

PERSONAL NAMES IN *ANNALS* I-VI

By RONALD SYME

Names of persons in the *Codex Mediceus prior* exhibit familiar corruptions, and many of the necessary corrections were easily made.¹ The cogent evidence was often external—the same character appeared elsewhere in Tacitus, or in some other writer, and inscriptions might certify the orthography of a name or even permit the identification of an individual. None the less, there were, and there are, traps and uncertainties. First, an inoffensive or unimpeachable name need not be correct. Nobody would have suspected 'Livius' (*Ann.* II, 30, 1—twice): only later passages (IV, 13, 2; 28, 1) showed that the person referred to was in fact Vibius Serenus. And 'Vescularius Atticus' (*Ann.* VI, 10, 2) would stand but for 'Vescularius Flaccus' (II, 28, 1). Secondly, the rarity (genuine or only fancied) of a name has often been allowed to impugn it. On the contrary, if a *gentilicium* is uncommon, or even unique, that is no ground for discomfort. The nomenclature of Italy is startling, fantastic and myriad in its manifestations. The *Annals* of Tacitus display names which, deceptively familiar from their occurrence in a classical text, are yet of a rarity to adorn an onomatological aviary.

Again, an error here and there, of a kind not obviously to be explained by a copyist's confusion of forms and letters, might be due to the author's own inadvertence. A Roman senator or a Roman historian carried in his head an enormous collection of names and personalities, for that was a necessary equipment in either profession if a man were not to incur the deadly reproach of ignorance about the *res publica* in one at least of its aspects, namely, knowing who was who in politics. Prosopography is not a modern invention. Though Tacitus was a scrupulous investigator, as witness his note on an obscure fellow—'originem non repperi' (*Ann.* VI, 7, 4)—the very variety and complexity of the material might cause a senator or a historian to make a slip about a name, in speech or in writing. For example, it was peculiarly easy to confuse Latinii and Lucanii (see below, p. 13). Modern scholars have the index and the lexicon. Those aids do not always preserve them from errors about names when they edit the text of Tacitus.²

Fourth and last, orthography. It is not enough to establish, on the basis of epigraphic usage, the commonest, or even the best, spelling of a name. What is in fact the same *gentilicium* may show variations between writer and writer, period and period—and according to the social status of its owner. Some forms are archaic (which often means respectable), or regional, others careless, vulgar—or just innovatory. For example, there are consonants doubled or not doubled. And, most remarkable perhaps, there are the variations between '-iedius', '-edius', and '-idius'. Those terminations are non-Latin in type and origin. Their incidence has been properly and thoroughly investigated in statistics of the inscriptions of central Italy: they are found to be characteristic of the region of the Abruzzi, being thickest among the peoples of the Marsi and Paeligni.³ Several of these names occurring in Tacitus demand attention, for orthography and for other reasons.

Names ending in '-enus' and '-ienus' have not been studied in the same systematic fashion.⁴ Yet it can be said that their area of greatest frequency seems to lie in the northern zone of the Osco-Umbrian dialects; Etruscan influence has been plausibly surmised.

¹ The common types of corruption were neatly classified and discussed by G. Andresen, 'Korruptierte Eigennamen bei Tacitus,' *Woch. für cl. Phil.* 1915, 1097 ff.; 1121 ff.

² Thus Fisher, 'Latinus' (*Ann.* IV, 71, 1); Küstermann, 'Curtius' (ib. 27, 2) and 'Publicum' (*Hist.* IV, 10, 1).

³ A. Schulten, 'Italische Namen und Stämme,' *Klio* II (1902), 167 ff. and 440 ff.; III (1903), 235 ff.

⁴ W. Schulze in his monumental work ('Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen', *Gött. Abh., phil.-hist. Klasse*, N.F. V, 5, 1904: referred to in the following observations as *LE*) did not realize until it

was too late the importance of establishing the regional distribution of names in '-ienus'. He was therefore compelled to employ the material as published by Conway—whose methods he describes as 'crude and superficial'. Compare his remarks, 'Conway's Gedanke, das Namenmaterial in die Stoffsammlung für die italischen Dialekte aufzunehmen, ist ausgezeichnet, aber seine Ausführung ist doch allzu roh und äusserlich. Leider habe ich versäumt, rechtzeitig die Frage nach der Verbreitung des Suffixes -ienus in meine Untersuchung einzubeziehen und muss nun das Material benutzen, wie es bei Conway dargeboten wird' (*LE* 104).

Here, too, variations occur in the ending of fundamentally identical family names, as between '-enus', '-ienus', and '-enius'. One may observe, for example, numerous 'Passenii' on the inscriptions from the sepulchre of the Passieni on the Via Latina (*CIL* VI, 7257-7280). At the same time, however, it is not at all to be believed that any of the senatorial Passieni of the early Principate ever chose to be styled 'Passenius'. And though variants in the spelling of the same *gentilicium*, even a senator's *gentilicium*, might occur at different periods and in different authors, it is not likely that a historian deliberately allowed himself the license of writing now 'Trebellenus', now 'Trebellienus'. Some editors would argue that such variants should be retained in the text.

To constitute a legitimate text is indeed a tricky business. Many valid corrections of proper names in the *Codex Mediceus prior* have been made since the year 1515, Lipsius' operations being especially notable and decisive, though some had to wait until the nineteenth century (for example, it was Borghesi who first interpreted 'Fulnicium' as 'P. Vinicium', *Ann.* III, 11, 2). Yet it turned out that a number of the alterations were questionable and even erroneous. It thus became necessary to go back and purge the received texts.⁵ The conservative reaction has been maintained in recent years. Even so, the latest editions of *Annals* I-VI contain personal names that derive from premature and superfluous emendation.

The appended list, while taking its origin from names that have been questioned or altered, is not confined to that class. It also includes several that were never remotely suspected. The justification for their appearance is a simple one: they exemplify rarities of nomenclature or variations in orthography, and so provide guidance or parallel in disputed instances. And there is one name, that of the *delator* Romanus Hispo (*Ann.* I, 74, 1) which stands in all the modern texts as it stood in the *Codex*, in a flagrantly incorrect form. Here a change is unavoidable.

Two *crucis*, unmanageable in the scope of the present paper, have been deliberately omitted. As for the one, it is enough to cite it—'† que tedii et Vedii Pollionis luxus' (*Ann.* I, 10, 5). The other is 'M. Lepidum', whom Augustus in his latest conversations reckoned among the 'capaces imperii' (*Ann.* I, 13, 2). Lipsius altered the *praenomen*, reading 'M'. Lepidum', and all editors of any consequence since Lipsius (with the solitary exception of G. H. Walther) follow his procedure, and some have investigated for themselves. Marcus Lepidus or Manius, this is no place to state the problem in all its complications or even adumbrate the case for M. Aemilius Lepidus (*cos.* A.D. 6), of Scipionic ancestry, the son of Paullus (*cos.* 34 B.C.), and of Cornelia.⁶

To conclude this preface. Though most of the items discussed seem to be little more than questions of orthography, in some an identity is at stake, as when an emendation reveals a new Atia (a member of the family of Augustus on the maternal side), or a lady of the Sextii Africani. The more important benefit accrues from the less prepossessing specimens of nomenclature. Rare and peculiar *gentilicia*, confined for the most part to one district of Italy or to one family of senatorial rank, illustrate the origin and the vicissitudes of *novi homines* under the early Principate, especially persons from the central highland zone, and fill out with colour and relief the social and political history of the age.⁷

Some of the names are so uncommon that it has been possible to record all the known instances.⁸ For others it is enough to concentrate on the significant details in the evidence, that is to say the marked preponderance of a name in some region of Italy or its attestation in local families of magisterial rank. In the search for origins the inscriptions of the capital and of the suburban towns of Latium are naturally of little use; yet even here the data about freedmen may help to show the rarity of certain *gentilicia*.

⁵ Andresen's new edition (1913) of Halm's Teubner text of the *Annals* registered many improvements on the previous edition of Halm (1883), among them rectifications of proper names; cf. also his article referred to above, p. 6, n. 1. Of some three hundred changes of all kinds, about one-half were a return to the readings of the *Codex*.

⁶ For a brief hint about M. Lepidus, see *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 433.

⁷ Cf. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 360 ff.; 456.

⁸ If some have been overlooked, the scattered and unsystematic publication of epigraphic material can take a part of the blame.

Nor will it be necessary at this late date to recall the emendations of proper names, whether convincing or superfluous, that have been offered by scholars ever since the *editio princeps*. It would make a curious record, not without a certain melancholy instruction. For brevity and for convenience, references will be confined almost exclusively to the treatment of the names in the latest three editions of *Annals* I–VI.⁹ Each item is prefixed with the form that occurs in the *Codex*.

M. ALETVS, II, 47, 4 : a senator of praetorian rank. The accepted remedy 'M. Ateius', sponsored by Borghesi and by Mommsen, is printed in all modern texts. 'Ateius' is a name rendered familiar by the tribune of 55 B.C., C. Ateius Capito, who called down curses on M. Crassus, and by the illustrious, and obsequious, jurist, C. Ateius L. f. L. n. Capito (*cos. suff.* A.D. 5), who was the grandson of a Sullan centurion, son of a senator of praetorian rank (*Ann.* III, 75, 1) : the latter may be identified as the 'L. Ateius L. f. An. Capito' attested in 50 B.C. (Cicero, *Ad fam.* VIII, 8, 5). Their local origin is unknown—perhaps Castrum Novum in south Etruria, cf. the inscription (late Republican or early Imperial) recording a magistrate there, L. Ateius M. f. Capito (*CIL* XI, 3583 = *ILS* 5515). The tribe of Castrum Novum has not been established : the collocation of this evidence might suggest the 'Aniensis'. Apart from the three Ateii Capitones, no Ateius is known as a senator, and there is no strong reason for producing another. Alternatives become equally plausible. Orelli conjectured 'Aletius', for which name cf. *TLL* s.v. 'Allius' and Schulze, *LE* 90 f. Also to be thought of is 'Aleius' (on which name, cf. *LE* 345). The smallest change of all, the common reading of 't' for 'i', will explain how 'Aleius' could pass into 'Aletus', cf. 'eiusque' giving 'et usque' (I, 13, 6). At the same time, however, one should ask whether 'Aletus' might not come from 'Aietius', with an eye on the senator Aietius Pastor (Seneca, *Controv.* I, 3, 11). The corruption 'l' for 'i' is easy, cf. 'se lustrabo' for 'Seius Strabo' (I, 7, 2)—and perhaps the 'L. Alenus' of Cicero, *De natura deorum* III, 74, where the *Codex Vindobonensis* in fact has 'L. Aienus'. The name 'Alenus' is rare. The only epigraphical instance cited by the *TLL* is 'Ulpius Alenus v.p.' of c. A.D. 306 (*CIL* IX, 687, Herdoniae); but 'Alenus', 'Alenius', and 'Alennius' are very much the same thing, observe 'L. Aleni C. f. Clu. Capitoni(s)' (*CIL* XI, 4577, Carsulae), clearly of the same family as 'C. Alennius L. f. Clu.' (*CIL* VI, 11383 = *ILS* 8325). On the other hand, 'Aienus' is rendered singularly attractive by the two Republican inscriptions of *magistri vicorum* in the land of the Vestini, 'T. Aienus V. f. Med.' (*CIL* I², 1804) and 'L. Aienus L. f.' (*CIL* I², 756 = *ILS* 4906).

A case could thus be made for 'Aietius' in Tacitus. But Seneca's 'Aietius Pastor' is unique—or at least it should be noted that the only epigraphically attested form of the name is 'Aiedius' (cf. *TLL*, a dozen instances). And he might really be 'Aletius Pastor'. However, to conclude, there are no adequate grounds for preferring 'Ateius' in *Ann.* II, 47, 4. The claims of 'Aletius', 'Aleius', and 'Aietius' must be considered.

ALIA, III, 68, 2 : mother of C. Junius Silanus (*cos. ord.* A.D. 10). Various suggestions have been made. For example, Grotius' 'Manlia' (preferred by Borghesi), which would produce the last known survivor, after Horace's friend Torquatus (*Epp.* I, 5, 3 ; *Odes* IV, 7, 23), of the patrician Manlii—and might seem at first sight to explain the emergence of the *cognomen* Torquatus among the Junii Silani of the early Empire. But that *cognomen* goes back a long way, deriving from the son of T. Manlius Torquatus (*cos.* 165 B.C.), adopted by D. Silanus (Cicero, *De finibus* I, 24) ; hence the *imagines* of the Manlii were displayed at the funeral of M. Brutus' half-sister, Cassius' widow (*Ann.* III, 76, 2). As this justification for 'Manlia' is superfluous, 'Allia' might seem to suffice. But this is ruled out by the context, which assigns the distinction and identity of Silanus' mother as the reason for exempting the maternal property from confiscation, and therefore supports Madvig's 'Atia'—'eadem ceteri, nisi quod Cn. Lentulus separanda Silani materna bona, quippe

⁹ Namely those of E. Köstermann (Teubner, 1934, replacing Halm-Andresen⁵, 1913) ; M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis (*Regia Academia Italica*, 1940) ; H. Fuchs (*Editiones Helveticae*, 1946). For observations on the last of these, cf. *JRS* xxxviii (1948),

122 ff. Lenchantin's text is provided with a complete and admirable *apparatus*. The present inquiry has been conducted independently of Fabia's *Onomasticon Taciteum* (1900), and, for the sake of brevity, makes no reference to that work.

Atia parente geniti, reddendaque filio dixit, adnuente Tiberio'. The emendation is accepted by the recent editors of Tacitus, but the historical consequences seem to have been overlooked, save by E. Hohl (P-W x, 1088); and the lady does not find a place in *PIR*². She must be no less than a descendant of Augustus' maternal grandfather M. Atius Balbus, a senator of praetorian rank from Aricia.

There were two women called Atia. The one, the mother of Augustus, took for her second husband L. Marcius Philippus (*cos.* 56 B.C.). The other, her younger sister, passed also into this house, being married to the consul's son L. Philippus (*cos. suff.* 38 B.C.). Who then is the third Atia? Conceivably the same as the younger sister. Of her husband Philippus nothing is recorded subsequent to his triumph in 33 B.C. and construction of the Porticus Philippi from the proceeds of the booty. He might have died soon after, and his widow might have married a Junius Silanus, the otherwise unrecorded parent of C. Junius C. f. M. n. Silanus (*cos. ord.* A.D. 10). The latter would then be half-brother of Marcia, the wife of Paullus Fabius Maximus (*cos.* 11 B.C.), and, like her, first cousin to the Princeps, which is paradoxical but not impossible. Despite his lineage Silanus need not have reached the consulate at the earliest permissible age (thirty-two), but might have suffered some retardation, like other *nobiles* in this period, especially those whose fathers had missed the supreme magistracy.

Conjecture for conjecture, it might be preferable to produce a third Atia. It could be done. Certain arguments tell for the existence of a younger M. Atius Balbus, maternal uncle of Augustus and governor of Sardinia in the triumviral period, cf. M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (1946), 150 ff. Atia might be identified as his daughter.

Speculation about these relatives of the Princeps should not neglect Sex. Pompeius, the consul of A.D. 14, described by Cassius Dio as his συγγενής (LVI, 29, 5, cf. Seneca, *De tranquillitate animi* XI, 10). Borghesi suggested that the link might be a second Marcia (*Oeuvres* v (1869), 141). Unfortunately the inscriptions he relied on were spurious (*CIL* VI, *977^{a-c}), and the problem subsists. The second Marcia may still excite hopes—she occurs in Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms* IV² (1908), 325.

The kinship of Sex. Pompeius with the dynasty happened to be recorded in the literary evidence. That an Atia was the mother of C. Silanus (*cos. ord.* A.D. 10) is a casual fact, emerging from an emendation in Tacitus. It helps to explain the remarkable prominence of the Silani in the early Empire. The Silani were numerous as well as successful—it was another branch of them that rose highest, with M. Silanus (*cos. ord.* A.D. 19), who married Aemilia Lepida the great-granddaughter of Augustus (cf. the stemma, *PIR*¹, J 550).

ANTEIVS, II, 6, 1: a legate of Germanicus Caesar in A.D. 16. Ulrichs bracketed this name, supposing it wrongly inserted, because of 'C. Antio' in the preceding phrase, and of the recent editors Fuchs concurs. Yet it would not be a surprise to discover an earlier member of the family of the consular P. Anteius (*PIR*², A 731) whom Agrippina the daughter of Germanicus is said to have favoured (*Ann.* XVI, 14, 2). The only other senatorial Antei are a father and a son, the one killed by Caligula, the other by his German bodyguard after the assassination of the tyrant (Josephus, *AJ* XIX, 125 f.). The local origin of the Antei cannot be ascertained—but observe Anteia L. f. Procula, married to one of the Voluseni of Sestinum in Umbria (*CIL* XI, 6019), perhaps more significant than the Anteia wife of the younger Helvidius Priscus (Pliny, *Epp.* IX, 13, 4).

ARVSEIVS VI, 7, 1: a *delator*, the accuser of L. Arruntius, perhaps but not necessarily the same person as L. Aruseius (VI, 40, 1). Reinesius proposed to read 'Aruleius' in both places, but the grounds are seen to be inadequate, for, though 'Aruleius' (cf. the not very frequent 'Arulenus') occurs, it occurs only on three inscriptions, all at Rome (*CIL* VI, 12490; 33540; 26466—two persons, each with the *praenomen* 'Lucius'). Now 'Aruseius' does in fact exist. The unique instance is *CIL* VI, 12492—a freedman of P. Aruseius. No modern editor has been frivolous enough to substitute 'Aruleius' for 'Aruseius'.

ATIDIVM GEMINVM IV, 43, 3: proconsul of Achaia, presumably in the time of Augustus. This *gentilicium* exhibits the predictable variants 'Atiedius', 'Atedius', 'Atidius', also the forms with the doubled 't'. The archaic form 'Atiedius' is discovered

as the name of a religious confraternity at Iguvium, e.g. 'fratrus atiersier' (*Tab. Iguv.* VII b 1 Devoto), and on early inscriptions from the Marsian country, 'Paapia Atiedi 1.' (*CIL* I², 1817 = *ILS* 3817) and 'V. A[t]iedius' (I², 392 = *ILS* 4023). There are further examples to be found in central Italy and in Umbria, e.g. *CIL* XI, 4795 (Spoletium, a magistrate). And, as a curiosity, may be noted a group of Atedii in Africa, all at or near Thugga (*CIL* VIII, 26726 f.; 27361; 27368). The form 'Atedius', familiar from Statius' friend Atedius Melior (*PIR*², A 1277) is very rare; likewise 'Atidius', though attested in literature for an agent of Verres (*In Verrem* II, 3, 75). The only epigraphic instances in Italy are suburban (*CIL* XIV, 2532, 4090³⁰ f., a pair of tiles, all from the territory of Tusculum). The forms with the doubled 't' are not so instructive: 'Attidius' becomes rather common.

There is no call to alter the name 'Atidius' in Tacitus, even though a person called M. Ἀττήδιος Κόγνιτορ be attested (*Inscr. v. Olympia* 86, 11), whose family may be assumed to have derived its *gentilicium* from the proconsul of Achaia.

'Atedius' and its derivatives will find parallel in these notes: compare the remarks on 'Bruttidius', 'Carsidius', 'Titedius', 'Vibidius', all Tacitean characters. It is a temptation to add 'Murredius', a *rhetor* much disliked by the elder Seneca (*Controv.* I, 2, 21, etc.). The *gentilicium* is not elsewhere attested in this form. There is only 'Murradius', and rare at that (*CIL* VI, 22723; 23075, mentioning the same woman as IX, 5571, Tolentinum in Picenum).

AVFIDIENVM RVFVM, I, 20, 1: *praefectus castrorum*, a common soldier to begin with. The name is rare—*CIL* V, 5575 (territory of Comum); XI, 4670 (Tuder); IX, 4242 (Amiternum); 4396 (between Amiternum and Reate, a *tribunus militum*). Compare the alternative form 'Aufidenus', significantly only in Umbria (*CIL* XI, 4676, Tuder; and XIV, 4500—a Tudertine soldier in the *Vigiles* in A.D. 168) and in Picenum (IX, 5015, Hadria; 5092, Interamnia), apart from the capital (VI, 12810; 20385; 22239), and its remarkable emergence in the nomenclature of a philosopher at Sparta, cf. the inscription published by A. M. Woodward, *BSA* XXIX (1927/8), 55 = *L'ann. ép.* 1931, 5. The equation 'Aufidenus'—'Aufidienus' may be supported by the fact that instances of each occur at Tuder.

The local habitat of the name seems to be the northern part of central Italy, and its social standing is not high. 'Salvidienus', rendered notorious by Octavianus' plebeian marshal, along with 'Salvidenus', will repay study. Of the regional and indigenous character of such *gentilicia*, a palmary example is 'Sibidienus', only found in Umbria (cf. *LE* 232), and in Umbria only in the north-east, at Tuficum (*CIL* XI, 5703–8; 8056; 8058 f.), and at Attidium close by (XI, 5673)—apart from a centurion at Carnuntum (III, 14348^{21a}), no doubt an Umbrian. As for 'Sibidenus', there are only *CIL* VI, 1057 and 33183.

BRVTTEDIVS NIGER, III, 66, 1: a senator and noted prosecutor whose ambition brought him to a bad end. Also 'Bruttidium' (ib. 4), which form is certified by the elder Seneca (*Controv.* II, 1, 35 f.), while Juvenal (x, 83) calls him Bruttidius and shortens the vowel into the bargain. Of the same family presumably is the *rhetor* Bruttidius Brutus (Seneca, *Controv.* VII, 5, 9; IX, 1, 11), also the official 'C. Bru[tt]idi(us) Brutus' (M. Rostowzew, 'Romische Bleitesserae' *Klio*, Beiheft III (1905), 49, nr. 521).

Epigraphically the name 'Bruttidius' is so rare as to give no hint whatsoever of local provenance. On the inscriptions of Italy, even including the capital, there is no 'Bruttidius', only one Brutidius (*CIL* VI, 28776). Even 'Bruttidius' registers only two examples (VI, 13646; V, 5446, near Comum), apart from the tiles stamped with the name of 'L. Bruttidius Augustalis' at Rome (xv, 373–9) and elsewhere (e.g. x, 8042²⁵, v, 8110⁷³, in Istria; VIII, 22632⁷ and 22632⁴⁶ (Carthage)).

CAESILIANVS, VI, 7, 1: a senator. All recent editors endorse and perpetuate Lipsius' emendation 'Caecilianus', presumably because of Magius Caecilianus, praetor in A.D. 21 (III, 37, 1). The reading of *M* is kept in *PIR*², C 187—rightly. Though the *gentilicium* 'Caesilius' occurs only once in senatorial nomenclature (*CIL* x, 7287, Panormus, of the Antonine period), it is quite reputable. To the instances cited in *TLL* add a magistrate at Ocriculum, of early date, without *cognomen* (*Epigraphica* III (1941), 149), and a *duumvir*

at Ostia in A.D. 94 (*Inscr. It.* XIII, 1, 5, p. 94). That would suffice. 'Caesilianus' happens to be found once at least, namely Λ. Ἀτειλίος Καισειλιανός (*IG* XIV, 1584, Rome).

CARSIVS SACERDOS, IV, 13, 2; GRASIDIVS SACERDOS, VI, 48, 4: a senator. Reinesius' emendation 'Carsidius' is unanimously accepted. The man was *praetor urbanus* in A.D. 27, '[Cars]idius Sa[cerdos]' (*CIL* I², p. 71 = *Inscr. It.* XIII, 1, 24, p. 297). One would like to know where he was when he supplied corn to the Numidian insurgent Tacfarinas, or so it was alleged, in A.D. 21: the same charge was brought against a Roman residing and trading in Africa, the son of the exile Sempronius Gracchus (*Ann.* IV, 13, 2 f., cf. I, 53, 3 ff.). For a man (Surdinius Gallus) who transferred his domicile to Carthage in A.D. 47 in an attempt to escape the burdens of the senatorial career, see *Dio* LX, 29, 2. The rarity of this *gentilicium* deserves comment—six instances only, three of them at Rome (*CIL* VI, 14440; 34697; 38638), one at Ostia (*CIL* XIV, 4838), one at Burnum in Dalmatia, a soldier 'P. Carsidius P.f. Calvus' from Lugdunum (*CIL* III, 14995), and one at Ephesus, a *grammateus*, Ποπλίου Καρσιδίου Ἐπίφ[ρονος] (*OGIS* 493). But observe 'Carsedius' which may be regarded as an alternative form, attested once only in 'Maxuma Carsedia T.f.' (*CIL* IX, 5058, near Hadria in Picenum): the style of nomenclature admitting a woman's *praenomen* is not orthodox Roman usage. For the origin of the name 'Carsidius' Schulze (*LE* 147) points to Etruscan 'carsna' (*CIE* 1963, Clusium), and 'Carso' used either as *nomen* (*CIL* XI, 3060, Horta) or as *cognomen* (*CIL* XI, 4387, Ameria); and of course there is the place Carsulae in Umbria, to say nothing of the *vicus* of Carso at Iguvium, 'carsome hoier' (*Tab. Iguv.* via 14 Devoto). But the incidence of 'Carsius' may arouse disquiet (*CIL* V, 7603, Alba Pompeia; XII, 679, Arelate; 993 Glanum), and, combined with the place-names Carsium (or Carsum) in Moesia Inferior, Carsidava in Dacia, it suggests rather a Celtic origin ultimately. Names of a Celtic type in Umbria and Picenum are a topic that still awaits investigation.

CETHECIO LABEONI, IV, 73, 3: legate of the Fifth Legion. All modern editors accept, and print, 'Cethego Labeoni.' Groag, however, hesitates, asterisks the entry 'Cethecius Labeo' (*PIR*², C 698), and observes: 'quod nomen lateat in *cethecio* parum liquet; *Cethego* corr. Lipsius nescio num recte.' There is nothing to criticize in the name-form produced by Lipsius' emendation, 'Cethegus Labeo.' The ancient aristocratic *cognomen* of a branch of the patrician Cornelii can be used as the equivalent of a *nomen*. That is normal enough. What deserves notice is the fact that 'Cethegus' as a *cognomen* is never vulgarized—it is only used by Cornelii of the *nobilitas*, whether Republican or their ostensible descendants under the Empire (see the evidence collected in *TLL*). No direct link can be established between Republican and Imperial Cethegi—the first of the latter is Ser. Cornelius Cethegus (*cos. ord.* A.D. 24), and he may really be a Cornelius Lentulus (cf. E. Groag, *PIR*², C 1336). So far, therefore, a 'Cornelius Cethegus Labeo' would be unobjectionable, though the *cognomen* Labeo is not attested among the Cethegi of the imperial age. Furthermore, one should at least call attention to the enigmatic writer on antiquarian topics Cornelius Labeo, much drawn upon for his learning by Macrobius, Servius, and other authors (*PIR*², C 1373): the date of Cornelius Labeo is a matter of deep and wide controversy. For all that, 'Cethegus' is not proved. Are there any alternatives? From 'Cethegus' was formed the *gentilicium* 'Cethegius', borne by three persons of low degree in the city of Rome (*CIL* VI, 14712 (two people); 19807); and there is 'Cethecius Pelagius v.p.' about A.D. 350 (*CIL* VI, 37123). 'Cethecius' is not impossible at an earlier date. Compare the Etruscan 'ceti' (*CIE* 1997, Clusium), 'A. Caitho C. f. Faber' (*CIE* 4278 = *CIL* XI, 2037, Perugia), and the forms 'Caetennius', 'Caetrius', 'Cetrius', etc. (Schulze, *LE* 137; 337). Nor is the termination '-ecius' without parallel in the nomenclature of Italy, for example 'Titecius', an early *primus pilus* and *tribunus militum* in the Marsian territory (*CIL* IX, 3851 f., Supinum), and 'Venecia' one of the names borne by the wife of the Umbrian senator Q. Camurius Numisius (*CIL* XI, 5672, Attidium: presumably Trajanic). All in all, it might be expedient to print the text according to *M*.

COMICIO POLLIONI, II, 86, 1: the parent of a Vestal Virgin. Ever since Lipsius' emendation of the *nomen*, the senator Domitius Pollio has stood as an undisputed character,

e.g. *PIR*², D 159. It may be noted that the unprepossessing *gentilicium* 'Comicius' in fact exists. To the instances cited by Schulze (*LE* 42, viz. *CIL* x, 5984, Signia; xiv, 3749, Tibur) add *CIL* iv, 1321 (Pompeii); viii, 2405 (Thamugadi) and 3544 (Lambaesis).

T. CVRTISIVS, iv, 27, 1: a former soldier of the Guard. Reinesius' conjecture 'Curtilius' is adopted by Fuchs but not by Köstermann and Lenchantin. The *nomen* 'Curtisius' happens not to be attested. It did not trouble Wilhelm Schulze (*LE* 236); and observe that 'Curisius' (*CIL* v, 5033, Tridentum, noted in *LE* 156) appears to be unique, likewise 'Curidius' (Cicero, *In Verrem* II, 4, 44: not in *LE*). On the other hand, though 'Curtilius' is familiar from the Neronian consular T. Curtilius Mancina (*PIR*², C 1605), there is no other senator, and the name is not really very common (see *LE* 78a and *TLL*, s.v.).

EXITIA, vi, 29, 4: wife of Mam. Aemilius Scaurus (*cos. suff.* A.D. 21). Lipsius disengaged 'Sextia' from the 'hortantes exitia uxore' of *M*, and the moderns concur, with the exception of Lenchantin, who prints in his text 'hortante exitium uxore'. Yet Tacitus would not defraud of name and fame the noble wife who urged and shared Scaurus' end, 'dignum veteribus Aemiliis.' Compare, in the same paragraph the suicide of Pomponius Labeo—'aemulataque est coniunx Paxaea.' Not that argument is needed. 'Sextia' is certain. The inscription *CIL* vi, 23073 (duly noted in *PIR*², A 404) reveals Nostus, freedman of Mam. Scaurus, married to Helice, freedwoman of Sextia. The name of Scaurus' wife (his second, at the least) is of some importance in bridging a gap in family history between T. Sextius, legate of Caesar in Gaul and governor of Africa Nova through vicissitudes of war and politics in 44–40 B.C. (P-W II A, 2041 ff.), and T. Sextius Africanus (*cos. suff.* A.D. 59). Another member has recently emerged, clearly the parent of the consul, as honorary *duumvir* at Ostia in A.D. 36 (*Inscr. It.* XIII, 1, 5, p. 188). The Sextii, having the tribe 'Voturia', are an old Ostian family (cf. E. Groag, P-W II A, 2039). Their womenfolk explain—or at least attest—their resurgence after temporary eclipse under Augustus, namely this Sextia, married to the illustrious Mam. Scaurus, and another (*Ann.* xvi, 10, 1), mother-in-law of L. Antistius Vetus (*cos. ord.* A.D. 55). They were presumably aunts of the consul T. Sextius Africanus; and both ended by suicide.

FALANIUS, I, 73, 1, and FAIANIVS, ib. 2: a Roman knight. The most peculiar problem of names in all Tacitus: the scribe who wrote the *Codex Mediceus* wrote 'Faianius', and then altered it to 'Falanius', but did nothing to 'Faianius' in the next sentence. The palaeographical facts are clear, though unfortunately neglected by Fisher, who printed 'Falanius' without comment in both instances. They are properly stated by the recent editors. But here concord ends. Köstermann and Fuchs have 'Falanius' while Lenchantin opts for 'Faianius'. The onomatological evidence should be considered and assessed, though it cannot intervene decisively. The *gentilicium* 'Falanius' has not turned up. That did not disturb Schulze, who cited the ancient Roman god 'Divus pater Falacer' (Varro, *LL* v, 84) and the Sabine village Falacrinae where a Roman emperor was born (Suetonius, *Divus Vesp.* II, 1), also names like the Etruscan 'falasial' (*CIE* 3413, Perugia) and 'Falius'—which occurs only in the remarkable 'L. Falius L. f. Tinia' a magistrate with a celestial *cognomen* at Hispellum in Umbria (*CIL* xi, 5281). Tinia is the Etruscan Juppiter. One may add a reference to the word 'fala' meaning 'a wooden tower' (Servius on *Aen.* ix, 705), and the Etruscan 'falado'—'falae dictae ab altitudine, a falado, quod apud Etruscos significat caelum' (Festus, p. 78 L). Further, to support 'Falanius', may be adduced the facts about 'Velanius'. The equestrian officer Q. Velanius (Caesar, *BG* III, 7, 4) was impugned by Hübner—'nomen nullum' (*Eph. Ep.* II, 73); and 'Veianius' must have seemed the obvious correction, compare for example the Veianii, comfortable farmers from Falerii who served as soldiers under Varro in Spain (*RR* III, 16, 10), or Veianius Niger, tribune in the Guard (*Ann.* xvi, 67, 4). But Schulze (*LE* 377) rehabilitated 'Velanius' with Etruscan 'velanial' (e.g. *CIE* 52, Volaterrae) and other forms, and with the Latin inscription that providentially turned up mentioning a 'Q. Vela[. . .]' (*N. Sc.* 1893, 380, Cascia in the Sabine country)—who might, however, be a 'Velatius': for that name, not cited in *LE*, see *CIL* vi, 1970; 32314 f.

On the other side, 'Faianius' though unusual in appearance, ought not to be regarded

as a rarity. To the examples cited in *LE* 185 add a freedman of P. Faianius (*CIL* vi, 35220), L. Faianius Olympus from Ostia (*CIL* xiv, 4382), and Q. Faianius Clemens, a soldier of the legion III Augusta (*L'ann. ép.* 1927, 41 = *I. l. Tun.* 464, Ammaedara). And, indeed, a municipal Faianius would fit very well the 'modicus eques Romanus' in Tacitus, cf. *CIL* xi, 838 (Mutina): 'L. Faiano/L. f. Sabino/aed. flam. patr. col./trib. coh. prim. Ligurum.' To conclude, let it be noted that Stein, who always preferred 'Faianius' (*P-W* vi, 1967), now prints that name without comment in *PIR*², F 107.

A postscript on 'Faianius' may allude to the possibility of its occurrence at an earlier date, on the list of the *consilium* of Cn. Pompeius Strabo in the camp before Asculum (*CIL* 1², 709 + p. 714 = vi, 37045: all the names are not printed in *ILS* 8888). Cichorius, from a personal examination of the bronze tablet, concluded that one of the missing names (no. 22 on his list) was a *gentilicium*, the second and the fourth letters of which were 'a', and proposed '[M]aja[ni]' (*Römische Studien* (1922), 130 ff., at 154 f.). There had been a Maianius, moneyer in the second century B.C. (*BMC, R. Rep.* ii, 243 f.). Cichorius noted and rejected certain alternatives—but 'Faianius' was not among them. That is not the end of the matter. Bang produced a slightly different reading, namely 'Fab[i]': indeed, he suggested a supplement to fill the whole gap, viz. 'M. Fab. [i] M. f. [Se]r.'—or '[Te]r.' On this reading, 'Fai[ani]' is not wholly excluded.

LATINIVS LATIARIS, IV, 68, 2, and LATINIVS, IV, 71, 1: a senator. Cassius Dio calls him Λατιάρσιος (LVIII, 1, 1b). Tacitus later refers to the man and the incident, calling him 'Lucanius Latiaris' (vi, 4, 1). Beroaldus here replaced 'Lucanius' by 'Latinus'. Andresen, however, observing that the collocation of 'Lucanius' and 'Latiaris' is supported by the tile of L. Lucanius Latiaris (*CIL* xv, 1245), corrected the first two instances, and 'Lucanius' now appears in the texts of Köstermann and Fuchs. A pretty problem is raised. It has not always been dealt with properly, or even understood, see for example the article 'Latinus Latiaris', *P-W* xii, 925 f.; and in 'Lucanius', *P-W* xiii, 1552 f. this Lucanius, like others of the name, will not be found. What should be done is clear—nothing. Lenchantin therefore prints the text according to *M*. Rather than assume a scribe's error, identically repeated, it would be preferable to suppose that the historian himself may have made a mistake in nomenclature. On the margin of this problem, but supporting 'Lucanius' will be noted Q. Lucanius Latinus, *praetor aerarii* in A.D. 19 (*CIL* 1², p. 74 = *Inscr. It.* xiii, 1, 27, p. 305).

The first known Lucanius is 'M. Lucanius M. f. Hor.' in the *consilium* of Cn. Pompeius Strabo (*CIL* 1², 709 + p. 714 = vi, 37045), compare the observations of Cichorius (*Römische Studien* (1922), 171 f.). His tribe should be taken into account—it is the tribe of Aricia. Now as shown above, the *cognomina* 'Latiaris' and 'Latinus' are attested for Lucanii in the early Empire—and are singularly appropriate if these men came from a town so prominent in Latin history and religion. The *gentilicium* 'Latinus' also occurs there, as witness 'Ti. Latinus Ti. f. Hor. Pandusa' (*CIL* xiv, 2166), identical with or related to the Latinus Pandusa who was praetorian legate in Moesia (*Ann.* ii, 66, 1). A historian might have something to plead in extenuation if he mixed up his Lucanii and Latinii.

OLENNIVS, IV, 72, 1: a *primipilaris*. The name is unique, but unimpeachable, cf. Schulze, *LE* 73, who cites, *inter alia*, 'Q. Aulinna Sex. f. Sab.' (*CIL* xi, 1758, Volaterrae), 'Aulenus' (*CIL* x, 4926 f., Venafrum, etc.) and the Etruscan soothsayer in a famous story, Aulenus Calenus (Pliny, *NH* 28, 15). Add 'L. Olienus L. f.' a *magister* at Capua in 110 B.C. (*CIL* 1², 674 = *ILS* 3770).

PONTIVS FREGELLANVS, VI, 48, 4: a senator. Köstermann and Lenchantin make no change, but Fuchs reads 'Pontilius'. The justification for the proposal deserves to be known. It is an inscription from Salonae: 'C. Pontilio/Fregellano/cos., patrono,/d.d./publice' (*CIL* iii, 8715 = *ILS* 960). This may, or may not, be the same man. For Pontilii see *LE* 212. No other senators are known.

The *gentilicium* 'Pontius' is so common in the Oscan regions that it is no surprise to find Pontii designated for convenience by a distinctive *cognomen*, thus the famous Pontii Telesini, the senator C. Pontius Paelignus (*CIL* v, 4348 = *ILS* 942, Brixia), or

Pliny's friend Pontius Allifanus (on the address of *Epp.* v, 14 in the *Codex Ashburnhamensis*). Pontilii are much rarer. Where the family of the consular C. Pontilius Fregellanus was established, there is no means of telling: the Latin colony of Fregellae had been razed to the ground and abolished for ever because of its recalcitrance in the year 125 B.C. The survivors dispersed. One of them, an Ovius, went to Ariminum, cf. A. Degrassi, 'Il monumento riminese di Q. Ovius Fregellanus,' *Athenaeum* xxix (1941), 133 ff.

ROMANO HISPONE, I, 74, 1: a *delator* regarded as archetypal by Tacitus. By a strange inadvertence all recent editors let this pass without compunction or comment, and are satisfied that 'Romanus Hispo' was the fellow's name; also Groag, in *PIR*², C 149 (discussing A. Caepio Crispinus). In *PIR*¹, R 57/58, however, and in P-W I A, 1063, he appears properly designated as 'Romanus Hispo'. Hispo is familiar from the elder Seneca, e.g. 'Hispo Romanus' (*Controv.* IX, 1, 11, where one MS. has 'Romanus') with inversion of *cognomen*, as in 'Silo Pompeius' and 'Brutus Bruttedius' (ib.). Now a *cognomen* of the type of 'Hispo' can actually be used strictly and officially as a *gentilicium*, cf. the 'Caepio' of 'Caepio Crispinus' in the same sentence in Tacitus, and so in theory 'Hispo Romanus' could stand as *nomen* and *cognomen*, and as such be subject to inversion, giving the order 'Romanus Hispo'; but such an explanation neglects the evidence for the *gentilicium* 'Romanus'. Again, in noble families with several *cognomina*, the *gentilicium* is frequently dropped and one of the *cognomina* functions in its place, for example 'Messalla Corvinus' or 'Cethegus Labeo' (*Ann.* iv, 73, 3), if 'Cethegus' is right, see above (p. 11). The *delator* cannot claim this aristocratic privilege.

The name 'Romanus' concerns controversy about the nature and origin of the name 'Roma'. The contribution of Schulze (*LE* 579 ff.) was notable: he invoked 'Romilius' as an Etruscan name. But Schulze was reluctant to have anything to do with 'Romanus' (*LE* 368); at the same time he did not commit himself (*LE* 524) to the view that it derives from 'servi publici' (cf. Varro, *LL* VIII, 83 and Livy IV, 61, 10). It is unfortunate that he did not provide and interpret the evidence for the distribution of the name 'Romanus' throughout Italy. The following brief indications may be instructive. No examples in *CIL* IX, in X only one (8059³⁴², on an object in the Naples Museum); and of the five inscriptions in *CIL* XI (Etruria, Umbria, and the Aemilia), most belong to persons of freedman status, none appears indigenous—and there is none at all in Etruria proper (*CIL* XI, 140; 208 (Ravenna); 3847 (Saxa Rubra); 3761 (Careiae); 5895 (Iguvium)). Cisalpine Gaul is another matter—over a dozen inscriptions, the majority at Brixia, which was not a colony but a native capital in origin. Note, for example, 'Q. Romanus Camburonis f.' (Pais, *Supp. It.* 1275, Brixia). And, appropriately enough, the name occurs in Noricum, e.g. *CIL* III, 5362 (Solva), 5078 (Iuenna), and the early cavalryman from Celeia, C. Romanus Capito, buried near Moguntiacum (*CIL* XIII, 7029). Cognate and confirmatory is 'Romatius', the evidence for which is furnished by Schulze, *LE* 368. It includes Pliny's friend and schoolfellow Romatius Firmus from Comum (*Epp.* I, 19; IV, 29), and other Romatii from that town (*CIL* V, 5286; 5303; Pais, *Supp. It.* 784; 1287, a magistrate).

The data point strongly to Cisalpine Gaul, and precisely to the Transpadane zone, as the place where 'Romanus' is prevalent. Its adoption by natives there and in Noricum suggests that 'Romanus' and 'Romatius' are Illyrio-Celtic, or whatever term be preferred, in origin. It is likely enough that the low-born *delator* Romanus Hispo comes from this region—perhaps from Ateste. It is worth while mentioning an inscription from the capital, of approximately Augustan date: 'P. Romanus C. f. Rom.,/C. Romanus P. f. Rom.,/tr. mil. II,/Manlia P. f.' (*CIL* VI, 3534). These people have the tribe 'Romulia', in which only two communities were enrolled, Sora and Ateste; they may be members of Hispo's family, in the previous generation.

The *cognomen* 'Hispo' is uncommon, apparently attested only for Cicero's friend the *publicanus* P. Terentius Hispo (*Ad fam.* XIII, 65, 1 and *Ad Att.* XI, 10, 1, cf. *Inscr.* v. *Magnesia* 140), for a magistrate at Caelium in Lucania (*L'ann. ép.* 1926, 141), and for the Trajanic senator M. Eppuleius Proculus Ti. Caepio Hispo (*PIR*², E 83), whose origin has not been ascertained, but may be northern, cf. the dedications to him at Mediolanium and

at Ravenna (*CIL* v, 5813; XI, 14 = *ILS* 1027): Juvenal, however, utilizes the name for a disgusting character (II, 50). To complete the evidence about 'Hispo', note *liberti* of the 'Hispones' near Comum (*CIL* v, 5496) and the tile from the vicinity of Rome with the stamp of a Caecilius Hispo (*CIL* xv, 895, corrected, and supported by another specimen from Tarracina, cf. P. Groebe, 'Ein neuer Ziegel aus Terracina,' *Klio* v (1905), 284 f.). Caecilii are not unknown at Comum—the younger Pliny was born a Caecilius.

The feminine of this *cognomen*, 'Hispulla', also appealed to Juvenal, being used for an unchaste woman and for a fat woman (VI, 74; XII, 11). The other instances point to Transpadane Italy and make quite a good showing—Terentia Hispulla Cn. f., mother of L. Valerius Catullus (*IG* II/III, 4159), and presumably of the family of the *publicanus*; Hispulla, wife of the consular Q. Corellius Rufus (Pliny, *Epp.* I, 12, 10), patently mother of Corellia Hispulla (to whom III, 3, is addressed); and, suggesting a link of kinship in this Transpadane circle, Calpurnia Hispulla, the aunt of Pliny's second wife (IV, 19 and VIII, 11 are addressed to her). The origin of Corellius Rufus is not discussed in *PIR*², C 1294 or by G. E. F. Chilver, *Cisalpine Gaul* (1940); but Momigliano (*JRS* xxxii (1942), 137) draws attention to Corellius, the *equus Romanus* born at Ateste (Pliny, *NH* xvii, 122), and to freedmen there (*N. Scav.* 1930, 280).

SANCIA, VI, 18, 1: the sister of Considius Proculus. Hirschfeld's 'Sancta' was accepted in *PIR*¹, S 130, but Groag (P-W IV, 914) pointed out that 'Sancius' exists, adducing *CIL* VI, 25859a (a freedwoman), and the latest editors stick to *M.* Schulze (*LE* 473) cites no other instance of the name, and there does not appear to be one.

SANGVNNIVM, VI, 7, 1: accuser, along with Aruseius, of L. Arruntius. The name is corrected in *M* by the *manus posterior* which writes 'qui' over it. Hence the generally accepted 'Sanquinius'. That name occurred in fact two chapters earlier, 'Sanquinius Maximus e consularibus' (VI, 5, 3). A wholly different person: the correction might not be right. The name 'Sanquinius' attracted the notice of Schulze, who, referring to Semo Sancus, argued that it is a 'theophoric' name (*LE* 467). Its preternatural rarity deserves to be emphasized. There are three members of a senatorial house, the enigmatic Q. Sanquinius Maximus, *praefectus urbi* and consul suffect for the second time in A.D. 39, legate of Germania Inferior in A.D. 45 (*PIR*¹, S 136); earlier, the Augustan moneyer M. Sanquinius Q. f. (*BMC, R. Emp.* I, 13 and 38); and, presumably brother or parent of the moneyer, the senator of praetorian rank Q. Sanquinius Q. f. Stel. (*CIL* XI, 3755, cf. I² 837 = *ILS* 905, Lorium, between Rome and Caere). By paradox this successful but soon extinct senatorial family has left behind not even a freedman anywhere to perpetuate its *gentilicium*, still less a provincial client. The only other Sanquinius in the epigraphical record seems to be Sanquinia C. f. (*CIL* XI, 2613 = I², 2613, Caere). If Caere be the home of the Sanquini, then the tribe of Caere, not so far established, may be the 'Stellatina', not the 'Voturia' (*CIL* XI, 3615).

The rarity of 'Sanquinius' is not in itself an argument of any validity against a second instance of it in *Annals* VI. Nipperdey's brilliant 'Sangurium' produced a name attested once only in the form 'Sanguri C. f.': this Sangurius along with another local magistrate called L. Gargonius erected a small shrine near Hadria in Picenum (*CIL* IX, 5019 = I², 1894). Schulze (*LE* 369) compares the *cognomen* 'Sanga' in the name of Q. Fabius Sanga, *patronus* of the Allobroges (Sallust, *Bell. Cat.* xli, 4, etc.), but perhaps not one of the patrician Fabii (cf. Münzer, P-W VI, 1867 f.). Münzer notes the slave name 'Sanga' (Terence, *Eun.* 776; 814). Add 'L. Licinius L. f. Sanga', soldier in the legion II *Adiutrix*, early Flavian in date (*CIL* VII, 186, Lindum). Nipperdey's conjecture might be right.

SIRPICVS, I, 23, 5: a centurion. One might have wondered whether the better form was not 'Serpicus', in view of the *cognomen* 'Serpicanus' found at Saepinum in Samnium (*CIL* IX, 2465; *N. Scav.* 1929, 218) and the apparently unique 'Serpoleius' (*BCH* xxxvi (1912), 77, Delos). But observe the place Sirpium in Samnium (*Geogr. Rav.* IV, 34 and *Tab. Peut.*); and Stein (P-W III A, 360) discovered a Sirpicus, in Numidia: 'L. Sirpicus/vixit a. IX/h.e.' (*CIL* VIII, 6167, Arsacal in the territory of Cirta). For *gentilicia* of this Illyrian termination, such as 'Paeticus', 'Patalicus', see especially W. Schulze, *LE* 36. A new example is 'Saulicus', a man from Ateste (*CIL* VI, 37567).

TITIDIUS LABEO, II, 85, 3 : a senator, husband of the shameless Vistilia. Identified with the senator of praetorian rank Titedius Labeo (Pliny, *NH* 35, 20—the *Codex Bambergensis* certifies 'Titedius'). Of the recent editors of Tacitus, Fuchs chooses to print 'Titedius'. The change is not justifiable. 'Titedius', 'Titidius' and 'Titedius' are merely different spellings of the same name, cf. above under 'Atidius'. The *gentilicium* looks very ordinary and undistinguished. Nor are other senators known. In fact, it is not at all common. Instances in *CIL* IX are confined to the territory of the Aequi and Marsi, viz. 'Titidius', *CIL* IX, 3654 = I², 1767 (Marruvium); 'Titedius,' 3877 (Supinum); 3948 (Alba); 'Titedius,' 4035, 4054, and 4059 (Carseoli); 3950 (Alba). Somewhere in these hills and valleys lies the home of the senator Titidius Labeo.

TREBELLENVS RVFVS, II, 67, 2 : a senator of praetorian rank, put in charge of the Thracian royal family. Elsewhere in the *Annals* this *gentilicium* appears as 'Trebellienus' (III, 38, 3, twice, and VI, 39, 1, twice). Now two dedications to T. Trebellenus Rufus in the town of Concordia, which is his domicile (he bears its tribe, the 'Claudia'), should surely put the spelling of the name beyond doubt (*CIL* V, 1878 = *ILS* 931; *L'ann. ép.* 1888, 24 = *ILS* 931a). Hence modern editors duly correct the four instances of 'Trebellienus'—except Lenchantin. And, indeed, it might seem desirable to retain the evidence for this variant: 'Trebellenus' and 'Trebellienus' may be regarded as alternative forms of the same name, compare above, on 'Aufidenus' and 'Aufidienus'. Yet it might be doubted whether a writer deliberately chose to spell the same senator's name in two different ways: a different source might be the explanation of the variant in orthography.

The name is remarkably rare. Schulze has one other instance (*LE* 246), namely, 'Trebelliena Nereis' (*CIL* VI, 27577); and the Italian volumes of the *Corpus* yield only 'Trebelliena Felicitas' (*CIL* IX, 2306 Telesia in Samnium). Nor is it found in the provinces of the West. As for the East, three persons called Τρεβελληνός, all at Sparta, no doubt derive the name from the senator, cf. H. Box, 'Roman Citizenship in Laconia,' *JRS* XXII (1932), 172.

The attempt to analyse the ethnic structure of northern Italy on the basis of nomenclature is baffled at almost every step (cf. G. E. F. Chilver, *Cisalpine Gaul* (1940), 80 ff.). Not only do the natives assume common Latin *gentilicia*. They modify their original names so as to simulate *gentilicia* of Etruscan or Oscan origin. Yet now and then it may be possible to detect immigrant families, at least in the early period and among the 'honestiores'. The name 'Trebellenus' is reassuring, likewise the *cognomen* of the senator C. Pontius Paelignus, presumably a citizen of Brixia (*CIL* V, 4348 = *ILS* 942).

VESEVLARIVS ATTICVS, VI, 10, 2 : a Roman knight, familiar friend of Tiberius. The correction of the *cognomen* from 'Atticus' to 'Flaccus' is universally accepted, because of the reference in the context to the affair of Libo Drusus, where one finds him designated as 'Flaccum Vesularium' (II, 28, 1). And a plausible explanation of the reading 'Atticus' is to hand—'librarii oculis ad *Curtium Atticum* paulo inferius memoratum aberrantibus' (Lenchantin). The mistake 'Atticus' for 'Flaccus' could have originated not only in the eye of a copyist but in the mind of the historian, preoccupied with the name of Curtius Atticus which he was going to mention later in the same sentence.

The *nomen* 'Vesularius' might not look reassuring at first sight. There is no need, however, to dally with 'Vesicularus' (found apparently only at Teanum Sidicinum, *CIL* X, 4797 = *ILS* 6298; 4819; *Eph. Ep.* VIII, 145, n. 579) or 'Versicularus' (*CIL* X, 4397, Capua). Schulze points to the Umbrian word 'veskla', and two instances of 'Vesclarius' (*LE* 333; 417), one at Rome, the other at Corfinium (*CIL* VI, 5044; IX, 3188). To be added are three freedmen of a P. Vesclarius at Rome (*CIL* VI, 17154 (two men); 17154 bis).

SEX. VESTILIVM, VI, 9, 2 : an elderly senator of praetorian standing, personal friend first of Drusus, then of Tiberius. Clearly a 'Vistilius', compare 'Vistilio' in the next sentence. Yet Lenchantin by an excess of scruple prints 'Vestilium' in his text. In Pliny, *NH* VII, 39, some *codices* have 'Vestilia' for 'Vistilia', it is true; and Schulze (*LE* 256) states that the Vestilii and the Vistilii belong to the same *gens*—this is based on the fact that, whereas two inscriptions of Rome mention freedmen of a Sex. Vistilius (*CIL* VI,

29051 f.), persons called 'Sex Vestilius' are attested as well (*CIL* x, 628, Salernum; xiv, 1751, Ostia: the sole epigraphic instances of 'Vestilius').

The family is presumably Umbrian, compare the name 'Veistinius' in magisterial inscriptions at Asisium (*CIL* xi, 5389, in the Umbrian dialect; 8021, two members of the family; 5426; 5442 = *ILS* 6619). The distribution of 'Vistilius' throughout Italy is instructive. It does not occur in *CIL* v, or ix, or in x (except for the 'Vestilius' mentioned above). On the other hand, four instances in *CIL* xi, all in Umbria, at Interamna (4317), Ameria (4511; 4539), and at Iguvium (5825)—the last of these is in fact a *libertus* of a Sex. Vistilius.

It may be presumed that the Vistilii in the senatorial order of society are members of a single family of local, and Umbrian, origin. Sex. Vistilius took his own life, having incurred the displeasure of Tiberius, 'seu composuerat quaedam in C. Caesarem ut impudicum, sive ficto habita fides' (*Ann.* vi, 9, 2). No doubt he was the parent of Vistilia, wife of Titedius Labeo—her father was of praetorian standing. This lady went so far as to seek official sanction for an irregular life—'licentiam stupri apud aedilis vulgaverat more inter veteres recepto, qui satis poenarum adversum impudicas in ipsa professione flagitii credebant' (*Ann.* ii, 85, 3). This exercise of 'Romana simplicitas' was not appreciated. Perhaps it was a comment on the conduct of that other Vistilia, who was married at least six times and who produced a string of children, among them Domitius Corbulo, and Caesonia, whom Caligula espoused (Pliny, *NH* vii, 39). Husbands and offspring were investigated by C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (1922), 429 ff. He might have spared a word for the rest of the family.

VIBIDIVM VARRONEM, ii, 48, 3: expelled from the Senate in A.D. 17. It is certain that the true form of the *cognomen* is 'Virro'. The evidence, cited and utilized in *PIR*¹, V 373 f., reveals a Sex. Vibidius Virro (perhaps the same person) as father of a Vestal Virgin (*IG* ii/iii², 3532; 4161), and she is obviously the one whom Tacitus calls 'Vibidiam virginum Vestalium vetustissimam' (*Ann.* xi, 32, 2); and there is also 'Sex. Virro L. f.' (the *gentilicium* has fallen out) of the tribe 'Sergia' attested in 9 B.C. (Frontinus, *De aquae ductibus* 129). Whether there is one Vibidius, or two, or three, need not matter: they belong to the same family. The corrected *cognomen* is printed by Köstermann and Fuchs, but not by Lenchantin. There is a case for letting it stand—Tacitus might have made a slip.

Elsewhere the *cognomen* 'Virro' appears to occur only in Juvenal (v, 39 ff., etc.), denoting a luxurious wastrel. Appropriately enough: the resentment of Tiberius Caesar in A.D. 17 was visited upon 'prodigos et ob flagitia egenos' (*Ann.* ii, 48, 3). Previous items in this catalogue have disclosed the unsatisfactory conduct proved or alleged against Italian *novi homines* of rare and distinctive nomenclature—Brutedius, Carsidius and Titedius. Now Vibidius Virro joins the collection. Observe the tribe 'Sergia' and the distribution of the name 'Veibedius' in *CIL* ix, viz. 3228 and 3274 (Corfinium); 3828 (Ortona). Also from Corfinium is the dialect epitaph 'N. Vibedis N.' (Conway, *The Italic Dialects*, nr. 223). Vibidius Virro was probably a Paelignian. Perhaps one should not omit the 'scurra' Vibidius whom Maecenas brought to the banquet of Nasidienus (Horace, *Sat.* ii, 8, 22).

VIBVLENVS AGRIPPA, vi, 40, 1: an *equus Romanus* who took poison during his trial before the Senate. Perhaps he was really 'Vibullius Agrippa': Dio calls him Οὐβούλιός τε Ἀγρίππας ἱππέυς (LVIII, 21, 4). There are no Vibuleni of any consequence at any time (the other Vibulenus in Tacitus is a common soldier, *Ann.* i, 22, 1, etc.), and the local distribution of 'Vibulenus' and 'Vibullius' in Italy furnishes no criterion of preference.

The *nomen* 'Vibullius', however, deserves attention. It first crops up in historical record with L. Vibullius Rufus, an agent of Pompeius Magnus in 56 B.C. (Cicero, *Ad fam.* i, 9, 10) and his *praefectus fabrum* in 49 B.C. (Caesar, *BC* i, 15, 1, etc.). Then there is a Vibullius praetor in A.D. 56 (*Ann.* xiii, 28, 1). But the notable thing is its occurrence in the nomenclature of great families in the Antonine age, Greek in origin or with Greek connections. First the family of the consular sophist Herodes Atticus: his mother was

Vibullia Alcia Agrippina, daughter of a Vibullius Rufus (*Inscr. v. Olympia* 621, cf. P. Graindor, *Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (1930), 28 f.). The *cognomina* 'Agrippina' and 'Rufus' might tempt speculation. Secondly, 'L. Vibullius Pius' belongs to the name of the Hadrianic senator of the Spartan Euryclid line, C. Julius Eurycles Herclanus L. Vibullius Pius (*IG* v, 1, 1172, Gythium); it is assumed by Q. Pompeius Falco (*cos. suff.* A.D. 108), along with the Euryclid name, at some time subsequent to A.D. 116, so it appears (cf. *ILS* 1035, and his grandson's inscription, *ILS* 1104); and it recurs with P. Coelius Balbinus Vibullius Pius, *cos. ord.* A.D. 137.

How the name 'Vibullius' was originally disseminated in Greece, it is impossible to say. Vibullii are frequent at Corinth, cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* II (1946), 9 f. Observe especially the agonothete L. Vibullius Pius (*Corinth* VIII, 2, 95). It must suffice in this place to indicate the problems as briefly as possible.

VITIA, VI, 10, 1: the mother of C. Fufius Geminus, *cos. ord.* A.D. 29. Nipperdey's 'Vibia' has not won acceptance. The *gentilicium* 'Vitius' occurs four times—all women of libertine class or nomenclature. Schulze has *CIL* III, 7912 (Sarmizegethusa) and VI, 29095: add VI, 2853 and 34259.

VVLCAIVS MOSCHVS IV, 43, 5: the rhetorician who had been exiled to Massilia. The *nomen* should be given a better orthography, likewise 'Vulgacium Araricum' (*Ann.* xv, 50, 1) and 'Vulcacius Tertullinus' (*Hist.* iv, 9, 2)—the latter is the same person as 'Volcacius Tullinus' (*Ann.* xvi, 8, 2), whichever *cognomen* be correct. Köstermann is satisfied with 'Vulcacius' in all four instances (*Annals* and *Histories*), and Fuchs prints 'Vulcacius' in *Ann.* iv, 43, 5, but Lenchantin here insists on 'Volcacius'. Classical epigraphic usage is uniform, at least in its earliest instances, in support of 'Volcacius', for example, the *Fasti Venusini* with L. Volcacius Tullus, *cos. ord.* 33 B.C. (*CIL* I², p. 66 = *Inscr. It.* XIII, 1, 7, p. 254), and the inscription from Priene mentioning apparently his nephew—Λευκίου Ουολκακίου [Γ]ύλλου (*OGIS* 458, II, l. 42): to say nothing of Volcacius the *haruspex* (*CIL* I², 990 = *ILS* 3038, Insula Tiberina) and 'C. Volcacius C. f. Varus Antigonae gnatus' (*CIL* XI, 2084 = *ILS* 7836), at Perugia, which city was no doubt the home of the consular Volcarii (cf. Propertius I, 22, 3). Furthermore, the index of *CIL* VI reveals fifteen Volcarii but only two Volcarii at Rome, one Vulcacius—the latter is Vulcacius Rufinus (*CIL* VI, 3205 = *ILS* 1237, of A.D. 347).

The Etruscan house of the consular Volcarii, showing two consuls (66 B.C. and 33 B.C.), not to mention an officer under Caesar in the Gallic and the Civil Wars, and a friend of Propertius, deserves study. Even the minor Volcarii here cited on a point of orthography are a temptation. Moschus, according to Porphyrio (on Horace, *Epp.* I, 5, 9) was a man of Pergamum, and Kiessling conjectured that he got his *nomen* along with the Roman citizenship from L. Volcacius Tullus, the consul of 33 B.C. ('Tacitus, *Ann.* iv, 43', *Hermes* xxvi (1891), 634 f., noted in *PIR*¹, V 621). Now the *cognomen* of the Roman knight Volcacius Araricus, which is unique and surely derives from the river Arar, suggests either an ancestor's exploit in Gaul or, as is much more likely, an origin thence; and, for that matter, the senator Volcacius Tullinus (or Tertullinus) might be a provincial rather than a descendant of the aristocratic Volcarii—none of them is known subsequent to Propertius' friend Tullus, nephew of the consul of 33 B.C. But this is not the place to speculate how and when one or other of the Volcarii—and one will not omit 'C. Volcacium Tullum adulescentem' (Caesar, *BG* VI, 29, 4)—came to make a grant of the citizenship to a native of Gaul. On the inscriptions of the Gallic provinces there is only one Volcacius, namely Volkacius Dioscorus (*CIL* XII, 3508, Nemausus).