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By “social mobility” I mean here a change of social class, which is not easy to discern in Etruria because we do not have much general information on the structure of Etruscan society. The most important change, and the most obvious, is the transition from servile to free status, hence the importance of freedmen for our subject. The word for “freedman” is well known, as we have circa 175 inscriptions: it is lautni, lautni (rec. lavtni), fem. lautni̞a, lautnita (rec. lavntita). Its meaning is attested by two bilingual Etrusco-Latin inscriptions (CIE, 1288 Clusium; 3692 Perugia), which testify to the equivalence of lautni to the Latin libertus.

Equivalence does not mean identity of status, especially during the independent cities period. At least two questions arise. What is the relationship between the lautni and his former master? What is the position of the lautni as regards citizenship? The onomastic, for which we have a very rich corpus of epitaphs, provides us with part of the answer.

As to the first point, we notice that the name of the former master is often, but not always, present, and above all that the freedman does not receive, as would happen in Rome, his master’s praenomen and gentilicum: he simply retains the single name he bore, when he was a slave; only after the annexation of Etruria will Roman law apply in this matter too. We can say that the remaining ties between the freedman and his former master are less strong than in Rome; the lautni-status itself seems to prevail over the personal ties.

It follows that the freedman remains without citizenship, whereas his son will be automatically entitled to it. A sure pointer to this can be seen in the expression of his identity, which has the same structure as for native citizens, with the taking of a praenomen and the use of the single name of the father as a gentilicum; in the following generation the patronymic (praenomen of the father, often shortened) appears as well as, sometimes, the
matronymic (gentilicium of the mother); from the latter proceeds the cognomen.

Therefore a study of the gentilicia and the cognomina can follow the social evolution of the successive members of a family: the single name can become a gentilicium, then a cognomen. The examples we shall give have been taken from the three most important collections of epitaphs, from the cities of Clusium, Perugia and Volterra and are for the most part “recent.”

Among family names, it is important to recognize those which are likely to reveal a servile origin; most of them are identical with single names borne by slaves: names transcribed from the Greek, like Τιφίλη (Δίφιλος), Τάμα (Δάμος), Ηρκλείτη (Ἡρκλείδης), or from another foreign language, like Μουτζέτι (< Celt. Mogetios); names identical with Etruscan (or Italic) praenomina, like Cae, Tite, Aule, which have parallels in Latin, or Larce, Velxe, which are only Etruscan; specific names for slaves, like Λεός, fem. Λεόνη, or for freedmen, like Launzi itself; ethnic names, like Venete, Lecusti. In addition, there are occupational names, like Ziχu, Fulu, Suplu, which are never used as single names, but can serve as family names.

We will begin by considering the names transcribed from the Greek, which provide the most obvious cases. For example we find in Clusium the epitaph of a couple inscribed on a tile:

\[ CIE, 2096 = TLE, 535 = Cl 1.1645: Τιφίλη : λαυ(τνί) / Βελχες / Πηλια \]

The husband bears a single name, Τιφίλη, transcribed from the Greek Δίφιλος; then comes the indication of his status with, in the genitive, the gentilicium of the master whose freedman he is, nom. Βελχες; the name of the wife, Πηλία, is co-ordinate through the enclitic -c, functionally equivalent to Latin -que: this name is single too, when the free women had a praenomen and a gentilicium, which means that the wife was very likely a freedwoman.

Another epitaph, also on an ossuary in Clusium, reveals the identity of their son:

\[ CIE, 2934 = Cl 1. 2513: Α(ρνθ) : Τιφίλη : Παλπέ : Πηλιας \]

This man uses as a gentilicium the single name of his father, and puts before it an Etruscan’s citizen ordinary praenomen; he adds a cognomen, Παλπέ, which corresponds to the Lat. Balbus. The last name is his matronymic, in this case the single name of his mother in the genitive. The normal place for the patronymic is vacant: as a freedman the father did not have a praenomen and his single name is still used as a gentilicium.

During the Roman period, we find, again in Clusium, in Latin-written epitaphs, the feminine form of the gentilicium, used as a matronymic, in the ablative:

\[ CIE, 1584 = CIL, 11, 2229: L. ΗΑΕΡΙΝΑ / ΤΙΦΗΛΙΑ ΝΑΤΩΣ \]

or in the genitive:
Then the family in its turn owns slaves, whom they can free; we know one of these who, by affinity with Roman law, has taken the gentilicium but not the praenomen of his former master:

*CIE, 2935 = Cl 1.2512: AR. TIBILE. P. L(ibertus)*

The social promotion of the family is complete.

Other single names of Greek origin used as gentilicia could be mentioned: such as *Herclite*, which transcribes ‘Ἡράκλεις (or Ήρακλείτος?). It is the single name of a *lautni*, on an epitaph from Sarteano, near Clusium:

*CIE, 1486 = [Cl 1. 873]: Herclite Tites / [Cl]ans l(autni)*

This man is a freedman of the family of the *Tite Clante*, to which we will return. During the Roman period we find what is probably the name of his son both on an olla, in Latin characters:

*CIE, 1488 = Cl 1.836: C. HERCLITE HA(stiae)*

and on a tile, in a bilingual inscription:

*CIE, 1487 = TLE, 500 = Cl 1. 835: C. HERCLIT(E) HA(stiae) / Cae / Ferclite*

In both Latin inscriptions, the last two letters are the abbreviation of the matronymic, here a praenomen, because the mother was probably a freedwoman; and there is nothing for the patronymic, because the father was a *lautni*, without praenomen.

Among the single names of slaves and freedmen, which can become gentilicia, a very important group is composed of praenomina also borne by citizens. The wide diffusion of these praenomina leads to the presence of the gentilicia from which they are derived in several cities, hence the assumption that we are dealing with great families with many settlements; as a matter of fact they are all local lineages descended in each city from a freedman, or even from several freedmen. Some of these praenomina are close to Latin or “Italic” forms, like *Cae, Tite, Aule,* others are only Etruscan, as *Larce, Velxe.* For the first group, let us take as an example *Cae = Caius,* an equivalence confirmed, if necessary, by a bilingual inscription on a cippus in Clusium:

*NRIE, 402-403 = TLE, 462 = Cl 1.354: C. TREBONI. Q. F / GELLIA. NATVS Cae / Trepu*
A frequent praenomen in Etruria, and especially in Clusium, Ca' was also used as a single name for slaves and freedmen. Maybe the same man has marked, when he was still a slave, a strigil with his single name and the gentiliciurn of his master in the genitive:

\[SE, 22, 132, 2 = Cl 6.8: Ca' Cultces\]

and then was given an epitaph on an ossuary, proving that he received the lautni-status:

\[CIE, 1854 = SE, 22, 132, 2 = Cl 1.1530: Ca' lautni : Cultces\]

In the feminine, the form is Cainei, a single name on an ossuary of Pienza, near Sienna:

\[CIE, 1120 = AS 1.381: Cainei\]

 Afterwards Ca' might become a gentilicium: we catch the beginning of the process in some inscriptions from Clusium, where the name, already used as a gentiliciurn, is nevertheless repeated (in the genitive), as the (single) name of the father, also on a fictile lid:

\[CIE, 1825 = Cl 1.1339: Arn\theta Ca' Caes\]

Since we lack precise information about the finds, it is impossible to identify with certainty this man as the one who, on an olla, uses an identical formula, but adds a gentilicium in the genitive, probably the name of the former master of his father:

\[NRIE, 326 = Cl 1.140: Arn\theta : Ca' : Caes : Marcnas\]

Later, the new gentilicium becomes part of more complete formulae, with cognomen and matronymic, like this one, found on an ossuary:

\[CIE, 1915 = Cl 1.14: : Ar(n\theta): Ca' : Patu / Atainal\]

or this other, on another ossuary, with the addition of the patronymic:

\[CIE, 1403 = Cl 1.312: L(ar)\theta : Ca' : Punpana : Lr : Larcial\]

As an instance of gentilicium in the feminine, we may quote an inscription on an ossuary in Clusium:

\[CIE, 1512 = Cl 1.815: Lar\thetai : Cainei : Pumpus'a\]

Compared with the very numerous occurrences of the name as a gentilicium
(about 300 inscriptions for both genders) only one inscription, on an olla, may present the name as a cognomen in the feminine; but the text is dubious and must be read:

\[CIE, 2825 = REE, 50, 105 = [Cl 1.2394]: \text{Lar\textipa{theta}ia . Teti . Cainei}\]

according to the facsimile of the \textit{CIE}, whereas the editors give other different readings.

Among the praenomina which are only Etruscan, one of the more interesting is \textit{Larce} (< arch. \textit{Larece, Larice}), abundantly attested as a citizen’s praenomen, particularly in Clusium (\textit{CIE}, 1812. 2108. 2233. 2995; gen. \textit{Larces: CIE}, 2835. 4854 \textit{Larces’a: CIE}, 1810. 1811. 2987; \textit{SE}, 22, 312), but also in Perugia (\textit{CIE}, 3935) or in Sienna (\textit{CIE}, 301). We find it as a freedman’s single name in Perugia:

\[CIE, 3600 = \text{Pe 1.1121: Larce . Mete/ls . lautni}\]

or in Clusium:

\[CIE, 4690 = \text{Cl 1.426: Larce / lautni / S’e: Pa(-?-s)}\]

yet again, for another \textit{lautni} in Clusium, but preceded by a praenomen, as if the freedman would already change it to a gentilicium:

\[CIE, 1637 add. = \text{Cl 1.686: A(rn)\textipa{theta} : Larce / Fupre : Tet/nis : lautni}\]

After that, \textit{Larce} becomes in Clusium a regular gentilicium, present in several formulae with praenomen and matronymic, as for example:

\[CIE, 4853 = \text{Cl 1.695: Ar(n)\textipa{theta} : Larce : Carnal}\]

The frequency of this kind of epitaph, containing different matronymics, testifies to alliances with ancient families, hence to a successful social integration. Finally the name is used as a cognomen:

\[CIE, 1705 = \text{Cl 1.2480: L(ar)\textipa{theta} : Tite : Larce : Ancarual}\]

\textit{Larce} gives Lat. \textit{Largus} (cf. \textit{CIE}, 2108), which is the name (gentilicium or cognomen ?) of a man mentioned by CICERO (\textit{Fam}, 6, 8, 1 = Ep., 558 Beaujeu) as a friend of his pen-friend A. \textit{Caecina}, member of an important family in Volterra. Some years later, \textit{Largus} is the cognomen of another \textit{Caecina}, who built his city’s theatre in association with his brother, the consul of 1 B.C., according to the inscription on a monumental slab of marble:

\textit{Caecina A. f. Seuerus co(n)s(ul) / C. Caecina A. f. Larg[us fac(iundum) cur(auerunt)]}
Largus can be explained as a cognomen of maternal origin used after the union of both families. A. Caecina Largus, a consul (probably suffect) in 13 AD, may be his son, and C. Caecina Largus, a colleague of Claudius in the consulate in 42 AD, his grandson. The daughter of the consul of 13 AD, Caecinia A. f. Larga marries A. Larcius Lepidus, whose gentilicium seems to be another adaptation in Latin of Larce. And there is also a propraetor of Thracia under Septimus Severus, in 195/196-198 AD, C. Caecina Largus.

Only one other family, also of Etruscan origin, uses this cognomen, the Anni of Perugia, amongst whom we know of L. Annius Largus, consul in 109 AD, and L. Annius Largus, consul in 147 AD. This cognomen is not in use in any other Roman family, which means that in spite of appearances it is not the Latin adjective largus (unless the later, without an Indo-European etymology, is taken from the Etruscan!). Moreover as a “Vornamencognomen” it can be observed in two different cities in totally unrelated families. Thus it was possible, for descendants of a modest family to reach, over a few generations, through far-seeing marriages, the very summit of the State.

We may have another example of an Etruscan praenomen changed to a Latin gentilicium with Veneleius, which is the gentilicium of a family of senators of the late Republic and of several consuls, in 92, 123 and 168 AD: the consul of 123 was also praetor Etruriae et quinquennalis of Pisa, which shows clearly his ties with the region. The name has been compared with the archaic praenomen Venel, widely attested in several cities, but the intermediary stages are missing.

In contrast to citizen’s praenomina used also as single names by slaves and freedmen, some other names are reserved for non free-born individuals. The most frequent is Leθe, fem. Leθi(a), which appears alone on two vases (3rd-2nd cent.) found in Fiesole, as a signature of the artist, probably a slave:

NRIE, 178 = CIL, 11, 6700, 1 d = Fs 6.3: Leθe
CII, App. 42 Gamurrini = Fs 6.4: Leθe

It is difficult to determine the status of the man, who left the same name on an archaic vase (6th century) found in Caere, but with the addition of another name in the genitive, probably the name of his master, former or actual:

NSA, 1937, p. 392 B 39; p. 453 = Cr 2.61: Leθe Catanas

Then we find Leθe as single name for freedmen, for example for a man in Clusium:

CIE, 1204 = Cl 1.71: Leθe lavtni / Herines

or for a woman in the same city:
Finally the name appears as a gentilicum, simply preceded by a praenomen, in an inscription on a tile in Clusium:

\[ CIE, 2414 = Cl 1.1255: \text{Le\'elia lautni\'a. Arntis} \]

and in two inscriptions on ossuaries in Perugia:

\[ CIE, 2404 = Cl 1.1915: \text{Aule / Le\'e} \]

And the man of the second one may be the father of a young child, who bears a single name, on an ossuary in the same city:

\[ CIE, 3997 = Pe 1.541: \text{Lar\'e : Le\'ees : S\'e\'eres} \]

The same form is used for the name of the husband of a woman still in Perugia:

\[ CIE, 3996 = SE, 36, 234, 4 = Pe 1.540: \text{Fasti . Cai . Le\'ees} \]

Two other inscriptions from the same city, one for a man, another for a woman include a free woman’s matronymic:

\[ CIE, 4054 = Pe 1.595: \text{S\'e\(\theta\)re} \cdot \text{Le\'e} \cdot \text{Apur\(\theta\)ial} \]

\[ CIE, 4162 = Pe 1.825: \text{Lar\(\theta\)i . Le\(\theta\)i . Rafis . S\'ential} \]

Inversely, Le\(\theta\)ial is present in some fifteen inscriptions, especially in Clusium and Perugia, among whom:

\[ CIE, 4386 = Pe 1.1106: \text{\(\theta\)ania . Lunces . Vl . Le\(\theta\)ial} \]

Le\(\theta\)e itself is never used as cognomen, but Le\(\theta\)iu is, as in this inscription, in which the identity of the matronymic may perhaps illustrate a “maternal” origin:

\[ REE, 50, 21 = Pe 1.876: \text{Ar . Petrus . Le\(\theta\)iu . La . Le\(\theta\)ial} \]

Another example of a specific slave and freedman name is Mansi, which appears in explicit formulae, with the name of the former master, as for instance on an ossuary in Clusium:

\[ CIE, 521 = Cl 1.491: \text{\(\theta\)ansi : Petrus : lautni} \]
and in the same city for the freedman of a man who bears the same name, therefore is himself a freedman, on a tile, which must be read:

\[CIE, 2324 =] REE, 50, 68 \[= Cl 1.1830]: \text{\textit{Oansi / la(utni) . Oansi/s}}

Lastly lautni / lavtni itself can undergo the same process. It is used as sole name, as an ownership mark on a vase in Volterra:

\[CII, 359 = Vt 2.9: \text{Lavtni}\]

then as a gentilicium, still in Volterra, on a lid, with a praenomen, a patronymic and a matronymic:

\[CIE, 129 = TLE, 393 = Vt 1.124: L . Lautni . V . Cavial\]

In this use, the feminine is what we would expect in a genuine gentilicium, Lautnei / Lavtnei, as proved by the epitaph of a woman, who could be the latter’s daughter:

\[CIE, 159 = Vt 1.126: Larti . Lautnei . L . ril . XXXIII\]

Ethnic names are also well attested, especially in Perugia, where we meet a whole lineage, titular of a monumental sepulture, with the name of Venete. The name indicates that the founder of the family came from Northern Italy and had no other designation than his origin of “Venetian,” which implies a servile status. However the attestations seem to begin only with the second generation following the freedman’s.

An epitaph like:

\[CIE, 4143 = Pe 1.806: S’e(\theta\epsilon) . Venete . La . Le\theta\iotaial . clan\]

shows that the deceased, who bears the ethnic name as gentilicium, had a father who already bore a praenomen and therefore was at least the freedman’s son; on the other hand the exit from the servile class is not yet complete, since the matronymic is still a typical freedwoman’s single name.

A son of this man’s could be one of three persons who have similar epitaphs, with the same praenomen (obliterated in the third one), but different matronymics, which seems to exclude that they should have had all three the same father:
In all cases, the mothers belong to families more or less well attested in Perugia, but the lack of patronymics casts a doubt over their social position. On the contrary, the gentilicium is used as a matronymic in a perfectly regular formula:


with praenomen, gentilicium and patronymic, which sanctions the definitive integration in Perugian society.

Some names of professions, which could be practised by slaves and freedmen, are well known, as ziχu, which comes from the root ziχ-, “write” and then designates the “scribe”, as in an epitaph on a sandstone lid from Perugia:

*CI E*, 3774 b = TLE, 601 b = Pe 1.1041: Larθ. Vetes ziχu

This word was not used as a single name, but we find it as a gentilicium in two inscriptions from Clusium, relating to the same man, on a tile and on an ossuary respectively:

*CI E*, 1414 = Cl 1.318: V(e)l. Ziχu. Vl. Mutual
*CI E*, 1415 = Cl 1.319: V(e)l. Ziχu. Vl. / Mut(ual)

The onomastic formula includes also praenomen, patronymic and matronymic: the defunct is at least the grand-son of the freedman who founded the lineage. For another man with the same gentilicium, also from Clusium:

*CI E*, 2242 = Cl 1.1765: A(rn)θ . Ziχu . A(rn)θ / Sert(ur - -)

the onomastic formula is slightly different, without a matronymic, but with a cognomen. Finally, dated to the beginning of the Roman period, we have the famous biligual text, which proves the meaning of the root through its Latin equivalent:

*CI E*, 1416 = TLE, 472 = Cl 1.320: Q. SCRIBONIUS. C. F / V(e)l. Zicu

We note that the Etruscan version does not include either patronymic or matronymic, and that the spelling is faulty, since the aspirate is replaced by the simple (as it would be in Latin); moreover the typically Etruscan praenomen V(e)l, is replaced in Latin by one of the most common praenomina, Q(uintus).
Another example is *fulu*, who is also the name of a profession, borrowed from the Latin *fullo*, “fuller,” but used as a proper name as well, with another form *Hulu*, and a fem. *Fuluni*. Let us consider the epitaph of a freedman on a tile in Clusium, that we can transcribe:

\[ CIE, 1275 = Cl \ 1.198 : Vel : fulu / Ucrs : lautni \]

In spite of the presence of the pronoun, the explicit mention that a *lautni* is concerned, and the name of his former master, some scholars regard the second word as a family name, or at least an individual name, citing a few exceptional cases where these elements coexist. But it seems preferable to see here an indication of the freedman’s occupation, who, according to the most common custom, bears a single name, *Vel*.

But this same word is used as a family name, on a lid in Cortona:

\[ CIE, 436 = TLE, 638 = Co \ 1.2 : Cure Fulu \]

or on an ossuary in Clusium:

\[ CIE, 3056 = Cl \ 1.2674: A(rn)\theta : Hulu : L(ar)\theta : Statinal \]

and in the feminine genitive, as a mark of ownership on vases in Volterra:

\[ CII, 353 = Vt \ 2.21: mi \ . Fului(al) \]
\[ CII, 354 = Vt \ 2.22: mi Fuluial \]

or as a matronymic on an alabaster lid in the same city:

\[ CIE, 150 = REE, 47, 42 = Vt \ 1.94: [Lart]ia . Cainai . Fuluial \]

finally as a cognomen on two tiles and an ossuary fictile in Clusium:

\[ CIE, 1844 = Cl \ 1.1415: La(r\theta) : Cae / Ful(u) \]
\[ CIE, 1845 = Cl \ 1.1416: L(ar)\theta : Cae [?] / Fulu F[ \]
\[ CIE, 1901 = Cl \ 1.1417: [- - -] Cae . Hulu \]

on a tufa ossuary in S. Quirico d’Orcia, near Siena:

\[ CIE, 202 = TLE, 415 = AS \ 1.272: Aule : Ceis’u Vipinal / Fulu \]

or even in Perugia, where *Fulu* appears in the epitaph on an ossuary of a woman designated only by her gentilicium, as the cognomen of her husband, following his gentilicium, both in the genitive:
CIE, 3904 = Pe 1.454: Velia . Cacnis . Fulus

Another example is suplu, which is probably the Etruscan etymon claimed for latin subulo, “flute-player,” by VARRO (L.L., 7, 35) and FESTUS (s.u., 402, 2 L; cf. PAVL., 403, 1 L). The word is an apellative joined to the name, obliterated to a large extent, of a flute-player, on a painting in the Golini tomb in Orvieto:

CIE, 5097 = TLE, 237 = Vs 1.181 / lin. 6: Tu [ - - ] l : suplu

and probably also in the epitaph of a lautni on an ossuary in Clusium:

REE, 46, 124 = Cl 1. 2384: A(rn)θ : suplu : lautni : Vels’is

But it is a slave’s or a freedman’s single name, placed as a mark of ownership on an archaic vase of Roselle:

REE, 44, 7 = REE, 45, 45 = Ru 2.7: mi Suplus

and probably the gentilicium of two men whose names are in a list on a bronze plate in Populonia:

CIE, 5211 = TLE, 380 = Po 4.4/lin. 3-4: Lθ . Suplu / Aθ . Suplu

The name is not used as a cognomen.

* One important factor of social mobility is marriage: it allows one to ascend or descend the social scale, it can cause geographical mobility - when a man takes a wife from another city - or result from a geographical move, motivated by political or economic reasons. It is remarkable that freedmen seem to have the right to legal marriage: the word puia, which indicates the legitimate wife of a citizen, is rather frequent in inscriptions mentioning a freedwoman, especially in Arezzo, Clusium and Perugia, as in:

CIE, 3679 = TLE, 591 = Pe 1.198: Urnas’is . lautniθa / puia . Arntus . Numis’is

In Clusium, another sign of legal marriage, the special “kinship genitive” in -s’a for the husband’s name is used for the lautni too; for example:

CIE, 1675 = Cl 1.1179: Sleparis : Alfnis : l(autniθa) / Acles’a

where the husband bears the Etruscan transcription of the Greek name Αχιλλεύς. But the lack of these signs does not necessarily mean that the union was not legally ratified, because they can be missing even in the case of unions between free persons; and the presence of a
man and a woman in the same sepulture can be considered as an even stronger indication of marriage.

But only unequal marriages involve a change in social condition. We find unions between a free woman and a freedman, like the one revealed by an olla from Clusium bearing:


where a lady, who in Latin transcription, would be called Hastia Egnatia, is associated with a freedman, whose single name is the Etruscan transcription of the Greek ‘Ἀντίοχος.

The situation is the same for an ossuary in Perugia, which joins:

\[ CIE, 4365 = Pe 1.1075: Fasti . Hamnia / lautni . Nus \]

where the name of the freedman is the transcription of ΝΟῗΣ; here too it is a Greek name. It is remarkable that, in both cases, the name of the woman precedes the name of the man, contrary to the general usage, because she is of an higher social rank.

The opposite situation does exist too, a free man joined to a freedwoman. Several cases are known in Clusium, as for example on a fictile lid:

\[ CIE, 1589 = Cl 1.777: Hatrunia : l(autni\ θa): Vipis / Murinas’a \]

where the name of the former master and the name of the husband, in the form of the “kinship genitive” in -s’a peculiar to Clusium, are found together. And when there is only one name, in the genitive in -s’a in Clusium, as in:

\[ CIE, 1744 = Cl 1.2258: Eris lautnta / Vilias’a \]

it is possible to understand that the freedwoman had married her former master.

* Other forms of social mobility are represented by integration into a family through adoption or marriage. The first case seems to lead to the foundation of a new family branch, which retains the mark of its origins in its cognomen. I should like to refer to an inscription from Clusium we have already mentioned:

\[ CIE, 1486 \ [= \ Cl 1. 873]: Herclite Tites / [Cl]ans l(autni) \]

The third word cannot be the genitive of clan (which is clens), because the master cannot be called Tites clan, “of Tite’s son”. If the meaning of “son” is excluded, how are we to understand it? The solution is probably to be found with the help of another inscription from Clusium:

\[ CIE, 2401 = Cl 1.2465 : L0 . Tite . Clante Aθ Lec[s]tinal \]
where we find the same association: *Clante* appears as a cognomen in a family, whose gentilicium comes from a praenomen; *Clans*, in the first inscription is very likely a genitive of this *Clante* (*=Clantes, *Clants). But this cognomen itself derives from an appellative, well attested in several cities, as for example on a lid in Tiburstone from Clusium:

\[CIE,2369 = Cl 1.1889: \text{Lar} \theta : \text{Latini} : \text{clanti} : \text{Latinial} : \text{Lar} \theta \text{ial} / \text{Scires} : \text{clan}\]

The contrast between *clan* and *clanti*, each with a filiation, suggests that *clanti* indicates the adoptive son; in this case, the man, who was the biological son of *Lar* \(\theta\) *Scire* and his wife *Latinia*, has been adopted by a kinsman of his mother who bears the same gentilicium as her.

So when *Clante* cannot be an appellative, it should be interpreted as a cognomen indicating a branch descended from an adopted child.

A special process seems to associate an “affiliation” and a marriage, in the case of a foreign national (i.e., from another Etruscan city) resulting in the foundation of a new branch. For example, in Volterra we have the burial-place of a branch of the *Ceicna* family, with the cognomen *Fetiu*, in use for four generations. Now the titular of the oldest urn is called simply:

\[CIE, 3039 = REE, 42, 329 = Vt 1.33: \text{Arn} \theta \cdot \text{Fe} \theta \text{iu} \cdot \text{Larisal}\]

with a gentilicium to be found in Perugia. If the name of the second person, his son, is too mutilated to be properly analysed (Vt 1.41), the grandsons of the founder bear the double gentilicium *Ceicna Fetiu* -- with the voiceless dental replacing the aspirate; for example:

\[CIE, 39 = NRIE, 1208 = REE, 42, 328 = Vt 1.32: \text{V . Ceicna} \cdot \text{Fetiu} \cdot \text{V . ril} \cdot \text{XXXV}\]

This means that the founder, or his son, or both have successively married a daughter of the Ceicna family, and their descendants have become part of this family. Other branches of the family may have the same origin, since they bear as a cognomen names used as gentilicium in other cities: *Ceicna S’elcia, Ceicna Tlapuni, Ceicna Caspu*.

This *Ceicna* family can serve for the study of a matrimonial policy: where did they choose their wives, in their city or elsewhere? To compensate for their acceptance and integration of the foreigners, who receive their daughters in marriage, the men of the gens take their own wives specifically from local families, apparently the great families of the city, of equal rank to themselves; and the same holds true for the marriages of most of their daughters. In this way from a matronymic, we learn about a marriage between a *Ceicna* girl and a young *S’upni*:

\[CIE, 52 a + \text{add.} = TLE, 401 = Vt 4.1 / \text{lin. 4: V . S’upni} \cdot \text{Ceicnal}\]
This appears on a lead sheet of the 3rd century BC containing a list of names, which has been variously interpreted as an exorcation tablet or a catalogue of members of a confraternity; the fact that the list begins with four men called S’upni shows the importance of the family. In the 1st century BC, a woman of this family was buried in one of the big hypogea of the Ceicna:

*CIE, 31 = Vt 1.18: [Rav]n0u . S’upnai . Ls . ril. LVIII*

This shows that she is the wife of one of the men of the family, but it is impossible to say which one, because the gamonymic is not used in Volterra and the name does not appear as a matronymic. In any case, there a continuity in the relationship between the two families.

Among the others families involved in these alliances we can mention the Ultace, Masve, Velane, who receive Ceicna daughters, or the Felmu, Herace, Armne, who give wives to the Ceicna. All these are ancient families of Volterra, already present on the lead sheet of the 3rd century and well attested in other inscriptions. Only one of the wives, a woman from the Curi family, bears a gentillicium otherwise unknown in Volterra:


but known in Perugia (*CIE, 3803; 3804*).

It would be interesting to discuss another aspect of social mobility, namely integration into Roman society and the political world but it is too large a topic for the present study. We must however at least recall the names of Caecina Largus and Annius Largus, who, as we saw earlier, reached the highest offices of the Roman state.

*The abundance and precision of the epitaphs allow us to sketch the fortunes of certain individuals or families, sometimes through several generations. An exhaustive study of the available material could probably enable us to outline a quantification of these movements, in space (by city) and time (with the radical cut of the Roman conquest). But we can already glimpse a society which, though hierarchical, was nonetheless open to individual ascensions and to the integration of foreigners.*