

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXII

HELSINKI 1998 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Iiro Kajanto in memoriam</i>	9
NEIL ADKIN	<i>The Ninth Book of Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria and Jerome</i>	13
GÉZA ALFÖLDY	<i>Drei Bauinschriften aus Gabii</i>	27
E. BADIAN	<i>Two Numismatic Phantoms. The False Priest and the Spurious Son</i>	45
LILIANE BODSON	<i>Ancient Greek Views on the Exotic Animal</i>	61
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>Missing Houses: Some Neglected Domus and other Abodes in Rome</i>	87
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Visceratio</i>	109
WALTHER LUDWIG	<i>Martin Crusius und das Studium des Griechischen in Nordeuropa</i>	133
SILVIO PANCIERA	<i>Ancora nomi nuovi o rari da iscrizioni latine di Roma</i>	149
MARK POBJOY	<i>The decree of the pagus Herculaneus and the Romanisation of 'Oscan' Capua</i>	175
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Three Notes on Roman Nomina</i>	197
W. J. SCHNEIDER	<i>Philologisch-kunstgeschichtliche Bemerkungen zu drei Stücken der Anthologia Latina</i>	225
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CLXXIII–CLXXVI</i>	235
RISTO VALJUS	<i>An Oriental Baker at Ostia</i>	259
TOIVO VILJAMAA	<i>Participium coniunctum – Syntactic Definitions of the Participle in Ancient Grammars</i>	265
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	277
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	319
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	321
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	325

THREE NOTES ON ROMAN NOMINA

I. Considerations on What Names Can and Should be Regarded as Nomina – II. On the Relative Frequency of Roman Nomina – III. Nomina Missing in, and to be Deleted from, the Second Edition of *Repertorium Nominum Gentilium et Cognominum Latinorum*

OLLI SALOMIES

I. Considerations on What Names Can and Should be Regarded as Nomina

In the early 1980s, there was a period when Professor Heikki Solin of Helsinki and I were busy collecting Roman names, both cognomina and nomina, Professor Solin being responsible for the cognomina, I for the nomina. Our plan was to supplement the material to be found in the standard collections of Roman nomina and cognomina by Schulze and Kajanto,¹ with a view to producing a reverse lexicon of both classes of names. In the end it turned out that we had found so many names missing in these two repertories that we published a book including not only the reverse lexicon but also a list of all nomina and cognomina known to us, the books of Schulze and Kajanto being referred to in the case of names listed in them, and full references being given in the case of "new" names missing in the two books. The result was called *Repertorium Nominum Gentilium et Cognominum Latinorum*, and it was published in 1988; a second edition, with additions and corrections, appeared in 1994.

Now in the title of the book the adjective *Latinus*, *-a*, *-um* was applied, with a certain licence, to both the nomina and the cognomina, but it is good to note that strictly speaking the adjective is applicable only to the

¹ W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (originally 1904; latest reprint 1991); I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (1965; reprinted in 1982).

cognomina. In the case of cognomina, it is both useful and, in most cases, possible to distinguish between Latin, Greek, and other cognomina, but in the case of nomina one has to face the question of defining a Latin nomen. What, in fact, is a Latin nomen? Now, if *Lucius*, *Marcus* and *Quintus* are Latin praenomina, and surely one can go as far as to assert that, then the nomina derived from these praenomina, *Lucilius*, *Marcius* and *Quintius*, can obviously be regarded as Latin nomina. As far as these things are simple – although one can introduce some trouble even at this stage, for example by observing that *Lucius* was also an Oscan praenomen, and that the nomen *Lucius*, in Latin formally identical with the praenomen but in Oscan having the suffix *-iis* which differentiates it from the praenomen ending in *-is*, is especially frequent in Samnium and Campania, in areas, that is, in which Oscan was the predominant language until replaced by Latin. So perhaps we should say, although I doubt this would be really meaningful, that *Lucilius* is a Latin nomen, *Lucius* an Oscan one, although of course both derive from the same root. But, to stay with nomina derived from praenomina, what about (say) *Aulus* and *Aulius*? It is well established that *Aulus* was a praenomen of Etruscan origin, although not uncommon in Rome; but what is one to think about the nomen *Aulius*, found among Republican senators? Could one classify this nomen as a Latin one, since it has been derived from a praenomen which, although of Etruscan origin, had become a part of the repertory of normal Latin names? Or should even the nomen *Aulius* be classified as Etruscan? To go on with problems with the etymological attribution of Roman nomina, it may well be that *Calvius* has something to do with *calvus*, and *Catius* with *catus*, and if this is the case, then we would be dealing with further Latin nomina. But again one can easily think of problems: if *Calvius* is Latin, what about *Calvenus*, *Calventius*, *Calvidius*, *Calvisius*, to say nothing of *Calviatius* or *Calvisidius*? These are names which certainly do not point to Rome, but rather to Samnium, Umbria and other Italian regions; and yet a good case can be made to regard them all as deriving from the same root, whatever its meaning. As for *Catius*, in making a judgment on the origin of *Catii*, one should take into account not only this name, but also nomina such as *Catedius*, *Catellius*, *Catidius*, *Catienus*, which, again, make one think of remote places somewhere in Italy rather

than of places where Latin was spoken in the early times when the system of having family names was developing.²

Furthermore, there are familiar names like *Aelius*, *Calpurnius*, *Cornelius* etc., which were most probably thought of as Latin names by contemporary Greeks and other non-Romans, but which in fact do not seem to admit a Latin etymology. But in spite of that, we are, of course, entitled to regard them as good Roman names. And this fact makes one ask the following question: is it really at all useful to try to find etymological explanations for Roman nomina, and e.g. to try to distinguish between Latin and non-Latin nomina? Now the answer is obviously that efforts of this kind would be rather senseless; on one hand because it is impossible to say anything of substance on the origin of most nomina (the old trick of saying that a name is probably Etruscan not really leading anywhere), and on the other because further studies based on Roman nomina are rarely of such nature that exact knowledge of the *etymological* origin of individual nomina would be needed.³ In studies which use nomina (for instance studies of population and population mobility) it is normally more important to be able to attach certain names to certain regions, and here pure "etymology" is rarely of any help; it is not etymology which makes us think of Paestum when we hear the name *Digitius* (cf. n. 26), of lands on the Rhine and the

² Note also the interesting cases in which a nomen a priori looking like a Latin (or at least Roman) one is in fact derived from a barbarian name; e.g. *C. Verginius Vergionis f. Vergio* (ILNarbonnaise, Antibes no. 11), where one sees that the nomen has been invented on the basis of the father's barbarian name *Vergio*. Similar cases in A. Chastagnol, in: *L'Afrique, la Gaule, la religion à l'époque romaine. Mélanges à la mémoire de M. Le Glay* (Collection Latomus 226, 1996) 407–415 (examples from outside Gaul: CIL III 4724, CIL V 774, 5377).

³ It is true that some authors use the etymological approach, for instance in commentaries to inscriptions in epigraphical publications. But this is misguided and leads to absolutely nothing. It is even worse, when scholars make the mistake of identifying etymology with local origins. This is the case for instance in G.B. Brusin's *Inscriptiones Aquileiae* (1991–1993), where it is often said of a name that it is Etruscan (or the like), but also fairly often that a *family* with a name considered as Etruscan (or Umbrian etc.) was Etruscan (or Umbrian etc.); a reader of the book not acquainted with Roman onomastical studies will get the ridiculous impression that people living in Aquileia were mostly Etruscans, to whom a few Umbrians, Samnites and other could be added (cf. *Gnomon* 69 [1997] 521; for another instance of a study of this kind see *Arctos* 23 [1989] 275).

Danube when have to deal with the name *Privatius*, but other considerations. (On the other hand, one would consider a name like *Barigbalius* African even if it were not known from an inscription – ILTun. 246 – found in Africa.)

So the truth is that, for many reasons, the nomina, unlike the cognomina, listed in the *Repertorium* are not Latin names in the strict etymological sense. They are rather names in the case of which it can be established that they were nomina in the Roman sense, that is, names of Latin, Etruscan, Oscan or other origin which were used as family names, the most important feature of which was the fact that they were inherited (in about the same way as modern family names), the sons and daughters of a *Tullius* becoming *Tullii* and *Tulliae*.

But how is one to recognize a Roman family name? Now this is a most interesting question and the main subject of this part of this paper. Normally, of course, it is the collocation of the name within the Roman nomenclature which makes us recognize a nomen when we see one. Here we have several alternatives because of the evolution of the Roman name system. But basically we can say that, in principle, any name that is collocated either between the praenomen and the filiation or (in the case of men omitting the filiation) between the praenomen and the cognomen, or (in the case of men who omit the filiation but mention the tribe)⁴ between the praenomen and the tribe will have been a nomen. It thus follows that *Tullius* in the nomenclatures *M. Tullius M. f.* (and, of course, *M. Tullius M. f. Cicero* and *M. Tullius M. f. Cor. Cicero*), *M. Tullius Cicero* and *M. Tullius Cor. Cicero* would be a nomen. (I am not saying that this a new observation.) Accordingly, even names which do not give the general impression of being nomina must be considered as such if found collocated as above. For instance, since we find a soldier from Amasia called *C. Niger C. f. Pol.* in CIL III 6607, a man called *M. Palicanus M. f. Quir. Marcellinus* in I. Ephesos 2230B, we must conclude that the names *Niger* and *Palicanus*, familiar as cognomina, could also sometimes be used as nomina. But there is a problem (the words 'in principle' used above were meant to imply this), namely the fact that there existed a habit of omitting the nomen from nomenclatures which included one or more cognomina, so that one could

⁴ As the men e.g. in ILS 1042, 1181. Cf. H. Solin, *Arctos* 21 (1987) 134f. = *Analecta epigraphica* (1998) 293.

say *L. Sulla* instead of *L. Cornelius Sulla*, *M. Cicero* instead of *M. Tullius Cicero*. If the filiation was added, it was collocated after the cognomen, and so we find nomenclatures like *M. Agrippa L. f.*, *L. Plancus L. f.* (CIL VI 1316 = ILS 41)⁵; however, since this type of nomenclature was typical of the upper classes, the problem is not so grave, because we have some knowledge of the representatives of these classes, and we can thus say – in fact we know – that the full names of these men were *M. Vipsanius L. f. Agrippa* and *L. Munatius L. f. Plancus*, from which it follows that *Vipsanius* and *Munatius*, not *Agrippa* and *Plancus*, were the nomina of these men. In the same way, nomenclatures including two cognomina in which the nomen is omitted (for instance *P. Lentulus Sura* Sall. Cat. 17,3) do not generally pose a problem because this type is mainly restricted to nobles, especially in the Republican period, which means that we have no problem in recognizing for instance the man mentioned above as a member of the *gens* of the Cornelii whose full name was *P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura*. However, this name type is also found, although not very frequently, during the Empire; in this period, the interpretation of these names can be more problematic, especially because the Republican *gentes* using inherited cognomina (the Cornelii Sullae, the Claudii Marcelli etc.), in whose names the cognomina reveal their nomina, were dying out. It is generally agreed that *M. Vestinus Atticus*, consul in 65 (PIR² I 624) was really a Iulius (and thus officially called *M. Iulius Vestinus Atticus*), and we know that L. Lollianus Avitus cos. 114 was by his full nomenclature called *L. Hedi Rufus Lollianus Avitus* (PIR² H 39, cf. Altertümer von Pergamon VIII 3, 22); furthermore, it seems likely that the nomenclature of a consul of AD 146, C. Annianus Ver[us], was in fact an abbreviation of *C. Ummidius Quadratus Annianus Verus*.⁶ On

⁵ This kind of nomenclature often appears on coins from the Republican period; for examples from inscriptions see Arctos 22 (1988) 126–8.

⁶ See Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature (1992) 52 n. 73. – As for consuls with a nomenclature of this kind, note the consul of 115, who is called both *M. Vergilianus Pedo* (CIL VI 43/44 = ILS 1634/5; CIL VI 791; AE 1949, 23) and *M. Pedo Vergilianus* (CIL VI 1984; when a cognomen only is used, the consul is called at times *Vergilianus* [e.g. CIL VI 31148. 32637 and numerous quarry inscriptions from Docimium], at times *Pedo* [e.g. CIL XV 20–22, the ms. consular fasti]). The nomen of this consul has yet to be established (*Popilius* is suggested in PIR² P 843), and the same goes for M. Rebilus Apronianus, consul in 117 (thus CIL VI 2076, CIL XV 25, CIL XIV 4235 = ILS 318 = Inscr. It. IV 1, 79).

the other hand, in the case of C. Erucianus Silo cos. 110 (PIR² E 92) it seems that *Erucianus* is indeed a nomen, this observation being based on the fact that the same name is used as a nomen by several representatives of the so-called lower classes, some of whom may well be freedmen (or descendants of freedmen) of the consul.⁷ One sees, then, that during the Empire things get a bit complicated, as far the interpretation of this type of name goes; this can be further illustrated by the following case. In the inscriptions from Ephesus, I. Ephesos 2076, 2077 and SEG XXXV 1109, we find a certain M. Ποπλικκιανὸς Ν(ε)ικηφόρος (i.e., *M. Publicianus Nicephorus*), a splendid character in early third-century Ephesus (as we know from many sources); if nothing else were known of his name, one would conclude that *Publicianus* was his nomen, an easy conclusion because nomina ending in *-ianus*, formed from nomina ending in *-ius*, were especially common in the Greek-speaking East.⁸ However, there are many other inscriptions regarding the same man which show that the conclusion presented above is a mistaken one, for in these texts a fuller nomenclature *M. Fulvius Publicianus Nicephorus* is used.⁹ It appears, then, that the correct conclusion would be that *Fulvius*, not *Publicianus*, was the nomen of the man.

In the exposition above we have already been dealing with a few nomenclatures consisting of more than just the praenomen, the nomen, and the cognomen. Now it is perhaps more common to find nomenclatures in which a nomen is followed by two or more cognomina (I mean the type *P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum*, often also found during the Empire), but there were also nomenclatures which included two or more nomina (this type not being found before the Empire), for instance *C. Plinius Caecilius Secundus* and *A. Platorius Nepos Aponius Italicus Manilianus C. Licinius Pollio* (Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature 27; 140). From the point of view of this paper this means that one can pick up nomina not only from the positions mentioned above, but also within lengthier nomenclatures where the nomina do not occupy the "normal" position. The problem is that

⁷ CIL VI 16993 (cf. *Aerychianus* CIL VI 25372); five instances from Ostia in CIL XIV, where the consul may have come from (cf. O. Salomies, in: *Studi storico-epigrafici sul Lazio antico* [ed. H. Solin, 1996] 72f.).

⁸ See *Arctos* 18 (1984) 97–104.

⁹ I. Ephesos 444. 445. 632. 679. 739. 1080. 1087A. 2078. 2079. 2082. 3049. 3063. 3089; SEG XXXV 1110.

in this case one cannot formulate any rules for identifying nomina except that names which give the impression of being nomina or which are for some reason most conveniently seen as nomina should be classified as nomina. Since *Caucidius*, appearing in the nomenclature of the senators L. Mummius Niger Quintus Valerius Vegetus Severinus Caucidius Tertullus (PIR² M 707) and P. Vigellius Raius Plarius Saturninus Atilius Braduanus Caucidius Tertullus (PIR V 434; cf. also PIR² A 720; M 541), but not otherwise attested as a name in Latin or Greek inscriptions, looks more like a nomen than a cognomen, it should be classified as a nomen even if the fact that it is indeed a nomen were not confirmed by an Oscan inscription.¹⁰ Another case which could be cited here is that of the Antonine equestrian from Heliopolis, M. Licinius Sex. f. Fab. Pompenna Potitus Urbanus (IGLS 2791). In theory this man could be interpreted as having either one nomen and three cognomina or two nomina and two cognomina, depending on the interpretation of *Pompenna*. In my view, this name should be a nomen, of Etruscan origin of course, to be compared with nomina like *Perpenna Porsenna Volusenna*. It is true that these names could also sometimes be used as cognomina (e.g. *Sisenna*; *Gargenna* AE 1981, 317), but in this case the interpretation as a nomen is recommended not only by the fact that in most cases the names of this type are nomina but also by the fact that this man, because of his filiation, seems to have an "adoptive" nomenclature of the type described in my *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature* 25–30.

However, in looking for nomina, one has to cast one's net much wider, it not being enough to keep an eye on nomenclatures of the "classical" *tria nomina* type or on polyonymous nomenclatures. Women did not, in principle, use a praenomen, so that we cannot apply the rule that a name collocated between a praenomen and a cognomen is a nomen to them, but we will have to content ourselves with the constatation that in female nomenclatures the name appearing before the cognomen will have to be a nomen. The same goes for men in whose nomenclature the praenomen is left out, a phenomenon common in authors from the earliest Empire onwards and somewhat later also in inscriptions. It is thus permissible to conclude that *Ceselius* in the nomenclature of Ceselius Montanus(?) (AE 1994, 520 from Sant'Agata di Puglia), and *Menigia* in the nomenclature of Menigia Quinta from Emerita (AE 1994, 858a) are nomina – not to speak of cases

¹⁰ E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* I (1953) no. 5 AD line 11.

like *Gavoleia* in the nomenclature of Gavoleia P. f. Rufa (M. Silvestrini, MEFRA 109 [1997] 10 from the ager Beneventanus) and *Egusia* in the nomenclature of Egusia L. l. Severa (Suppl. It. 15 Ateste 93), in which the filiation and the reference to the patron clearly indicate that the name coming at the beginning is a nomen.¹¹ Here, too, one must of course be careful, for there are cases in which a man or a woman are designated by two cognomina instead of a combination of a nomen and a cognomen, for instance *Messalla Corvinus*, *Silanus Torquatus*, *Thrasea Paetus*;¹² but the first cognomen can usually be identified easily as a such, so that for those looking for new nomina there is usually not a real problem.

To go on, remembering that nomina were sometimes used as cognomina, one also has to keep an eye on cognomina which for some reason give the impression of being nomina in origin. This type of nomenclature is found both in the early Empire, when we encounter men like P. Sulpicius Quirinius (cos. 13 BC) and Sex. Papinius Allenius (cos. AD 36), and women like Albia Terentia (the mother of the emperor Otho),¹³ and also later, when we find men like the emperor of AD 268–70, M. Aurelius Claudius. With such examples in mind, one can proceed to identify as nomina names used as cognomina but which look like nomina, and this is how we stumble into names like *Aulaeus*, *Aulanius* (these two already listed in our *Repertorium*), *Maiarius* (CIL VI 13770), *Pilionius* (Suppl. It. 13 Nursia 84), *Tudienus* (CIL VI 33858 c II 22), which, although attested only as cognomina, must by origin be nomina and which, accordingly, either already appear as nomina in our *Repertorium* or will appear as such in future editions. But cognomina are also useful to the collector of nomina inasmuch as they are often derived from nomina (much more often than being identical with nomina), usually

¹¹ Male names corresponding to this type (nomen – filiation (– tribe) – cognomen) are rare, and they are found mostly in inscriptions in which something has gone wrong; for some examples see *Die römischen Vornamen* 418ff.

¹² In the inscriptions of the Empire, one finds this type of nomenclature most often in consular dates (e.g. *Torquatus Asprenas*, one of the consuls of 128 [CIL VI 10048 = ILS 5287; CIL XIV 1433; CIL II 5095 cf. AE 1994, 1014]; *Civica Pompeianus*, one of the consuls of 136 [CIL VI 10242 = ILS 7861]; Scapula Tertullus – or Scapula Priscus –, one of the consuls of 195 [CIL XIV 169 = ILS 6172; CIL III 4407. 12802]).

¹³ M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial* (1987) no. 44; cf. *ibid.* nos. 82, 130, 159, 204, 205, 217, etc.

with the suffix *-ianus*; I am thinking here of the type *Aemilianus*, *Claudianus*. In this group of cognomina, there are quite a few which are derived from nomina not otherwise attested. A number of them are enumerated by Kajanto, *Cognomina* (see n. 1) p. 159f., but quite a few could be added, for instance *Ganicus* or *Caltonius* (extracted from *Ganiciana* Inscr. It. X 5, 1080 and *Caltonianus* CIL VIII 18020, 3). Of course, pursuing this line of thought one has to keep in mind that cognomina ending in *-ianus* can have been derived not only from nomina, but also from other cognomina, this type of cognomen being most popular from the second century AD onwards, when we start to encounter cognomina like *Maximianus*, *Severianus*. In many cases it is, it is true, difficult to decide whether a cognomen of this type is based on a nomen or a cognomen, since for instance the two cognomina mentioned above could have been derived not only from *Maximus* and *Severus*, but also from the nomina *Maximius* and *Severius*. Of course, in some cases there can be no doubt; if we know two senators, one called D. Fonteius Fronto, the other D. Fonteius Frontinianus, we can say that in this case *Frontinianus* is based not on *Frontinius*, but on *Fronto*, and because of the existence of senatorial *Ninnii Hastae*, the cognomen of the consul *Ninnius Hastianus* can obviously not be derived from the nomen *Hastius*.¹⁴ On the other hand (to get back to my theme proper), the problem is not very grave from the point of view of someone collecting unattested nomina, because I think that it is safe enough to say that those cognomina ending in *-ianus*, in the case of which no cognomen can be identified from which they could have been derived (this seems to be the case of *Ganiciana* and *Caltonianus*), must have been based on nomina.

To stay with names ending in *-ianus*, it is good to remember that this ending also appears in geographic names (of *fundi* etc.) derived from personal names and also in the names of many other things which were in some way or other connected with individuals;¹⁵ and a closer inspection of such names in fact does produce a great number of names in *-ianus* which have been derived from nomina otherwise unattested. We find for instance

¹⁴ For these, and further, instances see *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature* 61 n. 1.

¹⁵ From the index to Dessau's ILS (vol. IV, p. 641ff.) one can extract examples such as *horrea Lolliana*, *Seiana*, *Volusiana*, *horti Sallustiani*, *Titiani*, *insula Sertoriana*, *theatrum Pompeianum*.

fundus Dirrianus (CIL XI 1147, iii 25f.), *fundus Hermedianus* (CIL XI 5845), *fundus Vefeianus* (CIL X 407, 3, 4), *saltus Firronianus* (CIL V 5503), *ager Peduceianus* (CIL X 6706add., cf. CIL VI 33745 = ILS 1626), *agellus Aeseianus* (CIL V 4489),¹⁶ and, looking a bit further on, *olea Colminiana* (Cato, agr. 6, 1) and *Licerniana* (or *Liceriana*) *pira* (Plin. nat. 15, 54). Furthermore, *senatus consulta* (listed by A. O'Brien Moore, RE Suppl. VI 810–2) in the imperial period also often have names ending in *-ianum* derived from nomina (*s.c. Vellaeianum* etc.), although one finds them also derived from cognomina (*s.c. Libonianum, Orfitianum* etc.); however, *senatus consulta* (unlike *leges*, on which see below) do not seem to be able to produce new nomina.

But it is good to remember that the derivative ending in *-ianus* was not the original adjectival form corresponding to a nomen, for in the origin a nomen itself, not its derivative, was an adjective; it was only during the later Republican period when the nomen began to be thought of as being a noun rather than an adjective, and when, accordingly, adjectival forms ending in *-ianus* begin to appear.¹⁷ But even in the period when new names were coined mainly following the new style (*senatus consultum Trebellianum, horrea Lolliana* etc.), one still finds a large number of denominations following the older tradition; in addition to the well-known types *via Aurelia* (not *Aureliana*), *lex Antonia* (not *Antoniana*) and *aqua Marcia* (not *Marciana*), there are a large number of names of places and of other things named after individuals, in the names of which the nomen appears in its original adjectival form.¹⁸ And, to get back to my subject proper, from the point of view of the collector of nomina this means that one has to keep one's eye on these types of names, too. If one does this, some interesting things do emerge. For instance, *porta Mugonia* in Rome preserves a nomen which is otherwise attested only indirectly, the cognomen *Mugonianus* being known at Cirta (see Repertorium² s. v., p. 485). The nomen *Semurius* is

¹⁶ Observe that here, too, one has to be cautious; perhaps the *fundus Fangonianus* in CIL XI 6528 owes its name not to a certain Fangonius (listed in our Repertorium), but to a Fango (cf. C. Fuficius Fango RE VII 200 no. 5; Schulze 314).

¹⁷ Cf. for this development K. Meister, Lateinisch-griechische Eigennamen I. Altitalische und römische Eigennamen (1916) 81–98.

¹⁸ For some further examples, cf. again Dessau's index (see n. 15), where one finds *basilica Opimia, circus Flaminius, clivus Triarius, turris Mamilia*, etc.

known only from the name of the *ager Semurius* appearing in Cato (orig. fr. 16 P.).¹⁹ Cato also offers *lacus Prilius* (this name seems, however, to be attested also in a play by Titinius; see Repertorium² s. v., p. 149), and inscriptions furnish us with otherwise unattested nomina such as *Disaenius* in *pagus Disaenius* (AE 1947, 45, Patavium), *Granisius* in *fundus Granisius* (CIL XI 1147 ii 75, 77), *Veccius* in *saltus Veccius* (CIL XI 1147 iii 72, viii 37). Even lesser known *leges* turn out to be useful in this respect: the nomina *Ollinius* and *Pesolanus* seem to be attested only in the *leges Ollinia* and *Pesolania* (Gaius, inst. 4, 109; Paul. sent. 1, 15).

But it is also useful to keep an eye on those cases in which a single name is used of persons, on one hand because it is not uncommon that individuals are referred to in our sources by just one name, and on the other, because this one name often happens to be a nomen, for instance *Vergilius*, *Horatius*, *Tullia*. This type of denomination is, of course, more common in literary sources than in, say, inscriptions, and literary sources in fact do offer interesting instances of single names which (because of the fact they are not praenomina and cannot be thought of as cognomina or non-Latin individual names) must be nomina, and not only that, but nomina which are otherwise unattested; Vergil in the *Bucolics* (3, 90) mentions a certain *Bavius*, who has a name which makes the impression of being an (otherwise unknown) nomen, this impression being confirmed by some later sources from which it appears that this man was called M. Bavius (see RE III 152f.). Another instance is *Gannius*, the nomen (so it seems) of a poet perhaps of the late second or first century BC (*Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum*, ed. J. Blänsdorf [1995], p. 142f.). Furthermore, there is much potential material in the *Codex Iustinianus*, in which individuals are normally designated by just one name, in quite a few cases by the nomen (note e.g. *Serpius* 4, 32, 2 which looks like a nomen but which is otherwise unknown). There is also something to be gained from the study of single individual names in inscriptions (not, it is true, a very common phenomenon). One class of people appearing in inscriptions designated often by one name only are centurions named as commanders of *centuriae*; the nomen (instead of the cognomen) is often used in these cases even in the 2nd century AD (e.g. (*centuria*) *Caecili* CIL

¹⁹ In the same fragment, Cato also mentions an *ager Lintirius*, offering another otherwise unknown nomen. (Some might, however, be tempted to correct this to *Tintirius*, a nomen of which there are a few scattered attestations.)

VI 32521 of AD 147), and of course one also encounters names which must be nomina but which are otherwise unattested as such; for instance *Flageri* (the name – in the genitive – of a centurion in CIL VI 2607 and AE 1984, 68) must be the genitive of *Flagerius*, which one can without hesitation classify as a nomen.²⁰ But one can find stray instances of single names which must be nomina in other places also, for example in collections of Christian funerary inscriptions, in which the deceased usually have only one name; in the collection of Christian inscriptions from Rome, *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae*, one observes under no. 11852 *Caesuleius*, under no. 21297 *Stateius*, names which are readily recognizable as being nomina (not, it seems, otherwise attested) in origin.

Let me conclude this part of my paper by observing rather in passing that one can of course also extract new nomina from many other types of sources, and then by saying a few words on nomina which look like cognomina ending in *-ius*. Now cognomina of this type, derived from participles, adjectives and nouns and in origin often *signa* and *agnomina*,²¹ became popular in the later third century and are extremely common in later centuries; examples are *Constantius*, *Dulcitus*, *Gaudentius*, *Laurentius*, *Luxurius*, and there are of course also many of Greek origin such as *Eutropius* and *Gregorius*. In late-third and fourth-century inscriptions and other sources these names are sometimes used in combination with other cognomina ending in *-us*, in these cases making the initial impression of being used as nomina, especially if one remembers that many of the names ending in *-ius* attested later as cognomina are in fact attested earlier as being used as nomina (e.g. *Concordius*, *Constantius*);²² instances are *Dulcitus*

²⁰ However, I still hesitate to establish the existence of the nomen *Blicisius*, which would be based on the (praetorian) (*centuria*) *Blicisi* attested in CIL VI 37213, an inscription of the third century (and thus a bit late for this kind of speculation). On the other hand, there seems to be a nomen *Blicius* (CIL V 2058), and *Blicisius* could have the same relation to *Blicius* as *Calvisius* to *Calvius*; I have thus included *Blicisius* in the list below, accompanied by a questionmark.

²¹ On which see I. Kajanto, *Supernomina* (1967).

²² As for *Concordius*, cf. the material in Schulze (p. 148, 483, 525). *Constantius* is attested as the nomen of an *urbanicianus* from Nuceria who served from 197 to 218 (CIL VI 32526, a i 18). Note also e.g. *Praesentius*, a nomen of Etruscan origin (cf. Schulze 69 n. 4; 210 n. 6), which, however, could also be a cognomen derived from *praesens*.

Sabinus (AE 1977, 265B of AD 287) and *Strategius Musonianus* (*praefectus praetorio Orientis* in 354–358, PLRE I 611). Now in collecting material for the Repertorium I decided not to take into account these cases except when there were special reasons for considering the name ending in *-ius* as a nomen (and not as a cognomen followed by another cognomen). In the latter instance there was no reason at all to consider *Strategius* as a nomen (or at least as a name being used with the function of a nomen); *Strategius* was simply Musonianus' (first) cognomen.²³ On the other hand, the case is different with *Dulcitius Sabinus* in AE 1977, 265B; although the name *Dulcitius* cannot have existed as a nomen in the Republican period and in the earlier Empire, and clearly formally represents the late type of nomina in *-ius*, in this case it can be classified with some justification as a nomen, for the man Dulcitius Sabinus appears in a list of names where he is mentioned between Aurelius Augurius and Cassius Gelasius.²⁴ *Dulcitius* was thus used by its owner with a function for which his colleagues Augurius and Gelasius used the nomina *Aurelius* and *Cassius*, and so I think I was justified in registering *Dulcitius*, accompanied by a reference to the inscription mentioned above and (to exclude the possibility of being censured for my decision) by a question mark, in the Repertorium.

II. On the Relative Frequency of Roman Nomina

There exist calculations on the frequency of individual nomina, especially of the most frequently attested ones, for instance in the case of nomina found in provinces such as the Hispaniae and Gallia Narbonensis.²⁵ But there do not seem to exist calculations, or at least estimates, on the relative frequency of nomina in the Roman world. Of course we all know that *Arrius*, *Licinius*, *Valerius* and similar names are "common", whereas we

²³ In fact, we do know that the man was originally called *Strategius* (the nomen not being mentioned) and that he was called *Musonianus* by the emperor Constantine because of his erudition (Amm. 15, 13, 2).

²⁴ In the same text, *Gregorius*, appearing between *Maximius* and *Fan(i)us*, also seems to be used as a nomen.

²⁵ R. Syme, *Tacitus II* (1958) 784; R. C. Knapp, *AncSoc* 9 (1978) 211 (with an overview of the most common nomina in all volumes of CIL).

tend to think of names such as *Ligarius* or *Nasidienus* as being "rare", and one is accustomed to finding casual observations of this type on the frequency of nomina in many places, for example in commentaries on inscriptions with names appearing in them. However, I thought that it might be interesting and perhaps even useful to try to find out some concrete information on the relative frequency of nomina in the Roman world. Now since more than 12,000 nomina (or rather, more than 12,000 different forms of a somewhat smaller number of different nomina) are attested in the Roman world, of which hundreds, or perhaps even thousands, are attested only once, it would be impossible to list them all according to their frequency, but instead, one can try to do something about the more common ones, and this is exactly what I aim to do in this section. To do something like this, I could in theory count all the instances of nomina such as *Arrius*, *Licinius*, *Valerius* etc., in order to be able to produce a certain number of attestations of *Arrius* and to relate this number to (say) the number of *Licinii* and *Valerii*. However, to avoid having to spend years in doing something like this, I must use a cruder method. A long time ago, when I was collecting material for the *Repertorium*, I had the habit of making a note, on a provisional list of nomina, at each nomen whenever there was an attestation of this nomen in a collection of inscriptions or of other sources, the different collections (these including my own notebooks with information on texts appearing in publications without indices) being marked with separate numbers (for instance IGR IV = 100), and I have been going on with this since then. In practice this means that a glance at this list gives one a certain idea of the frequency of a nomen, for in the case of very common names which appear in all the big corpora and in numerous volumes of the *AE* and in other collections, the name is followed by a long list of marks. Now to achieve my aim of producing some information on the relative frequency of the more common nomina, I proceeded to count the number of marks attached to those nomina which had sixteen or more marks, and found out that altogether 575 nomina belonged to this category. Meanwhile, I had, at the same time, distributed these 575 nomina into different groups according to the number of marks. The groups are as follows:

A: 16–20 marks; **B:** 21–30 marks; **C:** 31–40 marks; **D:** 40–55 marks (distributed over one-and-a-half lines, there being about 30–35 marks per line); **E:** around two lines of marks (that would make around 55–80 marks); **F:** about two-and-a-half lines to three lines (this would produce around 80–

100 marks); **G**: between three and four lines (we are now somewhere between 100 and 120); **H**: four lines (120 or somewhat more marks); **I**: extremely common names on the frequency of which I have no information since I did not think it useful to make notes on nomina which can be found everywhere.

It is clear that this is indeed a most crude method, and my results cannot be treated as more than as vague indications of the relative frequency of the nomina appearing on the list. To point out some problems, an attestation of a nomen appearing in (say) not one, but two collections, will have two marks (e.g. one referring to a volume of AE, the other to a volume of Suppl. It.), a fact which obviously will distort the results, although, since this is a methodological problem affecting all nomina, this is perhaps not a very serious distortion inasmuch as we are talking here of relative rather than of absolute frequencies. On the other hand, it is true that some distortion is introduced by e.g. the fact that for some areas there are more epigraphical publications – each producing a new mark in my lists – than for others; for instance, there are numerous local publications in Spain, and so one could think that a nomen which is generally rare, but which has some Spanish attestations, would do better in my calculations than a nomen which in fact has about the same number of attestations, but in an area which is covered by a big corpus and not by additional local publications (one might here think of e.g. Africa). Again, fifty instances of a nomen in a major corpus (e.g. CIL VI or VIII) will produce just one mark, the same as one instance of a rare nomen in the same corpus (or in some other collection). This means that the number of marks cannot be used to calculate the number of individual attestations of a nomen; they simply indicate the number of collections in which a certain nomen can be found, and only this number is (as already said) the basis of the calculations which follow. On the other hand, the fact that a nomen appears once in fifty different collections of nomina perhaps tells us more of the frequency of the nomen in question than the fact that the nomen is found fifty times in one corpus (say, CIL VI or VIII) – but nowhere else.²⁶

²⁶ Of course I am not saying that the fact that a nomen is found exclusively or almost exclusively in one corpus only (which normally means that the nomen in question is attested in one city or area only) is without interest; in the case of Rome for instance this would probably in most cases point to the existence of a wealthy person of that name who had a large *familia*; in the case of provincial cities information of this kind can be

Before I present the list of nomina, let us have a look at what it means in practice if a nomen appears in one of the groups. Let us take *Abudius*, a nomen which appears in group A, this (as noted above) meaning that my notes say that this nomen is found in between 16 and 20 corpora or other collections of nomina. In practice this produces the following number of attestations:²⁷ PIR² A 17f.; Rome: 2 instances in CIL VI; Gabii: CIL XIV 2809; Aquileia: I. Aquileia 743. 2752. AE 1977, 725 = IMS VI 48; Parentium: CIL V 328. 329 = Inscr. It. X 2, 3. 4; Pola: CIL V 216 = Inscr. It. X 1, 177; brick stamps in this area: CIL V 8110, 34 cf. C. Zaccaria, AN 59 (1988) 325; AAAd 29 (1987) 514; Nemausus: Espérandieu, ILGN 438; Iader: CIL III 2938; Thessalonica: IG X 2, 1, 244. 259. 744; Demetrias: IG IX 2, 1162; Africa: BACTH 1914, 604 no. 29 (Ammaedara).

As for *Muttienus*, also in group A, this nomen is attested as follows: Rome: CIL VI 32515 e ii 24. V. Väänänen (ed.), *Le iscrizioni della necropoli dell'autoparco Vaticano* (1973) 87; Venusia: CIL IX 444/5. AE 1994, 469; Luceria: CIL IX 868. 869. 870. AE 1983, 239; Teanum Apulum: CIL IX 704. AE 1976, 154, 155; Veleia: CIL XI 1147, iv 93f., v 11 (*fundus Muttienianus*); Placentia: CIL XI 1216 (but this is a centurion of unknown origin); Interamna: CIL XI 4264; Ocrinum: CIL XI 7813; Pola: CIL V 8139 = Inscr. It. X 1, 85 (cf. F. Tassaux, in: *La città nell'Italia settentrionale in età romana* [1990] 93); Concordia: CIL V 1890; Patavium: CIL V 2999; Mediolanum: CIL V 6046; Senia in Dalmatia: ILJug. 2899; *vascula cretaea* from Dalmatia: CIL III 6434, 3. 10186, 15. 14031; Lete in Macedonia: Bull. épigr. 1953, 112; Dion: unpublished inscription of AD 36/37 seen by me in 1990.

used e.g. to establish the origin of (say) a senator with a rare nomen (for instance, one can assume that the two known senators with the nomen *Digitius* were from Paestum, since this nomen is hardly found outside Paestum (cf. O. Salomies, in: *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East* [ed. A.D. Rizakis, 1996] 118 with n. 37). On the other hand, it is true that, in the case of nomina such as *Atiarius* and *Eburenus*, of which there are many attestations, but from only one provincial city, Philippi in the case of *Atiarius*, Iconium in the case of *Eburenus*, one would very much prefer possible new attestations coming from somewhere else than from these two cities, for otherwise it will be impossible to trace the history of these two interesting nomina.

²⁷ I am here using material partly presented in the list of nomina in the article quoted in the preceding note, p. 118ff.

Let us also have a look at a nomen in group B (in 21–30 different publications), and let us choose *Cusonius*, which is attested as follows: Rome: CIL VI: 9 instances. CIL XV 6084; Nola: CIL X 1251; Nepes: CIL XI 3208; some city in *regio VIII* (Aemilia): Phlego, FGrHist 257 F 37; Aquileia: CIL V 909 = I. Aquileia 2854; Opitergium: CIL V 8786; Bellunum: CIL V 2057; Altinum: CIL V 2221; Ateste: CIL V 2663. 2575. Patavium: CIL V 2939; Tregnano in Venetia: NSA 1893, 131; Verona: CIL V 3310. NSA 1893, 13. Brixia: CIL VI 32520, A, 3; Anauni: Suppl. It. 6 Anauni 10; Arusnates: CIL V 3916. 3952; Arilica: CIL V 4011; Chalcis: IG XII 9, 916; Thessalonica: 8 instances in IG X 2, 1 and CIL VI 2679; Asia: I. Ephesos 1043. 1145. I. Kyme 42. Africa: CIL VIII 9376. AE 1939, 213 (a centurion of the legio III Augusta).

Appearing in group A thus in the case of *Abudius* and *Muttienus* means that the real number of attestations of the name is around or somewhat more than 20; in the case of *Cusonius*, belonging to group B in practice means around 40 attestations of the name. Obviously things can be very different in the case of other nomina belonging to these groups (for instance if there is a strikingly high number of attestations of a nomen in only one corpus); but the examples presented above may perhaps be taken to indicate roughly what one can expect of the number of real attestations of nomina belonging to groups A and B, this perhaps giving an idea of the frequency of nomina belonging to the other groups, and in any case I am talking here about relative rather than absolute frequencies. Let us then go on to the enumeration of the nomina belonging to the different groups. Nomina not appearing in the following lists have a smaller number of attestations.

Group A: Nomina in 16–20 different collections, publications etc.

Abidius – Abudius – Aedius – Aetrius – Aius – Alfenus – Alleius – Allienus – Ancharenus – Anius – Apicius – Apidius – Appaeus – Argentarius – Arrenius – Asellius – Atanius – Babbius – Badius – Bellicius – Betilienus – Birrius – Blassius – Caesellius – Caesidius – Caesilius – Calavius – Caprius – Careius – Caristianus – Caulius – Ceius – Celerius – Cispus – Cluentius – Cossinius – Dasimius (cf. *Dasumius* B) – Decidius – Decrius – Dellius – Dexius – Dindius – Etrilius – Fictorius – Fufidius – Horatius – Hosidius – Laetorius – Lappius – Lorentius – Maecenas – Maelius – Maenius – Manneius – Matius – Maximius – Mescinius – Mundicius – Murcius – Murdius – Mutilius – Mutius (cf. *Muttius*) – Muttienus – Muttius (cf. *Mutius*) – Nasidius – Nassius – Nevius – Ninnius – Obulcius – Ocratius – Ogulnius – Ostorius – Ovinus – Pedanius – Pedius – Perperna – Plutius – Procilius – Publius – Racilius – Ragonius – Rocius – Rufinius – Salaris – Saturius – Secundinius – Secundius – Sedatius – Sellius – Servaeus

– Sestullius – Suellius – Sutorius – Tarquitiu(s) – Tiberius – Tillius – Titacius – Tossius – Turellius – Tutilius – Urgulanius – Utius – Varenius (cf. *Varenus* B) – Varinius – Vehilius – Velius – Ventidius – Verius – Vettidius – Vibidius – Viccius – Vicirius – Vicrius – Vilius – Virrius – Vitorius – Voltilius.

Group B: Nomina in 21–30 different collections, publications etc.

Aburius – Aconius – Aeficius – Afinius – Albanus – Albinus – Albucius – Alfidius – Allidius – Amatius – Ambivius – Ammius – Ampius – Anneius – Anteius – Arius – Atellius – Atius – Atrius – Aufustius – Aulius – Aurelianus – Autronius – Avonius – Axius – Baburius – Barbatius – Bassius – Bellius – Bennius – Betutius – Blaesius – Blossius – Caetronius – Camerius – Camil(l)ius – Campanius – Cantius – Carisius – Cartilius – Catinius – Ceionius – Cerrinius – Cippius – Considius – Consius – Coponius – Cornificius – Cottius – Crepereius – Crispus – Critonius – Curiatius – Cusinius – Cusonius – Cuspis – Dasumius – Decumius – Egrilius – Equitius – Erucius – Faltonius – Fanius (cf. *Fannius* D) – Favonius – Folius – Fundanius – Galerius – Gallius – Genucius – Gessius – Graecinius – Haterius – Helvidius – Herius – Hirrius – Hostius – Laecanius – Laetilius – Laevius – Lanius – Lartidius – Lartius – Lepidius – Liburnius – Longinius – Lucanius – Luscius – Maecilius – Maesius – Magnius – Mamius – Mammius – Manius – Martius – Mattius – Minatius – Minius – Mulvius – Murrius – Mussius – Nasennius – Neratius – Nerius – Numitorius – Nunnius – Obellius – Occius – Orfius – Ovius – Pactumeius – Pacuvius – Papinius – Paquius – Patulcius – Peducaeus – Perel(l)ius – Pinnius – Planius – Plinius – Pollius – Poppaeus – Proculeius – Propertius – Raecius – Raius – Rasinius – Renni(s)us – Saenius – Safinius – Salluvius – Salonius – Samiarius – Septicius – Servius – Severius – Seuius – Silicius – Silvius – Sittius – Sosius (cf. *Sossius* C) – Spurius – Staberius – Tampius – Tan(n)onius – Tatius – Tedi(s)us – Tertius – Timinius – Tineius – Titurius – Trebellius – Trosius – Turius – Tutorius – Umbricius – Umbrius – Ummidius – Ursius – Valgius – Vallius – Varenus (cf. *Varenus* A) – Varronius – Vaternius – Vecilius – Veius – Velleius – Venidius – Vennonius – Venuleius – Verginius – Vetilius – Vetius (cf. *Vettius* H) – Vettienus – Victorius – Vinius – Vivius – Volcacius – Volussius (cf. *Volusius* E).

Group C: Nomina in 31–40 different collections, publications etc.

Accius – Agrius – Ancharius – Artorius – Ateius – Audius – Avianus – Avius – Babullius – Barbius – Caedicius – Caerellius – Caesennius – Caesernius – Calidius – Calvius – Camurius – Canius – Carminius – Carvilius – Cascel(l)ius – Catil(l)ius – Cattius – Cervius – Cestius – Cincius – Cordius – Curius – Decimius – Epidius – Eppius – Faenius – Flaminius – Flavonius – Florius – Fulcinius – Gargilius – Grattius – Heius – Hordeonius/Hordionius – Hortensius – Insteius – Latinius – Luccius – Maius – Malius – Mestrius – Metilius – Mummius – Norbanus – Novellius – Nummius – Oclatius (with *Oculatius* D) – Ofellius – Ofillius (with *Ofilius* D) – Olius – Orbius – Pacilius – Pescennius – Peticius – Pinarius – Plaetorius – Plancius – Poblucius – Pullius – Pupius – Quinctius – Romanus – Roscius – Rufrius – Rupilius – Rustius – Sabidius – Sabinius – Saufeius – Scantius – Seppius – Sestius – Sicinius – Sossius (cf. *Sossius* B) – Spedius –

Staius – Stertinius – Veranius – Verrius – Vibullius – Villius – Vinicius – Vipsanius – Visellius.

Group D: Nomina in approximately 40–55 different collections, publications etc.

Afranius – Aninius – Antestius (cf. *Antistius* G) – Antius – Appius – Apronius – Arellius – Atinius – Caesonius – Calventius – Calvisius – Cadius – Clodius – Cluvius – Cosconius – Fonteius – Fuficius – Fufius – Gabinius – Lucius – Lurius – Lusius – Lutatius – Mallius (cf. *Malius* C) – Mamilius – Manilius – Mevius – Mindius – Modius – Numerius – Paconius – Plautius – Publilius – Quintius (cf. *Quinctius* C) – Rufius – Sallustius – Sertorius – Stlaccius – Silius – Tadius – Trebonius – Tuccius – Turpilius – Veratius – Vergilius – Virius – Vitellius – Voconius – Volumnius.

Group E: Nomina in approximately 55–80 different collections, publications etc.

Acutius – Aebutius – Albius – Anicius – Annaeus – Aponius – Bruttius – Caecina – Caninius – Cocceius – Cossutius – Curtius – Decius – Didius – Ennius – Fadius – Fannius – Firmius – Hostilius – Iuventius – Laberius – Larcius – Lucceius – Maecius – Magius – Manlius – Messius – Mettius – Minicius – Novius – Numisius – Papirius – Papius – Petil(l)ius – Porcius – Postumius – Publicius (cf. *Poblicius* C) – Rubrius – Satrius – Scribonius – Sentius – Septimius/Septumius – Sergius – Sextilius – Sextius – (Sosius + Sossius) – Tettius – Titinius – Trebius – Turranius – Vedius – Volusius (cf. *Volussius* B).

Group F: Nomina in approximately 80–100 different collections, publications etc.

Alfius – Allius – Aquil(l)ius – Arrius – Arruntius – Asinius – Atilius – Avidius – Avil(l)ius – Caecilius – Caelius – Caesius – Calpurnius – Castricius – Coelius – Cominius – Fabius – Fabricius – Fulvius – Furius – Gavius – Gellius – Geminus – Granus – Helvius – Laelius – Livius – Lollius – Lucilius – Lucretius – (Malius C + Mallius D) – Marcius – Mucius – Munatius – Naevius – Nonius – Oppius – Otacilius – Paccius – Plotius Pontius – (Quinctius C + Quintius D) – Rutilius – Salvius – Seius – Servilius – Statilius – Staius – Sulpicius – Titius – Tullius – Varius – Veturius – (Volusius E + Volussius B).

Group G: Nomina in approximately 100–120 different collections, publications etc.

Acilius – Antistius – Ap(p)uleius – Baebius – Cassius – Egnatius (with *Ignatius*) – Memmius – Pomponius – Popil(l)ius – Sempronius – Terentius – Vettius.

Group H: Nomina in approximately 120–140 different collections, publications etc.

Attius – Aufidius – Herennius – Marius – Octavius – Petronius – Vibius.

Group I: Nomina appearing about everywhere

Aelius – Aemilius – Annius – Antonius – Aurelius – Claudius – Cornelius – Domitius – Flavius – Iulius – Iunius – Licin(n)ius – Ulpus (this nomen probably belongs to some other group, but I have no information on the number of attestations of Ulpus) – Valerius.

Index of the nomina in groups A–I:

Abidius A – Abudius A – Aburius B – Accius C – Acilius G – Aconius B – Acutius E – Aebutius E – Aedius A – Aeficius B – Aelius I – Aemilius I – Aetrius A – Afinius B – Afranius D – Agrius C – Aius A – Albanus B – Albinus B – Albius E – Albucius B – Alfenus A – Alfidius B – Alfius F – Alleius A – Allidius B – Allienus A – Allius F – Amatius B – Ambivius B – Ammius B – Ampius B – Ancharenus A – Ancharius C – Anicius E – Aninius D – Anius A – Annaeus E – Anneius B – Annius I – Anteius B – Antestius D – Antistius G – Antius D – Antonius I – Apicius A – Apidius A – Aponius E – Appaeus A – Appius D – Ap(p)uleius G – Apronius D – Aquil(l)ius F – Arellius D – Argentarius A – Arius B – Arrenius A – Arrius F – Arruntius F – Artorius C – Asellius A – Asinius F – Atanius A – Ateius C – Atellius B – Atilius F – Atinius D – Atius B – Atrius B – Attius H – Audius C – Aufidius H – Aufustius B – Aulius B – Aurelianus B – Autronius B – Avianus C – Avidius F – Avil(l)ius F – Avius C – Avonius B – Axius B – Babbius A – Babullius C – Baburius B – Badius A – Baebius G – Barbatius B – Barbis C – Bassius B – Bellicius A – Bellius B – Bennius B – Betilienus A – Betutius B – Birrius A – Blaesius B – Blassius A – Blossius B – Bruttius E – Caecilius H – Caecina E – Caedicius C – Caelius F – Caerellius C – Caesellius A – Caesennius C – Caesernius C – Caesidius A – Caesilius A – Caesius F – Caesonius D – Caetronius B – Calavius A – Calidius C – Calpurnius F – Calventius D – Calvisius D – Calvius C – Camerius B – Camil(l)ius B – Campanius B – Camurius C – Caninius E – Canius C – Cantius B – Caprius A – Careius A – Carisius B – Caristianus A – Carminius C – Cartilius B – Carvilius C – Cascel(l)ius C – Cassius G – Castricius F – Catil(l)ius C – Catinius B – Catus D – Cattius C – Caulius A – Ceionius B – Ceius A – Celerius A – Cerrinius B – Cervius C – Cestius C – Cincius C – Cippius B – Cispus A – Claudius I – Cluentius A – Clodius D – Cluvius D – Cocceius E – Coelius F – Cominius F – Considius B – Consius B – Coponius B – Cordius C – Cornelius I – Cornificius B – Cosconius D – Cossinius A – Cossutius E – Cottius B – Crepereius B – Crispus B – Critonius B – Curiatius B – Curius C – Curtius F – Cusinius B – Cusonius B – Cuspis B – Dasimius A – Dasumius B – Decidius A – Decimius C – Decius E – Decrius A – Decumius B – Dellius A – Dexius A – Didius E – Dindius A – Domitius I – Egnatius (with *Ignatius*) G – Egrilius B – Ennius E – Epidius C – Eppius C – Equitius B – Erucius B – Etrilius A – Fabricius F – Fabius F – Fadius E – Faenius C – Faltonius B – Fanius B – Fannius E – Favonius B – Fictorius A – Firmius E – Flaminius C – Flavius I – Flavonius C – Florius C – Folius B – Fonteius D – Fuficius D – Fufidius A – Fufius D – Fulcinius C – Fulvius F – Fundanius B – Furius F – Gabinius D – Galerius B – Gallius B – Gargilius C – Gavius F – Gellius F

– Geminus F – Genucius B – Gessius B – Graecinius B – Granus F – Grattius C –
 Haterius B – Heius C – Helvidius B – Helvius H – Herennius H – Herius B – Hirrius B –
 Horatius A – Hordeonius/Hordionius C – Hortensius C – Hosidius A – Hostilius E –
 Hostius B – Insteius C – Iulius I – Iunius I – Iuventius E – Laberius E – Laecanius B –
 Laelius F – Laetilius B – Laetorius A – Laevius B – Lanius B – Lappius A – Larcius E –
 Lartidius B – Lartius B – Latinius C – Lepidius B – Liburnius B – Licin(n)ius I – Livius
 F – Lollius F – Longinius B – Lorentius A – Lucanius B – Lucceius E – Luccius C –
 Lucilius F – Lucius D – Lucretius F – Lurius D – Luscius B – Lusius D – Lutatius D –
 Maecenas A – Maecilius B – Maecius F – Maelius A – Maenius A – Maesius B – Magius
 E – Magnus B – Maius C – Malius C – Mallius D – Mamilius D – Mamius B –
 Mammius B – Manilius D – Manius B – Manlius E – Manneius A – Marcius F – Marius
 H – Martius B – Matius A – Mattius B – Maximus A – Memmius G – Mescinius A –
 Messius E – Mestrius C – Metilius C – Mettius E – Mevius D – Minatius B – Mindius D
 – Minicius E – Minius B – Modius D – Mucius G – Mulvius B – Mummius C –
 Munatius F – Mundicius A – Murcius A – Murdius A – Murrius B – Mussius B –
 Mutilius A – Mutius A – Muttienus A – Muttius A – Naevius F – Nasennius B –
 Nasidius A – Nassius A – Neratius B – Nerius B – Nevius A – Ninnius A – Nonius F –
 Norbanus C – Novellius C – Novius E – Numerius D – Numisius E – Numitorius B –
 Nummius C – Nunnius B – Obellius B – Obulcius A – Occius B – Oclatius C – Ocratius
 A – Octavius K – Ofellius C – Ofillius C – Ogulnius A – Olius C – Oppius F – Orbius C
 – Orfius B – Ostorius A – Otacilius F – Ovinus A – Ovius B – Paccius F – Pacilius C –
 Paconius D – Pactumeius B – Pacuvius B – Papinius B – Papius F – Papius E – Paquius
 B – Patulcius B – Pedanius A – Pedius A – Peducaeus B – Perel(l)ius B – Perperna A –
 Pescennius C – Peticius C – Petil(l)ius E – Petronius H – Pinarius C – Pinnius B –
 Plaetorius C – Plancius C – Planius B – Plautius D – Plinius B – Plotius F – Plutius A –
 Poblicius C – Pollius B – Pomponius G – Pontius F – Popil(l)ius G – Poppaeus B –
 Porcius E – Postumius E – Procilius A – Proculcius B – Propertius B – Publicius E –
 Publilius D – Publius A – Pullius C – Pupius C – Quinctius C – Quintus D – Racilius A
 – Raecius B – Ragonius A – Raius B – Rasinius B – Rennius B – Rocius A – Romanus
 C – Roscius C – Rubrius E – Rufinius A – Rufius D – Rufrius C – Rupilius C – Rustius
 C – Rutilius F – Sabidius C – Sabinius C – Saenius B – Safinius B – Salaris A –
 Sallustius D – Salluvius B – Salonius B – Salvius F – Samiarius B – Satrius E – Satrius
 A – Saufeius C – Scantius C – Scribonius E – Secundinius A – Secundius A – Sedatius A
 – Seius F – Sellius A – Sempronius G – Sentius E – Seppius C – Septicius B – Septimius
 E – Sergius E – Sertorius D – Servaeus A – Servilius F – Servius B – Sestius C –
 Sestullius A – Severus – Sevius B – Sextilius E – Sextius E – Sicinius C – Silicius B –
 Silius D – Silvius B – Sittius B – Sosius B – Sossius C – Spedius C – Spurius B –
 Staberius B – Staius C – Statilius F – Stadius F – Stertinius C – Stlaccius D – Suellius A –
 Sulpicius F – Sutorius A – Tadius D – Tampius B – Tan(n)onius B – Tarquinius A –
 Tadius B – Tadius B – Terentius I – Tertius B – Tettius E – Tiberius A – Tillius A –
 Timinius B – Tineius B – Titacius A – Titinius E – Titius F – Titurius B – Tossius A –
 Trebellius B – Trebius E – Trebonius D – Trosius B – Tuccius D – Tullius F – Turellius
 A – Turius B – Turpilius D – Turranius E – Tutilius A – Tutorius B – Ulpianus I –
 Umbricius B – Umbrius B – Ummidius B – Urgulanius A – Ursius B – Utius A –
 Valerius I – Valgius B – Vallius B – Varenus A – Varenus B – Varinius A – Varius F –
 Varronius B – Vaternius B – Vecilius B – Vedius E – Vehilius A – Veius B – Velius A –
 Velleius B – Venidius B – Vennonius B – Ventidius A – Venuleius B – Veranius C –
 Veratius D – Vergilius D – Verginius B – Verius A – Verrius C – Vetilius B – Vetius B –

Vettidius A – Vettienus B – Vettius G – Veturius F – Vibidius A – Vibius H – Vibullius C – Viccius A – Vicirius A – Vicrius A – Victorius B – Vilius A – Villius C – Vinicius C – Vinius B – Vipsanius C – Virius D – Virrius A – Visellius C – Vitellius D – Vitorius A – Vivius B – Voconius D – Volcacius B – Voltilius A – Volumnius D – Volusius E – Volussius B.

III. Nomina Missing in, and to be Deleted from, the Second Edition of *Repertorium Nominum Gentilium et Cognominum Latinorum*

Nomina shown to be non-existent, to be deleted from the *Repertorium*. Reference is made to the publication in which the original mistaken reading of the name is corrected.

Avilienus MGR 18 (1994) 276 no. 99 (the correct reading is *Aulienus*)

Catalus (in VI 3897 = 32703) the correct reading is *Catalius*, with a ligature of the *l* and the *i* (autopsy of the inscription, in the American Academy at Rome)

Concius (allegedly in ICVR 1567) ICVR 23874 (the correct reading is *Congius*)

Elusius (allegedly in CIL X 4119) H. Solin, *Arctos* 19 (1985) 162 = id., *Analecta epigraphica* 1970–1997 (1998) 225

Felutius the correct reading in CIL X 5470 is *Tellutius* (M. Kajava, in: H. Solin [ed.], *Studi storico-epigrafici sul Lazio antico* [AIRF 15, 1996] 196f. no. 28)

Flan- cf. below

Gampulaeus AE 1995, 372

Gerraeus M.-F. Baslez, in: A.D. Rizakis (ed.), *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East* (*Meletemata* 21, 1996) 218 n. 12

Hurunius CIE 5801; CIL XI 7401

Metronius SEG XLII 817

Pedo AE 1995, 1055

Pollacaspenus M. Kajava, *Roman Female Praenomina* (1994) 53

Quintienus (allegedly in CIL V 5598, adduced by Schulze on p. 55) F. Cantarelli, *Catalogo del lapidario dei musei civici di Varese* (1996) 12–19 no. 3 (the correct reading is *C. Quinti Cn. f. / Quintiani / etc.*)

Roncarius Suppl. It. 13 Pedona 7

Subicius Inscr. It. X 1, 269 (but cf. AE 1991, 1076 from Hispania Citerior)

Ustilius (derived from a cognomen read mistakenly as *Ustilianus*) G. Camodeca, in: *Ercolano 1738–1988. 250 anni di ricerca archeologica* (1993) 524

Vetto AE 1995, 1055

Volonius (attested in CIL VI 29467) H. Solin, *Arctos* 29 1995 177 = *Analecta epigraphica* (1998) 382 (the correct form is *Vilonius*)

Nomina missing in the second edition of the *Repertorium*:

Acidilius AE 1994, 1216 (Aquitania) (perhaps not to be interpreted as a nomen)

Adsidius Ulp. dig. 48, 19, 5 pr.

- Aelliu[s]** CIL II² / 7, 1007
- Aeschinius** (cf. Aescinius) in *fundus Aeschinianus* CIL XI 1147 v 39
- Aescinius** in *fundus Aescinianus* CIL VI 10242 = ILS 7861 (Rome)
- Alitenu** S. Panciera, *Arctos* 32 (1998) 154
- Ambavius** AE 1992, 984 (Hispania Citerior)
- Anneaues** F. Cappelli, *Picus* 16–17 (1996–97) 234f. (Asculum Picenum; perhaps a mistake for *Annaeus*)
- Annosius** HEP. 5 (1995) 941 (an inscription now in Tarragona)
- Annusidius** (cf. *Annisidius*) A.D. Rizakis, *Achaie II. La cité de Patras. Épigraphie et histoire* (Meletemata 25, 1998) 136
- Apanicus** HEP. 4 (1994) 585 (Hispania Citerior)
- Apstidius** AE 1993, 573 (between Praeneste and Carsioli)
- Argennius** J. Bodet & S. Tracy, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the USA* (1997) p. 60 (a soldier from Mediolanum)
- Arictecius** (?) BACTH 1905, 372 n. 4 (Uppenna, Africa)
- Artue(ius?)** M. Mello, *Paestum romana* (1974) 19f.
- Asonilo** (?) AE 1995, 640 (Ruginello east of Milan)
- Baebirius** see *Bebirius*
- Βαιτέννιος** I. Prusa ad Ol. II 1039
- Barbulius** AE 1994, 469 (on a brick stamp in the museum of Venosa)
- Bebirius** J. Bodet & S. Tracy, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the USA* (1997) p. 85 (Puteoli; reading of the nomen by H. Solin)
- Blicisius** (?) CIL VI 37213 (cf. above n. 20).
- Bofonius** (or perhaps rather *Bufonius*) attested as Βοφονι(ν) (acc.) in an Oscan *defixio* from Lucania (G. Pugliese Carratelli, in: *Laos II. La tomba a camera di Marcellina* (E. Greco & P.G. Guzzo, eds., 1992) 17ff., cf. E. Campanile, *SE* 58 (1992) 371ff.)
- Bombilius** BACTH 1921, ccxlix n. 9 (Sitifis)
- Bufonius** (?) cf. *Bofonius*
- Caeselius** (cf. *Caesellius*, and *Ceselius*, below) CIL VI 13930; CIL VI 1485* cf. H. Solin, *Festschrift H. Chantraine* (1993) 343; P. Palazzo, in: *Les élites municipales de l'Italie péninsulaire des Gracques à Néron* (1996) 48 (amphora from Brundisium)
- Caesianius** VI 1488* cf. H. Solin, in: *Festschr. H. Chantraine* (1993) 344
- Calcidius** (cf. *Calchidius*) BACTH 1907, cxcix n. 2 (Aïn-Teffaha in Africa)
- Caltonius** inferred from the cognomen *Caltonianus* CIL VIII 18020, 3
- Campuleius** CIL X 8340 cf. AE 1995, 372; AE 1995, 376 (Potentia in Lucania); the cognomen *Campuleianus* AE 1994, 457 (Monticchio near Venusia)
- Καπιτωνιανός** SEG XXXIV 718 = IGBulg. 5904 (Parthicopolis)
- Carbo** M. Christol & Th. Drew-Bear, in: G. Paci (ed.), *Epigrafia romana in area adriatica* (Ichnia 2, Macerata 1998) 321 no. 7 (Antiochia Pisidiae)
- Ceselius** (= *Caeselius*) AE 1994, 520 (Vibinum)
- Cirius** AE 1995, 1068 (Nemausus; cf. *Cirrius*)
- Cittius** S. Gsell, *Recherches archéologiques en Algérie* (1893) 166 no. 167, 169 (Sitifis)
- Κλωδιανός[ς]** R. Herzog, *Koische Forschungen und Funde* (1899) 78 no. 65
- Cocleius** BACTH 1906, 212 (Thamugadi)
- Coffius** AE 1994, 517 (Vibinum; attested as a cognomen, but perhaps originally a nomen)

- Κωμέδιος** (?) AE 1941, 301 = SEG XXIV 953 = M.A. López Jimeno, *Las tabellae defixionis de la Sicilia griega* (1991) no. 20 = J.B. Curbera, *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997) 220 (Lilybaeum)
- Commun[ius]** BACTH 1909, clxxxvi no. 4 (Karthago)
- Creminus** (?) (a nomen?) AE 1993, 1165 (on an amphora from Baetica)
- Crippius** AE 1995, 1681 (Theveste)
- Cudius** (?) BACTH 1909, ccxxxv (Thysdrus)
- Cumarenus** AE 1992, 1382 (Iader)
- Curilius** Suppl. It. 15 Ateste 88
- Denatius** (?) CIL II² / 7, 250 (Corduba; Stylow proposes *Denctatius*)
- Docquirius** CIL II² / 7, 280 (Corduba)
- Ebatienus** Bollettino d'Arte 18 (1983) 84 (Rome?)
- Egusius** Suppl. It. 15 Ateste 93
- Epaticcius** AE 1995, 1064 (Nemausus)
- Ἐπτάνι(ο)ς** (or Ἐπτάν-) P. Cabanes & F. Drini, *Inscriptions d'Épidamne-Dyrrachion* (1995) 146
- Etruscus** Epigraphica 23 (1961) 35 (Canale Monterano in S. Etruria); AE 1991, 1695 (Numidia)
- Evolius** (?) AE 1994, 295 (Rome)
- Fadianus** BACTH 1901, 109 (Bougie in Africa)
- Farro** AE 1991, 1271 (a centurion in Germania Superior)
- Farusaenus** AE 1994, 585 (Asisium), with the emendation suggested by M. Kajava
- Ficul(-)** *Ricognizioni archeologiche* 4 (1989) 17 (*anulus fictilis* from Signia)
- Flanius** Inscr. It. X 1, 374; AE 1995, 552 (Pola)
- Furent(ius?)** AE 1993, 1103 (on an amphora from Africa)
- Fuxa[...]** BACTH 1918, 146f. n. 1, line 4 (Karthago, a soldier)
- Ganicus** inferred from the cognomen *Ganiciana* Inscr. It. X 5, 1080 (Brixia)
- Gavoleius** M. Silvestrini, *MEFRA* 109 (1997) 10 (ager Beneventanus)
- Gelasin(ius?)** BACTH 1904, 206 no. 35 (Lambaesis, a soldier)
- Getul[...]** Z. Benzina Ben Abdallah, *Ant. Afr.* 32 (1996) 123 no. 23 (in the Bardo Museum)
- Geusi(us)** AE 1993, 1286 (Poetovio)
- Grunius** BACTH 1904, 206 no. 35 (Lambaesis, a soldier)
- Heptanius** (?) cf. Ἐπτάνι(ο)ς
- Insidius** AE 1993, 593 (Asculum Picenum)
- Iphronius** (?) AE 1995, 1720 (Theveste)
- Isucius** A. Pelletier, *ZPE* 119 (1997) 209 no. 1 (Vienna [?])
- Iurdan[-]** B.E. Thomasson, *A Survey of Greek and Latin inscriptions on Stone in Swedish Collections* (1997) 152 (of unknown origin)
- Iustulenus** AE 1994, 859d (Emerita)
- Labennius** (or *L. Abenn-*?) AE 1991, 1667 (Dougga)
- Λάμπιος** M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (1993) 214 no. EV 171
- Lepthinius** (?) AE 1992, 1805 (Civitas Chul, Africa)
- Lollidius** CIL II² / 7, 340 (Corduba)
- Lucilianus** CIL V 635* = F. Resnati, in: *Notizie del Chostro Maggiore (Rassegna di studi del civico museo archeologico e del civico gabinetto numismatico di Milano)* 1995, fasc. lv–lvi, 70 no. 67 (Magonza east of Milan)

- Μαδίλιος** P. Cabanes & F. Drini, *Inscriptions d'Épidamne-Dyrrachion* (1995) 297 (Μαδίνα Πωμετείνα the eds., but *Madilia* seems to be the correct reading)
- Maiarius** CIL VI 13770 (attested as a cognomen but probably to be interpreted as a nomen; cf. [-]aiarius BCH 47 [1923] 88 no. 7 from Philippi)
- Malonius** (?) (cf. *Mallonius*) HeEp. 4 (1994) 1071 (Lusitania)
- Mamullius** AE 1991, 1033 (Jerez de la Frontera not far from Gades)
- Mannaeus** M. Christol & Th. Drew-Bear, in: G. Paci (ed.), *Epigrafia romana in area adriatica* (Ichnia 2, Macerata 1998) 329ff. no. 10 (Antiochia Pisidiae, a centurion)
- Masenius** (or *Masenus*) G. Lettich, *Iscrizioni lat. di Iulia Concordia* (1994) 83
- Masenus** (or *Masenius*) cf. *Masenius*
- Maxum[ius]** (written as *Maxsum-*; cf. *Maximius*) AE 1993, 957 (Lusitania)
- Medulius** AE 1992, 1388 (Iader)
- Megenatius** unpublished inscription from Abellinum (A. Simonelli, *Arch. Class.* 47 [1995] 155)
- Menigius** AE 1994, 858a (Emerita)
- Methonius** AE 1991, 662 (a semi-Etruscan text in Arretium but perhaps from Clusium)
- Mithrius** AE 1995, 1657 (Pagus Mercurialis near Uthina, Africa)
- Mitonius** (?) A. Lozano Velilla, *Die griechischen Personennamen auf der iberischen Halbinsel* (1998) 75 (Emerita)
- Μούφιος** P. Cabanes & F. Drini, *Inscriptions d'Épidamne-Dyrrachion* (1995) 292
- Muricius** (cf. *Murricius*) HEp. 3 (1993) 489 (Lusitania)
- Μουσηνός** (cf. *Mussenus*) ICVR 15755 cf. H. Solin, *Arctos* 30 (1996) 245 = *Analecta epigraphica* (1998) 390
- Narcisius** A. Lozano Velilla, *Die griechischen Personennamen auf der iberischen Halbinsel* (1998) 138
- Nerca[-]** CIL I² 2668 = *Suppl. It.* 15 Ateste 140
- Nevvius** G. Mennella, in: *Studi in onore di A. Garzetti* (1996) 260f. (Augusta Bagiennorum)
- Νωναρηνός** P. Cabanes & F. Drini, *Inscriptions d'Épidamne-Dyrrachion* (1995) 146
- Nympsius** unpublished inscription in the Naples Museum (observed by H. Solin)
- Ὀπήνιος** AE 1995, 1382 (Beroea)
- Oponius** (cf. *Opponius*) *Iscrizioni greche e latine del Foro Romano e del Palatino* (Tituli 7, 1996) 291 no. 123
- Ovinucianus** (?) AE 1992, 1286 (Germania Superior)
- Paronius** G. Paci & R. Rossi, *Picus* 16–17 (1996–97) 176 (ager Asculanus)
- Patulicius** J. Bodel & S. Tracy, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the USA* (1997) p. 61 (perhaps from somewhere in Central Italy)
- Pepanius** *Bollettino d'Arte* 18 (1983) 84 (Rome?)
- PESTINA** (?) see *Pestinia*
- Pestinia** fem. *Arch. Class.* 9 (1957) 86, cf. N. Terrenato, *JRS* 88 (1998) 102 (Volaterrae)
- PESTINIUS** (?) see *Pestinia*
- Pholius** (cf. *Folius*) unpublished inscription in the Naples Museum (reported by H. Solin)
- Pilionius** *Suppl. It.* 13 Nursia 84 (attested as a cognomen, but perhaps originally a nomen)
- Piontius** AE 1995, 668 (Mediolanum)
- Pipponicus** AE 1995, 576 (Iulium Carnicum)
- Πλαυτιανός** P.M. Nigdelis, *Klio* 77 (1995) 172, cf. 173 (Beroea)

- Plexsena** (cf. *Plexina*) HEp. 5 (1995) 900 (Villazán [prov. de Zamora], Hispania Citerior)
- Plexena** cf. *Plexsena*
- Plotus** (*sic?*) Mevania. Da centro umbro a municipio romano (1991) 80 no. 2.111
- Ποντιλῖνος** D. Berges, Rundaltäre aus Kos und Rhodos (1996) 114 no. 18 (Kos)
- Provincialis** CIL II 5559 = AE 1994, 940 (perhaps *p(rovinciae) l(ibertus)*, Lusitania; delete the reference to CIL II 5559 under *Provincius*)
- Puccius** A. Lozano Velilla, Die griechischen Personennamen auf der iberischen Halbinsel (1998) 199 (Emerita)
- Pulaienus** CIL VIII 26402
- Pullanus** CIL VIII 12578
- Κυρίτιος** (= *Quiritius?*) E. Schwertheim, Asia Minor Studien 22 (1996) 117 no. 22 (Troas)
- Raniliu[s]** Z. Benzina Ben Abdallah – R. Sanna, in: M. Khanoussi & A. Mastino (eds.), Uchi Maius 1 (1997) 296f. no. 14
- Rasnus** AE 1995, 464. 466 (Asisium, = *Rasinus*)
- Rasticius** AE 1991, 1008 (Baetica)
- Resinius** AE 1994, 1236 (Augusta Treverorum)
- Resinna** AE 1993, 652 (Rusellae)
- Roucarius** Suppl. It. 13 Pedona 7
- Ruficanus** (cf. *Ruficanus*) Suppl. It. 13 Septempeda 5
- Rufillius** Suppl. It. 13 Pedona 2
- Runcanus** (?) AE 1991, 1077 (Isturgi, Hispania Citerior)
- Safenius** (?) CIL X 3626
- Sahelicius** (?) CIL II 2289 = II² / 7, 488
- Salassus** (?) A.M. Burnett – M. Amandry – P.P. Ripollès, Roman Provincial Coinage (1994) no. 660 (Agrigentum)
- Salfenius** Z. Ben Abdallah & Y. Le Bohec, MEFRA 109 (1997) 48 no. 2d (Ammaedara; attested as a cognomen but probably originally a nomen)
- Santius** AE 1994, 1291 (potter in Vidy near Lousonna)
- Scrofarius** (?) (a nomen?) AE 1993, 574 (between Praeneste and Carsioli)
- Seppidius** (?) CIL II 3940 = II² 14, 533 (Saguntum; transmitted form *Seppidus*)
- Seranus** (cf. *Serranus*) A.M. Burnett – M. Amandry – P.P. Ripollès, Roman Provincial Coinage (1994) no. 410 (Turiaso, Hispania Citerior)
- Sescinius** AE 1994, 703 (Tarvisium)
- Sestus** AE 1995, 507 (Statonia)
- Setidien[us]** M. Buonocore, Epigraphica 59 (1997) 258 no. 13 (Alba Fucens)
- Severienus** A. De Giuli, BSPN 67 (1976) 61–5 = G. Mennella, in: A.F. Bellezza (ed.), Un incontro con la storia nel centenario della nascita di Luca de Regibus 1895–1995. Atti del pomeriggio di studio a Vogogna d'Ossola (Genova 1996) 94 (Pallanza on the Lago maggiore)
- Siculeius** to be inferred from the cognomen *Siculeianus* CIL V 8110, 34; AE 1995, 546 (on brick stamps from the area of Aquileia)
- Stadius** Z. Benzina Ben Abdallah, Ant. Afr. 32 (1996) 131f. no. 44 (in the Bardo Museum)
- Sufitius** CIL III 514 = A.D. Rizakis, Achaie II. La cité de Patras. Épigraphie et histoire (Meletemata 25, 1998) 141 (thus the reading of the *nomen* in the ms. copy; emended to *Sulpicius* by Mommsen and Rizakis)

- Supidius** G. Asdrubali Pentiti, *Epigraphica* 58 (1996) 171f. no. 3 (Ameria)
- Syllatius** (cf. *Sullatius*) J. Bodel & S. Tracy, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the USA* (1997) p. 203 (Rome)
- Tartarius** CIL VI 14731; AE 1995, 178 (Rome)
- Tarulleius** BACTH 1911, cxcvi (Sfax in Tunisia)
- Tegedius** Cod. Mus. Flor. 7, 1 f. 30' (Rome?) (Information due to H. Solin)
- Teresius** AE 1992, 1382 (Iader)
- Transilius** AE 1995, 166 (Rome, a man with the tribe *Vel*).
- Trebianicus** AE 1993, 549 (Aesernia; attested as a cognomen, but perhaps originally a nomen)
- Trottidius** (cf. *Trot(t)edius*) Suppl. It. 15 Ateste 197
- Tullenius** (?) perhaps to be deduced from the cognomen *Tullenianus* L'Africa romana 11 (1996) 1346–51 (Capsa)
- Upsedius** (cf. *Upsidius*) CIL I² 2800 = Suppl. It. 15 Ateste 199
- Urmis** A.M. Burnett – M. Amandry – P.P. Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage* (1994) no. 1504f. (Dion)
- Ursacius** (a *nomen*?) BACTH 1910, 90 no. 12 (Thaenae in Africa)
- Vacillius** AE 1994, 706 (Altinum)
- Vardius** AE 1992, 709 (Aquileia)
- Οὐειήνοϛ** AE 1995, 1554 (procurator of Lycia–Pamphylia in AD 80; cf. S. Sahin, *EA* 17 [1991] 116)
- Velturenus** AE 1994, 620 (a semi-Latin inscription from the ager Faliscus)
- Vetonius** to be inferred from the cognomen *Vetonianus* AE 1994, 1284 (Germania inferior)
- Vibonius** (?) CIL IX 120* cf. AE 1995, 347 (a *corrector Apuliae et Calabriae*; perhaps to be corrected in *Vinicius*)
- Vienus** (?) cf. *Οὐειήνοϛ*
- Vilagenius** V 7700 = Inscr. It. IX 1, 120 cf. G. Mennella, in: *L'epigrafia del villaggio* (1993) p. 265
- Vino[leius (?)]** Suppl. It. 13 Nursia 27
- Virellius** F. Bérard, in: G. Paci (ed.), *Epigrafia romana in area adriatica* (Ichnia 2, Macerata 1998) 213 (Lugdunum)
- Viton[ius?]** Suppl. It. 15 Ateste 207
- Vittidius** AE 1993, 648 (between Arretium and Cortona)
- Votonius** (cf. *Vottonius*) Suppl. It. 15 Ateste 159
- Vulius** (?) M. Cristofani, in: *Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift H. Rix* (1993) 69f. (attested as *vuliiis* [gen.] in an Oscan inscription from Nola)
- aceius** BACTH 1917, clxxxvii no. 1 (Karthago)

Reverse index of the new nomina:

Plexsena Plexena Pestina Resinna Carbo Asonilo (?) Farro Provincialis Trebianicus
 Apanicus Anneaeus Mannaeus Ursacius Epaticcius Puccius Arictecus Sahelicius (?)
 Patulicius Ganicius Muricius Rasticius Etruscius Isucius Stadius Tegedius Comedius
 Upsedius Calcidius Lollidius Seppidius Supidius Adsidius Insidius Annusidius Vittidius
 Trottidius Vardius Cudius -aceius Cocleius Tarulleius Vinoleius (?) Gavoleius Siculeius
 Campuleius Artue(ius?) Coffius Mufius Menigius Caeselius Ceselius Bombilius

Madilius Acidilius Ranilius Curilius Transilius Aellius Virellius Vacillius Rufillius
 Mamullius Pholius Evolius (?) Medulius Vulius (?) Cremius (?) Urmius (?) Maxumius
 Ruficanus Runcanus (?) Fadianus Caesianus Flanius Pepanius (H)eptanius Safenius
 Salfenius Vilagenius Tullenius Masenius (or -nus) Aescinius Sescinius Aeschinius
 Lepthinius Gelasinius (?) Resinius Pestinius Labennius (?) Argennius Baetennius
 Vibonius Bofonius Bufonius Methonius Pilonius Malonius (?) Oponius Paronius
 Iphronius (?) Vetonius Mitonius (?) Vitonius (?) Caltonius Votonius Rasnius Communius
 Grunius Lampius Crippius Roucarius Scrofarius Maiarius Tartarius Mithrius Baebirius
 Bebirijs Cirius Docquirius Teresius Blicisius (?) Narcisius Annosius Nympsius Geusius
 Egusius Syllatius Denatius Megenatius Sufitius Quiritius (?) Santius Furentius (?)
 Piontius Cittius Ambavius Nevvius Ovinucianus Clodianus Lucilianus Capitonianus
 Plautianus Pullanus Seranus Farusaenus Pulaienus Setidienus Veienus Severienus
 Ebatienus Vienus (?) Iustulenus Cumarenus Nonarenus Velturenus Masenus (or -nius)
 Musenus Alitenus Apstidinus Pontilinus Salassus (?) Plotus (?) Sestuus

Finnish Institute at Athens