

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XLI

HELSINKI 2007

INDEX

CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>Ostienses and Ostians in Three Inscriptions from Rome's Port</i>	9
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Cities and Courtesans</i>	21
PETER KRUSCHWITZ & HILLA HALLA-AHO	<i>The Pompeian Wall Inscriptions and the Latin Language: A Critical Reappraisal</i>	31
FABRICE POLI	<i>Notes d'épigraphie latine rémoise: au sujet de deux inscriptions du Musée Saint-Rémi (Reims)</i>	51
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Asinnii, Licinnii, etc. in the East</i>	59
KAJ SANDBERG	<i>Polybius on the Consuls: An Interpretation of Histories 6,12,4</i>	75
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCXXXVII–CCXLIII</i>	89
DAVID WOODS	<i>Tiberius on Caligula the Snake and Other Contextual Problems</i>	117
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	129
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	195
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	199
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	215

ASINNII, LICINNII, ETC. IN THE EAST

OLLI SALOMIES

Most scholars dealing with Greek inscriptions of the Roman period will no doubt have observed that Roman nomina ending in *-inius -ilius* etc. in Latin inscriptions are sometimes written with a geminate in Greek inscriptions, the best-known instance surely being Λικίννιος for *Licinius*. It is my aim in this article to present some observations on this phenomenon.

The earliest observation in print concerning the type Λικίννιος, etc., seems to be that of W. Dittenberger, *Hermes* 6 (1872) 152f. (in an article on 'Römische Namen in griechischen Inschriften und Literaturwerken'). Not much other than a few examples are offered here, and the section is introduced with the observation that the doubling of the consonant is attested above all in names ending in *-ilius* and *-inius*, "ohne Unterschied der Quantität des i". However, later scholars (e.g., W. Schulze)¹ normally attribute the presence of a double consonant to the fact that the vowel preceding the double consonant is short (as it is, e.g., in *Licinius/Licinnius*). I shall return to this question after a presentation of the material.

1. Nomina in *-inius*

In the case of the following nomina in which we find the variation *-inius/-innius*, we know that the *i* preceding the *n* was short:

- *Asinius*. Short *i*: Catull. 12,1.
- *Cosinius Cusinius*. *Cusin- ∪ ∪* : *CIL* IX 6417 = *CLE* 1131.²

¹ W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (1904 and later printings). Note also Pape–Benseler = W. Pape – G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (31884) and, in the case of papyri, Preisigke = F. Preisigke, *Namenbuch* (1922); Foraboschi = D. Foraboschi, *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum. Supplemento al Namenbuch di F. Preisigke* (1971).

² Cf. *Cusenius CIL* VI 16775. (The variation *i ~ e* in accentuated syllables of nomina usually

- *Licinius*. *Licin-* υυ : Catull. 50, 1. 8 and elsewhere (see Schulze [n.1] 108 n.1).
- *Papinius*. *Papin-* υυ : Sidon. Apoll. *carm.* 9, 226.³
- *Sertinius*. Short *i* attested by Horace (*sat.* 2, 3, 296; *epist.* 1, 12, 20).
- *Titinius*. *Titin-* υυ : Seren. Sammon. *lib. medic.* 1037.⁴

For remarks on the attestations of these nomina being furnished with the suffix -ίννιος, see below.⁵

Then there are some other nomina in *-inius* for which forms in *-innius* are also attested in Greek inscriptions, in the case of which it is not a certain, but a plausible assumption that the *i* is short. As these are not very common nomina, I shall give the references at this point.

- *Cerinius* (extremely rare);⁶ Κερυννία Φηλεϊκλα in *Klio* 52 (1970) 51f. no. 2 (Dion).
- *?[C]uspinius*: possibly in *IG V 2*, 1054 (Laconia), restored as [K]οσπίννιος; the nomen is not otherwise attested, but plausible (cf. *Cuspius*, *Cuspidius*).
- *Fulcinus* (no instances of **Fulceinius*, **Φολκείνιος*, etc.; cf. Φουλκεννία, below, with ε deriving from a short *i*). The spelling Φολκίννιος is found on a Macedonian coin mentioning L. Fulcinus, quaestor of Q. Metellus Macedonicus between 148 and 146,⁷ but one could also note the inscription from Thessalonica, *SEG* 49, 814 = *AE* 1999, 1430 = P.M. Nigdelis, *Ἐπιγραφικὰ Θεσσαλονίκεια* (2006) p. 103. One finds here a certain Φολκιλλία Βενερία. However, taking into account the fact that **Fulcil(i)us* is not otherwise attested and that, on the other hand, Fulcinii are not uncommon in Macedonia, I cannot help suspecting

indicates that the vowel was short.)

³ Note also that there is no instance of *Papeinius* in Latin inscriptions. It is true that the name of the husband is written Παπείνιος in an inscription from Dion, *Klio* 52 (1970) 51f. no. 2, but this must be based on a misunderstanding of sorts. (Cf. Γεμείνιος for *Geminus* – with short *i* before the suffix *-nius* –, below n. 23.)

⁴ Possibly also in Lucilius 169 M. (as restored by Marx; accepted, e.g., by F. Charpin in the Budé edition of 1978, 4,14). Schulze (n. 1) also observes (p. 243) that there is no instance of an *I longa* in this name in the inscriptions from Rome.

⁵ One might also note at this point that Caecina (with short *i*) Sabinus, one of the consuls of AD 316, is often called Κακίνιος in papyri (cf. R.S. Bagnall & K.A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* [2004] 178), among which there is one which uses the form with the geminate Κακίννιος (*P. Oxy.* 19, 2232).

⁶ *CIL* X 4595; *CIL* VIII 4698 = *ILAlg.* I 2323. Things get a bit complicated (but cf. below on *Afinius*, etc.) if this nomen is identical with *Cerrinius*, for in this nomen the *i* was certainly long (Schulze 430; cf. the spelling Κερρείνιος attested several times in Ephesos).

⁷ H. Gaebler, *Die antiken Münzen Nordgriechenlands* III, 1 (1906) 65; B.V. Head, *Historia Numorum* (21911) 239 (ταμίου Λευκίου Φολκιννίου; cf. *RE* VII 221 no. 2; T.R.S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* I [1951] 461).

that the name that was to be inscribed was in fact Φολκιννία (note also that the reading of this nomen given in the index of *AE* 1999, p. 724, is in fact " Φολκιννία?"). In addition to these instances, there is also Φουλκεννία Φάυστα in *IG* IX 12 1056 (Paxos). Otherwise, this nomen (found in Greek inscriptions mainly in Macedonia) is spelled Φο(υ)λκίνιος.

- *Lisinius* (instances in Schulze [n. 1] 180; also, e.g., *Suppl. It.* 16 Rusellae 51): Λισιννία Αὐρ(ηλία) Χρυσίου in *IG* XII 2, 562 = *IGR* IV 17 = G. Labarre, *Les cités de Lesbos* (1996) n. 88 (Eresos; the only instance of this nomen in the East).
- ?*Lucinius*. This rare nomen (cf. Schulze 85 and 183, with addenda in *Repertorium*⁸ 107) is written Λουκίνιος in *IG* X 2, 1, 929, which might be interpreted as pointing to the fact that the *i* was short; on the other hand, if Λυκείνιος, the nomen of Τι. Λυκείνιος I(---?) Ἑρμῆς in Ancyra (E. Bosch, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum* [1967] 225 no. 174), has something to do with *Lucinius*, the *i* may rather have been long.
- *Rasinius* (Schulze [n. 1] 91f.; cf. *Rasenius CIL* XI 5788): *Rasennius*/Ρασέννιος, *ID* 1771 = *CIL* I² 2235 (no doubt from *Rasinius* via *Rasenius*); Λ. Ρασίννιος Ἑρμιππος, *I. Ephesos* 2053 (approximately Severan).⁹
- *Safinius* (no instances of **Safeinius*, **Σαφείνιος*, etc.). Of *Σαφίνιος*, we find the following instances: *IG* II² 1961, line 23 = *SEG* 34, 153: [Λ]εύκιος Σαφίννιο[ς] Ἀθμονεύς (c. 40 BC; cf. S. Byrne, *Roman Citizens of Athens* [2003] 423); Πόπλιος Σαφίννιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Οὐελλίνα *IG* xii 6, 2, 709 (Samos); *SEG* 33, 956 (= R.A. Kearsley, *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia* [*IK* 59] no. 22) from Ephesos (the name being spelled here also Σαφίνιος and *Safinius*). In other cases, this nomen, not common and attested mainly on Samos,¹⁰ is spelled Σαφίνιος. – *Safinnius* is found in a Latin papyrus of AD 157, *CPL* 223.
- *Sicinius*: spelled Σικίννιος in some inscriptions of the legate of Thrace in AD 202, Q. Sicinius Clarus (*IGBulg.* 1690, 1999, 5407). Since Sicinii are attested in some numbers during the early Roman republic, this spelling is also found in some Greek authors (see Pape–Benseler; e.g., Dion. Hal. 6, 45, 3).

On the other hand, one also finds some instances of nomina with apparently, or at least probably, a long *i* before the *n* being equipped with a geminated *v* in Greek inscriptions:

⁸ H. Solin – O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum* (1988; 21994). Note that the reference there (p. 107 s.v. *Lucinius*) to *IGR* III 759 is a mistake, cf. *TAM* II 1194. On the other hand, one might add *Lucinius Fronto*, *Damigeron de lapidibus*, in R. Halleux & J. Schamp, *Les lapidaires grecs* (Budé, Paris 1985) 231, although this must be an invented character.

⁹ Further *Rasinii* (with just one *v*) in the East *AE* 1939, 44 (Philippi; cf. C. Vetidius Rasinianus from Philippi *CIL* XVI 10; *RMD* IV 203); *SEG* 39, 1338 (from the Caicus valley).

¹⁰ Cf. M. L. Lazzarini, *RFIC* 112 (1984) 327–330.

- *Afinius*: this nomen is spelled Ἀφείνιος in Sherk, *RDGE*¹¹ no. 12 = G. Petzl, *I. Smyrna* 589 (the *s. c. de agro Pergameno* of 129 or possibly 101 BC), lines 28 and 34, and in *FD* III 4, 114 ([Ἀ]φείνιος Σωτίων of Nicopolis, end of the first century AD), and this seems to be a pretty clear indication that the *i* was long; in spite of this, the name is written Ἀφίννιος in *I. Perge* II 401 (Τερτία Ἀφιννία Λουκίου θυγάτηρ, clearly an early text) and in *I. Ephesos* 1048 (Λούκιος Ἀφίννιος Λ. υἱὸς Παλ. Παυλεῖνος).¹²
- *Atinius*. The *i* is long in a Greek metrical inscription from Rome, *IG* XIV 1437 = *IGUR* III 1165 = *GVI* 1596 (acc. Ἀτινίαν υ—υ), cited already by Schulze p. 68, and if one excludes the possibility that this is just metrical licence,¹³ one must perhaps conclude with Schulze that the *i* seems to have been long. However, there are a number of Greek inscriptions in which the name is spelled Ἀτίννιος; this is the case in at least the following inscriptions: *IG* XII Suppl. 285 (Andros: [Τιβέ]ριος Ἀτίννιος [Ὀν]ήσιμος), *CIL* III 14400d = *IGR* III 1484 (Ἀτιννία Κλεοπάτρα; Lystra); *I. Anazarbos* 639 (Γάιος Ἀτίννιος Μοντανὸς Οὐλεντιανός).¹⁴ There is also the Latin inscription from Ephesos, *CIL* III 6087 = *I. Ephesos* 1636 = R.A. Kearsley, in *IK* 59, 29 (A. Atinnius No(v)ember).¹⁵
- *Carminius*. The *i* may well have been long, as two inscriptions have, or at least are reported to have, an *I longa* before the *n*, *I. Aquileia* 140 (with photo) and *CIL* VIII 3074 cf. p. 1740.¹⁶ (The Carminii thus seem to have had nothing to do with *carmina* ...) However, in a Latin papyrus of AD 150 from Egypt, *CPL* 117, the nomen of one of the consuls mentioned in the date is spelled *Carminnius*.
- *Verginius*. There is enough evidence to show that the *i* was long (see Schulze p. 100; cf. Οὐεργείνιος in *REG* 15 [1902] 313 no. 4 from Komana in Pontus; *RPh* 36 [1912] 53 no. 5 from Iconium). In spite of this, one observes a Οὐεργιννία Ἀσκληπία in a inscription from somewhere in Galatia (*RECAM* II 224).

¹¹ R. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (1969).

¹² The spelling *Afinnius* is found also in *ICVR* IX 24635.

¹³ One wonders whether "*Ateini*" in Pais 1080, 85 (a "patella Aquileiae rep.") could also be quoted here.

¹⁴ The existence of this person shows that non-citizens attested at Anazarbos who have the name Ἀτίννιος or Ἀτίννις (*I. Anazarbos* 294, 301, 399; the feminine form used as a cognomen in 497) indeed have a Latin (and not a barbarian) name. The same goes no doubt for Ἀτιννία Κουαλεως θυγάτηρ in S. Hagel – K. Tomaschitz, *Repertorium der westkilikischen Inschriften* (1998) 112 Hamaxia 32.

¹⁵ Schulze p. 68 quotes this inscription and the one from Lystra as instances of the spelling *Atinnius*; as he cannot explain this spelling by saying that the *i* must have been short, he says that the explanation must be that the name was of Etruscan origin.

¹⁶ On the other hand, an inscription from Luceria, *AE* 1996, 455, with *C]armeniu[s]*, might be adduced to show that the *i* was in fact short (for the variation between a short *i* and short *e* in accented syllables, cf. above n. 2). But we may in fact be dealing with the nomen *Armenius*.

- There is also *Lucinius*, once written Λουκίννιος, but the quantity of the *i* is not certain (cf. above).¹⁷

In the majority of the instances of names in *-inius* written with geminates, we are at any rate dealing with names with a short *i* before the *n*, and even in the cases of those names referred to above in which there is evidence for the *i* having been long, the evidence at least for *Atinius* and *Carminius* does not seem to me to be above suspicion. One observes, for example, that not a single instance of *Atinius* having been written as *Ἀτείνιος, *Carminius* as *Καρμείνιος can be found whereas it is normal to find names such as *Aninius* and *Caninius* written with the long *i* reproduced with εἰ.¹⁸

It seems clear that, at least originally, the gemination of the *v* in nomina ending in *-inius* was due to the fact that the *i* preceding the *n* was short. This was seen by Schulze (n. 1) who refers to this explanation in several places (e.g., p. 108 n. 1 on *Licinius*, p. 129 on *Asinius*, p. 231 on *Sicinius*); the same view is taken by H. Solin, in *Delo e l'Italia (OpuscIRF 2, 1982) 108f.* One could also note that, in the earlier period (say, up to the end of the first century BC), the gemination is attested exclusively in names with a short *i*, and that these names always form the majority of the instances. Moreover, the gemination of consonants following after short vowels with a stress is in general a development not completely unheard of; in Greek, one could perhaps refer to the existence of "Kurznamen" with a "Verdoppelung" of the consonants as, e.g., in Σθέννις (~ σθένος),¹⁹ On the other hand, it must be admitted that, at least in Greek, there are not very many parallels which one could adduce here.²⁰ That the phenomenon of the *Licinnii*, etc., has not been the subject of much scholarly attention may be due to the fact that stu-

¹⁷ Σαβίννιος in *IG II² 1961*, line 23 (c. 40 BC), the *i* in *Sabinus* being long, in fact turns out to be a Σαφίννιος (*SEG 34*, 153: [Λ]εύκιος Σαφίννιο[ς] Ἄθμονεύς; cf. above).

¹⁸ For Κανείνιος, cf., e.g., *CID IV 160*; *SEG 47*, 284 (somewhere in the Peloponnese); *IG XII 1*, 95 (Rhodes); *IG XII 2*, 88 (Mytilene, earlyish); *I. Ephesos 635C*, 639, 648, 892; etc. Ἀνείνιος; e.g., *I. Pergamon 374*, 485; *MAMA VII 282* (Amorion; further instances of Ἀνείνιος – but also of Ἀνείνιος – at Amorion are referred to in the commentary on *MAMA I 430*).

¹⁹ See E. Fraenkel, 'Namenwesen', *RE XVI* (1935) 1641f. (Σθέννις e.g., *IG II² 3829*, 4902, *I. Oropos 371f.*, 383, *IG XIV 1149 = IGUR 1491*). One could perhaps also note, e.g., the fact that Latin *Lupus* is often rendered as Λ(ο)ύππος (e.g., Πόντιος Λούππος *IG X 2*, 1, 578; the *PHI* database offers 42 matches for 'Λουππ'). From other languages, note perhaps Italian *Lucca* for *Luca*, etc.

²⁰ Cf., e.g., R. Kühner & F. Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache I* (31890) 268ff. on 'Vordoppelung der Konsonanten'. Note that in some of the "Kurznamen" with gemination mentioned by Fraenkel the stress is in fact not on the syllable preceding the gemination.

dents of Latin view this as a Greek phenomenon whereas students of Greek have ascribed the gemination of the consonant to Latin influence,²¹ the result being that neither Latinists (but note the contribution of H. Solin referred to above) nor Hellenists have felt that the phenomenon should be addressed in some way.

As for the forms in -ίννιος in names in which the *i* was long, I think that they could be explained by assuming that the orthography with a geminate was based on an imitation of the orthography of names in -ίννιος in which the *i* was short (of which especially Λικίννιος was quite frequent);²² it may, however, also be that, with the passing of time, the quantity of the *i* in some of the names in -*inius* had become uncertain.²³

It may be of interest to note that there are some nomina in -*inius* (with a short *i*) for which I have not been able to trace any instances of the spelling -ίννιος (or possibly -έννιος); thus, e.g., *Cominius Geminius* and *Flaminius*. In the case of *Flaminius*, one could assume that this comes from the fact that most of the instances of this nomen seem to be rather early;²⁴ as for *Cominius* (attested mainly in Macedonia) and *Geminus*, perhaps one could assume that some Greeks had started to pronounce them with a long *i* (cf. n. 23).

²¹ Thus Th. Eckinger, *Die Orthographie lateinischer Wörter in griechischen Inschriften* (Diss. Zürich, München 1892) 112f.; L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* I [1980] 326. Note also, e.g., the curt dismissal of the need to explain the phenomenon by Greek epigraphists by labelling spellings with a geminate as 'errors' or the like (e.g., M. Segre on Στερτίννιος in *I. Cos* EV 43 ['errato raddoppiamento'] and 301 ['un N superfluo']).

²² It should, however, be noted that there seem to be no occurrences at all of the spelling -ίννιος in the case of nomina with a long *i* such as *Albinus Aninius Caninius Graecinius Sabinus Varinius*.

²³ But this can, I think, be demonstrated only in the case of nomina in which a short *i* seems to have been treated as a long one; e.g., *Cominius*, in which the *i* is short (Schulze 108 n. 1; add Κομένιος *I. Leukopetra* 23, 25, 35), in spite of which one observes the spellings Κομείνιος (D. Samsaris, 'Η Ἀκτία Νικόπολη (1994) 51 no. 6) and Κομήνιος (*I. Leukopetra* 22, this nomen also being spelled Κομίνιος, *ibid.* 26f., 29–34, 36f., 39–41, 107; I am, however, not sure whether the spelling Κομήν- is of any real significance). Note also *Geminus* (with a short *i*, Schulze 108 with n. 5) being written Γεμείνιος in Thessalonica (*IG* X 2, 1, 181, 187; *AE* 1996, 1368 = *SEG* 46, 815; also in Preisigke, where one also finds Καικείλιος); cf. Γέμε[ι]να *Fouilles de Xanthos* VII 40 (also in Preisigke).

²⁴ For *Flaminius* on Delos, see *Les Italiens dans le monde grec* (*BCH* Suppl. 41, 2002) 196 no. 1–2; for Athenian instances leaving the impression of being early cf. *IG* II² 10146, 10166, 10941, 11674a (p. 888), for similar instances from Megara and Eretria, see *AE* 1991, 1452 = *SEG* 39, 414 cf. 41, 424; *AE* 1991, 1451 = *SEG* 41, 425; *IG* XII 9, 851, 853, 858 (note that the spelling is often Φλαμένιος).

Let us now move on to some observations regarding individual names with the suffix *-ίννιος*, starting, however, with an overview of the earliest instances in each case:

- Ἀσίννιος. The earliest attestation of this spelling seems to be J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (1982) no. 8, line 7 (*senatus consultum* concerning the *asylia* of Plarasa/Aphrodisias, 39 BC, Γνάιος Ἀσίννιος Γναίου υἱὸς [---]).²⁵
- Κο(υ)σίννιος. *AE* 1993, 1469 = *SEG* 43, 766 (Ephesus, in a letter of the proconsul P. Petronius, AD 30/31).
- Φο(υ)λκίννιος. This spelling is on a coin from the middle of the 2nd century (cf. above n. 7).
- Λικίννιος. Sherk, *RDGE* (n. 11) no. 12 = G. Petzl, *I. Smyrna* 589 (the *s. c. de agro Pergameno* of 129 or possibly 101 BC), line 29: Γάιος Λικίννιος Γαίου [--]. Further instances from the Republican period: *OGI* 436 = Sherk, *RDGE* (n. 11) no. 13 = T. Drew-Bear, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie* (1978) 1ff. no. 1 (C. Licinius Geta as praetor in c. 119 BC [?]); J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (1982) no. 8 (*senatus consultum* of 39 BC, cf. above; two T. Licinnii); *IGR* IV 701 = *MAMA* IV 52 (Synnada) and *I. Ephesos* 2941 (Lucullus); *IG* II² 1961 = *SEG* 34, 153, line 68 (an Αὔλος Λικίννιος Ἐω[μ]αῖος of c. 40 BC); *I. Perge* 376 = *AE* 2004, 1514 (apparently the latter part of the 1st century BC).
- Παπίννιος: *AE* 1990, 918 = *SEG* 39, 1176, B, F (Ephesus, in a list of contributions from the time of Tiberius).
- Σαφίννιος. Attested at Athens in c. 40 BC (see n. 17).
- Στερτίννιος. Attested in a list of names from Thespieae which seems earlyish, perhaps from the Julio-Claudian period,²⁶ *IG* VII 1777, line 9. This orthography is also used in some inscriptions from Cos of C. Stertinius Xenophon (*PIR*² S 913), the emperor Claudius' personal physician (Segre, *I. Cos* EV 43, 301).²⁷ However, there are also some Republican instances from Delos, the spelling in these cases being Στερτέννιος (for the variation *i/e* in short accentuated syllables cf. above n. 2 and *Rasinius/Rasenius* at n. 9):²⁸ *I. Delos* 2616, i 25, 2622 ii 22; M.-Th. Couilloud, *Les monuments funéraires de Rhénée* (1974) no. 372.
- Τιτίννιος. There do not seem to be very early occurrences of this spelling.

²⁵ It should be noted, however, that most of the documents in Aphrodisias were inscribed in the early third century, which may have had an influence on the orthography. (On the other hand, it is hard to see why an editor of the documents or a stonecutter would have wished to "correct" Ἀσίνιος to Ἀσίννιος.)

²⁶ C. Müller, in *Les Italiens* (n. 24) 95f. dates it to the 1st century AD, but this date seems a bit too broad (cf., e.g., the presence of a certain Κόιντος Λόξιος in line 14).

²⁷ On the inscriptions regarding Xenophon from Cos, cf. W. Eck, in S. Demougin & al. (eds.), *H.-G. Pflaum. Un historien du XX^e siècle* (2006) 486–8.

²⁸ Cf., on Delos, Στερτίνιος (common) ~ Στερτένιος (*ID* 2378).

Let us now proceed to a more general examination of the attestations of some of the more common nomina for which forms in -ίννιος are attested.

Asinius. The *PHI* database gives 23 matches for *Asinni-*, 32 for *Asini-*, but if one ignores those cases in which the reading is uncertain or based only on a restoration of the text, one arrives at the figures 17 for *Asinni-*, 14 for *Asini-*; if one adds inscriptions not in the database (*SEG* 43, 865 = *AE* 1993, 1506 from Sardis, 3rd century AD; *SEG* 44, 1117 = *AE* 1994, 1747 from Termessos, both with Ἀσίννιος), one might conclude that the form in -ίννιος was, during the Empire, possibly a bit more popular, although one observes, on the whole, that earlier inscriptions more often have Ἀσίνιος (e.g., *IG* V 2, 26; *IG* XII 6, 1, 367, B I [Asinius Pollio cos. AD 23]; *IGR* IV 1462 = *I. Smyrna* 362, clearly an earlyish text),²⁹ later ones Ἀσίννιος. However, Ἀσίνιος is not unheard of in the 3rd century AD.³⁰ It does not seem to be possible to discern differences between different areas (e.g., in Smyrna, one finds both Ἀσίνιος and Ἀσίννιος).³¹ – Preisigke and Foraboschi have 5 instances of Ἀσίννιος, none of Ἀσίνιος.

Cosinius Cusinius.³² The *PHI* database gives 11 matches for Κοσίννιος, 6 for Κοσίνιος, and 1 for Κουσίννιος, 6 for Κουσίνιος, but these numbers do not quite tell the whole story, as the same Cosinnius Gaianus appears in several inscriptions from Ephesus, his nomen being written consistently with a geminate. Κο(υ)σίννιος is found in the following inscriptions: *AE* 1993, 1469 = *SEG* 43, 766 (Ephesus, AD 30/31, letter of the proconsul P. Petronius, the same person, ὁ ἐμὸς φίλος, being called both Κοσίννιος and Κουσίννιος); *I. Ephesos* 1034–39, Λ. Κοσίννιος Γαιανός, αἰετὸς σαλπικτῆς ὀλυμπιονεΐκης in the time of Hadrian; *I. Ephesos* 1044, Γα. Ἰούλ. Κοσίννιος Τρυφωνᾶς, βουλ(ευτῆς); in a funerary inscription also from Ephesus, *AE* 1993, 1489 = *SEG* 43, 825, both Κοσίννιος and Κοσίνιος are found. Moreover, there is a further example of Κοσίννιος in a verse inscription from Caesarea Hadrianopolis in Pontos, C. Marek, *Stadt, Ära*

²⁹ Cf. also Γάλλοι Ἀσινίῳ τῶι ἐμῶι φίλῳ in a letter of Augustus, J.H. Oliver, *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors* (1989) no. 6, line 11.

³⁰ E.g., *I. Olympia* 356 (Asinius Quadratus, proconsul in around AD 200); *IG* XII 7, 53 (the consul of AD 242 in a consular date). *Altertümer von Hierapolis* 167 also seems fairly late. – Both Ἀσίνιος and Ἀσίννιος are used in *Fouilles de Delphes* III 4, 48 (early 2nd century AD).

³¹ There are also some instances of *Asinnius* in Latin inscriptions (*CIL* VI 12529, 25907).

³² That these are alternative spellings of the same name is clear, e.g., from the fact that the tribe *Velina*, on the whole not at all common, is attested in Asia both for Cosinii (*AE* 1993, 1489 = *SEG* 43, 825) and Cusinii (*I. Ephesos* 4119f.; *AE* 1941, 144); moreover, the same person is called both Κοσίννιος and Κουσίννιος in the same inscription (*AE* 1993, 1469 = *SEG* 43, 766 from Ephesus). The *o/u* was thus short. *Cosinius* is sometimes (on Kos normally) written *Cossinius*, this variation being observable also in Latin inscriptions from Italy (Schulze 159).

und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia (1993) 200 no. 49. There is also an instance of *Cusinnius* from Rome, *CIL* VI 16679.

Licinius. The *PHI Greek Inscriptions* database gives 320 matches for Λικίννι-, 160 for Λικίνι-, this clearly meaning that the spelling with a geminate was more popular than the spelling with a simple ν (in Preisigke and Foraboschi, too, the number of occurrences of Λικίννιος is larger than that of Λικίνιος). But the differences between the number of attestations of both spellings are greater if one has a look at certain regions. In Lycia, the nomen *Licinius* was, as a result of the activities of C. Licinius Mucianus, governor in the time of Nero (*PIR*² L 242), extremely common, and even a quick look at a collection of Lycian inscriptions from the Roman period will show that the form used is normally that with a geminate. The *PHI* database confirms this impression by producing 89 matches for Λικίννι- and only 9 matches (appearing in 5 inscriptions) for Λικίνι-.³³ On the other hand, in regions in which the inscriptions tend to be earlier, and in which Licinii appearing in inscriptions include Republican senators (Crassi, Luculli, Murenæ, etc.), the differences are smaller (in Attica, Λικίννι- 36 matches, Λικίνι- 15; in the Peloponnese, we are given 11 matches for Λικίννι-, 10 matches for Λικίνι-).

It was observed above that the earliest attestations of Λικίννιος with a geminate were from the late second century BC, and that there were several further instances of this orthography from the Republican period. It is, however, clear that, during the early period, the form without the geminate still dominated. If one studies the inscriptions set up in honour of Lucullus, one observes that Lucullus' nomen is written as Λικίννιος in two inscriptions, one from Ephesus and one from Synnada (both referred to above), whereas the form Λικίνιος is used in 7 inscriptions, 5 from Greece, 2 from Asia Minor.³⁴ In the case of L. Licinius Murena, only the form Λικίνιος seems to be attested.³⁵ But from the early Empire onwards, the form with a geminate seems to be the more common form almost everywhere, although one observes interesting cases of the persistence of the orthography with just one ν; for instance, in the inscriptions in honour of the consular M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus from Thyatira, attested in the period between

³³ One of these being an inscription in honour of the legate Mucianus himself, *IGR* III 486 = *OGI* 558 = *ILS* 8816. For Asia Minor in general, the numbers are 202 matches for Λικίννι-, 62 matches for Λικίνι-. – On Λικίνιος / Λικίννιος, cf. also H. Solin, art. cit. (at n. 19) 108f.

³⁴ *IG* II² 4104, 4233; *IG* X 2, 38 (Hypata); *ID* 1758; *IG* XII 1, 48 (Rhodes); *TAM* V 2, 918 (Thyatira); *AE* 2000. 1386 = *SEG* 51, 1588 (Klaros); *Bull. ép.* 1970, 441 (Andros).

³⁵ *IG* V 1. 1454 = *AE* 2000, 1336 (Messene); *I. Olympia* 321; *IG* XII 1, 48 (Rhodes); *I. Kaunos* 103 (similarly in the case of C. Murena the son, *ibid.* 104).

the late Severans and 238, the spelling is more often Λικίνιος than Λικίννιος.³⁶ On the other hand, the spelling with just one ν is extremely uncommon, e.g., in the case of the emperor Licinius Valerianus and his family³⁷ and in that of the still later emperor Licinianus Licinius.³⁸ Pape–Benseler (s. v.) also cite some instances of Λικίννιος in Greek authors (especially Plutarch). There are also a number of examples, most of them latish and from the Greek East, of the spelling *Licinius* in Latin inscriptions.³⁹

Papinius. As observed above, the earliest attestation of the spelling Παπίννιος is in a list of contributions from Ephesus from the time of Tiberius (AE 1990, 918 = SEG 39, 1176, B, F). The same form is used in similar list of about the same date (*I. Ephesos* 1396 cf. SEG 37, 883). The other occurrences, much later, come from Philadelphia in Lydia (SEG 17, 52 and 53). Παπίνιος, with just one ν, is found in earlyish inscriptions from Athens (IG II² 3919) and from a place called *Karahallı* in Lydia,⁴⁰ and in some inscriptions of somewhat later date.⁴¹

³⁶ Λικίνιος: TAM V 2, 985, 986; *I. Beroea* 101; cf. the abbreviation Λικίν., no doubt representing Λικίνιος rather than Λικίννιος: TAM V 2, 984; SEG 47, 1656 = AE 1997, 1425 (also from Thyatira). Λικίννιος: TAM V 2, 987; IG X 2, 1, 142 (Thessalonica). The inscriptions are all quoted by F. Millar, *JRS* 89 (1999) 92–5 = Id., *Government, Society & Culture in the Roman Empire* (2004) 439–443.

³⁷ Examples of the spelling with just one ν: *IGBulg.* III 883; *Gerasa* 159.

³⁸ IG VII 2504; both Λικίνι- and Λικίννι- are used in TAM V 2, 1182 (milestone from Apollonis).

³⁹ See Schulze 108 n. 1 (ascribing this correctly "griechischem Einfluß"), citing, from Rome, *CIL* VI 13341 and 21347. Further instances from the West: *ICVR* VI 15535; AE 1978, 630 (Carnuntum, a soldier from Savaria). Earlyish instances from the East: *CIL* III 7110 = *I. Smyrna* 383 (with *sueis*, etc.); cf. *Licinnianus* in AE 1984, 893 (Caesarea, Cappadocia, the son of a certain C. Coesius C. f. Fab. Florus). Further instances: the legate of Cappadocia under Maximinus, Licinnius Serenianus (*CIL* III 6932, 6945, already cited by Schulze; AE 1985, 813); inscriptions of Valerian and his family (*CIL* III 184 = *ILS* 540, already in Schulze; AE 1981, 750, Tomi). There are also many milestones of the emperor Licinianus Licinius in which the names are written with geminates, mostly from Asia Minor but also from Epirus (AE 1984, 814) and Macedonia (L. Gounaropoulou & M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Les milliaires de la voie Egnatienne* [1985] no. viii, B). Note also, e.g., *IDR* III 5, 1, 389; *IGLS* I 71; *CPL* 156 (AD 148; *C. Iuli Licinniani*).

⁴⁰ H. Malay, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Manisa Museum* (1994) no. 31 (13/12 BC: Γάιον Παπίνιον Γαίου υἱὸν Αἰμιλία Ῥῶον [= *Ra(v)um*]).

⁴¹ *IGR* IV 1403 = *I. Smyrna* 725; *Altertümer v. Hierapolis* 175. (For the incorrect spelling Παπείνιος in an inscription from Dion cf. n. 3). Cf. also H. Solin, art. cit. (at n. 19) 109.

Stertinius (cf. H. Solin, art. cit. [at n. 19] 109). As noted above, there are a few Republican instances of Στερτέννιος on Delos and some early imperial attestations of Στερτίννιος. The spelling with a geminate never became common (the contrast with Λικίννιος etc., is striking); the *PHI* database gives 7 matches for Στερτίννιος, but 102 matches for Στερτίνιος. However, this figure does not tell the whole story, as 64 of the 102 inscriptions cited there are inscriptions from Cos (or, in two cases, from the neighbouring island of Calymnos) honouring, or at least referring to, the physician Xenophon. Among the rest of the examples of Στερτίνιος, there are six further inscriptions from Cos, all earlyish (to these one can now add five more Stertini from Cos, not identical with the doctor, in *Iscrizioni di Cos* vol. II)⁴² and 11 attestations on Delos. Then there are inscriptions referring to Stertinius Maximus cos. AD 23 (*IG XII 6, 1, 367, B II*) and to Stertinius Quartus, proconsul of Asia in 126/7.⁴³ In addition, there are a few further instances, mainly from Ephesus, but also from some other places, most of them early.⁴⁴ The only attestations which are or, at least seem to be, a bit later are *IG X 2, 2, 87* from Heraclea Lyncestis and *I. Ephesos 1540 (ILS 8833)*, an inscription set up by Στερτίνιος Μόξιμος Εὐτύχης, ἱππικὸς[ς] Ῥωμαίων, in honour of the legate of Asia Attidius Tuscus, no doubt in the third century.⁴⁵ Some of the attestations of the form with a geminate also seem later than the first century AD (cf. below). It seems in general that *Stertinius* was a nomen which, in the early period of Roman overseas emigration, made a spectacular entry into the eastern lands, but which then somehow succeeded in fading away, leaving only a few traces datable later than the first century AD. And this may well be the explanation of the domination, in Greek inscriptions, of the form without the geminate.

As for the forms with the geminate, in addition to those referred to above, I seem to be able to locate only the following: A. Maiuri, *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos* (1925) nos. 628 (clearly not very early) and 631, both from Cos,⁴⁶

⁴² M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (edited by M. L. Lazzarini & G. Vallarino; Monografie della Scuola Archeologica di Atene etc. VI,2, 2007).

⁴³ *Sardis 7, 1, 52, I; IGR IV 1156; SEG 28, 1169 = AE 1978, 800* (Metropolis).

⁴⁴ For the date of Δέκμος Στερτίνιος Εἰσίων in *IG VII 1826* (from Creusis, the port of Thespieae) cf. Chr. Müller in *Les italiens* (n. 24) 98 (approximately Augustan).

⁴⁵ This man must be either identical with M. Nummius ... Attidius ... Tuscus cos. ord. 258 (cf. now *CIL VI 41225b*) or at least closely related. (Note also the formulations of the inscription, pointing to the third century.) The date suggested by R.A. Kearsley, *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia (IK 59, 2001)* no. 117, "AD I–early II", is incorrect.

⁴⁶ One should perhaps also consider reading not Στερτίν/[ι]ος but Στερτίν/[νι]ος in the recently published inscription from Cos, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (n. 42) 645, as suggested by the *ordinatio* of the inscription.

and *I. Iznik-Nikaia* 100 (2nd century AD or later)⁴⁷ and 230 (vol. II 1 p. 315).

Titinius. It was noted above that there do not seem to be very early examples of this nomen written with a geminate. The *PHI* database gives 5 matches for Τιτίννιος, 17 for Τιτίνιος; the explanation may be that this is one of the nomina appearing early in the East, and of which quite a few of the attestations are early.⁴⁸ In any case, one can find the form with a double ν in (at least) the following inscriptions: *IG XII* 8, 471 (Thasos; note the presence of M. Ulpii); *I. Ephesos* 710A; and P.M. Nigdelis, *Ἐπιγραφικὰ Θεσσαλονίκεια* (2006) p. 152 (clearly not very early). There is also a papyrus, *P. Leit.* 8 (Τιτίννιος Κλωδιανός, 3rd century AD), the only attestation of the nomen *Titin(n)ius* cited in Preisigke and Foraboschi.⁴⁹ Moreover, there are also instances of the cognomen Τιτιννιανός –ή: *I. Ephesos* 710A (second century AD?) and *IGR III* 803 = *CIL III* 231 (A. Curtius Auspicatus Titinnianus, one of the builders of the spectacular theatre at Aspendos, mid-second century, the name being written with a geminate both in the Greek and the Latin text).⁵⁰ There are also some further examples of the orthography with the geminate in Latin inscriptions: *CIL VI* 1908 and 32303 (the same persons).

2. Some other suffixes

There are also nomina with other suffixes (*-cius -lius -sius*, etc.) preceded by a short vowel in the case of which one observes the suffix now and then being written with a geminate. Of course, this is something which is not altogether unknown in Latin inscriptions from the West; for instance, *Sosius* (with short *o*) is sometimes written *Sossius*, especially in inscriptions of a somewhat later date.⁵¹ On the other hand, there are names where the forms with a geminate seem

⁴⁷ In this inscription, the person called [Στ]ερτίννιος has the cognomen Κουᾶρ[τος], without any doubt (although this is an inscription from Bithynia) inspired by the nomenclature of the proconsul of Asia in 126/7, P. Stertinius Quartus (n. 43); this person must thus be dated later than the proconsul.

⁴⁸ For early attestations cf., e.g., *ID* 2622, a, II, 6; *IG VII* 416 = *I. Oropos* 523, line 51; *I. Smyrna* 381.

⁴⁹ Τιτίννιος is also the reading in Plut. *Mar.* 38.

⁵⁰ For the Curtii mentioned in this inscription and the consulate of one of them in 159, cf. P. Weiß, *Chiron* 29 (1999) 162–5 (with a bibliography on this inscription p. 162 n. 20).

⁵¹ Note, e.g., consular dates of 107, 149, 169 and 193, when a Sosius held the consulate: *CIL VI* 31142 (107); *AE* 2000, 344 (Misenum, 149); *CIL XIV* 2408 = *ILS* 5196, *CIL XI* 405, *AE* 1993, 1783 (Caesarea, Mauretania; 169); *CIL VI* 1173, *Suppl. It.* 4 Trebula Suffenas 35, *CIL X*

to be more or less independent names and where the existence of two forms may be due to the regional and/or dialectal origins of the names in question; one thinks of names such as *Titius* / *Tittius*.⁵² Moreover, there are forms which seem to be variants of the same name but which are actually different names; for example, I do not think that *Atius* (with a long *a*) should be connected with *Attius*. However, this phenomenon cannot be studied at length in this article dealing with mainly Greek habits, and even in the case of these, I shall content myself with pointing out a few names in which one sometimes observes the gemination of a simple consonant preceded by a short vowel on which the accent lies.

A. Names in *-ilius*:

- *Aemilius*: in a few cases written Αἰμίλλιος.⁵³
- *Caecilius*: there are some instances of Καικίλλιος / Κεκίλλιος.⁵⁴
- *Cartilius*: Καρτίλλιος is attested in a papyrus (*P. Marm.*).⁵⁵
- *Hostilius* (the *i* was probably short):⁵⁶ a few times written Ὅστίλλιος⁵⁷
- *Otacilius*: sometimes written Ὀτακίλλιος.⁵⁸

4760 = *ILS* 6296 (193). For Σόσσιος in Greek consular dates, cf. *IG* XII 3, 325, 17f.; *IGR* I 23; III 705, 1275 (149); *BGU* 7, 1655; *I. Konya Mus.* 66 (169).

⁵² One might adduce here, e.g., the disposition of Oscan to use geminates instead of simple consonants before an *i* (C.D. Buck, *Elementarbuch der osk.-umbrischen Dialekte* [1905] 65), perhaps more common in genitives, e.g., *dekiis* (Lat. '*Decius*') ~ gen. *dekkieís* (thus Rix *Cm*14C 9, 10), but also in nominatives (cf. now *dekkiis* Rix *Sa*59 [p. 85]).

⁵³ *AS* 18 (1968) 104 no. 2,08 (Comana in Cappadocia); *IGLS* II 448 (AD 195), 472; *IGLS* III 2, 1138; *IGLS* XIII 9109 (AD 282/3); three instances in Preisgke. (For Αἰμίλλιονός cf. H. Solin, *Repertorium nominum et cognominum Latinorum* [1994] 289.) Also in two Latin inscriptions from Italy: *CIL* X 3428 cf. *Puteoli* 11 (1987) 68; *AE* 1980, 335 (near Otranto).

⁵⁴ *SEG* 46, 818 (Thessalonica); *IGBulg.* I² 86; *I. Perge* 454 (also in a Latin inscription from Perge, *ibid.* 202); *IGR* IV 802 (= III 29); *I. Philae* 317; cf. also Κεκίλλιονός (used as a nomen) *I. Leukopetra* 87 and *Caecillius* in a bilingual inscription from Prymnessus (*CIL* III 7043 cf. 14192,3 = *ILS* 976 = *IGR* IV 675. There are also a handful of occurrences of *Caecillius* (and *Caecillianus*) in Latin inscriptions outside Italy.

⁵⁵ M. Norsa, G. Vitelli, *Il papiro vaticano greco II* (Studi e testi 53, 1931). *Cartillius* in a Latin inscription: *CIL* VI 12428. The *i* was probably short (Schulze 335 n. 2).

⁵⁶ See O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen* (1987) 135 n. 381.

⁵⁷ Cf. previous note. In my note in *Vornamen*, I also quote examples from Greek authors. To the inscriptions cited there, add *I. Hadrianoi* 11; also in *P. Phil.* 35. *Hostillius* in a Latin inscription: *CIL* XI 4139 = V 8928 (the same text).

⁵⁸ *IGBulg.* II 732, III 900, 1710; *SEG* 46, 843 (the empress Otacilia Severa); *IG* XIV 2112 = *IGUR* 1059. For the *i* being short, cf. Schulze 131 (with n. 3). Note that the initial *o* should be short, not long (the normal spelling of this name thus being Ὀτακίλιος).

- *Rupilius*: in a few cases written Ῥο(υ)πίλλιος.⁵⁹
- *Turpilius*: there are two instances of Τουρπίλλιος from Macedonia.⁶⁰
- *Vergilius*: Οὐεργέλλιος (sic) SB 9016 (Cn. Vergilius Capito, prefect of Egypt under Claudius).

It must be observed that the fact that a name normally ending in *-ilius* is written with a geminate in Greek inscriptions cannot be used to show that the *i* preceding the suffix must have been short, for nomina with a long *i* are also attested as having been sometimes spelled with geminates; one thinks, e.g., of Λουκίλλιος, a poet often appearing in the *Anthologia Palatina* (*PIR*² L 376).⁶¹ Other nomina with a long *i* preceding the suffix *-lius* sometimes found spelled with a geminate are *Catilius*, *Pacilius*, *Rutilius* (only in late inscriptions) and *Servilius*; from Greek authors, one can add *Acilius*, *Atilius* and *Manilius*.⁶²

⁵⁹ *IG X 2*, 1, 171; *SEG* 49, 814 = Nigdelis, op. cit. (at n. 7) p. 103 (with two instances of Ῥουπιλλία and one of Ῥουπιλία); *I. Ephesos* 698, 714; many occurrences on Cos, where the spelling Ῥο(υ)πίλλιος is much more common than Ῥο(υ)πίλιος (see now *Iscrizioni di Cos* [n. 42] p. 218).

⁶⁰ *IG X 2*, 1, 713; Demitsas, Μακεδονία 821 (Serrhae). This is also the reading in *Plut. Mar.* 8, 1. Instances of *Turpillius* in Latin inscriptions: *CIL VI* 27790; *CIL IX* 1455, 2, 56; *I. Aquileia* 1568. Cf. also Οὐεργίλλιανός *P. Lond.* II 196 = Wilcken, *Chrest.* II 87, col. I (c. 141).

⁶¹ Λουκίλλιος also in *BMC Phrygia* 374 no. 32 (Sebaste, Phrygia); two instances in Preisigke and Foraboschi. This is also the reading in *Plut. Pomp.* 54, 2; *Brut.* 50, 1; *Ant.* 69, 1. In a Latin inscription: *AE* 1991, 456 (Abella). It should be observed that the cognomen Λουκιλλιανός –ή must normally be regarded as being derived from Λουκίλλα (cf., e.g., *Maximus* > *Maximilla* > *Maximillianus*), not from Λουκίλλιος; it cannot thus be used to illustrate the spelling of the nomen with a geminate.

⁶² Κατίλλιος: attested mainly in Nicaea (where *Catilius* was one of the most common nomina) or in the case of persons from Nicaea: *I. Iznik (Nikaia)* 756, 1204, 1323, 1372; *FD III 2*, 102 (AD 129); *IG XIV* 790 = *IGI Napoli* 128. In other places: *I. Kios* 105; *IG XII 8*, 600 (Thasos); *TAM V 2*, 1142. There is also one instance of Κατίλλιος (and one of Κατιλλιανός) in Preisigke, both from the 3rd century AD. The spelling Κατίλιος does not seem to have been very much more common than that with a geminate. There are also a handful of attestations of *Catillius* in Latin inscriptions, but this spelling is attested only once in Italy (*CIL VI* 14587) and is any case much less common than *Catilius*. Πακίλλιος: *P. Princeton* II 23 (Theadelphia, AD 13). Ῥουτίλλιος: *IGBulg.* III 897, IV 2021, 2040; *IGR III* 1033 = *OGIS* 640 (all these inscriptions referring to the third-century governor of Thrace and Syria Phoenice Rutilius Pudens Crispinus). Σερούλλιος: *P. Ryl.* II 78; *SB* 6952 (AD 195). Authors: Ἀτίλλιος: the reading in *Plut. Brut.* 39, 10 and *Galba* 26, 4; Ἀκίλλιος: *Dion. Hal.* 3, 67, 5; Μανίλλιος: a number of significant manuscripts in *Plut. Cato min.* 17, 6. Cf. also Μετιλλιανός, *AE* 2003, 1674 (Smyrna; I do not seem to be able to locate an instance of *Μετίλλιος). – On the spelling *Aurelius* in inscriptions of Caracalla, see now M. Christol & T. Drew-Bear, in S. Golvin (ed.), *The Greco-Roman East* (*YCS* 33 [2004]) 89.

B. Some instances with other suffixes (-cius, -rius, -sius):

- *Decius*: this nomen is now and then spelled Δέκκιος.⁶³
- *Herius*: written Ἡρριος in *Altert. von Hierapolis* 304 (and, but as a praenomen, in *EAD* 30, 402).⁶⁴
- *Serius*: the nomen of the Roman senator M. Serius M. f. is written Σέρριος in Sherk, *RDGE* no. 12 = G. Petzl, *I. Smyrna* 589 (the *s. c. de agro Pergameno* of 129 or possibly 101 BC); the form with the geminate is also used in a consular date of 156 (with the consul Serius Augurinus) from Cyanea (*IGR* III 705).⁶⁵ There are no certain examples of the spelling *Serrius* in Latin inscriptions.
- *Volusius*: the normal spelling of this nomen in Greek inscriptions of the later period (written Οὐλόσιος, etc. in early inscriptions)⁶⁶ seems to have been that with a geminate (Οὐλούσσιος, Βολόσσιος, Βολούσσιος, Οὐλούσσιος, etc.).⁶⁷

Before I conclude, I would still like to point out that the geminate in names of the type Δέκκιος, etc. can sometimes be observed to have been introduced in similar names in which the geminate is not preceded by a syllable carrying the accent; thus we find, in addition to Δεκίμιος, also Δεκκίμιος (*IGLS* VII 4034), and *Volusenus* normally spelled Οὐλοσσηνός, etc.⁶⁸ Furthermore, one wonders

⁶³ *IG* II² 2102, ii, 141; 2113, 63; 2132, 55–6; *Agora* XV 406, 13; *SEG* 26, 176, 185 (Athens, all examples being from the later second century AD); *IGBulg.* II 640 (c. 234, C. Messius Q. Decius Valerinus, legate of Moesia Inferior). There are also some early cases in which Δέκκιος, used in the genitive, is the Oscan praenomen used as a single name (*IG* XIV 282, Πασίων Δεκκίου Ἐγεσταίος; *ID* 1417 A, col. II, 139–41, Βάχχιος Δεκκίου Τήνιος; this person must have had Oscan ancestors [cf. Τρέβιος in line 150]); in these cases, the gemination may be due to Oscan influence. – There is also Σέκκιος Τρόφιμος from Side, a sophist (*IG* XIV 1702 = *IGUR* 626), the only Sec(c)ius in the East; but although *Secius* is the normal form of this nomen, *Seccius* is also attested, although only outside Italy, and is clearly of barbarian origin (cf., e.g., *Acceptus Secci f.*, *CIL* III 5057), and this form, not the Italian *Secius*, may have found its way to the East for some reason.

⁶⁴ But it must be noted that although the normal form of this name is *Herius*, *Herrius* is not completely unknown even in Italy (see *CIL* VI 8816, X 2517, etc.).

⁶⁵ Cf. possibly also Σέρριος ὄνομα κύριον, *Suda* Σ 250 (but this might be anything).

⁶⁶ E.g., *ID* 1624; *EAD* 30, 276; *IG* IV 1573; *I. Byzantion* 260; *SEG* 33, 835. From the Severan period: *AE* 2001, 1938 = *SEG* 49, 1951 (a senatorial lady in Elaioussa Sebaste).

⁶⁷ *IG* II² 2897; *I. Perinthos* 99; *I. Apamea u. Pylai* 24 (= *AE* 1991, 1464), 43 (= *I. Kyzikos* 394); *I. Prusa ad Ol.* 181; *I. Selge* 20; *SEG* 42, 1211A (Etenna); *IGR* III 829 (Syedra); *AE* 1999, 1635 = *SEG* 49, 1931 (Patara); two instances of Βολ(ο)ύσσιος are cited in Preisigke. *Volussius* is not totally unknown in Latin inscriptions (quite a few occurrences in *CIL* VI, etc.). – As for the suffix *-tius* being spelled *-ttius*, cf. Σουβαττιανός in *BGU* II 484 (201/2).

⁶⁸ *IG* IV² 1, 681; *IG* V 1, 233, 295, 490, 581; *IG* V 2, 544; *I. Smyrna* 438; *I. Perge* 467 ([Οὐολ]ουσσηνός). (Cf. also Οὐλοσσηνός *IGR* IV 534.) I seem to be able to find the spelling

whether one could also mention at this point the fact that *Matidius*, never written *Mattidius* in Latin inscriptions, is sometimes rendered Μαρτίδιος in Greek inscriptions;⁶⁹ or that *Atilius* is a few times rendered Ἀττ(ε)ίλιος, once in an early text from Delos.⁷⁰ Note also Ὅσσίδιος for *Hosidius* in Aphrodisias.⁷¹

University of Helsinki

Οὐλοσηνός only in *IG V* 1, 68. Cf. also H. Solin, art. cit. (at n. 19) 109 n. 40.

⁶⁹ *I. Ephesos* 278, 850, 3056 (?); Μαρτιδιανός *I. Ephesos* 627.

⁷⁰ *I. Delos* 1540 (140/139 BC); *CIG* 3665, line 41 (Cyzicus); *IG XIV* 242. In a Latin inscription from Corinth: *Corinth VIII* 3, 285. Ἀτίλιος is also the reading in Diod. Sic. 23, 15, 1 and 7 (M. Atilius Regulus). Cf. also Κουσσώνιος for *Cusonius P. Ryl.* II 165 (a prefect of Egypt, AD 266). Οὐεπτύριος in *BGU I* 24 (cited as such in Preisigke) seems to me most uncertain.

⁷¹ C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias* (1993) 166 no. 51, line 19. *Hossidius* is also attested in a Latin inscription from Africa (*CIL VIII* 9000).