

CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

General editors

J. P. T. CLACKSON, W. M. BEARD, G. BETEGH,
R. L. HUNTER, M. J. MILLETT, S. P. OAKLEY,
R. G. OSBORNE, T. J. G. WHITMARSH

MIGRATION, MOBILITY AND LANGUAGE CONTACT IN
AND AROUND THE ANCIENT MEDITERRANEAN

edited by

JAMES CLACKSON

University of Cambridge

PATRICK JAMES

Haileybury College

KATHERINE MCDONALD

University of Exeter

LIVIA TAGLIAPIETRA

University of Cambridge

NICHOLAS ZAIR

University of Cambridge



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

The rough chronological sequence of the chapters also has the happy outcome that the geographical focus of the first and last chapters is central Italy, while the authors of the intervening chapters move the story to the south of Italy and then to Italians and others in the east, in Delos, Pannonia and Egypt.

CHAPTER 2

INTERETHNIC MOBILITY AND INTEGRATION
IN PRE-ROMAN ETRURIA

The Contribution of Onomastics

Daniele F. Maras

Introduction

The presence of foreign roots, components, and full names in the Etruscan nomenclature is ubiquitous from the earliest documentation. This finds a possible explanation only in the existence of continuous and prolonged contact and human mobility within the Etruscan communities, with integration of foreigners into the Etruscan society at different levels since the earliest periods.

Scholars have noted different social trends through time. As regards the earliest available documentation up to the central decades of the seventh century BCE, the occurrence of Latin and Italic names among the members of the Etruscan elites that had access to writing seems to be the result of the phenomenon of synoecism, which brought about the constitution of proto-urban communities often including mixed populations with diverse ethnic origin. In the late seventh and sixth centuries, inscriptions in funerary contexts show that the integration of foreigners at a high social level continued, thus demonstrating the existence of an open and vital society, particularly in the cities of southern Etruria. On the contrary, from the fourth century BCE onwards, the vast majority of foreign elements in the name formulas pertain to people of low social status. In addition, even in the case of members of the elite bearing names of Latin or Italic origin, it is not clear whether these derive from recent immigration or rather from earlier integration.

However, the documentation is uneven and rather scattered in time and places. As a result, some chronological and geographical discrepancies affect our ability to gather complete information. In fact,

in the seventh and sixth centuries BCE, the largest collections of onomastic material are from Caere and Veii, where around one hundred funerary and votive inscriptions have been found. In the late archaic period (sixth and early fifth centuries BCE), the primacy shifts to Volsinii, whose necropoleis present around one hundred and fifty inscriptions. Finally, from the Hellenistic period (especially third and second centuries BCE) there is an overwhelming majority of inscriptions on funerary urns and tombs of Clusium and Perugia, which overshadows the number of epigraphic documents found elsewhere in Etruria.

Therefore, general patterns and trends have to be carefully evaluated both in the local contexts and at a regional scale and considered as provisional, pending further documents and information.

In the following pages, the formation and historical development of the nomenclature system in Etruria and central Italy will be reviewed, starting from the earliest documentation and taking into consideration Roman nomenclature, which is better known than Etruscan. In this framework, we can pinpoint names and formulas escaping the regular pattern and/or including non-Etruscan components, with special regard to cases of interethnic contact and personal mobility. Finally, the classification of the foreign components in the Etruscan onomastic documentation provides a general outline for future studies.

What's in a Name (Formula)?

The earliest known name formula consisted in a single personal name, called an individual name. As far as we know, this simple formula was shared originally by most cultures of the ancient Mediterranean and Europe, including the peoples of ancient Italy.¹ This fact was already acknowledged by ancient antiquarians and grammarians, as Varro speculated that the earliest figures in Roman history had only one name, such as Faustulus, Romulus, and Remus² – to whom Procas, Amulius, and Numitor can be added too. Appian states that the Romans later took

¹ Motta (2009:300); Salway (1994:124–5); Maras (2017:71).

² Varro *apud* Probus, *de Praenominibus* 4.1.

a second name (*gentilicium*) and then a third (*cognomen*) for easier recognition,³ thus creating the well-known *tria nomina* of the historical Roman nomenclature.

Remaining in the realm of literary sources and legend, the earliest figures having a binomial formula are Titus Tatius and Numa Pompilius, both belonging to the Sabine culture.⁴ However, it has been noted that the second element of their name formulas was not inherited by their children, as shown by Hersilia, Titus Tatius' daughter, and Pompo, Pinus, Calpus, and Mamercus, Numa's sons.⁵ In this regard, it is also significant that the derivate nomenclature of things associated with these men is based on their first names, as in the case of the *sodales Titii* and the *curia Titia*.⁶ In actuality, the second element of the nomenclature of the Sabine kings was a patronymic, as already noted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who records the name of Numa's father as Pompilius Pompon.⁷ The form of such patronymic adjectives as *Tatius* and *Pompilius* was not different from the aforementioned derivate nomenclature (*curia Titia* ~ **Hersilia Titia*). The earliest Roman-Sabine formulas, therefore, do not differ from the majority of ancient onomastic systems, from the Near East to Europe, which require the use of patronymics in the case of free people, at times in the form of adjectives, such as, for instance, Ajax Telamonios.⁸

According to Plutarch, the need for an inheritable component of the formula arose one generation later, when Numa's sons gave

³ Appian, *Pr.* 51. According to Probus and Priscian, Romans acquired binomial naming formulas because of their intermarriage with the Sabines in Romulus' time, when they simply juxtaposed personal names expressed in both languages; Salway (1994:124–5); Solin (2009:275 n. 77).

⁴ In the perspective of this study it is not relevant whether historical figures similar to Titus Tatius or Numa Pompilius actually existed or not. Their name formulas, however, show an intrinsic reliability when compared with what we know of the earliest nomenclature of central Italy. It is worth considering that Roman authors and their sources probably acknowledged the antiquity of the formation of names like these, which followed old patterns no more in use, but at times misunderstood them. In this regard, the case of the names of *Mezentius* and his son *Lausus* in Vergil is emblematic, when compared with the seventh-century inscription of *Laucies Mezenties* (in genitive) from Caere; Briquel (2016:174–80); see footnote 70 below.

⁵ Plut. *Numa* 21; see Facchetti (2007:115–16).

⁶ Peruzzi (1970:41–2); Colonna (1977:181).

⁷ D.H., 2.58.

⁸ Maggiani (2000:249–50); see also Maras (2003:240–3).

origin to several of the *gentes* of Rome: the Pomponii from Pompo, the Pinarii from Pinus, the Calpurnii from Calpus, and the Marcii from Mamercus, as well as the Aemilii.⁹ Consequently, the use of the patronymic adjective shifted from the simple filiation to the lineage, thus creating a durable family nomenclature.¹⁰

If we move to the safer ground of epigraphic evidence, it is remarkable that the process of formation of a nomenclature including an inheritable component (*gentilicium*) developed in central Italy between the late eighth and the mid-seventh centuries BCE.¹¹ Literary tradition and epigraphic evidence strikingly converge in pointing to the late eighth century BCE – the alleged age of Numa – as the starting point of the gentilician nomenclature system. Not surprisingly, the same period is known as a time of important social changes, with the development of proto-urban settlements in southern Etruria as a result of synoecism, and the birth of the Orientalizing aristocratic network, involving trade overseas, a gift-exchange system, and the spread of the ideology of symposium among the elites.¹² Not least, this is also the period that witnessed the introduction of writing in Italy as one of the principal status symbols of the Orientalizing culture.¹³

In southern Etruria, this changing social environment, along with the economic structure of the proto-urban settlements, created a need to bind the right of inheritance of land to specific individuals and their families. In other words, the ownership of land by the archaic *pater familias* implied the legal right to hand down family estates to his heirs, thus perpetuating his legal personhood,¹⁴ which was of central relevance for the family's relationships with *clientes*, *sodales*, and servants too.¹⁵ Hence the reason for a new onomastic system that incorporated an inheritable component, namely the *nomen gentilicium*. In fact,

⁹ Plut., *Numa*, 21.1–2; Solin (2009:286).

¹⁰ Incidentally, also derivate nomenclature changes from this period onwards, as the *curia Hostilia*, named after king *Tullus Hostilius*, demonstrates; Colonna (1977:181).

¹¹ Colonna (1977:176–80); Marchesini (1997:154–9); Smith (2006:17–20 and 158–9); Wallace (2008:79).

¹² Riva (2006).

¹³ Maras (2015:203–9).

¹⁴ Capogrossi (1990:11–30); Capogrossi (1994:57–68); Maras (2017:74–5).

¹⁵ Colonna (1977:185–8); Maggiani (2000:249).

family names or, better, 'names of lineage' are regularly linked to heritable legal rights, such as property and social relations of the clan,¹⁶ as well as dynastic rights of succession, for example, in the case of aristocratic dynasties, such as the Bacchiadai and the Peisistratidai in Greece.¹⁷

Most probably, the Etruscans were the first to use this new nomenclature, which later spread to Rome and the Latins as early as the seventh century BCE. Etruscan inscriptions with binomial formulas predate Latin attestations and hark back to the very beginning of the seventh century BCE.¹⁸

As mentioned above, Etruscan and Roman *gentilicia* took the form of patronymic adjectives, with reference to a historical or legendary forefather, as in the case of the *Romilii* and the *Hostilii* respectively from *Romulus* and *Hostus*, the *Valerii* and the *Pomponii* from the Sabine *Volesus* and *Pompo*, and probably the *Lunii* from the Faliscan *Iuna*.¹⁹ As a consequence, investigating the origin of the *gentilicia* might shed light on early phenomena of interethnic mobility, possibly dating to times preceding the written documentation. Originally, the formation of Etruscan *gentilicia* was basically identical to that of Latin names through the use of an adjective suffix (-*ius* in Latin vs. -*na* and variants in Etruscan): e.g., *Rumelna*, corresponding to *Romilius*; *Acvilna*, corresponding to *Aquilius*; but also *Velxana*, deriving from *Velxa*, and so on.²⁰ The historical development of the Etruscan system, however, was more complex and diverged from what we know of later Roman nomenclature. It is therefore worth reviewing the principal steps of the historical development of Etruscan nomenclature.

Nomenclature in Progress: Individual Names

Many early Latin and Etruscan inscriptions present monomial formulas in the form of individual names used without a patronymic or gentilicium. The relative frequency of monomial

¹⁶ Smith (2006:158–9).

¹⁷ Salway (1994:125, n. 6).

¹⁸ Colonna (1977:176; 1995:332–9); Maras (2017:76).

¹⁹ Rix (2009:499).

²⁰ de Simone (1989:263–5 and 278–9).

formulas, however, does not necessarily imply that the gentilician nomenclature was not widespread in this early period. As a matter of fact, the vast majority of inscriptions belong to non-official contexts, often involving gift-exchange, marriage gifts, or funerary goods. In these cases, we should not necessarily expect full official names in the graffiti.²¹

In Etruria several attestations are known in which the name of the receiver of a gift – usually a woman, possibly a bride – has a binomial formula, whereas the giver is indicated only by a single name, corresponding to a well-known *praenomen*:

ET Cr 3.20 (Caere, late seventh century BCE): *mi(ni) aranθ ramuθasi vestiricināla muluvanice*, ‘Aranth gave me to Ramutha Vestiricinai’.

ET Cl 3.2 (Clusium, late seventh century BCE): *mine viku mulu{ve}neke arpaś kamaia*, ‘Viku gave me to Arpa Kamai’.

Most probably, the family context in which the gift took place made it unnecessary to express the family name of the giver, which presumably at times was identical to that of the receiver.

In other cases, a name in the form of an adjective in *-na*, formally identical to a *gentilicium*, is written in isolation on an object:

ET Cl 2.1 (Clusium, mid-seventh century BCE): *plikaśnaś*.²²

ET Cr 2.4, 18–20 (Caere, mid-seventh century BCE): *(mi) karkanās (qutum/θahvna/spanti)*.²³

Possibly, these attestations demonstrate that in the early seventh century, *gentilicia* were used from time to time with reference to the entire *gens* rather than to an individual, presumably in the social context of gift-exchange among different families. All in all, the sparse epigraphic evidence available for the late eighth and early seventh centuries is not reliable enough to investigate the frequency and consistency of different forms of nomenclature at the earliest period of binomial formulas.

²¹ Colonna (1977:176–7).

²² Marchesini (1997:155–7).

²³ Briquel (2016:147–56); Maras (forthcoming); see also Morandi (2004:263).

Nomenclature in Progress: Patronymics

Some Etruscan inscriptions present binomial formulas whose second element cannot be regarded as a proper *gentilicium*. This is the case, for instance, of a number of graffiti on luxury goods found in the tomb Regolini-Galassi at Caere (early seventh century BCE), which record *larθia velθurus* in place of the usual simple *larθia*.²⁴ It seems evident that the precious silverware was marked with the name of its aristocratic owner and, in some special cases – significantly, on precious exotic vessels – with his filiation: ‘belonging to Larth, (son) of Velthur’. There is no evidence, however, whether Larth had no *gentilicium*, or omitted it in a family context, where everybody knew it.

In a similar funerary family context, albeit later, the figure of a young rider depicted in the Tomba delle Iscrizioni of Tarquinia (end of the sixth century BCE) – presumably the scion of the *gens* Matve that owned the tomb – is labelled *laris larθia*, ‘Laris (son) of Larth’, omitting the unnecessary *gentilicium*.

Two consequences derive from these and similar attestations: on the one hand, the early Mediterranean (and Greek) system of nomenclature including name and filiation apparently survived in Etruria within family traditions; on the other hand, inscriptions on funerary goods and from household contexts cannot be considered reliable for studying official name formulas.

A different case is made by funerary stelae that stood outside the tombs, in a public environment, and are more likely to be inscribed with the complete names of the deceased. In this context, it is worth mentioning the evidence of the stela from Vetulonia (second half of the seventh century BCE), whose name formulas preserve a complex family relationship:²⁵

ET Vn 1.1 (with a different reading): *[mi a]uϑeś θeluskeś tuśnutnâi[eś –] panalaś mini muluvaneke hirumi[n]a ϕersnałāś*

In the third word preserved, the presence of the suffix *-na* has recently been recognized²⁶ by reading a letter *-n-* added to or

²⁴ Buranelli and Sannibale (2005); Marchesini (2007:42–3); Colonna and Sannibale (2015).

²⁵ Maggiani (2007); Agostiniani (2011a).

²⁶ Maras (2016:244); Maras (2017:75).

corrected over a precedent *-a-*, which makes the reading *tusnutni[es]* equally acceptable. In either case, the name includes the double suffix *-na-ie-* that is typical of *gentilicia*. Therefore, it is most likely that the precedent word *theluskes* is actually a patronymic, whereas the following *[-]panalas* is a metronymic. All together the name is translated ‘Auvele Tusnutnaie, (son) of Theluske (and) of a *[-]panai*’. The giver of the tomb is presumably his heir, whose identical *gentilicium* is coherently omitted: ‘Hirumina (Tusnutnaie, son of Auvele and) of a Phersnai’.²⁷

From this earliest document of an official high-rank name formula, we can argue that its components were expressed in order of accumulation, starting from the original individual name, corresponding to the later *praenomen*, and then adding the patronymic, the *gentilicium*, and the metronymic.²⁸ Two contemporary gift inscriptions record a patronymic in the form of a name in the genitive case, followed by a *gentilicium* in *-na*:

ET Fa 3.2 (third quarter of the seventh century BCE): *mi mulu laricesi p[-] [-]naiesi clinsi velthurusi larus ruvries* (in pertinentive case), to be interpreted as ‘I (am) a gift from Larice *[-]naie* (son) of P $[-]$ (and his) son Velthur to Lar Ruvrie’.

ET Ru 3.1 (last quarter of the seventh century): *mini mulvanike venel rapales laivena[?]*, ‘Venel Laivena (son) of Rapale gave me’.²⁹

Nomenclature in Progress: Notes on the Early *Gentilicia*

As has been mentioned above, in origin *gentilicia* were formally identical to patronymic adjectives, deriving from an individual name through the addition of the suffix *-na*. As a consequence, in the earliest phase of the heritable nomenclature, there was the objective difficulty of distinguishing actual *gentilicia* from

²⁷ Maras (2016:244, n. 30). See, however, Maggiani (2000:256), whose reading *persnalnas* implies that the giver belongs to a different *gens*.

²⁸ Maras (2017:75–6).

²⁹ Maras (2017:75); see also Maras (2009:370–1, Ru do.1). On the function and meaning of the pertinentive case, see Agostiniani (2011b), with different opinions.

patronymics. This circumstance affects also our ability to interpret the names when there is no evidence whether the second element of the formula was heritable or not.

There is, however, a particular class of inscribed vessels that provide evidence for the variability of gentilician nomenclature in the early seventh century BCE. This is a series of bucchero *kyathoi* decorated and bearing gift inscriptions, which were produced partly in Caere and partly in Vetulonia and have been found in diverse parts of Etruria, as far as Caere in the south and Volterra in the north.³⁰ A number of these *kyathoi* were inscribed in the name of various members of the Paithina family, which most probably owned the workshop that produced the vessels. We know therefore the names of *Venel Paiθina[?]*, *[Velθ]ur Paiθinaie*, and *L[a]uxu[s] hie Paiθin[a]*³¹ (other names are too badly preserved to be of any help). The inscriptions of two other *kyathoi* of the series present the names of the *gens Purenaie*³² and of a *Pisna Puraie*,³³ who were possibly related. From these attestations it is arguable that in the context of the same family the suffixes of the *gentilitia* could vary in a range of different possibilities, with no apparent consequence in regard to their meaning.

According to a hypothesis of Adriano Maggiani, the multi-suffixation of some Etruscan *gentilicia* originated from the necessity of identifying actual inheritable family names from patronymic adjectives. In this regard, the evidence of the bucchero *kyathoi* might belong to an early phase of this system, when a number of suffixes were considered suitable for this purpose, according to the following scheme:

<i>Paiθe</i>	individual name:	‘Paithe’
<i>Paiθi-na</i>	patronymic adjective:	‘(offspring) of Paithe’
<i>Paiθi-na-ie</i> , <i>Paiθi-na-s</i>	<i>gentilicium</i> :	‘belonging to the offspring of Paithe’

Such a scheme, however, was not rigid and mandatory, as the many variants seen in the documentation demonstrate. A combination of

³⁰ Maras (2013a:333–6); Maggiani (2014 and 2018); Maras (forthcoming).

³¹ Respectively ET Cr 3.27, AS 3.6, and Vn 3.2.

³² ET Cr 0.1.

³³ ET Cl 2.44; Maras (forthcoming).

further suffixes often occurred, such as *-ie*, *-ra*, *-ice*, *-sie*, and so on, at times even in the absence of the usual *-na*.³⁴

In addition, some *gentes* followed the alternative pattern of making their own *gentilicium* by freezing the original patronymic in the form of the individual name of the forefather in the genitive case. Its equivalence to the patronymic adjective in *-na* is proved by the existence of parallel pairs deriving from the same name, as in the case of *Hvul(u)ves* versus *Hvul(u)venas* and *Matves* versus *Matunas*.³⁵ The complexity of the name-making system in Etruria makes it necessary to keep in mind all the diverse possibilities when dealing with name formulas and new *gentilicia* and/or foreign names. The following section is devoted to investigating the different ways in which non-Etruscan people entered and were integrated into Etruscan society.

Some Paradigms for the Integration of Foreigners in Etruria

Among the earliest pieces of evidence for the integration of foreigners into Etruscan society are the well-known inscriptions of Larth Telicles³⁶ and Rutil Hipocrates,³⁷ who have a name formula whose second element is derived from a Greek name, respectively Τηλεκλῆς and Ἰπποκράτης. In these cases, as has been pointed out, we have no clue whether the second part of the formula was inheritable or not. There are thus three different possibilities for interpreting these names:

³⁴ Maggiani (2000:252–7).

³⁵ See *ET Ve* 3.9 and 3.30 (*hvulves*), *Fa* 3.5 (*hvulves*), *Vs* 1.100 (*vhulvenas*); *ET Ta* 7.13 and 7.19 (*matves*), *Cr* 1.130–9 (*matunas*). Such variability poses a serious limit to the possibility of speaking of ‘*echte Gentilizia*’ as opposed to ‘*Individualnamen-*’ and ‘*Vornamen-gentilizia*’ in the Archaic period, according to the theory of Rix (1963); see also Benelli (2011:193–5).

³⁶ *ET OA* 2.2 (third quarter of the seventh century BCE): *mi larθaia telicles*; Colonna (1977:134); Morandi (2004:531–2); Maras (2017:72). Note that Colonna (2004:81–2) assumes this is the name of a woman, followed by Marchesini (2007:47–8); cf. *ET Vc* 2.9 (*mi larθaia maies*); Marchesini (2007:76).

³⁷ *ET Ta* 6.1 (second half of the seventh century BCE): *αχαρι rutil hipocrates*; Bagnasco Gianni (1996:173); Colonna (2004:82); Morandi (2004:239); Marchesini (2008:65–6); Maras (2017:72).

Mobility and Integration in Pre-Roman Etruria

- I. They belong to Etruscanized Greeks, whose original individual name was converted to a *gentilicium*, to be inherited by their offspring.
- II. They belong to Etruscan children of Greek travellers or migrants: in this case there is no way to know whether the second element of the formula is a patronymic or a *gentilicium*.
- III. They belong to the Etruscan offspring of Greek ancestors, going back two or more generations, whose names were converted into ‘*Individualnamengentilizia*’ and therefore inherited by their descendants.³⁸

In the absence of further data, it would be unwise to choose among these possibilities that are all equally plausible. However, it is possible to gather additional information by investigating better known although later cases, which allow us to outline some possible paradigms for the inclusion of new elements into the Etruscan name system in case of migrations and human mobility.

Model No. 1: An Immigrant and His Offspring

Precious information is provided by the family tree described at length in the *elogium* of Laris Puleas, written on the lid of his sarcophagus in Tarquinia,³⁹ dating from the mid-third century BCE. The deceased declares himself to be son of Larce (Puleas), grandson of Larth (Puleas), and descendant⁴⁰ of the Greek (immigrant) Laris Pules.⁴¹

Most plausibly, the name *Pules* (in genitive) has been interpreted as the Etruscan version of the Greek Πόλλης, a name borne by famous legendary and historical seers, which was particularly suitable for the (alleged) forefather of an Etruscan *haruspex* such as Laris Puleas.⁴² What is especially relevant for our topic is that the Greek immigrant Πόλλης was integrated in Etruria and received an Etruscan name formula made of two elements: a regular *praenomen Laris*, followed

³⁸ For a recent critical examination of the interrelated concepts of *Individualnamengentilizia* and *Vornamengentilizia* in recent studies, see Benelli (2011).

³⁹ *ET Ta* 1.17: *l(a)ris puleas. larces. clan. larθal. papacs velthurus. nefts. prums. pulex. larisal. creices . . .*; Heurgon (1957); Morandi (2004:390, 393–4).

⁴⁰ It is not relevant here whether the meaning of *prums* is ‘great-grandson’ or simply ‘offspring’.

⁴¹ Furthermore, he adds that he is the nephew of Velthur (Puleas).

⁴² Heurgon (1957:117–21); Facchetti (2007:124–6).

by the original individual name converted into a *gentilicium* and transliterated into Etruscan with few adaptations (/o/ > u; -λλ- > -l-). The process corresponds to the first of the hypotheses presented above in regard to the earlier Greek immigrants Τηλεκλῆης and Ἴπποκράτης.

In this case, however, we are lucky enough to have information on the following events, since, after settling down, *Laris Pules* had some descendants, who took their family name after him by adding the suffix *-na*: *Pule-s* > *Pule-na-s*.⁴³ Although there is no evidence for this, it is theoretically possible that a different branch of the family preserved the original name with the *-s* ending, as in the aforementioned case of *Matves* and *Matunas*, both descending or pretending to descend from a *Matve*,⁴⁴ whose 'ghost' in the form of an *eidolon* is depicted as receiving an offering in the Tomba delle Iscrizioni of Tarquinia.⁴⁵

The paradigm of *Laris Pules* and his offspring allows us to investigate further cases of former immigrants who gave origin to Etruscan *gentes*. Among the elites of the archaic period, it seems likely that the Oscan name *Vestirikis* was used as the base for the *gentilia* of Caere *Vestiricina* and *Vestrices*.⁴⁶ Likewise the parallel case of *Peticinas* from Caere and *Petaces* from Bisenzio probably derived from an original Italic **Petikis*.⁴⁷ In both cases, however, the Italic documentation is much more recent than the Etruscan attestations, casting some doubts on the relationship between the relevant names.

We are probably on a safer ground when etymological and linguistic processes are involved, as in the case of the late-archaic name formula of *Larth Purzes*, son of *Ušele* in *Volsinii*. In fact, this is possibly evidence of the earlier immigration from Umbria of a **Purzie* (< **Purçie*, cf. Latin *Porcius*).⁴⁸ The immigrant might have been his father *Ušele* – if the Etruscan

⁴³ It is worth noting that in the transition from *pules* to *pulenās* the final *-s* deriving from the adaptation of the Greek name was treated as the ending of an Etruscan genitive case; Heurgon (1957:113), who transcribes the name as *pule*; de Simone (1970:234).

⁴⁴ Morandi (2004:302).

⁴⁵ Colonna (2016:135); Maras (2018a:96).

⁴⁶ *ET Ve* 3.15, 3.40 and *Cr* 3.20 (*vestiricina*), *Cr* 2.115 (*vestrices*); Morandi (2004:194–6).

⁴⁷ *ET Cr* 2.30 (*peticinas*), *AT* 2.12 (*petaces*); de Simone 1972; Morandi (2004:369–70); Colonna (2013:13). See also Marchesini (2007:70–1), with a different opinion.

⁴⁸ Colonna (2000: 281–2).

praenomen had been added, as in the case of *Laris Pules* – or an elder relation. In either case, there is a striking chronological coincidence with the supposed Umbrian ancestor of *Porsenna*, king of *Volsinii* and *Clusium* at the end of the sixth century BCE according to the sources,⁴⁹ whose Etruscan name was probably **Purzena*, which might be referred to the same lineage.

Moving to lower social classes, we might expect to find a relevant number of immigrants among craftsmen in all times. It is not surprising, therefore that the name formula of the vase painter *Arnthē Práxiās* (early fifth century BCE) fits the paradigm of *Laris Pules*, but the foreign component of the name is still written in Greek characters.⁵⁰ Unfortunately, we have no clue if *Práxiās* ever had offspring in Etruria⁵¹ and, if so, whether they were integrated into Etruscan society or not.

We are luckier, however, in the case of another vase painter, who signed a red-figure crater found in *Civita Castellana* and dates from the third quarter of the fourth century BCE:

ET Fa 7.1: *ser̄(u)r purphirnas*⁵²

The vase is referred to the style that John D. Beazley defined as the 'Campanizing Group' and attributed to the work of immigrants from southern Italy who settled in south Etruria and started new workshops. In particular, *Sertur Purphirnas* belonged to the second generation of Campanizing painters, who took over their masters' workshops (and it is worth mentioning that it is a well-founded anthropological standard that craftsmanship is handed down in family contexts from father to son).

It is, therefore, not surprising that his *gentilicium* betrays a Greek origin, since he is the heir of one of the immigrant painters from Campania who started the new fashion of vase painting. Most probably, his father's name was **Πορφύρος* or *Πορφύριος* (*vel sim.*)⁵³ and

⁴⁹ Plin., *Nat.*, 2.140; 36.91–3; Colonna (2000:278–9).

⁵⁰ The Etruscan *praenomen* was even adapted to Greek phonology by adding a final *-e*. See also Bruni (2013:300–5), with a different opinion and further bibliography.

⁵¹ Unless we take into consideration the unlikely possibility that either a *Caia Práxiās* at *Perugia* (*ET Pe* 1.24) or a *Prasalu* at *Spina* (*ET Sp* 2.84) might be much later relations.

⁵² For the reading, see Maras (2014:471–2).

⁵³ In the same period, see, for instance, the Achaeanian *Πορφύρα* (fourth–third cent. BCE) and *Πορφυρίων* (end of the fourth cent. BCE), as well as the Athenian *Πορφυ[ρώ]* (fourth

had been Etruscanized as **purp̄ire* before the mid-fourth century BCE, presumably adding an Etruscan *praenomen*. Consequentially, his offspring derived their *gentilicium* from his name by adding a *-na*, exactly as in the case of the Puleas from Laris Pules.

Model No. 2: Names of Function and Mercenaries

One more sphere in which we find foreigners partially or entirely integrated into Etruscan society is that of mercenaries, who are known to have had a special status in ancient cultures.⁵⁴ Scholars have often investigated the case of *Macstrna*, depicted in one of the wall paintings of the Tomb François of Vulci (ca. 340 BCE), thought to be equivalent to Mastarna, the Etruscan name of Servius Tullius.⁵⁵

According to the legend handed down by the emperor Claudius, Mastarna was the right-hand man of Caelius Vibenna, an Etruscan warlord from Vulci, who came to Rome at the time of Tarquinius Priscus. After Caelius' death, Mastarna took over the command and settled on the Caelian hill, later becoming king of the city with the name of Servius Tullius.⁵⁶ For a long time scholars have acknowledged that the alleged Etruscan name of the would-be-king derives from Latin *magister*, in the sense of 'captain (of the army)' (*magister populi*). Massimo Pallottino recognized the derivative value of the suffix *-na* that provides the name with the meaning of 'belonging to the *magister*', that is to say 'vice-captain', 'first officer' or, possibly, 'attendant'. In other words, although perceived as a personal name by the source of Claudius,⁵⁷ *Macstrna*/Mastarna was originally a name of function in the context of the military fellowships (*sodalitates*) of the archaic period.⁵⁸ This might be the reason why in the painting of Tomb François the monomial name formula of *Macstrna* stands almost alone among the binomial formulas of the other characters depicted.

cent. BCE) and the later Leukadian Πορφυρ[-] (second cent. BCE ?); Fraser and Matthews (1997:372); Osborne and Byrne (1994:337); Maras (2014:472, n. 76).

⁵⁴ Colonna (2013:7–9).

⁵⁵ See lastly Torelli (2011:230–2); Massa-Pairault (2013–14); Torelli (2016:7–11); Maras (2018a:101–2).

⁵⁶ Sources and comment in Briquel (1990).

⁵⁷ Most probably an early annalist, such as Fabius Pictor; see Maras (2010:190–2).

The only other single name in the scene is that of *Rasce*, one of the companions of *Macstrna*. Significantly, this name has been associated with the Etruscan word *rasna*,⁵⁹ once believed to be the ethnic name of the 'Etruscans', but later shown to correspond to Latin *populus*, both in its original sense of 'army' and in the later political sense of 'people'.⁶⁰ In this context, it is not by chance that the couple *macstrna* ~ *rasce* finds parallels in the two elements of the Latin military rank *magister populi*: if *macstrna* means 'belonging to the *magister*', *rasce* might be translated as 'belonging to the *populus*', that is to say 'to the army'.⁶¹

For our purposes, it is most relevant that both in Latin literary sources and in earlier Etruscan iconographic attestations, these names of function are used as personal names. It would be intriguing to investigate if this type of nomenclature became heritable and was integrated into the Etruscan gentilician system.

In the late archaic period, there is a comparable case of a foreign name of function transformed into an Etruscan personal name by adding an adjective suffix. This is the case of *Carucra*, name of a devotee who made an offering to *Herclē* in the southern sanctuary of Pyrgi,⁶² which is evidently derived from non-Attic/Ionic Greek κάρυξ.⁶³ The close parallel with *Macstrna* makes it possible to translate the name as 'belonging to the herald', presumably in a diplomatic context of the mid-fifth century BCE.⁶⁴

Remarkably, the later onomastic evidence from Caere includes a *gentilicium* *Crucra* that might be related to the earlier *Carucra*, if the first vowel could have been dropped as in the cases of *malax*/*m̄lax*⁶⁵ and, possibly, *tamia*/*t̄mia*.⁶⁶ If this hypothesis can be

⁵⁹ Pallottino, in Buranelli (1987:228–9).

⁶⁰ Rix (1984).

⁶¹ Maras (2018a:102). In actuality, the form *ras-ce* is derived from the root *ras-* in parallel to the form *ras-na*, whose meaning is 'people, army'; therefore, the relationship between these two terms might be more complex and requires further research. I heartily thank Luciano Agostiniani for sharing his thoughts with me on this and other topics discussed in this chapter.

⁶² *ET Cr* 3.43.

⁶³ Colonna (2004:73–4); Maras (2009:358, Py do.6).

⁶⁴ Maras (2018a:101).

⁶⁵ Maras (2007:238–9, n. 11).

⁶⁶ Maras (2009:351, n. 1).

accepted, we could argue that the devotee of Pyrgi – presumably a Greek immigrant – had offspring still living in Caere some centuries later.⁶⁷

In other cases, we are not so lucky as to have the name of the immigrant forefather. However, we can gather information from family names that seem to be derived from foreign words belonging to the military sphere. This is the case of *Avele Arxusnas*, owner of a family tomb of the late sixth century BCE in the necropolis of Crocifisso del Tufo at Volsinii, whose *gentilicium* derives from a personal name, **arxu-s(i)e*, which is in turn constructed on the Greek word ἄρχων, ‘chief’.⁶⁸ Similarly, the name of *Laucie Mezentie*,⁶⁹ inscribed on a cup of the early seventh century BCE at the Louvre and corresponding to the legendary king Mezentius, mentioned in the *Aeneid*, might be derived from an Italic form **med-ent-yo-* (less probably **med-ye-nt-yo-*), with the meaning of ‘ruler’.⁷⁰ In addition, the later *Avle Meteliś*, mentioned by the inscription of the Arringatore,⁷¹ has been convincingly related by G. Colonna to the archaic Latin word *metellus* (> *metel(e)-ie*), which originally meant ‘mercenary’.⁷²

Finally, the *gentilicium* of *Larθ Cupures* son of *Aranθ*, inscribed on a late archaic cippus shaped as the helmed head of a warrior from the necropolis of Crocifisso del Tufo at Volsinii,⁷³ could be derived from a laudatory attribute in the context of a mercenary army. In fact, it might be related to the Italic root **kupro-*, ‘good, worthy’, according to an intriguing hypothesis of G. Colonna,⁷⁴ in reference to the military ability of the deceased and his foreign provenience, shown by the use of the alphabet of Veii.⁷⁵ The main objection to seeing an Italic connection is the three-syllable form

⁶⁷ See, however, Colonna (2004:82–4), who compares *crucra* to a different Greek name, Κρόκος, thus removing any possibility of relationship with *carucra*.

⁶⁸ Candeloro and Colonna (2011:290, n. 50).

⁶⁹ *ET Cr* 2.149.

⁷⁰ de Simone (1991); Morandi (2004:308–9); Marchesini (2007:44–5); Briquel (2016:174–80, n. 70); Torelli (2016:10).

⁷¹ *ET Pe* 3.3.

⁷² Colonna (2014).

⁷³ *ET Vs* 1.113.

⁷⁴ Colonna (1993:19–20); Colonna (2000:282); see also Morandi (2004:147) and Marchesini (2007:89).

⁷⁵ Maggiani (2005a:45–7).

of the name *cupure-*, which might be only indistinctly compared with the anaptyctic Paleo-Sabellic form *qupírih*⁷⁶ and the farther Elymian name *kupura/kupra*.⁷⁷ It is worth mentioning, however, that the anaptyxis could be entirely attributed to the Etruscan reception of a foreign name, as in the roughly contemporary cases of *Herecele* (< Ἡρακλῆς) and *Pereceles* (< Περικλῆς).⁷⁸

In all the aforementioned cases, a name of function, an epithet, or a job name was converted into a *gentilicium* at the time of the integration of its foreign bearer into Etruscan society. It is not surprising that this phenomenon occurred mainly in the ambit of mercenary armies, which were one of the main causes of inter-ethnic personal mobility in the ancient world. In my opinion, however, it would be wise to consider this paradigm in a broader sphere with reference to further cases of immigration and integration of foreign elements.

Model No. 3: Provisional Business Integration

A number of inscriptions of the archaic period have name formulas that apparently present two *gentilicia*, often with a *-na-* ending. Such formulas occur from time to time in funerary and instrumental inscriptions, as in Veii (late seventh century BCE: *una uras pupunas*),⁷⁹ Orvieto (early sixth century BCE: *mi aveles vhulyenas rutelna*),⁸⁰ and Pisa (early fifth century BCE: *lethe kakuś papnie*).⁸¹ The most relevant evidence, however, comes from the *tesserae hospitales* found in Rome, Carthage, and Murlo, which are documents of trade and social contact, often involving foreigners:

ETAS 2.14 (Murlo, end of the seventh century BCE): *mi avil[e -] [-]na*.⁸²

⁷⁶ *ST Sp AP* 2.

⁷⁷ Agostiniani (1984–5:211–12).

⁷⁸ *ET Vs* 1.67; Cristofani (1974:315); cp. *celeniarasi* in *ET AV* 1.29, when compared to *cliniiaras* in *ET Ta* 3.2; Maggiani (1999:56). See also Morandi (2004:368) and Marchesini (2007:86), with different opinions.

⁷⁹ *ET Ve* 2.11; Maras (2012:53–4); Maras (2014:150–1).

⁸⁰ *ET Vs* 1.45; Rix (1963:379–83); Maras (2017:77).

⁸¹ Maggiani (2006:334–5).

⁸² Maggiani (2005b:162–3, n. 18); Maggiani (2006:321–2); Tuck and Wallace (2013:16 and 32–5, nn. 4 and 7).

ETAS 2.15 (Murlo, end of the seventh century BCE): *mi sp[urie] [-]as vheisalna[?]*.⁸³

ET Af 3.1 (Carthage, first half of the sixth century BCE): *mi puinel karθazies vesqu[?]na*.⁸⁴

ETLa 2.3 (Rome, S. Omobono, first half of the sixth century BCE): *araz silqetas spurianas*.⁸⁵

In consideration of the nature of the *tesserae hospitales* as identification documents in the framework of exchanges between different families and, at times, even peoples, it has been hypothesized that the second *gentilicium* appearing in these cases belongs to the local *gens* that hosted foreign individuals and guaranteed their safety and their right to take part in trade and business in the local community.⁸⁶ Apparently, this procedure was formally similar to the temporary adoption of a foreign trade partner by a local powerful family, as evidenced by the use of the formula with a double *gentilicium*, not too different from the later Latin formula of adoption (e.g., *C. Iulius Caesar Octavianus*). In this regard, it is worth noting that the aforementioned formulas of Orvieto and Pisa might refer to permanent adoption, possibly at times rising to a higher social status.⁸⁷

The nomenclature system, however, presents some differences depending on the origin of the mentioned person and his original name. In the case of the *tessera* from Carthage, a local person is mentioned by a name formula in which the first two elements both mark his foreign origin: *Puinel*, to be compared to Latin *Poenus*,⁸⁸ and *Karθazies*, apparently derived from the name of Carthage itself (*Qart-Hadašt*). Similarly, the *tessera* of S. Omobono has a *gentilicium*, *Silqetas*, that has been related to the ethnic *Sulcitanus*, presumably in the context of overseas trade relations

⁸³ Maggiani (2005b:163, n. 19); Maggiani (2006:323); Tuck and Wallace (2013:17 and 31–3, nn. 3 and 5).

⁸⁴ Maggiani (2006:319–21).

⁸⁵ Maggiani (2006:321).

⁸⁶ Maggiani (2006:334–5).

⁸⁷ Maggiani (2006:334–5).

⁸⁸ Significantly, this *praenomen* occurs in one more *tessera hospitalis* from Murlo (Maggiani 2006:324–5), where it could also refer to a foreigner; Colonna (2013:15).

with the Phoenician world.⁸⁹ In this case, however, a regular Etruscan *praenomen* has been chosen.

Significantly, these attestations show that Phoenician traders did not use their own name when travelling to Etruria for business, but made up or were allotted a local temporary name, under the supervision of a local *gens*.⁹⁰ These newly-formed gentilicia which referred to the ethnic origin of their bearers are also attested in the literary tradition, which records Lucumo from Tarquinia, son of Damaratus, who migrated to Rome and was named Lucius Tarquinius after his city of origin.⁹¹

Una Uras from Veii was probably a foreigner too, considering his *praenomen*, which suggests a Faliscan origin.⁹² In this case, it is possible that he was a *cliens* or an associate of the powerful family buried in the Tumulus Chigi, possibly ‘adopted’ by the family *Pupuna* as the use of a double *gentilicium* suggests.⁹³ It is therefore significant that the miniature aryballos that bears the relevant inscription could have been a sort of token, with a symbolic value in the context of funerary goods.

A Classification of the Foreign Components in Etruscan Name Formulas

In the last part of this chapter, I will list and comment systematically on methodological patterns for identifying foreign elements in Etruscan nomenclature with a view to strengthen the basis for future studies.

The best opportunities to investigate the presence and integration of foreigners in Etruscan society come from bicultural and bilingual contexts within and outside Etruria. In most cases, however, the presence of foreign objects among funerary goods and

⁸⁹ Colonna (2013:15); see also Maggiani (2006:321).

⁹⁰ It is remarkable that still in later times there was no correspondence between Greek and Phoenician names in bilingual inscriptions, as evidenced by a pair of twin inscriptions from Malta (Zanovello 1981), thus showing that two parallel name systems existed for people living in bicultural contexts.

⁹¹ Colonna (2013:9–10). In actuality, the name of the Etruscan *gens Tarχna* was probably formed from the name of Tarchon, considered to be their forefather (cp. the Latin pairs *Romulus* ~ *Romilii* and *Caeculus* ~ *Caecilii*); Morandi (2004:526–8, n. 1181).

⁹² Maras (2012:54).

⁹³ Maras (2012:53–4).

even the use of unexpected exotic customs cannot be considered clues to the provenience of the people involved, as objects and customs could have been imported and used by local people.

The study of nomenclature, therefore, is crucial for the investigation of the incidence of foreign components in Etruscan society. Naturally, in the case of name formula, it is important to try to determine how recent the introduction of a non-Etruscan element is and how relevant it is with regard to the origin and culture of its bearer.⁹⁴ In the following paragraphs, some recurring patterns will be presented, based on case studies in which scholars have presented evidence for human mobility and integration at different levels of likelihood.

Presence of Non-Etruscan Inscriptions

On rare, fortunate occasions, inscriptions in foreign languages are found in Etruscan contexts, which attest to the presence of non-native persons or, possibly, even of alloglot communities. The evaluation of these pieces of evidence is therefore the starting point of our review of foreign names in Etruria.

The known bilingual inscriptions are mostly not relevant, since they mainly belong to the late period of acquisition of the Latin language on the part of the Etruscans and therefore provide no evidence for the integration of foreign people into Etruscan society, but quite the opposite. The most relevant texts are non-Etruscan inscriptions in funerary contexts, as in the case of the paleo-Italic signature on the crater of the Ferrone necropolis at Tolfa,⁹⁵ which provides evidence for the early use of a non-Etruscan language in the hinterland of Caere.⁹⁶ This text, however, gives no clue on how and how far the mentioned *Setums* was integrated in Etruscan society and if he had an Etruscan name formula too.⁹⁷

Apart from cases relating to Romanization, the opportunities for comparing inscriptions in Etruscan and in a different language

⁹⁴ See in general Marchesini (2007:17–29).

⁹⁵ *ST* Um 4.

⁹⁶ Bellelli (2008:67–8).

⁹⁷ See also Morandi (2004:463).

recording the same name are extremely rare and generally occur either in mixed cultural contexts or in boundary sites. This is the case, for instance, for a number of red glazed cups found in Civita Castellana, inscribed with the Faliscan name *voltai*, in the dative case.⁹⁸ A single similar cup from the same site is inscribed with the corresponding Etruscan form *ulties*, in the genitive case,⁹⁹ and another one from Vignanello has the alternative form *vultasi*, in the pertinentive case.¹⁰⁰ It seems likely that the person who commissioned the inscribed cups – possibly to be used as gifts or tokens of hospitality¹⁰¹ – needed occasionally to translate his name into Etruscan, presumably in the context of interethnic relationships.

The case of the name *Apiqu*, written in the Latin alphabet under the foot of an Attic stemmed saucer of the late fifth or early fourth centuries BCE, probably found in Caere,¹⁰² is rather different. As a matter of fact, this name is known in Caere from the early seventh century BCE¹⁰³ and is attested until the Hellenistic period in relation to an important aristocratic family of the city that owned the Tomba dei Sarcofagi.¹⁰⁴ The unexpected use of Latin in a post-archaic inscription encourages us to speculate on the possible Latin relations of this family, whose name is one of the few aristocratic *gentilicia* of early Caere that lack the usual *-na-* ending. Although written in the Latin alphabet, the form *Apiqu* follows Etruscan phonology, including an ending *-u*, and presumably corresponds to **apicō*.¹⁰⁵ This, in turn, has been considered to be a variant of **apicus* (whence the Latin *gentilicium Apicius*), deriving from Greek ἄποκος, ‘hairless’,¹⁰⁶ or possibly from Greek ἄποικος, in the sense of ‘emigrant, colonist’ (a name of function quite suitable for a Greek immigrant of the early seventh century BCE).

⁹⁸ *CIE* 8435–58.

⁹⁹ *ET* Fa 2.20; Maras (2013b:278).

¹⁰⁰ *ET* Fa 3.4; Maras (2013b:279, n. 87).

¹⁰¹ Maras (2013b:279–80).

¹⁰² Briquel (2016:220–2, n. 84).

¹⁰³ *ET* Cr 1.32 (ca. 650–630 BCE): *mi l[arθ]ia apiqu*, under the foot of an Etrusco-Corinthian vase in the Tomba I dei Letti e dei Sarcofagi (Grande Tumulo II).

¹⁰⁴ Briquel (2016:221).

¹⁰⁵ Colonna (2004:81, n. 78); Briquel (2016:222).

¹⁰⁶ Colonna (2004:81); Marchesini (2007:47).

In my opinion, however, there is no need to postulate a Greek origin for the name, which is most probably derived from Latin *apex*, with reference to the cap of the Roman *flamines*: **apīcō* is literally the ‘person who wears an *apex*’, that is to say a priest. From this surname, or name of function, two forms of the *gentilicium* derived, with no suffix in Caere and with the regular *-ius* suffix in Rome (*apicius* from either a simplified **apicon-ius* or a variant **apicus*).¹⁰⁷

Evident Graphic/Phonetic Identity

In the absence of direct evidence from non-Etruscan inscriptions, the most frequent method for recognizing foreign elements in Etruscan nomenclature is the similarity of the written form of onomastic formulas, which suggests similar patterns of sounds (phonetic identity). In many cases, there is little doubt that the names have been borrowed from a different language.

As regards Greek names, the cases of *Larth Telicles* and *Rutile Hipocrates* have already been mentioned. Some further examples, in approximate chronological order, are as follows:

Seventh century: *Tipe(ia)*, from *Veii* (ET Ve 2.8, if corresponding to Τίβειος or Τίβιος).¹⁰⁸

Sixth century: *Axilenas* and *Pereceles*, from *Volsinii* (ET Vs 1.122 and 1.67, deriving respectively from Ἀχιλλεύς¹⁰⁹ and Περικλῆς);¹¹⁰ *Miliūnas*, from *Pontecagnano* (ET Cm 2.104, deriving from Μελίτων).¹¹¹

Fifth century: *Hermxraße*, *Stepene* (or *Stepe*), and *Θinaste*, in the labels of a black-figure amphora probably produced in *Volsinii* (ET Cl 7.5, corresponding to Ἑρμοκράτης, Στέφανος, or Στιβεύς and, possibly, *Δινάστης);¹¹² *Eurves* (ET Vs 3.8, corresponding to Εὐρύας);¹¹³ *Scirunies*, from *Pontecagnano* (ET Cm 2.138, possibly deriving from Σκίρων).¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁷ Attested in Etruscan as *apice* (ET Cm 2.120 and Cl 1.2455–62; see Morandi (2004:73, n. 121).

¹⁰⁸ Colonna (2004:82); Morandi (2004:539–40); Marchesini (2007:57–8).

¹⁰⁹ Morandi (2004:97).

¹¹⁰ See note 69.

¹¹¹ Pellegrino and Colonna (2002).

¹¹² Colonna (1997a); Cerchiai (2014); Maras (2018b:146, n. 42).

¹¹³ Maras and Michetti (2003:378); Marchesini (2007:79–80).

¹¹⁴ Cinquantaquattro and Colonna (2011).

Hellenistic period: *Tamsnie*, from *Caere* (ET Cr 1.161, if deriving from Δάμασος);¹¹⁵ *Tiple*, from *Tarquiniā*, and *Tiϕile*, from *Clusium* (ET Ta 3.5 and Cl 1.1645, both probably corresponding to Δίφιλος);¹¹⁶ *Evr̄s*, in a signature from *Civita Castellana* (ET Fa 0.17, from Εὔρος).¹¹⁷

Browsing this partial list shows that Greek elements entered Etruscan nomenclature at diverse social levels, including aristocratic immigrants in the early archaic period, mixed communities in Campania, and craftsmen, slaves, and performers in the Classical and Hellenistic periods. It is not clear whether the *gens Tamsnie* of *Caere*, belonging to the local elite at least from the late fourth century BCE, originates from a much earlier immigrant or from recent social climbing. Anyway, the Greek derivation is only hypothetical (< **Tam(a)s(e)-n(a)-ie*).

As we have seen, Etruscan and Latin nomenclature share many *gentilicia*, as a consequence of interethnic mobility from the earliest period of the cities of southern Etruria and Latium. In many cases, the parallel formation of *gentilicia* on identical onomastic bases differed only for the suffix used: *-na* in Etruscan and *-ius* in Latin.

There are cases, however, in which a Latin *gentilicium* occurs unaltered in Etruscan formulas, such as *Hustile(ia)* (ET Vc 2.1, in genitive, seventh century, corresponding to *Hostulus* < **hostēlos*), *Zalvie* (ETAH 2.1, seventh century, corresponding to *Salvius*),¹¹⁸ *Leceniies* (ETAd 2.1, late sixth century, from *Licinius*),¹¹⁹ *Ause[i]e* (ET Cr 2.195, fifth century, from *Aurelius* < **auselios*), *Clavtie* (ET Cr 5.2 and Cs 2.4, fifth–fourth centuries, from *Claudius*),¹²⁰ *Lvcili* (ET Cr 1.159, fourth century, from *Lucilius*).¹²¹ This list is far from being complete, but is sufficient to show how complex and intertwined the relationship is between Latin and Etruscan onomastics throughout the centuries.

¹¹⁵ Morandi (2004:502).

¹¹⁶ Morandi (2004:540); Facchetti (2007:129–30).

¹¹⁷ Maras and Michetti (2003).

¹¹⁸ Marchesini (2007:77–9). Remarkably, the *gens Salvia* maintained its connection with *Ferentium* in the Imperial period and gave birth to emperor Marcus Salvius Otho in 32 CE; Morandi (2004:436–9).

¹¹⁹ Morandi (2004:277).

¹²⁰ Morandi (2004:134–5).

¹²¹ Morandi (2004:292).

Finally, a number of Etruscan *gentilicia* correspond to Italic names known from later epigraphic sources. In this regard, to the aforementioned *Vestiricina-* and *Peticina-* we can add here *Paiθina-* (ET Cr 3.27, AS 3.6 and Vn 3.2, seventh century, probably from Italic **Baitos* or Latin *Paetus*),¹²² *Maies* and *Maias* (ET Vc 2.9 and Cr 2.194, seventh and fifth centuries, from Oscan **Maiis**),¹²³ *Vinucenas* (ET Vs 1.126, sixth century, from Oscan **Vīnikiis**, arc. *Vīnuχs*),¹²⁴ *Uḫaliies* (ET Cm 2.18, sixth century, from Oscan **Ūpfals**),¹²⁵ *Plaisenas* (ET Vs 1.18 and 1.121, from a paleo-Italic **Blaisiis**).¹²⁶ In addition, it is worth mentioning the possibility that the recent *praenomen Tasma*¹²⁷ derives from the Messapian name $\Delta\alpha\zeta\iota\mu\omicron$.¹²⁸ As we have seen, however, the vast majority of the documentation for the Italic languages is much more recent than the Etruscan attestations, which often date back to the Orientalizing and Archaic periods. It is therefore difficult to ascertain the historical origin of parallel name formulas in different languages, which in theory could have been subject to borrowing from Etruscan to Italic.

Etymology

Even more complex and, often, more uncertain than phonetics is the acknowledgement of foreign elements in Etruscan nomenclature based on etymology. This method is easily applied in the case of perfect correspondence of names in Latin and Etruscan, as in the following few examples: *Rutelna-* ~ *Rutilius* (< **rutelos*); *Laivena-* ~ *Laeuius* (< **laiwos*); *Hvul(u)ve-* ~ *Fuluius* (< **folwos*); *Flaviena-* ~ *Flavius* (< **flawos*); *Una(na)-* ~ *Iunius* (< Fal. *iuna*).

Some further names can be added to the list even if no parallel Latin *gentilicium* is actually attested: *Flusena-* (< **flos-* > *Florus*, a *cognomen*); *Crepu* (< Lat. *creppus*, 'he-goat', presumably in a sense comparable to that of *lupercus*);¹²⁹ *Caicnas* (< **kaikos* >

¹²² Morandi (2004:343–4); Maras (2009:379).

¹²³ Morandi (2004:298).

¹²⁴ Agostiniani (1983:48); Morandi (2004:201), with a different opinion.

¹²⁵ Agostiniani (1983:39, n. 21).

¹²⁶ Morandi (2004:381), with further bibliography.

¹²⁷ ET Vs 1.257, from Bagnoregio (second century BCE): *tasma šatnas*.

¹²⁸ For further foreign names adapted as *praenomina*, see Marchesini (2007:23–6).

¹²⁹ Colonna (1997b:65); Morandi (2004:143); see also Marchesini (2007:71–2).

Caecus, a *cognomen*; cf. *Caecilius*). At times, is even difficult to establish the direction of the loan, as in the cases of *Acvilna-*¹³⁰ ~ *Aquilius*¹³¹ and *Ecisie*¹³² ~ *Egerius*.¹³³

Etymology is also at the base of the recognition of foreign names of function that we mentioned above in relation to mercenaries and warlords. Further cases concern Etruscan *gentilicia* apparently deriving from other languages of pre-Roman Italy, as in the following examples, deriving from Italic names (*Meties* and *Metiena* < **Metto-* [cf. Lat. *Mettus*];¹³⁴ *Alfiana* < **Alfo-* [cf. Lat. *Albius*]; *Vipes* and *Vipiennas/Vipinas* < Osc. **Vīibis**;¹³⁵ *Laucie-/Luvcie-* < Osc. **Lúvkis**;¹³⁶ *Trepe-/Treple-* < Osc. **Trebiis**¹³⁷) and numerals (*Pumpuna* < Ital. **pompo-* [cf. Lat. *Pomponius*]; *Utaves* < **ohtave-* [cf. Lat. *Octavius*]; *Nunie* < **nonie-* [cf. Lat. *Nonius*]).¹³⁸

In addition, some Etruscan names have uncertain comparanda in Celtic onomastics, as in the cases of *Epunianas*,¹³⁹ possibly deriving from **epo-nyo-*, in connection with the semantic sphere of the 'horse',¹⁴⁰ and *Katacinas*,¹⁴¹ if deriving from *katako-*, rec. *Catac(i)us*,¹⁴² and even in the Phoenician lexicon, such as *Melacinas* and *Melctrna*,¹⁴³ possibly depending on MLK, 'king', and MLKT, 'queen', and the obscure *Mazbavana*,¹⁴⁴ which might be derived from MZBH, 'altar', in the context of religious cultural exchange.

¹³⁰ ET Ve 3.7, Vc 3.4–5 (early sixth century BCE): *mine muluven(ic)e avil(l)e acvilnas*.

¹³¹ de Simone (1989).

¹³² ET Cr 2.7 (second quarter of the seventh century BCE): *mi θihvaries ecisie*; Colonna (1970).

¹³³ Remarkably, both names *Aquilius* and *Egerius* have Etruscan connections in the sources. See also Marchesini (2007:26–9; 43–4).

¹³⁴ Morandi (2004:311–12).

¹³⁵ Morandi (2004:201–11).

¹³⁶ Morandi (2004:276–7; 291–2).

¹³⁷ Morandi (2004:544–5).

¹³⁸ Salomies (2009:515–20); see also Wallace (2008:93–4) and Roncalli (2009).

¹³⁹ ET Vc 2.7.

¹⁴⁰ Sassatelli (2003:336), with further bibliography.

¹⁴¹ ET Vs 1.165.

¹⁴² de Simone (1978); Sassatelli (2003:335–6); Morandi (2004:264–5); Marchesini (2007:28).

¹⁴³ Respectively ET Ve 3.2 and AS 2.12, 1.217, and 1.276; see also Morandi (2004:310).

¹⁴⁴ ET AT 0.1; see Bagnasco Gianni (1996:195), Cristofani (1996:223).

Ethnic Adjectives Used as Names

From time to time, the foreign origin of a person is incorporated into his or her nomenclature by transforming the relevant ethnic adjective into part of his or her name formula.¹⁴⁵ In such cases, there are a number of different possibilities:

- 1) the ethnic adjective can be added to the personal name as a nickname or a *cognomen*;
- 2) the ethnic name is used in the place of a *gentilicium*;
- 3) a *gentilicium* is derived from the ethnic name by adding a suffix;
- 4) the reference to a foreign people is included in the *praenomen*;
- 5) an ethnic adjective is used in the place of a personal name.

In case no. 1, it is usually not clear if the ethnic adjective is actually part of the relevant name formula. After all, in the aforementioned inscription of *Laris Puleas*, the third element of the formula of the forefather was not inherited by his offspring (*Creice*, 'the Greek'). It is therefore possible that *Θανχvil Craica*, attested in Vulci in the mid-fifth century BCE,¹⁴⁶ was also still considered a foreigner with no *gentilicium* (a sort of metec, or resident alien).

As a consequence, when name formulas are found including an ethnic adjective in the place of a *gentilicium* (no. 2), scholars should always wonder whether this is part of the name or just an indication of the origin of its bearer. This is the case, for instance, of the early inscription of *Tite Latine* from Veii,¹⁴⁷ where we have no clue if the second element of the formula was heritable or not.¹⁴⁸ Considering its early period, the mentioned person was possibly still regarded as a foreigner from Latium.¹⁴⁹

Less certain is the case of names referring to Etruscan cities, such as *Veiane* (from the name of Veii)¹⁵⁰ and *Velχite* (from Vulci),¹⁵¹ or Latin cities, such as *Lapicane* (from Labici)¹⁵² and, possibly, *Runate*

¹⁴⁵ Hadas-Lebel (2009); Colonna (2013:10–13).

¹⁴⁶ *ET Vc* 2.33–4; see also Morandi (2004:140–1).

¹⁴⁷ *ET Ve* 2.4 (end of the seventh century BCE); *mi tites latines*.

¹⁴⁸ Morandi (2004:275).

¹⁴⁹ Colonna (1976b:376, n. 131); Colonna (2013:10–11).

¹⁵⁰ *ET Fa* 2.6–10, *Cr* 2.112, *Vc* 2.4, *Fe* 3.3; Morandi (2004:167).

¹⁵¹ *ET Cl* 1.576–7.

¹⁵² *ET Cr* 2.131 and 5.8 (third century BCE); Morandi (2004:270–1), with further comparanda.

Rumate (from Rome).¹⁵³ In this regard, however, we have the literary evidence of the Tarquinii, who were named after their city of origin, according to the legend, as mentioned above.

A number of *gentilicia* derive from ethnonyms or poleonyms with the addition of the *-na* or equivalent suffix (no. 3), following the normal procedure used for individual names, as in the following examples:¹⁵⁴

Kalaprena(s) (cf. Lat. *Calabri: ET Ta* 2.3, early seventh century BCE, from Tarquinia; *Vs* 1.59, late sixth century BCE, from Orvieto);¹⁵⁵

Tursikina (cf. Lat. *Etruscus: ET Cl* 2.3, third quarter of the seventh century BCE, from Castelluccio);¹⁵⁶

Avhiricina(s) (cf. Lat. *Africa: ETAT* 3.2, end of the seventh century BCE, from S. Giuliano);¹⁵⁷

Xairitna(s) (cf. Lat. *Caeritis: ET Vc* 2.72, mid-fifth century BCE, from Vulci);¹⁵⁸

Umrana (cf. Lat. *Vmbri: ET Cl* 1.362–6, Hellenistic period, from Clusium).¹⁵⁹

In these cases, it is uncertain whether the new *gentilicia* originated from real ethnic adjectives used as nicknames (respectively **Kalapre*, **Tursike*, **Africe*, and so on), or from identical individual names. Evidence in support for the former hypothesis comes from the *tesserae hospitales*, which show Phoenician ethnonyms used as fictitious *gentilicia* (*Karθazie*, *Silqetenas*), and demonstrate that from time to time temporary name formulas were used by non-integrated foreigners.¹⁶⁰ On the other hand, however, some attestations are known where an ethnic name is used as a *praenomen* (no. 4) or even as an individual name (no. 5).

¹⁵³ *ETAH* 2.2 and *AS* 2.2; Colonna (1981:169–70); Morandi (2004:429–30).

¹⁵⁴ Further comparanda are listed in Colonna (2013:11–15).

¹⁵⁵ Morandi (2004:261); Colonna (2013:13).

¹⁵⁶ de Simone (1976); Marchesini (2007:28–9).

¹⁵⁷ Morandi (2004:36–7); Colonna (2013:15), with reference to Phoenician immigrants. See also Marchesini (2007:28), with a different interpretation.

¹⁵⁸ Colonna (2004:85); Morandi (2004:583–4).

¹⁵⁹ Morandi (2004:568) with further comparanda; Colonna (2013:12).

¹⁶⁰ See notes 88–90. Further *gentilicia* referring to a Phoenician origin are listed in Colonna (2013:14–15).

This issue is especially relevant inasmuch as it affects our understanding of when the integration took place. There is the possibility that it goes back to earlier generations, not necessarily implying that the bearers of such ethnic *gentilicia* were of a lower social status. Unfortunately, it is not possible to offer any general answer.

When an ethnic name is used in place of a personal name (no. 5), it could be considered as a nickname, suitable to identify a metic, as in case no. 1. The 'depersonalization', however, is deeper in this case, for the individual name is fully replaced. This phenomenon was certainly suitable in the case of slaves or foreign people of low social class, but also, possibly, in certain other contexts. A few examples follow:

Celthes (cf. Lat. *Celtae*: ET Cr 3.22, late sixth century BCE, from Caere);¹⁶¹

Latiþe (cf. Lat. *Latium*: ET Ta 7.5, late sixth century BCE, from Tarquinia);¹⁶²

Cale (cf. Lat. *Galli*: ET Ta 7.13, end of the sixth century BCE, from Tarquinia);¹⁶³

Nucrtele (cf. Lat. *Nuceria*: ET Ta 7.25, end of the sixth century BCE, from Tarquinia);¹⁶⁴

Kursike (cf. Lat. *Corsica*: ET Po 2.43, mid-fifth century BCE, from Populonia);¹⁶⁵

Umrke (cf. Lat. *Vmbri*: ET Po 2.44, end of the fifth century BCE, from Populonia);¹⁶⁶

Eluveitie (cf. Lat. *Heluetii*: ET Pa 0.3, end of the fourth century BCE, from Mantua).¹⁶⁷

People in a number of different situations feature in this list, including slaves (such as the *Cale* of the Tomba delle Iscrizioni

¹⁶¹ Sassatelli (2003:333), with further bibliography; Colonna (2004:76).

¹⁶² Colonna (1988:447–8); Colonna (2013:11).

¹⁶³ Colonna (2016:135, n. 59); see also Sassatelli (2003:334).

¹⁶⁴ Maras (2018a:100, n. 86).

¹⁶⁵ Maggiani (1999:47–51).

¹⁶⁶ Maggiani (1992:184; 187, fig. 15, n. 48).

¹⁶⁷ Sassatelli (2003:333).

and the *Umrke* (slave) of *Pelka* at Populonia), ritual performers (such as the pugilists *Latiþe* and *Nucrtele* in the paintings of the tombs degli Auguri and delle Iscrizioni at Tarquinia), possibly mercenaries (such as *Celþe* in Caere) and foreign visitors (such as *Kursike* at Populonia and *Eluveitie* in Mantua).¹⁶⁸

In all these cases, foreign individual names might still have existed but were not used in Etruria. In addition, it remains uncertain if the ethnic nickname later underwent a process of transformation into a proper name. In this case, however, it might be significant that *Cale* is a well-known *gentilicium* of the hinterland of Tarquinia.¹⁶⁹

Closing Remarks: Diverse Categories of Interethnic Mobility

In this chapter a number of different types of geographical mobility and integration have been described and commented on by presenting a series of case studies. In the framework of the historical development of Etruscan onomastics, the presence of foreign elements in personal nomenclature has been highlighted, thus identifying some categories in which it is more common to find early immigrants, newcomers, and visiting foreigners. These include members of the elite since the earliest documentation available, harking back to the early and mid-Orientalizing period. In this category, Greek immigrants are found side by side with Latin and Italic families, paralleling the legend of Demaratus. As the noble Corinthian had a retinue including skilled craftsmen, it is not surprising that many Greek immigrants were artisans, particularly potters and painters. In addition, ritual performers are a further category of people featuring Greek names, along with Italic immigrants and some possible Phoenician elements. In this group we can include not only dancers and athletes, but also the noble ancestor of Laris Pulenas.

As expected, a number of military persons are of foreign origin, for they belong to the widespread category of mercenaries and

¹⁶⁸ See further ethnic names in Colonna (2004:76–7).

¹⁶⁹ ETAT 1.29, 48, and 64 (from Tuscania), and ETAH 1.42 (from Bomarzo); see also ET Vc 1.121 and Vt 8.1.

military chiefs, who from time to time settled in Etruria and apparently had offspring there. In this case, it is remarkable that the nicknames used in military contexts were transformed into part of official name formulas. Traders (and, possibly, diplomats, keeping in mind that in antiquity these categories of travellers often melted into one another) probably had a special status in Etruscan communities, as some *tesserae hospitales* referring to foreigners seem to demonstrate. In these cases, a fictitious, temporary name was allotted to the visiting person, including a reference to his/her foreign origin. Finally, slaves and low-class immigrants were often of foreign origin and are frequently attested in the later periods, particularly in the Hellenistic period.

Of course, this list is far from complete and many of the presented cases are hypothetical or uncertain. However, in my opinion, it is sufficient to acknowledge that the procedures of integration of immigrants into Etruscan society went on throughout all of Etruscan history, and that this was recorded in epigraphy. Etruscan nomenclature was an evolving system, open to the introduction of new elements and suitable to creating new *gentilicia* and integrating foreign name formulas from the Orientalizing period to the late Hellenistic period. Finally, Roman nomenclature overcame the Etruscan system, after which a new historical phase of onomastics started for Etruria and Italy.

CHAPTER 3

ELUSIVE MIGRANTS OF ANCIENT ITALY

ELENA ISAYEV

The landscapes of the Italian peninsula, no less than others in the ancient Mediterranean of the third and second centuries BC, hosted numerous intersections for the convergence of resources – people, objects, ideas and stories – recounted in multiple languages and mediums.¹ Propelled by technology, trade, warfare and alliances, as well as love, curiosity and brigandage, the ensuing connectivities stimulated the emergence of new sociocultural trends and communities. Both material and literary endeavours attest to the dynamism of multiple movements within and through Italy in this period (Isayev 2017). Yet, tracking migrants who were part of these human flows, in terms of numbers, origins, destinations and the drivers of their mobility, proves difficult apart from a few exceptional episodes. Beyond the peninsula it is particularly hard to identify individuals of Italian origin living abroad before the Late Republic, despite multiple indicators of ties between communities in Italy and sites around the Mediterranean, especially in the archaeological record. In part, the elusive nature of migrants may be attributed to the governing authorities' lack of interest in counting and recording people on the move, beyond what was necessary for military recruitment, the census and taxation. While there were requirements for traders to register their goods at customs houses (Lefèvre 2004; Bresson 2007),² we have

¹ I am most grateful to Katherine McDonald and Nick Zair for inviting me to join in the dynamic discussions of the 2016 workshop that underpin this volume, and to the many scholars there who inspired new paths to follow among them, how women's trajectories fit into these ancient intersections. I am particularly grateful to Patrick James for sharing with me his current research on migration in Greek comedy, which, along with the comments of the anonymous reviewers and the editorial team, has been very thought provoking and enhanced this chapter.

² Plautus *Asinaria* 240–3; *Menaechmi* 117–19; *Trinummus* 795, 1105–7.