

Downloaded from UvA-DARE, the institutional repository of the University of Amsterdam (UvA)
<http://dare.uva.nl/document/123784>

File ID 123784
Filename Chapter 7. The onomasticon

SOURCE (OR PART OF THE FOLLOWING SOURCE):

Type Dissertation
Title The Latin dialect of the Ager Faliscus : 150 years of scholarship
Author G.C.L.M. Bakkum
Faculty Faculty of Humanities
Year 2009
Pages LII, 678 (2 delen)
ISBN 9789056295622

FULL BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAILS:

<http://dare.uva.nl/record/292896>

Copyright

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use.

Chapter 7

The onomasticon

As a large part of the Faliscan material is onomastic, no study of Faliscan can be complete without an assessment of the Faliscan onomasticon: it has in fact been the subject of a separate study by Hirata (1967). This chapter opens with a short discussion of the problems inherent in the use of the onomasticon as a subject of linguistic study (§7.1). The next section treats the names in the Early Faliscan inscriptions (§7.2). This is followed by sections on the onomastic formulas of men (§7.3) and of women (§7.4), the formulas of filiation (§7.5), and the onomastic formulas of freedmen and -women (§7.6). The next sections treat the attested praenomina (§7.7), gentilicia (§7.8), and cognomina (§7.9). The chapter concludes with a discussion of the onomasticon from the perspective of ethnic identity (§7.10).

7.1. The onomasticon: methodological issues

7.1.1. Names and language. In using onomastic data as the basis of linguistic study, several specific problems present themselves, and these are all the more important in a study of material like the Faliscan inscriptions, where the onomastic data far exceed the lexical ones. Onomastic elements are *associated* with a certain language rather than a *part* of it, for although they adhere to the morphology and phonology of the language in which they originate, they are not a part of its lexicon, in the sense that they do not necessarily have a meaning apart from their reference to a specific person. This is true even if a name consists of a lexeme, as in the case of a nickname such as *Plautus* or a name of good omen such as *Scaeva*. Using these words as names changes their point of reference: they no longer refer to ‘flat feet’ or ‘good luck’ themselves, but to a specific person presumably possessing these. Such ‘telling names’ may have an added value because they can be ‘understood’, but they are still names, not words.

For this reason, onomastic elements can move between language communities with far greater ease than lexical or morphological elements (cf. §1.3.2.2). Names are the constant companions of the people they refer to, even if a person moves between language communities, both in the sense that that person migrates between areas where different languages are spoken and in the sense that that person is bi- or multi-lingual and changes between the frameworks of the different languages at his or her disposal. The Faliscan material is very illustrative in this respect: whereas the main conclusion of the preceding chapter was that the extant Faliscan lexicon contains few or no Etruscan elements, in the onomasticon Etruscan names abound (§7.7.2, §7.8.2).

A name is, in a sense, the ultimate vehicle of the whole range of a person's identities. Apart from 'just' referring to a person, names, in countless unspoken ways, express a person's ties to his or her gender, family, ethnic group, and religion, and are therefore a kind of condensation of all that person's identities. As such, a name is a definition not only of *who* the person is, but also of *what* he or she is, and stays with that person even, or perhaps even more, among strangers, whether these speak the same language or a different one. Names are carriers, not of meaning, but of associations of personal and cultural significance: a great difference from lexical elements.

This of course does in no way preclude that a person's name may be *adapted* in various ways if it is used within the framework of a language different from the one it originated in. For instance, the phonological form may be adapted in order not to sound too 'foreign', especially if the name contains phonemes or phonotactics that are alien to the language to which it is adapted. An example of this is the way in which the Sabine chieftain Attus Clausus adapted his gentilicium to *Claudius* (Liv. 2.16). The morphological form of a name may have to be adapted, if it is to be declined according to the morphology of a different language: such adaptations resulted in the Latin versions *Arruns* and *Lars* of the Etruscan names *Arnθ* and *Larθ*. Names may have their derivational suffixes altered so that they resemble names of a different language: thus, the Faliscan onomasticon has *Succonius* beside *Zuxu* (§7.8.2). Names that have recognisable lexical elements may even be translated, so that Etruscan *Zixu* became *Scribonius* (Cl 1.318-320), or they may be replaced by similar-sounding ones, or ones regarded (rightly or not) as etymological equivalents, so that in the ager Faliscus the very frequent *Gaiius* was ousted by *Gaius* (§7.7.1.24-25).

Such adaptations always show a desire to adapt and fit in, whether the choice to do so is made willingly, hoping perhaps for a better acceptance or better chances within a different community, or under some form of pressure, where people bearing names from a specific ethnic or social background are discriminated against, or where a new administration sets new rules as to the use of names. Similarly, being able to *preserve* the old name unadapted in a new environment may also speak volumes both about the person able to do so and about the environment in which this can occur.

How do these preliminary remarks apply to the study of the Faliscan onomasticon? First, the onomasticon is not so much of linguistic as of socio-linguistic interest. This has already been pointed out in the preceding chapter: lexical elements can only be derived from the onomasticon in exceptional circumstances. Even when a name contains lexical elements, it can never be assumed as a matter of fact that these elements were also present in the lexicon, for the name may have originated in a different area and contained lexical elements that in the ager Faliscus may have had different associations or meanings, had become obsolete, or simply did not exist. On the other hand, the way in which people choose, use, adapt or preserve their names may be of considerable sociolinguistic interest.

Second, gentilicia are often used to pinpoint the ‘roots’ of a family, as is done e.g. by Peruzzi (1990:283-9) for the Etruscan gentilicia from Corchiano. This can of course be done to some extent, and it can be of great use in socio-historical studies if there is abundant additional historical material to substruct such links. Yet a simple similarity of a name means close to nothing in the case of a socio-linguistic study. The fact that a person at Falerii Veteres had an Etruscan gentilicium that occurs also or even exclusively at Perugia is in itself not very significant, not only because the families may still be entirely unrelated, but, more importantly, because it is impossible to make any valid inferences about that person’s personal ethnic or linguistic background that are relevant to the interpretation of the text they occur in.

This is connected with a third and more serious fallacy, namely the assumption that a person with an Etruscan or Sabellic or Latin name *ipso facto* had that specific cultural background, identified with that specific cultural background, or was a speaker of the language associated with that background. It is a dangerous kind of simplification to equal names (even though they demonstrably originated within a specific culture or language) with specific cultures, peoples, or languages, and treat these as if they were in a one-to-one relation. Recent studies on ethnic identity have shown that distinctions were certainly not so clear-cut (cf. e.g. Cornell 1997 on ethnic identity in early Rome). I shall return to this question in chapter 9.

7.1.2. The problem of abbreviations. Some very simple problems in the material are caused by abbreviations. In many inscriptions, names are abbreviated, and many *Besitzerinschriften* consist entirely of abbreviated names. Although editors have generally ignored this (not small) number of inscriptions, they do contain data that might be used for onomastic research. I have made use of this material as follows:

- Inscriptions consisting entirely of abbreviations are assumed to contain *one* name even if they consist of consonant clusters such as *mr* or *cs* (which can be abbreviations of *Marcus* or *Caesius*), unless the letters are separated by an interpunct.
- Inscriptions consisting of one abbreviated name have *not* been used, as it cannot be established (a) whether the name is a praenomen or a gentilicium; (b) whether the name is male or female; (c) what name is represented by the abbreviation.
- Inscriptions consisting of two abbreviations are assumed to consist of a praenomen and a gentilicium: these have been used in the lists of praenomina and gentilicia (§7.7.1, §7.8.1), but not in the discussion of onomastic formulas (§7.3-6), since it cannot be established whether the name is male or female.
- Abbreviations in longer inscriptions are usually praenomina and have been used both in §7.3-4 and §7.6. The abbreviations in FILIATION present a problem of their own, for, unless these are followed by *SON/DAUGHTER*, abbreviations of patronymic adjectives and of the father’s praenomen cannot be distinguished: see §7.5.

7.2. Names in the Early Faliscan inscriptions

7.2.1. The Early Faliscan onomastic formulas. Considering the date of the Early Faliscan inscriptions, the names occurring in these texts may be expected to be praenomina and *Individualnamen*, and early instances of gentilicia.

Gentilicia are first found in the area in the Etruscan inscriptions: this may be due to cultural factors, or it may simply be due to the fact that there are more Etruscan than Faliscan inscriptions from the sixth and fifth centuries. The earliest instances may be *lar*s ruvries* Etr **XIX** from Mazzano Romano (c.650-625), and *leθaie* Etr **XLVIII** from Mazzano Romano (c.570-560). The first certain instances of gentilicia in Etruscan inscriptions from the ager Faliscus are from the second half of the sixth century, *velθarus velanas* Etr **XVI** from Narce (c.550-500) and *larisa zuχus* Etr **XXXII** from Corchiano (c.525-500). Gentilicia then appear regularly from the fifth century onwards in Etruscan inscriptions: the first instance in a non-Etruscan inscription from the area occurs in the Sabellic inscription *pa<qu>is blaisiis* **468*** of unknown provenance.

The single names that occur in the Early Faliscan inscriptions are the following:

*eco quto *e uotenosio* (= *uo(l)tenosio* or *uo<l)tenosio*) *titias duenom duenas salue[to]d uoltene* : EF **3**

prau[i]os urnam : soç[iai] porded karai : EF **1**

eko lartos EF **6**

eko kaisiosio EF **7**

tele[1-2?] med fifiked* EF **9**

aĩmiosio eqo EF **467***

These show several names that occur also in the later inscriptions, namely the praenomina *Aemius*, *Caesius*, *Lars*, and *Titia*. *Voltenus* appears to be connected to the later Faliscan praenomen *Volta* (see §7.7.1.85), and might be considered a gentilicium if the inscription is not too early for this. *Tele...* is perhaps a Greek name in Τηλε- or Τελε-. *Prau[i]os* may be connected to Latin *prauus*, and be a nickname or a play on the ‘good’ or ‘beautiful’ theme of many of the early Faliscan, Latin, and Etruscan inscriptions. (All these names, as well as those given below, are discussed in §7.2.2.)

More difficult to assess are the strings of names that occur in EF **1** and EF **4**. Thus, apart from the *prau[i]os* already mentioned, EF **1** has:

*ceres : far *[0-2]e[1-3]tom : *[3-5]uf[1-4]ui[.]m : *[3-4]*ad euios : mama z[e]xtos med ff.]iqod* : EF **1**

Here, *euios : mama z[e]xtos* has been variously interpreted. The early interpretation as PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM COGNOMEN (Herbig *CIE* 8079 (‘Sextus Mama Euius’), Ribezzo 1918:56 etc., Vetter 1939a:155) can be ruled out: even apart from the difficulties encountered in interpreting the verb *ff.]iqod* as third person *singular*, it would be

quite early for a gentilicium, and far too early for a cognomen (see §7.9). Most authors have interpreted *mama z[e]xtos* as praenomina instead. *Mama* is probably of Etruscan origin, comparable to the Latin praenomen *Mamus* (G. Giacomelli 1963:202, Salomies 1987:75), while *z[e]xtos* is quite clearly the numeral praenomen *Sextus*, which occurs also in later inscriptions, albeit rarely (§7.7.1.62). If and how *euios* is connected to these names is rather more difficult. It has been taken as a gentilicium *euios* to go with the praenomina *mama* and *z[e]xtos*, which might not be impossible if *euios* is regarded as singular (Meister 1916:101): interpreting it as a plural (Norden 1939:206-7, Vetter 1953:280) is difficult or impossible (cf. §4.3.6). Another possibility is that it is a third praenomen (cf. perhaps Praesamnitic *eyies* Ps 4), although in that case it is unclear why it should be separated from *mama z[e]xtos* by an interpunct. G. Giacomelli (1963:41-2) interpreted *euios* as a theonym to go with the fragmentary words that precede it, and although this interpretation is based on Vetter's untenable reading *l[o]ufir* and can only be maintained with great difficulty, it is possible that *euios* should be taken with the preceding words rather than with *mama z[e]xtos*.

Even more difficult is the reading and interpretation of EF 4, where there appear to be two groups of names, one of women's names and one of men's:

*e**azieputilepekapena (e**azieputilepe kapena?) rufia k̄aleptia ues saluete sociai ofetios kaios uelos amanos salueto salues seiteiofeteqemeneseseie* EF 4

Of the women's names, *rufia* can hardly be interpreted as anything else than as a woman's name (cf. *ruvries* in Etr XIX), which leaves no other possibility than the same interpretation for *k̄aleptia* (even if individual letters of this part of this name have been read differently). A third name *kapena* has often been read in the unclear first part of the text, *e**azieputilepekapena*, and this would appear to be a gentilicium rather than a praenomen (cf. Prosdocimi 1990:302-5). Of these names, *rufia k̄aleptia* looks like a praenomen followed by a gentilicium, but I wonder whether it is not far too early to assume this formula: in view of the following *ues saluete sociai*, these may be separate names belonging to two different women. The men's names are likewise difficult. *Ofetios* sounds very much like Italic names such as *Opetius* or *Ufentius*, but cannot be directly connected to either: see §7.2.2.9. *Kaios* is clearly the Latin praenomen *Gaius*, but this name does not appear elsewhere in the Faliscan onomasticon: see §7.7.1.24); *uelos* is in all probability the Etruscan praenomen *Vel* (§7.7.1.80), but whether it is a genitive (Pisani 1937:238-9, cf. §4.5.2) or a thematized nominative **Velus* is unclear. *Amanos* had tentatively been linked by G. Giacomelli (1963:173-4) to the Etruscan gentilicium *Amana* (as a thematized nominative?); Salomies (1987:99) also pointed to *Amanus* and *Amanius* in Latin. How these names are to be strung together is unclear. Vetter (1925:26, 1953:284) took *ofetios kaios uelos amanos* as a gentilicium *ofetios* followed by three praenomina ('the Ufentii, Gaius, Vel, [and] Amanus'), just like he had interpreted *euios : mama z[e]xtos* in EF 1 (see above). If *uelos* is a genitive, this could of course be a genitive of the father's name (*kaios uelos* = 'Gaius [son]

of Vel' or *ofetios kaios uelos* = 'Ofetius [and] Gaius [sons] of Vel'). This could be another argument against taking *amanos* as the gentilicium, for placing the filiation after the praenomen and before the gentilicium is in accordance with the later Umbrian and Volscian custom, but not with that of the Middle and Late Faliscan texts: see §7.5. (The place of the filiation may not yet have been fixed, especially at a time when gentilicia were just making their first appearance.) The only alternative seems to be to leave *amanos* as an isolated name without filiation.

7.2.2. The names attested in the Early Faliscan inscriptions. The names that occur in the Early Faliscan inscriptions are the following. For ease of discussion I have classed the names under their closest Latin equivalent or approximation, and have arranged the lemmata according to the order of our own alphabet.

1. *Aemius*. praen. m. *aiṃiosio* EF 467* (gen.). – A patronymic derivation of *Aemus*, attested for Middle Faliscan in *eimoi* MF 293 and possibly in the abbreviation *a[ī?]m* MF 89 (either a praenomen or a patronymic adjective), that can represent either *Aemus* or *Aemius*. This name does not occur elsewhere in Italy except in Venetic <a>i-mo-i Le 26; see also §7.7.1.3.
2. *Amanus*. m. *amanos* EF 3. – Either a gentilicium (G. Giacomelli 1963:173) or a praenomen (Hirata 1967:33-4): see §7.2.1. Salomies (1987:99) points to the *Amanus* in Sil. 17.44 and the Latin gentilicium *Amanius*. The name could be an adaptation of the Etruscan gentilicium *Amana* (*amanas* Vs 1.92, also *J amanaš*[Ve 3.4?]): see §7.8.2.
3. *Caesius*. praen. m. *kaisiosio* EF 7 (gen.). – The name occurs also in the later periods: see §7.7.1.18.
4. ? *Caleptius*. gent. (?) f. *ḱaleptia* EF 4. – However these letters are read (*kalketia* G. Giacomelli 1963:180, *kalestia* Hirata 1967:40-1, *kaliptia* Prosdocimi 1990:295, etc.), it can hardly be anything other than a woman's name (cf. §7.2.1), albeit one that is without parallels in the Etruscan, Latin or Sabellic onomasticon. The same is true of the other readings that have been proposed.
5. ? *Capena* or *Capenus*. f. *ḱapena* EF 4. – The name looks like an Etruscan gentilicium, or it might be the feminine of a gentilicium *Capenus* adapted from an Etruscan **Capena* (cf. §7.8.2). Etruscan had *Capn-* (*capna* AT 1.200, CI 1.454, Pe 1.869, 1.973, *capnal* CI 1.202, 1.578, *capna[l]* CI 1.203, 1.633, *capnas* Pe 1.975, *capnaš* CI 1.2214; *capnei* CI 1.201; *capni* Pe 1.436), and *Capan-* (*capanei* Pe 1.213, 214). The *Capenus Sequamus* in [Liv.] *Per.* 120 appears to be a Gaul. If and how the name is connected to the toponym *Capena* is unclear.
6. ? *Euius*. m. *euios* EF 1. – G. Giacomelli's (1963:41-2) interpretation of *euios* as a theonym *Εὔιος* = 'Liber' was largely based on Vetter's untenable reading (first

- 1925:27-8) *l[o]uffir* in the same text. If *euios* is an anthroponym (see §7.2.1), possible parallels are Praesamnitic *evies* Ps 5 (also read as *efies*), and perhaps in the Latin gentilicium *Euius* (Hirata 1967:49). Salomies (1987:83) compares *Euius* to the Oscan praenomen *Ovis* (*úvis* Cm 35, elsewhere abbreviated, see *ST*), but this is difficult, as it requires that the rounding **/eʷ/ → */oʷ/* did not take place during the Proto-Italic period, but at a later stage (see §3.2.5).
7. **Lars.** praen. m. *lartos* EF 6 (gen.). – This is the only direct attestation of this praenomen in a Faliscan inscription, although it is indirectly attested for Middle Faliscan in the patronym *lartio* MF 265. It does recur in the Etruscan inscriptions from the area (*larθ* Etr XXXIV, XXXV, XXXIX, *lazi* Etr XI-XV, *lazia* Etr XVII): see §7.7.2.33.
 8. **Mama/Mamma.** praen. m. *mama* EF 1. – This praenomen is of Etruscan origin (thus G. Giacomelli 1963:202, cf. *mama* OA 2.58?), rather than a shortened form of a name such as *Mamarcus*, as Stolte (1928:295) suggested. Salomies (1987:75) also discusses the apparently Oscan praenomen *Mamus*. Note also the (patronymic?) gentilicia *Māmius* and *Mammius* in Latin and in Oscan (*maamiis* Cm 47, *maamiejs* Po 55).
 9. **? Ofe(n)tius.** m. *ofetios* EF 4. – Vetter (1953:286-7) rendered this name as *Ufentius*, a name derived from the potamonym *Ūfens* (either the modern Ofento in Southern Latium, or another, unknown, river of the same name): for such potamonymic names, see §7.8.2. Although attractive at first sight, this derivation presupposes an impossibly early monophthongization of */oʷ/ → /ō/* (see §3.7.2), as G. Giacomelli (1963:208) pointed out. There appear to be no other names that can easily be connected to *ofetios*, however.
 10. **Prauius.** m. *prau[i]os* EF 1. – G. Giacomelli (1963:213) classed it as a gentilicium, but I doubt whether it is not rather some kind of nickname or pun on the Latin adjective *prauus*, referring to the ‘good’ or ‘beautiful’ theme of several of the Early Faliscan inscriptions and their Latin and Etruscan counterparts: see §7.2.1.
 11. **? Rufia** f. *rufia* EF 4. – Although editors generally read *rufia* (*rofia* Vetter 1953:285-7), this presupposes an impossibly early monophthongization of */oʷ/ → /ō/ → /ū/* (see §3.7.2), unless it is assumed that the name is entirely unrelated to the Latin adjective *rufus*. For the feminine in *-ia* beside a masculine in *-us*, cf. *Titia* : *Titus* and *Tullia* : *Tullus* (§7.7.2).
 12. **Sextus** praen. m. *z[e]xtos* EF 1. – The name is attested also for the later periods: see §7.7.1.62.
 13. **Tele...** m. *tele*[1-2?]* EF 9. – Unclear: perhaps a Greek name in *Τηλε-* or *Τελε-*?

14. *Titia* praen. f. *titias* EF 3 (gen.). – The name is attested for the later periods in *titias* MF 201 (gen.), as well as in a number of attestations of its male equivalent *Titus*: see §7.7.1.75.
15. *Vel* praen. m. *uelos* EF 4 (either a genitive or a thematized form, see §7.2.1). – The praenomen is also attested for Middle Faliscan: see §7.7.1.80.
16. *Voltenus* m. *uotensio* (= *uo(l)tenosio* or *uo(l)stenosio*) EF 3 (gen.), *uoltene* EF 3 (voc.). – A problem with this is that the derivation is not clear, unless it is a thematized adaptation of an Etruscan gentilicium **Voltena*, which itself would have to be based on the Faliscan praenomen *Volta* (for which see §7.7.1.85): for such thematizations, see §7.8.2.

Of these names, *Lars* and *Vel* are clearly Etruscan; perhaps Etruscan too are *Mama*, *Amanus*, and *Voltenus*. Others are Latin-Faliscan: *Rufia* (?), *Sextus*, *Titia*, and probably *Prauius*. *Ofe(n)tius* seems to be of Italic origin, and the same could be true of *Euius*, if it is indeed a name. Of unclear origin are *Aemius*, *Caesius*, *Caleptia* (?), *Capena*, and *Tele*...

7.3. Middle and Late Faliscan male onomastic formulas

As mentioned in the preceding section, the gentilicium had become a normal onomastic element from the fifth century onwards at least in the Etruscan inscriptions from the area, and by the Middle Faliscan period, the full formula for a man's name in Faliscan inscriptions had become PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM. It was of course still possible to use PRAENOMEN or GENTILICIUM, but these formulas are massively outnumbered by the full formula PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM. In many cases, especially in sepulchral or public inscriptions, FILIATION was added to PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM: see §7.5. During the Middle Faliscan period, cognomina begin to make their appearance, so that the full formula now became PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM [FILIATION] COGNOMEN: see §7.9.

In the enumeration of the instances below, I have only included the instances where the man's name is the primary subject of the text, as owner, maker, deceased, official, or dedicant. I have excluded the instances where the man's name occurs in FILIATION (normally as PRAENOMEN) and HUSBAND_{GEN} WIFE (normally as PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM), since these formulas 'require' a specific form of the man's name. These instances are discussed in §7.9 and §7.4.2 respectively.

(1) PRAENOMEN (14-16 instances). When using a single name, there is a preference for the use of PRAENOMEN (in contrast to the women's names, where GENTILICIUM seems to have been preferred: see §7.4.1). The use of PRAENOMEN is virtually limited to *Besitzerinschriften*, where, within the context of the household, this would have been

enough. In sepulchral inscriptions it is understandably rare (2 instances, against 105 instances of PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM): although in a family tomb the gentilicium would not require specification, it would still be useful to know which family member was buried where. (PRAENOMEN is also the normal formula in FILIATION, as the gentilicium had already been named in the name of the son or daughter: see §7.6.)

(a) *Besitzerinschriften* (14-17 instances): *caisioi* MF 20, *serui* MF 34-36, *tulom* MF 68 (if indeed genitive plural of a praenomen); *iuna* MF 73, *iuna* MF 74, *iunai* LF 112, *iuna* MF 198, *uli* MF? 261-262 (perhaps a gentilicium); *cauios* MLF 382, *uoltai* MLF 367-370; *iunai* MLF/Cap 475*.

(b) *sepulchral inscriptions* (2 instances): *iuna* MLF 297, *iuna* MLF 298.

(c) *others* (0 instances): -

(2) GENTILICIUM (9-12 instances). This formula also occurs mainly in *Besitzerinschriften*, where of course an item might be regarded as the property of the family rather than of one individual. There is only one uncertain instance of its use from the sepulchral inscriptions, where it would not be expected to be very frequent: given that most burials were in tombs that belonged to one or two families, inscribing a *loculus* with GENTILICIUM only would have been of little use.

(a) *Besitzerinschriften* (8-10 instances): *ani* MF 45, *licinio* MF 259-260, *ulties* MF/Etr 64 (or a woman's name?), *hermana* MF/Etr 265; *tulie* MLF 383 (or a woman's name?), *[fel]icinatiu* LF 384; *açiuaiom* Cap 465, *setorio* MLF/Cap 476*; *anni* LtF 63.

(b) *sepulchral inscriptions* (1 instance?): ? *manileo* MF 355 (I would rather read this as *m anileo*, i.e., PRAENOMEN + GENTILICIUM).

(c) *others* (1 instance): *pleina* MF/Etr 199 (signature?)

(3) PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM (156-158 instances, 43-68 with FILIATION). This is by far the most frequent formula in all the categories into which men's names can be divided, except, perhaps, the *Besitzerinschriften*. It is also the only formula where FILIATION and sometimes COGNOMEN are added, showing that this was the 'official' formula. FILIATION only occurs in the sepulchral and the (mainly Latino-Faliscan and Latin) public inscriptions and dedications, and once in a potter's signature (*oufilo : clipeaio : letei : fileo* MF 470*).

(a) *Besitzerinschriften* (22-24 instances): ? *f ofiti* MF 58 (doubtful), *tiroi · colanioi* MF 69-71, *caui : turi* MF 273, *marci : anel[i]* MF 472*, *cauiio : petṛoṇeṛo* MF 473*; *larise uicina* MF 371, *larise | uicina* MF 372, *statio cailio* MLF 376, *m adicio* LF 378 (or *ma dicio?*), *uolti : catinei* MLF 469*; *c · pscni* Cap 387, *k · uomanio* Cap 388, *a · irpios* Cap 389, *k · pa · aiedies* Cap 390, *at · fertrio* Cap 391, *f · pacios* Cap 392, *sex | senti* Cap 399, *k · sares* Cap 404, *m · anio* Cap 420, *sex · sen-ti* Cap 430, *p · iunio* Cap 462, *ueiṛeto* Cap 464 (if read as *uei ṛeto*, and not a *falsum*).

CHAPTER 7

	<i>Besitzer</i>	<i>sepulchral</i>	<i>other</i>	<i>total</i>		
PRAENOMEN	MF 10-11 MLF 3-5 Cap 1	MLF 2		MF 10-11 MLF 5-7 Cap 1	MF 10-11 MLF 5-7 Cap 1	<i>all</i> 16-19
+ FILIATION	-----					
GENTILICIUM	MF 4-6 MLF 1 Cap 2 Lat 1	MF 0-1	MF 1	MF 5-8 MLF 1 Cap 2 Lat 1	MF 5-8 MLF 1 Cap 2 Lat 1	<i>all</i> 9-12
+ FILIATION	-----					
SINGLE NAME TOTAL	MF 14-17 MLF 4-6 Cap 3 Lat 1	MF 0-1 MLF 2	MF 1	MF 15-19 MLF 6-8 Cap 3 Lat 1	MF 15-19 MLF 6-8 Cap 3 Lat 1	<i>all</i> 25-31
+ FILIATION	-----					
	<i>all</i> 22-27	<i>all</i> 2-3	<i>all</i> 1	<i>all</i> 25-31		
PRAENOMEN + GENTILICIUM	MF 6-7 MLF 5 Cap 11-12	MF 20 MLF 11 LF 9 LtF 1	MF 4 MLF 4 LF 1 Lat 5	MF 30-31 MLF 20 LF 10 LtF 1 Cap 11-12 Lat 5	MF 57-58 MLF 29 LF 28 LtF 11 Cap 11-12 Lat 19	<i>all</i> 155-157
+ FILIATION?		MF 14 MLF 3 LF 3 LtF 5	LtF 2	MF 14 MLF 3 LF 3 LtF 7		
+ FILIATION		MF 12 MLF 6 LF 13 LtF 2 Lat 6	MF 1 LF 2 LtF 1 Lat 8	MF 13 MLF 6 LF 15 LtF 3 Lat 14		
	<i>all</i> 22-24	<i>all</i> 105	<i>all</i> 28	<i>all</i> 155-157		
TOTAL	44-51	107-108	29	180-188		

Fig. 7.1. The onomastic formulas of men's names.

THE ONOMASTICON

	<i>Besitzer</i>	<i>sepulchral</i>	<i>other</i>	<i>total</i>		
PRAENOMEN	MF 1	MF 4 MLF 1	MLF 1	MF 5 MLF 2	MF 6 MLF 3 LF 2	<i>all</i> 11
+ FILIATION	MLF 1	MF 1 LF 2		MF 1 MLF 1 LF 2		
GENTILICIUM	MF 7 MLF 4	MF 9 MLF 2 LF 1	MF 1	MF 17 MLF 6 LF 1	MF 17 MLF 6 LF 1 Ltf 2 Lat 2	<i>all</i> 28
+ FILIATION		Lat 1 Ltf 2 Lat 1		Lat 1 Ltf 2 Lat 1		
SINGLE NAME TOTAL	MF 8 MLF 4	MF 13 MLF 3 LF 1	MF 1 MLF 1	MF 22 MLF 8 LF 1	MF 23 MLF 9 LF 3 Ltf 2 Lat 2	<i>all</i> 39
+ FILIATION	MLF 1	Lat 1 MF 1 LF 2 Ltf 2 Lat 1		Lat 1 MF 1 MLF 1 LF 2 Ltf 2 Lat 1		
	<i>all</i> 13	<i>all</i> 24	<i>all</i> 2	<i>all</i> 39		
PRAENOMEN + GENTILICIUM	MLF 0-1	MF 19 LF 6		MF 19 MLF 0-1 LF 6	MF 23 MLF 0-1 LF 10	<i>all</i> 35-38
+ FILIATION? + FILIATION	Cap 0-2	Lat 2 MF 4 LF 4		Cap 0-2 Lat 2 MF 4 LF 4		
	<i>all</i> 0-3	<i>all</i> 35	<i>all</i> 0	<i>all</i> 35-38		
TOTAL	13-16	59	2	74-77		

Fig. 7.2. The onomastic formulas of women's names.

(b) *sepulchral inscriptions* (105 instances, 39 with FILIATION, and a further 25 where FILIATION is probable or possible): *uolti † teti* MF 11, *cauio : pauiceo : | ![oc]ies* MF 12 with FILIATION, *o haθi* MF 13, *teti atron* or *teti atroni* MF 13, *uolta | ne-roni | ca fi* MF 15 with FILIATION, *iuna | malio* MF 39, *iuna · oufilio* MF 48, *cauio · aufilio* MF 49, *caui[o] · aufilio* MF 50, *ka[s]i[o] · aufjilio · iun[?eo]* MF 51 with FILIATION; *[---]a · aufi[lio] ?---* MF 53 (where FILIATION can be restored), *puponio · firmio* MF 54, *uel zu[con]eo* MF 56, *ca lin[---]* MF 57 (where FILIATION can be restored), *leiuelio partis | uolti* MF 79 with FILIATION, *[ma]rco : pleina : marcio : man[o]mo* MF 80 with FILIATION, *uel [·] uisni · olna* MF 82 (double gentilicium), *[·]pi : uesθi* MF 83, *caui [·] †**(*)[i]* MF 84, *mar : eina* MF 87, *[uo]ltio [·] ueico* MF 88, *[4-5]a hac****a : [?]q[?]m : maximo* MF 89 with FILIATION, *[leu]elio : cailio [· ...] max[om]o [·]* MF 90 (where FILIATION can be restored), *la : ie[---]* MF 93 (where FILIATION can be restored), *iuna : ce[lio---]* MF 96 (where FILIATION can be restored), *cei[s]i[·] | holc[osi] | ar · p[...]* MF 140 with FILIATION?, *[---]io : cre[---]* MF 142 (where FILIATION can be restored), *[---]o : cr[---]leo : c[---]* MF 143 (where FILIATION can be restored), *ca[u]io : le[ueli]o : cau[i] | hileo* MF 146 with FILIATION, *i[un]a le[---]* MF 148, *[u]ol[ta] : pupelio | [m]ano[m]o* MF 149, *tulo · pup[elio] ?---* | *iuneo* MF 151 with FILIATION, *uolti[o] : marc[---] | putellio* MF 152 (with FILIATION?), *cais[i]o | : zaconio* MF 153, *iu · uiu[---]* MF 157 (where FILIATION can be restored), *[---] su[---]* MF 191 (where FILIATION can be restored), *cauio : arutlo* MF 195, *cauio †[---]* MF 197 (where FILIATION can be restored), *aruz : cešie : aruto* MF 257 with FILIATION, *ueltur · tetena | aruto* MF 266 with FILIATION, *arute macena* MF 269, *larise : mar|cna : citiai* MF 270 (with FILIATION?), *cauio : nomes|ina : maxomo* MF 272, *cauio : oufilio | uolteo* MF 275 with FILIATION, *ceisio : oufilio | uolθeo* MF 276 with FILIATION; *c mecio : a[---]* MLF 211 (where FILIATION can be restored); *tito : uelmineo | titoi* MLF 305 with FILIATION, *iuna uelmineo | titio* MLF 307 with FILIATION, *cauio uelmineo | popliai file* MLF 308 (with FILIATION?), *tito † uelmineo | nu i*ice* MLF 309 with FILIATION, *cuicto uelmineo |[---?]* MLF 310 (where FILIATION can be restored), *uoltio [·] uelmineo | titio* MLF 312 with FILIATION, *uolta : uelmineo* MLF 313, *tito : uel|mineo : iun|ai i*ice* MLF 315 with FILIATION, *popli[o] | uelmi|no* MLF 316, *cauio · latrion* MLF 324, *m · titio · tulio · uoltilio · hescuna* MLF 346 (double gentilicium) with FILIATION, *aufilo · aratio* MLF 348, *cauio · aratio* MLF 349, *tito · aratio* MLF 350, *caisio · tirio* MLF 351, *faino* MLF 352 (if not to be read as *faino*?), *oct*i[...]* *uoltili* MLF 353 (if read as *oct* i[...]* *uoltili* or *oct*i [...]* *uoltili*) with FILIATION, *tito polafio* MLF 354, *m anileo* MLF 355 (if not to be read as *manileo*), *[iu]na : upreciano* MLF 363; *uoltio · uecineo | maxomo | iuneo* LF 220 with FILIATION, *marcio : acarcelinio* LF 223, *ca · uecineo [·] uoltio* LF 224 with FILIATION, *ca · uecineo* LF 225, *tito [·] acarcelinio : | ma : fi* LF 226 with FILIATION, *l · clipear[i]o* LF 230, *c · clipear[i]o | m · f* LF 231 with FILIATION, *c · au[---]isi* LF 236 with FILIATION, *[·]a · protacio · m · f* LF 242 with FILIATION, *[---]o [·] spur[i]lio* LF 248 (where FILIATION can be restored), *sesto † | fulczeo* LF 329, *uoltio | folcozeo | zextoi | fi* LF 330

with FILIATION, *cesio folcuso* LF **331**, *celio *olcuzeo* | ****io* | *poplia* | *uelcei f*|*e* LF **332** (with FILIATION?), [*..*] *folcosio* | *****oi* LF **333** with FILIATION, *cauio* | *uetulio* LF **335**, *tito · marhio* | *uoltilio* LF **336** with FILIATION, *ueltur* | *ortecese* LF **339**; *cailio · titorio* MLF/LtF **358**, *tito · batio* MLF/LtF **359**; *m · cl[i]peario · m · f* LtF **233** with FILIATION, *m · pani[---]* LtF **239**, *uo · nel[n---]* LtF **299**, *m · neroni* | *a · f* LtF **325** with FILIATION, *st · aco[---]* LtF **327** (where FILIATION can be restored), [*se*] *x · nel[?]ro[---]* LtF **328** (where FILIATION can be restored), *c · neroni* LtF **340**, *m · aco[---]* | *rutil · ce[---]* LtF **341** (with FILIATION?); *m · spurilius · c · f* Lat **237** with FILIATION, *c · spurilius* | *m · f* Lat **238** with FILIATION, *Pu(blius) Fuluius C(aii) f(iilius)* | *C(aii) n(epos) Suto(r)* Lat **250** with FILIATION, *l · uecilio · uo · f* Lat **251** with FILIATION, [*·*] *uecilio · l · f* Lat **251** with FILIATION, *l · c · leuieis · l · f* Lat **251** with FILIATION.

(c) *others* (28 instances, 14 with FILIATION): (i) signatures (4 instances, 1 with FILIATION): *ç cutri* MF **200**, *arθ[3-5]rē* MF/Etr **267**, *oufilo* : *clipeaio* : *letei* : *fileo* MF **470*** with FILIATION, *cauios frenaios* MF **471***; (ii) inscriptions on public works, public dedications (16 instances, 10-12 with FILIATION): *a* [*·*] *Josena* MLF **206**, *ue narionio* MLF **206**, *cauio lullio* MLF **207**, *cauio latinaio* MLF **210**; [*·*] *hirmio · m · f · f* LF **213** with FILIATION, *ce · tertineo · c · f* LF **213** with FILIATION; *c* *(*)coņeo · l***(*)* LtF **290** with FILIATION (or a cognomen?), *ce · pau[ceo 1-2]so* LtF **290** with FILIATION (or a cognomen?), [*---*] *jilio · c · f · f* LtF **215** with FILIATION; *la · cotena · la · f* LF/Lat **214** with FILIATION, *l · latrius · k · f* Lat **218** with FILIATION, *c · salu[e]na · uoltai · f* Lat **218** with FILIATION, [*·*] *u]mpricius · c · f* | [*?*] *aburcus* Lat **219** with FILIATION, *c · egnatius · s[ex ·]f* Lat **291** with FILIATION, *c · didius · t · f* Lat **456** with FILIATION, *m · uettius · m · f* Lat **456** with FILIATION; (iii) private dedications (5 instances, 1 with FILIATION): [*·*] *munio regena** Lat **377**, *mar · popi st · f* Cap **421** with FILIATION, *l · calpurnius* Cap **432**, *m · t · u · genucilio* Cap **435** (three *liberti*), [*---*] *rcius* Cap **436** (a *libertus*); (iv) reversed filiation (1 instance): *marci* : *acarcelini* LF **221**; (v) statue (1 instance): *caui* : *terteinei* MLF/Cap **474***; (vi) unknown (1 instance): *st · clanidio* Cap **394**.

To these instances should be added the following 33 damaged sepulchral inscriptions: (a) with only the praenomen preserved (7 instances, 1 with FILIATION): *ueņe[?---]* MF **43**, [*u*] *olt[---]* MF **145**, *kreco* : [*---*] MF **147**, *uol[ta :]**[---]* MF **158**, [*leu*] *elio · [--- | ---]io · ca[---]* MF **159**, [*u*] *olt[---] u]olt[i][i---]* MF **163** with FILIATION; *cauio [---] | ruso[?---]* MLF **318** (*ruso* may be a cognomen); (b) with only the gentilicium preserved (19 instances, 8 with FILIATION): [*.....*] *ner[oni.]* | [*i*][*.....*] MF **16** with FILIATION, [*---*] *hirmeo iu ·* MF **19** with FILIATION, [*---*] *ou*[.]o *q**[---]* MF **52** with FILIATION, [*---*] *c]elio · cesi · fi[---]* MF **94** with FILIATION, [*---*] *celio [---]* MF **95** possibly with FILIATION, [*---*] *c]elio [---]* MF **97** possibly with FILIATION, [*---*] *reic[lio]* | [*---*] *maxom[o]* MF **98** probably with FILIATION, [*---*] *reiclio [?---]* MF **99** possibly with FILIATION, [*.....*] *rei[cli.]* | *m*[....]* MF **100**, [*---*] *iena : u[---]* MF **102**, *faff[---]* MF **139?** possibly with FILIATION, [*---*] *crafi--- | iu?]neo* MF **141** with FILIATION [*---*] *ronio : uol[t---]* MF **156** with FILIATION, [*---*] *marcio* LF **228** (or a patronym?) [*---p*] *rotacio[---]* LF **244**

possibly with FILIATION [---]fate MLF 285, [---?] preconof--- MLF 361, [---] upre-
ciano MLF 364, [---]nio · ia · * LtF 341 with FILIATION; [---]** · uei[---] t · f LtF 327
with FILIATION; (c) with only the cognomen preserved (1 instance, with FILIATION): [---
ma]xomo # uoltilio MF 162 with FILIATION; (d) with only the FILIATION clearly pre-
served (6 instances, all with FILIATION): [---]cēla[---|---] iun[---] MF 166, [---]f LF 247,
[---]*o · c · f LF 249; [---]o ce ⁴F LtF 171, [---] c · f · mo[---] LtF 172, [---?] decon[---
|---]a · f LtF 174

I have not included the following instances: (a) unclear reading or interpretation: *apolo*
MF 65 (a theonym), *namureṭua* (?) MF/Etr 66, *acrez cat* (?) MF 67, *tuconu* (?) MF 85
(perhaps PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM, if read as *t u(e?)comu*), [--- pu]pel[i---] MF 150,
[---u]oltio : | [---]o : MF 164, [---]io : uolti[---] MF 167, [---ar]uto r[---] MF 169, *cesit*
: *ferē* MF 263, *puiatu* MLF 208, *laris* : *m* : *rφcχa* | *uāiēsivisist* (?) MLF/Etr 290;
[--- ?]anco ma LF/LtF 232, [---] cuba | [---]nte LtF 326; (b) either a man's name or a
woman's: *uentarc[i]* MF 80, *uoll[---]MF 86* (GENTILICIUM?), [---] *uenēlies* MF 258
(probably a gentilicium), *popl[---]* [u]elmi[ne---] MLF 317, [---?]*a*kit*ue* a · f LF
234 (PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM FILIATION?), [---]a · neln f[---]uxo · ohi*[.] LtF 300;
(c) isolated names in -e(s): *acre* MF/Etr 279, *ame* MF/Etr 280, *amē* MF/Etr 282.

The material is presented in tabular form in fig.7.1. From this table the following ten-
dencies may be read:

- The use of the single name (whether PRAENOMEN or GENTILICIUM) is normal only
in the *Besitzerinschriften* (22-27 instances, out of a total of 44-51) and very rare in
sepulchral and other inscriptions (3-4 instances altogether, out of a total of 136-137).
- If the single name is used, it is PRAENOMEN (16-19 instances) rather than GEN-
TILICIUM (9-12 instances). The use of GENTILICIUM is very rare in all categories. This
is a contrast with the formulas of women's names: see §7.4.1.
- PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM is the normal formula in the sepulchral inscriptions (105
instances, out of a total of 107-108). It is also quite frequent in *Besitzerinschriften*
(22-24 instances, out of a total of 44-51).
- In the categories other than *Besitzerinschriften* and sepulchral inscriptions,
PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM appears to have been the normal formula in public inscrip-
tions, including public dedications (20 instances altogether, out of a total of 29).
- Note also that in FILIATION, the normal formula for the father's name is
PRAENOMEN, with the exception of *ca uipi* : *leueli* | *filea* MF 14.

Resuming, it may be said that PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM FILIATION is the official for-
mula from the first Middle Faliscan inscriptions onward: in that respect, the Faliscan
usage does not differ from that of Etruscan, Latin, or the Sabellic languages. The use
and the frequency of FILIATION are discussed in §7.9.

7.4. Female onomastic formulas

7.4.1. The formula of women's names. In Faliscan usage, as in Etruscan, contemporary Latin, and apparently also in the Sabellic languages (although the material is limited in this case)¹¹⁵, it was normal for a woman to have a praenomen as well as a gentilicium: *pace* G. Giacomelli (1963:160), there is no great difference between the ager Faliscus and the surrounding areas in this respect. Views on this subject can be and have been obscured by the later Roman usage, where women's praenomina became increasingly rarer (see Kajava 1995:114-8). This decrease in the use of praenomina does not appear to have occurred in the ager Faliscus, however: the use of the double name remains regular throughout all periods (see below). The full formula for women's names in Faliscan is therefore PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM, which may be extended with FILIATION (§7.5) and the marital formula HUSBAND_{GEN} WIFE (§7.4.2). Yet even in the ager Faliscus and Capenas women were often designated by one name only, and this is usually GENTILICIUM, as in Latium, whereas in the case of men there was a preference for PRAENOMEN (§7.3). There are no instances of Faliscan women having a cognomen, as is to be expected: in Etruscan, woman's cognomina are extremely rare in South Etruria, and occur with any frequency only at Clusium (cf. Rix 1965:40-2), while in Latin the earliest examples are probably from the second half of the second century (Kajanto 1977a:64-7, Kajava 1995:30-1): see §7.9.

(1) PRAENOMEN (11 instances, 4 with FILIATION). This formula was used both in *Besitzerinschriften* and in sepulchral inscriptions. The use in *Besitzerinschriften* can be compared to the quite frequent use of PRAENOMEN in *Besitzerinschriften* where the owner is male (see §7.3). In sepulchral inscriptions, the use of PRAENOMEN for women (9 instances) is more frequent than that of PRAENOMEN for men (2 instances), even though the number of recognizable women's names in sepulchral inscriptions (59) is far smaller than that of men's (107-8). This is probably due to the fact that women were buried with their husbands in the tomb of the husband's family: what mattered in these inscriptions was not the woman's own gentilicium, which differed from that of her husband's, but the fact that she was related by marriage to one of the family owning the tomb. In 6 out of the 9 instances of PRAENOMEN in women's sepulchral inscriptions, the name of the woman follows that of a man whose gentilicium is given (MF 48, 49, 50, MLF 312, LF 242, LF 332) and who was presumably her husband.

(a) *Besitzerinschriften* (3 instances, 1 perhaps with FILIATION): *titias* MF 201; *locia eimoi* MLF 293 with FILIATION (?), *sceiuai* LF 379.

¹¹⁵ Only the Paelignian sepulchral inscriptions (Pg 12-17, 28-33, 51-54) give some insight in the formulas of women's names; all other Sabellic languages yield only a few instances of women's names each (Um 3, 30, 38; MV 6; MV 7; Hi 4, 7; Po 51, 66?, Cm 25, Lu 46).

(b) *sepulchral inscriptions* (9 instances, 3 with FILIATION): *ca uipi : leueli | filea* MF 14 with FILIATION, *poplia* MF 48, *thanacuil* MF 49, *poplia* MF 50, [*p*]oplia MF 160; *sextia* MLF 311, *sceua* MLF 312; *cauia · uxo · a · f* LF 242 with FILIATION, *poplia | uelcei f* | e LF 332 with FILIATION.

(c) *others* (1 instance): *popliai* MLF 308.

(2) GENTILICIUM (25-26 instances, 3 of which with FILIATION). If a single name is used, GENTILICIUM appears to have been the preferred formula in the case of women, whereas in the case of men there was a preference for PRAENOMEN. This formula, too, appears to be used both in *Besitzerinschriften* and in sepulchral inscriptions.

(a) *Besitzerinschriften* (9-10 instances) *turia* MF 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, ? *ulties* MF/Etr 64 (unclear); *pupias* MLF 304, *seralia* LF 380, *tulie* MLF 383.

(b) *sepulchral inscriptions* (15 instances, 3 with FILIATION): *louřia* MF 41, *uollia* MF 47, *latria* MF 75, *thania* MF 81 (where two other women are designated as *ca* : *u[eculi]a* and *ca* : *e[c]nata*), [---] : *ceřili[a]* MF 99, *cincia* MF 135, *uoltaia* MF 196, *morenez* MF 269, *zeruatronia* MF 272; *fulonia* MLF 313; *m{e?}ania* LF 224 (in LF 225 she is described as *ca mania*); *hlau|elea · m · f* · LtF 325 with FILIATION, *plenes · q · f* LtF 231 with FILIATION; *plense* Lat 251, *claudia · c · f* Lat 393 with FILIATION.

(c) *others* (1 instance): *citiai* MF 270 (in FILIATION?).

(3) PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM (35-38 instances, 8 of which with FILIATION). As in the men's names, this appears to have been the official formula, as it is the regular formula in sepulchral inscriptions (35 instances, out of a total of 59 recognizable women's names in sepulchral inscriptions) and is moreover virtually restricted to sepulchral inscriptions (35 instances out of a total of 35-38 instances of PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM). Yet even in the sepulchral inscriptions there is a large number of instances where a single name is used (24 instances out of a total of 59 recognizable women's names), and the number of attestations of single names is slightly larger (39 instances) than that of PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM (35-38 instances).

(a) *Besitzerinschriften* (0-3 instances): ? *uei uatia* MLF 463 (unclear); ? *ca · e**sa* Cap 458 (very unclear), ? *sta sediu* Cap 466.

(b) *sepulchral inscriptions* (34 instances, 8 with FILIATION): *poplia | ĥirmia* MF 18; *fāsies : c[ai]sia* MF 41; *cauia : satelie* MF 42; *cauiacue | [u]eculia : uoltia* MF 80 with FILIATION; *ca : u[eculi]a* MF 81; *ca : e[c]nata* MF 81; *tan[---] | cail[ia] ?---* MF 92; *tanacu[il] | anelia* MF 101; *poplia | fařarñ* MF 136; [.]q*řa | *lepua | uoltia* MF 144 with FILIATION; *ian[ta : ..]ni[a]* MF 146; *iata : leue[lia]* MF 147; ři [.] řiria *lo[?---]|l[e]a : cs : f* MF 155 with FILIATION; *poplia : calitenes* MF 265; *poplia | zuconia* MF 271; [---]nθia MLF 212 (or a patronym?); řa : *fir-mia : titia* MLF 302 with FILIATION; *poplia : cocelia* MLF 303; *cauia loriea* MLF 314; *tana | lartia* MLF 338 (or is *lartia* a patronym?); *tan(α)cuil · aratia* MLF 347; *cauia | hadenia* MLF 360; *iata :*

senbia MLF **362**; *ca aconia* LF **220**; *uipia* : *zertenea* LF **221**; *cauia* : *uecinea* LF **223**; *ca* · *mania* LF **225**; *pola marcia* : *sus[?---]* LF **227**; *cau[ia ·] uecin[e]a* · *uotilia* LF **222** with FILIATION; *pop* · *petrunes* · *ce* · *f* LF **226** with FILIATION; *cesula* : *tiperilia* : *te f* LF **229** with FILIATION; *cejsja* **e[0-4?]i*ia* · *ce* LF **235** with FILIATION; *cauia* | *uetulia* LF **334**; *po[l]ae* · *abelese* Lat **251**; ? *a[rria]* | *plaria* LtF **340**

(c) *other* (0 instances): -

To this should be added 17 damaged sepulchral inscriptions: (a) with only a praenomen preserved (5 instances): *cauia* * **[---]a* MF **94**, *iataçue* : !*[---]* MF **158**, *[po]plia* [*---*] MF **161**, *cauia* | *[---]* MLF **306**, *mino* · *s[---]* LtF **173** (b) with only a gentilicium preserved (5 instances): *iuna* : *ce[lio---]* | *arutielia* [*?---*] MF **96** *[---pu]pel[*i---*]* MF **150**, *[---]* : *zaconiai* MF **154**, *[---]* *ueneljes* : *sapnonia* MF **258**, *st* · *aco[---]* | *leuia[---]* LtF **327**; (c) with fragmentary women's names: *ueñef[?---]na* · | *ux[o(r) ?---]* MF **43**, *[---]* | *cai[lia ---]* MF **93**, *[---]iena* : *u[---]---* *ono* : *ux[o(r)]* MF **102**, *[---?]uoxie[.]eai* MLF **310**, *[---]*lia* · *c* · *f* LF **249** with FILIATION, *[...]nea* · **a* | *[u]xor ia* · * | *ma* · *oşcin* * LtF **301** with FILIATION, *[---]nio* · *ia* · * *[---]jilia* · *cø* * LtF **341**.

I have not included: (a) unclear reading or interpretation: *řica* MF/LtF **21**, *namureřua* (?) MF/Etr **66**, *açřez cat* (?) MF? **67** (praenomen or gentilicium?), *ipa* MF? **78**, *[---]alTai* : MF **109**, *aie* * MF **110**, *[---]a*ome* MF **156**, *apa* Cap **457**; (b) either a man's name or a woman's: *uentarc[i]* MF **80**, *uoll[---]MF* **86** (GENTILICIUM?), *[---] ueneljes* MF **258**, *popl[---]* | *[u]elmi[ne---]* MLF **317**, *[---?]*a*kit*ue* * *a* · *f* LF **234**, *[---]a* · *neln f[---]uxo* · *ohi*[.]* LtF **300**; and (c) isolated names in *-e(s)*: *acre* MF/Etr **279**, *ame* MF/Etr **280**, *amę* MF/Etr **282**.

The material is presented in tabular form in fig.7.2. From this table the following tendencies may be seen:

- In single names, GENTILICIUM (28 cases) is preferred to PRAENOMEN (11 cases), in spite of the fact that in the ager Faliscus women did have praenomina.
- Not only is GENTILICIUM more popular than PRAENOMEN, it appears to become more popular as time progresses, perhaps due to Latin influence:

<i>praenomina</i>	MF: 6	MLF: 3	LF: 2	LtF: -	Cap: -	Lat: -
<i>gentilicia</i>	MF: 17	MLF: 6	LF: 1	LtF: 2	Cap: -	Lat: 2

- The use of the single and the double name appears to have been equally popular:

<i>single name</i>	MF: 23	MLF: 9	LF: 3	LtF: 2	Cap: -	Lat: 2
<i>double name</i>	MF: 23	MLF: 0-1	LF: 10	LtF: -	Cap: 0-2	Lat: -

- The use of PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM is virtually limited to sepulchral inscriptions (35 out of 35-38 cases of the use of the double name). The single name can be used in *Besitzerinschriften* (13 out of 39 cases of the single name) and in sepulchral inscriptions (24 out of 39 cases of the single name).

7.4.2. Adding the husband's name: the marital formula.¹¹⁶ In several instances, the woman's onomastic formula is further expanded by adding HUSBAND_{GEN} WIFE. Leaving aside cultural and personal motives to add the husband's name, the primary aim in doing so in the Faliscan family-tombs will have been to clarify the relationship between the various deceased buried in the same tomb, as a wife would of course have had a gentilicium that differed from that of her husband's family. With the exception of LF 242 (below) the formula is only used in sepulchral inscriptions of women whose husband had not or not yet been buried in the same loculus. In the case of *cau[ia ·] uecin[e]a · uotiliā | maci : acacelini : uxo* LF 222, the text was in fact replaced after the husband's burial in the same loculus by *marcio : acarcelinio | cauia : uecinea | heç cupat* LF 223, which shows the usual Faliscan custom of simply stating the names (sometimes joined by *-cue*) when husband and wife were buried together.

Adding this marital formula is mostly an Etruscan custom (cf. the numerous instances of *puia* and *puiac* in *ET*). The Latin sepulchral inscriptions yield only 24 instances where the name of the woman (either as the deceased or as the 'procurateur', cf. §8.9.2) is accompanied by *uxor* (*CIL* I².171, 184, 288, 300, 1220, 1289, 1294, 1328, 1349, 1352, 1424, 1432, 1490, 1536, 1595, 1824, 1829, 1830, 1843, 1886, 1907, 2284, 2460, 2636). The only Sabellic instance of this custom appears to be Paelignian [4-5] *pracom p[20-30] | usur pristafalacirix* Pg 9. The relative frequency of the formula in the ager Faliscus is probably due, not to direct Etruscan influence, but rather to the fact that the Etruscan and Faliscan areas shared the same mode of burial, and the function of the sepulchral inscription was therefore the same in both areas.

The instances of the addition of HUSBAND_{GEN} WIFE occur in Middle Faliscan, Late Faliscan, and Latino-Faliscan inscriptions:

(a) HUSBAND_{GEN} WIFE (4-8 instances). This appear to have been the regular formula, with the components in the same order as in the filiation formula FATHER_{GEN} SON/ DAUGHTER (cf. §7.5). It occurs in *cauia : satelie | caui : feliciniate | uxor* MF 42, *fasies : c[ai]isia | louci : teti : uxor* MF 41, *poplia : calitenes | aronto : cesies | lartio : uxor* MF 265; *cau[ia ·] uecin[e]a · uotiliā | maci : acacelini : uxo* LF 222, probably also in *· iii · ![.....|.....]nai[?---]....]o uxo* MF 17, *[---]iena : u[---]---]ono : ux[o(r)]* MF 102, *pola marcia : sus[?---]* LF 227 (if *sus[?---]* = *s us[o(r)]*), and perhaps in *[---]a · neln f[---]juxo · ohi*[.]* LtF 300. Note that LF 222, *cau[ia ·] uecin[e]a · uotiliā | maci : acacelini : uxo*, has both FILIATION and [HUSBAND_{GEN} WIFE], in this order. This is to be expected, not because of a greater role of the father or of the gens the woman was born into, but rather because FILIATION was at once a more common (everyone has a father, but not everyone has a husband) and a more general (men and women both have fathers, but only women have husbands) part of the onomastic formula.

¹¹⁶ I refer to this formula as *marital* rather than as *gamonymic*, restricting the latter term to the Venetic use of the gamonymic adjective (cf. Lejeune 1974:60-3).

(b) *WIFE HUSBAND*_{GEN} (1-4 instances). This appears to have been a (rare) variant where the members of the formula appear in reversed order, occurring in *tanacu[il] | anelia · · | uxor · ia* MF 101, perhaps also [...]*nea · *a | [u]xor ia · ** | *ma · oşcin** LtF 301, perhaps also *cauio [---]|ruso[?---]* MLF 318 (if *uso[?---] = uso[r]* ... = ‘uxor ...’), perhaps also *uene[?---]na · | ux[o(r) ?---]* MF 43. The fact that this reversed formula occurs at all may indicate that the marital formula was not as fixed as *FILIATION*.

(c) An exceptional case is *[.]a · protacio · m · f · maçistratu | keset · cuestod · pi · pretod · pis | cauia · uxo · a · f* LF 242: (a) it is the only instance where the marital formula is added to *PRAENOMEN*, while in elsewhere it is added to *PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM*; (b) it is the only certain instance where the marital formula consists of *WIFE* only; and (c) it is the only certain instance where *FILIATION* follows the marital formula instead of preceding it, as in LF 222. All these exceptional features arise from the simple fact that the normal usage in Faliscan inscriptions was to use the marital formula *HUSBAND*_{GEN} *WIFE* only in cases where husband and wife were *not* buried together: it almost looks as if the composer of the text of the inscription, which focuses entirely on the husband and his impressive *cursus honorum*, had misunderstood the marital formula.

(d) Unclear is *m · c[*i*]peario · m [· f | --- |---]or* LtF 233 (if *---]or = ... ux]or*).

In a few inscriptions, a word other than *uxor* appears to have been used. In two Latino-Faliscan or Latin inscriptions the word *coniunx* may have been used, but these texts are too damaged to be sure: *m · acof]nio · ia · ** | *rutil · ce[]ilia · co** LtF 341 and *[---?] decon[---|---]a · f* LtF 174, if to be read as *de con[---]*: note that, as said above, in Latin inscriptions the word used is always *uxor*, never *coniunx*. I find it hard to agree with Vetter’s (1953:305) suggestion to read *lepuia* in *[.?]a iā | lepuia | uoltilia* MF 144 as an abbreviated husband’s name *le* followed by Etruscan *puia* ‘wife’: not only would this be an instance of interference from Etruscan, which is very rare (§9.2.2), but it would be an instance of interference within a formula, but it would also be an instance of *HUSBAND*_{GEN} *WIFE* preceding *FILIATION*.

7.5. The formula of filiation

7.5.1. *FILIATION*. The onomastic formula can be extended with *FILIATION*. As may be seen from the tables presented earlier in this chapter (figs. 7.1-2), its use appears to have been ‘formal’. First, *FILIATION* is found only in sepulchral and official inscriptions (including public dedications), with the exceptions of the *Besitzerinschrift locia eimoi* MLF 293, the signature *oufילו : clipeaio : letei : fileo : met : facet* MF 470*, and the private dedication *mar · popi · st · f · n · mart · d · d · me* Cap 421. Second, *FILIATION* is normally added only to the full onomastic formula *PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM*, although there are rather more exceptions in the case of women: not only the *Besitzerinschrift*

locia eimoi MLF 293, but also within the sepulchral inscriptions, *ca uipi : leueli | filea* MF 14, *cauia · uxo · a · f* LF 242, *poplia | uelcei f|e* LF 332, *hlau|elea · m · f · LtF* 325, *plenes · q · f* LtF 231, and *claudia · c · f* Lat 393. These exceptions are probably due to the fact that in women's names the use of the single name was more common than in men's names. With regard to the use of FILIATION over time, I can find no discernable tendency in the tables other than a slight increase in its use in the case of men in the Late Faliscan and Latin inscriptions, which is at least partly due to its use in public inscriptions, which are more frequent in these categories.

7.5.2. FATHER_{GEN} [SON/DAUGHTER] and the patronymic adjective. In the Faliscan inscriptions, FILIATION was always added after the gentilicium, as in Etruscan, Latin, and the majority of the Sabellic languages, not after the praenomen, as was the custom in Umbrian and Volscian.¹¹⁷ However, FILIATION could be expressed in two completely different ways, namely (1) by the formula FATHER_{GEN} [SON/DAUGHTER], and (2) by means of a patronymic adjective (see also fig.7.3):

(1) The formula FATHER_{GEN} SON/DAUGHTER and FATHER_{GEN}. In Faliscan, one of the ways to express filiation was the formula FATHER_{GEN} *filius/filia*, as in Latin. Whether FATHER_{GEN}, which occurs in several inscriptions (see fig.7.3), was an independent formula or just a shortened form of FATHER_{GEN} *filius/filia* cannot be established. In Etruscan, the frequency of FATHER_{GEN} clearly shows that it was a separate formula that could be used as an alternative to FATHER_{GEN} *clan/seχ*. In the Sabellic languages, FATHER_{GEN} was in fact the normal formula, whether placed after the praenomen, as in Umbrian and Volscian, or after the gentilicium, as in Oscan and the other Sabellic languages. It may be significant that in the only clear Middle Faliscan examples of FATHER_{GEN}, *aruz : cesje : aruto* MF 257 and *ueltur · tetena | aruto* MF 266, the names are of the persons involved are all Etruscan.

(2) Patronymic adjectives. In Faliscan, filiation could also be expressed by patronymic adjectives, derived from the father's praenomen by means of the suffix *-io-*, e.g. *Marcus* → *Marcus* 'Marcusson' or *Titus* → *Titus* 'Titusson'. When the father's name itself was already derived with this suffix, the suffix *-ilio-* (possibly originally a diminutive suffix) was used instead, e.g. *Voltius* → *Voltilius*. The same suffixes appear in the Latin and Sabellic patronymic gentilicia, although in the Sabellic languages *-idio-* was used rather than *-ilio-*. When the father's name belonged to the first declension, as in the case of the Faliscan praenomina *Iuna* and *Volta*, the resulting adjectives were *Iunius* and *Voltius* rather than *Iunaeus* and *Voltaeus*. In view of the spellings *iuneo* MF 151, *iuneo* LF 220, perhaps also *iu?]neō* MF 141, and *uolteo* MF 275, *uolteo* MF 276, this

¹¹⁷ Two inscriptions from the area that have been interpreted as showing the Umbrian order are *k · pa · aiedies · Cap* 390 and the older reading of Cap 388, *† c · uomano*.

may be doubted, since the *-eo* may stand for /-ēōs/ ← /-āiōs/ (§3.7.6). On the other hand, I read *uoltio* in LF 224, and when the patronymic adjectives of *Iuna* and *Volta* are used as a praenomen or a gentilicium, they are always spelled with *i* (gentilicium *iumio* Cap 462; for the attestations of the praenomen *Voltius*, see §7.7.1.86).

Patronymic adjectives are of course well known from other Indo-European languages: they were used e.g. in various Greek dialects (especially Lesbian, Boeotian, and Thessalian, see Buck 1955:134-5) and in Venetic (cf. Lejeune 1974:52-7), and must have been used in both Latin and the Sabellic languages as well, as many Latin and Sabellic gentilicia are of patronymic origin. There are in fact several instances of Sabellic forms in *-is* occurring in the usual position of the filiation that cannot be genitives and could be patronymic gentilicia. This interpretation is debatable, however, and some of the forms may simply be graphical errors. The instances are: Umbrian *titis* in *νυ(ν)ϰis titis teteies TI Ib.45* (probably an error for *tite(s)* or *tite(s)*: this line and the preceding one contain several errors), South Picene *taruis* in *[---]s : taruis : petrúnis AP.5* (unclear) and *pet{i}eronis* in *noúinis : pet{i}eronis : efidans AP.4* (perhaps a gentilicium), and Praesamnitic *veneliis* in *vinuys veneliis peracis estam tetet venelei viniciiu Ps 3* (a patronymic adjective if *peracis* is a gentilicium).

It is therefore not the *existence* of patronymic adjectives in Faliscan that is remarkable, but the fact that they continued to be used long after they had become fossilized as gentilicia throughout the rest of Central and Southern Italy: the Faliscan material shows instances of patronymic adjectives even from the Late Faliscan inscriptions (see fig.7.3). Although the remarkable use of the patronymic adjectives in Faliscan has often been pointed out, it should be noted that this was always an *option* and not the only possible variant: the patronymic adjective and the formula FATHER_{GEN} [*filius/filia*] occur side by side from the Middle Faliscan period onwards. There is no indication that, originally, the Faliscan way of expressing filiation was *exclusively* by means of the patronymic adjective and that FATHER_{GEN} [*filius/filia*] was due to influence from other traditions: FATHER_{GEN} [*filius/filia*] appears already at times when it is hardly possible to ascribe its use to Latin influence, and although it could conceivably be modelled on the Etruscan formula FATHER_{GEN} [*clan/seχ*], there is certainly no need to assume this.

On the other hand, the *disappearance* of the use of the patronymic adjective may well be ascribed to Latin influence, as can be seen from fig.7.3, where the instances of the patronymic adjective and of FATHER_{GEN} [*filius/filia*] are presented in tabular form. This clearly shows that the patronymic adjective is the more frequently used option in the Middle Faliscan inscriptions, but in the Late Faliscan inscriptions it is less frequent than FATHER_{GEN} [*filius/filia*], while the Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions have *only* FATHER_{GEN} [*filius/filia*].¹¹⁸

¹¹⁸ Even if my interpretation of the forms in *-oi* in MF 40, MLF 293, 305, and LF 330, 333 as genitives is not adopted, this picture remains the same: in fact, it becomes more pronounced.

		<i>patronymic adjective</i>		FATHER _{GEN} [<i>filius/filia</i>]	
MF	Falerii Veteres	<i>marcio</i>	80	<i>uipi : leveli filea</i> ♀	14
		<i>uoltilia</i> ♀	80	<i>ca fi [---]</i>	15
		<i>iu]neo</i>	141	<i>cesi · f</i>	94
		<i>[---]leo</i>	142	<i>cau[i] hileo</i>	146
		<i>uoltilia</i> ♀	144	<i>cs : f</i> ♀	155
		<i>mesio</i>	148	? <i>ar · f</i> ^a	140
		<i>iuneo</i>	151	<i>cicoi</i>	40
		<i>uoltilio</i>	162	<i>uolti[</i>	79
		<i>[u]oltil[i---]</i>	163	? <i>l[oc]ies</i> ^b	12
			12		
	Corchiano	<i>lartio</i> ^b	265	<i>aruto</i>	257
		<i>uolteo</i>	275	<i>aruto</i>	266
		<i>uoltheo</i>	276		
	<i>originis ignotae</i>		<i>letei : fileo</i>	470*	
MLF	Corchiano			<i>ei]oi</i> ♀ ^d	293
	Vignanello	<i>titia</i> ♀	302	<i>titoi</i> ^d	305
		<i>titio</i>	309	<i>ium ai</i> ^d	315
		<i>titio</i>	314		
	Grotta Porciosa	? <i>lartia</i> ♀ ^c	339		
LF	Falerii Novi	<i>iuneo</i>	220	<i>m [· f]</i>	213
		<i>uotilia</i> ♀	222	<i>c · f</i>	213
		? <i>marcia</i> ♀ ^c	227	<i>la · f</i>	214
		? <i>marcio</i> ^c	228	<i>ma : fi</i>	226
		? <i>uoltio</i> ^e	224	<i>ce : f</i> ♀	226
				<i>te f</i> ♀	229
				<i>a · f</i>	234
				<i>m · f</i>	242
				<i>a · f</i> ♀	242
				<i>·] f</i>	247
				<i>c · f</i>	249
				<i>c · f</i> ♀	249
				<i>ce]isi</i> ^f	236
			? <i>uolti</i> ^e	224	
	Carbognano-Vallerano	<i>***io</i>	332	<i>zextoi fi</i> ^d	330
		<i>uoltilio</i>	336	? <i>uelcei f e</i> ♀	332
				<i>*****oi</i> ^d	333

^a Perhaps to be read as *ar · p*. ^b The interpretation of this form is unclear. ^c Perhaps a gentilicium rather than a patronym. ^e Possibly a dative. ^e I read a patronymic adjective *uoltio*, where previous editors have read a genitive *uolti*. – Not included in this table are (1) damaged instances (MF 16, 158, 166; LF 211, 215); (2) abbreviated filiations (MF 19, 88, MLF 309, LF 235); (3) the problematic cases MF 11–12, 263; (4) instances where previous editors have in my view erroneously presupposed a filiation: MF 152, MLF 354, Cap 388, 390.

Fig. 7.3. FILIATION in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions.

THE ONOMASTICON

	<i>patronymic adjective</i>	FATHER _{GEN} [<i>filius/filia</i>]	
LtF	Falerii Veteres	<i>ce</i> ¹ <i>f</i> 171	
		<i>c</i> · <i>f</i> 172	
		<i>a</i> · <i>f</i> 174	
	Falerii Novi	<i>m</i> · <i>f</i> 231	
		<i>q</i> · <i>f</i> [♀] 231	
	Corchiano	... <i>f</i> ^a [♀] ? 300	
		<i>ia</i> · <i>f</i> 301	
	Fabbrica di Roma	<i>a</i> · <i>f</i> 325	
		<i>m</i> · <i>f</i> [♀] 325	
	Grotta Porciosa	? [<i>s</i>] <i>t</i> · <i>f</i> [♀] 327	
? <i>ia</i> · <i>f</i> 342			
Lat	Falerii Novi	* [<i>.</i>] <i>f</i> 216	
		<i>k</i> · <i>f</i> 218	
		<i>uoltai</i> · <i>f</i> 218	
		<i>c</i> · <i>f</i> 219	
		<i>c</i> · <i>f</i> 237	
		<i>m</i> · <i>f</i> 238	
		<i>c</i> · <i>f</i> · <i>c</i> · <i>n</i> ^b 250	
		<i>uo</i> · <i>f</i> 251	
		<i>l</i> · <i>f</i> 251	
		<i>l</i> · <i>f</i> 251	
		<i>s</i> [<i>ex</i> ·] <i>f</i> 291	
		Cap	Corchiano ager Capenas
	<i>st</i> · <i>f</i> 421		
	<i>t</i> · <i>f</i> 456		
			<i>m</i> · <i>f</i> 456

^a Context unclear. – Not included in this table are (1) damaged instances (MF 16, 158, 166; LF 211, 215); (2) abbreviated filiations (MF 19, 88, MLF 309, LF 235); (3) the problematic cases MF 11-12, 263; (4) instances where previous editors have in my view erroneously presupposed a filiation: MF 152, MLF 354, Cap 388, 390.

Fig. 7.4. FILIATION in the Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions.

It would be interesting to know if this shift in usage in the formula of filiation was also a shift in the expression of ethnic identity. The use of the patronymic adjective appears to have been associated exclusively with Faliscan inscriptions, and may well have been regarded as distinctive. In the sense that in the period after 240 the choice for FATHER_{GEN} [*filius/filia*] could be associated with adhering to a (Roman) Latin formula rather than to a local standard, it can be regarded as a change in expressing identity at least in the use of the onomastic formular. I doubt, however, whether this shift was very great or of very great importance, as the use of FATHER_{GEN} [*filius/filia*] was already well-established within Faliscan itself.

7.6. The names of freedmen and freedwomen

The texts from the ager Faliscus and Capenas contain several examples of freedmen and freedwomen, some explicitly designated as such. As was discussed in §2.3.2, there is no way of concluding whether the status of the Faliscan freedmen and -women corresponded more to that of the Latin *libertus* or that of the Etruscan *lautni*. The first four of the following instances have also been discussed by Rix (1994:94-6).

In the Middle Faliscan inscriptions, two women are explicitly designated as freedwomen. The first occurs in MF 41, which consists of two inscriptions separated by a triple interpunct, the first reading *fasies : c[ai]sia | louci : teti : uxor* ‘Caesia Fasia, wife of Lucius Tettius’, the second, *louřia | [l]oifirta* ‘Luria, freedwoman’. The freeborn woman is designated by PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM [HUSBAND_{GEN} WIFE], the freedwoman by GENTILICIUM, but as it is not uncommon for a woman to be designated by GENTILICIUM in a sepulchral inscription (16 instances out of a total of 59), I doubt whether this difference is in fact significant. It is useless to speculate whether Luria was a freedwoman of Caesia Fasia, or, if not, what the relationship was between the two.¹¹⁹

The second instance occurs in LF 221, which is a special case: *uipia : zertenea : loferta | marci : acarcelini | mate : he : cupa* ‘Vibia Sertinia, freedwoman, mother of Marcius Acarcelinius, lies here’. Here the freedwoman is interred in the tomb because she is the mother of Marcius Acarcelinius, who lies buried in the same tomb, and who apparently had become an important man in Falerii Novi. As has been suggested, the gentilicium *Acarcelinius* may well be a new formation: the *gens Sertinia* may have been the *gens* to which Vibia belonged when a slave rather than her original gentilicium. Note that here the woman is designated by PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM and a ‘reversed filiation’, as she does not owe her status and burial in the family tomb to her father, but to her son.

Two other instances are less clear, and consist of fragmentary texts with the word *lo*, which could be interpreted as an abbreviation of *loferta*. These are *ři [.] řiria lo[?---]|[e]a : cs : f* MF 155 and *[---]*i : u[o]ltiai lo* MF 165. Of these, the first appears to show another freedwoman with PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM, although the text has also been read as *ři[n]řiria* with GENTILICIUM only.

Further examples of freedmen and freedwomen designated as such can be found in the Capenate dedications from Lucus Feroniae, where we find an *a[řria]* or *sal | plaria · t · l* Cap 431 (see below), *m · t · u · genucilio · sen · l* Cap 435, and *[---]rcius · l · l* Cap 436.

¹¹⁹ Peruzzi (1964b:140-2) implausibly connected these inscriptions to the role played by *libertae* in Bacchanalia-upheaval, which, according to Livy (39.8-19), also affected Falerii.

In Etruscan, freedmen and -women could also be designated by double gentilicia, the second being the gentilicium of the former master, as has been discussed extensively by Rix (1994:97-111). Of double gentilicia, too, there are at least two examples from the ager Faliscus, *uel [·] uisni · olna* MF 82 and *m · tito · tulio · uoltilio · hescuna* MF 346. An isolated instance of a freedwoman apparently designated *only* by two gentilicia is *a[rria] | plaria · t · l* in Lat 431 from Lucus Feroniae, but this depends on the restoration, which is very dubious: the text has been read in a entirely different way by Torelli (1941:741-6), and in his reading the name is *sal | plaria · t · l*, with a well-attested praenomen *Saluia*.

7.7. The praenomina

7.7.1. The praenomina attested from the Middle Faliscan period onward. The praenomina that are attested in the Middle Faliscan, Late Faliscan, Latino-Faliscan, and Latin inscriptions from the ager Faliscus and Capenas are presented in the following list (for the Early Faliscan inscriptions, see the list in §7.2.2).

I have included all abbreviations that can be considered praenomina, as explained in §7.1.2: contextless abbreviations are included between [], but *only* if the abbreviations are attested elsewhere in a context where they clearly represent praenomina, or if they can easily be matched with an existing praenomen. Names occurring only in Latin inscriptions from the area are included as lemmata between []; names occurring only in Etruscan inscriptions have been included only if the same name or an obviously related name is attested in the Faliscan onomasticon. As the data for the Sabellic onomasticon are relatively few, they have only been noted when cognates or derivations *are* attested, not when they are not. Note that for ease of reference I have used the closest Latin equivalent as the header to the lemma (except in the case of abbreviations) and ordered the lemmata according to the modern alphabet.

1. *A.* abbr., see *Aulus*.
2. ? *Acr-*. *acr̥ez* MF 67 (gen.?), *acre* MF/Etr 279. – G. Giacomelli (1963:172) hesitatingly classed this name as a praenomen, in which case it is probably connected with Etruscan *Acri* (*acri* Pe 1.871 (perhaps a gentilicium?), *acris* Pe 1.86, Pe 1.928, *acrial* 1.1242): such a praenomen must have formed the base of the Latin patronymic gentilicium *Acrius*. Hirata (1967:32) classed it as a gentilicium: see §7.8.1.6.
3. *Aemus*. m. *eimoi* MLF 293 (gen. or dat.).
4. *Aemius*. m. *ajm̥iosio* EF 467* (gen.). Pace G. Giacomelli (1963:173) and Hirata (1967:33) this is a praenomen rather than a gentilicium.

The abbreviation *q[i?]m* MF **89** (either a praenomen or a patronymic adjective) can represent either *Aemus* or *Aemius*.

The praenomen itself is not attested for any other language of ancient Italy except Venetic *·(a)·i·mo·i* Le 26, although *Aemius* must have formed the basis of the old Latin patronymic gentilicium *Aemilius*, and an abbreviated gentilicium *aīm* is attested for Samnitic in *m · t · g · aīm · h[n]* tSa 15. The origin of the praenomen is unclear: G. Giacomelli (1963:173) and Hirata (1967:33) suggested that it may have been Etruscan.¹²⁰

5. *Aim.* abbr., see *Aemus*.
6. ? *Am-* or *Amm-*, *ame* **280**, **282** (without context). Hirata (1967:34) classed the name as a praenomen, pointing to the Latin (patronymic) gentilicium *Ammius*. G. Giacomelli (1963:173) regarded it as a gentilicium: see §7.8.1.12.
7. ? *Ancus.* m. very dubiously in *[---?] anco ma* LF **232**. According to Salomies (1987:20-1, in Latin the praenomen occurs only in the names of Ancus Martius and of an Ancus Publicius from the time of Tullus Hostilius (Dion. 3.43.3). As there are no attestations at all for Etruscan or the Sabellic languages, this makes it even more unlikely that it should occur here. Its origin is either Etruscan or Sabine: note also the Sabellic (?) form *A(μ)πυς appearing (together with Ταρπίνιος) in the list of kings in Cod. Vat. 1307 (Conway 1897:48).
8. *Ar.* abbr., see *Arruns*.
9. *Arruns.* m. *ar]uto* MF **169** (gen.), *aruz* MF **257**, *aruto* MF **257** (gen.), *aronto* MF **265** (gen.), *aruto* MF **266** (gen.), *arθ[3-5]rē* MF/Etr **267**, *arute* MF **269** (acc. used as nom.?). Cf. also Etruscan *arnθial ur[4-5?]* Etr **XXVII**. The abbreviation *Ar.* that may perhaps be read in MF **140**, **168** probably represents this praenomen. Derived from this praenomen are the Faliscan gentilicia *Arruntulus* and *Arruntielius* (see §7.8.1.20-21). The curious nominative *arute* MF **269** has been regarded as showing epenthetic [-e] added to an unusual word-final consonant or cluster and as an accusative *arute(m)* used as a nominative: see §9.2.2.4. – An almost emblematically Etruscan praenomen attested from all over the Etruscan area (numerous attestations in *ET*). In Latin literary sources it is always the name of Etruscans: in Latin epigraphic sources, it appears outside Etruria only in *J ar uesc[---]* *CIL* III.10444 from Aquinum. The name is also attested for Oscan, as *arūt* Po 47. Apart from these attestations, it formed the base of the patronymic gentilicium *Arruntius* that occurs both in Latin (e.g. *[arr]untia[e] · c · l · erotidi* *CIL* XI.3189 from Vignanello) and in Oscan (*arruntiis* Po 58, *αρροντιες* tLu 1).

¹²⁰ The only Etruscan counterpart referred to by G. Giacomelli (1963:173) and Hirata (1967:33), however, the gentilicium *Eimi*, does not occur in the indices to *ET*.

10. *At.* abbr. m. *at* Cap 391 [without context also in LtF/Lt 294]. Perhaps *Atta*, *Attus* or *Attius* (Stolte 1928:301), for which see Salomies 1987:21. This name is often taken together with *Appa*, *Appius*: this name is read by G. Giacomelli (1963:176) and Hirata (1967:36) in the contextless *apa* Cap 457.
11. *Au.* abbr., see *Aufilus/Oufilus* and *Aulus*.
12. *Aufilus/Oufilus.* m. *oufilo* MF 470*, *aufilo* MLF 348, perhaps also *ohi**[.] LtFLat 300? Derived from this is the gentilicium *Aufilius/Oufilius* (see §7.8.1.25). Abbreviations: (1) *Au.*, see under *Aulus*; (2) *A.*, see under *Aulus*; (3) *O.*, dubious reading in MF 13. – A corresponding praenomen occurs in Etruscan as *Aufle* (4 attestations in *ET*) and *Afle* (6 attestations in *ET*) from Perugia: Rix (1965:66) suspected that *Aufle* in fact rendered the Faliscan name. Latin had an (unrelated?) name *Ofillus* or *Ofellus* (Salomies 1987:91), as well as patronymic gentilicia *Aufilius/Aufillius* and *Ofilius/Ofillius*, see §7.8.1.25. There are no correspondents or derivations in the Sabellic languages, except perhaps the Umbrian gentilicium *uférie[r]* Um 8, which would correspond to **Ofidius*. Salomies (1987:91) also points to Oscan *úpvals* Cp 2, *upfals* Cp 3 etc., which occurs once as *úff[alleis]* Fr 1, but this name appears to be unrelated.
13. *Aulus.* m. The praenomen is found in the area in full only in Etruscan *auvilesi* Etr VIII: note also *a]u]vileš feluskeš* Vn 1.1 from Vetulonia, which according to Poccetti (1997) may be ‘Aulus the Faliscan’. Possible abbreviations are (1) *Au.* Cap 459; (2) *A.* MLF 206, LF 234, 242, Lat 174?, 325, Cap 389: both abbreviations could also stand for *Aufilus*. – This praenomen appears to be limited to the inscriptions from the period after c.240 (see §7.10.5), implying that its occurrence in the area was due to Latin influence, even though it is of Etruscan origin. It was not very frequent in Etruscan (*ET* gives slightly over 40 instances, and c.30 instances of the abbreviation *av*) or in Latin: according to Salomies 1987:24-5, c.3-4% of Roman men were called *Aulus* at any given time, with a maximum of c.6% (c.10% in Etruria). It may be attested for Oscan in the abbreviation *avl* Sa 28.
14. *C.* abbr., see *Gaius* and *Gaius*.
15. *Ca.* abbr., see *Gaius* and *Gaius*.
16. *Cau.* abbr., see *Gaius*.
17. *Caelius.* m. *celio* LF 332; *cailio* 358; perhaps also unclear *ce[---]* LtF 231? Abbreviations of this name may be (1) *Ce.* m. LF 213, 226, 235, LtF 171 [and without context in MF? 30, MF? 68, MLF 320, 321], although this could also be an abbreviation of *Caesius*; (2) *Cl.* in *cl · anu* Cap 397. *Caelius* occurs also as a gentilicium (see §7.8.1.31). – Both the praenomen and the gentilicium are (patronymic) derivations of the Etruscan praenomen *Caele* (*caile* Vc 7.24, Vs S.4,

kailles Cs 2.3). Latin had only the gentilicium: the praenomen occurs only (in its Etruscan form) in the story of Caele Vibenna (Varro *L* 5.8). The praenomen is attested for Oscan in the abbreviation *kail* Fr 1.¹²¹

18. **Caesius** and **Caesula**. m. *kaisiosio* EF 7 (gen.); *caisioi* MF 20 (gen.), *kai[s]i[fo]* MF 51, *cesi* MF 94 (gen.), *cais[io]* MF 153, *çesi* MF 263? (gen.), *ceisio* MF 276; *caisio* MLF 351; *cesio* LF 331; perhaps also fragm. *ce[---]* LtF 231?; f. *c[ai]sia* MF 41. Either m. or f. is *çe[is]i.* MF 140. Indirectly attested in the patronymic adjective or gentilicium *cesilia* MLF 211. Abbreviations of this name may be (1) **Ce**. masc. LF 213, 226, 235, LtF 171 [and without context in MF 30, MF? 68, MLF 320, 321], although this may also be an abbreviation of *Caelius*; (2) [**Cs**. without context in MF? 204, an abbreviation that may expressly have been chosen to avoid confusion with *Caelius*]; (3) **K**. occurring in Lat 218, Cap 388, 390, 404. This is of course the abbreviation of the Latin praenomen *Kaeso*, but it may well have been used for the Faliscan name that came closest.¹²² – The name is probably originally a patronymic adjective of a **Caesus* that also seems to underly the (diminutive) praenomen *cesula* LF 229 (cf. also Kajava 1995:36). Etruscan, too, had a praenomen *Caisie* (*kaisie* Cr 3.14, *kaisies`* Vs 2.1; Latin had *Kaeso*, which may have had a different origin (Salomies 1987:26-7), although *Caesia* occurs as a women's praenomen in *ceisia · loucilia* CIL I².559 from Praeneste (but cf. Kajava 1995:36) and the existence of *Caesius* is indirectly attested by the Latin patronymic gentilicium *Caesilius*. Similar gentilicia are attested for Paelignian (*caisies* Pg 27) and Oscan (*kaisillieis* Cp 25, *caisidis* Lu 51). The unrhotalicised *s* is either a case of a name preserving an archaic form or a simplification of /ss/.
19. **Ce**. abbr., see *Caelius* and *Caesius*.
20. ? **Cincus**. m. perhaps *cicoi* in [---]o *cicio · cicoi : cupat : ifra* MF 40. G. Giacomelli (1963:88, 184-5) regarded *cicoi* as an Etruscan feminine gentilicium = *Cicui* (cf. Etruscan *cencui* Cr 1.724, 1.1491). I would prefer to regard the form as a genitive in *-oi* (see §4.4.4) of a father's praenomen that would apparently be **Cincus*, related to the gentilicium *Cincius* that is attested for Faliscan in *cincia* MF 135. Not also the Etruscan gentilicium *cencu* Etr XXI: see §7.8.1.38.
21. **Cl**. abbr., *cl · anu* Cap 397. *Cl*. may stand for *Caelius*, like *Cs*. stood for *Caesius*. G. Giacomelli (1963:185) and Hirata (1967:45) read the text as a gentilicium *clanu*.

¹²¹ Vetter (1953:301-2) read [*c]elio : cailio* in MF 90, which forced him to render the praenomen as 'Gellius' rather than as 'Caelius'.

¹²² As *Kaeso* was already becoming rare in Latin (Salomies 1987:26-7), the relatively frequent occurrence of *K*. in the area can be explained by assuming that either *Kaeso* was regarded (or used) as a Latin counterpart of *Caesius*, or that the abbreviation *K*. was used for *Caesius*.

22. *Cs.* abbr., see *Caesius*.
23. *F.* abbr. m. *f*MF 58?, MLF 352, Cap 392. Already Garrucci (*SIL* 813) interpreted the *f* in Cap 392 as an abbreviation of *Fertor*, comparing the gentilicium *fertrio* in Cap 391 (§7.8.1.60). Salomies (1987:71) agrees with this, quoting also *f · grechia CIL* I².350 from Praeneste, and rejects the *F(austus)* originally proposed by Hensen (1864:146).¹²³ *Fertor* is only attested in the name of Fertor Resius, king of the Aequicoli: see Salomies 1987:102 and Ámpolo 1972.¹²⁴
24. *Gaius.* m. *kaios* EF 4. (I do not adopt Bormann's reading (*CIL* XI.3162b,5) *caio* in LF 332.)
25. *Gaius* and *Gauia*. m. *cauio* MF 12, *caui* MF 42 (gen.), *cauio* MF 49, *caui[o]* MF 50, *caui* MF 84 (gen.), *ca[u]io* MF 146, *cau[i]* MF 146 (gen.), *cauio* MF 197, *cauio* MF 207, *cauio* MF 210, *cauio* MF 272, *cauio* MF 275, *caui* MF 273 (gen.), *cauios* MF 471*, *cauio* MF 473*; *cauio* MLF 308, *cauio* MLF 318, *cauio* MLF 324, *cauio* MLF 349, *cauios* MLF 382, *caui* MLF/Cap 474* (gen.); *cauio* LF 336 (*falsum*?); f. *cauia* MF 42, *cauia* MF 80; *cauia* MLF 314, *cauia* MLF 360, *cau[ia]* LF 222, *cauia* LF 223, *cauia* LF 242, *cauia* LF 334. Cf. Etruscan *cavies* Etr XLV. Abbreviations of these praenomina are: (1) *Cau.* m. or f. Cap 459 [and without context in LtF 277, Cap 398]; (2) *Ca.* m. MF 15, LF 224, LF 225, LtF 231, fem. MF 14, 81 (twice), LF 220, 225, Cap 458, m. or f. MF? 38, MF 57? [and without context in MF? 133, MLF 323, Cap 405, 406, 407, 408.]; (3) *C.* m. MF 200, MLF 211, LF 213, c/ LtF 215, 249 (twice), 340, Lat 218, 219, 237, 238, 250, 251, 291, Cap 387, 393, 395, 456, probably m. Cap 396, 400, 419, 424, 427, 429, m. or f. LtF 236, LtF 172, 173.

For ease of discussion, I treat these praenomina together although I very much doubt that they were related, let alone identical. Authors who regard them as identical (e.g. G. Giacomelli 1963:182-3) usually assume that the name was originally /gāũio-/ (perhaps related to *gaudeo* ← PIE */gēh₂uid^h-/) and that this somehow lost its /ũ/, although there appears to be no regular development to which this loss can be ascribed. Salomies (1987:29) follows *LHS* I p.138 in assuming that /gāũio-/ or /gāũio-/ was a derivation of a */gāũo-/ (which in itself is perfectly feasible): this would then have become */gāo-/ by the same process by which *Gnaeuos* became *Gnaeus*, and this */gāo-/ was then reformed to /gāĩio-/ → /gāio-/ *Gaius* (apparently not to the rather more expected */gāĩo-/, since this would have given */*Gaeus*).

¹²³ Salomies erroneously ascribes the interpretation *Fertor* to Vetter (1953:328) and the interpretation *Faustus* to Degraffi (*ILLRP* 1233).

¹²⁴ Just like the Faliscans (see §2.2.3), Fertor Resius is named as the source of the *ius fetiale* in *CIL* VI.1302, *Lib. Praen.* 1 (where this attribution is ascribed to Varro), and *Vir. Ill.* 5.4.

The evidence, however, does not support this theory, for whereas *Gnaeus* was still used as an archaic form (attestations in Salomies 1987:29-30), there is no trace at all of either **Gauos* or **Gaos*, in spite of *Gaius* being by far the more frequently used praenomen;¹²⁵ furthermore, the attestation of Early Faliscan *kaios* EF 1 and the Etruscan derivations of *Gaius* (see below) would place this whole process before the sixth century, and therefore well before the loss of /u/ in *Gnaeus*. However, whether etymologically related or not, the distribution of *Gaius* and *Gaius* in the agri Faliscus and Capenas indicates that they may well have been regarded as equivalents, as is discussed below.

The praenomen *Gaius* is in all probability of Latin origin, and its attestations are likewise almost exclusively Latin, apart from one instance in Umbrian (*cais* Um 23) and one in Oscan (*cais* Fr 10). Etruscan has a frequently attested gentilicium *Cae* or *Cai*, which is probably derived from the Latin praenomen (cf. Rix 1965:217). *Gaius* on the other hand is usually associated with the areas where Sabellic languages were spoken: it occurs in South Picene *kaiiēis* AQ 3 and in Oscan *gavis* Hi 10, *ga[vis]* Cm 14,3, *gaavi[eis]* Fr 1, [γ]αϜις Lu 45, [γ]αϜ[ις] Lu 63, (γ)αϜιμ Lu 47, γαϜιν Lu 46, Samnitic [ga]avieis Sa 14 (for the abbreviated instances, see *ST*). There are also a number of instances from Etruscan, virtually all from Southern Etruria (*kavīe* Cr 2.56, *kavie* Cr 5.1, *cavies* Cr 2.74, *kaviesi* AT 3.1 *kavīes* Vs 1.99, *kavies* Vs 1.159, *cavies* Fa 2.25=Etr XLV, *kavias* OA 2.11, *cavias* OA 2.52; from Northern Etruria are *cavial* Vt 1.124 and *cavias* Fe 2.15). Yet the number of Faliscan instances of *Gaius* is in fact greater than that of the Sabellic and Etruscan instances put together: perhaps *Gaius* should be regarded as a common Central Italic, perhaps even Faliscan praenomen, rather than a Sabellic one. Although it is certainly not unique to the ager Faliscus in the way *Iuna* and *Volta* are, its frequency in the area allows it to be classed as a Faliscan praenomen and may have played a role in establishing ethnic or cultural identity.

This is made even more feasible by the distribution of *Gaius* and *Gaius*. *Gaius* is absent from the Middle and Late Faliscan onomasticon, while *Gaius* is the most frequently attested Middle and Late Faliscan praenomen: on the other hand, there is no trace of *Gaius* in the Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions, where the abbreviation *C.* is the most frequently attested praenomen. This can be explained either by assuming that the abbreviation *C.* was used for *Gaius* as well as for *Gaius* (thus G. Giacomelli 1963:178), or, as I would prefer, by assuming that Latin *Gaius* and Faliscan *Gaius* were regarded as equivalents (whether this was etymologically justifiable or not is irrelevant). Someone called *Gaius* could then

¹²⁵ Salomies (1987:29) calculates that c.20% of Roman men were called *Gaius* at any given time, while describing *Gnaeus* as “In der republikanischen Zeit ebenso selten wie *Aulus*” (1987:30), i.e., c.3-4%, with a maximum of 6%.

just as easily give his name as *Gaius* and abbreviate this as *C.* when adapting to or adopting the framework of Latin: see §7.10.5. With the spread of Roman influence, this may ultimately have led to the disappearance of *Gaius*.

26. **Graecus** m. *kreco* : [---] MF 147. The name may have been a nickname, but the occurrence of *Graecus* and *Gr.* elsewhere (Latin *CIL* I².336, 3279) rather implies that it was an older existing praenomen, perhaps Etruscan (Salomies 1987:71-2). The Etruscan attestations of *Craic-/Creic-* (*ET* gives 29 attestations) are all of gentilicia, which in itself could be an indication that the praenomen existed if these gentilicia were patronymic (note the patronymic gentilicium *creicnal* Ar 1.4). The name also occurs in Venetic (*gra-i-ko-i*: Le 77).

H- see also F-

27. ? **Her-**. A very dubious attestation in *cesit* : *fere* MF 263 (with hypercorrect *f*). G. Giacomelli (1963:192) and Hirata (1967:51) compared the Latin gentilicium *Herius* and various Etruscan gentilicia in *Fer-*; Salomies (1987:73) includes it in her discussion of the praenomina *Herius* and *Herennius*. The interpretation of the inscription is debated, note that *fere* does not occupy the position of a praenomen.
28. **Iantus** and **Ianta**. f. *ian[ta]* MF 146, *iata* MF 147, *iata* MLF 362. Abbr. **Ia**. m. MF 101, LtF 301, LtF 341; f. MLF 302. – The Faliscan instances are almost the only attestations of a very infrequently attested Etruscan praenomen: the only other attestations are Etruscan *iantia* Vn 2.7 and perhaps *ianzu* Vt 4.6, and possibly also the Umbrian abbreviation *ia* Um 8; it must also have formed the basis for the Latin patronymic gentilicium *Iantius*. Perhaps related, too, is Venetic *ia-nt-s*: Le 124. G. Giacomelli (1963:195) noted that the form *Iantus/Ianta* is entirely based on Herbig's restoration (under *CIE* 8586) *ian[ta]* in MF 146, while the other attestations are without *n*: the omission of syllable-final *n* is so common in Faliscan, however, that this can hardly be an argument to doubt *Iant-* (§3.5.7a).
29. **Iuna**. m. *iuna* MF 39, *iuna* MF 48, *iuna* MF 73, *iuna* MF 74, *iuna* MF 96, *iunai* LF 112 (gen.), *i[un]a* MF 148, *iun[---]* MF 166, *iuna* MF 198; *iuna* MLF 297, *iuna* MLF 298, *iuna* MLF 307, *iun[ai]* MLF 315 (gen.), *[iu]na* MLF 363; also *iunai* MLF/Cap 475* (gen.). Indirectly attested in the patronymic adjective: *iuneo* MF 151, *iuneo* LF 220, perhaps also *iu[?]neō* MF 141. Abbr. **Iu**. MF 19, 157; **Iun**. MF? 203, LF? 381. Derived from this is the patronymic gentilicium *Iunius* that occurs once in the ager Capenas (see §7.8.1.76). – The name is exclusively Faliscan, and has no counterparts in Latin, Etruscan or Sabellic, although the Latin gentilicium *Iunius* could point to an existence in Latin as well (unless it is presupposed that the gens Iunia originated from the ager Faliscus).¹²⁶ *Iunius* was derived

¹²⁶ *CIL* I².559 from Praeneste is sometimes quoted as an instance of *Iunius* used as a praenomen, but the reading is *t · iunio · setio* rather than *iunio · setio*: see Wachter 1987:117.

by H. Petersen (1962:352) from the name of the month, originally meaning ‘born in June’, and Salomies (1987:114) assumed the same for *Iuna*, but in that case the derivation is awkward. It remains in any case unexplained why *Iuna* and the other uniquely Faliscan praenomen, *Volta*, were masculine names of the first declension, a category absent from the Latin or Sabellic onomasticon.

Since the name is uniquely Faliscan and occurs with relatively great frequency (15 instances, which makes it the second most frequently attested praenomen), it may well have been a carrier of Faliscan ethnic identity (see §7.10.5), which would render its disappearance after the Middle Faliscan period all the more significant: in the Late Faliscan inscriptions, there is only one instance of the patronym *iuneo* in LF 220, and the name is entirely absent from the Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions. If the name did play a role in the ethnic identity of the ager Faliscus, it may well have been regarded as connected with the name of Juno, the central deity of the area (see §2.3.4), even though it is unlikely to have been derived from it.

30. **K.** abbr., see under *Caesius*.
31. **La.** abbr. m. *la* MF 93, LtF 214 (twice) [and without context in MF 373-375, MLF 286, MF/LtF 252, LtF 278]. It may be an abbreviation of either *Laris* or *Lars* (see below): in MF 373-375 it is perhaps rather *Laris*, as these inscriptions were found together with *larise uicina* MF 371 and *larise | uicina* MF 372, although *Lars* was far more frequently used praenomen at least in Etruscan.
32. [? **Laeuius.** *leuia* LtF 327 (probably rather a gentilicium, see §7.8.1.81). – The name also occurs as a gentilicium, see §7.8.1.81.]
33. **Laeuilius.** m. *leiuelio* MF 79, [*leu*]elio MF 90, [*leu*]elio MF 159. The name occurs also as a gentilicium (see §7.8.1.82). – *Laeuilius* is a patronymic derivation from *Laeuius*. The spelling *ei/e* represents /ē/ ← /aj/ (G. Giacomelli 1963:199, Hirata 1967:57) rather than the /ē/ required by the connection with *Liuius* suggested by Deecke (1888:129): note the Etruscan praenomen *laives* AV 2.1 and the patronymic gentilicium *laivena[* Ru 3.1, *laiven[as]* Vs 1.58. A praenomen *Laeuus* occurs once in Latin, a *Laeuus Cispus* from Anagni at the time of king Tullus (Fest. 476.11-2L): Latin also had a gentilicium *Laeuius*. The name is derived from the adjective *laeus*, like *Scaeva* from *scaeuus*: both had the meaning ‘well-omened’ in the official sacral language: “*laeua prospera existimantur, quoniam laeua parte mundi ortus est*” (Plin. *NH* 2.142), “*scaeva, id est sinistra, quod quae sinistra sunt, bona auspicia existimantur*” (Var. *L.* 7.97). There are no attestations of related names from the Sabellic languages, except perhaps for the abbreviated gentilicium *lai* Sa 5.

34. **Laris.** m. *larise* MF 270, *laris* MLF/Etr 290, *larise* MF 371, *larise* MF 372; Etruscan *larisa* Etr XXXII, perhaps also *lar*s* Etr XIX. – An Etruscan praenomen that is frequently attested from various locations (see *ET*). Absent from the Sabellic languages (except perhaps for the abbreviation *la* Um 27), and attested in Latin only indirectly in the patronymic gentilicium *Larisius*. The *-e* in several of the Faliscan forms (see also under *Arruns*), may be an epenthetic [-e] added after an /s#/ that was realized in more strongly than the weak Faliscan /s#/ (cf. §3.5.7*d*), perhaps reflecting an Etruscan pronunciation (§9.2.2.1,4).
35. **Lars.** m. *lartos* EF 6 (gen.). Indirectly attested in the patronym *lartio* MF 265. Derived from this is the patronymic gentilicium *Lartius* (see §7.8.1.78). [Also *larθ* Etr XXXIV, XXXV, XXXIX, also *lazi* Etr XI-XV, and *lazia* Etr XVII.] – An emblematically Etruscan praenomen (for the numerous attestations, see *ET*). In view of its frequency in Etruscan and its occurrence in the Etruscan inscriptions from the ager Faliscus and Capenas, the number of Faliscan attestations is surprisingly low. The Latin attestations are limited to inscriptions from Etruria and the name of the consul, Lars Herminius (Salomies 1987:32), although Latin had the gentilicium *Lartius*. The praenomen is not attested for the Sabellic languages, except perhaps for the Umbrian abbreviation *la* Um 27.
36. **Lucius** and **Lucia.** m. *l[oc]jes* MF 12?, *louci* MF 41 (gen.); f. *locia* MLF 293. Abbreviations of this praenomen are probably (1) **Lo.** m. MF? 33 (In *ti* [-] *ṭiria lo* [?---] *l[e]a* : *cs* : *f* MF 155 and [---] **i* : *u[o]ltiai lo* MF 165, *lo* in is interpreted rather as *loferta* = *liberta*); (2) **L.** m. LF 230, Lat 218, 251 (four times), 477*, Cap 428, 432, f. Cap 436. – Apparently a Latin praenomen that was frequently used in Latin¹²⁷ and occurs also in the Sabellic languages (Praesamnitic *lucies* Ps 13, Umbrian *vuvçis* TI Ib.45, Ila.44, and *vuvçia* TI Ilb.26, and Oscan *lúvkis* Cp 36 etc. (12 instances in *ST*); *ST* furthermore gives over 50 instances of the abbreviation *l* in Marrucinian, Vestinian, Paelignian and Oscan). Borrowed into South Etruscan inscriptions as *Luvce* and *Luvcie* (*luvçe* AT 5.2, *luvce* Vs 1.282, *lucies* Ta 1.220, *luciiēs* Ta 7.31, *lucies* Cr 2.139, Vc 6.12; f. *lucii* AT 1.102, *lucii* AH 2.3, *lucia* Ta 1.149, *lucial* Ta 1.75). In the ager Faliscus it is not very frequent, and it appears to be associated predominantly with the Late Faliscan and Latin inscriptions (see §7.10.5).
37. **M.** abbr., see *Marcus* and *Marcusius*.
38. **Ma.** abbr., see *Marcus* and *Marcusius*.
39. ? **Maesus** or **Maesius**, see below under **Messus** or **Messius**.

¹²⁷ According to the calculations by Salomies (1987:34), c.20% of Roman men were called *Lucius* at any given time.

40. *Mar.* abbr., see *Marcus* and *Marcus*.
41. *Marcus*. m. [ma]rco MF 80. Indirectly attested in the patronymic adjective *marcio* MF 80; *marcia* LF 227 (perhaps a gentilicium?), *marcio* LF 228.
42. *Marcus*. m. *marci* LF 221 (gen.), *maci* LF 222 (gen.), *marcio* LF 223. (These instances all refer to the same person, the son of a freedwoman: the praenomen may simply be the patronymic adjective derived from his father's name.)
 Either *Marcus* or *Marcus* (probably the former): *marci* MF 472* (gen.). Abbreviations of these praenomina are: (1) *Mar.* in MF 87, Cap 421; (2) *Ma.* LF 226 (probably *Marcus*), 242, LtF 232, 301; *M.* in MLF 346, 355?, LF 213, 378, LtF 231, 233 (twice), LtF 239, 325 (twice), Lat 237, 238, Cap 420, 435, 456 (twice).
 The abbreviations might conceivably belong to other praenomina.
 A Latin praenomen, probably connected with the theonym *Mars* (thus *Lib. Praen.* 5, cf. *Mamarcus* : *Mamars*). It is well-attested in Etruscan inscriptions: *ET* gives over 30 instances, nearly 20 of which from southern locations, especially Caere. It is not attested from the Sabellic languages, although it is unclear what praenomen is abbreviated by the abbreviations *M.* and *Ma.* that occur in Umbrian, Volscian, Paelignian and Oscan texts (see *ST*: Oscan *Mar.* probably stands for *Maras*, but might also conceivably stand for *Marcus*). In the ager Faliscus, the instances of *Marcus* are almost all from the Late Faliscan, Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions, which might imply that its use was due to Latin influence: see §7.10.5.
43. ? *Messus* or *Messius* m. *mesio* in *iuna lē[---]* | *mesio* MF 148. I think it very unlikely that *mesio* is a cognomen, as G. Giacomelli (1963:205) and Hirata (1967:61) suggested (see §7.9): it is probably a second name. The absence of rhotacism suggests that the *s* represents /ss/, in which case *Messius* is an obvious candidate: this could either be a praenomen *Messius* or a patronymic adjective from a praenomen **Messus* (cf. Salomies 1987:127), or a gentilicium *Messius* as in *CIL* XI.3782 from Veii. Alternatively, *mesio* could be a patronymic adjective derived from a praenomen **Maesus*, cf. the (patronymic?) gentilicium *Maesius*, occurring both in Latin and in Oscan (μαισιμ Lu 47).
44. *Minor*. f. *mino* LtF 173 (uncertain). Kajava (1995:48) cites 8-9 instances of this praenomen, all from Praeneste, critically discussing (1995:118-124), but not rejecting, the traditional view that praenomina like *Minor* and *Paula* were used to distinguish between sisters. Such a usage would be necessary if women did not have 'real' praenomina: the fact that the name occurs here in a Latino-Faliscan inscription may reflect a Latin custom rather than a Faliscan one, connected with the disappearance of women's praenomina in Latium, which appears to have been less pronounced in Faliscan.
45. *Nu.* abbr. m. *nu* MF? 202, MLF 309. The instances are both doubtful: if they are indeed abbreviated praenomina, *Numerius* or a related name is the obvious candi-

date. This praenomen occurs in Latin as *Numerius*, and with some frequency in the Sabellic languages, both as *Num(e)sis* (e.g. Umbrian *numesier* Um 38, Oscan *ñiñmsis* Cm 14,2, [n]iñmsis Cm 6, *niñmsieis* Cm 6, *νμψμ* Lu 46) and as *Nom(e)sis* (e.g. *νομψις* Lu 47, *νοψμ* Lu 46). Etruscan has both the praenomen *Numesie* (*numes* Cm 2.48 (abbreviated?)), *numisiies* Cm 2.8, *numesiesi* Ta 3.1, *numesia* Vs 1.268, *numuōieś* Ar 1.13), and the gentilicia *Numsie* and *Numsina*: the latter is also attested for the ager Faliscus (*nomesina* MF 272): see §7.8.1.107. Cf. also the theonym *Mars Numesius* in LtF 377 from Ponzano Romano and Cap 421 from Capena. The origin of the name is debated, and may be either Italic or Etruscan (see Salomies 1987:39), probably rather the former (De Simone 2006:170-3).

46. *O.* abbr. m. in *o haḫḫi* MF 13? Doubtful. See *Aufilus/Ofilus*.
47. *Oct-* m. A dubious attestation in *oct*if[...]* uoltilio MLF 353, where *oct* is probably a numeral praenomen like *Octavius*,¹²⁸ in Latin one of the rarer numeral praenomina. In Oscan, only *Ohtavis* is found as a praenomen (*οταφης* Lu 63), a (patronymic) derivation of an unattested **Ohtaus*. The existence of this **Ohtaus* is implied also by Etruscan *Uhtave* (usually used as a gentilicium, but apparently as a praenomen in *uhtaves* Pe 1.817, *uhtaves* Pe 1.1267), where the *h* clearly points to a Sabellic origin.
48. *Paquius* m. *paqwis* in *paqis blaisiis* Sab 468*. This praenomen is in all probability the one represented by the abbreviation *Pa.* in Cap 390. A Sabellic praenomen attested for Oscan in *πακφης* Lu 40 (and *pakkuiis* Si 19?), and in abbreviated form in Marrucian *paq* MV 8, *pa* MV 9: the Sabellic languages also had several closely related praenomina (Oscan *paakiu* Po 87, *πακτηης* Lu 23, *paakul* Cm 7) and gentilicia (Paelignian *pacia* Pg 4, Oscan *πακιδις* Lu 63, *πακτηης* Lu 23, *pakulliis* Cm 14,5). The praenomen occurs in Latin inscriptions virtually only in Central and Southern Italy (attestations in Salomies 1987:84), and it appears to be unattested for Etruscan. Both Faliscan attestations are from inscriptions that show Sabellic epigraphic and onomastic features.
49. *Paula.* f. *pola* LF 227, *po[l]ae* Lat 251. Kajava (1995:50-59) quotes numerous instances of *Paula/Paulla* and *Pola/Polla* as a woman's praenomen, and critically discusses (1995:118-124) the traditional view that praenomina like *Minor* (above) and *Paula* were used to distinguish between sisters. As in the case of *Minor*, the attestations of *Paula* are from the Late Faliscan and Latino-Faliscan inscriptions, perhaps implying that these praenomina were due to Latin influence, where such praenomina became increasingly necessary as the custom of giving women 'real' praenomina diminished. The name is spelled with *o* so soft that the form

¹²⁸ Herbig (CIE 8204) in fact read the Faliscan attestation as *oçto*, referring to Schulze's remarks (1904:21) on *Octo*, where the latter discussed Celtic origins of Latin gentilicia.

Pola/Polla may well have led a live independent from the adjective *paula/paulla* (cf. §3.7.4).

50. ? **Petro.** m. A very dubious attestation in *petr]ono* MF 102 (gen.). A Sabellic numeral praenomen ('nordoskisch' according to Salomies 1987:85-6), attested in South Picene *petroh* TE.1 and in a number of Latin inscriptions from Central Italy (see Salomies 1987:86). It also formed the base of the gentilicium *Petronius* attested for South Picene (*pet{f}eronis* AP.5), Marrucian (*petroni* MV 3), Paelignian (*ptruna* Pg 52), and Latin, which occurs also in the ager Faliscus (see §7.8.1.119). Etruscan has well-attested gentilicia *Petru* (more than 120 attestations) and *Petruna, Petruni* (more than 40 attestations).
51. **Publius** and **Publia.** m. *popli[o]* MLF 316, perhaps *popli[---]* MLF 317; f. *poplia* MF 18, *poplia* MF 48, *poplia* MF 50, *poplia* MF 136, [*p]oplia* MF 160, *poplia* MF 265, *poplia* MF 271, *poplia* MLF 303, *popliai* MLF 308 (gen.), *poplia* LF 332. Abbreviations (1) **Pop.** f. in LF 226; (2) **P.** LF 337?, Lat 250, Cap 409, 462 (although this might conceivably stand for a name other than *Publius*, this is unlikely in the case of the Latin and Capenate attestations). Surprisingly, in the Faliscan inscriptions this praenomen appears to have been used almost exclusively for women, while its use for men appears to be associated with the Latin and Capenate inscriptions. – The praenomen is either of Latin or of Etruscan origin, perhaps rather the latter, although the Etruscan instances of the praenomen are few (*puplies* Vs 1.29, *pupli* Cl 1.2079, 1.2080, 1.2344, *pupli{na}* Cl 1.2109, perhaps also *pup[liš]* Cl 1.2179). In Latin, the praenomen was fairly well attested, although not particularly frequent.¹²⁹ There are no attestations for the Sabellic languages, although these may be hidden in abbreviations such as *po* and *p* (see *ST* for instances of these abbreviations).
52. ? **Pumponius** or **Puponus.** m. *puponio* in *puponio · firmio* MF 54. G. Giacomelli (1963:214) and Hirata (1967:70) regarded the name as a gentilicium, but it is apparently used as a praenomen here. It could conceivably be a patronymic praenomen derived from the Sabellic praenomen *Pompo* (South Picene *pomp[úne]i* AQ.2, Oscan *pu(m)puf* Cp 42), but *u* seems to point rather to an Etruscan origin, e.g. the gentilicia *Pumpu/Pupu* and *Pumpuni/Pupuni* (for attestations, see *ET*). Latin had the gentilicia *Pomponius* as well as *Puponus*.
53. **Pupia.** f. *pupias* MLF 304 (gen.). The name occurs in isolation and can be either a praenomen or a gentilicium: a related praenomen *Pupus* occurs in Latin inscriptions from Northern Italy (see Salomies 1987:129, Kajava 1995:64), and there are several related Etruscan and Latin gentilicia (see §7.8.1.123, 124, 128, 129).

¹²⁹ Salomies (1987:46) calculates the total of Roman men called *Publius* at 10%.

54. *Q.* abbr., see under *Quinctus*.
55. ? *Qua.* abbr. [---]*[5-7]: *cua* MF 129? If this is a praenomen at all, it looks like a numeral praenomen such as *Quartus*. This makes the interpretation even more doubtful, as the numerals 1-4 do not seem to have been used as praenomina during this period in Latin except in Northern Italy: see H. Petersen (1962:348-50) and Salomies (1987:111-2, 118).
56. *Quinctus.* m. *cuicto* MLF 310. Abbr. *Q.* LtF 231. A Latin numeral praenomen, not attested in Etruscan (except in the gentilicium *Cvinte*, rendering a Latin name) or the Sabellic languages, although the corresponding Sabellic form *Pompt-* occurs as a (patronymic?) gentilicium in Paelignian (*ponties* Pg 5) and in Oscan (*πομπτιες* Me 1 etc., *pintiis* Po 1 etc.). The fact that *Quinctus* occurs only in Latin and Faliscan may be connected to the fact that these praenomina had a lexical meaning: cf. the case of *Sextus* (see below).
57. *Saluia.* f. *sal* | *plaria* · *t* · *l* in Torelli's reading (1974:741-6) of Cap 431. *Saluius* is well-attested praenomen of Sabellic origin, occurring throughout Central Italy: see Salomies 1987:88-90. The female *Saluia* was popular as a slave-name (Solin 1996:9-10, Kajava 1995:69 n.88), as it is here.
58. *Scaeuia.* f. *sceua* MLF 312, *sceiui* LF 379. I regard this name as a female praenomen (cf. Solin 1996:57), not as a cognomen, as has been suggested (e.g. Torelli 1967:536-7): there are no attestations in the Faliscan inscriptions of COGNOMEN alone, nor of women having cognomina (cf. §7.9). Furthermore, the name is a name of good omen, derived from the adjective *scaeuus* ("scaeuia, id est sinistra, quod quae sinistra sunt, bona auspicia existimantur", Var. *L.* 7.97), just as *Laeus/Laeuius/Laeuilus* is derived from *laeuus* (see under *Laeuilus*). Latin had gentilicia such as *Scaeuus* etc. (Schulze 1904:226-7), while Etruscan had a probably borrowed name *sceua* Cl 1.1243, 2028, *sceuas* a Cl 1.1045 (cf. also the gentilicium *Sceva/Scevia* (9 attestations, mainly from Clusium)).¹³⁰ For the forms with *-f*, Etruscan *scefi* Pe 1.630, *sceffi* Pe 1.1211, *scefia* Pe 1.201, and the Paelignian gentilicium *scaifia* Pg 14, see §3.2.8.
59. *Sen.* abbr. in *m* · *t* · *u* · *genucilio* · *sen* · *l* Cap 435. Moretti (1975:133-4) suggested that it could be the abbreviation of a cognomen, but I doubt whether this is likely at this date: it is perhaps an unidentified praenomen, cf. the abbreviated Samnitic praenomen *sn* tSa 21, tSa 32.
60. *Seruius.* m. *serui* MF 34-36 (gen. or abbr. nom.). It is impossible to ascertain whether *serui* is the praenomen or the gentilicium *Seruius*: both PRAENOMEN and

¹³⁰ The Latin gentilicium and the occurrence of the name in Etruscan make it even less likely that *Scaeuia* was a cognomen.

GENTILICIUM are possible in Faliscan *Besitzerinschriften* (§7.3). – The origin of the praenomen is either Latin or Etruscan: Salomies (1987:47-9) decides for the latter, in spite of the fact that the praenomen is not attested for Etruscan (but cf. the gentilicium *śervei* Pe 1.1191, *śervi* Pe 1.1190). The praenomen was not very frequent in Latin either. The name is probably not connected to the noun *seruus* (which has been thought to be of Etruscan origin, cf. Bréyer 1993:383-5).

61. **Sex.** abbr., see *Sextus*.
62. **Sextus.** m. *z[e]xtos* EF 1; *sesto* LF 329, *zextoi* LF 330 (gen.). Abbreviation: **Sex.** in *se]x* LtF 328, *s[ex* Lat 291, *sex* Cap. 399, 430. – A Latin numeral praenomen, not attested for Etruscan (except for the indirect attestation in the gentilicium *śekstalus* Sp 2.71) or the Sabellic languages, although, in view of the occurrence of other Sabellic numeral praenomina, it may well have existed also in the Sabellic languages (cf. the Oscan gentilicium *sehsimbrijs* Po 36, derived from the name of the sixth month, which according to H. Petersen (1962) is also the original meaning of the name *Sextus*). Apart from the Early Faliscan instance of *z[e]xtos* EF 1, this praenomen occurs only in the Late Faliscan, Latino-Faliscan, and Latin texts, which could imply that its popularity was due to Latin influence: see §7.10.5.
63. **St.** abbr., see *Staius*.
64. **Sta.** abbr., see *Staius*.
65. **Stat.** abbr., see *Staius*.
66. **Staius.** m. *statio* MLF 376. Abbreviations that probably represent this praenomen are: (1) **Stat.** MF? 29? (the text is *statuo*, probably to be read as *stat uo*); (2) **Sta.** f. (?) Cap 466 [without context in MF? 28, *staf* MF? 128]; (3) **St.** m. LtF 327, Cap 394. – An Italic praenomen that occurs with some frequency in Latin (attestations in Salomies 1987:90-1), but is primarily known from Oscan (Samnitic *statis* Sa 36 etc.: *ST* lists 14 attestations, not counting abbreviations or the use of the name as a gentilicium). There are no Etruscan attestations.
67. **T.** abbr., see under *Titus*.
68. **Tana.** f. *tana* MLF 338. – An emblematical Etruscan female praenomen, occurring both as *Θana* (numerous instances, mainly from Tarquinii, Clusium, and Perugia: see *ET*) and *Tana* (only AH 1.67, Cl 1.725, Pe 1.71, 1.135). Not attested for Latin or the Sabellic languages.
69. **Tania.** f. *θania* MF 81. – Like *tana*, a frequently attested Etruscan female praenomen (*ET* lists 170 instances), attested for Latin in *tania · papric[i]* / *c · f* CIL XI.2977 from Tuscania.

70. **Tanaquil.** f. *θanacuīl* MF 49, *tanacu[il]* MF 101, *tan(a)cuīl* MLF 347. – A typical Etruscan female praenomen, derived from the theonym *Θana*, occurring as *Θan-* (*θancvil* Vs 1.287, Po 4.4, *θancvilus* OA 2.63), *Θana-* (*θanaχvil* Ta 7.3, *θan]αχvil* Vs 1.190, *θana]cvi[us* Ta 2.1, *θanakvilus* Cr 2.42), and *Θane-* (*θaneχvil* Ta 7.31, *θanecvilus* AV 2.11). Not attested from Latin or the Sabellic languages: note that it is apparently a nominal compound *Θana+cvil*, a type of praenomen that is apparently absent from the Italic onomasticon.
71. **Te.** abbr., see *Tettius*.
72. **Tettius.** m. *teti* MF 13. The abbreviation **Te.** in LF 229 probably belongs to this name. The name occurs also as a gentilicium *Tettius* (see §7.8.1.153). – Salomies (1987:93) points to the abbreviated praenomen *tet* in *CIL* X.6098 from Urbino: there also appears to be an attestation in South Picene *tetis* TE.2. The name occurs only as gentilicium in Latin, Paelignian, and Etruscan: see §7.8.1.152.
73. **Ti.** abbr. *ti* in *ti* [-] *ti*ria MF 155. Perhaps *Titia*? G. Giacomelli (1963:223) and Hirata (1967:79) suggested *Tiberius*, based on the Roman convention *T.* = *Titus* and *Ti.* = *Tiberius*, but there is no indication that the Faliscan abbreviations were distributed in this way: furthermore, there are no cases of a *Tiberia* even in Latin.
74. **Tirrus.** m. *tiroi* MF 69-71 (gen.). Derived from this is the gentilicium *Tirrius* (see §7.8.1.155). – The name is not attested in Etruscan or the Sabellic languages, and occurs in Latin only in *tirri · craisli · tir · f* *CIL* XIV.3110 from Praeneste, where it is unclear whether the name is *Tirrus* or *Tirrius*.
75. **Titus** and **Titia.** m. *tito* MLF 305, *titoi* MLF 305 (gen.), *tito* MLF 309, *tito* MLF 315, *tito* MLF 346, *tito* MLF 350, *tito* MLF 354; *tito* LF 226, *tito* LF 336, *tito* 359. (The instances do not include the theonym *Titus Mercus*, for which see §6.4) Indirectly attested in the patronymic adjective *titia* MLF 302, *titio* MLF 307, *titio* MLF 312. The corresponding female praenomen appears to have been **Titia** rather than *Tita*, a patronymic praenomen derived from *Titus*: *titias* EF 3 (gen.), MF 201 (gen.). The abbreviation of this praenomen is in all probability **T.** masc. LtF 327, Lat 216, Cap 415, 425, 431, 435, 456. – The origin of the name is debated: I follow Combet-Farnoux (1980:113-69) in assuming that it was originally an Italic adjective meaning ‘propitious, well-omened’, as in the Faliscan theonym *Titus Mercus* (cf. §6.4) and the *aus titiae* mentioned by Varro (*L.* 5.81). The praenomen is well-known from Latin, although not frequently used,¹³¹ and occurs also in South Picene (*titum* AP.1, *titii* TE.5), in Umbrian (*titis TI* Ib.45), and in various Sabellic derivations (South Picene *titienom* TE.3, Paelignian *titis* Pg 15,

¹³¹ Salomies (1987:57) calculates the percentage of Roman men called *Titus* at c.3-5%, far less than e.g. *Gaius* or *Lucius* (each c.20%).

Oscan *titieis* He 3 (and *titti* tPo 13?), *τιτιδιες* Lu 15, 27). Etruscan has a fairly well-attested praenomen *Tite* (the indices to *ET* list over 20 instances, beside a greater number where this name is used as a gentilicium).

76. **Tr.** abbr. *tr* Cap 461. Probably *Trebius*.
77. **Tullus** and **Tullia**. m. *tulo* MF 151, perhaps also *tulom* MF 72 (gen. pl.?). The corresponding female praenomen may have been *Tullia* rather than *Tulla*, a patronymic adjective derived from *Tullus*, occurring in *tulie* MLF 383 (although this may also be an instance of the gentilicium *Tullius*). Derived from this is the patronymic gentilicium *Tullius* (see §7.8.1.156). – Latin had both the praenomen and the gentilicium, the former occurring only in *tul · tullius · tul · f* CIL I².1493, 1497 from Tibur. There are no attestations from the Sabellic languages, with the possible exception of the abbreviated gentilicium *tu* Um 39. Etruscan has *Tule*, which occurs only three times: *mini tule* Ve 3.32, *fasti : kainiei : tuleśa : kn* Ar 1.1, and *larθ : tule : kavinei | tuś(urθi)* Ar 1.94. The name is either Latin or Etruscan.
78. **V.** abbr. *u* Cap 435.
79. **Ve.** abbr. *ue* MF 43?, MLF 206 [and without context MF? 284, MLF 322].
80. **Vel.** m. *uelos* EF 4 (gen. or a thematized form, see §7.2.1), *uel* MF 56, *uel* MF 82, perhaps *uejl* MF 191. Also Etruscan *velusa* Etr XXXIV. – An Etruscan praenomen, attested in a very large number of attestations (mostly from Clusium, Volsinii and Tarquinii, see the indices to *ET*). It is not attested in Latin or in the Sabellic languages, although Latin has gentilicia such as *Velius* and *Veleius*, both of which occur also in Oscan (*velieis* Cm 22, *velei[is]* Hi 3).
81. **Velce(i)us** or **Velcaeus**. m. *uelcei* LF 332 (gen.). An adaptation of Etruscan praenomen *Velxe* (CI 1.1327, 1328, Ar 1.9): like *Veltur*, this name preserves the Etruscan /e/ (cf. the Faliscan name *Volta*).
82. **Veltur** m. *ueltur* MF 266, *ueltur* MLF 339. Also Etruscan *veltharus* Etr XVI, *velthursi* Etr XIX, [*u*]eltur Etr XXXVIII. – A well-attested Etruscan praenomen (*ET* gives more than 80 instances from various locations, mostly from Tarquinii). There are no attestations from the Sabellic languages, while Latin had only the gentilicia *Velthurius*, *Volturius*, and *Vulturius*, which show the usual Latin development /e/ → /o/ before velar /l/ (§3.3.4.1). Faliscan does not show this development in *Veltur*, although it appears in *Volta* (see below), indicating that *Veltur* was still an Etruscan name, in contrast to the entirely Faliscan *Volta*.
83. ? **Venel.** m. dubiously attested in *ueŋe[?---]na · | ux[o(r) ?---]* MF 43. Perhaps abbreviated *uen* in *uentar[c....* MF 80? A derivation *Venelius*, either a patronymic adjective or a gentilicium, occurs in *uenelies* MF 258. – A well-attested Etruscan praenomen (the indices to *ET* give more than 50 instances from various loca-

tions). Latin had only the patronymic gentilicia *Venelius* and *Venilius*, but there are attestations of the praenomen in Praesamnitic (*uenel{i}eis* Ps 12, *uenilei* Ps 3, patronymic adjective *ueneliis* Ps 3) and Oscan (*uenileis* Cm 30).

84. *Vibius* and *Vibia*. m. *uipi* MF 14 (gen.); f. *uipia* LF 221. – Probably a patronymic praenomen derived from Etruscan *Vipe*, which is attested for the areas surrounding the ager Faliscus: Tarquinii (*vipe* Ta 1.39, 1.92, AT 1.28, *vipe/s* Ta 1.93, *vipes* Ta 1.237, AT 1.74), Volsinii (*vipe* Vs 1.233, *vipes* Vs 1.133, 1.231), and Horta (*vipes* AH 1.8). It is therefore not unthinkable that *Vibius* in fact originated in the ager Faliscus. The praenomen is also attested fairly frequently for Latin (attestations in Salomies 1987:96, mostly from Central and Southern Italy and Etruria), where *Vibius* also occurs as a gentilicium. In the Sabellic languages it is attested for Umbrian (*vipies* Um 5, *vibie* Um 37), Paelignian (fem. *uibia* Pg 51, abbreviated *uib* Pg 33) and is most common in Oscan (*viibis* Fr 1 etc., f. $\text{ϕ}\iota\beta\iota\alpha\omega$ Lu 46: the indices to *ST* list at least 15 instances, not counting abbreviations). Salomies (1987:96) regards *Vibius* as an Oscan praenomen, but as most of the Oscan instances are from Campania, the use of the name there may be due to Etruscan influence. An Etruscan origin might also explain the relative frequency of the praenomen in Latin inscriptions when compared to other Sabellic praenomina, and the frequency of Etruscan gentilicia such as *Vipe* and *Vipena/Vipina/Vipiena*.

85. *Volta* m. *uolta* MF 15, [*u]ol̥ta* MF 149, *uol[ta* MF 158; *uolta* MLF 313, *uoltai* MLF 367-370 (gen.); *uoltai* Lat 218 (gen.). Also Etruscan *vultasi* Etr XLII. Indirectly attested in the patronymic adjective *uolteo* MF 275, *uoltheo* MF 276; *uoltiq̄* LF 224; perhaps also in *u]oltio* MF 164 (this may also be an instance of the gentilicium *Voltius*) and *uolti[---]* MF 167 (this may also be an instance of the gentilicium *Voltius*, or of the patronymic adjective *Voltilius*).

86. *Voltius*. m. *uolti* MF 11 (gen.), *uolti* MF 79 (gen.), [*uo]ltio* MF 88, *uolti[o* MF 152; *uolti* MLF 469* (gen.), *uoltio* MLF 312; *uoltio* LF 220, *uoltio* LF 330; probably also *ulties* MF/Etr 64, if this is to be read as *u(o)lties*. Indirectly attested in the patronymic adjective *uoltilia* MF 80, *uoltilia* MF 144, *uoltilio* MF 162, *u]olti[̥i---]* MF 163; *uoltilio* MLF 346; *uotiliq̄* LF 222, *uoltilio* LF 336; perhaps also *uolti[---]* MF 167 (this may also be an instance of the patronymic adjective *Voltius*, or of the gentilicium *Voltius*).

Either *Volta* or *Voltius*: [*u]olt[---]* MF 145, [*u]olt[---]* MF 163. A patronymic adjective, either *Voltius* or *Voltilius*, in *uolt[---]* MF 156. The abbreviation of these names is in all likelihood the *Vo.* in LtF 299, Lat 251.

Both *Volta* and *Voltius* occur frequently in the Faliscan inscriptions, but the name is not attested for Etruscan (apart from *vultasi* Fa 3.4=Etr XLII, which renders the Faliscan name), Latin (which had the gentilicium *Voltius*), or the Sabellic languages. These names can therefore be regarded, together with *Iuna* and perhaps

also *Ianta* and *Tirrus*, as specifically Faliscan praenomina. Unlike *Iuna*, however, *Volta* and *Voltius* continued to be used into the Late Faliscan period: *Volta* in fact makes its final appearance in the Latin **218**, from the late second century. The name is usually derived from an Etruscan **velt-* or **velθ-*, with the regular development of /e/ → /o/ before a velar /l/ (§3.3.4.1). This Etruscan base, however, is apparently not attested, but cf. the rare gentilicium *Velti* (*veltī* Pe 1.277, 1.565, 1.1031, *vel|l|tia(l)* Pe 1.564, *veltia(l)* Pe 1.1087). What remains surprising is that the word was included in the *first* declension instead of to the second.

7.7.2. The origins of the Faliscan praenomina. As might be expected in an area that lies on the crossroads of several different cultures and languages, the Faliscan onomasticon is of mixed origin: the same, however, could be said of the Latin or Etruscan, and, to a lesser extent, of the Sabellic onomasticon. As said in §7.1.1, ascribing names to languages or peoples is difficult (although in the case of the praenomina it is easier than in the case of the gentilicia, cf. §7.8.2): in many cases it is unclear in what language the name originated. Even if the origin of the name is clear, the name may have reached the area through another language than the one in which it originated (as appears to have been the case with *Aulus* and *Publius*): an important point, since such a name may therefore have been associated with a different group than the speakers of the language in which it originated. That having been said, the origins of the Faliscan praenomina are probably more or less as follows:

(1) Faliscan: Exclusively Faliscan are *Iuna* and *Volta* (with its derivation *Voltius*): though *Volta* is ultimately derived from an Etruscan praenomen, it appears to be a very old derivation and has no counterparts in Etruscan: even its Etruscan base **Velte* is attested only indirectly at best. Interestingly, both *Iuna* and *Volta* are masculine praenomina of the *first* declension, a category absent from the Latin and Sabellic onomasticon. Praenomina that occur chiefly in Faliscan and only sporadically in other languages are *Aufilus* (of Italic origin?), *Iantus/Ianta* (perhaps of Etruscan origin?) and *Tirrus* (of unknown origin). *Laeuius* and *Laeuilus* also appear to have been Faliscan, and the same is perhaps true of the female praenomen *Scaeuia*. The derivation of *Vibius* from Etruscan may have been Faliscan in origin, and the great frequency of *Gaius* in the area may similarly point to a Faliscan origin of this name: both names occur with some frequency also in Etruscan and the Sabellic languages, however.

(2) Latin: Several praenomina that occur in the area are of Latin origin: these are *Gaius*, *Lucius/Lucia*, *Marcus* (with its probably Faliscan derivation *Marcius*), and the numeral praenomina *Quinctus*, *Sextus*, and *Oct-*. Of these, *Gaius*, *Lucius* and *Marcus* occur with any frequency only in the Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions. The same is true of *Aulus* and *Publius*, which are of Etruscan origin, but occurred regularly in Latin, and may have been regarded as Latin rather than as Etruscan.

(3) **Sabellic:** Interestingly, there is hardly any praenomen that is *exclusively* Sabellic except the very dubiously attested *Maesius* or *Messius*, and *Petro*. Several praenomina that occur only in abbreviated form in the ager Capenas and are perhaps Sabellic are *At(tus)*, *F(ertor)*, *Sen()*, and *Tr(ebius)*.

(4) **Italic:** Of Italic origin, but not ascribable to either Latin, Faliscan, or the Sabellic languages in specific are *Gaius/Gauia* (which could perhaps be of Faliscan origin) *Staius*, *Titus*, the very dubiously attested *Ancus*, and, occurring only in abbreviated form, *Nu(merius)*. Among these praenomina, the frequency of *Gaius/Gauia* is surprising: it is the most frequently attested praenomen in the area (see below). *Titus* and *Numerius* also occur in the theonyms *Titus Mercus* and *Mars Numesius* (see §6.4)

(5) **Etruscan:** Clearly Etruscan or of Etruscan origin are *Arruns*, *Aulus*, *Laris*, *Lars*, *Tana*, *Tanaquil*, *Tania*, *Vel*, *Velceius*, *Veltur*, and *Venel*. Probably Etruscan as well are *Caelius*, *Publius*, and *Vibius*, and possibly *Seruius* and *Tullus*. Of these names, however, *Aulus*, *Publius*, and *Seruius* are also well-known from Latin. Probably also Etruscan, but less certainly attested are *Acr-*, *Am-/Amm-*, *Cincus*, and *Her-*.

Difficult to ascribe to any specific origin are *Caesius* (Etruscan or Italic?), *Aemus* and its derivation *Aemius* (Etruscan or Italic?), *Pupius* and *Puponius* (Sabellic?), and *Tettius* (Etruscan or Italic?).

Apart from the origin, the *frequency* of the names must be taken into account. In view of the great uncertainty in some instances (especially the abbreviated names), it is not very useful to push quantification too far, but several tendencies are clear.

By far the most frequently used name is *Gaius/Gauia* (together 30 instances, not counting abbreviations), followed by the specifically Faliscan names *Iuna* (15 instances, not counting abbreviations or patronymic adjectives), *Volta* (7 instances, not counting abbreviations or patronymic adjectives) and *Voltilius* (8 instances, not counting abbreviations). Together, these four names therefore make up 60 instances of the *c.*230 instances of praenomina occurring in the inscriptions: note that the 60 instances do *not* include abbreviations and the total of *c.*230 does. Of the names of unknown origin, only *Caesius/Caesia* is frequent (11-12 instances, not counting abbreviations): if this name is included with the other four, these five names together make up 71-72 instances of the *c.*230 instances of praenomina, or nearly one-third of all attestations of praenomina.

Of the names of Latin origin, several are associated with the Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions instead of with the Faliscan ones: this is the case with *Gaius*, *Lucius*, *Marcus*, and the Latin names of Etruscan origin *Aulus* and *Publius*. This picture is partly based on the abbreviated praenomina in the Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions, however, and could therefore be biased. The distribution of *Publius/Publia* in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions is curious: whereas *Publia* occurs 11 times, *Publius* occurs only 2-3 times.

Etruscan names are many in number, but most are comparatively rare. The most frequent one is *Arruns* (7 instances), followed by *Laris* (4 instances), *Vel* (3-4 instances), *Tanaquil* (3 instances), and *Veltur* (2 instances). The others, including *Lars*, which in Etruscan is among the most frequent praenomina, are all attested in one or two instances at best. (Cf., however, §7.10.5 with note 142.) In spite of this rather meagre frequency, these names are still more frequent than they are in Latin or Sabellic inscriptions, as may be expected for an area where the Etruscan presence must have been large. The specifically Sabellic names not only are few, but each is used in only one or two instances.

Keeping in mind that praenomina were *given*, not *received* like gentilicia, this implies that the inhabitants of the ager Faliscus had some clear preferences in the names they chose for their children, and as several of the most frequent names did not occur elsewhere, these names may well have been a part of ethnic identity. This is discussed further in §7.10.5.

7.7.3. Types of Faliscan praenomina. Among the praenomina occurring in the Faliscan inscriptions, several groups can be identified according to their derivation:

(1) Patronymic praenomina. Many praenomina are of patronymic origin, and in the light of the lasting use, in Faliscan, of patronymic adjectives (§7.5.2), this is hardly surprising. Examples are *Aemius*, *Caelius*, *Caesius*, *Laeuius* and *Laeuilus*, *Marcus*, *Mesius*, *Vibius*, *Voltius* and *Voltilius*, perhaps also *Paquius*, *Pu(m)ponius*, *Salvia*, *Seruius*, *Stadius*, *Tettius*, and possibly also *Letaeus* and *Velceius*. It is noteworthy that the one instance of *Marcus* (LF 221, 222, 223) may well be an *ad hoc* praenomen for a man who is apparently a ‘fatherless’ son of a freedwoman, reflecting his parentage not in his gentilicium, but in his praenomen: this indicates that the process of using patronymic adjectives as praenomina was a still continuous process. Since many gentilicia, too, were of patronymic origin, it is not surprising to find the same name used both as a praenomen and as a gentilicium, as in the cases of *Caelius*, *Caesius*, *Laeuius*, *Laeuilus*, and *Marcus*. See also §7.8.2. on the patronymic gentilicia.

This derivation may also be the origin of the female praenomina in *-ia* beside a male equivalent in *-us*: far from being the female form of the male name, these female praenomina reflect patronymic adjectives, so that beside *Titus* ‘propitious (m.)’ stands not *Tita* ‘propitious (f.)’, but *Titia* ‘daughter of Titus’. Examples of this are *Titia*, *Tullia*, perhaps also *Pupia*, and possibly Early Faliscan *Rufia* (§7.2.2)

(2) Numeric praenomina. A number of praenomina are numeric: *Quinctus*, *Sextus*, *Oct-*, and possibly also *Qua-*, based on Latino-Faliscan numerals, and perhaps *Petro*, and, indirectly, *Pu(m)ponius*, based on Sabellic numerals. They may originally have indicated the month of birth (rather than the sequence of sons within the family), which

would explain why originally only numeric praenomina derived from the ordinals for ‘four’ and higher are attested: see H. Petersen 1962 and Salomies 1987: 111-20.

(3) *Praenomina of good omen.* Several names have a ‘propitious’ meaning, bearing a connotation of ‘good omen’. As such I regard *Laeuius* and its derivation *Laeuilus*, derived from *laeuus*, the female praenomen *Scaeva*, derived from *scaeuus*, and *Titus* (which also occurs in the theonym *Titus Mercus*) and its derivation *Titia*. Perhaps also *Salvia* may be included in this group, if related to *saluus*.

7.8. The gentilicia

7.8.1. The gentilicia attested from the Middle Faliscan period onward. The following list contains all gentilicia attested in the Middle Faliscan, Late Faliscan, Latino-Faliscan, and Latin inscriptions from the ager Faliscus and Capenas (for the Early Faliscan inscriptions, see the list in §7.2.2).

I have included all abbreviations that can be considered gentilicia, as explained in §7.1.2: contextless abbreviations are included between [], but only if the abbreviation is attested elsewhere in a context where it clearly represents a gentilicium, or if it can easily be matched to an existing gentilicium. Names occurring only in Latin inscriptions are included as lemmata between []; names occurring only in Etruscan inscriptions have been included only if the same or a related name is attested in the Faliscan onomasticon. As the data for the Sabellic onomasticon are relatively few, it has only been noted when cognates or derivations *are* attested, not when they are not. For ease of reference I have used the closest Latin equivalent as the lemma (except in the case of abbreviations) and ordered the lemmata according to the modern alphabet.

1. [*Abellensis*. f. *abelese* Lat 251 (dat.) Apparently a gentilicium derived from a toponym *Abella*. This place may be identical with Campanian *Abella*, although the toponymic adjective derived from that name was *Abellanus* in Latin (also used as a gentilicium) and in Oscan (*abellaniū* Cm 1.A3 etc.). Solin (1972:165 n.2) regarded it as an ethnicon rather than a gentilicium, but in view of the other toponymic gentilicia in the area (see §7.8.2), it may well be a gentilicium.]
2. *Acarcelinius*. m. *acarcelini* LF 221 (gen.), *acacelini* LF 222 (gen.), *acarcelinio* LF 223, *acarcelinio* LF 226. The name is not attested elsewhere:¹³² Schulze (1904:111, 368) suggested that it was derived from a gentilicium like *Accaeus* with a suffix parallel to the one in *Rup-arcellius*: G. Giacomelli (1963:171) and Hirata (1967:31-2) assumed that this gentilicium might be *Acus* (see below under

¹³² Schulze (1904:111) hesitatingly referred to *CIL* VIII.15474 as a further attestation of the name, but that text reads *gemina | fili|a carcelinia*.

- Aconius*). Already Peruzzi (1963b:441-6), however, pointed out that the name might be a new formation, perhaps derived from a toponym, and A. Mancini (1981) in fact quite attractively derived it from an */akarkelom/ that would be equivalent to (but not necessarily identical with) the */okrikelom/ reflected in Latin *Ocriculum* and Umbrian */okrijlom/ implied by Etruscan *ucrislane ET* C11.2609, 2611-2613 etc. Cf. also Calzecchi-Onesti (1981:184-8, 165-7) on *acr-/arc-* in Italic toponyms and on *Ocriculum*.
3. ***Aci***. abbr. *aci* Cap **395**. Probably *Accius* or *Acilius*: the latter is attested in *CIL* XI.7531 from Falerii Novi and *CIL* XI.7768 from Fiano Romano.
 4. ***Acciuaeus***. m. *açiuaiom* (or *aļiuaiom*) Cap **465** (gen. pl.). The name appears to be a derivation of *Accius* (cf. above under *Aci*.) with the same suffix as in *karkavaios CIL* I².2917a (Colonna 1990a).
 5. ***Aconius***. f. *aconia* LF **220**, perhaps also m. **(*)conęo* LtF **290**. Other attestations may be *aco[---]* LtF **341** and *aco[---]* LtF **327**. (G. Giacomelli (1963:172) preferred to interpret these texts as instances of a gentilicium *Acus*.) The name is an adaptation of the Etruscan gentilicium *Aχu* (21 attestations, mostly from Clusium and Perugia; cf. also *Aχuna*), and occurs in *CIL* XI.3115-3119 from Falerii Novi.
 6. **? *Acr-***. *açreç* MF **67** (gen.?), *acre* MF/Etr **279**. Hirata (1967:32) classed the name as a gentilicium, in which case it would be connected with Etruscan *acris* Pe 1.951 and *acries* Vs 1.138: cf. the Latin gentilicium *Acrius*. G. Giacomelli (1963:172) regarded it as a praenomen: see §7.7.1.2.
 7. ***Adicius***. m. *adicio* MLF **378**. A Latin gentilicium *Adicius* occurs in *CIL* V.4251 from Northern Italy.
 8. **? *Aenus***. Perhaps m. *aino* in *faino* MLF **352**, if this is not to be read as *faino* (see *Faenus*). Like Latin *Aenius*, *Aenus* could be an adaptation of the Etruscan gentilicium *Eina* (*eina* MF **57**): see also §7.8.2.
 9. **? *Aieius***. f. *aie** MF **110** (read as *aiea* by Herbig *CIE* 8032). The reading *aiea*, the interpretation 'Aieia', and the derivations proposed (see e.g. Stolte 1928:289) are all equally doubtful. G. Giacomelli (1963:172) connected this name with *Aiedius*.
 10. ***Aiedius***. m. *aiedies* Cap **390** (nom. sg. or pl.?). The name is apparently not attested elsewhere. For names in *Aie-*, see Schulze 1904:116-7: cf. perhaps the abbreviated Oscan gentilicium *aie* Po 89. The suffix *-idius* is of Sabellic origin: if the inscription, *k · pa · aiedies*, is interpreted as 'K. Aiedius, son of Pa.', it shows further Sabellic features in the nominative in *-ies* and in the (Umbrian-Volscian) placement of FILIATION between the praenomen and the gentilicium: see §9.3.2.
 11. ***Alliuaeus***. m. *aļiuaiom* (or *açiuaiom*) Cap **465** (gen. pl.). The name appears to be a derivation of the Sabellic gentilicium *Alis* or *Allis* (Latin *Allius*) that occurs in

South Picene *alies* TE 2 and Marrucinian *alies* MV 4 (twice), formed with the same suffix as in early Latin *karkavaios* CIL I².2917a (Colonna 1990a).

12. ? *Am-* or *Amm-*. without context *ame* 280, *aṃē* 282. G. Giacomelli (1963:173) classed this name as a gentilicium, but Hirata (1967:34) as a praenomen (cf. §7.7.1.6), pointing to the Latin (patronymic?) gentilicium *Ammius* (which occurs in CIL XI.3080 from Falerii¹³³). The name appears to be of Etruscan origin.
13. *Annius*. m. *ani* MF 45 (gen.?), *anio* Cap 420, *anni* LtF 63 (gen.?).
14. *Annilius*. m. *anel[i]* MF 469* (gen.); f. *anelia* MF 101. Another attestation would be *manileo* MLF 355, which can be read as *m anileo* as well as *manileo*.
The Latin gentilicia *Annaeus*, *Anniius*, *Annilius*, and several others in *Ann-* are adaptations of the well-attested Etruscan gentilicia *Anae/Ane/Ani* (for the numerous attestations, see *ET*: from Civita Castellana is *anae lauvcies* Etr XXIX). Cf. also the Faliscan poet *Annianus* or *Anianus* mentioned by Ausonius (*Cent.* 11). Gentilicia of this group are also attested for the Sabellic languages, e.g. South Picene *anaiūm* AP.1, Paelignian *anaes* Pg 10, *annies* Pg 40, *annia* Pg 15, 33, Oscan *annīei* Cp 38, Paelignian *anniaes* Pg 39, *aniaes* Pg 38, Vestinian *aninies* MV 11.
15. *Ap.* abbr. *ap* Cap 419.
16. *Anu.* abbr. *anu* in *cl · anu* Cap 397. The attestation is doubtful: the text was read as *clanu* by G. Giacomelli (1963:185) and Hirata (1967:59-60), the latter comparing Etruscan names in *Clan-*. Since the names in the Capenate inscriptions are mostly Latin rather than Etruscan, I would rather read *cl · anu* and compare the Latin names in *Anu-* (cf. Solin & Salomies 1994:17-8).
17. *Aratius* or *Arantius*. m. *aratio* MLF 348, *aratio* MLF 349, *aravtio* MLF 350; f. *aratia* MLF 357. The gentilicium may be a patronymic derivation from the Etruscan praenomen *Araθ/Aranθ*, in which case it could be read either as *Aratius* or as *Arantius*. The Latin onomasticon has no corresponding names: perhaps the name may be compared to *Aradius* (cf. Faliscan *calitenes* MF 265, which corresponds to Latin *Calidemus*), but this name appears to be of Middle-Eastern origin (Schulze 1904:113). Cf. perhaps also the Etruscan gentilicium *arathenas* Vs 1.88.
18. [*Arn.* abbr. in MF/Etr 37. It is not clear if this is a gentilicium or a praenomen: if it is a gentilicium, it could be *Arnius* (Schulze 1904:412). See also §7.7.1.9.]
19. [? *Arrius*. f. *a[rria]* in *arria | plaria* Cap 431. The restoration is extremely doubtful: a very different reading, in which the name would be *sal | plaria*, with a praenomen *sal(uia)*, was proposed by Torelli (1974:741-6): see also Kajava (1995:70).]

¹³³ The *Iulia Ammia* of this inscription seems to be of Oriental extraction, however, as she is called *tigranis | regis f* (perhaps Tigranes of Armenia, executed in 36 CE, cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6.40).

20. *Arruntulus*. m. *arutlo* MF 195.

21. *Aruntielius*. f. *arutielia*[?---] MF 96.

Both names are derivations of the Etruscan praenomen *Arnθ*, for which see §7.7.1.9. *Arutlo* appears to be a diminutive: G. Giacomelli (1963:175-6) compared Etruscan *aruntleσα* AS 1.227. The derivation of *arutielia* is difficult: it appears to be derived from *Arruntius*, but neither as a diminutive (which probably would have been *arutela*) nor as patronymic derivation (which would have been *arutilia* or *arutelia*). The formation is reminiscent of the Sabellic gentilicia in *-iēnus*, but it may well be an error, e.g. *aruti{e}lia* or *arut{i}elia*.

22. *Atronius*. m. *atron* (or *atroni*?) MF 13 (abbr. or gen.). Like Latin *Atronius*, it is an adaptation of Etruscan *Atru* (*atru* Cl. 1.1298, *atrus* Ru 2.5, *atrus* Sp 2.76) or *Atrune* (*atrunias* Cl 1.1347).

23. *Au...* in *au*[---] LF 236.

24. *Aue*. abbr. *ae* Cap 396. G. Giacomelli (1962:176) suggested a connection with Etruscan *Avei* (*avei* Pe 1.896, *aveis* Pe 1.897, 1.898, 1.1132, 1.1297, AS 1.160) and Latin *Aueius* (thus also Hirata 1967:37), comparing also *Auius* and *Auienus*.

25. *Aufilius/Oufilius*. *oufilio* MF 48, *aufilio* MF 49, *aufilio* MF 50, *auffilio* MF 51, *ou**[..]o MF 52, *aufi*[lio ?---] MF 53, *oufilio* MF 275, *oufilio* MF 276. A patronymic gentilicium derived from the (Faliscan?) praenomen *Aufilus/Oufilus*, for which see §7.7.1.12. Latin, too, had *Aufilius/Ofilius*, but also *Aufillius/Ofillius* and *Aufellius/Ofellius*: note the intervocalic *-f-*, pointing to a non-Roman origin of the name. Cf. perhaps also the Umbrian gentilicium *uferie[r]* Um 8.

26. ? *Aufitius*. m. *ofiti* in *f ofiti* MF 58 (if not to be read as *fofiti*). A Latin gentilicium *Aufitius* occurs in *CIL* VI.6945 from Rome.

27. ? *Aulena*. m. *olna* MF 82. Editors usually interpret this as a noun, but no satisfactory interpretation has ever been given for it: I would rather read it as a second gentilicium (describing a freedman, cf. §7.6), comparing Etruscan *Ulena* (*ulenas* Ru 2.4), *Aulna* (*aulnal* AS 1.11, Cl 1.1241, Pe 1.943, *aulnas* Vs 1.244, *aulnas* Fe 3.3), *Aulne* (*aulnei* Cl 1.1308, Pe 1.93) and Latin *Olnius* and *Aulenus*.

28. *Battius*. m. *batio* MLF/LtF 359. The use of *b* is surprising, and probably points to a non-Faliscan origin of the name. Latin had a gentilicium *Battius* (Schulze 1904:423).

29. [*Blaesius*. m. *blaisiis* 468*. The name, like Latin *Blaesius*, appears to be of Sabellic origin, cf. Oscan *blaisiis* Cm 14.C8. The text also has a Sabellic praenomen *pa<qu>is* and shows Sabellic epigraphic and linguistic features (such as the syncope of the final syllable).]

30. *Ca*. abbr. *ca* Cap 427, 428.

31. **Caelius.** m. *cailio* MF 90, *c]elio* MF 94, *celio* MF 95, *ce]lio* MF 96, *c]elio* MF 97, *celio* MF 105; *cail]ia* MF 92; *cailio* MLF 376. A patronymic gentilicium derived from the praenomen *Caelius* and ultimately from Etruscan *Caile* (see §7.7.1.17). The gentilicium also occurs in Latin; Etruscan had a related gentilicium *Cailina* (*cailinal* Vt 1.43).
32. **Caesilius.** f. *cesilia* MLF 211. A patronymic gentilicium derived from the praenomen *Caesius* (for which see §7.7.1.18). The gentilicium also occurs in Latin (Schulze 1904:135) and in Oscan (*kaisillieis* Cp 25).
33. **Caesius.** m. *cesje* MF 257, *cesies* MF 265, cf. also *ceises* Etr XXXIV. (The name *Caesius* also occurs as a praenomen: see §7.7.1.18.). The name occurs in Etruscan as *Caise/Ceise* (*caise* AH 1.80; *ceises* AT 1.67, 1.145, *ceisi* Ta 1.116, AT 1.67) and *Ceisé* (*ceisî* Pe 1.325, 1.326, *ceisîs* Pe 1.323, 1.327, *ceisîal* Pe 1.505), as well as *Caisie* (*caisies* Cm 2.49): Latin had *Caesius*, as well as several other names in *Caes-*.
34. ? **Calinius.** The name was read by Herbig (1910:187) in *calin[---]rezo[---]* MF 57. The gentilicium occurs in Latin and in Oscan (*καλινις* Me 1, *καλεινις* Me 3, *καλι[νις]* Me 2). As a gentilicium at the beginning of the text is very unusual, I would rather read *ca lin[---]*.
35. **Calitenus.** f. *calitenes* MF 265. The name has been equated since Herbig CIE 8387 with Latin *Calidenus*, for which cf. Schulze 1904:138. It is in all probability related to the Etruscan gentilicium *caliti* Pe 1.1441, which looks as though it might be derived from a toponym *Cales*. Cifani (2002:33), without referring to *calitenes*, suggested that *Cale* may have been the original name of modern Gallese in the north-eastern ager Faliscus. For *Calit-* : *Calitenus* cf. perhaps *Volta* : *Voltenus* (Lejeune 1952b:124 n.1).
36. [**Calpurnius.** m. *calpurnius* Cap 432.]
37. **Catineus.** m. *catinei* MLF 469* (gen.). Latin has *Catineus* beside *Catinius*. Cf. Etruscan *catni* Ta 1.166.
38. **Cincius.** m. *cicio* MF 40; f. *cincia* MF 135; cf. also Etruscan *ceñcu* Etr XXI. Like Latin *Cincius*, the gentilicium is derived from the Etruscan gentilicium *Cincu* (*cincus* OA 2.60, *cincual* Pe 1.53, *cinc[ual]* Cl 1.102; cf. also *cincunia* Pe 1.54, 1.748) or *Cencu* (15 attestations, apart from Fa 2.4=Etr XXI all from Clusium). The gentilicium also occurs in *CIL* XI.3327 from Forum Cassii.
39. **Citius.** f. *citiai* MF 270 (gen. or dat., but cf. §9.2.3c). G. Giacomelli (1983:185) pointed to Etruscan *citia* in *TLE* 495, which appears to be the only Etruscan parallel. Latin has a gentilicium *Citius*.

40. *Clanidius*. m. *clanidio* Cap 394. The name apparently does not occur elsewhere, but is formed with the Sabellic suffix *-idius*. The closest parallel is *Clandius* in *CIL* XI.2004 from Perusia, but this name is connected rather with the Etruscan gentilicium *Clante* (Schulze 1904:529 n.6). Cf. perhaps also *cl · anu* Cap 397, read as *clanu* by G. Giacomelli (1963:185) and Hirata (1967:59-60).
41. [*Claudius*. m. *claudia* Cap 393.]
42. *Clipearius* (and *Clipeaeus*?). m. *clipeaio* (*clipea<rho>io*?) MF 470*; *clipiar[io]* LF 230, *clipear[io]* LtF 231, *cl[i]peario* LtF 233. A *Berufsgentiliz* ‘Shieldmaker’ derived from *clipeus/clupeus* (a word that is probably of Etruscan origin, see §6.2.9). It is unclear whether *clipeaio* is an error for *clipea<rho>io* or if this is a different derivation from the same noun: cf. also *frenaios* MF 471* instead of the expected *frena<rho>ios*. The gentilicium *Clipearius* apparently occurs only in the ager Faliscus (if this can be concluded from Schulze 1904:416): unclear is *clupiaria* | *origo* | *q · mudasidius* | *arists* *CIL* VI.4925 from Rome.
43. *Cocilius*. f. *cocelia* MLF 303. G. Giacomelli (1963:186) compared Latin *Caucilius*/*Cocilius*, but also *Coelius* and *Coculnius*. This last name is derived from the Etruscan gentilicium *Cuclni* from Tarquinii (*culcnial* Ta 1.9, 1.14, *culcnies* Ta 1.31, 1.95, 1.96, *culcnif[es]* Ta 1.97).
44. *Colanium*. m. *colanioi* MF 69-70 (gen. or dat.). Herbig (1914a:239) connected the name to the Latin gentilicia *Colus* and *Colius*. Hirata (1967:46) compared the Etruscan gentilicium *Culni* (*kulnei* Vs 1.208 *culni* Cl 1.1524, cf. also *culnaial* Cr 2.54, 2.55, 2.57). Latin has a gentilicium *Colianius*, which might be related.
45. [*Cotena*. m. *cotena* Lat 214. *Cotena* appears to be attested only here, although Schulze also points to *Κοττίνιας* in an inscription from near Faenza. The name reflects Etruscan names like *Cutna/Cutne* (12 attestations, mostly from Clusium).]
46. *Cutrius*. m. *cutri* MF 200 (abbr.). Latin *Cotrius*. The spelling with *u* is Etruscan rather than Faliscan, cf. *Popius* : *Pupius* (below).
47. [*Didius*. m. *didius* Lat 456.]
48. ? *Decon...* Perhaps attested in *deconf* LtF 174. Thulin (1907:292-4) interpreted this as an instance of an unattested gentilicium *Deconius*, an adaptation of the Etruscan gentilicium *Tecunas* from Volsinii (*tequnas* Vs 1.48, 1.153, 1.154, *tequna[s]* 1.151).
49. ? *E...sus* in *e**sa* Cap 457. Unclear.
50. *Egnatius*. m. *egnatius* Lat 291 ; f. *e[c]nata* MF 81; also *Ekn* = *Egnat* LF 246. Identical with Latin *Egnatius*, epigraphically attested for the area in *CIL* XI.3083 (twice) from Falerii Novi, and *CIL* XI.3257 (twice) from Sutrium. The name oc-

curs in Etruscan as *Ecnate/Ecnati* (*eknate* Vs 1.299, *ekṇat[e]* Ta 7.40, *ecnate* Vs 1.170; *ecnaṭiḥ* Ta 1.256, *ecnatial* Ta 1.95) and *Ecnatna/Ecnatni* (*ecnatna* AS 1.316, *ecnatnas* Vs 1.202, 1.307, *ecnatnal* Cl 1.1455, *ecṇ[a]ṭnal* Vt 1.110, *ecnatn[al]* Cl 1.1682; *ecṇatni* Cl 1.388, *ecnatnei* AS 1.232, *ecṇatṇei* Cl 1.1568). Cf. perhaps also the abbreviated Volscian praenomen *ec* VM 2. The name may be an Etruscan toponymic adjective in *-te/-ti*.

51. *Eina*. m. *eina* MF 57. Identical with Etruscan *eina* Cl S.17, *eini* Cl 1.1574, *einis* Cl 1.1575. The name may originally have been *Aina* (cf. *aina* Ru 0.13, without context?), an adaptation of which may be *aino* MLF 352, if the text, *faino*, is to be read as *faino*: see *Aenus*.

F- see also H-

52. [? *Fab*. abbr. without context *hap* MF? 46. Probably to be interpreted as an abbreviation of the gentilicium *Fabius*, with Faliscan *h-* for an original /#fV/ (see §3.5.2). Latin *Fabius*, a Latinization of the Etruscan gentilicium *Fapi* (*fapi* Cl 1.220, *fapis* Pe 1.904 (used as a praenomen).]
53. ? *Fac...* in *hac****a* MF 89. The only Etruscan parallel would appear to be *ḡacsneal* Pe 1.1191, in which case the Faliscan instance would show the Faliscan spelling *h-* for original /#fV/ (see §3.5.2).
54. ? *Fadius*. m. perhaps *ḡaḡi* MF 13 (gen. or abbr.). If indeed to be read thus, the name identical with Latin *Fadius* (Schulze 1904:132, 516), perhaps an adaptation of an Etruscan name gentilicium *hatina* Pe 1.686, cf. also on *Fadenius* (below).
55. *Fadenius* or *Hadenius*. f. *hadenia* MLF 360 (either with *h* for original /#fV/ or with a hypercorrect *f* for original /#hV/, see §3.5.2). Probably connected to Etruscan *hatina* Pe 1.686, Latin *Fadenus* (Schulze 1904:132). Cf. also *Fadius*.
56. *Faenus*. m. *faino* MLF 352. G. Giacomelli (1963:189) compared Latin *Faenius*: for Faliscan *Faenus* : Latin *Faenius*, see §7.8.2. The text may have to be read as *faino*, cf. *Aenus* and *Eina* (above).
57. *Fa(r)farn...* *fafarn* MF 136 (abbr.), *faff[---]* MF 139. Herbig (*CIE* 8237) suggested a connection with the name of the nearby river *Farfarus* (Ovid *Met.* 12.328-30) or *Fabaris* (Verg. *A.* 7.716): see §6.5.1. For other potamonymic gentilicia, see *Nari-onius* and *Vomanius*.
58. *Fassius*. f. *fasies* MF 41. The only direct parallel appears to be Oscan *fassii[s]* ZO 1. Latin had only *Fassidius*, derived with the Sabellic suffix *-idius*.
59. *Feliginas*. m. *feliḡinate* MF 42 (gen.), *[fel]ḡicinatiu* LF 384 (gen. pl.). The name has parallels in Etruscan *Felcinate/Felcinatne* (*felcinatial* Pe 1.485, 1.1235; *felcinatnal* Cl 1.2673) as well as in Latin *Fulginas* (cf. Schulze 1904:528). The names

are derived from a toponym **Feligin-* (**Felginum* Rix 1965:233 n.133), which may well be identical with *Fulginium/Fulginiae* (modern Foligno in Umbria, on the Via Flaminia).

60. **Fertorius.** m. *fertrio* Cap 391. A patronymic gentilicium derived from *Fertor*, which may be attested from the area in the abbreviation *f*: see §7.7.1.23. Latin had both *Fertorius* and *Hertorius*. (*Fertrio* has also been interpreted as *Fer(e)trio(s)*, but there seem to be no parallels for a gentilicium *Feretrius*.)
61. **Fescuna** or **Hescuna.** m. *hescuna* MLF 346. Derived by Colonna (1990b:123 n.52) from the toponym *Fescennium* in the ager Faliscus, with the spelling *h-* for original /#fV/ (cf. §3.5.2). Latin gentilicia that are perhaps related are *Fescenna* (Schulze 1904:80) and *Fescennius* (Schulze 1904:231). Cf. perhaps also Etruscan *Hescanas* from Volsinii (*hescanas* Vs 7.34, 7.38, *hescan[as]* Vs 7.35, *hes[canas]* Vs 7.36, *hesca[nas]* Vs 7.31, *hescnas* Vs 1.183. 0.23).
62. **Firmius.** m. *ħirmeo* MF 19, *firmio* MF 54, *ħirmio* LF 213; f. *ħirmia* MF 18, *fir-mia* MLF 302. The name has been connected with Latin *Firmius* and the adjective *firmus*, in which case it shows the Faliscan development /#fV/ → /#hV/ in *ħirmeo* MF 19, *ħirmio* LF 213, and *ħirmia* MF 18 (§3.5.2). G. Giacomelli (1963:193) connected it with Etruscan names such as *hermana* MF/Etr 265, in which case the forms with *f-* would be due to hypercorrect (§3.5.2).
63. **Flauilius.** f. *ħlau|elea* LtF 325. The spelling with *hl-* is unique, reflecting a hypercorrect extension of the spelling *h-* for original /#fV/: see §3.5.2. Although Latin had several gentilicia derived from *Flauus/Flauius*, the gentilicium *Flauilius* is not attested for Latin, although its originally Sabellic counterpart *Flauidius* is.
64. **Folcosius.** m. *fulczero* LF 329, *folcozero* LF 330, *folcuso* LF 331, **olcuzero* LF 332, *folcosio* LF 333; also *holc[osi]* MF 140. *Folcosius* is only attested here, although Latin has a closely related gentilicium *Holconius* (see Schulze 1904:169, who also compared gentilicia like *Fulcennius*, *Fulcinius* etc.). These names would appear to be adaptations of an unattested Etruscan **Fulχu* or **Hulχu*: cf. Etruscan *Hulχena* (*hulχenas* Vs 1.28, 1.99, *hulχnas* Vs 2.35) and *Hulχnies* (*hulχnies* AT 5.2, *hulχniesi* Ta 5.2, 5.5, *h[ul]χ[n]iesi* Ta 5.4).
65. **Frenaeus** or **Frenarius.** m. *frenaios* MF 471*. The name is not attested elsewhere: if *frenaios* is an error for *frenarvios*, it could be a newly-formed *Berufsgentiliz* ‘Bridler’, (related to Latin *frenum* ‘bridle’), like *Clipearius* ‘Buckler’. In view of other gentilicia in *-aeus* (*latinaio* MLF 210, *uoltaia* MF 196), the possibility of a gentilicium *Frenaeus* cannot be excluded, cf. Berenguer & Luján 2004:219-20.

66. **Fullonius.** f. *fulonia* MLF 313. Like Latin *Fullonius* and Umbrian *fulonie* Um 7, this name may be derived from Etruscan *Fulu* (19 attestations, mostly from Clusium and Volaterrae) or *Ful(u)na/Ful(u)ne* (27 attestations, mostly from the ager Saenensis). Already Schulze (1904:168) rightly rejected taking this name as a *Berufsgentiliz* derived from Latin *fullo*. G. Giacomelli (1963:194) identified *Ful-* with *Fol-* in *Folcosius*.
67. [**Fuluius.** m. *Fuluius* Lat 250. Also in *CIL* XI.3156 from Falerii Novi.]
68. [**Furius.** m. *fourios* Lat 216. Also in *CIL* XI.3164 and 3170 from Falerii Novi.]
69. [**Genucilius.** m. *genucilio* Cap 435.]
70. **Gr.** abbr. *cr* MF 33. Probably to be interpreted as *Graecius* or *Graecilius*, see *Grae...*
71. **Grae...** *crq[i---]* MF 141, *cre[---]* MF 142, *cr[---]* MF 143; possibly also the abbreviated gentilicium *cr* MF? 33. The fragmentary name is in all probability to be read as *Graec...*, probably *Graecius* (cf. Schulze 1904:522) or perhaps *Graecilius*. Latin has several gentilicia in *Graec-*, and Etruscan had both *Creice* (e.g. *creice* Cl 1.1280; *ET* gives c.20 instances of this gentilicium, from various locations) and *Creicna* (*creicnal* Ar 1.4). The gentilicium may be derived directly from the ethnonym, but also from the praenomen *Graecus* (attested for Faliscan as *kreco* MF 147), especially if this was an existing Etruscan praenomen, as Salomies (1987:71-2) suggests and seems to be implied by the (patronymic) gentilicium *Creicna*: see §7.7.1.26. See also 132. *Raec(i)lius*.

H- see also F-

72. ? **Her-**. Very dubiously attested in *cesit : fere* MF 263. Salomies (1987:73) includes *fere* in her discussion of the praenomina *Herius* and *Herennius* (cf. §7.7.1.27), but G. Giacomelli (1963:192) and Hirata (1967:51) regarded it as a gentilicium (cf. perhaps *Hirius* in *CIL* XI.2980 from Tuscania?).
73. **Hermana.** *hermana* MF/Etr 265, cf. Etr *her* Etr VI-VII. An Etruscan gentilicium occurring also in *hermanas* Cl 2.11, cf. also *Hermena* (*hermenas* Pa 3.1 *h]ermenas* Vs 1.152, perhaps also *h]ermenaiē* Ve 3.19). Latin has *Herminius* and *Hermenius*. G. Giacomelli (1963:192) connected the gentilicium *Firminus* (see above) with this name.
74. **Hirpius.** m. *irpios* Cap 389. Since the name has been read correctly by Briquel (1972:833-7) as *irpios* rather than the *srpios* of all previous editors, it has become possible to connect it with the cult of the *Hirpi Sorani* on Mount Soracte (see §2.3.4): in Pliny's account (*NH* 7.2.19), these are described as "familiae sunt per-paucae quae uocantur *Hirpi*". A Latin gentilicium *Hirpius* was already known (Schulze 1904:234): see §6.6.5.

75. *Ie...* in *ie[---]* MF 93. Various possible names may be found in Hirata 1967:54 and Solin & Salomies 1994:95-6. Cf. perhaps *iegia · ty|che* CIL XI.3447 from Tarquinii, or Paelignian *ieis* nPg 8?
76. *Iunius*. m. *iunio* Cap 462. The gentilicium is derived from the specifically Faliscan praenomen *Iuna* (for which see §7.7.1.29): in view of the frequency of this praenomen, however, it is surprising to find only one early attestation of the gentilicium (and that from the ager Capenas): the name further occurs in CIL XI.3174 from Falerii Novi, and in CIL XI.3934 from Capena. Note that the Latin gentilicium *Iunius* was derived by H. Petersen (1962:352) from the name of the month rather than from the praenomen.
77. *L...* in *l[---]* MF 158.
78. *Lartius*. f. *lartia* in *tana | lartia* MLF 338. It is unclear whether *lartia* is a patronymic gentilicium or a patronymic adjective: in either case, it is derived from the Etruscan praenomen *Larθ* (see §7.7.1.35), like the corresponding Latin gentilicium *Lartius*.
79. *Latinaeus*. m. *latinaio* MLF 210. Perhaps derived from the Latin ethnicon *Latinus* rather than from Etruscan gentilicium *Latini* (c.70 attestations, nearly all from Clusium) or *Latine* (Cm 2.57, *latines* Ve 2.4). For the derivation, see G. Giacomelli 1962.
80. *Latrius*. m. *latrio* MLF 324, *latrius* Lat 218; f. *latria* MF 75. Latin *Latrius* (and *Laterius*?), Etruscan *latrnei* CI 1.501, perhaps also Latin *Latronius* and Etruscan *laθruni* Pe 1.1091.
81. *Laeuius*. m. *leuieis* Lat 251 (abl. pl.); f. *leuia* LtF 327 (possibly a praenomen, see §7.7.1.32).
82. *Laeuilius*. m. *leueli* MF 14 (gen.), *le[ueli]o* MF 146; f. *leue[li]a* MF 147. The name also occurs as a praenomen, see §7.7.1.33. *Laeuius* is in all probability a patronymic derivation from the praenomen *Laeuus*, while *Laeuilius* is in its turn a patronymic derivation from the name *Laeuius*. This praenomen is derived from the adjective *laeuus* ‘well-omened’: see §7.7.1.32-33 on the praenomina *Laeuius* and *Laeuilius*. (Cf. also the praenomen *Scaeuia*, §7.7.1.58) G. Giacomelli (1963:199) rejected a possible connection with *Linius*; Hirata (1967:57) unnecessarily suggested a connection with *Laelius*.
83. *Le...* in *le[---]* MF 148, which may be read as *Lae-*, *Le-*, or *Li-*.
84. *Lepuius* (*Laepuius*?). f. *lepuia* MF 144. Unclear: there are no Latin, Etruscan or Sabellic gentilicia that appear to be related, in spite of the suggestions made by G. Giacomelli (1963:199), Hirata (1967:56), and others (which all concentrate on *Lep-* in stead of on *Lepu-*). Cf. perhaps Latin *Laeponius*, which appears to be an

adaptation of an Etruscan **Laipu*: this *Laipu* might have been adapted in a different way in Faliscan to *Laepuius*.

85. **Letaeus**. m. *letei* MF 470* (gen.). This unique name clearly renders the equally unique Etruscan *leθaie* Etr XLVIII, probably derived from *lete* Sp 2.109: on these names, see Vetter 1948:67-72 (who regards these as names implying descent from serfs or bondsmen).
86. **Licinius**. m. *licinio* MF 259-260. Latin *Licinius*, an adaptation of Etruscan *Licine* (*lik[fin]e* Cl 2.18, *licinesi* Cr 3.13 *licineši* Cr 3.18; *licnef* Vs 2.38, *licni* Ta 1.1222, Cl 1.2206, *licnis* Cl 1.2207).
87. **Lin...** perhaps in *ca lin[---]re zo[---]* MF 57. Herbig (1910:187) read *calin[---]* with the gentilicium *Calinius*, see above.
88. [**Lucilius**. m. *loucilios* Lat 268 (import). Also in *CIL* XI.3109 from Falerii Novi.]
89. **Lullius**. m. *lullio* MLF 207. Latin *Lollius* (*CIL* XI.7487 from Falerii and 3864, 3887 from the ager Capenas), and *Lulleius*, *Lolleius*, Etruscan *Lule* (*lule* Cl 1.394, *luleśa* Cl 1.395, 1.1470, 1.2589; *lulia* Cl 1.1136, 1.1955). The spelling with *ll* is surprising (cf. §11.2.5.5 and §3.5.5.3).
90. **Lurius**. f. *louria* MF 41.
91. **Luriaeus** or **Lurieus**. f. *loriea* MLF 314.
The second gentilicium is in all probability a derivation from the first, either *Lurieus* (G. Giacomelli 1963:200-1) or *Luriaeus*.¹³⁴ The gentilicia *Lurius* and *Lurianus* occur also in *CIL* XI.3181 from Falerii Novi. G. Giacomelli (1963:200-1) and Hirata (1967:58) also pointed to *Loreius*.
92. **Ma**. abbr. *ma* Lat 451-452. It is also possible to read *na*.
93. **Maecius**. m. *mecio* MLF 211. Latin *Maecius*.
94. **Mallius** (or **Manlius?**). m. *malio* MF 39. Latin *Mallius*. The name could also be read as *ma(n)lio* = Latin *Manlius*, which occurs in *CIL* XI.3254 from Sutri.
95. **Manius**. f. *m{e}ania* LF 224, *mania* LF 225. *M{e}ania* is an error for *mania* (as appears both from the inscription and from the fact that both inscriptions refer to the same person), not a distinct gentilicium (thus e.g. G. Giacomelli (1963:204-5) and Hirata (1967:61)). Like Latin *Manius*, it is either a gentilicium derived from the praenomen *Manius*, or directly from the adjective *manus* (which is also found in the Faliscan cognomina, see §7.9).

¹³⁴ I do not understand what phonetic realisation of this name is intended in Rix's remark (1994:94) on *loriea*, ">iea< Schreibung für [iəa] wie in etr. *θaniae*, *Veliea*": the *e* is apparently assumed to be non-syllabic.

96. ? *Manilius*. m. *manileo* MLF 355. Like Latin *Manilius*, it is a patronymic gentilicium derived from the praenomen *Manius*. (Cf. also the gentilicium *Manius*.) The form *manileo* occurs without context: it is therefore also possible to read the text as *m anileo* (cf. above under *Annilius*),
97. *Marcena*. m. *macena* MF 269, *mar||cna* MF 270. The Etruscan gentilicium *Marcna/Marχna*, *Marcne/Marχne*, *Marcni/Marχni* is very well attested (c.155 attestations, mostly from Clusium). I doubt whether this name is the direct basis of the gentilicium *Marcus* (below).
98. *Marcus*. m. *marc[---]* MF 152, *marcio* LF 228 (perhaps rather a patronymic adjective); f. *marcia* LF 227 (probably a gentilicium rather than a patronymic adjective). Like Latin *Marcus*, the name is probably a patronymic gentilicium derived from the praenomen *Marcus*, rather than adaptation of Etruscan *Marcena*. (In that case, the expected form would probably be *Marcinius*, a gentilicium that does in fact occur in Latin: cf. Schulze 1904:188.)
99. *Marhius*. m. *marhio* LF 336. The name may be connected to *Marcus* (above), but G. Giacomelli (1963:204) may well have been right in pointing rather to Campano-Etruscan *mar-hie-s*. Cm 6.1 and suggesting a connection with the Oscan praenomen *Marahis* (e.g. *marahis* Cm 14.C6, *μαραηις* Lu 2, *marahieis* Cm 28, *μαραειν* Lu 46), which may go back to an older (Etrusco-Sabellic?) */marxio-/.
100. *Morren-*. f. *morenez* MF 269. The name is an Etruscoid form in *-ez* = *-es* (cf. §3.5.3, §9.2.2). *Morenez* is an adaptation of an Etruscan gentilicium such as Etruscan *Murina/Murine/Murini* (32 attestations, mainly from the ager Saenensis). There are no direct Latin equivalents: G. Giacomelli (1963:206) and Hirata (1967:62) pointed to Latin gentilicia in *Murr-*.
101. [*Munius*. *munio* Lat 337. The name also occurs in *CIL* XI.3941 from Capena.]
102. *Na*. abbr. *na* Lat 451-452. It is also possible to read *ma*.
103. *Narionius*. m. *narionio* MLF 206. Probably related to Latin *Naronius*: G. Giacomelli (1963:207) pointed to other names where there are derivational variants *-onius* and *-ionius*. *Nar(i)onius* may be connected to the name of the nearby river *Nar*: cf. the Latin gentilicium *Narius* (Schulze 1904:80). Cf. also Etruscan *Nari* (*nar[i]* Pe 1.1126, *n[ari]* Pe 1.1127, *naria* Cl 1.2008, 2009, *narial* Pe 1.813, *nari[al]* Pe 1.1080, *naries* Cl 1.2010).
104. *Neln...* *nel[n---]* LtF 299, f.? *neln* LtF 300 (abbreviated?). The name is entirely unclear: *Neln...* could conceivably reflect *Naelēn-/Naelīn-*, *Nelēn-/Nelīn-* or *Nilēn-/Nilīn-*, but none of these possibilities has any parallels in Latin, Etruscan or the Sabellic languages.

- 105. *Neronius*.** m. *ne-roni* MF **15**, *neroni* LtF **325**, *ne[?]/ro[---]* LtF **328**; *ne[oni.]* MF **16**, *neroni* LtF **340**. Latin *Neronius*, probably originally from a Sabellic **ner*. Cf. the abbreviated Umbrian praenomen *ner* Um 10, 21, also occurring in Latin inscriptions from Umbria (attestations in Salomies 1987:80).
- 106. *No*.** abbr. *no* Cap **425**.
- 107. *Nomesina*.** m. *nomes|ina* MF **272**. *Nomesina* is the Faliscan rendering of Etruscan *Numōina* (*numōinal* Cl 1.969, 1.1102, 1.1596, 1.2026, *numō[i]nal* Cl 1.1103; *numōine* Cl 1.2027). Etruscan also had *Numōie* (*numōie* Cl 1.753, *numōi* Cl 1.2025, 1.2028, *numōis* Pe 1.197, 1.198): this appears in Latin as *Numisius/Nomisius*, e.g. in *CIL* XI.3110 and 3176 from Falerii, and in *CIL* XI.2958 from Tuscania.¹³⁵ These gentilicia are derived from the Sabellic praenomen *Nu-mesis/Nomesis*: see §7.7.1.45). Cf. the theonym *numesio · m[art]e* in LtF **377**.
- 108. *Orticensis*.** m. *ortecese* MLF **339**; cf. Etruscan *urtcsnas* Etr **XXXV**. *Orteces-* and *urtcs-* are in all probability connected (Colonna 1990b:136), and appear to be derived from the same toponym: this cannot be *Horta*, as G. Giacomelli (1963:209) has convincingly shown, but rather an unknown **Ortica*/**Orticum*.¹³⁶ This may be related to the name of modern *Corchiano* (older *Orchiano*): see §6.5.11.
- 109. *Oscin*.** *oşcin** LtF **301** (abbr.?). The text and the possible parallels for the name are unclear: cf. perhaps Latin *Hoscinius* and Etruscan *Huzcena* (*huzcna[s]* Ta 1.250, *huzcna[i]* Ta 1.50, 1.51, *huzcneşc* Ta 1.185, *huzcena[s]* Cr 2.74), although this requires an omission of *h-* that is not attested for Faliscan (§3.5.2).
- 110. *P*.** abbr. *p* **454**.
- 111. *Pa*.** abbr. *pa* Cap **457**.
- 112. *Pacius*.** m. *pacios* Cap **392**. Like Latin *Pacius*, the name is derived from the well-attested Oscan praenomen *Pacis* (e.g. *pakis* Cp 37,9: for the many attestations, see *ST*). In the Sabellic languages, however, the gentilicium only occurs in Paelignian *pacia* Pg 4 (cf. also the Samnitic abbreviation *pk* Sa 51).
- 113. *Pani...*** in *pani[---]* LtF **239**. Perhaps Latin *Panicus*? Cf. also Etruscan *Pance* from Caere (*pa]nces* Cr 1.66, *panci* Cr 1.59, *panc[i]* Cr 1.64).
- 114. *Panur...*** in *au cau | panur* **459**. It is doubtful if *panur* is indeed a gentilicium: it may be an abbreviation of the (slave?) name Πανούργος (Deecke 1888:217), cf. the *N. Munitor Panurcus* in *CIL* XI.3166 from Falerii Novi.

¹³⁵ *L. Numisius Viator* in *CIL* XI.3110, however, gives his tribus as *Pollia* and *L. Numisius Proculus* in *CIL* XI.2958 as *Stellatina*, whereas the tribus of Falerii was the *Horatia* (§2.6.2).

¹³⁶ The name may also have been **Hortica*/**Horticum*, but neither Faliscan *ortecese* nor Etruscan *urtcsnas* has *h-*, and there are no certain attestations of omission of *h-* in Faliscan (§3.5.2).

115. ? *Partius*. m. *partis* MF 79. The curious ending is the result either of an abbreviation (cf. Latin *Partiscius*?) or of a rare and irregular syncopation /-ios/ → /-is/ (§3.6.6.2) accompanied by an equally rare retention of -s (§3.5.7d). There are no corresponding names in Latin or Etruscan: G. Giacomelli (1963:210) and Hirata (1967:66) compared Etruscan *partunus* Ta 1.9, 1.13, 1.15, and *parθanaś* Cl 1.2035, and Latin *Partuleius*.
116. *Paucius*. f. *pauiceo* MF 12, *pai[ceo* LtF 290, and perhaps to be restored in *cauio* [: *pauiceo* :] | *ruso* [?---] MF 318. (This restoration is based on the assumption that the inscription contains a cognomen *ruso* and that this cognomen also occurs in *ce · pai[ceo ru]so* LtF 290.) G. Giacomelli 1963:210 equated the name with Latin *Paucius*, comparing also Latin *Paullius*. I greatly doubt the connection with *Faucius* suggested by Hirata 1967:66-7.
117. *Pe*. abbr. *pe* Lat 406, perhaps also Cap 403, if the inscription, *kape*, is to be read as *ka pe*. Perhaps *Pescennius*, see below.
118. *Pescennius*. m. *pscni* Cap 387. Latin *Pescennius* (and *Pescenius*). Schulze (1904:80) connected this name with the Etruscan gentilicium *Fescenna* in *CIL* XIV.1016 from Ostia, which in turn would be connected with the toponym *Fescennium*, one of the major sites of the ager Faliscus. Cf. also *Hescuna* (above).
119. *Petronius*. m. *peṭṛoṇeṭ* MF 473*; f. *petrunes* LF 226. A patronymic gentilicium from the Sabellic numeric praenomen *Petro* (see §7.7.1.50). The name occurs in Etruscan as *Petru/Petruī* (more than 130 attestations) and as *Petruna/Petruni/Petrunie* (together with *Petrn-* more than 50 attestations), in Latin as *Petronius* (e.g. *CIL* XI.3207 from Nepi), in Marrucinian as *petroni* MV 3, and in Paelignian as *ptruna* Pg 52. The *u* in *petrunes* LF 226 may be due to Etruscan influence (cf. §3.6.3, §7.8.2).
120. [*Plarius*. f. *plaria* Cap 431.]
121. *Pleina*. m. *pleina* MF 80, *pleina* MF/Etr 199, *plenes* LtF 231, *plenese* Lat 251 (dat.). Intriguingly, this obviously Etruscan name does not appear to be attested elsewhere: whether it is identical with or related to *plinialc* Ta 1.113 is unclear. Schulze (1904:89) and Stolte (1928:296) hesitated to equate this name with Latin *Plinius* (*Plīnius*) because of the spelling Πλίσιος (without diphthong) in *SIG* 558: they preferred to connect the name with *Pleius*.
122. ? *Poenus*. perhaps *poef*[?---] MF? 130, and *puiatu* MLF? 208. [Cf. perhaps also *puiunal* Etr XX.] The attestations are very doubtful. G. Giacomelli compared Latin *Poenus* and Etruscan *Puina* (*puina* Vt 1.137, 4.1).
123. *Polfaeus*. m. *polafio* (= *polfavio*) MLF 354. Hirata suggested that the name was a misspelling for *polfavio* (cf. also *latinaio* MLF 210, *uoltaia* MF 196), comparing

names like *Polfennius*. This is a plausible solution: Schulze (1904:216) in fact gave a number of names formed from a base *Polf-/Pulf-*, while Etruscan has a well-attested gentilicium *Pulfna* (more than 45 attestations in *ET*, all from Clusium). Cf. also Marrucinian *polfenis* MV 1, Paelignian *polf* Pg 13.

124. **Popi.** abbr. *popi* Cap 421. Probably *Popius* or *Popilius*. See also under *Pupius*.
125. [**Popilius.** m. *popil[i]* Lat 295, *popili* Lat 296, *popili* Lat 478* (all imports).]
126. **Praeconus** or **Preconus.** m. in [---?] *precono*[---] *cuitenet*[---] *let* MLF 361. Although the inscription is fragmentary and difficult to interpret, the name *precono* appears to be certain. Latin had a gentilicium *Praeconius*, which Schulze (1904:87 n.4) hesitatingly connected to Etruscan *Percenna*, which he in turn derived from the Oscan praenomen *perkens* Cm 6, *perkedn[eis]* Cm 6. If that is correct, the Latin and Faliscan name may (originally) have been *Pre-* rather than *Prae-*. For a Faliscan *Praeconus* beside a Latin *Praeconius*, see §7.8.2.
127. **Protacius.** m. *protacio* LF 242, *p]rotacio* LF 244. For the name, see Schulze (1904:97, 366). Latin *Protacius* is attested in *CIL* XI.3208 from Nepi, *CIL* VI.25097 (twice) from Rome,¹³⁷ and probably also in *CIL* XII.5728 from Antibes.
128. **Ps.** abbr. *ps* Cap 415. Perhaps *P(e)s(cennius)*, attested for the ager Capenas.
129. **Pupilius** or **Pupelius.** m. *pupelio* MF 149, *pu]pe*[i---] MF 150, *pup[elio* MF 151. In all probability a patronymic gentilicium derived from a praenomen *Pupius*, which in its turn is derived from the praenomen *Pupus*: see §7.7.1.53. *Pupilius* may be identical with *Popilius*, with the *u* due to Etruscan influence, but note the quantitative difference between the Latin gentilicia in *Pöp-* and those in *Pūp-* (Schulze 1904:213). Latin had *Pupilius* as well as *Pupelius*.
130. ? **Pupius.** f. *pupias* MLF 304 (gen.). The name occurs in isolation and may be a praenomen or a gentilicium (both PRAENOMEN and GENTILICIUM appear in women's names in *Besitzerinschriften*, see §7.4.1). If it is a gentilicium, the name is probably identical with Latin *Pupius*. Alternatively, it could be identical with *Popius*, probably attested in *popi* Cap 421, in which case the *u* could be due to Etruscan influence: see under *Pupilius*. For *Pupia* as a praenomen, see §7.7.1.53.
131. [**Quintus** or **Quintius:** *quinti* Lat 477* (import).]
132. **Raec(i)lius.** m. *Reiç[lio]* MF 98, *reiclio* MF 99; *rei[cli.]* MF 100. G. Giacomelli (1963:215) pointed to a Latin *Raecilius* as a parallel, but this gentilicium is not mentioned in Solin & Salomies 1994: the closest parallels are Latin *Raecius* (e.g. in *CIL* XI.3206 from Nepi) and Etruscan *Reicna* (8 attestations, all from Clu-

¹³⁷ Renzetti Marra (1990:331 n.17) points to the fact that the *M. Protacius Regulus* in this text is from the *Horatia*, which was also the tribe of Roman Falerii: see §2.6.2.

- sium). Kretschmer (1943:158) pointed to *Raec-* : *Graec-* (cf. Ῥαικός· Ἑλλην Hesyeh. ρ 58 Latte/Hansen). *Raec-* appears to be limited to the Northern Adriatic and Istrian coast. Torelli (1967:536) proposed to read MF 99 as *p]reiclio*, with a gentilicium *Praec(i)lius* that occurs also in *CIL* XI.3181 from near Fabbrica di Roma, but, although possible in MF 98 and 99, this is unlikely in the case of *rej[cli.]* MF 100, where the name stands at the beginning of the line.
133. *S...* in (1) *ḡ*[---]* MF 197; (2) *s[---]* LtF 173.
134. *Sab.* abbr. Cap 400. In all probability *Sabinus*.
135. *Sacconius.* *zaconio* MF 153, *zaconiai* MF 154 (gen. or dat.). Latin *Sacconius*, an adaptation of Etruscan *Σαχου* (*σάχου* Cl 1.2499, 1.2500, Pe 1.1175, *σαχους* OA 2.40, *σάχους* Pe 1.423, *σάχους* Cr 2.40, *σάκουσα* Cl 1.1911).
136. [? *Saluena.* m. *salu[e]na* (or *salu[i]na*?) Lat 218. The name apparently occurs only here in Latin: Etruscan had *Salvina* (*salvinal* Cl 1.1643, *śalvinei* Cl 1.2346.)
137. *Sapnonius.* f. *sapnonia* MF 258. There are no direct parallels in either Latin or Etruscan. The closest parallel is Etruscan *Sapu* (*sapu* Cl 1.2358, *śapu* Cl 3.3, *σαπούσα* Cl 1.1139, *śαπούσα* AS 1.461, Cl 1.2016), which was adapted in Latin to *Sapnonius*, but the formation of this gentilicium is different. Perhaps *Sapnonius* is an adaptation of an Etruscan gentilicium **Sap()nu*.
138. ? *Sarius.* m. *sares* Cap 404. Latin *Sarius*, Vestinian *saries* MV 11. It is not necessary to try to connect the name to that of Mount Soracte, as did Hirata 1967:73.
139. *Satellius* or *Satilius.* f. *satelie* MF 42. Latin *Satellius*, *Satilius*, Etruscan *Σατνα* (*σατνα-/σάτνα-*, 24 attestations, mainly from Clusium, cf. *ET*).
140. *Sedius* or *Saedius.* f. (?) *sediu* Cap 466. The closest parallel is Latin *Sedius* or *Saedius* (Schulze 1904:93) but in view of the suffix the name appears to be of Sabellic origin and be a monophthongized form of the Sabellic gentilicium *Saidius*, which occurs in Oscan *saidiieis* Cp 9.
141. *Sentius.* m. *sentu* Cap 399, *sen-ti* Cap 430; f. *senθia* MLF 362, perhaps also *[---]nθia* MLF 212. Latin *Sentius*, Etruscan *Sente/Σente* (21 attestations, mainly from Clusium).
142. ?*Seralius:* *seralia* LF 380. There are no parallels for this gentilicium: could it be a misspelling for e.g. *serania* or *seratia*?
143. *Sertinius.* f. *zertenea* LF 222. Like Latin *Sertinius*, it is an adaptation of Etruscan *Zertna* (*zertnai* Ta 1.52, 53, *zertnas* Vs 1.205): the *z-* in Faliscan *zertenea* probably reflects the *z-* in the Etruscan form.
144. *Sertorius.* m. *setorio* MLF/Cap 476*. Latin *Sertorius*, occurring in *CIL* XI.3181 from Fabbrica di Roma. Probably a patronymic gentilicium from the praenomen

Sertor (cf. Salomies 1987:46-7), which was apparently of Etruscan origin (*ser-tur/serθur/sertur/serθur*: for attestations, see *ET*).

145. **Seruatronius**. f. *zeruatronia* MF 272. Latin *Seruatronius* also occurs in *CIL* X.8230 from Capua. The name is Etruscan: cf. Schulze 1904:342 on the derivations in *-atronius*, Etruscan *-atru*.
146. **Seruius**. m. *serui* MF 34-36 (gen. or abbr. nom.). It is impossible to ascertain whether *serui* is a praenomen or a gentilicium: as both PRAENOMEN and GENTILICIUM occur in Faliscan *Besitzerinschriften* (§7.3), both are possible. – The gentilicium *Seruius* has parallels in Etruscan *śervei* Pe 1.1191, *śervi* Pe 1.1190, and in Latin *Seruius* and *Seruilus*. It is probably unconnected with the noun *seruus* (sometimes thought to be of Etruscan origin, cf. Bréyer 1993:383-5).
147. **Spurilius**. m. *spur[ilio]* LF 248, *spurilius* Lat 237, *spurilius* Lat 238, perhaps to be restored in *[---]ilio* LtF 215. Latin *Spurilius*. A patronymic gentilicium derived from the praenomen *Spurius*, which is ultimately of Etruscan origin (cf. Salomies 1987:50-6). This derivation in all probability originated within Latin, and although *Spurilius* can therefore be equated with Etruscan patronymic gentilicia like *Spurinna*, it is not an adaptation of an Etruscan gentilicium.
148. **Succonius**. f. *zuconia* MF 271, probably also m. *zu[con]||eo* MF 56, perhaps also *[--- ue?]l su|[con ---]* MF 191. Cf. *larisa zuχus* Etr XXXII. Latin *Succonius*: the name is an adaptation of Etruscan *Sucu* (from Caere: *sucus* Cr 1.152, 1.155, 1.172, 2.31, *sucui* Cr 1.100) or *Zuχu* (mainly from Clusium: *zuχu* Cl 1.1619, 1.1769, 1.1770, 1.2173, *zuχús* Cl 1.1771; *zuχus* Vs 1.136, *zuχús* Pe 1.965). A *Socconia Voluptas* occurs in *CIL* XI.3223 from Nepi.
149. **T...** m. *†**(*)[i]* MF 84 (gen.). The name can be read as either *Ta...* or *Tri...*, but the *talī* read by Herbig (1910:101 etc.), which would tie in with the Latin gentilicium *Talius*, is perhaps too short.
150. **Tar...** perhaps in *uentarc[i]....* MF 80, if this can be read as *uen tar[.....* ‘Ven(el) Tar...’. Latin and Etruscan have several gentilicia in *Tar-* (perhaps *Tarc-* or *Tarqu-*?).
151. **Tertineius**. m. *tertinei* MLF/Cap 474* (gen.), *tertineo* LF 213. *Tertineius* is apparently attested only for Faliscan: Latin has *Tertinius*.
152. **Tetena** or **Tetena**. m. *tetena* MF 266.
153. **Tettius**. m. *teti* MF 11.
Latin *Tettius* (thrice in *CIL* XI.2990 from Tuscania, also in Paelignian *tettia* Pg 16. The name also occurs as a praenomen: see §7.7.1.72. In Etruscan, the gentilicium is *Tetina* (70 attestations in *ET*, mainly from Clusium and the ager Saenensis) or *Tetna* (19 attestations, mostly from Clusium). Cf. also South Picene *ti-*

- tenom* TE.3? *Tettius* may be an adaptation of the Etruscan name (G. Giacomelli 1963:223 and Hirata 1967:78-9), but in view of the existence of a praenomen *Tettius* (cf. Salomies 1987:93), attested from the ager Faliscus in *teti* MF 13, the names might be entirely unconnected (cf. above one *Marcena* and *Marcus*). Latin has a number of gentilicia in *Tetti-*, which need not all be derived from the Etruscan gentilicium.
154. ***Tiberilius***. f. *tiperilia* LF 229. A patronymic gentilicium derived from the praenomen *Tiberius*, itself derived from the potamonym *Tiberis*. Note that *tiperilia* is the Faliscan spelling of the Latin gentilicium *Tiberilius*: the Faliscan form would have been **Tiferilios*, cf. perhaps *tif* MLF 460 (either a praenomen or a gentilicium). The gentilicium is not attested from Etruscan (but cf. the gentilicium *teperi* Pe 1.865, *teperial* Pe 1.875, 1.880) or the Sabellic languages.
155. ***Tirrius***. m. *tirio* MLF 351, *tirio* MLF 358; f. *ṭiria* MF 155. A patronymic gentilicium derived from the Faliscan praenomen *Tirrus* (see §7.7.1.74). The gentilicium is attested for Latin in *CIL* XI.3132 from near Civita Castellana - Falerii Novi: for Etruscan cf. perhaps *tiria* TC 2, 16, 28, *tiṛia* TC 37, *tiriiai* TC 26?
156. ***Tullius***. m. *tulio* MLF 346; *tulie* MLF 383. A patronymic gentilicium derived from the praenomen *Tullus* (see §7.7.1.77). The gentilicium also appears in Latin (e.g. *CIL* XI.3036 and 3037 from near Viterbo): in Etruscan, it occurs as *tule* Ar 1.94.
157. ***Turius***. m. *turi* MF 273 (and the abbreviation *t* MLF 274 on the same vessel); f. *turia* MF 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27; [and without context probably also *tur* MF? 44 and *tu* MF? 38]. Latin has a gentilicium *Turius*, which occurs e.g. in *CIL* XI.3038 from near Viterbo and *CIL* XI.3064 from Horta. There are no equivalents or cognates in Etruscan or the Sabellic languages.
158. [***Umbricius***. *u]mpricius* Lat 219. Also in *CIL* XI.3254 from Sutri.]
159. ***Umbricianus***. m. *upreciano* MLF 363, *upreciano* MLF 364.
- The attestations of *Umbricus* and of *Umbricianus* were found in the same tomb as Etruscan *umrie* Etr XLIII. Pace Schulze (1904:258), Stolte (1928:300), and G. Giacomelli (1963:232), the basis of these names is clearly the ethnonym of the Umbrians. The Etruscan names *umres* AS 1.174, *umria* Cl 1.2620, 1.2621, *umṛias* Cl 1.1294, *umriās* Cl 1.2621, and *umriś* Pe 1.1268 as well as Latin *Umbricus* (and *Umberius*) reflect the ethnonym **Umbros* which appears in Latin as *Umbros* and in Greek as Ὀμβρος. *Umbricius* may have been derived as *Umbr-icius* within the Latin onomasticon, but the Etruscan gentilicium *Umrce* (*umrceś* AS 1.129, *umrcial* AS 1.395) shows that it is more likely to have been derived as *Umbricius* from a different ethnonym also reflected by Greek Ὀμβρικός. Neither the ethnonyms nor the names are attested for the Sabellic onomasticon.

160. ? *Vatius*. f. *uatia* perhaps in *uei uatia* MLF 463 (but its companion inscription has *uei ueto* MLF 464, if this is not a *falsum*). Both attestations are doubtful. If attested, the gentilicium has an equivalent in Latin *Vatius*.

Ve- see also *Vi-*

161. [*Vecilius*. m. *uecilio* Lat 251 (twice).]

162. *Veculius*. f. [*u]eculia* MF 80, *u[eculi]a* MF 81.

I wonder whether *Vecilius* and *Veculius* are not in fact the same name. Latin had both *Vecilius* and *Vicilius*, and *Veculius* occurs in *CIL* XI.3843 from Veii. G. Giacomelli pointed to an Etruscan gentilicium *Vecu*, but the expected adaptation of that name would be *Veconius/Viconius* (which is in fact attested for Latin, see below under *Vicon(i)us*). Whether *Vecilius/Veculius* is identical with *Vicin(i)us/Vecin(i)us* (thus Stolte 1928:299) is another matter.

163. ? *Ve...* (*Veianius*?). *uei*[*---*] LtF 327, perhaps also *uei* LtF 205 (abbr.). Both attestations are very unclear: the name may be *Veianius*, attested in *CIL* XI.3197 from Nepi, *CIL* XI.3805 from Veii, *lazi veiane-s*· Etr XI-XIV and *lazi veianes*· Etr XV, and in Varro (“fratres Veianii ex agro Falisco” *R.* 3.16.10),

164. *Vel*. abbr. *uel* Cap 424.

165. *Velminaeus* (or possibly *Velmineius* or *Velminius*). m. *uelmineo* MLF 305, *uelmineo* MLF 307, *uelmineo* MLF 308, *uelmineo* MLF 309, *uelmineo* MLF 310, *uelmineo* MLF 312, *uelmineo* MLF 313, *uelmineo* MLF 315, perhaps misspelled *uelmi|no* MLF 316, [*u]elmi[ne-]* MLF 317. The name is in all probability an adaptation of the Etruscan gentilicium *Velimna* (*velimna* Pe 1.142 etc.: 23 attestations, from Clusium and Perugia). For the curious metathesis in Etruscan *velimn-*: Faliscan *uelmin-*, G. Giacomelli (1963:228-9) rightly compared Latin *Volminius* *CIL* VI.21470 and the more common *Volumnius*, both likewise derived from *Velimna*. She also pointed to an Etruscan inscription from Veii (now Ve 3.19), *je]m̄eṇaie muluuanic[*, which can be restored as *v]e]m̄eṇaie* (cf. Ribezzo 1931c:93-4).¹³⁸ From the Faliscan instances it is unclear whether the ending *-eo* in *uelmineo* represents *-ios/*, *-ēos/* ← *-ēios/*, or *-ēos/* ← *-āios/*: see §3.7.6.

166. ? *Venelius*. *ueneliēs* MF 258. A patronymic gentilicium derived from the Etruscan praenomen *Venel*, possibly attested also from the ager Faliscus (see §7.7.1.83). Latin *Venilius*, and a direct parallel in Etruscan *venelies* Vc 2.10.

167. ? *Ventarc...* *uentarc[.....]* MF 80. Unclear: there are no parallels from the Latin, Etruscan or Sabellic onomasticon that can be restored, nor is it clear if the name is really a (second?) gentilicium. Perhaps it can be divided as *uen tarc[.....]*: see *Tar-*.

¹³⁸ *ET* gives the text as [*-?- h]e]m̄eṇaie muluuanic[e -?-]*, which is equally possible (see the drawing in Giglioli 1930:307). Both *Velmenaie* and *Hermenaie* do not occur elsewhere.

168. *Vestius*. m. *uesθi* MF 83 (abbr.). Latin *Vestius*, perhaps of Etruscan origin.
169. [*Vettius*. m. *uettius* Lat 456.]
170. *Vetulus*. f. *uetulia* LF 334 (and m. *uetulio* LF 336, if not a *falsum*). The name has parallels in Latin *Vetulus*, Etruscan *vetlnei* Pe 1.336 and *vetlnal* Cl 1.1467.
- Vi- see also Ve-**
171. *Vi*. abbr. *ui* Cap 414.
172. *Vicina*. m. *uicina* MLF 371, *uicina* MLF 372. There are no attestations of this name in Etruscan: the closest cognate is *veicnas* Vs 1.203, *veceņes* Ta 7.29. In spite of the different vocalism, this name may therefore be identical with *Vicinius*/*Vecinius*.
173. *Vicinius* or *Vecinius*. m. *uecineo* LF 220, *uecineo* LF 224, *uecineo* LF 225; f. *uecin[e]a* LF 222, *uecinea* LF 223. G. Giacomelli (1963:226) equated the name with Latin *Vecenius*, an adaptation of Etruscan *Vecena* (*veceņes* Ta 7.29), but the name may be identical with Latin *Vicinius* and an adaptation of Etruscan *Veicna* (*veicnas* Vs 1.203). If so, it could be identical with *uicina* MF 371, 372 (see above under *Vicina*).
174. *Vicon(i)us*: *ueicoņo* MF 88, perhaps also in *tuconu* MF 85, if this can be read as *t u(e)comu*. Latin has *Veconius*, *Vecconius*, and *Viconius*. The names are adaptations of the Etruscan gentilicium *Vecu*, attested for Clusium (*vecu* Cl 1.843, 1.844, 1.845, 1.846, 1.847, 1.851, OI S.52, *vecui* Cl 1.848, 1.849, *vecuā* Cl 1.852, *vecus* Cl 1.850). For a Faliscan *Veconus* beside Latin *Veconius*, see §7.8.2.
175. ?*Vinu...* possibly in [---] *uinu[---]* MLF 365. Latin *Vinucius*, Etruscan *vinucenas* Vs 1.126, Oscan *viņikiis* Po 3, all apparently derived from the praenomen attested in Praesamnitic *vinuņs* Ps 3 and the patronymic adjective *viniciiu* Ps 3.
176. ?*Viui...* perhaps in *uiui[---]* MF 157.
177. *Vis(i)nius*. m. *uisni* MF 82 (abbr. or gen.). The name has parallels in Latin *Visinius* (e.g. *CIL* XI.3614 from Caere) and *Vesnius*, and in Etruscan *Viσ(e)na/ Viσne* (*viσenas* Vs 1.9 and *viσnai* Vc 1.31, *viσnalś* Vc 1.92, *viσnei* Vc 1.53).
178. *Vo*. abbr. *uo* MF? 29, Cap 429.
179. *Vollius*. f. *uollia* MF 47; *uoll[---]* MF 86. Other attestations of this name are perhaps *uli* MF? 261-262, if this can be read as *u(o)li*. Latin likewise had a gentilicium *Vollius* or *Volius*.¹³⁹ The spelling with *ll* is surprising (cf. §11.2.5.5 and §3.5.3.3); cf. *Lullius*.

¹³⁹ I fail to see why Hirata (1967) included this name under *Volta*: even if *Vollius* and *Volta* are ultimately derived from the Etruscan praenomen *Vel*, they are derived in entirely different ways, and *Vollius* can in no way be considered to be a regular derivation from *Volta*.

- 180. *Voltaeus*.** f. *uoltaia* MF **196**. A gentilicium derived from the Faliscan praenomen *Volta* (see §7.7.1.85) but not as a patronymic gentilicium, since the patronymic adjective from *Volta* is *Voltius* (§7.5.2); see G. Giacomelli 1962.
- 181. ? *Voltius*.** *ulties* MF/Etr **64**. G. Giacomelli (1963:232) and Hirata (1967:89) compared Etruscan *Ulθe* (ager Saeniensis and Perugia) and *Velθe* (only in the *Liber Linteus*), remarking “ha affinità con *volta*”. In my view, the name may be read as *u(o)lties* (with a graphical contraction, see §11.2.5.8) which, as the form occurs in isolation, can be interpreted either as a patronymic gentilicium *Voltius* or as the praenomen *Voltius* (for which see §7.7.1.86).
- 182. *Vomanius*.** m. *uomanio* Cap **388**. *Vomanius*, which also occurs in Latin (e.g. *CIL* XI.3338 from Blera), is perhaps derived from a potamonym *Vomanus* (Schulze 1904:481): the nearest river of that name known to modern authors is part of the Po estuary, however, a long way from the ager Faliscus and Capenas. See also §6.5.1. Other potamonymic gentilicia may be *Fa(r)farn-* and *Narionius*.
- 183. ACEPHALOUS FRAGMENTS** (consisting of more than the endings [---]o, [---]io, [---]eo, [---]a, [---]ia, or [---]ea: *(*)*coņeo* LtF **290** (perhaps *acoņeo*, see under *Aconius*), **e[0-4?]i*ia* LF **235**, **i[...]* MLF **353**, [*Josena* MLF **206**, [*lni[a]* MF **146**, [*...]nea* LtF **301**, [*...]ta* MF **146**, [---]fate MLF **285** (gen. of a probably toponymic gentilicium in *...fas*), [---]iena MF **102**, [---]ilio LtF **215** (perhaps *spur]ilio*, see under *Spurilius*), [---]lio MF **137**, [---]nio LtF **341**, [---]nθia MLF **212** (perhaps *se]nθia*, see under *Sentius*), [---]rcius Cap **435** (e.g. *mar]cius?*), [---]ronio MF **156** (probably *ne]ronio*, see under *Neronius*).

7.8.2. The origins of the Faliscan gentilicia. Many of the gentilicia in the list in §7.8.1 can be placed into one of several clearly recognizable categories (for an overview of the derivational suffixes, see G. Giacomelli 1963:132-49). Some of these categories can be connected with an origin of the name in a specific language, either Etruscan, Latin-Faliscan, or a Sabellic language. As has been said in §7.1.1, one of the major motives of looking at the onomasticon in a linguistic study is that the onomasticon can provide (socio)linguistic data on the ethnic background of the population, and its contacts with the areas around it. The first problem here is that it is often difficult (to say the least) to ascribe the origin of a gentilicium to a specific language, as has been explained in §7.1.1. Although I have divided the gentilicia into groups according to their most likely origin, it should be stressed that in many cases attribution is very uncertain. The inferences that may be drawn from these data are discussed in §7.10.3.

(1) patronymic gentilicia in -ius, -ilius and -idius (cf. §7.5.2). This is clearly the category in which most of the gentilicia belong that *can* be placed in a specific category. This category can be subdivided according to the praenomina from which they are derived (see also §7.7.2): **(a)** from Faliscan praenomina: *Aufilius/Oufilius*, *Iunius*,

Laeuius and *Laeuilius*, and *Vollius*; **(b)** from praenomina that occur both in Latin and Faliscan: *Lucilius* (only on an import), *Marcus*, *Quinctius* (only on imports), **(c)** from praenomina that are Latin rather than Faliscan: *Spurilius* (from an originally Etruscan praenomen), *Tiberilius* (note the *-b-*); **(d)** from Sabellic praenomina: *Fertorius*, *Neronius*, *Petronius*, *Tettius* (?), *Vinu...* (?), possibly also *Pu(m)ponius*, if this is indeed a gentilicium (§7.7.1.52), and (Etruscan?) *Marhius*; **(d)** from praenomina common to both Latin/Faliscan and the Sabellic languages: *Genucilius* (only on an import), *Manius* and *Manilius*, and *Tullius*; **(e)** from Etruscan praenomina: *Aratius/Arantius*, *Caelius*, *Lartius*, *Sertorius*, and *Venelius*; **(f)** from praenomina of uncertain origin: *Caesius*, *Graec...* (Etruscan?), and *Tirrius*; **(g)** patronymic gentilicia with the Sabellic suffix *-idius*: *Aiedius*, *Clanidius*, and perhaps *Didius*.

In view of the suffixes with which these gentilicia are derived, they are clearly of Italic origin, but they are of a type that is so common in the Italic languages that it is in many cases impossible to ascribe gentilicia of this type to any specific Italic language. Although it is probable that many originated in the language to which the praenomina belonged from which they were derived, this is by no means necessary: a well-established name like *Spurilius* is derived from a praenomen of Etruscan origin, but one that also occurred in the Latin onomasticon, and the derivational suffix is clearly Latin-Faliscan. Patronymic gentilicia derived from Faliscan praenomina will have originated within the ager Faliscus: these are *Aufilius/Oufilius*, *Iunius*, *Laeuius* and *Laeuilius*, and *Vollius*. The gentilicia that are formed with the suffix *-idius* that is the Sabellic equivalent of Latin *-ilius* may be assumed to be of Sabellic origin.

(2) Etruscan patronymic gentilicia in *-na* and their adaptations: *Aulena*, *Cotena*, *Eina*, *Hac...na*, *Fescuna* (if this is not a toponymic gentilicium), *Hermana*, *Marcena*, *Nomesina*, *Pleina*, *Salu[e?]na*, *Tetena/Tettena*, *Vicina*, perhaps also Early Faliscan *Capena* (§7.2.2); and, adapted from such names, *Licinius*, *Vicinius*, *Visinius*, *Aenus*, *Faenus*, *Poenus*, and perhaps the Early Faliscan names *Amanus*, *Capena*, and *Voltenus* (§7.2.2). These names constitute a clearly recognizable Etruscan type, and may have been recognized as patronymic even by those who did not speak Etruscan (much like Scottish names in *Mac...* or Irish names in *O'...* are recognizable as patronymic to speakers of English that know no Gaelic), especially since they often contain recognizable praenomina (e.g. *Aulena*, *Marcena*, *Nomesina*, *Tettena*).

Most of these names remain unadapted both in Latin and in Faliscan: in accordance with their nominative in *-a*, such names could be declined according to the first declension (§4.2.1). Note that Faliscan had two frequently occurring local male praenomina in *-a*, *Iuna* and *Volta*, which may have made it even easier to adopt Etruscan gentilicia in *-na* without adaptation of the suffix. On the other hand, if required, such names could be adapted. In Latin, this was usually done by means of *-na* → *-inius*, and examples of such adaptations in the Faliscan onomasticon are *Licinius* and *Vicinius* (occurring beside *Vicina*) and probably also *Visinius*. In Faliscan, there are

also cases where such gentilicia were thematized without further adaptation of the suffix, as *-na* → *-nus*: possible examples of this are *Aenus*, *Faenus*, *Poenus*, and perhaps Early Faliscan *Amanus*, *Capena*, and *Voltenus* (see §7.2.2).

(3) other names derived from praenomina: *Arruntulus*, *Arruntielius*, *Voltaeus*. These names are derived from praenomina, but not with the *-ius* and *-ilius* of the patronymic derivations (cf. §7.5.2). The derivational suffixes of *Arruntulus* and *Arruntielius* are Italic, although they are derived from Etruscan *Arruns*. *Voltaeus* on the other hand is derived from Faliscan *Volta*, but with a suffix that recalls Etruscan names such as *Velminaeus*, *Letaeus* from the ager Faliscus and other Etruscan names in *-aie*: G. Giacomelli (1962) regarded the suffix as Italic, however.

(4) adaptations of Etruscan gentilicia in -u. These names are a category that does present morphological difficulties, and therefore had to be adapted in some way in order to be declined. Apparently, the nominative in *-u* was comparable to the nominatives in *-o* of the \bar{o} -stems in (§4.5.1.3), and the usual way of Latinizing these gentilicia was therefore by means of *-u* → *-onius*. Faliscan examples of this are *Aconius*, *Atronius*, *Fullonius*, *Sacconius*, *Sapnonius*, *Seruatronius*, and *Succonius*, and possibly *Decon*.... Yet Faliscan has two names where the Latinization was apparently by means of *-u* → *-onus*, *Viconus* and perhaps also *Praeconus*. This adaptation is in a sense comparable to the adaptation *-na* → *-nus* described above under (2). Related as well appears to be *Folcosius*, with *-u* → *-osius*. A different, and simpler type of adapting these names, occurring also in Latin, is *-u* → *-ius*, as in *Cincius*. Unclear is *Laepuius*: it looks as if this was adapted by means of *-u* → *-uius*.

(5) geographical: (a) toponymic: *Abellensis*, *Acarcelinius*, *Feliginas*, *Fescuna* (?), *Orticensis*, *Veianius* (?), perhaps also *Calitenus* and *Egnatius*, and the *...fas* in [---]fate MLF 285; **(b) potamonymic:** *Fa(r)farn*..., *Narionius* (?), *Vomanus* (and, indirectly, *Tiberilius*); **(c) ethnonymic:** *Grae*... (perhaps rather patronymic?), *Latinaeus*, *Sab(in-)*, *Umbrius*, *Umbricius*, and *Umbricianus*. Several of the toponymic and potamonymic gentilicia are connected with local toponyms and potamonyms. Note that *Abellensis* and *Tiberilius* have a *-b-* that can only point to a (Roman) Latin origin, while in the case of *Fa(r)farn-* (if connected with the potamonym at all), the name is derived from the apparently local name *Farfarus*, not from the Latin form *Fabaris*. The ethnonymic names, too, mainly reflect the peoples inhabiting the areas surrounding the ager Faliscus and the ager Capenas: the exception is *Graec*..., but this may be a patronymic gentilicium derived from an older praenomen *Graecus*. With regard to the derivation, note the Etruscan toponymic adjective suffix *-te/-ti* in *Feliginas* and the *...fas* in [---]fate MLF 285, and perhaps also in *Calitenus* and in *Egnatius*.¹⁴⁰

¹⁴⁰ Note also *alsi*is* Etr XL, which, if to be read as *alsiſis*, is probably a toponymic name derived from *Alsium*. The suffix *-te/-ti* is also used in the toponymic adjective *Capenas*.

(6) **Berufsgentilizen:** *Clipearius* and *Frenarius*. This is a rare group in the Faliscan onomasticon, and both names are not attested elsewhere. The nouns from which they are derived, *clipeus* and *frenum*, occur also in Latin, although *clipeus* may be of Etruscan origin (§6.2.9). The derivational suffix is Italic.

Whereas these gentilicia are more or less recognizable, there remains a large group that cannot be ascribed so easily to one language or the other. I have divided these according to the languages in which they have most parallels.

(7) **gentilicia that appear to have only local parallels:** *Protacius*, *Turius*.

(8) **gentilicia that have parallels in both Etruscan and Latin:** *Annius* and its derivation *Annilius*, *Calitenus* (toponymic?), *Calpurnius*, *Catineius*, *Colanius*, *Egnatius* (toponymic?), *Fabius*, *Fadius*, *Fadenius*, *Firmius*, *Lullius*, *Polfaeus*, *Satellius*, *Sentius*, *Sertinius*. Most, if not all, of these names appear to be of Etruscan origin, but since they are attested for the Latin onomasticon as well, some may have reached the area through the Latin onomasticon rather than in their Etruscan form: the adaptation of these names may therefore have taken place elsewhere than in the ager Faliscus.

(9) **gentilicia that have parallels only in Etruscan:** *Letaeus/Lete(i)us*, *Velminaeus/Velmine(i)us*. Both are adaptations of Etruscan gentilicia in *-aie*, and are not attested outside the area. Probably also of Etruscan origin are *Acr-* (?), *Am-/Amm-*, *Arn*.

(10) **gentilicia that have their main parallels in Latin:** *Acciuaeus*, [*Claudius*], *Curtius* (although the vocalism points to an Etruscan intermediary), *Flauilius* (patronymic?), [*Fulvius*], [*Furius*], *Maecius*, *Mallius*, [*Munius*], *Tertineius*, *Vestius* (of Etruscan origin?), *Vettius* (of Sabellic origin?), *Vecilius*, *Veculius*, *Vetulius*.

(11) **gentilicia that are probably of Sabellic origin:** *Alliuaeus*, *Battius* (?), *Blaesius*, *Fassius*, *Hirpius*, *Pacius*, *Pescennius*, *Sedius/Saedius/Saidius*. Most of these occur in inscriptions from the ager Capenas: see §9.3.2

(12) **gentilicia that are probably Italic rather than Etruscan:** *Arrius*, *Calinius*, *Cocilius*, *Plarius*, *Popi*. and *Popilius*, *Pupius* and *Pupilius*, *Sarius*.

(13) **gentilicia of indeterminate origin:** *Adicius*, *Aieius* (?), *Aufitius*, *Citius* (Etruscan?), *Latrius* (Etruscan?), *Lurius*, *Neln-*, *Oscin-*, *Pani...*, *Panur...*, *Partius*, *Pauicius*, *Raec(i)lius*, *Seralius*, *Vatius*, *Ventarc...* (?), *Viui...* (?), *Vollius*. Several of these gentilicia are of dubious attestation.

7.9. The cognomina

7.9.1. Attestations of cognomina in the Faliscan inscriptions. There are several attestations of cognomina from the Faliscan inscriptions. All are from sepulchral in-

scriptions and occur solely in combination with the onomastic formula PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM. The attestations are:

1. **Maxumus** (5-7 attestations):¹⁴¹ [4-5]a hac****a : [?]a[?]m̄ : maximo MF 89, with FILIATION? COGNOMEN, [---]reic[lio] | [---]maxom[o] MF 98, [---ma]xomo # uoltio MF 162, with COGNOMEN FILIATION, cauiō : nomes|ina : maxomo MF 272, uoltio · uecineo | maxomo | iuneo LF 220, with COGNOMEN FILIATION; perhaps also (either *Maxumus* or *Manumus*) in [leu]elio : cailio [: ...] ma.]om[o :] rex [: ..]** MF 90, probably with FILIATION COGNOMEN, and perhaps **xi[.] in the very fragmentary MF 91 (the *titulus posterior* of MF 90) which can be little else than *maxi[mo]*. *Maximus* ‘the Greatest’ is a cognomen indicating power or success, but it is surprising to find this cognomen in at least four different families. This may suggest that the adoption of this cognomen was not due to some extraordinary achievement, but rather to a feat that was attained with some regularity by deserving individuals, e.g. membership of a ruling body or functioning in a specific high magistracy.
2. **Manumus** (2-3 attestations): [ma]rco : pleina : marcio : man[o]mo MF 80, with FILIATION COGNOMEN, [u]ol̄ta : pupelio | [m]ano[m]o MF 149; perhaps also (either *Maxumus* or *Manumus*) in [leu]elio : cailio [: ...] ma.]om[o :] rex [: ..]** MF 90, probably with FILIATION COGNOMEN. *Manumus*, ‘the Best’ or perhaps rather ‘the Most Good’, on the other hand, may have had a sacral connotation (cf. §6.2.1 s.v. *manus*).
3. **?i*ice** (2 attestations?): tito f uelm̄ineo | nu i*ice MLF 309 with FILIATION COGNOMEN?, tito : uel|mineo : iun|ai i*ice MLF 315 with FILIATION COGNOMEN?. It is unclear if *i*ice* is a cognomen: most editors have interpreted it as a verb (see §5.2.1.9, §6.2.38), but this is partly due to the interpretation of *iun|ai* in MLF 315 as a dative rather than as a genitive. If it is a cognomen, it is unclear how *i*ice* is to be read: neither *ipice* nor *idice* seems to produce a promising cognomen (*I(m)pige(r)? I(n)dige(ns)?*).
4. **?Ruso** (2 attestations?): cauiō[---] | ruso[?---] MLF 318, perhaps to be restored in *ce · pauif[ceo ru?]so* LtF 290. The cognomen *Ruso* is well-known from Latin sources (cf. Solin & Salomies 1994:394) and occurs in *CIL* XI.3254 I.13 from Sutri. It is probably derived from *russus/rūsus* ‘reddish’, with the *-o* that is frequently used in derivation of Latin cognomina: assuming an Etruscan connection (G. Giacomelli 1963:216) is not necessary. Both attestations are doubtful, however: note that reading *ru]so* in LtF 290 would provide the only instance of a cog-

¹⁴¹ I cannot adopt Colonna’s (1972c:446-7) interpretation of [---]ronio : uol[t---]a*ome MF 156 as containing a cognomen *m]axome*: this would be the only instance of monophthongization of /-ai/ to /-ē/.

nomen in a public inscription from the ager Faliscus at a time when this was rare even in Latin texts (cf. Kajanto 1977a:67).

5. Previous editors have read several other cognomina in the texts. Of these, the following can be rejected for reasons discussed under the individual inscriptions: *cela* MF 12, MF 83, MF 84, *cela* MF 166 (all instances of the noun *cela* ‘cella’); *rezo* MF 56 (fragmentary text); *uentarc[...]* MF 80 (rather a name of another individual); *thania* MF 81 (a woman’s name), *tuconu* MF 85 (unclear, but if it is a cognomen, it would be a name consisting only of COGNOMEN occurring in isolation), *[---]ono* MF 102 (perhaps rather a genitive in *[---]ono(s)*), *kreco* MF 147 (a praenomen), *sus[?---]* LF 227 (unclear, perhaps *s us[o(r)]?*), *sorex* LtF 231 (a ghostword), ****io* LF 332 (badly legible, probably a patronymic adjective), *esχ* Cap 389 and 404 (to be read as a verbal form *esū*), *posticnu* MLF/Cap 474* (a Sabellic noun, cf. South Picene *postiknam* CH.2), and *velusa* Etr XXXIV (rather an Etruscan genitive). Still worth considering perhaps are *putellio* MF 152 (rather a gentilicium?) and abbreviated *sen* Cap 435 (rather a praenomen?). Note that G. Giacomelli (1963) and Hirata (1967) sometimes appear to use the term cognomen also for a second gentilicium: for which see §7.6.

7.9.2. The chronology of the Faliscan cognomen. Rix (1965 *passim*, cf. 1965:379-80) has shown that in Etruscan cognomina started to appear in the fifth century and became current for men from the third century onward: cognomina for women remained scarce in most of Etruria, except at Clusium (Rix 1965:40-2). In Rome, cognomina may have made their first appearance in the fifth century, but they remained a prerogative of the patrician families until well into the second (Kajanto 1977a:64-7).

The scarcity of cognomina in the Middle and Late Faliscan inscriptions may be due to the fact that they were a new feature in the ager Faliscus as well or that they were limited to a specific group, as in Rome. Also, the occurrence of the filiation *after* the cognomen in *[---ma]χomo # uoltilio* MF 162 and *uoltio · uecineo | maxomo | iuneo* LF 220 may indicate that it did not yet have a fixed place in the onomastic formula. Neither are there secure indications that Faliscan cognomina were hereditary, apart from the occurrence of *i*ice* in MLF 309 and MLF 315, both from the gens Velminaea. Another possible but even more dubious instance would be *ruso*, if MLF 318 is to be restored as *cauio [· pauiceo] | ruso[?---]*, and LtF 290 as *ce · pauiceo · ru[?]so* LtF 290.

Although there is no evidence of the existence of something resembling the Roman patrician class in Faliscan society, there are a few indications that the Faliscan cognomina may have been associated with high social status. Thus, *[leu]elio : cailio [: ... | max/man]om[o :] rex [: ..]*** MF 90 shows not only a cognomen but also the (sacral?) title *rex*, and high status has also been assumed in the case of *uoltio · uecineo | maxomo | iuneo* LF 220, even apart from the fact that *Maximus* is in itself a name implying

greatness.¹⁴² If Faliscan cognomina were not yet hereditary, the repeated occurrence of *Maxumus* would then point to *individual* rather than to *family* status, perhaps referring to some notable (political or military?) achievement or success. This might partly explain the occurrence of *Maxumus* as a cognomen of individuals of at least four different families.

There are no clear instances of cognomina from the Late Faliscan period apart from *uoltio · uecineo* | *maxomo* | *iuneo* LF 220. *Harisp...* in *c · clipear[io]* | *m · f · harişp[ex* LtF 231 and *[---] | harişp[---]---]sor* LF 232 is a priestly title than a cognomen. Apart from this, there is only the doubtful instance of *Rutilus* in *m · aco[---] | rutil · ce[---]* LtF 341. Even sepulchral inscriptions with quite extensive *cursus honorum* from this period yield no cognomina, and neither do the public inscriptions from Falerii Novi and along the roads of the ager Faliscus.¹⁴³ This absence of cognomina after the war of 241-240 could imply that as far as cognomina were concerned, the Faliscan onomasticon was adapted to the Roman usage of the period, where cognomina were still a patrician prerogative, and did not regularly appear in public inscriptions.

If that is true, the Latin inscriptions from the area from the second half of the second century and later might be expected to contain more cognomina, for around this date the cognomen also begins to appear in the names of plebeians and freedmen in inscriptions from Rome and Latium. Cognomina indeed appear in the dedication *[.] munio regena* | numesio · m[art]e* | *d d l m* Lat 377, where *regena** may well be a cognomen, in the sepulchral inscription of *Pu(blius) Fuluius C(ai) f(ilius) | C(ai) n(epos) Suto(r)* Lat 250 (106 BCE), which also has a very formal double filiation,¹⁴⁴ and in the dedication *[. · u]mpricius · c · f | [?]aburcus · q · | [ap]olinei · dat* Lat 219 (c. 120-50 BCE).

7.10. The Faliscan onomasticon and the question of identity

7.10.1. Names as markers of identity. As was said in §7.1.1, names are markers of identity, not only the identity of the person they refer to, but also of the ramifications of that person's identity with regard to gender, family, social group, ethnic group, etc.

¹⁴² On an epigraphic level, note that *[ma]rco : pleina : marcio : man[o]mo* MF 80 and *[4-5]a hac****a : [?]a[?]m : maximo* MF 89 are both decorated with a painted border, an exceedingly rare feature in Faliscan sepulchral inscriptions (§11.1.4.1c). On the other hand, *cauio : nomes|ina : maxomo* MF 272 was scratched on a tile in a very careless manner.

¹⁴³ Kajanto (1977a:67) explained the absence of cognomina in Republican public inscriptions as a relic from the time when cognomina were not yet a regular part of the name.

¹⁴⁴ In accordance with what was said in the preceding note, the names of the consuls still appear in this inscription *without* cognomina as *C(aio) Atilio (et) Q(uinto) Servi(lio)*.

In societies where family names exist, such as those of ancient Italy, a distinction should be made between gentilicia and praenomina. Gentilicia are *inherited*: they express the relationship to the family, and the social or ethnic group from which this family comes. Praenomina are *given*, that is, chosen by a parent, and especially in an area like the ager Faliscus, with its heterogeneous ethnic make-up, they can represent a choice for a certain identity. From this perspective it could be said that the gentilicium represents the *origins* of the family, which remain unchangeable and may be of great importance in a society that values tradition and the ancestors, while the praenomen, which may change from generation to generation, can denote the *direction* in which the family is heading, and of which group they want their children to be a part.

A third point by which identity, especially social identity, may be established is by the onomastic formula: for the period and the area that is the subject of this study, this means e.g. the use of double gentilicia, the use of cognomina, and the differences between the onomastic formula of men and of women.

7.10.2. The onomastic formula and social status. The onomastic formula can denote social groups and the importance of an individual or section of the group with regard to the other members.

First, there are specific formula for freedmen and -women (§7.6), where Faliscan appears to follow the Etruscan usage of giving a double gentilicium in some texts (MF 82, 346), but the Latin usage of naming the former master with the word *libertus* or *liberta* in others (MF 155, 165). Apparently, it was important that freedmen and freedwomen were recognizable by a distinct onomastic formula.

A second point involving both the onomastic formula and social status is the use of the cognomen (§7.9). Whether or not it was restricted to a specific group, as it was in Rome, where cognomina were long a prerogative of the patrician families, cannot be established. There are indications, however, that it was associated with high status, and that it may have depended on certain individual (political?) achievements.

Thirdly, there are the onomastic formulas of women (§7.4). It is noteworthy that these are more liable to variation than those of men, and that it is more usual for a woman than for a man to be designated by one name only, in which case there is a preference for using the gentilicium – unlike in the case of men, where the praenomen is preferred. This may foreshadow a tendency observable also in Rome, where the importance of the praenomen as part of the (official) onomastic formula appears to have been on the decrease during the late Republican period (cf. Kajava 1994:114–24). The fact that there are no instances of Faliscan women having cognomina is also significant, although it does not set the ager Faliscus apart: during the Middle and Late Faliscan period, women's cognomina were very rare in Etruria, except for the area of Clusium, and probably still non-existent in Latium (§7.9.2).

7.10.3. Gentilicia and the question of ethnic origin. Having established, albeit in a very tentative way, the linguistic origins of the gentilicia that occur in the Faliscan inscriptions (§7.8.2), it is time to look at what implications can be drawn from these data. A number of provisos have been made earlier (§7.1.1), and these severely limit the inferences that can be made. One thing that *can* safely be said, however, is that the majority of the Faliscan gentilicia appears to be of Etruscan origin, while only a very small number of names can with some certainty be regarded as local: the long persistence of the patronymic adjective in the ager Faliscus may imply that the development of the gentilicia proceeded at a slower rate than elsewhere. However, in view of the gentilicia, a large number of the inhabitants appear to be of Etruscan descent at least.

The point, however, is what this means from an ethnic and linguistic perspective. As said in §7.1.1, as long as there is nothing to show that people with Etruscan gentilicia were (still) Etruscan in the sense that they were regarded as Etruscan or thought of themselves as Etruscan (in whatever sense they defined this), this means little. In what sense were families with Etruscan gentilicia Etruscan? Were there families that were obviously Etruscan to their neighbours, or families whose connection with what modern scholarship calls Etruscan was only very slight? Posing the question from a linguistic perspective: is it safe to assume that such families spoke Etruscan as their first language, and, more importantly for the linguistic study of the area as a whole, that *they* spoke Etruscan as their first language while the majority of people with a non-Etruscan gentilicium did not?

The answer to most of these, and similar, questions can at best be a surmise, at worst an assumption. If the Roman onomasticon is reviewed in a similar way, it can likewise be said that a great number of the Roman gentilicia were of Etruscan origin. Yet it is obvious that fourth- or third century Rome was not an Etruscan city at least in the linguistic sense: as Cornell (1997) has shown in his article on ethnicity in early Rome, from the earliest time onwards, Roman was something that you could *become*. Whatever the original identity of a person or that person's family, that identity could be changed: not for nothing he quotes the story of Tarquinius Priscus, son of a Greek potter, married to an Etruscan wife (Liv. 1.34), bearing an Etruscan name, who eventually became a Roman king. In other words, gentilicia may be markers of the *original* identity of the family, but the individual members of later generations, although they might be proud of their ancestry or pay some form of respect to it, may not necessarily have regarded themselves as belonging to that original identity.

In this respect, I think it is noteworthy that the great majority of Etruscan gentilicia were adapted, where necessary, to the requirements of Faliscan (§7.8.2): indications that they remained phonetically, phonologically, or morphologically different are very scarce. An exception are the names in *-na*, that show a larger number of instances where the name remains unadapted, as happened in the Latin onomasticon. In general, however, unadapted names are generally found only in the Etruscan inscrip-

tions from the area, while there are hardly any instances of Faliscan names appearing in Etruscan inscriptions from the area (§9.2.2), implying that the adaption of names worked in one direction only.

Although the majority of gentilicia was therefore of Etruscan origin, the language of the area was Faliscan, and families with Etruscan gentilicia on the whole used Faliscan and Faliscan forms of their names at least in the epigraphic texts, whatever they may have spoken or written in other contexts (§9.2.1). It is also noteworthy that with few exceptions (see below), in contrast to the gentilicia, the majority of the *praenomina* in the area was local and not Etruscan, whatever the onomastic background of the families involved (§7.10.5).

In some cases, however, there are indications that the bearers of Etruscan names were indeed ‘Etruscan’ in one or more senses of this word. This is most notable in a group of inscriptions from Corchiano that show a number of Etruscan traits (§9.2.2.3), the most important ones being

poplia : *calitenes* | *aronto* : *cesies* | *lartio* : *uxor* MF 265

ueltur · *tetena* | *aruto* MF 266

arute macena | *morenez* MF 269

larise : *mar*||*cna* : *citiai* MF 270

poplia | *zuconia* MF 271

cauio : *nomes*|*ina* : *maxomo* | *zeruatronia* MF 272

Within this group, not only are all gentilicia Etruscan, and mostly unadapted (§7.8.2), but the *praenomina* are predominantly Etruscan, too (§7.10.5); furthermore, the inscriptions show linguistic features such as *-e* in *arute* and *larise* and *-es/-ez* for female names (§9.2.2.1), orthographical features such as the use of *z-* (§3.5.3), and epigraphic features such as the fact that these inscriptions were scratched (§11.1.4.1c), which may all be considered Etruscan or at least non-Faliscan.

Peruzzi (1990) has shown in his study of the gentilicia in these inscriptions that the families named may have been recent immigrants from the area of Clusium. Yet even these families use the Faliscan alphabet, language and textual formulas: it is not their gentilicia, but the gentilicia occurring in a context of other features that makes it possible for the modern scholar to regard them as more Etruscan than others.

7.10.4. Praenomina and the family. One bond that can be expressed by *praenomina* is that with the family, especially in cases of a *praenomen* that ‘runs in the family’, children being named after a relative, often the grandfather (cf. Salomies 1987:378-88). The Faliscan family tombs and the frequent use of PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM give some insight into this usage for the *ager Faliscus*. A good example is the third-century tomb of the *gens Velminaea* at Vignanello, where the following members of the *gens* can be identified:

THE ONOMASTICON

Gavius	<i>cauio uelmineo</i> <i>popliai file</i> MLF 308
Iuna son of Titus	<i>iuna uelmineo</i> <i>titio</i> MLF 307
Publius	<i>popli[o]</i> <i>uelmi no</i> MLF 316
Publius or Publia	<i>popl[---]</i> <i>[u]elmi[ne---]</i> MLF 317
Quinctus	<i>cuicto uelmineo</i> <i>[---?]uoxie[.]eai</i> MLF 310
Titus son of Iuna	<i>tito : uelmineo : iun ai i*ice</i> MLF 315
Titus son of Nu. ?	<i>tito † uelmineo</i> <i>nu i*ice</i> MLF 309
Titus son of Titus	<i>tito : uelmineo</i> <i>titoi</i> MLF 305
Volta	<i>uolta : uelmineo</i> MLF 313
Voltius son of Titus	<i>uoltio [:] uelmineo</i> <i>titio</i> MLF 312

Even within this small group there are at least three and possibly even five different men called *Titus*: furthermore, there is both a ‘Iuna son of Titus’ and a ‘Titus son of Iuna’, implying that praenomina could skip a generation, as they did in Rome.

A similar picture occurs from the *gens Aufilia*. The following members of this *gens* were buried in a family tomb at Falerii Veteres:

Caesius son of Iuna	<i>kai[s]i[o · aufilio · iun[?eo]</i> MF 51
Gavius	<i>cauio · aufilio</i> MF 49
Gavius	<i>caui[o] · aufilio</i> MF 50
Iuna	<i>iuna · oufilio</i> MF 48
Iuna or Volta?	<i>[---]a · aufilio</i> MF 53

Two other members of the *gens*, apparently brothers, were buried at Corchiano:

Caesius son of Volta	<i>ceisio : oufilio</i> <i>uoltheo</i> MF 276
Gavius son of Volta	<i>cauio : oufilio</i> <i>uolteo</i> MF 275

Finding more than one *Gaius* is perhaps not very surprising, since this praenomen occurs with great frequency (§7.7.1-2), but three within such a small group may be significant. Two other men are called *Caesius*, which is also a frequent praenomen, although not as frequent as *Gavius* (§7.7.1-2). Interestingly, of the two sons of Volta from Corchiano, one is called *Gaius* and the other *Caesius*, making it even more probable that these were the preferred and perhaps hereditary praenomina within the *gens*. Also, there appear to be either two *Iunae* or two *Voltae* in the family.

Less clear instances are the following:

(a) The *gens Spurilia* shows both a Marcus son of Gaius (*m · spurilius · c · f* Lat **237**) and a Gaius son of Marcus (*c · spurilius* | *m · f* Lat **238**), both from Falerii Novi, one presumably being the father of the other.

(b) Among the five members of the *gens Folcosia* whose praenomina are known (*ceis[i.]* | *holc[osi]* | *ar · p[...]* MF **140** from Falerii Veteres, and *sesto* ⁴ | *fulzeo* LF **329**, *uoltio* | *folcozeo* | *zextoi* | *fi* LF **330**, *ceļio* **olcuzeo* | ****io* LF **332**, *cesio folcuso* LF **331** from Carbognano-Vallerano) there are perhaps two *Caesii*.

(c) The gens *Vicinia* shows a closely related Gavius (*ca · uecineo* [·] *uoltio* LF 224, *ca · uecineo* LF 225) and Gavia (*cau[ia ·] uecin[e]a · uotilia* LF 222, *cauia : uecinea* LF 223). In the traditional reading of LF 224, *ca · uecineo* [·] *uolti* ·, they were even regarded as brother and sister.

(d) The gens *Socconia* may provide two men called *Vel*, but the attestations are very doubtful (*uel zu[con]eo : fe [cupa]* MF 56 and [--- *ue?*] *su[conio? ---]*ic* MF 191). Note that the gentilicium is adapted from Etruscan *Zuxu*, and that the praenomen is Etruscan as well.

7.10.5. Praenomina and ethnic identification. Apart from the familial identification, praenomina can also be used to express ethnic identification. This is of some interest in an area like the ager Faliscus, lying as it does on the crossroads of several quite different cultures and languages, each with their own names.

In §7.7.2 it was established that there is a clear preference for several praenomina, namely *Gaius*, *Iuna*, *Volta* and its derivation *Voltius*, and *Caesius*. Even when abbreviations and patronymic adjectives are not counted, these five together make up nearly one-third of all instances of Faliscan praenomina (including abbreviated praenomina). Now *Iuna*, *Volta* and *Voltius* are peculiar to the area, occurring nowhere else, while *Gaius* and *Caesius* do occur elsewhere, but nowhere with a frequency that came close to the frequency of these names in the ager Faliscus. (Note that with the exception of *vultasi* Etr XLII, these names do not even appear in Etruscan inscriptions from the area: see §9.2.1.) If the fragmentary picture presented by the epigraphic sources represents the real distribution of praenomina in the ager Faliscus during the fourth to the second century BCE, this must mean that someone bearing the name *Iuna*, *Volta*, or *Voltius* would have been immediately recognisable as someone from the ager Faliscus, or perhaps even as ‘a Faliscan’, that is, someone who regarded himself as such.

The persistent choice for a local praenomen like *Iuna* or *Volta* must have reflected an adherence to some form of specifically Faliscan identity that was clearly different from an Etruscan, Latin, or Sabellic one. This is even more apparent from the fact that these names, popular as they were, quickly disappear from the record in the inscriptions that can be dated to the period after *c.*240. *Iuna* recurs only in a patronymic adjective in LF 220, *Volta* in MLF 367-370, in a patronymic adjective in LF 224, and makes a last appearance in a filiation in LF/Lat 214. The disappearance of *Iuna* and *Volta* may be due to the fact that Latin did not have male praenomina of the first declension, or it may be due to reasons connected with a changing identity of the populace, or at least of that part of the populace that left (sepulchral) inscriptions. *Gaius* and *Caesius* likewise disappear from the record, and were perhaps replaced by their perceived Latin equivalents *Gaius* and *Kaeso*.

On the other hand, the inscriptions from the period after *c.*240 show praenomina that either were absent or not very frequent in the Middle Faliscan onomasticon. These are *Aulus*, *Gaius*, *Lucius*, *Marcus*, *Publius*, and perhaps also *Sextus*. All of these appear to be associated with Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions from the area, even though *Aulus* and *Publius* are (ultimately) of Etruscan origin. Their frequency in the later inscriptions must be due to people inclined to use the Latin rather than the Faliscan onomasticon, whether they did so because they were immigrants or descendants of immigrants from Latium or because they were members of local families whose identity was shifting towards a ‘Latin’ one. I do not think that it is necessary to ascribe this to a conscious ‘breach with the past’ on the part of the Faliscan population (or at least those members of the population that left (sepulchral) inscriptions), but rather to the fact that the area had become part of a larger world that was Latin, with Rome at its centre: in such a world the identity especially of the families that made up the administration of the area could no longer be strictly local.

Etruscan praenomina do appear in fairly great number in the area, but apart from *Arruns*, they do not appear to have enjoyed great popularity, and even *Arruns* comes at best in sixth place in the number of instances of individual praenomina. There are no indications that Etruscan names were among those that recurred within one family, or that families with Etruscan gentilicia preferred to use Etruscan cognomina: in most cases, there are simply too few attestations of a particular gentilicium for this. The only indications are the dubious recurrence of *Vel* in the *gens Succonia* (§7.10.4) and perhaps *aruz : cesje : aruto* MF 257 (below). On the whole, families seem to have preferred Faliscan praenomina, whether or not the gentilicium is Etruscan, and Etruscan praenomina also occur in families that do not have specifically Etruscan gentilicia.

A notable exception to this are the inscriptions from Corchiano, *aruz : cesje : aruto* MF 257, *poplia : calitenes | aronto : cesies | lartio : uxor* MF 265, and *ueltur · tetena | aruto* MF 266, *arute macena | morenez* MF 269, *larise : mar||cna : citiai* MF 270.¹⁴⁵ In all these cases, there is a combination of Etruscan praenomen with an Etruscan gentilicium, and in MF 257, 265, 266, the filiation shows that the father had an Etruscan praenomen as well. These inscriptions also show a number of other Etruscan features (cf. §7.10.3 and §9.2.3). This could imply that Etruscan praenomina occurring within families with an Etruscan gentilicium were an indication of an Etruscan rather than a Faliscan identity.

An example that subsumes the whole gamut of the Faliscan onomasticon is that of the *gens Clipearia*. The gentilicium is a *Berufsgentiliz*, probably pointing to a fairly modest background as artisans. In the mid- or late fourth century, a potter or painter signed

¹⁴⁵ Note that these four inscriptions provide four out of the seven instances of *Arruns*, one of the two instances of *Veltur*, and the only instance of *Lars*.

his work with *oufilo : clipeaio : letei : fileo : met : facet* MF 470*, showing a praenomen *Aufilus* that is quite rare and Italic (if not Faliscan), while his father's name can only be matched by the Etruscan gentilicium *lethaie* in Etr XLVIII. From two tombs near Falerii Novi, and therefore probably dating to the period after *c.*240, are three more *Clipearii*, a *l · clipear[io]* LF 230, a *c · clipear[io] | m · f · harisp[ex]* LtF 231, who (apart from being a *haruspex*) was at least *ce(n)]iso* and *rex*, and a *m · cl[i]peario · m [·f]* LtF 233, whose name may likewise have been followed by a *cursus honorum* (all that is left is [---]or). If these are members of the same gens as Aufilus Clipearius (and I can hardly imagine that within such a small community they were not, since the gentilicium is quite rare), they appear to have made a social climb from being a family of shieldmakers and potters with Italic and Etruscan praenomina to being magistrates at Roman Falerii Novi, and to have adjusted their choice of praenomina accordingly to the Latin *Gaius*, *Lucius*, and *Marcus*. In a sense, this is as illustrative of the social and onomastic development of the ager Faliscus as Livy's story of the rise of Tarquinius Priscus (1.34) is of Rome and Etruria.