cognomina in *-illa*, it seems clear that it would also have been possible to derive them from cognomina in *-ulla*. The best example of that is surely the cognomen *Terentullianus*, attested for Κλαύδιος Οὐαλεριανὸς Τερεντυλλιανός from Eumeneia in Asia (probably about Severan), known from *AE* 1978, 798 and 799 (in which inscriptions he calls himself υἱὸς

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the photo at EDR131511 (where the inscription is dated to “301/500”) and EDCS-12700595.

<sup>12</sup> Some instances of this cognomen are registered in Kajanto p. 253; add *CIL* V 3068; *CIL* II 400; *IMSI* 76.

<sup>13</sup> For the orthography *Quet-* rather than *Quiet-* see e.g. M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (1977) 130.

<sup>14</sup> Kajanto p. 262 (in *CIL* VI 2907 [*ILS* 2110] and III 2281 spelled *Quetilla*); add *AE* 2001, 562 (Rome).

Ἀσίας καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας)<sup>15</sup> and *MAMA IV 336*. The name is clearly derived from *Terentulla*, also attested in Asia,<sup>16</sup> where we also find many Terentii.

Further similar cases are not easy to come by; not to mention cognomina in *-ullianus* derived from nomina ending in *-ullius* (e.g. *Babullianus Cintullianus*), even in the case of cognomina derived from cognomina ending in *-ullus/-ulla* (e.g. *Antullianus*<sup>17</sup> *Catullianus Tertullianus Titullianus*) there is always the possibility that the cognomen in *-ullianus* derives from a male cognomen ending in *-ullus*<sup>18</sup> rather than from a female cognomen in *-ulla*. This is because there do not seem to be female cognomina in *-ulla* for which there would not be a corresponding masculine form ending in *-ullus*. In fact, unlike male cognomina in *-illus*, some of the male cognomina in *-ullus* are fairly common (e.g. *Catullus Fabullus Homullus Marullus Tertullus*, etc.).

## 2. Nomina ending in *-inus*

Among Latin or Roman names that can be identified as nomina, i.e. as family names (as contrasted with cognomina) there are some names ending in *-inus*. Most nomina of course end in *-ius*, and there are also other more or less common suffixes such as *-aeus* or *-(i)enus*, but the suffix *-inus* is typical of cognomina. Moreover, as the suffix *-inus* does not really correspond to what editors expect nomina to look like, the nomina in *-inus* are often “corrected”.<sup>19</sup> I think, however,

<sup>15</sup> This person does not seem to appear in G. Frija, *Les prêtres des empereurs: Le culte impérial civique dans la province romaine d'Asie* (2012) or in the same scholar's online prosopography <https://www.pretres-civiques.org/liste-des-pretres>.

<sup>16</sup> *I.Ephesos* 788; also in *I. Byzantion* 171.

<sup>17</sup> There is, of course, the very rare nomen *Antullius* (e.g. *CIL VI 1317, 6075*) from which *Antullianus* could be derived. *Antullus/-lla*, however, is much more common, and the fact that this cognomen is now and again attested as the cognomen of persons with the nomen *Antonius* (*Antulli: AE 1991, 125* from Rome; *CIL II 1727, 1728, 6149*; and cf. the *Antonii Clementes Antulliani* from Althiburos in Africa in *CIL VIII 27768*; *Antullae: CIL XI 3930; XII 755; VIII 2808*; cf. Nuorluoto 113) seems to point to the conclusion that the cognomen was at least in some cases somehow thought to correspond to *Antonius* (this is thus another ‘irregular’ derivation).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. e.g. the brothers Tertullianus and Tertullus, sons of a certain P. Olius Tertullianus, in *CIL V 2381 = AE 1996, 709* from Ferrara.

<sup>19</sup> E.g. *Masotinus* is corrected to *Masotin(i)us* in the Clauss-Slaby database (EDCS-26600836);



that most of the nomina in *-inus* can be accepted as such, and my aim is to offer a few remarks on these names here. Those nomina which were known to me by 1994 can be found in the reverse index in the *Repertorium*<sup>20</sup> on p. 282f. and 495. However, the reading of some nomina registered there, *Audinus Camarinus Fuficolinus Mulinus Vettulinus*, has subsequently proved to be incorrect,<sup>21</sup> and these names, as well as some uncertain and/or not pertinent names recorded (in most cases equipped with a question mark) in the *Repertorium*,<sup>22</sup> will thus not be considered in the following. On the other hand, several ‘new’ nomina ending in *-inus* have been published since 1994, and some nomina published earlier have become known to me only after the publication of the *Repertorium*. The list of nomina in *-inus* must thus be supplemented with at least the following names:<sup>23</sup> *Alexandrinus* (AE 2017, 1074 from Germania Superior, a soldier); *Anulinus* (CIL

---

*Considinus* to *Considi(e)nus* in the same database (EDCS-01300565); and *Frontinus* to *Frontin(i)us* both there (EDCS-09000837) and in the Hispania Epigraphica database (HE-4389; note, however, that the inscription may in fact be a modern copy of a genuine one, and that the reading *Frontinus* could thus be an error. See F. Feraudi-Gruénais in the Heidelberg database, HD004097). Cf. below n. 65.

<sup>20</sup> See n. 8. W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (1904 and later reprints) will be cited as “Schulze”.

<sup>21</sup> *Audinus*: to be corrected in *Caudinus* (see EDR107229); *Camarinus* (from Schulze 139 who cites CIE 4572): to be corrected in *Camurinus* (CIL XI 6722, 2); *Fuficolinus* is to be corrected in *Fuficulenus* (EDR075286), *Mulinus* in *Mulleius* (EDR125869) and *Vettulinus* in *Vettulenus* (EDCS-28801136).

<sup>22</sup> E.g. *Anuntinus* (the text is corrupt) *Boninus Dercinus Pirinus*.

<sup>23</sup> I have considered only those nomina which are certainly attested as ending in *-inus*; but it should be noted that there are several nomina, not taken into consideration here, which could belong to the same category but which are attested only in the genitive ending in *-i* which can represent both nomina ending in *-inus* and those ending in *-inius*. E.g. *Anitini* in *P. Anitini P. l. Alexandri* in J. P. Brun – P. Munzi, in C. Gasparri – G. Greco, *Cuma: Indagini archeologiche e nuove scoperte* (2009) 242 no. 8 (EDR115653) could be the genitive either of *Anitinus* or of *Anitinius*. A similar case is that of *Abisinus* or *Abisinius* (AE 2016, 325 from Ausculum). I have also omitted some uncertain or suspect names, e.g. *Alcinus* (CIL II 1568 = II<sup>2</sup> 5, 392). Note, moreover, that the correct reading of the nomen “*Pontilinus*” (*Ποντιλίνος*, D. Berges, *Rundaltäre aus Kos und Rhodos* [1996] 114 no. 18 with photo, cf. J. Nollé, *ibid.* p. 154 = SEG 46, 1097) is in fact *Pontidienus* (IG XII 4, 1347, Ποντιδιήνης Γαίου Οινώνης. In the commentary the nomen is by mistake transcribed as “Pontidiana”), and that *Censorina* (Κησωρίνα), said by D. Bosnakis and K. Hallof, *ZPE* 224 (2022) 142 to be a nomen attested on Kos, is in fact the cognomen of the daughter of a certain Μάρ. Κοίλιος Εὔνου (ibid. p. 119 no. 213).

XIII 11311);<sup>24</sup> *Atelicinus* (AE 2019, 393 from Antium);<sup>25</sup> *Celerinus* (see n. 61); *Florentinus* (?) (CIL V 6549 cf. *Suppl. It.* 31 Novaria p. 126);<sup>26</sup> *Frontinus* (CIL II<sup>2</sup> 7, 789; but see n. 19); *Pedisinus* (Πεδισίνοϛ, IG, X, 2, 1, 241 cf. AE 2011, 1204, A, col. II, l. 10 from Thessalonica); *Viselinus* (R. Cordella – N. Criniti, *Epigraphica* 83 [2021] 156–8 no. 3 from Nursia); *Volusinus* (BACTH 1911, 393 no. 20 = *IL Afr.* 78).

Even a quick look at the nomina attested as ending in *-inus*, of which there seem to be about 160-170 names, makes it obvious that we are dealing with a heterogenous group. My impression is that we could divide the names into the following groups:

1. nomina with a non-Latin or non-Roman background, ‘barbarian’ names, etc.;
2. cognomina used for one reason or another as nomina;
3. nomina formally identical with adjectives derived from toponyms;
4. nomina in which the suffix *-inus* represents a genuine suffix of family names. This is from my point of view by far the most interesting group, on which I shall accordingly concentrate. Before that, let us have a quick look at the other groups. The references to the attestations of the individual nomina can normally be found in the *Repertorium* or via the references there to Schulze’s book (n. 20), but in the case of some names of more than average interest I shall quote the sources.

As for group 1, I would see as belonging to this group nomina attested in a less Romanized, provincial or ‘barbarian’ milieu. E.g. the following names could in my view qualify for this group: names with a N. Italian background: *Acisinus Capellinus* (?)<sup>27</sup> *Lancidinus Leucinus Lotticinus*<sup>28</sup> *Mag(a)plinus/Megaplinus*

<sup>24</sup> *Anulinus* is the proposed reading of the nomen in W. Binsfeld et al., *Katalog der römischen Steindenkmäler des rheinischen Landesmuseums Trier* (1988) p. 31 no. 48. The nomen was registered as *Anulin[iu]s* in the *Repertorium* p. 18, citing *CIL* XIII 11311.

<sup>25</sup> The inscription was published by H. Solin, in H. Solin (ed.), *Studi storico-epigrafici sul Lazio antico* II (Comm. Hum. Litt. 137, 2019) 151f. no. 115.

<sup>26</sup> Attested for a certain Florentina Herennia, the wife of M. Philoclus M. f. Cla. Marcellinus. We may, however, be dealing with the inversion of nomen and cognomen, the real name being Herennia Florentina.

<sup>27</sup> C. Capellinus Sora, *CIL* V 5442 = R. Dell’Era, *Le iscrizioni romane del Canton Ticino* (2022) no. 17. According to Dell’Era (p. 156), this is a nomen of the ‘Transpadane’ type; but Schulze p. 153 considers it Etruscan, and the cognomen *Sora* does have an Etruscan ring (cf. Schulze p. 371).

<sup>28</sup> Lotticina Marcellina, the wife of a certain C. Boicus Silvester, also with a N. Italian nomen (*CIL* V

*Mamertinus* (?)<sup>29</sup> *Maximinus*; nomina mainly because of the findspots of their attestations apparently with a Gallic-Germanic-Danubian background: *Anulinus* (n. 24) *Macrinus*<sup>30</sup> *Masculinus Ursulinus Valentinus*, possibly also *Masotinus* attested in Germisara in Dacia. Perhaps one could add *Haerisinus* (*Aerisinus Herisinus*) and *Halinus*, which seem to be names with an Etruscan background that have not undergone a ‘modification’ into nomina of the Italic (as contrasted with the Etruscan) type.

Most of the nomina whose background I attributed tentatively to the northern provinces could obviously also be classified simply as cognomina (or individual names) used as nomina, and this takes us to the second group of nomina. At least the following names known as cognomina, in most cases as fairly common cognomina, are also attested as nomina:<sup>31</sup> *Aquilinus* ?*Firminus Frontinus* (see n. 19) *Fuscinus Graecinus Longinus Mes(s)alinus Quintinus Saturninus Scaevinus Sextinus*. Taking into account both the fact that, as already observed by Schulze p. 60f., *Longinus* was from the Augustan period onwards a common nomen among soldiers stationed in Egypt, surely all of them former peregrines, and the fact that other cognomina are attested as the nomina both of early (e.g. *C. Niger C. f. Pol.*, *CIL* III 6607 = *ILS* 2247) and later soldiers (cf. Schulze p. 293f.), my guess is that many of these nomina were in origin adopted as their family names by peregrine men entering the Roman army as legionary or auxiliary soldiers. But surely some of the names could also belong to those above in group 1, and there must of course be other possible explanations. For instance in the case of *Sextinus*, attested in Gallia Lugdunensis and in Belgica,<sup>32</sup> one could perhaps also consider the possibility that the name is epichoric – if not derived from the name of the city of Aquae Sextiae (in which case it would

---

433 = *Inscr. It.* X 3, 130). Cf. perhaps *Louticinius* (*Suppl. It.* 16 Forum Vibii 12 = *AE* 1998, 659). H. Solin (n. 25) derives *Lotticinius* from *Lottius*.

<sup>29</sup> M. Mamertinus Maternus *Aug(usta Praetoria?)*, *CIL* VI 32627 (mentioned by Schulze on p. 61 n. 7 and on p. 294). This name, however, can surely also have been derived from a toponym (cf. below at n. 43).

<sup>30</sup> This is apparently the only form attested for *Macrinus Vindex*, praetorian prefect under Marcus and Verus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 25); but this man’s son M. *Macrinus Avitus Catonius Vindex*, consul in ca. 175, is normally called *Macrinus* (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 22, cf. *AE* 2019, 137); perhaps this man wanted his nomen to look more ‘Roman’. These two *Macrini(i)* may well have come from Cologne (see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 25).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Schulze 61 n. 7. I omit *Geminus*, where *-inus* (*-īnus*) does not represent the suffix *-īnus*.

<sup>32</sup> *CIL* XIII 2492 = *ILTG* 307; *CIL* XIII 3993 = *ILB* 80.

belong to Group 3). In addition to the names mentioned above there are some nomina formally identical with cognomina which do not seem to fit the pattern of more or less common cognomina having been taken into use as nomina. I am thinking of the following nomina: *Laterinus Macedinus Matutinus Militarinus*<sup>33</sup> ?*Placidinus*.<sup>34</sup> *Laterinus*, *Macedinus* and *Militarinus* are, unlike *Matutinus* and *Placidinus*, not attested as cognomina, and in the case of *Macedinus*, *Matutinus* and *Militarinus* there are no corresponding nomina in *-ius*, which there are in the case of *Laterinus* and *Placidinus*, i.e. *Laterius* and *Placidius* (which are both rare nomina). Although it seems a mystery how these names in *-inus* can have ended up as nomina, I would like point out that *Laterinus*, *Macedinus* and *Matutinus* are all nomina attested in Italian inscriptions surely not later than the first century AD; *Laterinus* is attested for a man without cognomen from Casinum (*CIL* X 5160a);<sup>35</sup> *Macedinus* for a man from Trebula Suffenas with filiation and tribe (*CIL* XIV 3508, now lost, but said to have been inscribed “in caratteri grandi e ben formati”); and *Matutinus* is attested in AD 60 for a man from Trebula Mutuesca (*AE* 2002, 397 = *CIL* IX 8877, b, col. I, 14).<sup>36</sup>

Group 3 consists of nomina formally identical with adjectives derived from toponyms, like e.g. *Aeserninus*, obviously derived from *Aesernia* (cf. *CIL* IX 2676). Names of this type – not necessarily ending in *-inus*, for one also finds e.g. *Aequiculus Amiternius Mevanas Saepinius Trebulanus* etc. (in general see Schulze 524-535) – are attested as nomina of freedmen owned and then manumitted by municipalities and their descendants. This is the case, for example, of the Aesernini mentioned above or in that of Q. Reatinus Sallustianus, *lib(ertus) r(ei)*

<sup>33</sup> *CIL* VI 22493 (seen by Henzen and Mau), set up, clearly in about the Severan period or even later, *M. Militarino Victuri* (sic) by the man's wife. It should be noted that *Militarinus* is not actually attested as a cognomen; for *Militaris*: *Militarinus* cf. e.g. *Natalis*: *Natalinus*.

<sup>34</sup> The existence of this nomen, known from the third-century inscription *CIL* VI 3335 = EDR159894 with photo, is in fact questionable. The inscription runs as follows: *D. M. M. Gallienio* (thus, rather than *Call-*) *Placidinio benef(iciario) legat(i) leg(ionis) I Minervi(ae) ... Placidinus Paternus frument(arius) leg(ionis) I Min(erviae)*, and we thus have an instance both of *Placidinius* and *Placidinus*. One wonders, then, if *Placidinus* should not be corrected to *Placidin<i>us*, which would in the case of third-century soldiers of a legion based in Bonn in Germania Inferior and thus surely themselves from the region be more plausible.

<sup>35</sup> Interestingly, the same nomen is also attested in a Greek inscription from Parium in Asia (*AE* 2009, 1377), where the man has the same praenomen Q. as the man attested in Casinum.

<sup>36</sup> The same nomen is attested much later in Puteoli (or Naples?), *CIL* X 2723 = EDR179466.

*p(ublicae) R(eatinorum)* (CIL IX 4699 a–e).<sup>37</sup> It thus seems probable that many holders of nomina of this type were former municipal slaves or their descendants. On the other hand, surely one can assume that some of these nomina simply denoted origin from, or some other relation to, a certain city or place, especially as many nomina of this type clearly do not refer to municipalities likely to own and manumit slaves but rather to smaller places, such as *vici* and *pagi* and the like. Be that as it may, I have been able to trace the following nomina referring to toponyms that can be identified and thus more or less certainly belong to this group: *Acerretinus*<sup>38</sup> *Aequitinus*<sup>39</sup> *Aeserninus Alexandrinus* (see above at n. 23) *Amerinus Aquinus*<sup>40</sup> *Aricinus Arrecinus*<sup>41</sup> *Caudinus Durrachinus/Dyrracinus Faventinus Florentinus* (see above n. 26) *Gabinus Iguinus* (i.e., *Igu(v)inus*) ?*Leucinus* (cf. Leuca in Calabria)<sup>42</sup> *Ligustinus* (attested in 171 BC for a soldier *Crustumina ex Sabinis*, Liv. 42.34.2ff.) *Lorinus* (cf. Lorium in S. Etruria)<sup>43</sup> *Lucerinus Mamertinus* (but see above n. 29) *Mandorinus* (cf. Manduria in

<sup>37</sup> For all questions regarding the nomenclature of former municipal slaves, see F. Luciani in S. Segenni – M. Bellomo (eds.), *Epigrafia e politica II: Documenti e iscrizioni per lo studio di Roma repubblicana* (2021) 171–216 (with a list of all former municipal slaves p. 196–216, including those with a nomen derived from the name of the municipality in Tabella 2 on p. 204–212; note also the other publications of Luciani cited in the bibliography).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. also *Acerrentinus*, attested as the cognomen of *M. Claud[i]us M. f. Acerrentinus*, a municipal notable in Parentium (AE 2016, 430), but perhaps in origin a nomen. But whereas *Acerretinus* may have been derived from the name of Acerrae in Campania, *Acerrentinus* makes one rather think of Acerentia in Lucania.

<sup>39</sup> Attested in Saloniae in Dalmatia (CIL III 2021); cf. *Aequum* in Dalmatia? But Schulze p. 355 registers this nomen in the company of nomina of the type (*A*)*equasius Aequisius Equitius*.

<sup>40</sup> Kajanto p. 184 compares the name of the city of Aquinum; but the normal adjective derived from the name is of course *Aquinas*.

<sup>41</sup> Attested for the son of a slave of the *r(es) p(ublica) Aricinorum* (CIL XIV 2156 = ILS 3255; Luciani [n. 37] 204 no. 1), and in this particular case clearly derived from the toponym Aricia. But the distribution of the nomen *Arrecinus*, also attested for equestrians and senators active in the first century AD, including the Emperor Titus' first wife (see PIR<sup>2</sup> A 1072-4; PME A 160) makes one think that this nomen could in some cases have another background. Cf. Schulze 525 with n. 15.

<sup>42</sup> But it seems somewhat disturbing that this nomen is attested only in Parentium (CIL V 402 = *Inscr. It.* X 2. 247); it thus seems better to consider (cf. above at nn. 27–28) *Leucinus* as a nomen with a N. Italian background (cf. Schulze 45 n. 2).

<sup>43</sup> But there is also *Lorenus* and *Lorenus* and thus this nomen should perhaps rather be placed in the next group. Cf. Schulze p. 589 in the addenda to the names discussed on p. 182.

Calabria) *Marrucinus Medullinus Nortinus* (?)<sup>44</sup> *Palatinus Plestinus/Plaestinus Pomentinus (Pomitinus) Pomptinus Potentinus* (?)<sup>45</sup> *Reatinus Sabinus (Safinus)*<sup>46</sup> *Setinus Signinus/Segninus Urvinus (Urbinus) Vestinus*.<sup>47</sup>

But there are also a number nomina in *-inus* which for one reason or another leave the impression of having been derived from toponyms, but from toponyms which do not seem to be attested. That the nomina *Subocrinus* and *Summocrinus* have been derived from the placenames *\*Subocrium* ('below the hill/citadel') and *\*Summocrium* ('on the top of the hill') is obvious,<sup>48</sup> but a nomen like *Rupedinus*, attested in Nersae in the country of the Aequiculi (*CIL IX 4127*) could also be an instance. In this case one could think of postulating the existence of a locality called e.g. *\*Rupedium*. Note too that *Rupedinus* cannot have been derived from names such as *\*Rupedius* or *\*Rupedus*, as these names do not exist. And there are also other nomina in *-inus* which are in my view most conveniently explained by assuming that they are derived from toponyms. Note the following: *Agreninus*

<sup>44</sup> Attested already in Umbrian as *nurtins* (H. Rix, *Sabellische Texte* [2002] p. 63 Um8 = M. H. Crawford *et al.*, *Imagines Italicae* [2011] I p. 122f. Mevania 2). For another attestation in Mevania, see *AE 1991, 636*. I wonder whether this nomen could refer to Volsinii, where the cult of the Etruscan goddess Nortia was based (*Nortinus* is attested as a cognomen in Volsinii in *CIL XI 2690*; but in this case the name has surely been derived from the name of the goddess, cf. Kajanto p. 113).

<sup>45</sup> [*Potenti*]nus *dec(urionum) lib(ertus) Dignus* *CIL X 141* (Potentia), as restored by Mommsen in the commentary, where he suggests the reading [*Potenti*]nus, and in the index p. 1149, where the abbreviation *dec.* is taken to refer to the *decuriones*. For scholars accepting Mommsen's interpretation see A. Sansone, *Lucania romana: Ricerche di prosopografia e storia sociale* (Vetere 23, 2021) 184 n. 395; Sansone himself quotes the text as "[ --- ]nus Dec. lib. Dignus" (p. 184 no. 19), but mentions the inscription on p. 169 among those which mention decurions. In EDCS-11400227 the reading is *Dec(imi) lib(ertus)*. This inscription is not mentioned by Luciani (n. 37).

<sup>46</sup> For Oscan-Umbrian *\*Safinus*, the equivalent of Latin *Sabinus*, see J. Untermann, *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen* (2000) 642, cf. 641. The nomen is attested for a late Republican architect operating in Capua (*AE 1982, 173a* = 1988, 292 = EDR078488; from the photo one sees clearly that the reading is *Safino*, not *Safinio*). According to S. Bernard, in P. Lulof – I. Manzini – C. Rescigno (eds.), *Deliciae Fictiles V: Networks and Workshops. Architectural Terracottas and Decorative Roof Systems in Italy and Beyond* (2019) 503, the nomen "may indicate Samnite background".

<sup>47</sup> Note also *Quirinus*, attested in an earlyish inscription from Amiternum (*CIL I<sup>2</sup> 3290* = IX 8340; also in *CIL VI 7002*). One wonders whether this nomen could have something to do with the *Quirina* tribe of Amiternum.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. the Sabine *vicus Interocrium* (Schulze p. 531). For the meaning of *ocr-* see Untermann (n. 46) 791–793. In addition to *CIL IX 4081* (from Alba Fucens), the nomen *Subocrinus* is now also attested in *AE 1994, 372 a*) from Ficulea.

*Allecinus Arcusinus Ianterninus Iestinus Laterdinus Laterninus Netatinus* (?)<sup>49</sup> *Onedinus Pallentinus Pandusinus Tasatinus Vebelinus*.<sup>50</sup> All these cases have in common the fact that the names do not exist as cognomina and that unlike in the cases in the next group a corresponding nomen in *-ius* is not known; nomina such as *\*Agrenius* or *\*Laterdus* are not attested (for the possibility of postulating the existence of *\*Allecus* cf. below at n. 70). In the case of *Allecinus* and *Iestinus* there are corresponding forms in *-inius*, *Allecinius* and *Iestinius* (*AE* 1997, 718 = *Suppl. It.* 28 no. 33 from Patavium). I would see these forms as attempts to ‘Romanize’ the names.

I now arrive at Group 4 which consists of nomina in *-inus* in which the suffix can in my view be taken as a genuine gentilicial suffix, possibly a variant of *-ienus*. I have touched upon this subject some years ago in a paper dedicated to nomina ending in *-(i)enus*,<sup>51</sup> but I find the subject is worth returning to briefly in this context. In the said paper, in which one of my main aims was to point out that the four suffixes *-enus/-ienus/-enius/-ienius* are merely variants of each other and practically interchangeable (cf. e.g. *Passenus Passienus Passenius Passienus*), I observed (p. 625) that there are a number of nomina in *-inus* for which a parallel form ending in *-(i)enus* exists; for instance, besides *Albinus* and *Alfinus* there are also *Albienus* and *Alfenus/Alfienus*. In addition to *Albinus* and *Alfinus*, the other nomina in *-inus* mentioned by me on p. 625 as having parallel forms ending in *-(i)enus* are as follows: *Atatinus Camurinus Considinus Ligustinus Lorinus Pasidinus Pedisus Plotinus Pomptinus Pontilinus Rubellinus Rufinus Salinus Turpilianus Vedinus Vettinus Volusinus*. But there are in fact more nomina belonging to the said category. Note *Aberrinus*, surely related to *Aberenus*<sup>52</sup>; *Calvinus*<sup>53</sup>/*Calvenus*

<sup>49</sup> The reading of this nomen remains uncertain as the inscription (*CIL* X 2772) is lost.

<sup>50</sup> This nomen can probably not be taken to have something to do with the nomen *Vibellius*, in which the *i* is no doubt long as in *Vibius* and as in all names derived from the root *Vib-*.

<sup>51</sup> O. Salomies, in F. Mainardis (ed.), ‘Voce concordī’: *Scritti per Claudio Zaccaria (Antichità Altoadriatiche* 85, 2016) 615–631, at 625f. I shall refer to this paper as Salomies 2016.

<sup>52</sup> *Aberrinus*: *CIL* VI 10450 and 39549; *ILAlg.* II 7335 (there is also *Aberrinius*, a form that has been furnished with a ‘more Latin’ suffix). *Aberenus*: *CIL* VI 14696.

<sup>53</sup> In *Repertorium* p. 43 I refer to the *Thesaurus* article on *Calvinus* and *Calvinus* as a nomen (as contrasted with the cognomen), but all instances cited there are of the nomen *Calvinus*. *I. Kyzikos* 254 thus remains the only instance of the nomen *Calvinus* (spelled *Καλβεῖνος*).

(*Calvenius*); *Flavinus/Flavenus*; *Marsinus* (?)<sup>54</sup>/*Marsenus* (*Marsenius*); *Munninus* (also *Moninus Monninus*)/*Munnienus* (*Munnenius Monnienius Monnenius*); *Muttinus/Muttienus* (*Muttenus*); *Oflinus* (surely a syncopated form of \**Ofilinus*)/*Ofil(l)enus Ofil(l)ienus*; *Pasinus*<sup>55</sup>/*Passienus* (*Passienius Passenus* etc.); *Poblinus/Publienus* (*Publienius*); *Pontinus* (?)<sup>56</sup>/*Pontienus*; *Sepinus/Sepienus Seppienus*; *Tettinus*<sup>57</sup>/*Tettienus* (*Tettienius Tettenius*); *Titussinus/Titisienus* (*Titisienius Titisenus Titisenius*); *Varinus/Varienus*; *Velinus*<sup>58</sup>/*Velenus* (*Velenius*); *Vibbinus*<sup>59</sup>/*Vibienus*.

I am not sure what to do about the nomina *Alleinus*, *Serveinus* and *Tulleinus* (nomina that have become known only after the publication of Schulze's book in 1904). In each case, forms ending in *-ienus -enus* (i.e., *Allienus Allenus*, *Servienus Servenus*, *Tullienus Tullenus*) are also attested, not to speak of other suffixes (e.g., *Allius Alleius*, *Servius Serveius*, *Tullius Tulleius*, etc.). I find it hard to believe that <ei> could have been inscribed for a long *i*, especially as *Alleinus* and *Tulleinus* are attested in inscriptions that are not very early, and I also find it hard to believe that the suffix *-einus* could in these cases be a mistake for *-ienus*. Instead, I wonder whether one could think of the possibility that *-einus* is a suffix of its own, perhaps concentrated in a restricted area (*Serveinus* is attested in an earlyish inscription from Trebula Suffenas while the two other names are attested in Rome).

In addition to the pairs of names in *-inus* and *-(i)enus* enumerated above there are some similar pairs of names in *-inus* and *-(i)enus* that seem to have their background in the Celtic regions of N. Italy and which thus need to be

<sup>54</sup> *CIL* XI 4486 from Ameria, not seen by Bormann, who suggests the correction in *Marsidius* (there is a *Marsidius* in 4485).

<sup>55</sup> There is also *Passinus*, but this form is attested in an inscription mentioning, in addition to a certain L. *Passinus Crispus* (of course not identical with, but still taking one's thoughts to, C. *Sallustius Crispus Passienus*, consul in AD 27 and 44, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 146 cf. *AE* 2013, 1497 a), two *Passinae*, and the form *Passinus* may thus be due to an error of the stonemason.

<sup>56</sup> *AE* 1993, 919 = J. Esteban Ortega, *Corpus de inscripciones latinas de Cáceres* 2 (2012) no. 750.

<sup>57</sup> *Tettino Xenophonti* is the transmitted reading in *CIL* VI 14482 (where the nomen is 'corrected to *Tetti[e]no*).

<sup>58</sup> *Velinus* is also attested in *AE* 1988, 887, probably from Rome (thus EDR081184, with the date "1 d.C./50 d.C.").

<sup>59</sup> *CIL* IX 966 (EDR017269) from Vibinum.



kept apart from the nomina that must have originated in central Italy.<sup>60</sup> Note the following: *Catullinus/Catullienus*; *Celerinus*<sup>61</sup>/*Celerienus*; *Gemellinus/Gemellienus*<sup>62</sup>; *Iustinus/Iustien(i)us*; *Lancidinus/Lancidenus*; *Secundinus/Secundienus*; *Severinus/Severienus*;<sup>63</sup> *Sextinus/Sextienus*.

But let us return to central Italy and have a look at the following group of nomina in *-inus*. This group consists of nomina in the case of which corresponding nomina in *-(i)enus* are not attested but which are clearly in some relation to nomina ending in *-ius*. I am thinking of the following nomina alongside each of which there is a corresponding nomen in *-ius* (e.g. *Apstidinus* ~ *Apstidius* *Abstidius*): *Agrestinus* *Anisinus* *Apstidinus*<sup>64</sup> *Arquinus*<sup>65</sup> *Asellinus* *Betuinus*<sup>66</sup> *Caesellinus* *Cautinus* (?) *Cornuinus*<sup>67</sup> *Crascinus* (cf. below) *Crispinus* *Culcinus* *Matuinus* *Pomplinus* *Scaevinus* *Scaptinus* *Surdinus* *Vetrasinus* (?)<sup>68</sup> *Viselinus* (cf. above at n. 26); [*V*] *inulinus* (?).<sup>69</sup>

There are also some nomina in *-inus* alongside which there are no attested corresponding forms in *-ius* but which may possibly have been derived from nomina. In explaining the nomen *Atelcinus*, H. Solin (n. 25), who compares the nomina *Allecinus* *Ar(r)ycinus* *Crascinus* *Lotticinus*, assumes the name to have been derived from *Atel(l)ius* with the suffix *-cinus*. But the nomen *Cras(s)icius*, surely based on *Crassius*, is attested, and one wonders whether one could not tentatively postulate the existence of *\*Allecius*<sup>70</sup> and *\*Atellicius*, derived from *Allius* and *Atellius* in about the same way as (e.g.) *Titecius* derives from *Titius*

<sup>60</sup> For the nomina in *-ienus* in N. Italy, cf. Schulze p. 55f.

<sup>61</sup> *RIB* 659, cf. P. Kruschwitz, *ZPE* 204 (2017) 24 n. 4; a soldier, perhaps from N. Italy.

<sup>62</sup> *AE* 2003, 767 from Comum.

<sup>63</sup> *AE* 1996, 774 = *Suppl. It.* 31 Novaria 3.

<sup>64</sup> *AE* 1993, 573 (Gerano a little west of Sublaqueum/Subiaco).

<sup>65</sup> *CIL* VI 12350, an inscription not seen by the editors (and corrected by them to *Arquin[ius]*).

<sup>66</sup> Probably to be understood as *Betu(v)inus*, cf. *Betuvius*; but there is also the nomen *Betuus*, from which *Betuinus* could have been derived. Cf. *Cornuinus* and *Matuinus*.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. *Cornuius* (*CIL* XI 2669 from Saturnia, etc.); perhaps to be understood as *Cornu(v)ius* and *Cornu(v)inus*.

<sup>68</sup> A nomen (?) attested only in the *Historia Augusta* (*Marcus* 12.3), but plausible alongside *Vitrasius*.

<sup>69</sup> *CIL* VIII 21175a.

<sup>70</sup> *Allicia* *C. f. Paetina* in *EE* IX 328 (Castulo) seems to be an erroneous reading of the name *Valeria C. f. Paetina* (see EDCS-33000040). *Alicius*, however, is attested.

and *Crassicus* from *Crassius*. (As for the other two names, *Ar(r)ycinus* is better taken to derive from *Arícia* rather than from *Arrius*, and *Lotticinus* belongs to the N. Italian group of nomina in *-inus*, see above n. 28). To continue, perhaps one could also think of reconstructing *\*Bambius* on the basis of *Bambinus*, *\*Caiecius* on the basis of *Caiecinus*,<sup>71</sup> and *\*Visu(v)ius*<sup>72</sup> on the basis of *Visuinus*. There is also *Crastinus*,<sup>73</sup> but it seems difficult to attach this nomen to any group of known nomina.<sup>74</sup>

It is obvious that much that has been said above must remain uncertain, and a number of suggestions will no doubt prove to be mistaken. Of course there also remain nomina (e.g. *Crastinus*, cf. above) that cannot in my view at least for the moment be fully explained. However, I believe that on the basis of the material presented above it may well be justified to identify *-inus* as another suffix of nomina, to be added to the well-known broad palette of suffixes attested for Latin and Italian family names, *-ius -eius -aeus -enius -edius -idius -ellius* etc.<sup>75</sup> If on the other hand one ignores the attestations of the nomina in *-inus* in N. Italy in the Transpadane regions and, on the other, those attested in Rome and in the provinces, due to immigration and emigration, it becomes evident that the attestations of these nomina concentrate in about the same regions that one can observe in the case of the nomina ending in *-(i)enus*. In Salomies 2016 p. 617 I observe that the “main area of attestation of the nomina in *-(i)enus* is in and around the Sabine country and Umbria. These names are found in particular in the area north of the line Trebula Mutuesca – Alba Fucens – Aufinum – Pinna, to the east of the line Cures – Ocriculum – Tuder – Tifernum Tiberinum – Sarsina, and to the south of the line Sarsina – Ariminum. Outside this area, there are (in addition to Rome) some places with a striking concentration of these names, especially the two neighbouring towns of Aemilia, Bononia and Mutina, and (in the south) Venusia<sup>?</sup>. If we study the attestations of the nomina in *-inus*, the result is not at all dissimilar: the earliest attested nomen, *Ligustinus*, is attested in 171 BC for a soldier *ex Sabinis*, and in inscriptions from the Sabine towns

<sup>71</sup> Cf. *Caiedius* and e.g. *Murrecius* : *Murredius*, *Titecius* : *Titedius*.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. perhaps *Vesuius Vesuvius*.

<sup>73</sup> In addition to *CIL* XI 4988 (I<sup>2</sup> 2104), cited by Schulze, this nomen is also attested in Dyrrachium (*AE* 1978, 747 = *CIA* 81 = *LIA* 115).

<sup>74</sup> Schulze p. 173 n. 1 refers to this nomen in his discussion of *Grasinius Crasinus* etc.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. e.g. the tables of suffixes in Schulze p. 388–391, 403–405, 432–434.

names in *-inus* are attested in Cures (*Scaptinus*), Trebula Mutuesca (*Matutinus*, *Muttinus*, *Serveinus*), Reate (*Betuinus*, *Caesellinus*, *Munninus*,<sup>76</sup> *Varinus*) and Nursia (*Viselinus*). In the country of the Aequi(culi) we find *Betuinus* in Nersae and *Vedinus* in Alba Fucens, in that of the Vestini *Atatinus* in Aveia; in Picenum there are the nomina *Alfinus* and *Oflinus* in Firmum, *Vettinus* in Ricina and *Crasicinus* in Staffolo near S. Vittore di Cingoli.<sup>77</sup> In Umbria we find nomina in *-inus* only in the south, namely in Ameria (*Crispinus*, *Marsinus*). In addition to these attestations, there are also those of nomina in *-inus* in places close to the regions just mentioned: *Turpelinus* in Falerii a little to the west of Cures; *Macedinus* in Trebula Suffenas; *Apstidinus* close to Sublaqueum (Subiaco), both just south of the region of the Aequi; and *Rufinus* in Sulmo in the country of the Paeligni.

Elsewhere in Italy south of Cisalpine Gaul there are obviously several instances of nomina in *-inus* in Rome and its neighbourhood, but otherwise there are only solitary instances from places as far away as Vibinum and Brundisium in Apulia.<sup>78</sup> But in Aemilia there are two cities of especial interest, Bononia and Mutina, both cities singled out in Salomies 2016 as places of interest to the student of nomina ending in *-(i)enus* (see above). In both cities – but only in these two neighbouring cities in northern central Italy north of Perugia (cf. n. 78) and south of the river Padanus (Po) – we find not only nomina in *-(i)enus* but also those in *-inus*, for in Bononia we find *Plotinus* and *Poblinus* (CIL XI 775 and 776), and in Mutina two instances of *Munninus* (see EDR133964 and EDR135995). Perhaps we could conclude that these two cities may have been centres of immigration from those regions in central Italy where nomina in *-(i)enus* and *-inus* are concentrated.

As for nomina in *-inus* in general, I observed above that they do not seem to be attested in Umbria north of Ameria. In this respect, this category of nomina clearly differs from the nomina in *-(i)enus* which are very well attested

<sup>76</sup> Note in addition to CIL IX 8661 the inscription from Rome, CIL VI 22708 mentioning a certain [T.] Munninus T. I. Philocles *Reatinus*.

<sup>77</sup> For this site cf. G. Paci in *Supplementa Italica* 8 (1991) 74f.

<sup>78</sup> I have observed instances in the following cities: *Plotinus* in Praeneste (CIL XIV 3369), *Albinus* in Tusculum (CIL XIV 2526), *Laterinus* in Casinum (n. 35), *Agrestinus* in Pompeii, *Asellinus* in Nuceria, *Vibbinus* in Vibinum (CIL IX 966), *Cautinus* (?) in Brundisium (CIL IX 93), *Rubellinus* in Beneventum (CIL IX 1738) and *Camurinus* in a *defixio* from Perugia (CIL XI 6722, 2 = A. Kropp, *defixiones. Ein aktuelles Corpus lateinischer Fluchtafeln* (2008) no. 1.1.4/1).

throughout Umbria. On the other hand, if one excludes Umbria, the area of the dissemination of the nomina in *-inus* resembles very much that of the names in *-(i)enus*. Thus I think that we can conclude that *-inus* is a variant, perhaps a local variant typical of certain areas such as the country of the Sabines, of the suffix *-(i)enus*. This does not necessarily mean that they would have been freely interchangeable according to one's wishes, for in the inscription *CIL IX 4639* from Montereale north of Reate a certain Q. Caesellinus T. f. Qui. Colominaeus with a nomen in *-inus* is the husband of Metidiena L. f. Secunda, whose nomen has the suffix *-ienus*.

*University of Helsinki*