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Chapter 7

The onomasticicon

As a large part of the Faliscan material is onomastic, no study of Faliscan can be complete without an assessment of the Faliscan onomasticicon: 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 onomasticicon 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 onomasticicon from the perspective of ethnic identity (§7.10).

7.1. The onomasticicon: 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 *Scaeua*. 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 multilingual 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 onomasticicon 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 Zizu (§7.8.2). Names that have recognisable lexical elements may even be translated, so that Etruscan Zizu 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 Gauius 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 where 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 Perusia 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 *lethaie* 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, *velkarus velanas* Etr XVI from Narce (c.550-500) and *larisa zuus* 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 *paqvius 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
- *aijniiosio ego* 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 gentilicum if the inscription is not too early for this. Tele... is perhaps a Greek name in *Te*/*ke*- or Te*le*-.* Prau[i]os may be connected to Latin praus, 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:

  z[e]xtos *med [f][f]iqod* : EF 1

Here, *euios : mama z[e]xtos* has been variously interpreted. The early interpretation as PRAENOMEN GENTILICUM 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 *f[f]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 Praesamnritic *evides* 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]/g877fir* 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**azieputilepapena* (*e**azieputilepe kapena?*) *rufia kaleptia 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 *kaleptia* (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**azieputilepekapaena*, and this would appear to be a gentilicium rather than a praenomen (cf. Prosdocimi 1990:302-5). Of these names, *rufia kaleptia* 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. *aîmiosio* EF 467* (gen.). – A patronymic derivation of *Aemus*, attested for Middle Faliscan in *eîmôi* MF 293 and possibly in the abbreviation *q[î?]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 *<aî-m-oî* 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 */amanas*/ 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. *kaleptia* EF 4. – However these letters are read (*kalketia* G. Giacomelli 1963:180, *kalestia* Hirata 1967:40-1, *kal/g851ptia* 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. *kapena* 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, Cl 1.454, Pe 1.869, 1.973, capnal Cl 1.202, 1.578, capna[l] Cl 1.203, 1.633, capnas Pe 1.975, capnaś Cl 1.2214; capnei Cl 1.201; capni Pe 1.436), and *Capan-* (capanei Pe 1.213, 214). The *Capenus Sequanus* 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 *Euios* = ‘Liber’ was largely based on Vetter’s untenable reading (first
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 (uvis Cm 35, elsewhere abbreviated, see ST), but this is difficult, as it requires that the rounding */e>u/ → */o/ 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 /ma/mius and /ma/mmius in Latin and in Oscan (maamis Cm 47, maamieis 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 impressively early monophthongization of /ou/ → /o/ (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. praui/os EF 1. – G. Giacomelli (1963:213) classed it as a gentilicum, 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 impressively early monophthongization of /ou/ → /o/ → /u/ (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. Ti-tia : Titus and Tullia : Tullus (§7.7.2).

12. Sextus praen. m. ze[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 Τελς- or Τελς-?
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. *uotenosio* (= *uo(l)tenosio* or *uo‹l›tenosio*) 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 *Voltemus*. 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<sub>GEN</sub> 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, ulti 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]cinatiiu 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 manileo, 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 : cliqueio : letei : fileo MF 470*).

(a) Besitzerinschriften (22-24 instances): ? ofiti MF 58 (doubtful), tiroi · colonioi MF 69-71, cani : turi MF 273, marci : anel[i] MF 472*; cauiio : petroge MF 473*; larise uicina MF 371, larise | uicina MF 372, statio cailio MLF 376, m adicio LF 378 (or ma dio?); uolti : catinei MLF 469*; c · pscni Cap 387, k · uomanio Cap 388, a · iprios 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, ueiueto Cap 464 (if read as uei ueto, and not a falsum).
### Table 7.1. The onomastic formulas of men’s names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Besitzer</th>
<th>sepulchral</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRAENOMEN</strong></td>
<td>MF 10-11</td>
<td>MLF 2</td>
<td>MF 10-11</td>
<td>MF 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLF 3-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>MLF 5-7</td>
<td>MLF 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cap 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cap 1</td>
<td>Cap 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+ FILIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>all</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENTILICUM</strong></td>
<td>MF 4-6</td>
<td>MF 5-8</td>
<td>MF 5-8</td>
<td>MF 5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLF 1</td>
<td>MF 1</td>
<td>MLF 1</td>
<td>MLF 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cap 2</td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
<td>Cap 2</td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+ FILIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>all</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGLE NAME</strong></td>
<td>MF 14-17</td>
<td>MF 0-1</td>
<td>MF 15-19</td>
<td>MF 15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>MLF 4-6</td>
<td>MLF 2</td>
<td>MLF 6-8</td>
<td>MLF 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cap 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cap 3</td>
<td>Cap 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+ FILIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>all</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRAENOMEN +</strong></td>
<td>MF 6-7</td>
<td>MF 20</td>
<td>MF 30-31</td>
<td>MF 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENTILICUM</strong></td>
<td>MLF 5</td>
<td>MLF 11</td>
<td>MLF 20</td>
<td>MLF 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LF 9</td>
<td>LF 1</td>
<td>LF 10</td>
<td>LF 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ltf 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ltf 1</td>
<td>Ltf 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cap 11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cap 11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+ FILIATION?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>all</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155-157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRAENOMEN +</strong></td>
<td>MF 12</td>
<td>MF 1</td>
<td>MF 13</td>
<td>MF 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENTILICUM</strong></td>
<td>MLF 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>MLF 6</td>
<td>MLF 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LF 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>LF 15</td>
<td>LF 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ltf 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ltf 3</td>
<td>Ltf 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lat 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lat 8</td>
<td>Lat 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+ FILIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>all</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155-157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>44-51</strong></td>
<td><strong>107-108</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>180-188</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 7.1. The onomastic formulas of men’s names.**
## The Onomasticon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Besitzer</th>
<th>sepulchral</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRAENOMEN</strong></td>
<td>MF 1</td>
<td>MF 4</td>
<td>MLF 1</td>
<td>MF 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ FILIATION</td>
<td>MLF 1</td>
<td>MF 1</td>
<td>LF 2</td>
<td>MF 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MLF 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LF 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENTILICUM</strong></td>
<td>MF 7</td>
<td>MF 9</td>
<td>MLF 2</td>
<td>MF 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ FILIATION</td>
<td>MLF 4</td>
<td>MF 1</td>
<td>LF 1</td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LtF 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGLE NAME</strong></td>
<td>MF 8</td>
<td>MF 13</td>
<td>MLF 3</td>
<td>MF 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>MLF 4</td>
<td>MF 1</td>
<td>LF 1</td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ FILIATION</td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
<td>LF 2</td>
<td>LtF 2</td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
<td>LtF 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lat 1</td>
<td>Lat 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRAENOMEN + GENTILICUM</strong></td>
<td>MF 19</td>
<td>LF 6</td>
<td>MF 19</td>
<td>MF 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ FILIATION?</td>
<td>Cap 0-2</td>
<td>Lat 2</td>
<td>MF 0-1</td>
<td>Lat 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ FILIATION</td>
<td>MF 4</td>
<td>LF 4</td>
<td>MF 4</td>
<td>Cap 0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lat 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | all 13   | all 24     | all 2    | all 39         |

|                | all 13   | all 24     | all 2    | all 39         |

|                | all 0-3  | all 35     | all 0    | all 35-38      |

| TOTAL          | 13-16    | 59         | 2        | 74-77          |

---

Fig. 7.2. The onomastic formulas of women’s names.
with filiation, cesio folcuso LF 331, celio *olcuzeo | ****io | poplia | uelcei f|e LF 332 (with filiation?), [f] folcosio | *****oi LF 333 with filiation, cauio | uetului LF 335, tito - marhio | uoltilio LF 336 with filiation, ueltur | ortecese LF 339; cailio · tirio MLF/LtF 358, tito · batio MLF/LtF 359; m · c[i]peario · m · [f] LtF 233 with filiation, m · panif[---] LtF 239, uo · nel[---] LtF 299, m · neroni | a · f LtF 325 with filiation, st · aco[---] LtF 327 (where filiation can be restored), [se]x · ne[?]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(ilius) | C(aii) n(epos) Suto(r) Lat 250 with filiation, l · uecilio · uo · f Lat 251 with filiation, [f] uecilio · l · f Lat 251 with filiation, l · c · leuietis · l · f Lt 251 with filiation.

(c) others (28 instances, 14 with filiation): (i) signatures (4 instances, 1 with filiation): c cutri MF 200, artl[3-5]re MF/Etr 267, oufolo · clipeatio · letei · fileo MF 470* with filiation, cauios fernaios MF 471*; (ii) inscriptions on public works, public dedications (16 instances, 10-12 with filiation): a [.j]osena LF 206, u[e] marionio MF 206, cauio lullio MLF 207, cauio latinoa MLF 210; [.j.] hirmio · m·f · f Lt 213 with filiation, ce · tertneo · c · f LF 213 with filiation; c* (*)coneo · [****) LtF 290 with filiation (or a cognomen?), ce · paui[cee] l-2so LtF 290 with filiation (or a cognomen?), [---]ilio · c · f[---] LtF 215 with filiation; la · cotena · la · f LF/Lat 214 with filiation, l · latrius · k · f Lat 218 with filiation, c · salu[ene]va · uolai · f Lat 218 with filiation, [. · u]mpriicius · c · f | [?] aburcus Lat 219 with filiation, e · egnatius · s[ex · f] Lt 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): [.j] muiio 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 · tertenei 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): uene[?---] MF 43, [u]olt[---] MF 145, kreco : [---] MF 147, uol[ta :]***[---] LF 158, fleu[elio · [----]io · ca[---] LF 159, [u]o[l][---] uo[l][i]i[---] LF 163 with filiation; cauio [---] rusol[?---] LF 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 *a*[---] MF 52 with filiation, [---] celio · cesi · fi[---] MF 94 with filiation, [---] celio [---] MF 95 possibly with filiation, [---] celio [---] MF 97 possibly with filiation, [---] reic[l[io] | [---] maxom[o] MF 98 probably with filiation, [---] reiclio [?---] MF 99 possibly with filiation, [------] rej[cli.] | m*[----] MF 100, [---]iena : u[---] MF 102, fif[---] MF 139? possibly with filiation, [---] cra[i[---] iu?neo MF 141 with filiation [---]ronio : uol[---] MF 156 with filiation, [---] marcio LF 228 (or a patronym?) [---]rotacio[---] LF 244

THE ONOMASTICON
possibly with FILIATION [-|-] fate MLF 285, [-|-] precono[-|-] MLF 361, [-|-] upreciano MLF 364, [-|-] mio · ia · * LtF 341 with FILIATION; [-|-]** · uei[-|-] t · f LtF 327 with FILIATION; (c) with only the cognomen preserved (1 instance, with FILIATION): [-|-] ma/g793/xomo H uolti/io* MF 162 with FILIATION; (d) with only the FILIATION clearly preserved (6 instances, all with FILIATION): [-|-]c/g833/la[-|-] iun[-|-] MF 166, [-|-]f LF 247, [-|-]*o · c · f LF 249; [-|-]o · ce `'F LtF 171, [-|-] c · f · mo[-|-] LtF 172, [-|-?] decon[-|-]f LtF 174

I have not included the following instances: (a) unclear reading or interpretation: apolo MF 65 (a theonym), namure/g1810/ua (?) MF/Etr 66, acrë/g793/za cat (?) MF 67, tucomu (?) MF 85 (perhaps PRAENOMEN GENTILICUM, if read as t u(e?)comm), [-|-] pu/g2637/pe/[i---] MF 150, [-|-]uol/g2637/te : [-|-]o : MF 164, [-|-]jio : uolti[-|-] MF 167, [-|-]ar/g2637/to r[-|-] MF 169, çesit : fere MF 263, puiatu MF 208, laris : m : rççç/a ugiëï/visist (?) MLF/Etr 290; [-|-?]anco ma LF/LtF 232, [-|-] cuba [-|-] jte LtF 326; (b) either a man’s name or a woman’s: uentarc[i ..... MF 80, uol/g2637/lf] MF 86 (GENTILICUM?)), [-|-] uenélies MF 258 (probably a gentilicium), popl[-|-] uelmi/ne---] MF 317, [-|-?]a*kit*ue* a · f LF 234 (PRAENOMEN GENTILICUM FILIATION?)), [-|-]a · nel/g2637/n f[---]uxo · ohi*[-|-] LtF 300; (c) isolated names in -e(s): acre MF/Etr 279, ame MF/Etr 280, ame MF/Etr 282.

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

- The use of the single name (whether PRAENOMEN or GENTILICUM) 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 GENTILICUM (9-12 instances). The use of GENTILICUM is very rare in all categories. This is a contrast with the formulas of women’s names: see §7.4.1.
- PRAENOMEN GENTILICUM 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 GENTILICUM appears to have been the normal formula in public inscriptions, 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 GENTILICUM FILIATION is the official formula 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), it was normal for a woman to have a praenomen as well as a gentilicum: 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 HUSBANDGEN 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 gentilicum, 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).

(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 sepulchral inscriptions.

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

(b) *sepulchral inscriptions* (15 instances, 3 with FILIATION): *louria* MF 41, *uolliia MF 47*, *latria MF 75*, *θανια* MF 81 (where two other women are designated as *ca : u[eculi]a* and *ca : e[cf]nata*), [---] *czeńil[a] MF 99*, *cincia MF 135*, *voltaia MF 196*, *moreanzez 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* LF 325 with FILIATION, *plenese q f LF 231* with FILIATION; *plenese Lat 251*, *claudia c f Lat 393* with FILIATION.

(c) *others* (1 instance): *citiiai 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 | hirmia MF 18*, *fasies c[i]sia MF 41*, *cauiia | satelie MF 42*, *cauiacue | uo[eculia : uoltilia MF 80* with FILIATION; *ca : u[eculi]a MF 81*, *ca : e[cf]nata MF 81*, [---] *calie|a ?---* MF 92; *tanacu[i]l | anelia MF 101*, *poplia | farsarn MF 136*, [*?]a*i|a lepuia | uoltilia MF 144 with FILIATION; *iam[ta : ]lni[a] MF 146*, *iata | leue|lia MF 147*, *[.] tiria lo?---* LF 155 with FILIATION; *poplia | calitienes MF 265*, *poplia | zuco-nia MF 271*, [---] *nöbia MLF 212* (or a patronym?); *ja : fir-miia | titia MLF 302* with FILIATION; *poplia : cocelita MLF 303*, *cauiia lorieta MF 314*, *tana | lartia MLF 338* (or is lartia a patronym?); *tan(u)cuel | aratia MLF 347*, *cauiia | hadenia MLF 360*, *iata :
To this should be added 17 damaged sepulchral inscriptions: (a) with only a praenomen preserved (5 instances): cauia * *[---]*a MF 94, [pop]elia: *[---] MF 158, [pol]petrunes: *[---] MF 359, [pol]ae: *[---] MF 161, cauia: *[---] MLF 360, mino: *[---] LF 173 (b) with only a gentilicium preserved (5 instances): iuna: *[celio---]* arutielia: *[---?] MF 96, [---]pel[i---] MF 150, [---]: zaconiai MF 154, [---] uenelies: sapnonia MF 258, st: acor[---] leuia[---] LF 327; (c) with fragmentary women’s names: uene[---]*na: *[u]x[o(r)]?---] MF 43, [---] cai[lia ---] MF 93, [---]fiena: *[u[---]ono: ux[o(r)]?---] MF 102, [---]?juoxie[---]a MLF 310, [---]*lia: *[---] LF 249 with filiation, [---]*nea: *[u]xor* ia: *[ma: o'scin* LF 301 with filiation, [---]nio: ia: *[---]*lia: *[c]or* LF 341.

I have not included: (a) unclear reading or interpretation: rica MF/LtF 21, namure'tua (?) MF/Etr 66, acr'ez cat (?) MF? 67 (praenomen or gentilicium?), ipa MF? 78, [---]altai i MF 109, aie* MF 110, [---]*ome MF 156, apa Cap 457; (b) either a man’s name or a woman’s: uentarc[i .... MF 80, uoll[---]MF 86 (GENTILICUM?), [---] uenelies MF 258, popl[---] [u]elmi[---] MLF 317, [---]*a*kt*ue* a: *f LF 234, [---]a* nel[---]uxo* ohi[---] LF 300; and (c) isolated names in -e(s): acre MF/Etr 279, ame MF/Etr 280, am'ne 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, GENTILICUM (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 GENTILICUM more popular than PRAENOMEN, it appears to become more popular as time progresses, perhaps due to Latin influence:

  | praenomina | gentilicia |
  | MF: 6 | MLF: 3 |
  | LF: 2 | LF: 1 |
  | LtF: - | LtF: 2 |
  | Cap: - | Cap: - |
  | Lat: - | Lat: 2 |

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

  | single name | double name |
  | MF: 23 | MF: 23 |
  | MLF: 9 | MLF: 0-1 |
  | LF: 3 | LF: 10 |
  | LtF: 2 | LtF: - |
  | Cap: - | Cap: - |
  | Lat: 2 | Lat: 0-2 |

- The use of PRAENOMEN GENTILICUM 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. 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 caui\[ia\] · uecin\[e\]a · uotilia | maci : acacelini : uxo LF 222, the text was in fact replaced after the husband’s burial in the same loculus by marcio : acarcelinio | caui\[ia\] : uecinea | h\[ec\] cu\[pat\] 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 I.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 caui\[ia\] : satelie | caui\[ia\] : felicinate | uxor MF 42, fasies : ca\[i\]sia | louci : teti : uxor MF 41, popl\[ia\] : calitenes | ar\[on\]to : cesies | lartio : uxor MF 265; caui\[ia\] · uecin\[e\]a · uotilia | maci : acacelini : uxo LF 222, probably also in · iii · f[.........][naif]?---[....]|uxo MF 17, [---]\[i\]ena : uf[---]---jono : uxo\[o\(r\)]

MF 102, pola marc\[ia\] : sus[?\(-\)] LF 227 (if sus[?\(-\)] = s us\[o\(r\)]), and perhaps in [---]a · nel\[n\] f[---]uxo · ohi\[*\]\[\] LF 300. Note that LF 222, caui\[ia\] · uecin\[e\]a · uotilia | 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\textsubscript{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 \cdot \cdot \cdot | uxor \cdot ia MF 101, perhaps also [...]nea \cdot *a | [u]xor ia \cdot * | ma \cdot oscin* LF 301, perhaps also cauio [---]ruso[?---] MLF 318 (if uso[?---] = usol(r) ... = ‘uxor ... ’), perhaps also uene[?---]na \cdot | uxo(o) ?---] MF 43. The fact that this reversed formula occurs at all may indicate that the marital formula was not as fixed as \textsc{filiation}.

(c) An exceptional case is [.]a | protacio \cdot m \cdot f \cdot mqestratu | kset | cuestod \cdot pi \cdot pretod \cdot pis | cauia | uxo \cdot a \cdot f LF 242: (a) it is the only instance where the marital formula is added to \textsc{praenomen}, while in elsewhere it is added to \textsc{praenomen gentilicium}; (b) it is the only certain instance where the marital formula consists of \textit{wife} only; and (c) it is the only certain instance where \textsc{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\textsubscript{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 \textit{cursus honorum}, had misunderstood the marital formula.

(d) Unclear is m \cdot c[i]peario \cdot m \cdot f \cdot [---]or LF 233 (if [---]or = ... uxor).

In a few inscriptions, a word other than \textit{uxor} appears to have been used. In two Latino-Faliscan or Latin inscriptions the word \textit{coniunx} may have been used, but these texts are too damaged to be sure: m \cdot acof [nio \cdot ia \cdot * | rutil \cdot cef \cdot jilia \cdot co* LF 341 and [---?] decon[---]a \cdot f LF 174, if to be read as de con[---]): note that, as said above, in Latin inscriptions the word used is always \textit{uxor}, never \textit{coniunx}. I find it hard to agree with Vetter’s (1953:305) suggestion to read lepuia in [...]a iq | lepuia | vultilia MF 144 as an abbreviated husband’s name \textit{le} followed by Etruscan \textit{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\textsubscript{Gen} WIFE preceding \textsc{filiation}.

### 7.5. The formula of filiation

#### 7.5.1. \textsc{filiation}. The onomastic formula can be extended with \textsc{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, \textsc{filiation} is found only in sepulcral and official inscriptions (including public dedications), with the exceptions of the \\textit{besitzerinschrift locia eimo} MLF 293, the signature oufilo : clipeatio : letei : fileio : met : facet MF 470*, and the private dedication mar \cdot popi \cdot st \cdot f \cdot n \cdot mart \cdot d \cdot d \cdot me Cap 421. Second, \textsc{filiation} is normally added only to the full onomastic formula \textsc{praenomen gentilicium}, although there are rather more exceptions in the case of women: not only the \textit{besitzerinschrift}
locia eimoi MLF 293, but also within the sepulchral inscriptions, ca uiπi : leuelt | filea
MF 14, cauit : uxo · a · Pf 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 in-
scriptions, which are more frequent in these categories.

7.5.2. FatherGen [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 FatherGen [son/daughter], and (2) by
means of a patronymic adjective (see also fig.7.3):

(1) The formula FatherGen son/daughter and FatherGen. In Faliscan, one of the
ways to express filiation was the formula FatherGen filius/filia, as in Latin. Whether
FatherGen, which occurs in several inscriptions (see fig.7.3), was an independent for-
mula or just a shortened form of FatherGen filius/filia cannot be established. In Etrus-
can, the frequency of FatherGen clearly shows that it was a separate formula that could
be used as an alternative to FatherGen clan/sex. In the Sabellic languages, FatherGen
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 FatherGen, aruz : cesie :
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 patronym-
ic 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 diminu-
tive 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 iueneo MF 151,
iueneo LF 220, perhaps also in?jneoe MF 141, and uolteo MF 275, uoldeo 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, f c · uomanio.
may be doubted, since the -eo may stand for /-ǭōs/ ← /-ājōs/ (§3.7.6). On the other hand, I read volto 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 iunio 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 gentilia 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 gentilia. This interpretation is debatable, however, and some of the forms may simply be graphical errors. The instances are: Umbrian titis in vuvcis titis teteies TI Ib.45 (probably an error for titio or titio: 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 Præsamnnitic veneliis in vinu/g548s 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 gentilia 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 FATHERGEN [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 FATHERGEN [filius/filia] was due to influence from other traditions: FATHERGEN [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 FATHERGEN [clan/sez], 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 FATHERGEN [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 FATHERGEN [filius/filia], while the Latino-Faliscan and Latin inscriptions have only FATHERGEN [filius/filia].

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>patronymic adjective</th>
<th>FATHER&lt;sub&gt;Gen&lt;/sub&gt; [filius/filia]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MF Falerii Veteres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marcio</td>
<td>uipi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voltilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in/neom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]leom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voltilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mesio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iuno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uoltiio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[u]olti[i---]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? !/oc]ies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corchiano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lartio</td>
<td>aruto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uoltio</td>
<td>aruto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>originis ignotae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leteo</td>
<td>470*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uoteloe</td>
<td>470*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLF Corchiano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titia</td>
<td>eimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titio</td>
<td>titio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grotta Porciosa</td>
<td>iaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titio</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? lartio</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF Falerii Novi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iuno</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uoltilla</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? marcia</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? marcio</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? uoltiio</td>
<td>ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbognano-Vallerano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***io</td>
<td>zextoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uoltiio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Perhaps to be read as ar · p.  b The interpretation of this form is unclear. c Perhaps a gentilicium rather than a patronym. d Possibly a dative. e I read a patronymic adjective uoltiio, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>patronymic adjective</th>
<th>FATHERGEN [filius/filia]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LtF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falerii Veteres</td>
<td>ce 4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c ·f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a ·f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m ·f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q ·f  ῶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...f  ῶ  ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ia f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a ·f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m ·f  ῶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?[s]t ·f ῶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?ia ·f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falerii Novi</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corchiano</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabbrica di Roma</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grotta Porciosa</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falerii Novi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ager Capenas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* { · } f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uoltai · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c · f · c · n b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uo · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s/{ex · }f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c · ῶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>st · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m · f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ 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 FATHERGEN [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 formula. I doubt, however, whether this shift was very great or of very great importance, as the use of FATHERGEN [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 | lucci : teti : uxor ‘Caesia Fassia, wife of Lucius Tettius’, the second, louria | [l]oifirta ‘Luria, freedwoman’. The freeborn woman is designated by PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM [HUSBANDGEN 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 Fassia, 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 ṭi [?] ūria lo[?--]l[e]a : cs : f MF 155 and [--] *i : u[ο]ltiai lo MF 165. Of these, the first appears to show another freedwoman with PRAENOMEN GENTILICIUM, although the text has also been read as ū[i][n]tīria 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[frria] 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 gentilicum 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 · hescuma 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 praenomen, 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-, acrēx MF 67 (gen.?), acre MF/Etr 279. – G. Giacomelli (1963:172) hesitantly classed this name as a praenomen, in which case it is probably connected with Etruscan Acri (acri Pe 1.871 (perhaps a gentilicum?), acris Pe 1.86, Pe 1.928, acrial 1.1242): such a praenomen must have formed the base of the Latin patronymic gentilicum Acrius. Hirata (1967:32) classed it as a gentilicum: see §7.8.1.6.
3. Aemus. m. eimoi MLF 293 (gen. or dat.).
4. Aemius. m. aimsonio EF 467* (gen.). Pace G. Giacomelli (1963:173) and Hirata (1967:33) this is a praenomen rather than a gentilicum.
The abbreviation $a[i?]m$ 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 ‘$a-em-oi$’ Le 26, although *Aemius* must have formed the basis of the old Latin patronymic gentilicium *Aemilius*, and an abbreviated gentilicium *aí* is attested for Samnitic in $m \cdot t \cdot g \cdot aí \cdot h[n] \ tSa 15$. 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*.


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)πνς* appearing (together with *Ταφίνος*) in the list of kings in Cod. Vat. 1307 (Conway 1897:48).

8. *Ar*. abbr., see *Arruns*.

9. *Arruns*. m. *arjuto* MF 169 (gen.), *aruz* MF 257, *aruto* MF 257 (gen.), *aronto* MF 265 (gen.), *aruto* MF 266 (gen.), *ar[t][3-5]ře* MF/Etr 267, *arute* MF 269 (acc. used as nom.?). Cf. also Etruscan *arnťual 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 *jar uesc^[---]* CIL III.10444 from Aquincum. The name is also attested for Oscan, as *arút* Po 47. Apart from these attestations, it formed the base of the patronymic gentilicium *Arruntius* that occurs both in Latin (e.g. *[arr]untiae[c] · e · l · erotidi* CIL XI.3189 from Vignanello) and in Oscan (*arruntiiis* Po 58, *αρώντις* 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*.
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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 *Aulus/Ofulus and Aulus*.

12. **Afulus/Ofulus.** m. *oufilo* MF 470*, aufilo* MLF 348, perhaps also *ohi*\[\ldots\] LtFLat 300? Derived from this is the gentilicium *Afulus/Ofulus* (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 *Afle* (4 attestations in *ET*) and *Afle* (6 attestations in *ET*) from Perusia: Rix (1965:66) suspected that *Afle* in fact rendered the Faliscan name. Latin had an (unrelated?) name *Ofillus* or *Ofellus* (Salomies 1987:91), as well as patronymic gentilicia *Afulus/Afulius* and *Ofillus/Ofillius*, see §7.8.1.25. There are no correspondents or derivations in the Sabellic languages, except perhaps the Umbrian gentilicium *uferie[r] Um 8, which would correspond to *Ofidius*. Salomies (1987:91) also points to Oscan *úffals* Cp 2, *upfals* Cp 3 etc., which occurs once as *uff[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 *ajviles feluskeš* Vn 1.1 from Vetulonia, which according to Poccati (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 *Afulus*. – 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 *Gauius*.

15. **Ca.** abbr., see *Gaius* and *Gauius*.

16. **Cau.** abbr., see *Gauius*.

17. **Caelius.** m. *celio* LF 332; *cailio* 358; perhaps also unclear *cef\[\ldots\] LsF 231? Abbreviations of this name may be (1) *Ce.* m. LF 213, 226, 235, LsF 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,
kailes 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]ifo MF 51, cesi MF 94 (gen.), cai[s]io MF 153, cesi MF 263? (gen.?), ceisio MF 276; caisio MLF 351; cseo LF 331; perhaps also fragm. ce[---] LfF 231?; f. c[ai]sio MF 41. Either m. or f. is cesi[s]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, LfF 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, kai/g86/g790ie/g86/g790 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 Caesilus. Similar gentilicia are attested for Paelignian (caisies Pg 27) and Oscan (kaisillieis Cp 25, caisidis Lu 51). The unrhhotacised 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 : callio 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 gentilicum fertrio in Cap 391 (§7.8.1.60). Salomies (1987:71) agrees with this, quoting also f · grecia CIL I ἒ.350 from Praeneste, and rejects the F(austus) originally proposed by Henzen (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. kaio EF 4. (I do not adopt Bormann’s reading (CIL XI.3162b,5) caio in LF 332.)


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, cf. 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 /gāui-/ (perhaps related to gaudeo ← PIE */gēh₂uiidʰ/-) and that this somehow lost its /u/, 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 /gāui-/ or /gāio-/ was a derivation of a */gāu̯-/ (which in itself is perfectly feasible): this would then have become */gāo-/ by the same process by which Gnaeus became Gnaeus, and this */gāo-/ was then reformed to /gāio-/ → /gāio-/ Gaius (apparently not to the rather more expected */gāo-/ since this would have given *Gaeus).

123 Salomies erroneously ascribes the interpretation Fertor to Vetter (1953:328) and the interpretation Faustus to Degrassi (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 I and the Etruscan derivations of *Gaius* (see below) would place this whole process before the sixth century, and therefore well before the loss of /ɣ/ in *Gnaeaus*. However, whether etymologically related or not, the distribution of *Gauius* 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 *kauíveis* AQ 3 and in Oscan *gavis* Hi 10, *ga[vis] Cm 14.3, gaavi[eis] Fr 1, [ɣ]a[veis] Lu 45, [ɣ]a[vis] Lu 63, (ɣ)ave Lu 47, γa[vis] 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 (*ka[ys] Cr 2.56, kaaie Cr 5.1, cavies Cr 2.74, kaviesi* AT 3.1 *kayfies 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 *Gauius* is in fact greater than that of the Sabellic and Etruscan instances put together: perhaps *Gauius* 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 *Gauius*. *Gaius* is absent from the Middle and Late Faliscan onomasticon, while *Gauius* is the most frequently attested Middle and Late Faliscan praenomen: on the other hand, there is no trace of *Gauius* 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 *Gauius* as well as for *Gaius* (thus G. Giacomelli 1963:178), or, as I would prefer, by assuming that Latin *Gaius* and Faliscan *Gauius* were regarded as equivalents (whether this was etymologically justifiable or not is irrelevant). Someone called *Gauius* 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 lead to the disappearance of *Gauius*.

### 26. *Graecus* m. kreco:[---] MF 147

The name may have been a nickname, but the occurrence of *Graecus* and Gr. elsewhere (Latin *CIL* I.3.36, 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 in 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 *cesi : 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 *ian·t··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).


---

\(^{126}\) *CIL* I.3.559 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 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 Lars or Lars (see below): in MF 373-375 it is perhaps rather Lars, 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. Laeulius. m. leuelio MF 79, [leu]elio MF 90, [leu]elio MF 159. The name occurs also as a gentilicium (see §7.8.1.82). – Laeulius is a patronymic derivation from Laeuius. The spelling ei/e represents /e/ ← /ai/ (G. Giacomelli 1963:199, Hirata 1967:57) rather than the /e/ required by the connection with Liuius suggested by Deecke (1888:129): note the Etruscan praenomen laives AV 2.1 and the patronymic gentilicium laiven/g809[ Ru 3.1, laiven[as] Vs 1.58. A praenomen Laeuis occurs once in Latin, a Laeuus Cispius 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 Scaea from scaeus: both had the meaning ‘well-omened’ in the official sacral language: “laeua prospera existimantur, quoniam laeua parte mundi ortus est” (Plin. NH 2.142), “scaea, 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*§ 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. §3.5.7d), 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. [[oc]jies MF 12?, *louci* MF 41 (gen.); f. *locia* MLF 293. Abbreviations of this praenomen are probably (1) *Lo*. m. MF? 33 (In *ti [ ] tiria lo[?---]l[e]a : cs : f* MF 155 and *[---]*u[a]ltia 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 *luvcies* Ps 13, Umbrian *vuvcis* TI Ib.45, Ila.44, and *vuvcia* TI Ib.26, and Oscan *lukvis* 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* (*luvc* AT 5.2, *luvc* Vs 1.282, *luvces* Ta 1.220, *luvcies* Ta 7.31, *luvcies* Cr 2.139, Vc 6.12; f. *luvci* AT 1.102, *luvci* AH 2.3, *luvcia* Ta 1.149, *luvcial* 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 Marcius.

38. **Ma.** abbr., see Marcus and Marcius.

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 Marcius.

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. **Marcius.** 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 Marcius (probably the former): marci MF 472* (gen.). Abbreviations of these praenomina are: (1) **Mar.** in MF 87, Cap 421; (2) **Ma.** LF 226 (probably Marcius), 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, Volscan, Paetignian and Oscian texts (see ST: Oscian 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 lef[---] | 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 rho-tacism 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 (μασιος 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
niumsis Cm 14,2, niiumsis Cm 6, niiumsieis Cm 6, νομψυμ Lu 46) and as
Nom(e)sis (e.g. νομψυς Lu 47, νοψυμ Lu 46). Etruscan has both the praenomen Nu-
mesie (numes Cm 2.48 (abbreviated?), numsieis Cm 2.8, numsiesis Ta 3.1, numes-
sia Vs 1.268, numusieś Ar 1.13), and the gentilicia Numsie and Num sina: the lat-
ter is also attested for the ager Faliscus (nomesina MF 272): see §7.8.1.107. Cf.
also the theonym Mars Numerius in LtF 377 from Ponzano Romano and Cap 421
from Capena. The origin of the name is debated, and may be eitherItalic or Etrus-
can (see Salomies 1987:39), probably rather the former (De Simone 2006:170-3).

46. O. abbr. m. in o hafti MF 13? Doubtful. See Aufilus/Ofilus.

47. Oct- m. A dubious attestation in oct*i[....] uoltilio MLF 353, where oct is proba-
ably a numeral praenomen like Octauus,128 in Latin one of the rarer numeral
praenomina. In Oscan, only Ohtavis is found as a praenomen (στας 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, ȝhtaves Pe 1.1267), where the h clearly
points to a Sabellic origin.

48. Paquius m. paqua in paquis blasiiis Sab 468*. This praenomen is in all prob-
ability the one represented by the abbreviation Pa, in Cap 390. A Sabellic
praenomen attested for Oscan in πακτης Lu 40 (and pakhtis Si 19?), and in ab-
breviated form in Marrucinian paq MV 8, pa MV 9: the Sabellic languages also
had several closely related praenomina (Oscan pak#hij Lu 87, pakthij Lu 23, paak-
kul Cm 7) and gentilicia (Paelignian pacia Pg 4, Oscan pak#hij Lu 63, pakthij Lu
23, pakullis 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.

instances of Paula/Paula 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 tith o so soft that the form

128 Herbig (CIE 8204) in fact read the Faliscan attestation as ocfo, referring to Schulze’s re-
marks (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/paula (cf. §3.7.4).

50. ? Petro. m. A very dubious attestation in petrójono 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 (petjijeronis AP.5), Marrucinian (petróni 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 pop[---] MLF 317; f. poplia MF 18, poplia MF 48, poplia MF 50, poplia MF 136, [p]opli[a] MF 160, poplia MF 265, poplia MF 271, poplia MLF 303, popli[a] 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 Puponius. 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[jine]i AQ.2, Oscan pu(m)puʃ 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 Puponius.

53. Pupia. f. pupiias 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 (*τομπτίες* Me 1 etc., *piintis* 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* 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:n.88), as it is here.

58. **Scaeua**. f. *sceu* MLF **312**, *sceiuai* 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 *scaeua* (“*scaeua*, id est sinistra, quod quae sinistra sunt, bona auspicia existimantur”, Var. L. 7.97), just as *Laenus/Laeius/Laeuius* is derived from *laeus* (see under *Laeuilius*). Latin had gentilicia such as *Scaeuius* etc. (Schulze 1904:226-7), while Etruscan had a probably borrowed name *sceua* CI 1.1243, 2028, *sceuas* a CI 1.1045 (cf. also the gentilicium *Sceva/Scevia* (9 attestations, mainly from Clusium). For the forms with -f-, Etruscan *scefi* Pe 1.630, *scefi* Pe 1.1211, *scefi* Pe 1.201, and the Paeliginian gentilicum *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 *Scaeua* 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 ërvei Pe 1.1191, ërvi 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 seʃx LtF 328, sʃx Lat 291, sex Cap. 399, 430. – A Latin numeral praenomen, not attested for Etruscan (except for the indirect attestation in the gentilicium ëkstalu 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 sehsimbris 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 Statius.

64. Sta. abbr., see Statius.

65. Stat. abbr., see Statius.

66. Statius. m. statio MLF 376. Abbreviations that probably represent this praenomen are: (1) Stat. MF? 29? (the text is statuo, probably to be read as statuo); (2) Sta. f. (?) Cap 466 [without context in MF? 28, staʃ 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 (Samnite 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 òana (numerous instances, mainly from Tarquinii, Clusium, and Perusia: 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. òania 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. *θανακυίλ* MF 49, *tanacu[*il] MF 101, *tanacuil* MLF 347. – A typical Etruscan female praenomen, derived from the theonym *θανα*, occurring as *θαν-*(θανεκυίλ Vs 1.287, Po 4.4, *θανεκυίλιν* OA 2.63), *θανα*- (*θαναγυίλ* Ta 7.3, *θαναγυίλιν* Vs 1.190, *θαναγυίλινι*us Ta 2.1, *θανακυίλιν* CR 2.42), and *θανε*- (*θανεκυίλ* Ta 7.31, *θανεκυίλιν* AV 2.11). Not attested from Latin or the Sabellic languages: note that it is apparently a nominal compound *θανα+κυίλ*, a type of praenomen that is apparently absent from the Italic onomasticon.

71. **Te.** abbr., see Tettius.

72. **Tettius.** m. *τετι* 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 *τετ* in CIL X.6098 from Urbino: there also appears to be an attestation in South Picene *τετις* TE.2. The name occurs only as gentilicum in Latin, Paelignian, and Etruscan: see §7.8.1.152.

73. **Ti.** abbr. *τί* in *τί* [^*τίρια*] 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. *τιρρί* 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. *τίτο* MLF 305, *τίτοι* MLF 305 (gen.), *τίτο* MLF 359, *τίτο* MLF 359. (The instances do not include the theonym Titus Mercus, for which see §6.4) Indirectly attested in the patronymic adjective *τίτια* MLF 302, *τίτιο* MLF 307, *τίτο* MLF 312. The corresponding female praenomen appears to have been *Titia* rather than *Tita*, a patronymic praenomen derived from *Titius*; *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 *aues titiae* mentioned by Varro (L. 5.81). The praenomen is well-known from Latin, although not frequently used, and occurs also in South Picene (*titīm* AP.1, *titīi* TE.5), in Umbrian (*titis* TI 1b.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?), *τιτιδες* 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).


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.). – 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 : kainie : tuleo : kn* Ar 1.1, and *lar : tule : kavinei | tuš(urth) Ar 1.94. The name is either Latin or Etruscan.

78. *V.* abbr. *u* Cap 435.


80. *Vel*. m. *uelos* EF 4 (gen. or a thematized form, see §7.2.1), *uel* MF 56, *uél* MF 82, perhaps *uel* 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, *veleis* Hi 3).

81. *Velce(i)us* or *Velcaeus*. m. *uelcei* LF 332 (gen.). An adaptation of Etruscan praenomen *Velge* (Cl 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 *velðarus* 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 *Vethurius*, *Volturius*, and *Vulturius*, which show the usual Latin development /e/→/o/ before velar /l/ (§3.3.4. I). 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 *ueve[––]na · | ux[o(r) ?––] MF 43. Perhaps abbreviated *uen* in *uentarc*.….. MF 80? A derivation *Venelius*, either a patronymic adjective or a gentilicium, occurs in *uenelis* 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 (*ueneli*īs Ps 12, *uenilei* Ps 3, patronymic adjective *ueneliīs* 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, *vipes* 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 (*uibia* Pg 51, abbreviated *uib* Pg 33) and is most common in Oscan (*viíbis* Fr 1 etc., f. *#ibian* 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/Vipiēna*.

85. *Volta* m. *uolta* MF 149, *uol[t]a* 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, *uolθeο* MF 276; *uoltio* LF 224; perhaps also in *uoltio* MF 164 (this may also be an instance of the gentilicium *Voltius*) and *uolt[---]* MF 167 (this may also be an instance of the gentilicium *Voltius*, or of the patronymic adjective *Voltilius*).

86. *Voltius*. m. *volti* MF 11 (gen.), *volti* MF 79 (gen.), *[u]oltio* MF 88, *uolti[o* MF 152; *volti* MLF 469* (gen.), *uoltio* MLF 312; *uoltio* LF 220, *uoltio* LF 330; probably also *ulttēs* MF/Etr 64, if this is to be read as *u(o)ltēs*. Indirectly attested in the patronym adjective *volttilia* MF 80, *volttilia* MF 144, *uoltilio* MF 162, *uolt[i---]* MF 163; *uoltilio* MLF 346; *uoltīia* LF 222, *uoltilio* LF 336; perhaps also *uolt[i---]* 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 *[uolti---]* 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 *vultas* 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 (velti Pe 1.277, 1.565, 1.1031, veltilia(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 Laeuius also appear to have been Faliscan, and the same is perhaps true of the female praenomen Scæua. The derivation of Vibius from Etruscan may have been Faliscan in origin, and the great frequency of Gauius 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 Gauius, Lucius/Lucia, Marcus (with its probably Faliscan derivation Marcius), and the numeral praenomina Quintus, Sextus, and Oct-. Of these, Gauius, 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) Sabellian: Interestingly, there is hardly any praenomen that is exclusively Sabellian 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 Sabellian are At(tus), F(ertor), Sen(), and Tr(ebius).

(4) Italic: Of Italic origin, but not ascribable to either Latin, Faliscan, or the Sabellian languages in specific are Gauius/Gauia (which could perhaps be of Faliscan origin) Statius, Titus, the very dubiously attested Ancus, and, occurring only in abbreviated form, Nu(merius). Among these praenomina, the frequency of Gauius/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 Caelu, 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-, Circus, 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 (Sabellian?), 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 Gauius/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 Voltillus (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 Laeulius, Marcius, Messius, Vibius, Voltius and Voltilius, perhaps also Paquius, Pu(m)ponius, Saluia, Servius, Statius, Tettius, and possibly also Letaeus and Velveius. It is noteworthy that the one instance of Marcius (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, Laeulius, and Marcius. 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 Laeuilius, derived from laeuus, the female praenomen Scaeua, derived from scaeuaus, and Titus (which also occurs in the theonym Titus Mercus) and its derivation Titia. Perhaps also Saluia 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 gentilicum) and in Oscans (abellanii 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: Schulze (1904:111, 368) suggested that it was derived from a gentilicum like Accaeus with a suffix parallell to the one in Rup-arcellius: G. Giacomelli (1963:171) and Hirata (1967:31-2) assumed that this gentilicum 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 l 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 */okri\i\lom/ implied by Etruscan ucrislane ET Cl 1.2609, 2611-2613 etc. Cf. also Calzecchi-Onesti (1981:184-8, 165-7) on acr-/arc- inItalic 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. Acquiaeus. m. açiuaiom (or a\li\uaiom) 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. açonia LF 220, perhaps also m. *(*)co\vlo 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 /e\vno 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 f\aino 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 aie\a by Herbig CIE 8032). The reading aieq, 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. Alluaeus. m. al\ia\iom (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 *ales* TE 2 and Marrucinian *ales* MV 4 (twice), formed with the same suffix as in early Latin *karkavaios* CIL I.2.2917a (Colonna 1990a).

12. *Am- or Amm-* without context *ame* 280, *ame* 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 *Amnìus* (which occurs in CIL XI.3080 from Falerii 133). The name appears to be of Etruscan origin.

13. *Annìus*. m. *ani* MF 45 (gen.?), *anio* Cap 420, *anni* Ltf 63 (gen.).

14. *Annìlius*. 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*, *Annius*, *Annìlius*, 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 *Annìanus* or *Anìanus* mentioned by Ausonius (Cent. 11). Gentilicia of this group are also attested for the Sabellic languages, e.g. South Picene *anaiúm* AP.1, Paelignian *anaes* Pg 10, *annies* Pg 40, *annia* Pg 15, 33, Oscæ *annìe* Cps 38, Paelignian *annìaes* Pg 39, *aniaes* Pg 38, Vestinian *anìnies* MV 11.


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. *Aratìus* or *Arantìus*. m. *aratio* MLF 348, *aratio* MLF 349, *arcatio* MLF 350; f. *aràtia* MLF 357. The gentilicium may be a patronymic derivation from the Etruscan praenomen *Aràð/Aranth*, in which case it could be read either as *Aratìus* or as *Arantìus*. The Latin onomasticon has no corresponding names: perhaps the name may be compared to *Aradìus* (cf. Faliscan *calìtenes* MF 265, which corresponds to Latin *Calìdenus*), but this name appears to be of Middle-Eastern origin (Schulze 1904:113). Cf. perhaps also the Etruscan gentilicium *aràthenas* 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 *Arnìus* (Schulze 1904:412). See also §7.7.1.9.]

19. [? *Arrius*. f. *a[rria]* in *arrìa* | plaria Cap 431. The restoration is extremely doubtful: a very different reading, in which the name would be *sàl* | *plaria*, with a praenomen *sàluia*, 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 *arnutlesa* 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. *arutī[e]lia* or *arutī[el]ia*.

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

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


25. **Auffilius/Oufilius.** oufilio MF 48, auffilio MF 50, oufilio MF 51, ou*[Jo] MF 52, auffi[l]io ?---] MF 53, oufilio MF 275, oufilio MF 276. A patronymic gentilicium derived from the (Faliscan?) praenomen *Auffilus*/Oufilus, for which see §7.7.1.12. Latin, too, had Auffilius/Ofilius, but also Auffillius/Ofillius and Auffellius/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. **Auffitus.** m. ofiti in f ofiti MF 58 (if not to be read as *sofiti*). A Latin gentillicium *Auffitus* 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 gentillicium (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, aulnaś Fe 3.3), Aulne (aulnei Cl 1.1308, Pe 1.93) and Latin Olnius and Aulenes.

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 *paquvis* and shows Sabellic epigraphic and linguistic features (such as the syncopation of the final syllable).]

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

31. **Caelius.** m. caelio MF 90, c]elio MF 94, celio MF 95, c]elio MF 96, c]elio MF 97, celio MF 105; cael|ia MF 92; cai]to MF 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** (ca|inal |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 (ka|is|ille|is Cp 25).

33. **Caesius.** m. ces/g851e MF 257, ces|ies 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 **Ceio** (ceio| Pe 1.325, 1.326, ceio| Pe 1.323, 1.327, ceio|al 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 (καλιν|ς Me 1, καλιν|ς Me 3, καλι|ς 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 : Voltemus (Lejeune 1952b:124 n.1).

36. **[Calpurnius.** m. calpurnius Cap 432.]

37. **Catineius.** m. catinei MLF 469* (gen.). Latin has **Catineius** beside **Catinius**. Cf. Etruscan catni Ta 1.166.

38. **Cincius.** m. cicio MF 40; f. cincia MF 135; cf. also Etruscan cen|cu 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. citiae MF 270 (gen. or dat., but cf. §9.2.3c). G. Giacomelli (1983:185) pointed to Etruscan **citta** in TLE 495, which appears to be the only Etruscan parallel. Latin has a gentillicium **Citius**.

261
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‹rio?) MF 470*; *clipier[i]o* LF 230, *clipier[i]o* LtF 231, *cl[i]pearrio* 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‹rio* or if this is a different derivation from the same noun: cf. also *frenaios* MF 471* instead of the expected *frena‹rios*. 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 *Coclius* 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, culcn[es] Ta 1.97).

44. **Colanius.** 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 *Kot...niaj* in an inscription from near Faenza. The name reflects Etruscan names like *Cutna/Cutne* (12 attestations, mostly from Clusium).]


47. [**Didius.** m. *didius* Lat 456.]


49. ? **E...sus** in *e**sa* Cap 457. Unclear.

50. **Egnatius.** m. *egnatius* Lat 291 ; f. *e[ç]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 Ecnaē/Ecnati (eknate Vs 1.299, ekṇat[e] Ta 7.40, ecnaē Vs 1.170; ecnati[ ] Ta 1.256, ecnatial Ta 1.95) and Ecnatna/Ecnatni (ecnatna AS 1.316, ecnatas Vs 1.202, 1.307, ecnataal Cl 1.1455, ecṇ[a]nal Vt 1.110, ecnat[al] Cl 1.1682; ecnati Cl 1.388, ecnati 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 f aino: 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 φaσνεαl 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 haθi 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 f aino, cf. Aenus and Eina (above).

57. Fa(r)farn... fafarn MF 136 (abbr.), faf[---] 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 Nar[onio]nus and Vomanius.

58. Fassius. f. fasies MF 41. The only direct parallel appears to be Oscan fassii[fZO 1. Latin had only Fassidius, derived with the Sabellic suffix -idius.

59. Feliginas. m. felicinate MF 42 (gen.), [fel]icinatu LF 384 (gen. pl.). The name has parallels in Etruscan Felcinate/Felcinatne (felcinattal Pe 1.485, 1.1235; felci[ natnal 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. (Fertro 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, h[esca]n[a]s Vs 7.31, hescnas Vs 1.183.0.23).

62. **Firmius.** m. *firmio* MF 19, *hirmio* LF 213; f. *firmia* MF 18, *hirmia* LF 302. The name has been connected with Latin Firmius and the adjective firmus, in which case it shows the Faliscan development /#fV/ → /#hV/ in hirmeo MF 19, hirmio LF 213, and hirmia 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. *hlau|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. *fulczeo* LF 329, *folcozeo* LF 330, *folcuso* LF 331, *olcuzeo* 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 *Ful|zu* or *Hu|zu*: cf. Etruscan Hul|zena (hul|zenas Vs 1.28, 1.99, hul|znas Vs 2.35) and Hul|zies (hul|zies AT 5.2, hul|ziesi Ta 5.2, 5.5, h[u|lu]j[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 frenar|ios, 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, uloltaia 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. **Graec...** *gra[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 *cësit : fere* MF 263. Salomies (1987:73) includes *fere* in her discussion of the praenomina *Herius* and *Heremius* (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 *hermanaś* Cl 2.11, cf. also *Hermenā* (hermenas Pa 3.1 h)ermenas Vs 1.152, perhaps also h)ermenae Ve 3.19). Latin has *Hermius* and *Hermenius*. G. Giacomelli (1963:192) connected the gentilicium *Firmius* (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.
CHAPTER 7

75. *Ie*. in *ie*[---] MF 93. Various possible names may be found in Hirata 1967:54 and Solin & Salomies 1994:95-6. Cf. perhaps *ie gia · ty|che* CIL XI.3447 from Tarquinii, or Paelignian *ieiis* 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 *Lar* (see §7.7.1.35), like the corresponding Latin gentilicium *Lartius*.

79. *Latinaeus*. m. *latinaio* MLF 210. Perhaps derived from the Latin ethnicon *Latimus* 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.


81. *Laeuius*. m. *leueli* MF 14 (gen.), *leuelio* MF 146; f. *leuelia* MF 147. The name also occurs as a praenomen, see §7.7.1.33.

82. *Laeulius*. m. *leueli* MF 14 (gen.), *leuelio* MF 146; f. *leuflia* MF 147. The name also occurs as a praenomen, see §7.7.1.33.

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 *le*/*baie* 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* (likin*e* Cl 2.18, licinesi Cr 3.13 licinesi Cr 3.18; licen*ef* Vs 2.38, liceni Ta 1.1222, Cl 1.2206, licenis 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, lulœïa 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. *lo/ria* MF 41.

91. **Luriaeus or Lurieius.** f. *loriea* MLF 314. The second gentilicium is in all probability a derivation from the first, either *Lurieius* (G. Giacomelli 1963:200-1) or *Luriaeus*.134 The gentilia *Lurius* and *Luriamus* 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, “>ier< Schreibung für [iɛa] wie in etr. *θανιεα, 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 *Manilius.*) 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 *Marcena/Marγna, Marcene/Marγne, Marcni/Marγni* is very well attested (*c*.155 attestations, mostly from Clusium). I doubt whether this name is the direct basis of the gentilicium *Marcius* (below).

98. **Marcius.** 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 *Marcius*, 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 *Marcius* (above), but G. Giacomelli (1963:204) may well have been right in pointing rather to Campano-Etruscan *marhie\\text{-}\text{i}e\\text{-}s*. Cm 6.1 and suggesting a connection with the Oscan praenomen *Marah\\text{-}\text{is}* (e.g. *marah\\text{-}is* Cm 14.C6, *\mu\acute{a}rh\acute{a}\\text{-}s* Lu 2, *marah\\text{-}ie\\text{is}* Cm 28, *\mu\acute{a}rh\\acute{a}\\text{-}ev* 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 \\text{-}ez = \\text{-}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*.


104. **Nel...** nel[n---] LtF 299, f.? neln LtF 300 (abbreviated?). The name is entirely unclear: *Nel...* could conceivably reflect *Naelen-/Naelin-, Nel\text{-}en-/Nel\text{-}in-*, or *Nilen-/Nilin-, 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; nero[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 Num/g305i(na) (num/g305/g1444inal Cl 1.969, 1.1102, 1.1596, 1.2026, num/[i]nal Cl 1.1103; num/a/ine Cl 1.2027). Etruscan also had Num/aie (num/aie Cl 1.753, num/aí Cl 1.2025, 1.2028, num/aís Pe 1.197, 1.198): this appears in Latin as Num/isius/ 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 Num/esis/ Nomesis: see §7.7.1. 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.** ošcin* LtF 301 (abbr.?). The text and the possible parallels for the name are unclear: cf. perhaps Latin Hoscinius and Etruscan Hzecena (hzecn[a]s Ta 1.250, hzn[a]i Ta 1.50, 1.51, huzc[enes] Ta 1.185, huzecenas[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).


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 Πανοόγγος (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 Pro|culus 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. *pars* MF 79. The curious ending is the result either of an abbreviation (cf. Latin *Particius*) or of a rare and irregular syncopation */-ios/ → */-is/* (§3.6.6.2) accompanied by an equally rare retention of */-s/* (§3.5.7.d). 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 *parθanαs* Cl 1.2035, and Latin *Partuleius*.

116. *Pauicius*. f. *pauiceo* MF 12, *paui[ceo* LtF 290, and perhaps to be restored in *caui o [*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 * · *pauiceo ru*so* LtF 290.) G. Giacomelli 1963:210) equated the name with Latin *Paucius*, comparing also Latin *Pauillius*. I greatly doubt the connection with *Faucius* suggested by Hirata1967:66-7.

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. *psci* 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. *petrοnεq* 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/Petrui* (more than 130 attestations) and as *Petruna/Petruni/Petruniε* (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 *pliniale* Ta 1.113 is unclear. Schulze (1904:89) and Stolte (1928:296) hesitated to equate this name with Latin *Plinius* (Plinius) because of the spelling Πλίνιος (without diphthong) in SIG 558: they preferred to connect the name with *Pleius*.

122. *Poenus*. perhaps *poe[---]* MF? 130, and *puiatu* MLF? 208. [Cf. perhaps also *puinαl* 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 (=polfaio*) MLF 354. Hirata suggested that the name was a misspelling for *polfaio* (cf. also *latinaio* MLF 210, *voltaiα* MF 196), comparing
names like Polfenius. 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 gentilicum 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. popili[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 gentilicum 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[ei]s 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, pupel[i] MF 150, pup[elio MF 151. In all probability a patronymic gentilicum 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 Pòp- and those in Pùp- (Schulze 1904:213). Latin had Pupilius as well as Pupelius.

130. ? Pupius. f. pupiias MLF 304 (gen.). The name occurs in isolation and may be a praenomen or a gentilicum (both PRAENOMEN and GENTILICIUM appear in women’s names in Besitzerinschriften, see §7.4.1). If it is a gentilicum, the name is probably identical with Latin Pupus. 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 Pupius. For Pupia as a praenomen, see §7.7.1.53.

131. [Quintus or Quintius: quinti Lat 477* (import).]

132. Raec(i)lius. m. Reic[flio] MF 98, reicliio MF 99; reic[clio] MF 100. G. Giacomelli (1963:215) pointed to a Latin Raecilius as a parallel, but this gentilicum 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.
Kretschmer (1943:158) pointed to Raec- : Graec- (cf. Ραύκος- Ἐλλην He- sych, p 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 gentilicum 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 rei[cl.] MF 100, where the name stands at the beginning of the line.

133. S... in (1) s*[--] MF 197; (2) s[---] LtF 173.

134. Sab. abbr. Cap 400. In all probability Sabinus.

135. Sacconius. zaconi MF 153, zaconiai MF 154 (gen. or dat.). Latin Sacconius, an adaptation of Etruscan Ζακονίς (21 attestations, mainly from Clusium, cf. ET).

136. [? Saluena. m. salu[e]na (or salu[i]na?) Lat 218. The name apparently occurs only here in Latin: Etruscan had Salvina (salvina Cl 1.1643, śalvīnē 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, šapu Cl 3.3, sapu̇a Cl 1.1139, šapu̇a AS 1.461, Cl 1.2016), which was adapted in Latin to Saponius, but the formation of this gentilium 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 Σατνίς (santna/-sántna-, 24 attestations, mainly from Clusium).

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 saidiēi Cap 9.

141. Sentius. m. senti Cap 399, sent-ti Cap 430; f. sen[th]ia MLF 362, perhaps also [---]nθia MLF 212. Latin Sentius, Etruscan Sente/Sente (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. seran[a] 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/sertur/serтур/сертур: for attestations, see ET).


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 /ɛ̃ervei Pe 1.1191, /ɛ̃ervi Pe 1.1190, and in Latin Seruius and Seruilius. It is probably unconnected with the noun seruus (sometimes thought to be of Etruscan origin, cf. Bréyer 1993:383-5).

147. Spurilius. m. spurilio 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 gentilia 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 zu/g548us Etr XXXII. Latin Succonius: the name is an adaptation of Etruscan Sucu (from Caere: sucu Cr 1.152, 1.155, 1.172, 2.31, sucui Cr 1.100) or Zu/g548u (mainly from Clusium: zu/g548u Cl 1.1619, 1.1769, 1.2173, zu/g548u Cl 1.1771; zu/g548u Vs 1.136, zu/g548u Pe 1.965). A Soc-conia Voluptas occurs in CIL XI.3223 from Nepi.

149. T... m. /g3/g1810**(*)[i] MF 84 (gen.). The name can be read as either Ta... or Tri...; but the /ɡ87/ 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 Tar- 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 Tettena. m. tetena MF 266.

153. Tettius. m. tetti 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 Sae-nensis) or Teina (19 attestations, mostly from Clusium). Cf. also South Picene ti-
Tienom 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 Marcius). 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. tîria 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, tîria 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. umbricius Lat 219. Also in CIL XI.3254 from Sutri.]

159. Umbricianus. m. upreciano MLF 363, upreciano MLF 364.

The attestations of Umbrius and of Umbricianus were found in the same tomb as Etruscan umrie Etr XI.III. 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, umríaš Cl 1.1294, umriaš Cl 1.2621, and umriš Pe 1.1268 as well as Latin Umbrius (and Umerius) reflect the ethnonym *Umbros which appears in Latin as Umbrius and in Greek as "Oμβριος. Umbricius may have been derived as Umbr-icius within the Latin onomasticon, but the Etruscan gentilicium Umrc (umrcėš 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 "Oμβριος. Neither the ethnonyms nor the names are attested for the Sabellic onomasticon.
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160. *Vatius*. f. *uatia* perhaps in *uei uatia* MLF 463 (but its companion inscription has *uei uteo* MLF 464, if this is not a falsum). Both attestations are doubtful. If testified, the gentilicium has an equivalent in Latin *Vatius*.

Ve- see also Vi-

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

162. *Veculius*. f. *ueculia* MF 80, *ueculia* 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 *Vicinius-unstyled* (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*/*g2637es*/*g2637* Etr *X*-*XIV* and *lazi veianes* Etr XV, and in Varro ("fratres Veianii ex agro Falisco" R. 3.16.10),


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/neo* MLF 316, *uelmi/neo---* 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 Perusia). For the curious metathesis in Etruscan *velim-*: 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), *velmenaie muluvanic* [e -?--], which can be restored as *velmenaie* (cf. Ribezzo 1931c:93-4).138 From the Faliscan instances it is unclear whether the ending *-eo* in *uelmineo* represents *-ios/, -/g413/g1173os/ /g312 /-g1711/g2951os/, or *-ios/ -/g914/g834/ /g312 /-g1440/g2951os/: see §3.7.6.

166. *Venelius*. *ueneljes* 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* Ve 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]ermenaie muluvanic[e -?--], which is equally possible (see the drawing in Giglioli 1930:307). Both *Velmenaie* and *Hermenaie* do not occur elsewhere.


170. *Vetulius*. m. *vetulius* MLF 336; f. *vetulio* LF 334 (and m. *vetulio* LF 336, if not a *falsum*). The name has parallels in Latin *Vetulius*, Etruscan *vetnei* Pe 1.336 and *vetnai* CI 1.1467.

**Vi-** see also **Ve-**


172. *Vicina*. m. *vicina* MLF 371, *vicina* MLF 372. There are no attestations of this name in Etruscan: the closest cognate is *veinac* Vs 1.203, *vecanes* Ta 7.29. In spite of the different vocalism, this name may therefore be identical with *Vicinius*/Vecinius.

173. *Vicinius* or *Vecinius*. m. *uecino* LF 220, *uecino* LF 224, *uecino* 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* (*vecanes* Ta 7.29), but the name may be identical with Latin *Vicinius* and an adaptation of Etruscan *Veicna* (*veinac* Vs 1.203). If so, it could be identical with *vicina* MF 371, 372 (see above under *Vicina*).

174. *Vicon(i)us*: *ueic/nos* MF 88, perhaps also in *tuconu* MF 85, if this can be read as *tueconu*. Latin has *Veconius*, *Vecconius*, and *Viconius*. The names are adaptations of the Etruscan gentilicium *Vecu*, attested for Clusium (*vecu* CI 1.843, 1.844, 1.845, 1.846, 1.847, 1.851, OI S.52, *vecui* CI 1.848, 1.849, *vecu/a* CI 1.852, *vecus* CI 1.850). For a Faliscan *Vecomus* beside Latin *Veconius*, see §7.8.2.

175. *Vinu...* possibly in *uyu/g877/g81/g877* MLF 365. Latin *Vinucius*, Etruscan *vinucenas* Vs 1.126, Oscan *viñiñiis* Po 3, all apparently derived from the praenomen attested in Praesamnitic *vinu* Ps 3 and the patronymic adjective *viniciu* Ps 3.


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 *Vin(e)na/ Vione* (*vinenas* Vs 1.9 and *viñanae* Vc 1.31, *viñana/l* Vc 1.92, *viñaei* Vc 1.53).


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 *Volliu*. 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*.
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180. **Voltaeus.** f. *voltaia* 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.** ultius MF/Etr 64. G. Giacomelli (1963:232) and Hirata (1967:89) compared Etruscan *Ulthe* (ager Saeniensis and Perusia) and *Velthe* (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) 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 [--Jo, [--Jo, [--Jeo, [--Jae, [--Jia, or [--Jea: *[(*)]co/g1772/g833o LtF 290 (perhaps */g809co/g1772/g833o*, see under *Aconius*), *[0-4?]i*ta LF 235, *[.]osena MLF 206, *[.]inoa MLF 212 (perhaps *spur]ilio, see under *Spurilius*), [--Jio MF 146, [--Jaeo MF 301, [--Jea MF 146, [--Jate MLF 285 (gen. of a probably toponymic gentilicium in ...fas), [--Jena MLF 102, [--Jile LtF 215 (perhaps spur]ilio, see under *Spurilius*), [--Jioo MF 137, [--Jicio LtF 341, [--Jothia MLF 212 (perhaps *se]n[thia, 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 praenomen: *Aufilius/Oufilius, Iunius,*
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Laeuius and Laeuilius, and Voltius; (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: Gemucilius (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, Claniidius, and perhaps Didius.

In view of the suffixes with which these gentilicia are derived, they are clearly ofItalic 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 Voltius. The gentilicia that are formed with the suffix -idius 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, Aemus, Faenus, Poenus, and perhaps the Early Faliscan names Amanus, Capena, and Volte-

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.
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 *ôn*-stems in (§4.5.1.3), and the usual way of Latinizing these gentilicia was therefore by means of -*u* → -*onis*. 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* → -*onis*, *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* → -*osis*. 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 *Calitemus and Egnatius*, and the ...*fas in [---]fate MLF 285; (b) potamonymic: *Fa(r)farn...*, *Narionius (?), Vomanius* (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 *Calitemus* and in *Egnatius*.140

---

140 Note also *alsi*/*is* Etr *XL*, which, if to be read as *alsi̇s*, 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, Fadenuius, Firmius, Lullius, Polfaeus, Satellius, Sentius, Sertinianus. 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, Velmineauus/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), Flauius (patronymic?), [Fulius], [Furius], Maecius, Mallius, [Munius], Tertineius, Vestius (of Etruscan origin?), Vetius (of Sabellic origin?), Vecilius, Veculius, Vetulius.

(11) gentilicia that are probably of Sabellic origin: Alliuaeus, Battius (?), Blaesius, Fassiis, Hirpius, Pacius, Pescennius, Sedius/Saediussaidius. 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)lus, Seralius, Vatius, Ventarc... (?), Viui... (?), Volliu. 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****α : [?]α[?]m : maximo MF 89, with FILIATION? COGNOMEN, [---] reic[li]o | [---] maxom[o] MF 98, [---]somo ἣ uoltilio MF 162, with COGNOMEN FILIATION, cauio : nomes[ina : maxomo MF 272, uoltio · uecineo | maximo | ineo LF 220, with COGNOMEN FILIATION; perhaps also (either Maxumus or Manumus) in [leu]elio : callio [: ...] ma.jom[o ]j 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 less 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]ol/g/a : pupelio | [m]ano[mo] MF 149; perhaps also (either Maxumus or Manumus) in [leu]elio : callio [: ...] ma.jom[o ]j 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 ἢ uelmineo | 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)ige(r)? I(n)ige(ns)?).

4. **?Ruso** (2 attestations?): cauio[---] | ruso[?]--- MF 318, perhaps to be restored in ce · paiu[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 Su-tri. 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---]---Ja*some MF 156 as containing a cognomen m/faxome: this would be the only instance of monophthongization of /-ai/ to /-ei/.
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’); *rez* MF 56 (fragmentary text); *uentarc[......]* MF 80 (rather a name of another individual); *ðamia* 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), *es?[---]* Cap 389 and 404 (to be read as a verbal form *es[i]*), *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]yomo *uolti**o** MF 162 *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 *cauo* · *pauiceo* | *ruso[?--]*, and LtF 290 as *ce* · *pauif[ceo* · *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* · *manjom[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. 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 *uoiltio · uecineo | maxomo | iuneo* LF 220. *Harisp... in c · clipear[io] | m · f · harisp[ex] LtF 231 and [---]| harisp[---|---]|sor* LF 232 is a priestly title than a cognomen. Apart from this, there is only the doubtful instance of *Rutilius in m · aco[---] | rutil · ce[---] LtF 341*. Even sepulchral inscriptions with quite extensive *cursus honorum* from this period yield no cognomen, and neither do the public inscriptions from Falerii Novi and along the roads of the ager Faliscus. 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 [*J] 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, and in the dedication [*J] umpricius · 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[0]mo* MF 80 and *[4-5]a hac****a : [?]aq[?]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(ai) Atilio (et) Q(uinto) Servidio*. 
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 heterogenous 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 gentilicum 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 gentilica 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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{poplia} : \text{calitenes} & | \text{aronto} : \text{cesies} | \text{lartio} : \text{uxor} \text{ MF } 265 \\
\text{ueltur} : \text{tetena} & | \text{aruto} \text{ MF } 266 \\
\text{arute macena} & | \text{morenez} \text{ MF } 269 \\
\text{larise} : \text{mar} | \text{cna} : \text{citiat} \text{ MF } 270 \\
\text{poplia} & | \text{zuconia} \text{ MF } 271 \\
\text{caio} : \text{nomes} | \text{ina} : \text{axomo} & | \text{zeruatronia} \text{ MF } 272
\end{align*}
\]

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 GENTILICUM 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:
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: kai[s][io · a[ufi]lio · iun[?eo] MF 51
- Gavius: caui[o · a[ufi]lio MF 49
- Gavius: caui[a] · a[ufi]lio MF 50
- Iuna: iuna · a[ufi]lio MF 48
- Iuna or Volta?: [---]a · a[ufi]lio MF 53

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

- Caesius son of Volta: ceisio · oufi[lio | wol[e]o MF 276
- Gavius son of Volta: caui[o · oufi[lio | wol[e]o MF 275

Finding more than one Gauius 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 Gauius 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 Veteres, 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 · fulczeo LF 329, uoltio | folcozeo | zextoi | fi LF 330, celio *olceuzeo | ***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[i]a · uecin[e]a · uotlia LF 222, cauia : uecinea LF 223). In the traditional reading of LF 224, ca · uecineo [·] uoltio ·, 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 [--- uel su[conio? ---]*ic MF 191).

Note that the gentilicium is adapted from Etruscan Zu[zu], 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 Gauius, 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 Gauius 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. Gauius 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 : ctitai 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 *leθaie* 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 · clippingio*] LF 230, a c · clippingio] | m · f · harișp[ex LtF 231, who (apart from being a haruspec) was at least ce(n)]so and rex, and a m · clippingio · 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.