

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. LIII



HELSINKI 2019

## ARCTOS – ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

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

### *Publisher:*

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

### *Editors:*

Martti Leiwo (*Editor-in-Chief*), Lassi Jakola (*Executive Editor and Secretary*), Anna-Maria Wilskman (*Review Editor*).

### *Editorial Advisory Board:*

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

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

### *Note to Contributors:*

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

### *Requests for Exchange:*

Exchange Centre for Scientific Literature, Snellmaninkatu 13, FI – 00170 Helsinki, Finland.  
– e-mail: [exchange.centre@tsv.fi](mailto:exchange.centre@tsv.fi)

### *Sale:*

Bookstore Tiedekirja, Snellmaninkatu 13, FI – 00170 Helsinki, Finland.  
– Tel. +358 9 635 177, fax +358 9 635 017, internet: [www.tiedekirja.fi](http://www.tiedekirja.fi).

ISSN 0570-734-X

Layout by Maija Holappa

Printed by KTMP Group Oy, Mustasaari

## INDEX

	TOMMI ALHO	In sulphuream Papistarum conspirationem exercitia: <i>Retelling the Gunpowder Plot at the King's School, Canterbury (1665–84)</i>	9
	ANTONINO CRISÀ	<i>After a Trip: The Effects of Augustus' Propaganda in Sicily through Historical, Numismatic and Archaeological Sources</i>	37
	URPO KANTOLA	<i>Bemerkungen zu griechischen Inschriften mit römischen Namen</i>	69
	CHRISTIAN LAES	<i>Lectors in the Latin West: The Epigraphical Evidence (c. 300–800)</i>	83
	JENNA RICE	<i>"Just Rage": Causes of the Rise in Violence in the Eastern Campaigns of Alexander the Great</i>	129
	RONALD RIDLEY	<i>Vicit disciplina militaris, vicit imperii maiestas? Livy 8.30–35</i>	157
	OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Latin Cognomina Ending in -illianus</i>	185
	HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta Epigraphica 327–330</i>	211
	TOIVO VILJAMAA	<i>Words or Sounds? Ancient Grammarians on Interjections</i>	219
	IAN WORTHINGTON	<i>Augustus' Annoyance with Athens</i>	247
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>		255
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>		310
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>		313
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>		316



## LATIN COGNOMINA ENDING IN *-ILLIANUS*

OLLI SALOMIES\*

My aim in this paper is to catalogue and discuss a smallish group of Latin cognomina, namely those derived from existing cognomina by adding the ending *-illianus*, as for instance in *Maximillianus* (for those derived from *nomina* see below). The suffix *-illianus* (if it appears in cognomina derived from cognomina) belongs to those suffixes which can be described as “late”, by which I mean suffixes appearing in cognomina in our sources only after the early Empire; other “late” suffixes are e.g. *-ianus* (if derived from cognomina), *-illus* (if derived from either *nomina* or cognomina; to be contrasted with the female suffix *-illa* attested already in the late Republic), *-ius*, *-icinus* (a combination of the suffixes *-ico-* and *-ino-*). The consular *fasti* give us an indication of the spread of the cognomina with these suffixes: the earliest consul with a cognomen ending in *-ianus* derived from a cognomen rather than from a *nomen*<sup>1</sup> is, as far as I can see, A. Cornelius Palma Frontonianus consul in 99 and again in 109;<sup>2</sup> this man is followed in from AD 115 onwards by a number of Severiani,<sup>3</sup> in 155 by a cer-

---

\* Thanks are due to the two (anonymous) referees of this paper. Abbreviations of epigraphical publications are mainly those of the *Année épigraphique* (sometimes slightly modified). ‘Kajanto’ = I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Comm. Hum. Litt. 36:2, 1965); PFOS = M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (I<sup>er</sup>–II<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (1987); *Repertorium* = H. Solin & O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum* (1994<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> Cognomina in *-ianus* derived from *nomina* are of course attested already in the Republican period especially as adoptive cognomina (Scipio *Aemilianus*, etc.).

<sup>2</sup> The cognomen certainly derives from *Fronto*, not from *Frontonius*, a late *nomen* attested mainly in the provinces.

<sup>3</sup> P. Iuventius Celsus T. Aufidius Hoenius Severianus was consul in AD 115 (see *AE* 2005, 299) and again in 129. *Severianus* derives certainly from *Severus* rather than *Severius*, cf. T. Hoenius Severus, consul in 141. The next Severiani are Sex. Cocceius Severianus Honorinus consul in 147 and M.

tain Sabinianus, in 157 by a certain Orfitianus and in 160 by a certain Hastianus.<sup>4</sup> As for *-illus*, the earliest consul with a cognomen derived with this suffix from a name (and not identical with a noun or a diminutive form of a noun)<sup>5</sup> is Plautius Quintillus, consul in 159 (and father of another Quintillus, consul in 177); in the third century, after the not exactly datable late Severan consul L. Caesonius Lucillus Macer Rufinianus (the son of one Manilia Lucilla),<sup>6</sup> we find Lucillus consul in 265 and Sabinillus consul in 266.<sup>7</sup> The earliest consul with a cognomen ending in *-ius* is Constantius (one of the two *Caesares*) in AD 294, who is followed by many consuls with a cognomen of this type in the fourth century, and the first (and the last) consul with a cognomen derived from a name with the double suffix *-ic-inus* is Lupicinus in AD 367.<sup>8</sup> As for *-illianus*, the suffix to be discussed here, the earliest consul with a cognomen of this type is P. Manilius Vopiscus Vicinillianus (etc.), consul as early as 114; he is followed in the third century by Sex. Catius Clementinus Priscillianus, consul in 230.

Kajanto in his book on the Latin cognomina says (p. 13)<sup>9</sup> that “the ending *-illianus* generally appears in the form *-ilianus*”, but stresses that the correct form must have been *-illianus*. The endings *-ilianus* and *-illianus*, however,

---

Sedatius Severianus consul in 153.

<sup>4</sup> [Nin]nius Hastianus, surely the son or grandson of Q. Ninnius Hasta, consul in 114 (himself a descendant of an homonymous consul in 88).

<sup>5</sup> Cognomina such as *Pulvillus* (attested for early Republican Horatii between 509 and 386 BC [RE Horatius 13–15]), *Camillus* (attested for Republican and early imperial patrician Furii [RE Furius 41–48]), *Regillus* (attested for patrician Aemilii from the third century onwards [RE Aemilius 127–130]) thus belong to a different category.

<sup>6</sup> PIR<sup>2</sup> C 209, consul probably in 225/230, cf. P. M. M. Leunissen, *Konsuln und Konsulare in der Zeit von Commodus bis Severus Alexander* (1989) 184.

<sup>7</sup> As mentioned above, female cognomina in *-illa* are attested already during the Republic. The wife of Catiline was called Aurelia Orestilla (RE Aurelius no. 261) and the corpus of Republican inscriptions, CIL I<sup>2</sup>, includes inscriptions mentioning women called Balbilla, Lucilla (but the reading of the inscription from Rome, CIL VI 14574 = I<sup>2</sup> 1273, now lost, seems uncertain and problematic), Posilla and Urbilla. In his youth, Augustus was alleged to have had a relationship with a Terentilla and a Rufilla (Suet. Aug. 69,3); cf. my observations in W. Eck & M. Heil (eds.), *Prosopographie des Römischen Kaiserreichs* (2017) 126–8.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Ursicinus*, attested for several fourth-century men (PLRE I Ursicinus 1–7).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the same author's *Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions of Rome and Carthage* (AIRF II:1, 1963) p. 68f.

should not necessarily be lumped together; in spite of this, Kajanto tends to ignore the difference between names in *-ilianus* and *-illianus*, for he normally registers cognomina with these two endings as representing just one cognomen; for instance the cognomina *Quin(c)tilianus* and *Quin(c)tillianus* appear in his lists conflated as *Quin(c)til(l)ianus* (p. 153 and 174). But the fact is that, if there is a significance in the difference between the two spellings *Quintilianus* and *Quintillianus*,<sup>10</sup> we are dealing with two names with different etymologies, for *Quintilianus* with one *L* should be regarded as having been derived from the nomen *Quintilius*, whereas *Quintillianus* with double *L* should be seen as a derivation from the cognomen *Quintillus/Quintilla*, itself derived from the nomen *Quintius* or in some cases from the praenomen *Quintus* (cf. n. 79).

But whereas the nomen *Quintilius* is only rarely written with a double *L*, there are also nomina in which case we find both forms in *-ilius* and forms in *-illius*, for instance *Petil(l)ius* and *Popil(l)ius*, and the forms in *-illius* can of course be used in deriving cognomina in *-ianus*. Moreover, even in the case of nomina for which *-ilius* with one *L* was certainly the normal and correct ending we sometimes find spellings with double *L*, both in the case of nomina ending in *-ilius* (e.g. *Caecilius*) and in the case of those ending in *-illius* (e.g. *Atillius*), both nomina occasionally appearing as *Caecillius* and *Atillius*.<sup>11</sup>

As a result, we find two types of cognomina ending in *-illianus*, those derived from nomina (not considered here) and those derived from cognomina:

- *Atillianus*<sup>12</sup> *Petillianus*<sup>13</sup> *Popillianus* etc., derived from the nomina *Atillius Petillius Popillius*; and, on the other hand,
- *Maximillianus Novatillianus Priscillianus* derived normally from the female cognomina *Maximilla Novatilla Priscilla* (rather than from the masculine *Maximillus Novatillus Pris-*

<sup>10</sup> From now on, I omit the references to the archaic and solemn forms with a *c*.

<sup>11</sup> There are some instances of both forms in the Claus-Slaby database.

<sup>12</sup> For *Atillianus* cf. W. Eck, in M. Maiuro & al. (eds.), *Uomini, istituzioni, mercati. Studi di storia per E. Lo Cascio* (2019) 299–319 (a letter of Hadrian, dated *Pontiano et Atilliano co(n)s(ulibus)*); *CIL VIII* 3011; C. B. Welles in C. H. Kraeling (ed.) *Gerasa* (1938) no. 172 (Ἀτλλιανός).

<sup>13</sup> In *CIL V* 58 = *Inscr. It. X* 1, 89, C. Plaestinus C. f. Petillian[us] is the brother (adopted by a certain C. Plaestinus) of Q. Petillius C. f. Velin[a] Crispus.

*cillus*, cf. below), for their part derived from the cognomina *Maximus Novatus Priscus*.

Now in the case of *Atillianus Petillianus Popillianus* there is no problem in identifying these cognomina as having been derived from nomina rather than from cognomina. But in the case of some nomina in *-ilius* corresponding to nomina in *-ius*, especially *Lucilius Quintilius* (but also *Sextilius* etc.), there is a problem, for these names, too, can sometimes be written with a double *L*; *Lucillius* is in fact not that rare,<sup>14</sup> and as for *Quintillius* note M. Quintillius Epaphroditus and his freedwoman in *CIL* VI 25275. Cognomina could of course also be derived from these forms, this resulting in *Lucillianus* and *Quintillianus*, forms which could also be derived from *Lucillus/Lucilla* and from *Quintillus/Quintilla*. On the other hand, we also often find (as observed by Kajanto, cf. above)<sup>15</sup> cognomina which should have the suffix *-illianus* having been furnished with the suffix *-ilianus*: a legate of Moesia Inferior in 236–8 appears in our sources both as Flavius Lucillianus and as Flavius Lucilianus,<sup>16</sup> and the cognomen of the third-century senator, M. Caecilius Novatillianus, appears in one inscription correctly as *Novatillianus*, but as *Novatilianus* in two other inscriptions pertaining to him (cf. below at n. 46). Cf. also e.g. *Crescentilianus Gratilianus Magnilianus Maximilianus Pacatilianus Priscilianus Sergilianus Titilianus* in the catalogue below, all forms in *-ilianus* representing certainly or at least probably forms in *-illianus*.

<sup>14</sup> For *Lucilius* written as *Lucillius* cf. e.g. *CIL* VI 21587; *AE* 1991, 456 (Abella); *CIL* IX 3097; *CIL* V 5176. 7946; *CIL* XII 65; *CIL* XIII 4548; *Tituli Aquincenses* II 662; *CIL* VIII 15614. For Λουκίλλιος in Greek inscriptions cf. *Arctos* 41 (2007) 72, with references not only to inscriptions but also to Λουκίλλιος the poet, often appearing in the *Anthologia Palatina*.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. M. Niedermann, in *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire ancienne offerts à Alfred Ernout* (1940) 271f. = Id., *Recueil Max Niedermann* (1954) 225f., although I am not sure his summary of the issue is altogether adequate (“*Maximiliānus* et *Prisciliānus* sont de simples variantes phonétiques et graphiques de *Maximiliānus* et *Prisciliānus*”); for one thing, the *i* preceding the *l* was surely short, not long (cf. *Priscilianus amor*, the second hemiepes of a pentameter in *ILCV* 1307 = *ICVR* 19220).

<sup>16</sup> See *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 306; the cognomen is written with double *L* in *CIL* III 7605 = *ISM* V 97 and in *AE* 1926, 98 = *IGBulg.* II 638. This man may well be identical with L. Flavius Lucilianus, patron of Canusium in AD 223, *CIL* IX 338 = *ILS* 6121 = *ERC* 35). Cf. below at n. 34.

As for the derivation of the cognomina in *-illianus* derived from cognomina, I observed above that most of them would be derived from female cognomina in *-illa*; the main reason for this claim is the fact that female cognomina in *-illa* are far more common than their masculine equivalents in *-illus*.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, we find this derivation appearing now and then in our sources;<sup>18</sup> note *CIL* VI 37097, Laecanius Novatillianus son of Faminia Novatilla; *CIL* X 2771 (Neapolis), Nepotillianus son of Nepotilla; *CIL* III 3553 = *Tituli Aquincenses* 641, (Iulius) Quintillianus son of Septimia (?) Quintilla; *CIL* III 3998 = *AIJug.* 583 (Municipium Iasorum), Carmaeus Atticillianus son of Iul(ia) Att<i>cilla (or perhaps Att<t>icilla); *CIL* III 14360 Titius Lucil[ ]ianus son of [---]m(ia) Lucilla; *IGR* IV 1234 = *TAM* V 2, 957 (Thyatira), M. Αὐρ. Πρεισκιλλιανός, a knight, son of Αὐρ. Ἀθηναῖος (an Asiarch) and Φλ. Πρεῖσκιλλα. In Kremna in Pisidia, Rutilianus Longillianus Callippus, a duumvir of the colony, is surely a close relative of a certain Ulpia Rutiliana Longilla (cf. below at n. 34); and cf. below at n. 70 on P. Iul(ius) Iunianus Tironillianus. On the other hand, there are also male cognomina ending in *-illus*, and especially *Quintillus*, attested also in senatorial families, is not extremely rare;<sup>19</sup> and there is in fact an inscription from Berytus mentioning a certain [Ti. (?) Car]maeus Ti. f. Fab. Montanus Quintillianus who was the son of Ti. Carmaeus Quintillus (*AE* 1939, 63 = *IGLS* VI 2748).

I shall now proceed to an examination of the attestations of the cognomina in *-illianus* which are relevant from my point of view.

<sup>17</sup> This was already observed by Niedermann (n. 15). Note e.g. that, according to the prosopography of senatorial women by Raepsaet-Charlier (*PFOS* p. 807), seventy different cognomina in *-illa* are attested for senatorial women of the first two centuries AD, whereas only three or four cognomina in *-illus*, *Tuscillus* *Laevillus* *Quintillus* and possibly *Bassillus*, are attested for senators in the same period: for *Tuscillus* see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 475 (the son of a consul in AD 99) and *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 108 (consul in AD 135, see below n. 82); *Laevillus*: *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 391 and 477; *Quintillus*: *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 473f.; *Bassillus* (?): *PIR*<sup>2</sup> B 73 (from a fragment of the *fasti* of the Palatine *salii*, *CIL* VI 1977, now lost, recording this man's election; but the cognomen, sometimes restored as *Bassil[us]*, could also have been *Bassil[lianus]* or *Bassil[ianus]*).

<sup>18</sup> Some of the instances mentioned below are also quoted by I. Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies* (n. 9) p. 69.

<sup>19</sup> Cf., in addition to the senatorial Plautii Quintilli (above at n. 5 and n. 17), *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1480 = *PLRE* I Quintillus 1 (perhaps identical with a procurator of Sardinia under Claudius, i.e. in 268–270, *AE* 1984, 446) and *PLRE* I Quintillus 2; and *CIL* II 1754. 3002; *HEp* 1993, 248 = *AE* 1989, 361d; *ILJug.* 2578; *IGLS* VI 2748; *CIL* VIII 5681. 6766. 6831. 7880. 9205. 21131; *ILAlg.* I 2314; *ILAlg.* II 1500. 4502. 5395; slaves and freedmen: *AE* 1982, 287 = *Suppl. It.* 1 Falerii Novi 41; *CIL* III 12363.



*Atticillianus* (Kajanto p. 168 and 203):<sup>20</sup> C. Galbius Atticillianus, a *praetextatus* in Canusium in AD 221 (*CIL* IX 338 = *ILS* 6121 = *ERC* 35); for Carmaeus Atticillianus in Municipium Iasorum see above.

*Balbillianus* (Kajanto p. 240):<sup>21</sup> C. Domitius Balbillianus, son C. Domitius Alexander, centurion of the legion *III Augusta* (*CIL* VIII 2863 cf. 18152); [ --- ] Γ(---?) Βαβιλλιανός in a prytany list from Cyzicus, mentioning also Aurelii (*CIG* 3664, l. 18).

*Bassillianus* (?): cf. n. 17.

*Crescentillianus* (Kajanto p. 234):<sup>22</sup> T. Magnius Felix Crescentillianus, prefect of Egypt under Valerian and Gallienus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 96); Plotius Crescentilianus (*sic*), *fl(amen) p(erpetuus)* in Thamugadi, *CIL* VIII 2403 (A. Chastagnol, *L'albun municipal de Timgad* [1978]), 1, 32 (c. AD 350); Kajanto also adds the

<sup>20</sup> According to Kajanto p. 203, *Atticilla* is attested for two senatorial women, sixty other women and one freedwoman. This cognomen is probably normally derived from *Atticus*, but there is also the nomen *Atticius*; this nomen could incidentally be the source of the only attestation of *Atticillus*, namely the four-year-old son of a certain T. Sici[nius ---] (*CIL* VI 12701); this inscription also mentions a [ --- ] *cia Prima*, who may be Sici[nius]' wife and the boy's mother, in which case one could think of restoring [*Attic*] *cia*.

<sup>21</sup> Kajanto p. 240 mentions several women with the cognomen *Balbilla*, one in a Republican inscription (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 2109 = XI 4930), two senatorial, fourteen other and one Christian. But *Balbillus* is also attested, and interestingly already in the first century. This cognomen is found in a relatively early inscription from Rhegium (*IG* XIV 617 = *IReggio Calabria* 8; dated to the Julio-Claudian period by the editor L. D'Amore on p. 35) and for three persons, apparently all of eastern origin, in the middle of the first century, namely for two men called Ti. Claudius Balbillus, both from Alexandria and active in the middle of the first century, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 812 (one of the Alexandrian ambassadors to Claudius in AD 41) and 813, probably the former's son, equestrian and prefect of Egypt between 55 and 49 AD. Moreover, there is Balbillus, Nero's astrologer (Suet., *Nero* 36; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> B 38), possibly mentioned in *CIL* III 7107 = *ISmyrna* 619 (see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> T 190) and in that case another Ti. Claudius. In addition, there is Ti. Iulius Balbillus, a *sacerdos Solis* attested in the time of Septimius Severus in a number of inscriptions from Rome (*CIL* VI 708. 1027. 1603. 2129. 2130. 2269. 227), a certain Βάλβιλλος ἠουοκᾶτος (*IG* XIV 997 = *IGUR* 124), and a Balbillus who with his wife Firma set up the funerary monument of their son L. Arruntius Heliodorus in Castrum Novum (*CIL* XI 3590). There are also some Balbilli or Barbilli in Egypt, the choice of the name possibly having been inspired by the prefect.

<sup>22</sup> According to Kajanto p. 234, there are 25 instances of *Crescentilla* in the *CIL* and one freedwoman *Crescentilla* in *CIL* X. But *Crescentillus*, not registered by Kajanto or in the *Repertorium*, is also attested, namely in *CIL* VI 39061 cf. H. Solin, *Analecta epigraphica* (1998) p. 73 = EDR103417 for M. Ulpius Crescentillus, a boy of 11 years and the son of Ulpia Lartilla and the brother of C. Anaedius Trofimus.

bishop of Lambiridi in Africa in AD 411, Crescentilianus (sic; P. B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae Catholicae* [1873] p. 466).

*Domitillianus* (Kajanto 168):<sup>23</sup> Κλ(αύδιος) Δομετιλλιανός Πρόκλος, a senator from Sagalassos (*IGR* III 356 = *I. Sagalassos* 41, proposing a date in the first part of the third century).<sup>24</sup>

*Flaccillianus* (*Repertorium* p. 332):<sup>25</sup> attested as a second name for two non-citizens in the Lydian cities Philadelphia (Ἀλέξανδρος γ' Φλακκιλιανός (sic), *TAM* V 3, 1460) and Silandus (Ἀπολλώνιος β' Φλακκιλλιανός, *TAM* V 1, 62 of AD 186/7). In Asia Minor, the cognomina *Flaccillus* and *Flaccilla* are attested in Ephesus.<sup>26</sup>

*Flavillianus* (*Repertorium* p. 333).<sup>27</sup> Λούκιος Σεπτίμιος Φλαβιανός Φλαβιλλιανός, an athlete from Oenoanda in Lycia in the Severan period (*SEG* 44, 1169; 1194-6; *AE* 2011, 1412, cf. *AE* 2016, 1720); and two Φλαβιλλιανοί, surely somehow connected with the athlete, are mentioned in the genealogical inscription of Licinnia Flavilla (Λικιννία Φλάβιλλα) from the same town (*IGR* III 500, III, l. 70; IV, l. 15).

*Frugillianus* (*Repertorium* p. 335). H. Solin registers Φρουγιλλιανός Αὐξάνων from Phrygian Apeamea (*MAMA* VI 225), but there is also [ --- ]nius Tiro Frugillianus, a *camillus* at a meeting of the Arval brethren in AD 155 (*CIL* VI 2086 = J. Scheid, *Commentarii Fratrum Arvalium qui supersunt* [1998] p.

<sup>23</sup> According to Kajanto p. 168, fifteen Domitillae are known, including three senatorial women and a Christian. (But the Claus-Slaby database gives 38 results for the search 'Domitilla' and the PHI Greek Inscriptions database three results for 'Δομίτιλλα' and 'Δομέτιλλα'.)

<sup>24</sup> Cf. H. Halfmann, in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* II (Tituli 5, 1982) p. 641.

<sup>25</sup> For *Flaccilliana* (cited in *Repertorium* from an unpublished inscription) see now *AE* 2001, 301 (Rome). As for *Flaccilla*, this cognomen is according to Kajanto p. 240 attested for more than thirty persons, including four senatorial women, one freedwoman and one Christian.

<sup>26</sup> For the high-priestess Φαβωνία Φλάκιλλα see *IEphesos* 1060; and there is also at least one Favonius Flaccillus (Φαβώνιος Φλάκιλλος, cf. *IEphesos* 667 and 823), who could have been Flaccilla's son or descendant (Flaccilla is dated to around AD 200 by G. Frija in her prosopography of priests and priestesses in Roman Asia, no. 131 [see <http://www.pretres-civiques.org/recherche?str=Favonia&type=&cite=&empereur=&pretrise=&after=&before=>], where the Flaccillus (or Flaccilli?) is (are?) dated to the third century. In Ephesus, the cognomen *Flaccilla* is perhaps also attested in *SEG* 34, 1108 ([Α]ρουντία Φλάκ[κιλλα?]).

<sup>27</sup> For *Flavilla* see Kajanto p. 169 and 227; *TAM* II 920 (Rhodiapolis). Several Flavillae appear in the family tree of Licinnia Flavilla (cf. below).

236–9 no. 80, l. 28; J. Rüpke, *Fasti sacerdotum* [2005] p. 711 no. 349; not registered in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F or T), perhaps from Asia Minor, where one finds not only the Frugillianus from Apamea but also several attestations of the cognomen Φρούγιλλα (and also of Φρούγιος Φρουγιανός etc.).<sup>28</sup>

*Gratillianus* (Kajanto p. 147 under cognomina derived from nomina; cf. p. 282, where Kajanto cites *Gratilianus* with one *L* as being derived from *gratus*).<sup>29</sup> In both places, Kajanto, who does not seem to distinguish between the two spellings, also mentions persons whose cognomen is written with just one *L*, but on p. 282 he does cite (under *Gratilianus*) Flavius Gratillianus, epistrategos of Heptanomia in Egypt in AD 164/165 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 282; J. D. Thomas, *The epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt* 2 [1982] p. 188 no. 46). There is also M. Antius Grat[il]ianus, quaestor of Sicily in AD 213 (*CIL* X 7228; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 782), in whose case the cognomen seems to have been written with a double *L*.<sup>30</sup> The cognomen *Gratillianus/-a* (for the female equivalent *Gratilliana* see n. 29) is surely derived from *Gratilla*;<sup>31</sup> but what about *Gratilianus* with just one *L*? The nomen *Gratilius* is attested<sup>32</sup> and *Gratilianus* could thus be derived from this nomen; but the nomen is rare, whereas cognomina identical with, or derived from, *gratus* are common, and I thus suggest that in most cases the cognomen written as *Gratilianus*, of which we know five instances,<sup>33</sup> should in fact be in-

<sup>28</sup> See T. Corsten (ed.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* Vol. V.A (2010) p. 459; J.-S. Balzat & al. (eds.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* Vol. V.B (2013) p. 435. Cf. H. Solin, *Repertorium* p. 335 (with only one instance of *Frugilla* outside Asia Minor).

<sup>29</sup> For the female equivalent *Gratilliana*, not registered by Kajanto or in the *Repertorium*, see *IAquil* 372; *CILA* I 68.

<sup>30</sup> Although it must be admitted that the name, inscribed at the end of line 5 and in the beginning of line 6, could possibly also have been *Grat[i]llianus* rather than *Grat[il]llianus*. However, the stone was seen by Mommsen who must have assumed that two letters were needed to fill the lacuna. There is a photo of this text at ISic0508 (<http://sicily.classics.ox.ac.uk/inscription/ISic0508>), but not of the side on which the quaestor is mentioned.

<sup>31</sup> For this cognomen see Kajanto p. 282 (almost thirty instances); senatorial *Gratillae* are listed in *PFOS* 790 and 795.

<sup>32</sup> *CIL* VI 19115. 19116. 35398; *CIL* X 2491. 2492; D. K. Samsaris, *Η Ακτία Νικόπολη* (1994) p. 51 no. 2, cf. p. 175.

<sup>33</sup> See *AE* 2007, 1770 (an equestrian officer, AD 178); *CIL* VI 2579 (centurion of the praetorians in AD 211/222); *AE* 2004, 1243 (Novae, apparently a legate in 218/222); *PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 139 (AD 257); *PLRE* I *Gratilianus* (ca. AD 300).

terpreted as representing *Gratillianus*.

*Longillianus* (*Repertorium* p. 353). This cognomen is attested only in Pisidia for the patron of Ειρήνη Λονγιλλιανού και Σεουήρου οικονόμισσα (*MAMA* VIII 399 from the “Pisido-Phrygian borderland”; the two men are perhaps brothers), and for Ῥοτειλιανός Λονγιλλιανός Κάλλιππος, duovir of the colony of Kremna in about the middle of the third century (*ICentral Pisidia* 39, 40, 41), who must be closely related to Οὐλ(πία)Ῥοτ(ειλιανή) Λόνγιλλα (*ICentral Pisidia* 38), the presence of the cognomen *Longilla* (not in Kajanto or in the *Repertorium*)<sup>34</sup> indicating the derivation of the cognomen *Longillianus*.

*Lucillianus* (Kajanto, who does not distinguish between *Lucillianus* and *Lucilianus*, p. 149 among cognomina derived from nomina and p. 173 among nomina derived from praenomina via *Lucil(l)us*). The cognomen of Flavius Lucillianus, legate of Moesia Inferior in AD 236–8, appears in our sources both as *Lucillianus* and as *Lucilianus* (above n. 16). This name is written with a double *L* in many inscriptions, e.g. *CIL* VI 9559; *ICVR* VII 20015. 21904. 21905; *AE* 1990, 285 = *Suppl. It.* 4 Trebula Suffenas 65; *CIL* X 8317 (Sicily); *CIL* II<sup>2</sup> 14, 727 (Saguntum, *Lucill[ianus]*); *CIL* III 5771 = 11885 (Raetia); *CIL* III 14360 (Vindobona); *CIL* VIII 4813 = *ILAlg.* II 6336. However, it is only in the case of *CIL* III 14360 (already cited above at n. 18) that we can be fairly sure that the intended reading was in fact *Lucillianus* and that the name was derived from *Lucilla*, for in this particular case we know that the mother was called Lucilla; in the other cases the orthography with two *L* may just be a variant of *Lucilianus* and the name derived from the nomen written with a double *L* (cf. n. 14). On the other hand, we also observe cases where *Lucilianus* was probably written instead of the expected *Lucillianus*; thus perhaps in the case of the inscription from Moughtiacum, *CIL* XIII 6811, where Adiatorius Lucilianus, an equestrian, is the son of Ulpia Lucilla.

*Magnillianus* (Kajanto p. 275):<sup>35</sup> P. Allius Magnillianus, the son of P. Alliu[s] A[n]n[i]us (?) (*aed(ilis)*, *IIIvir*) and [ --- ]ia Nucерina (*CIL* X 8105 = *In-*

<sup>34</sup> *Longilla* is attested also in *I. Sagalassos* 20 (the same women *ibid.* no. 94) and in *MAMA* VIII 129 from the “Isauro-Phrygian borderland”.

<sup>35</sup> *Magnillus* is attested for a *vicarius Africae* in AD 391 (*PLRE* I Magnillus; cf. H. Solin, *Arctos* 45 [2011] 150) and for [ --- ?] Magnillus, a 10-year-old boy who died in Vesontio (*CIL* XIII 5396). Kajanto p. 275 registers nine Magnillae, including one senatorial (*PFO*s 447, second century) and one Christian woman (note *ILJug.* III 1300 = *IMS* III 2, 45 from Timacum Maius, where T. Fl(avius) Maximus has three daughters, Maximilla, Magnilla and Quinta).

*scr. It.* III 1, 29, Volcei); (Vetulenius) Magnilianus (sic), the son of Q. Vetulenus Urbanus Herennianus, a *fl(amen) p(er)p(etuus)* and *cur(ator) r(ei) p(ublicae)* (*CIL* VIII 23964 [= *ILS* 5713]. 23965 from an African city between Carthage and Thuburbo Maius, ca. AD 300).<sup>36</sup> *Magnilianus* is written with one *L*, but as the nomen *\*Magnilius* is not attested, the assumption that even in this case we are dealing with a name which should in fact have been written *Magnillianus* seems plausible.

*Marsillianus*:<sup>37</sup> Valerius Pudens Marsillianus *c(larissimus) v(ir)* (*AE* 2016, 1853 from a site near the modern city of Meknassy in Tunisia).

*Maximillianus* (Kajanto p. 276).<sup>38</sup> This cognomen is attested within the nomenclature of C. Neratius C. f. C. n. C. pron. C. abn. Cor. Proculus Betitius Pius Maximillianus, a local dignitary and patron of Aeclanum (*CIL* IX 1160 = *ILS* 6485, set up in AD 138/161), who must be identical with a man of almost the same name, but with *Maximillianus* preceding the elements *Betitius Pius* (*CIL* IX 1161).<sup>39</sup> This man must be the ancestor of the senators mentioned in *CIL* IX 1126 and *CIL* IX 1121 = 1162, both with the cognomen *Maximillianus* included

<sup>36</sup> For the date cf. C. Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire* II (1981) p. 77. The two identical inscriptions *CIL* VIII 23964 and 23965 both begin with the genitive *Magnilianorum* (only this text, and not also the son's cognomen, is cited by Kajanto) which because of its position and because of the genitive looks like a *signum* of sorts; because of the plural one could assume that the father used his son's cognomen *Magnilianus* as a *signum* (cf. I. Kajanto, *Supernomina. A Study in Latin Epigraphy* [1966] p. 50).

<sup>37</sup> *Marsillus* (Kajanto p. 185), derived from the cognomen *Marsus*, is attested for D. Laelius Marsillus from the Sabine city of Amiternum (*CIL* IX 4502), who may be identical with, or closely related to, D. Laelius D. f. Pal. Marsil[us] (*CIL* IX 4508). *Marsillus* in *CIL* XIII 3069 (Cenabum in the Lugdunensis, mentioning a certain Marcus Marsilli) may be barbarian. As for *Marsilla*, Kajanto says that there are two *Marsillae* in *CIL*, probably referring to *CIL* X 3020 (Puteoli) and *CIL* IX 3945 (Alba Fucens close to the country of the Marsi), but note also *ICVR* 21899a and especially Tullia P. f. Marsilla Quentina Rossia Rufina Rufia Procula, a senatorial woman (*PFOS* 767; *PIR*<sup>2</sup>, T 396; *AE* 2014, 449), certainly a close relative of P. Tullius Marsus, suffect consul in AD 206 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> T 385).

<sup>38</sup> *Maximillus* (Kajanto p. 276) seems to be attested only in Africa (*CIL* VIII 6328 = *ILAlg.* II 9547, *Maximilus*; *ILAlg.* I 2653); *Maximillus* in *CIL* III 5914 = *IBR* 266 (Raetia), adduced by H. Solin, *Arctos* 44 (2010) 246, is just a tentative and surely incorrect restoration of a corrupt text (cf. J. Osnabrügge in HD058816). As for *Maximilla*, Kajanto registers more than 100 *Maximillae*, including three senatorial women and nine Christians.

<sup>39</sup> Thus S. Evangelisti, in M. L. Caldelli & G. L. Gregori (eds.), *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, 30 anni dopo* (2014) 642.

in their nomenclatures (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 404; B 119).<sup>40</sup> As for the patron mentioned in *CIL* IX 1160, who looks like either the son of a certain Neratius and one Betitia or the son of Betitius and Neratia,<sup>41</sup> *Maximillianus* clearly goes with *Betitius* rather than with *Neratius*, and this takes us to a certain Betitia C. f. Maximilla in *CIL* IX 1234. It would be good if we could take this woman to be an ancestor – say the mother or the grandmother – of the patron in order to explain the presence of the cognomen *Maximillianus*, but according to the inscription this Maximilla was married not to a certain Neratius but to Vibius, and there are problems with the date of this inscription;<sup>42</sup> but there can in any case have been several generations of Betitiae Maximillae.

To continue with senatorial Maximilliani, there is also Q. Marcius Victor Felix Maximillianus, legate of the legion XIII Gemina in Dacia under Severus and Caracalla, and his son, mentioned in the same inscription (*CIL* III 1118 = *IDR* III 5, 350), P. Marcius Victor Maximillianus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 253, 254); these men are clearly Africans.<sup>43</sup> But there are also persons with the cognomen *Maximilianus* with just one *L*; as the nomen *\*Maximilius* is not attested, we have most probably to assume that this cognomen is derived from *Maximilla* and that the correct orthography would in each case have been *Maximillianus*. For fourth- and fifth-century Maximiliani belonging to the higher classes see *PLRE* I Maximilianus 1 and 2, *PLRE* II Maximilianus 1–3 and *CIL* VI 41332. Clearly this cognomen must have had an upper-class ring to it, for among the *plebs* the instances are rare; the most interesting one is L. Annius Maximilianus in *CIL* IX 1216 from Aeclanum, i.e. the same city where we observe upper-class

<sup>40</sup> See now Evangelisti (n. 39) p. 650f. no. A7 and A8, dating no. A7 to the middle of the second century and no. A8 to about the Severan period.

<sup>41</sup> Evangelisti (n. 39) p. 646 prefers the latter scenario.

<sup>42</sup> Evangelisti (n. 39) p. 651 (no. A10) dates the inscription to the second half of the second century, but in EDR134490 the same author assigns it the date “71 d.C. / 130 d.C.”.

<sup>43</sup> M. Corbier, in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* II (*Tituli* 5, 1982) p. 687–9, attributing them to Bulla Regia. The son is surely identical with P. Marcius Maximillianus, patron of Canusium in AD 223 (*CIL* IX 338) and with Marcius Maximillianus, governor of a province (Pannonia Superior?) in AD 240 (*AE* 1998, 1619) and perhaps also with a certain Maximillianus, proconsul of Asia in AD 253/4 (*TAM* V 3, 1422); this proconsul was assumed to have been called Flavius Montanus Maximillianus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 323; B. E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidum* I<sup>2</sup> [2009] p. 92 no. 26:220), but it now seems that the second cognomen of the proconsul Montanus was in fact *Maximianus* (for all this see *MAMA* XI 104 with P. Thonemann’s commentary; *AE* 2012, 1489 = *SEG* 62, 877).

Maximilliani (see above) who may have provided the inspiration for this man's cognomen.<sup>44</sup>

*Nepotillianus* (Kajanto p. 305): Nepotillianus son of Nepotilla (*CIL* X 2771 from Neapolis, already cited above at n. 18).

*Novatillianus* (Kajanto p. 353):<sup>45</sup> C. Laecanius Novatillianus, *subpr(aefectus vigilum)* in and around AD 207, the son of Laecanius Vitalianus and Faminia Novatilla, known from five inscriptions (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> L 37); and his son Laeccanius (sic) Novatilianus (sic), mentioned in *CIL* VI 1621 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> L 36). M. Caecilius Novatillianus, a senator possibly from Beneventum<sup>46</sup> in the later third century (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 66), known from three inscriptions: the cognomen is written *Novatillianus* in *CIL* IX 1572 = *ILS* 2939, but as *Novatilianus* with one *L* in *CIL* IX 1571 and in *CIL* II 4113 = *CIL* II<sup>2</sup> 14, 973.

*Pacatillianus* (*Repertorium* p. 373):<sup>47</sup> P. Cavarasius Pacatilianus, the son of P. Cavarasius Cataplus and Cavarasia Nice (*AE* 1978, 39 from Rome). In the commentary in the *Année épigraphique*, it is said that *Pacatilianus* “dérive visiblement du gentile *Pacatilius*”, but \**Pacatilius* is not attested, and the commentary would have gained very much by the inclusion of a reference to *CIL* XIV 2660 = XV 7833, a *fistula* from Tusculum belonging to Cabarasia (sic) P. f. Pacatilla, as this *fistula* shows that *Pacatilianus* must (as one would in any case expect) derive from *Pacatilla* and moreover, that the correct orthography would be *Pacatillianus*. As for the relation of this Pacatilla to the parents of Cavarasius Pacatil(l)ianus, my guess is that the parents were freedmen of Pacatilla, who had given their son a cognomen derived from the cognomen of their patroness.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> For other instances see the Clauss-Slaby database under “Maximilian-”, with a number of instances also from Christian inscriptions.

<sup>45</sup> For *Novatilla* see Kajanto (and Faminia Novatilla below); add Attia Flavia Veratia Augurina Novatilla *c(larissima) p(uella)* (*AE* 1977, 22; her family is perhaps from Ephesus, cf. M. Heil in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> V p. 423).

<sup>46</sup> But see G. Camodeca, in P. Caruso (ed.), *Antiqua Beneventana* (2013) 238f.

<sup>47</sup> For *Pacatilla* (written *Pacatila* in *CIL* IX 2615) see Kajanto p. 262 and below. Add Emilia (sic) Pacatilla in Sitifis, *BACTH* 1946–49, p. 350.

<sup>48</sup> For freedmen giving their children cognomina identical with, or reminiscent of, the cognomina of their patrons, cf. my observations in H. M. Schellenberg & al. (eds.), *A Roman Miscellany. Essays in Honour of Anthony R. Birley* (2008) p. 85–88.

*Passenillianus*: M. Casineius Vassius Passenillianus Titianus *c(larissimus) v(ir)*, AE 2013, 334 = G. Camodeca, EDR135848 from Beneventum (about Severan). This cognomen is evidently derived from \**Passenilla* (apparently not yet attested),<sup>49</sup> for its part derived from the nomen which appears in our sources as *Passenus Passenius Passienus Passienius*.<sup>50</sup> *Casineius*, *Vassius* and *Titius* are attested in Beneventum, whereas *Pass(i)eni(i)* are not found in the area,<sup>51</sup> so perhaps one could conclude that the item *Passenillianus* in this man's nomenclature came from the maternal side.

*Primillianus* (?) (Kajanto p. 291): according to Kajanto this cognomen is attested in *CIL* VI 9487 = *ILS* 7743 and, written with one *L*, in AD 411 in "Series episc. 466";<sup>52</sup> but even in *CIL* VI 9487, now lost, the copies of Cyriacus have the reading *Primiliano* (or *Prymiliano*) with just one *L*, which has been corrected to "*PRIMILLIANO*" in *CIL*. However, it is certainly possible to assume that the name should be understood in both cases as representing *Primillianus*, which should then be derived from *Primillus/Primilla*.<sup>53</sup> On the other hand, it is possible to postulate the existence of the nomen *Primillius*, for there is a Greek inscription from Beroea mentioning Πρεμιλλιανὸς Κούρτιος and his freedwoman Πρεμιλλιανὴ Διονύσια (*SEG* 27, 274 = *IBeroeae* 334), and nomina in *-ius* are frequently furnished with the suffix *-ianus* in Greek inscriptions from Macedonia,<sup>54</sup> all this resulting in the possibility that *Primillianus* could in fact be derived from the nomen *Primillius*. But surely the derivation from *Primillus/-a* is the most plausible one.

<sup>49</sup> But note *Passienil[la]* in *CIL* VIII 23156 = *ILS* 9292 = *ILPBardo* 116.

<sup>50</sup> For this variation see my article in F. Mainardis (ed.), 'Voce concordi'. *Scritti per Claudio Zaccaria* (2016) 615–631.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. G. Camodeca in the presentation of this inscription in *Antiqua Beneventana* (cf. above n. 46) p. 241.

<sup>52</sup> This is a reference to P. B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae Catholicae quotquot innotuerunt* (1873/1886) p. 466, where we find a certain Primilianus, bishop in Lucus Magnus in Africa in AD 411.

<sup>53</sup> For this cognomen see Kajanto p. 291, with almost 150 instances of *Primilla*. The corresponding masculine form *Primillus* is attested in Afilae (M. Ulpius Prim[il]lus, EDR153007), Beneventum (C. Helvius Primillus, *CIL* IX 1836), Catina (L. Arrius Primillus, *CIL* X 7048), and in a Christian inscription from Rome (*ICVR* I 2936 = *ILCV* 3896).

<sup>54</sup> See my paper in *Arctos* 18 (1984) 97–104.



*Priscillianus* (Kajanto p. 288).<sup>55</sup> This cognomen is sometimes written *Priscilianus*, but seeing that there is no trace of the nomen \**Priscilius* combined with the fact that *Priscilla* is quite common and that even its masculine equivalent *Priscillus* is not unknown (n. 55), it seems certain that all attestations of *Priscilianus* with one *L* are to be interpreted as representing *Priscillianus* derived from *Priscillus/Priscilla*. Among equestrians and senators, we find this cognomen from the Severan period onwards in the case of the following persons: L. Lucilius St<e>l. Pansa Priscillianus (thus *AE* 1988, 1023 from Ephesus), a knight from Beneventum, procurator of several other provinces and of Asia in ca. 214–216, known from many inscriptions (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> L 391).<sup>56</sup> The cognomen is rendered as *Priscillianus* in all inscriptions except in *CIL* IX 663 where we find *Priscilianus* (but this inscription, now lost, is only known from an old copy). But this man's son (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> L 392) appears in any case as L. Lucilius Priscilianus (with one *L*) as patron of Canusium in *CIL* IX 338 = *ILS* 612. To continue with senators, the consul of AD 230, Sex. Catus Clementinus Priscillianus, surely an Italian (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 564) is normally referred to as *Clementinus*, but is in some consular dates<sup>57</sup> given the cognomen *Priscillianus* (*Priscilianus* *CIL* XIII 8588), which seems to have been his second cognomen.

In an inscription in honour of L. Valerius Maximus, a patrician and consul in 233 and 256 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> V 131), the consul is given the additional names, of unknown origin, *Acilio Priscilian[o]* (sic) in the inscription in his honour from Lavinium, *ILS* 8979; another, albeit fragmentary, honorific inscription addressing a senator of whose nomenclature only *Priscilli[ano]* has been preserved, could also refer to this consul (see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 952, mentioning Catus Clementinus as an alternative). Another senator honoured in Lavinium, Iunius Priscilianus (sic)

<sup>55</sup> Kajanto p. 288 registers around 140 Priscillae, three of them senatorial and four Christian. As for *Priscillus*, this cognomen is also attested in the first century AD: *CIL* VIII 26518 = M. Khanoussi & L. Maurin, *Dougga, fragments d'histoire* (2000) no. 25 (from the time of Tiberius); *AE* 1993, 462b (AD 62); *CIL* IV 2374 (Pompeii and thus pre-AD 79). For later instances see *CIL* VI 32929 = *ILS* 2700 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1188; *PME* A 168); *CIL* VI 17587. 33124; *CIL* III 7312 = *IG* IX 1,4, 1008.

<sup>56</sup> For Beneventum see G. Camodeca, in the article cited in n. 46, p. 248f.; A. De Carlo, in the same volume p. 293f. For his career see M. Christol, *Ant. Class.* 77 (2008) 201–214. For other inscriptions mentioning this man see *CIL* IX 662+663 (Ausculum); *I. Ephesos* 696A I & II (in these inscriptions the cognomen has not been preserved), 697, 3053; *AE* 1947, 89 (Athens).

<sup>57</sup> In addition to the inscription cited above see *CIL* II 3720 = *AE* 2015, 701 (with [*P*]r[is]cilliano) and the ms. *fasti* in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores Antiquissimi* XIII p. 377 and 392.

Maximus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 800; *PLRE* I Maximus 45), is known from four inscriptions, of which three<sup>58</sup> preserve the first cognomen, written with just one *L* in each case. The rest of the Priscilliani can be relegated to a footnote.<sup>59</sup>

*Procillianus* (Kajanto p. 177): this cognomen is obviously derived from *Procillus/Procilla*; in this case the masculine and the female forms must probably be kept apart, for *Procillus* is attested only for C. Valerius Procillus (?), the son of the Helvian chieftain C. Valerius Caburrus in 58 BC<sup>60</sup> and for a marine in the fleet of Ravenna calling himself *nat(ione) Ger(manus)* (*CIL* XI 95), thus leaving the impression that it is a barbarian name.<sup>61</sup> On the other hand, the female equivalent *Procilla* is quite common<sup>62</sup> and was apparently perceived as a variant of, and corresponding to, *Proculus* and *Procula*.<sup>63</sup> The cognomen *Procillianus* should, then, surely be interpreted as being derived from *Procilla*. The cognomen is attested for Domitius Leo Procillianus, legate of Syria Phoenice in 207 (*RE* Suppl. XIV 114, Domitius 63a),<sup>64</sup> known from two inscriptions, *AE* 1969/70, 610 = *IGLS* XVII 1, 118 (Palmyra: *Dom(itio) [Leone] [Pro]cilliano*) and *IGLS* VII 4016bis (Arados: Δομίτιου Λέοντος Προκιλλιανού). In addition to this man we find C. Minucius Procillianus in *CIL* X 4223 (Casilinum), Ti.

<sup>58</sup> *CIL* XIV 2074. 2075. 2076 (= *ILS* 6184).

<sup>59</sup> *ICVR* 23251. 23333m; *CIL* V 4485 = *Inscr. It.* X 5, 276 = *ILS* 6716 (Brixia), Sex. Valerius Publicola Priscillian(us), the son of Sex. Valerius Sex. fil. Fab. Publicola, a knight, and Clodia Q. f. Procilla, *sacerd(os) divae Plotinae* (i.e. after AD 123; G. L. Gregori, *Brescia romana* I [1990] p. 189 no. A, 295, 058 dates this man to the middle of the second century; for another Sex. Valerius Publicola from Brixia, but with the additional cognomen *Vettillianus*, see below at n. 86); *AE* 1934, 213 = *IMS* I 45 (Aur(elius) Priscillianus, son of Nunnus Priscianus and Sept(imia) Lupercilla); *CIL* III 6580 (a veteran in AD 194); *TAM* V 2, 957 = *IGR* IV 1234 (cf. above at n. 18).

<sup>60</sup> F. Münzer, *RE* VIII A 234f. Valerius no. 368; the cognomen may be uncertain, for Münzer, citing others, thinks that the correct reading may in fact have been *Troucillus*.

<sup>61</sup> For Gaulish or Celtic personal names ending in *-illus* see A. Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz* II (1904) 34f. s.v. *-i-llō-*.

<sup>62</sup> Kajanto p. 177 says the cognomen *Procilla* is attested more than sixty times, the attestations including three senatorial women (but note that *PFOS* includes altogether six Procillae), one freed-woman, and one woman in a Christian inscription.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Procilla daughter of Proculus: *CIL* XII 212; Procilla daughter of Procula: *CIL* VI 33776 and *CIL* III 12765; Proculus son of Procilla: *CIL* XIV 2981. *CIL* X 8131. *CIL* III 5545; Procula daughter of Procilla: *CIL* III 12770; Proculus son of Procilla: *CIL* X 5662; Procilla sister of Procula: *CIL* X 2717.

<sup>64</sup> B. E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidum* I<sup>2</sup> (2009) p. 131 no. 33:101.

Κλαύδιος Προκιλλιανός, a Galatarch (*OGI* 542 = *IGR* III 194 = *GLIA* I 83), Τι. Κλαύδιος Προκιλλιανός, a hymnode in Pergamum in AD 129/138 (*IPergamon* 374, l. 28); and C. Albu(c)ius C. f. Tr(omentina) Procilianus (sic), a decurion etc. in Salona (*CIL* III 2074), whose cognomen must be understood as *Procilianus* because this man was the son of Liguria Procilla, mentioned in the same inscription. On the other hand, the cognomen of Flavidius Procilianus in the *album* of Thamugadi in Numidia of ca. AD 350 (*CIL* VIII 2403 = A. Chastagnol, *Lalbum municipal de Timgad* [1978], 2,33) may well derive from the nomen *Procilius*, attested in Cirta in Numidia (*CIL* VIII 19618 = *ILAlg.* II 1595).

*Quintillianus* (Kajanto 174, who does not distinguish between *-ili-* and *-illi-*). The spelling with a double *L* is attested for M. Coculnius Sex. fil. Quir. Quintillianus, a man from Cirta made senator by Septimius Severus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1234); the cognomen is written with double *L* in *CIL* VIII 7041 = *ILS* 6857 = *ILAlg.* II 626, but rendered as *Quintilianus* in *CIL* VIII 7042 and 19508 = *ILAlg.* II 627 and 628. Another Quintillianus belonging to the upper classes is C. Iulius Quintillianus, prefect of the *vigiles* in AD 211 (*CIL* XIV 4388; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 511), most probably identical with a man of the same name who was legate of Moesia Inferior in AD 215 (*AE* 1998, 1618 = Pferdehirt, *RGZM* 73).<sup>65</sup> The spelling with double *L* appears in both inscriptions and may well be the correct one, but in *CIL* VI 1058 and 1059 (both from AD 210 and referring to the same man as prefect of the *vigiles*) the cognomen is written *Quintilianus* with one *L*. An earlier Quintillianus belonging to the equestrian order is now attested as prefect of the *cohors I Bracarorum* in AD 132.<sup>66</sup> Other instances of *Quintillianus* with double *L* known to me are *ICVR* IX 24676; *CIL* X 1755; *AE* 1978, 2756 = *Suppl. It.* 3 Locri 1; *CIL* XI 2664; *CIL* II 6106 = II<sup>2</sup> 14, 1247; *AE* 2012, 1143 (Carnuntum); *CIL* III 3553 = *Tituli Aquincenses* 641; *CIL* III 7688; *IGLS* VI 2748. 2850; *AE* 1998, 1436 (Berytus); *ILAlg.* II 4992. 8669.<sup>67</sup> Except for the inscription from Aquincum, where the mother of one Quintillianus is called Quintilla (cf. above at n. 17) and for *IGLS* VI 2748, where Quintillianus is the son of Quintillus (above at n. 19), the exact interpretation of the name in each case must remain uncertain, for seeing that *Quintillianus*, derived from *Quintillus/Quintilla*,

<sup>65</sup> Thomasson, op. cit. (n. 64) p. 54 no. 20:112.

<sup>66</sup> W. Eck & A. Pangerl, in G. I. Farkas & al. (eds.), *Visy 75. Artificem commendat opus. Studia in honorem Zs. Visy* (2019) p. 135–7.

<sup>67</sup> Note also Κοιντιλλιανός (*IGBulg.* 5434; *ICentral Pisidia* 131).

could be rendered as *Quintilianus* one should surely also consider the reverse possibility that *Quintilianus*, derived from *Quintilius*, could in some cases have been rendered as *Quintillianus*, and there is also the fact, pointed out above at n. 14, that the nomen *Quintilius* was sometimes written as *Quintillius*, this form for its part being potentially the source of the cognomen *Quintillianus*.

*Regillianus* (Kajanto 316): L. Marcus Simplex Regillianus, mentioned in inscriptions from Thugga with L. Marcus Simplex, surely Regillianus' father (*CIL* VIII 1471 = 15513/15514 = *DFM* 31/32 of AD 168; *CIL* VIII 26610 cf. *AE* 1999, 1843). One wonders whether the father might not have been married to one Regilla.<sup>68</sup> In addition, a certain Πηγυλλιανὸς Πηγυεῖνος is mentioned in the inscription of AD 238/244 from Callatis, *ISM* III 74, B, l. 23.

*Sergillianus* (cf. *Repertorium* p. 401): Sergilianus, a slave *vilicus* who set up a votive inscription in Montana in Moesia Inferior (*AE* 1975, 744 = 1985, 737 = 1987, 874); as the nomen \**Sergilius* is not attested, it seems that the name should be understood as representing *Sergillianus*. Perhaps this slave was owned by a certain Sergilla.<sup>69</sup> As for Αὐρ(ήλιος) Σε[ργ]ιλλιαν[ός] in Bostra (*IGLS* XIII 9009), the cognomen should perhaps be read as Σε[πτ]υμιαν[ός].

*Sextillianus* (Kajanto p. 155 as *Sextil(l)ianus*): M. Cocceius Sextillianus, *dec(urio) municipi Margi* (*CIL* III 8253 = *IMS* IV 38 from Naissus). If the spelling with a double *L* is correct, the cognomen could be interpreted as having been derived from *Sextius* (or perhaps *Sextus*) via *Sextillus/Sextilla*.<sup>70</sup>

*Tironillianus* (Kajanto p. 320): P. Iulius Iunianus Tironillianus *c(larissimus) p(uer)* (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 370), the son of P. Iulius Iunianus Martialianus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 369), legate of Numidia in the time of Severus Alexander<sup>71</sup> and an African

<sup>68</sup> For a Regilla in Thugga see *CIL* VIII 26976 = *Mourir à Dougga* 645. In the nomenclature of [ --- Cl]audi Caesaris Augusti servus Regillianus (*CIL* XI 7745), *Regillianus* is not a cognomen but an imperial slave's agnomen (see H. Chantraine, *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst römischer Kaiser* [1967] 331 no. 281).

<sup>69</sup> For *Sergilla* cf. Kajanto p. 170. This cognomen seems to be attested only in Saguntum for Antonia M. f. Sergilla (*CIL* II 3841ff. = II<sup>2</sup> 14, 337ff.) and perhaps a Sergi[a --- ] Sergilla] (*CIL* II 3845 = II<sup>2</sup> 14, 341).

<sup>70</sup> *Sextillus* is perhaps attested in *CIL* IV 5664 and in *CIL* VI 32533 b, I, 36 (as for *P. Graux* II 9 of AD 33, adduced by H. Solin, *Arctos* 49 [2015] 214 as an attestation of *Sextillus*, the reading of the papyrus is in fact Σεξτίλλιος). *Sextilla* is, according to Kajanto p. 170 and 174, attested eight times, this number including a slave.

<sup>71</sup> Thomasson, op. cit. (n. 64) p. 182f. no. 60.

from Thamugadi.<sup>72</sup> This Tironillianus is known from *AE* 1920, 30, *AE* 1989, 892 and *ILS* 6022.<sup>73</sup> Now *Tironillianus* takes one's thoughts to *Tironilla*, the cognomen of Antonia Tironilla, wife of Iulius Max[ --- ], mentioned as having taken part, among the *matronae equestres*, in the Severan secular games of AD 204;<sup>74</sup> the reading Max[ --- ] of the cognomen of Tironilla's husband seems certain (cf. the photo available at the Clauss-Slaby database) and the man is a knight;<sup>75</sup> I wonder whether it would be possible to assume that we have here Iunius Martialianus' parents (the father could have been called e.g. Iulius Max[imus]), the result being that Tironillianus would have inherited his cognomen from his grandmother.

*Titillianus* (?) (cf. Kajanto p. 157, registering *Titilianus* from *PIR*<sup>1</sup> S 67). Kajanto says, following *PIR*,<sup>76</sup> that the cognomen of this T. Sallustius Rufus Titilianus is "corrupt", but this is contested by H. Solin in *Repertorium* p. 412 who refers to *Titillianus* in *MAMA* VIII 517 from Aphrodisias (for a better reading of the inscription see *AE* 1999, 1606). This is the cognomen of Σαλλούστιος Τιτιλλιανός, συνκλητικός around the middle of the second century (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> S 97, where this man is identified with the man in the *fiſtula*), the son of the senator Σαλλούστιος Ροῦφος (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> S 96) and the brother of Σαλλουστία Φροντεῖνα (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> S 104). The only plausible way<sup>77</sup> of explaining the appearance of the cogno-

<sup>72</sup> M. Le Glay, in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* II (*Tituli* 5, 1982) p. 773.

<sup>73</sup> In this last inscription, the spelling of the cognomen is (in the genitive) *Tironiliani* in the original publication in *MEFR* 13 (1893) p. 470 and in *AE* 1894, 84, but perhaps by error *Tironilliani* with double *L* in *ILS*.

<sup>74</sup> *CIL* VI 32329 = *AE* 1932, 70 = G. B. Pighi, *De ludis saecularibus populi Romani Quiritium* (1941) p. 159, l. 29 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 899).

<sup>75</sup> For some suggestions for identifying the husband see A. Álvarez Melero, *Matronae equestres* (2018) p. 157 (all Iunii Maximi mentioned there being Africans).

<sup>76</sup> The author of the article in *PIR*<sup>1</sup> (H. Dessau?) says that the second cognomen of the man, T. Sallustius Rufus Titilianus, known from the *fiſtula* *CIL* XV 7526, is "fortasse corruptum", referring for no obvious reason to the nomenclature of a certain T. Atilius Rufus Titianus who cannot have had anything to do with the man in the *fiſtula* (and whose cognomen derives most probably from the family's praenomen *Titus*, cf. e.g. the numerous (T.) Flavii Titiani, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 378–387).

<sup>77</sup> There is, of course, the nomen *Titilius* (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 317 [Praeneste]. X 3699. IX 3112; written *Titillius* in *CIL* VI 7975; for *Titilius* : *Titius* cf. e.g. *Quintilius* : *Quintius*) on which the cognomen *Titil(l)ianus* could in theory be based. But there is no trace of this extremely rare nomen in the eastern parts of the empire and its emergence in Aphrodisias would be close to a miracle.

men *Titillianus* in the Aphrodisian network of Sallustii and Flavii<sup>78</sup> is to assume that the cognomen derives ultimately from the praenomen *Titus* of an unknown Aphrodisian T. Flavius (several persons in the city had evidently received Roman citizenship under the Flavians) and to postulate the existence of a Flavia Titilla with a cognomen formed from her father's praenomen,<sup>79</sup> who would have been Titillianus' mother or grandmother. In this case, the spelling of the cognomen with double *L* would be correct, the spelling *Titilianus* in the *fastula* being incorrect.

*Tuscillianus* (Kajanto p. 157 and 188): *CIL* II 4989 cf. 5161 = *IRCP* 80 (Balsa in Lusitania, perhaps from about the middle of the second century), an inscription in honour of T. Rutilius Gal. Tuscillianus, the son of Q. Rutil(ius) Rusticinus and the grandson of T. Manlius Martialis ('Tuscillianus' mother was thus a Manlia). There is the nomen *Tuscilius* which one could imagine having sometimes been written *Tuscillius*,<sup>80</sup> but this nomen is not attested in the Spanish provinces, whereas the cognomen *Tuscus* is often found there<sup>81</sup> and even the diminutive form *Tuscillus* is attested in the nomenclature of the senator Gn. Papirius [f.] Gal. Aelianus Aemil(ius) Tuscillus from Iliberris in Baetica, consul in 135.<sup>82</sup> We can thus surely conclude that *Tuscillianus* is derived from the cognomen *Tuscillus/Tuscilla*; perhaps this man's mother was a (Manlia) Tuscilla.

<sup>78</sup> See J. Reynolds, in P. Scherrer & al. (eds.), *Steine und Wege. Festschrift für Dieter Knibbe* (1999) p. 327–334; cf. the stemma on p. 329 and in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> S p. 26.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. the cases in which Quintillae are daughters of men with the praenomen *Quintus*: *CIL* VI 19148; *CIL* IX 1421; *CIL* II 245. 267. 347. 5068. 5187; *CIL* XII 2739. 2783; *AE* 1962, 143 (Vasio); *ILAlg.* II 3045. The cognomen *\*Titilla* does not seem to be attested but is of course perfectly plausible and acceptable.

<sup>80</sup> This spelling is, however, not actually attested.

<sup>81</sup> For *Tuscus* and derivatives being namens indicating Spain cf. R. Syme, *Roman Papers* IV (1988) p. 102, cf. p. 111 and 147; J. M. Abascal Palazón, *Los nombres personales en las inscripciones latinas de Hispania* (1994) p. 535f. (with references also to *Tuscilla*, *Tuscinus*, etc.).

<sup>82</sup> A. Caballos Rufino, *Los senadores hispanorromanos y la romanización de Hispania* I (1990) p. 248f. no. 137; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 108 (the complete nomenclature is attested in *CIL* II 2075 = *CIL* II<sup>2</sup> 5, 676). The year of the consulate: cf. *AE* 2007, 1778; W. Eck & A. Pangerl, *ZPE* 203 (2017) 227–34. For another Tuscillus belonging to the senatorial order and possibly originating from Spain note L. Memmius Tuscillus Senecio (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 475), the son of Senecio Memmius Gal. Afer, consul in AD 99 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 457); a Spanish origin (“hipotético, aunque verosímil”) is assigned to these senators by Caballos Rufino, p. 211f. no. 118.

*Valentillianus*: M. Αὐρ(ἥλιος) Ἀττινᾶς Τατιανοῦ Οὐαλεντιλλ[ι]ανός, a local dignitary in an unknown Lydian city, perhaps Saittai (AE 2000, 1420 = SEG 50, 1194).<sup>83</sup> For the date, note M. Aurelius Attinas, surely a relative, proconsul of Macedonia perhaps around AD 230/250;<sup>84</sup> *Valentillianus* is obviously derived from the cognomen *Valentilla*, attested also in Asia Minor (note Curtia Iulia Valentilla ὑπατική from a Lydian city, probably Philadelphia, PFOS 305; for Philadelphia cf. AE 2015, 1470).<sup>85</sup>

*Vettillianus* (?) (*Repertorium* p. 421): Sex. Valerius Sex. fil. Fab. Poblícola Vettillianus, *eq(ues) R(omanus)*, CIL V 4484 = *Inscr. It.* X 5, 275 (Brixia, about Severan).<sup>86</sup> The nomen *Vetilius*, not uncommon, is sometimes written *Vetillius*,<sup>87</sup> and the spelling (not attested) *Vettillius* (cf. *Vetidius* ~ *Vettidius*), leading to *Vettillianus*, would thus also be possible. But although the nomen *Vetilius* is attested precisely in Brixia (*Inscr. It.* X 5, 578), I think that it is more probable that *Vettillianus* is derived from *Vettilla*, itself derived from the nomen *Vettius* (very common in Cisalpine Gaul). The cognomen *Vettilla* is not very common, but there is an Aebutia L. f. Vettilla in Comum (CIL V 5677), and all three Vettillae (nos. 333, 334, 778<sup>88</sup>) in the prosopography of senatorial

<sup>83</sup> Cf. on this inscription H. Bru & G. Labarre, *DHA* 43/2 (2017) p. 160f. The inscription has been copied in Smyrna; the tentative attribution to Saittai is based on the fact that a certain Aurelius Attinas is attested by coin from Saittai from the time of Elagabalus (cf. G. Petzl, *EA* 32 [2000] p. 199).

<sup>84</sup> *IG* X 2, 148; cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1462; B. E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidium* I (1984) 23:42.

<sup>85</sup> According to Kajanto p. 247, *Valentilla* is attested six times in *CIL* (in the Clauss-Slaby database, the number of attestations is fourteen); for Greek inscriptions from Asia Minor see T. Corsten (ed.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* Vol. V.A (2010) p. 349 and J.-S. Balzat & al. (eds.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* Vol. V.B (2013) p. 333. A search in the PHI Greek Inscriptions database produces many further matches for Οὐαλέντιλλα in Asia Minor.

<sup>86</sup> No date is offered for this text by G. Migliorati in EDR09275, but the formulations (and the mistakes) of this text all point to a date not earlier than the second part of the second century, and Vettillianus' wife Nonia Arria Hermionilla must be closely related with the Nonii Arrii of Brixia (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 114–116) attested in the end of the second century. G. L. Gregori, *Brescia romana* I (1990) p. 191 n. A, 295, 076 suggests a date in the beginning of the third century. Cf. Sex. Valerius Poblícola Priscilianus, also from Brixia, above n. 59.

<sup>87</sup> *CIL* III 2985; S. Hagel & K. Tomaschitz, *Repertorium der westkilikischen Inschriften* (1998) p. 96f. Kotenna 3 (Οὐετιλλία). Cf. Οὐετιλλιανός (nomen) *I. Prusias ad Hypium* 7, l. 22 (for the category of nomina in *-ianus* derived from nomina in *-ius* see my paper cited in n. 54).

<sup>88</sup> Βέτιλλα in the inscription *Fouilles de Xanthos* no. 42 = AE 1981, 826b is surely only a loose rendering of *Vettilla*.

women by Raepsaet-Charlier (above n. \*) are from northern Italy. Perhaps one could say that this is a cognomen characteristic of Cisalpine women belonging to the higher classes; possibly Valerius Pobllicola Vettillianus' mother or grandmother was a Vettilla. The same cognomen also seems to be mentioned in *ICilicie* 125 (Βεττιλλιανό[ς]).

*Vicinillianus* (?) (Kajanto 312): attested for the consul ordinarius of AD 114, P. Manilius P. f. Gal. V[opis]cus Vicinillianus L. Elufrius Severus Iulius Quadratus Bassus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 142; the name is rendered as above in *CIL* XIV 4242 = *ILS* 1044 = *Inscr. It.* IV 1, 109). The easiest way of explaining the cognomen *Vicinillianus* would probably be to assume that the name is derived from an unattested nomen \**Vicinillius*.<sup>89</sup> However, the fact that one of the children of a certain N. Prosius Platanus who set up the monument was called *Vibia Vicinill[a]*<sup>90</sup> points to the conclusion that *Vicinillianus* was interpreted as having been derived not from an unknown nomen but from the cognomen *Vicinilla* (cf. n. 90 for the cognomen *Vopiscianus* of one of the sons of Platanus and Eutychia, clearly a reference to the consul's main cognomen). As for the derivation of *Vicinilla*, there is the extremely rare nomen *Vicinius* (n. 89), not really plausible, and there is of course also the noun *vicinus*, according to Kajanto p. 312 also attested once as a cognomen.<sup>91</sup> But then there is also *Vicina*, the cognomen of L. Plotius Vicina, proconsul of Crete and Cyrene in the time of Augustus between 2 BC and AD 7 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 520). W. Schulze thought that this could be an Etruscan nomen used as a cognomen,<sup>92</sup> and that is perhaps a plausible interpretation. In any case, the female cognomen *Vicinilla* could obviously also be derived from *Vicina* (cf. e.g. *Galba: Galbilla*, *Murena: Murenilla*), and I suggest that it is this cognomen that is at the beginning of the development leading to *Vicinillianus*.

<sup>89</sup> *Vicinius* is rare, but attested (*CIL* VIII 14743; cf. the nomen *vecineo(s)* in the Faliscan inscription E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* I [1953] 322d); \**Vicinillius* could in theory be in the same relation to *Vicinius* as e.g. *Gavillius* to *Gavius*.

<sup>90</sup> This is, I think, the correct interpretation of the formulation *N. Prosius Platanus cum Manilia Eutychi[a] uxore et Vibia Vicinill[a] et Manilis Vopisciano et Attico libe[ris] suis*. Apparently Platanus, when still a slave, had a relationship not only with Manilia Eutychia (surely a freedwoman of the consul) but also with a Vibia.

<sup>91</sup> Kajanto refers to *CIL* V 7842, seen by Mommsen but now lost (cf. E. Cimarosti, in EDR010365), from Forum Germa(-) in the area of modern Cuneo. The reading of Mommsen is *Vicino / Comiacus / V SVVI*, but I am not sure this text permits us to postulate the existence of a cognomen *Vicinus*.

<sup>92</sup> W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (1904) p. 102.



One could for instance assume that the mother or the grandmother of the consul of 114, who was a patrician and who was thus born around AD 80, had been a Plotia Vicinilla, a descendant of the proconsul of Crete and Cyrenae. Having just mentioned a proconsul of this province I cannot help pointing out that, interestingly, another proconsul of the same insignificant province can be extracted from the full nomenclature of the consul of 114, for *Vicinillianus* is followed in the full nomenclature by the item *L. Elufrius Severus*, which must refer somehow to L. Elufrius Severus, proconsul of Crete and Cyrenae in AD 100 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> E 57).<sup>93</sup> This observation, however, does not lead us anywhere, for another proconsul of Crete is not really needed in order to explain Vopiscus' second cognomen, and the fact that his full nomenclature includes references to two proconsuls of this particular province is probably only a coincidence.

The above catalogue consisting of cognomina in *-illianus* derived from cognomina in *-illus/-illa*<sup>94</sup> contains 31 names, some of them uncertain. I would like to conclude this article with some general observations, and to begin with the observation that in cognomina derived from cognomina, the suffix *-illian-* is clearly a suffix preferred in male, rather than in female, names, as about 30 male names ending in *-illianus* must be contrasted with a much smaller number of female cognomina ending in *-illiana*. The *Repertorium* registers only two names in *-illiana*, *Fadilliana* and *Flaccilliana* (cf. above n. 25), but there is also *Gratilliana* (cf. above n. 29)<sup>95</sup> and *Rusticilliana* (Ρουστικιλλιανή *ICentral Pisia* 28 from Cremna),<sup>96</sup> and one could also adduce *Drusilliana*, the agnomen of the imperial slave girl Cinnamis (*CIL* VI 8824).<sup>97</sup> We could perhaps conclude that, because the female suffix *-illa* was common and popular, female cognomina derived from cognomina in *-illa* (as e.g. *Flaccilliana* from *Flaccilla*) may

<sup>93</sup> Perhaps the proconsul had died after the proconsulate and Manilius Vopiscus had inherited him, adding his names to his own in gratitude.

<sup>94</sup> I hope it is clear that I am dealing exclusively with cognomina derived from cognomina in *-illus/-illa*, and not with cognomina of the type *Aquillianus Popillianus* derived from nomina.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. the reverse index on p. 434 and p. 507.

<sup>96</sup> This name is probably derived from *Rusticilla*; but it should be noted that there is also the nomen *Rusticilius*, which is in fact attested in the Greek east, although only in Thessalonica (A. B. Tataki, *The Roman Presence in Macedonia* [2006] 367 no. 490) and thus very far from Pisidia.

<sup>97</sup> The rest of the cognomina in *-illiana* which one can find in the Clauss-Slaby and the PHI Greek Inscriptions databases (*Lucilliana* Λουκιλλιανή Ποπιλλιανή *Quintilliana*) are certainly or at least probably derived from nomina.

have been considered not really needed or desirable, whereas the masculine suffix *-illus*, which never became very popular, was because of this in some cases replaced with the suffix *-illianus* which was normally derived from names in *-illa* and probably considered to amount to a form corresponding to these female forms. To quote one of the referees of this paper, “[t]he essentially diminutive quality of the *-illus/-illa* suffix probably made it inherently more suitable for girls in the minds of parents. Whereas this effect was neutralized, if not even reversed, by the addition of *-ianus*, making *-illianus* more popular as a name choice for boys”.

As for the chronology of the names in *-illianus*, most of the instances of the names cited in the catalogue are either not exactly datable (but normally probably “late”, about Severan or so), or can be dated to the third century or later. Only four of the names are attested for persons who were certainly active in the second century, the earliest being the consul of AD 114, P. Manilius Vo-piscus Vicinillianus; C. Neratius Proculus Betitius Pius Maximillianus, [ --- ] nius Tiro Frugillianus and Flavius Gratillianus are attested during the reign of Pius. As the consul of 114 was probably born around AD 80 (above at n. 92), my conclusion is, then, that the *terminus post quem* for the development of the cognomina of this type is the end of the first century AD. This is exactly the same period when we start to observe other types of cognomina derived from cognomina, especially those in *-ianus* (*Frontonianus Severianus* etc., cf. above at n. 1ff.), but also e.g. those in *-inus* (like e.g. *Maximinus* rather than *Maximus*), this being a phenomenon which I like to think represents a general tendency to prefer lengthy and expressive cognomina, a tendency resulting in the end in cognomina with double suffixes of the type *Lupicinus* (above n. 8: *Lupus* + *-ico-* + *-ino-*) and *Valentinianus* (*Valens* + *-ino-* *-iano-*).

It is in my view probable that most of the names in *-illianus* were derived from female names in *-illa*, for this suffix is much more common than its masculine equivalent and *-illianus* derived from *-illa* is the derivation that appears in our sources (cf. above at n. 18), although it is true that I have been able to trace one inscription in which a certain Quintillianus is the son of a Quintillus (above at n. 19). It could also be noted that for many of the names in the catalogue above no corresponding male form in *-illus* is known,<sup>98</sup> whereas only in

<sup>98</sup> *Domitillianus Flavillianus Frugillianus Gratillianus Longillianus Nepotillianus Novatillisus Pacatillianus Passenillianus Sextillianus Tironillianus Titillianus Valentillianus Vettillianus Vicinillianus.*

two cases is the corresponding female form in *-illa* not attested.<sup>99</sup> On the other hand, cognomina in *-illus* do exist, although not in the same numbers as those in *-illa*, and in the case of several of the names above the corresponding name in *-illus* is in fact found; thus e.g. in the case of *Atticillianus* alongside which name there is not only *Atticilla* but also one instance of *Atticillus* (n. 20).<sup>100</sup>

But the problem of the cognomina in *-illianus* is that they evidently came into existence in completely different situations and environments. We have, for example, cognomina of this type attested for senators from various parts of the Empire: *Gratillianus Marsillianus Maximillianus Novatillianus Passenillianus Priscillianus Procillianus Quintillianus Tironillianus Titillianus Vicinillianus*, among which we can observe names which must have been felt to be “noble”, especially *Maximillianus* and *Priscillianus*. Some of the senatorial names can be attributed to Italy (*Novatillianus Passenillianus Priscillianus Vicinillianus*), some to both Italy and Africa (*Maximillianus*), some only to Africa (*Marsillianus Quintillianus Tironillianus*), some to the Greek-speaking provinces in the East (*Domitillianus Titillianus* and probably *Procillianus*).<sup>101</sup> Some of the names we find among senators are also found among persons belonging to the equestrian order (*Novatillianus Priscillianus Quintillianus*) or in the category of the *domi nobiles* (*Maximillianus*). Then there are other names which we find attested not for senators, but for local dignitaries and which accordingly were probably thought of as corresponding to the status of the families in which the cognomen was in use; to this category belong names attested in Italy (*Atticillianus Vettillianus*), in Italy and Africa (*Magnillianus*), in Spain (*Tusillianus*), in Moesia (*Sextillianus*) and in Africa (*Crescentillianus Regillianus*).<sup>102</sup> But we also find names in *-illianus* among more or less ordinary people and even among slaves (e.g. *Balbillianus Nepotillianus Pacatillianus Sergil(l)ianus*). A group of names in *-illianus* of especial interest is that consisting of names

<sup>99</sup> *Passenillianus Titillianus*.

<sup>100</sup> Further names in this group are *Atticillianus Balbillianus ?Bassillianus* (for *Bassillus* cf. CIL VI 36364 = ILS 8218, *clivus Bassilli*; IG XIV 1888 = IGUR 824; ILAlg. II 4282) *Crescentillianus Flaccillianus Lucillianus Magnillianus Marsillianus Maximillianus Primillianus Priscillianus Procillianus Quintillianus Regillianus Tusillianus*.

<sup>101</sup> The origin of the senator *Gratillianus* must probably remain uncertain.

<sup>102</sup> The prefect of Aegypt under Valerian, T. Magnius Felix *Crescentillianus*, whose name has an African ring, probably also came from Africa.

attested in the Greek-speaking east, either exclusively in eastern inscriptions or both in the west and in the Greek-speaking east, both for so-called ordinary people and for members of the higher classes. The names *Balbillianus Priscillianus Procillianus Quintillianus Regillianus Vettillianus* are also known in the west, whereas *Domitillianus Flaccillianus Flavillianus Frugillianus Longillianus Titillianus Valentillianus* are found only in Greek inscriptions from the east. The names attested in Greek inscriptions probably came into existence in about the same way as those we find in Latin sources, namely by being derivations of female names in *-illa/-ιλλα*;<sup>103</sup> the Latin suffix *-ianus/-ιανός* is known to have been quite popular in the Greek lands in the imperial age, for we find it being added not only to Latin but also to Greek names (*Amyntianus Berenicianus Eutygianus* etc.) and even to Latin nomina in *-ius*.<sup>104</sup>

*University of Helsinki*

---

<sup>103</sup> The suffix *-ιλλα* is also found in Greek names (cf. e.g. the poets Πράξιλλα and Τελέσιλλα), and sometimes also in names of barbarian origin; cf. Δραγιλλιανός in the nomenclature of Δραγιλλιανός ε΄ Τυλλιανός Έλευσεινιανός Πούλχος, a knight in Perge (*IPerge* 322).

<sup>104</sup> See my paper cited in n. 54, with instances of Ίουλιανός for Ίούλιος, etc.