

terior de color distinto, como en nuestro caso, de la línea de contorno, una modalidad que pasará al bajo Imperio, aunque en esta época sean menos frecuentes las composiciones de peltas dispuestas según este esquema.

El motivo es frecuentísimo tanto en la zona occidental del Imperio como en Hispania, por lo cual una relación de paralelos, temáticos, resultaría abrumadora y, al mismo tiempo, poco indicativa para el establecimiento de la cronología del mosaico. Son indicativos un mosaico de Arcos de la Frontera, aparentemente del siglo IV d. C., pero cuyas orlas de dentellones inducen a llevarlo al siglo III d. C.²³. El tema se repite, con peltas de acusado remate floral, en mosaicos de la villa de "Los Cipreses", Jumilla (Murcia)²⁴. A la misma época corresponde un mosaico de la partida de "Algorós", en Elche (Alicante)²⁵, Andallón (Asturias)²⁶, en Santhervás del Burgo (Soria)²⁷, Moncada (Valencia), éste del siglo III d. C., Valladolid²⁹, fines del siglo III d. C., y Budens (Algarve), de cronología similar al anterior³⁰.

Llama la atención la distribución geográfica de este tema aunque, por el momento sea preferible no pretender deducir especiales consecuencias. Se observa el predominio del tema en la Citerior, desde el siglo III d. C., y prácticamente, su ausencia en Andalucía, a excepción del citado mosaico de Arcos de la Frontera.

La datación del mosaico de Tarragona en el siglo III d. C., avanzada con anterioridad³¹, puede perfilarse ahora situándolo a fines del segundo cuarto del siglo III d. C.—ALBERTO BALIL y RITA MONDELO.

PLEMIANUS AND LATINILLA: TWO MISNOMERS IN SPANISH EPIGRAPHY

1. *D(is) M(anibus) [s(acrum)] / L. Cor(nelius) Hadrianus d(e)ff(unctus) / a(nnis) IIII, L. Cor(nelius) Plemianu[s] / pat[er], Victoria mate[r] / f(aciendum)] c(uraverunt)*¹.

The name Plemianus is a *hapax*; no other is attested in Latin literature or epigraphy. Moreover, the suffix *-anus* frequently designates a *cognomen* derived from a *nomen*² — but there is no *nomen* Plemius either. However, there is a *nomen* Pleminius, of which the most famous bearer is Q. Pleminius, the lieutenant of Scipio who

²³ MORA-FIGUEROA, *Habis*, VIII, 1977, 351 s. BALIL, *CAN X*, 379 s. BLÁZQUEZ, *CME*, IV, 1982, n.º 41.

²⁴ BLÁZQUEZ, *CME*, IV, 1982, n.º 79.

²⁵ IBARRA, *Ilici*, 1979, 192 ss. RAMOS-FOLQUÉS, *AEArq.*, XXVI, 1953, 342 ss.

²⁶ FERNÁNDEZ-OCHOA, *Arqueología romana de Asturias*, 1982, 360 ss. *Mosaicos romanos de Hispania Citerior*, IV *Conventus Asturum 1. Astures Trasmontani*, en prensa.

²⁷ ORTEGO, *NAH*, III-IV, 1954-1955, 175, lám. CXLVII, 1.

²⁸ BALIL, *Celticum*, IX, 1964, 217 ss. *BSAA*, XLV, 1979, 19 ss.

²⁹ RIVERA, WATTEMBERG, *BSAA*, XX, 1954, 143 ss. WATTEMBERG, *idem*, XXX, 1964, 121 s.

³⁰ ESTACIO DA VEIGA, *O Archeologo Português*, XV, 1910, 212 ss. VIANA, *AEArq.*, XXVI, 1953, 119 ss. ESTACIO DA VEIGA DOS SANTOS, *Arqueologia romana do Algarve*, I, 1971, 86.

³¹ BALIL, *BR AH*, 1960 cit.

¹ TOLEDO, *Hispania Antigua Epigraphica*, n.º 1.771; L. A. CHURCHIN, "Misread Inscriptions from Central Spain", in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 59, 1985, p. 187.

² I. KAJANTO, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki, 1965, p. 32.

plundered Locri in 205 B.C.³, and from which a *cognomen* Pleminianus could naturally be formed. Whether his Pleminius had earlier served in Spain is unknown, but there were undoubtedly others, and it is by no means unusual to find Republican senatorial *nomina* (and *cognomina* derived from them) in Spanish epigraphy of the Early Empire⁴. I would therefore submit that the father's name in this inscription is L. Cornelius Pleminianus, and that his *cognomen* was accidentally shortened through haplography (on account of the two i's) by the mason.

2. *Veneri / Latinillae / Spedius Ma/ternianus / maritus*⁵.

This inscription, now lost, is known through a drawing published by I. Boy in 1713; Boy's reading of the first two lines is "Veneri Latiliniillae". The second line, obviously miscopied, was emended to "Latinillae" by Hübner, although no parallels exist in Spain; indeed this is the only pagan example in the Empire⁶. But most puzzling is the first line, since it is highly improbable that the woman would have a divine name, and in any event the double *cognomen* would be superfluous, Hübner's suggestion was that the dedication to Venus might stand in place of the usual (but not compulsory) dedication to "Dis Manibus". It is true that dedications are occasionally made to Venus in honour of a deceased woman, but never so abruptly: the formula *in memoriam* or (in the lone Spanish example) *in h(onorem) m[em(oriae)]* invariably comes between the name of Venus and that of the deceased⁷. Moreover, Venus in Spanish epigraphy is not normally cited without an attribute: she is usually Venus Augusta, Venus Victrix, domina Venus or Venus sancta⁸. In sum, Hübner's interpretation of "Veneri", together with the supposed necessity of changing three letters in the second line of Boy's copy to produce an unlikely *cognomen*, is far from satisfying, and an alternative solution may justly be sought.

The inscription would make more sense if lines 1-2 gave a feminine *nomen* and *cognomen*, or a *cognomen* and filiation. The latter solution is in fact, possible, and with no more resort to emendation than Hübner's. The answer lies in seeing in "Veneri" not a dedication to Venus but part of the common *cognomen* Veneria, of which Kajanto counts 361 pagan examples in *CIL*, including 288 free-born women and 43 servile or freed women⁹. A for the second line, the restoration "Latinillae", unparalleled in pagan epigraphy, can hardly remain. Boy's LATILINILIAE more probably masks L. ATILI [F]ILIAE. We need only assume that the end of line 1 was worn or illegible and that Boy thus missed "Veneri[ae]", but that of the letters he saw, all but one were correctly copied. The woman's full name, then, would be Atilia Veneria and, if my proposal is correct, she and her father be added to the eleven members of this gens already attested at Tarraco¹⁰.—L. A. CURCHIN.

³ LIVY, 29.6-16; VAL. MAX., 1.1.24; cf. W. SCHULZE, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Göttingen, 1904, p. 89.

⁴ On the adoption of senatorial *gentilicia* among Spanish peregrines see R. C. KNAPP, "The Origins of Provincial Prosopography in the West", in *Ancient Society*, 9, 1978, p. 187-222.

⁵ TARRACO, *CIL*, II, n.º 4.415; *ILS*, n.º 8.059; VIVES, *ILER*, n.º 4.454; ALFÖLDY, *Röm. Inschr. von Tarraco*, n.º 461.

⁶ KAJANTO, *o. c.*, p. 180.

⁷ *ILS*, n.º 3.176-77; *CIL*, II, n.º 6.054; *ILER*, n.º 424. For *honorem memoriae* with genitive of the person commemorated, cf. SÜET., *aug.*, 31.5.

⁸ *ILER*, n.º 412-424.

⁹ KAJANTO, *o. c.*, p. 214. Venerius as a *nomen* is rare and questionable, see SCHULZE, p. 482-83.

¹⁰ ALFÖLDY, *o. c.*, p. 487.