PERSONAL NAMES
IN THE
WESTERN ROMAN WORLD

ED. BY

TORSTEN MEIßNER

Katherine McDonald

Do Personal Names in South Oscan
Show Influence from Greek?[*]

Abstract

This paper examines the possible Greek influence on the onomastic system of the Oscan inscriptions of Lucania, Bruttium and Messina, which are written using a Greek-based alphabet. While, in the past, scholars have suggested that Oscan-speakers in these areas were extremely Hellenized, it is not always made clear which areas of their language and culture were most or least influenced by their Greek-speaking neighbours. In fact, the onomastic evidence, which shows only minimal influence from Greek except in areas under extreme pressure, suggests that the speakers of the South Oscan area maintained strong cultural links to the rest of Oscan-speaking Italy.

I. Introduction

South Oscan – that is, the Oscan of Lucania, Bruttium and Messina which was written using a Greek-based (Ionic) alphabet rather than the Etruscan-derived 'native' Oscan alphabet of further north – has long been somewhat on the fringes of the study of Oscan language. This is in part because of the relatively recent discovery of a large number of the extant South Oscan texts; many of these are therefore not included in the most thorough and influential works on Oscan onomastics, such as Lejeune's *L'anthroponymie osque*.[1] Consequently, it is high time this material is revisted and reexamined.

In some cases, scholars (including Lejeune) have stated that the Oscan-speakers of Lucania and Bruttium were extremely Hellenized, or at least were part of the Greek cultural sphere rather than maintaining contacts with other Oscan-speakers.[2] In fact, various aspects of the corpus as it exists now suggest rather that Oscan-speakers who adopted the Greek alphabet maintained very strong ties to an 'Oscan' identity, and remained notably un-Hellenized in the language of their epigraphy. In this paper, the focus will be on the personal names found in South Oscan. These names play a key part in our understanding of the culture and ethnolinguistic vitality of the community which produced this small corpus of texts.

---

[1] LEJEUNE 1976.

[2] 'Le monde osque méridional à partir du IVe s. est profondément engagé dans la sphère culturelle grecque, et cesse de subir l'influence des Osque centraux.' ibid.: 274.

The data used in this paper are based primarily on Rix's *Sabellische Texte*, with some alterations and additions from Crawford's new edition.[3] In general, these alterations do not make much difference to the overall view of the corpus; but in cases where more recent work has shown that a name may have been interpreted incorrectly by Rix in a way that has wider implications, or where there is some controversy, I will provide more information.[4] Inscriptions will be numbered according to Rix (two letters plus a number, e.g. Po 3); inscriptions that do not appear in *Sabellische Texte* will be numbered according to Crawford (town plus number, e.g. PETELIA 2).

There is no completely universal terminology for discussing onomastics; for example, the different possible meanings of 'name' in the context of ancient onomastics can lead to some ambiguity. Here, the term 'personal name' will refer to an individual's full name, as he or she has chosen to give it in the text. The term 'name component' will refer to a single lexical item within the personal name. Thus, a three-part name such as 'Gaius Julius Caesar' would be described as one personal name comprising three name components. The term 'name element' is most often used for the consistuent parts of compound Indo-European names, and this usage is maintained here: thus, *Alex-andros* is one personal name with two elements; compound names can be 'hybrids', so that the topographic name *Caesaromagus*, for example, has one Latin (*Caesar*) and one Celtic element (*magus*).[5]

Two or more attestations of the same name component (and, indeed, two or more attestations of the same full personal name) are counted separately in my totals. For tile stamps and coins, I have sought to treat each issue or stamp as one attestation, no matter how many extant copies of this issue have been found, on the basis that the manufacture of the stamp was the original 'utterance'. I include abbreviated names as separate name components, even when abbreviated to one letter, including when it is unclear what the abbreviation stands for, so long as they are reliably identified as name components. Fragmentary forms are also included. However, I have not included abbreviations or fragmentary forms where it is not clear that these are names, or where they could be geographical rather than personal names.[6]

The aim of this paper has been, overall, to find a way of comparing like with like as fairly as possible. Therefore, the emphasis is on totals of name components rather than full personal names, on the basis that, either because of damage or because of a decision made at the original engraving (whether by the engraver, composer or the bearer of the name), personal names in this corpus can have between one and four components. This is particularly true for very damaged or complicated inscriptions, especially curse tablets, where it is not always clear which name components we should group together to make one 'personal name'. With a corpus such as this, containing many fragmentary

---

[3] Rix 2002; Crawford 2011.

[4] See for example the discussion below on La Regina 2002.

[5] Falileyev, Gohil & Ward 2010: 86.

[6] I have excluded instances of ϝε in certain ambiguous circumstances, listed by Crawford, since this may refer to a public body (vereiia-) or a divine name (Venus) rather than to a person: see Crawford 2011: 26. I have also excluded *ST* Lu 48–56 from this discussion because of the considerable doubt over their original provenance. Crawford suggests that they may come from the Social War administration at Corfinium rather than from Bantia, which is plausible but unverified: see Crawford 2010: 278. Also excluded is material labelled 'Pre-Samnite' by Rix.

inscriptions, there is inevitably room for error; all the same, the approach taken here should not lead to any significant misrepresentations of the evidence as we have it now.

II. The nature of the evidence

Before considering personal names in detail, it is important to consider the kinds of documents in the corpus. This includes not just the genres of document which we find in the South Oscan area, but also the relative numbers of texts from different find-spots. As will become clear very quickly, the evidence (and the onomastic evidence in particular) is strongly skewed towards certain types of documents and certain find-spots; this makes it very difficult to produce an overall picture of the onomastic practices of the area.

We have a total of 152 inscriptions from the South Oscan area, counting each coin issue and each tile stamp as one inscription. This total includes the minority of Oscan texts from Lucania and Bruttium which are written in the Latin or Central Oscan alphabets, although the majority are in the South Oscan alphabet. The location which has given us by far the most inscriptions is Rossano, with 40 inscriptions. Several other locations, such as Messina and Vibo Valentia, have yielded a number of inscriptions, but many sites have only given us one or two, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: *Total number of South Oscan inscriptions (numbers from ST and Crawford) and number of name components by site.*[7]

Site	Number of inscriptions	Inscription numbers	Name components, number	Name components, percentage of total
All	152	N/A	239	100.00 %
Ager Teuranus	3	Lu 43, TEURANUS AGER 3, 4	4	1.67 %
Anxia	2	Lu 39 ANXIA 2	0	0.00 %
Atina Lucana	1	Lu 2	4	1.67 %
Bantia	3	*Lu 1, 38* BANTIA *3*	0	0.00 %
Baragiano	1	NUMISTRO 2	1	0.42 %
Bruttium	7	BREIG 1a, 1b BRETTII 1 HYPORUM 1a, 1b NUCERIA 1 TAESIA 1	0	0.00 %
Castiglione di Paludi	2	Lu 47 THURII COPIA 2	11	4.60 %
Consilinum	2	Lu 3, 40	4	1.67 %
Cosenza	1	CONSENTIA 1	0	0.00 %

---

[7] All inscriptions are in the adapted Ionic Greek alphabet, except those with numbers given in italics, which are in the Latin alphabet. POTENTIA 43 and tLu 15 are the only inscriptions in this collection written in the 'native' Oscan alphabet.

Site	Number of inscriptions	Inscription numbers	Name components, number	Name components, percentage of total
Crimisa	3	Lu 23, 24, 44	12	5.02 %
Grumento	1	GRUMENTUM 1	0	0.00 %
Heraclea	1	HERACLEA 1	1	0.42 %
Laos	10	Lu 46, 63 LAOS 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f, 1g, 4	66	27.62 %
Lucania (incertus locus)	16	Lu 18, 19, 26, 37 nLu 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 LUCANI 1 ORLANOI 1 ORSANTINOI 1a, 1b, 1c PITANATAI 1 SAUNITAI 1	9	3.77 %
Lucania or Brettii or Sicilia	2	LUCANIA / BRETTII / SICILIA 2, 4	2	0.84 %
Messina	9	Me 1[8], Me 2, 4, 5, MESSANA 2, 3, 8 nMe 1a, nMe 1b	18	7.53 %
Monasterace Marina	4	CAULONIA 2, 3, 4, 5	0	0.00 %
Montegiordano	1	Lu 61	1	0.42 %
Montescaglioso	1	tLu 12	0	0.00 %
Muro Lucano	1	Lu 4	2	0.84 %
Nocera Terinese	7	NUCERIA 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f, 2	1	0.42 %
Paestum	4	Lu 14, 42 PAESTUM 2, 4	3	1.26 %
Pisicci	1	METAPONTUM 2	0	0.00 %
Rhegium	1	tLu 14	0	0.00 %
Roccagloriosa	3	Lu 45, Lu 62 BUXENTUM 2	13	5.44 %
Rossano di Vaglio	40	Lu 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 57, 58, 59, 60, 64, tLu 10[9] POTENTIA 7, 18, 29, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 43	32	13.39 %
Serra di Vaglio	1	POTENTIA 39	1	0.42 %
Serra Lustrante	1	LUCANIA 2	1	0.42 %
Strongoli	6	PETELIA 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2	36	15.06 %
Taurianum	2	tLu 13 TAURIANI 2	1	0.42 %
Tegianum	1	Lu 41	1	0.42 %
Tempsa	1	tLu 11	0	0.00 %

---

[8] Note that there are two copies of this inscription in Messina. Possibly they were on different sides of the same building (thank you to Michael Crawford for this observation). Note also that the apparent third copy in Rix's edition (Me 3) does not exist, and is based on an erroneous early modern copy; therefore Me 3 is excluded from this discussion. See CRAWFORD 2006 for more detail.

[9] tLu 10 is found at two locations.

Site	Number of inscriptions	Inscription numbers	Name components, number	Name components, percentage of total
Tricarico	3	Lu 13, tLu 1, tLu 10	6	2.51 %
Velia	1	tLu 15	1	0.42 %
Vibo Valentia	10	Lu 25, tLu 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 VIBO 9	8	3.35 %

However, the pattern of attestations of personal names does not follow the same pattern. We have 221 male and 18 female name components in this corpus, making 239 in total. Rossano unsurprisingly gives us a high number of name components – 32 in total. But the site that gives us the most names is in fact Laos: in just ten inscriptions (seven of which are coin issues), it provides 66 name components, over a quarter of the total. Other important sites for names are: Strongoli, with six inscriptions and 36 name components; Crimisa, with three inscriptions but 12 name components; Roccagloriosa, with three inscriptions and 13 name components; and Messina, with nine inscriptions and 18 name components. While, in part, this must be put down to accidents of survival, we should also be aware that our corpus of names is heavily skewed, not just towards certain sites, but also towards certain types of documents.

Table 2: *South Oscan inscriptions and name components by type of documents (as classified by Rix).*

Inscription Type	Number of inscriptions	Number of name components	Name components, percentage of total
Curses	8	120	50.21 %
Dedications	40	45	18.83 %
Official/Legal	13	22	9.21 %
Coins	41	20	8.37 %
Tile stamps	31[10]	15	6.28 %
Other/unknown	14	9	3.77 %
Funerary	4	7	2.93 %
Loomweights	1	1	0.42 %

So, as stated above, we have 221 male and 18 female name components (239 in total). 120 of these, around 50 %, come from curse tablets – despite the fact that only eight of our 152 inscriptions are curse tablets. 45 name components come from dedications, 22 from other official inscriptions, only seven from gravestones, 15 from tiles stamps and 20 from coins.

There is a connection between the sites which are over-represented in our corpus of name components and the kinds of documents produced at each site. In particular, names are found most commonly in curse tablets – so that sites such as Laos, which only give us curse tablets, also furnish us with the greatest number of name components. Dedications

---

[10] As stated above, tLu 10 has two find spots but is counted here as one tile issue.

also tend to include names, so it is no surprise that the federal sanctuary site at Rossano di Vaglio is well-represented, even considering the large number of inscriptions found there. The skew of the evidence is therefore partly down to mere accidents of survival (and damage to inscriptions which do survive), but it is also linked to the 'epigraphic habit' of each of the sites.

The effect of this on our view of South Oscan onomastics should not be underestimated. The large number of names from curse tablets, in particular, causes problems. It may be tempting to see curse tablets as closer to everyday speech than formulaic official inscriptions, but it has long been recognised that curse tablets have their own problems. Firstly, they are not necessarily less prone to being formulaic than official, religious or funerary inscriptions – their formulae may be less familiar, but curse tablets were highly driven by tradition and convention, and in many cases (particularly in the Roman imperial period) may have been written by professionals.[11] The other, even greater, hurdle is that curse tablets often deliberately obfuscate, perhaps to increase the magical potency of the text. As we will see, this causes a number of problems of interpretation, including which name components should be put together to make one 'personal name' and, significantly, how we should understand apparent phonological and morphological irregularities in the text.

At this stage, it is also worth noting the problematic dating of many of these texts. In Rix's volume *Sabellische Texte*, the dates of the material are spread from the mid-fourth century to the end of the second century BC. However, all the second century material is from Rossano, and there are considerable problems with dating at this site.[12] In many other cases, the date is even more uncertain – 57 of the 177 name components in Rix come from inscriptions for which he gives no date – and so dating tends to be done (problematically) according to letter forms alone in many instances. Combined with the small number of texts, this makes it very difficult indeed to find any diachronic patterns in the material.

III. Oscan and Greek names – typical patterns

Oscan names from the central area are typically based on this model:

$$PR + GE + (PA) + (CO)$$

That is, a praenomen (given name), a gentilicium (heritable family name), and a patronymic (in the form of the father's praenomen in the genitive).[13] There are many less formal inscriptions without the patronymic, or with only one name component – either the praenomen or the gentilicium. Which components appear in a man's name is decided by a range of factors, including the genre of the inscription (public/private/commercial/ etc.), personal choice by the individual, and the state of completeness of the surviving inscription.

There is no abbreviation of the word 'son' or similar after the patronym, as there is in Latin (which uses the abbreviation <F> for *filius*), and as a result we usually do

---

[11] GAGER 1999: 5. The first evidence of professional writers of curse tablets appears in Attica around 400 BC (FARAONE 1991: 4), so we cannot exclude that possibility here.

[12] CRAWFORD 2011: 52–53.

[13] LA REGINA 2002: 57; CLACKSON and HORROCKS 2007: 42–44.

not know for certain whether the patronymic refers to the man's father or his former owner.[14] The cognomen is rare, but appears occasionally, particularly in texts from the north written in Latin characters. The less frequent use of cognomina in Oscan is partly because of the early nature of our corpus, with many texts coming from the fourth and third centuries BC, when cognomina were also much less common in Latin, even among the aristocracy.[15]

Women's names are rare in the Oscan corpus as a whole, though they are more common in the northern Paelignian area where the Latin alphabet was commonly used.[16] This discrepancy can be put down to the existence of many more funerary inscriptions among the Paeligni; funerary epitaphs are rare in the rest of the Oscan corpus, so women are severely under-represented on the whole. In any case, from what we can see, women's names tend to have a gentilicium in the feminine, optionally followed by a father's name in the genitive. Some women also have a praenomen, but these are in the minority.

There are some individual names in the corpus which do not fit this general pattern. For example, famously, **phílí[ps]** and **spartaks** appear in Po 53, above a painting of gladiators (apparently labelling the figures in the painting). There are various other individual names scattered around the corpus, and as these often have a recognisable Greek (or other non-Italian) origin, they are usually assumed to be the names of slaves or other Greek immigrants.

The Greek system is somewhat different, and can be formulated as:

$$IND + (PA) + (DE/ET)$$

Typically, Greek-speakers (both men and women) have one individual name followed by a father's name in the genitive, and optionally a demotic or ethnic origin if further specification was needed. This is more typical of the naming systems of Indo-European languages as a whole.[17] Again, the number of components is dependent on the genre of the inscription, the individual's decision at the time of writing, and the state of the preservation of the inscription. An individual's given name can be inherited, often from the father's father, but need not be. These names are often formed as compounds of two or more elements, unlike names in the Italian system, which are generally not compounds (or at least, any origin in a compound is no longer visible).

Therefore, based on these typical models, this paper will examine four possible types of evidence of Greek influence on onomastics in South Oscan:

(1) The appearance of typical Greek compound-names, or names with some elements derived from Greek words or names. If there was strong Greek influence, or even routine intermarriage, we might expect to find fully Hellenized names being used occasionally in the written documents produced in South Oscan.

(2) The order in which the names are written. Since Greek names go INDividual name + PAtronym, it has been pointed out (see below for references) that strong Greek influence could lead to a change in order of Oscan names – so PRaenomen + PAtronym + GEntilicium.

---

[14] Lejeune 1976: 5.
[15] Salway 1994: 127.
[16] Lejeune 1976: 5.
[17] Salway 1994: 125.

(3) Phonological and morphological borrowing from Greek names into Oscan names. Even if name components or name elements which are wholly Greek do not appear, we might find Oscan names taking on other aspects of Greek pronunciation or spelling.

(4) A reduction in the number of appearances of names of two or more components. Since the Greek practice was for each person to have one basic name component, rather than two or more, it would follow that if there was strong Greek influence in the language or writing of the area, then it might become more common to refer to an individual using one name only.

IV Evidence of Greek influence on South Oscan onomastics

(1) Fully Hellenized names, or Greek name components

Fully Greek names are found integrated with Oscan names within the tradition of one family, notably in Naples, where there was a substantial Oscan-speaking minority in the predominantly Greek-speaking city from the late fifth century BC onwards.[18] However, the texts from Naples are all in Greek, not in Oscan, so they cannot provide an exact parallel to the situation in the Oscan-speaking cities of Lucania and Bruttium.[19] One selection from the Greek inscriptions of Naples (from the north-west wall of the Tomb of Santa Maria La Nova, end of fourth/beginning of third century, now lost) will demonstrate how this phenomenon can operate.[20]

[–]	?
[τρ]εβιο[σ]	Trebius,
[ζ]ωιλου	son of Zoilos
ΕΠΕΙ[–]	?
ζωιλοσ	Zoilos
τρεβ[ι]οσ τρεβιου	Trebius, son of Trebius
Ν[–] Ω[–]	?
αρ[ισ]τοβουλο[σ]	Aristoboulos
[–]	?
[–]	?
τρεβιοσ	Trebius

Here we have several examples of the name Trebius, which is an Oscan name, common across Campania, being used in a Greek text; the first personal name of the inscription appears to have one Oscan and one Greek component to it, indicating a high level of acculturation, and even intermarriage between Oscan- and Greek-speakers. The population of Naples also has a tendency to use names which, while Greek-derived, are not typical of the onomastics of the Greek mainland. Names such as *Epilutos, Khreumenon, Dika,*

---

[18] LOMAS 1998: 410.

[19] For more examples of names of Oscan origin used in Greek-language texts, see CRAWFORD 2011: 1525–1534.

[20] MIRANDA 1990: 89–90; LEIWO 1994: 60.

---is, and others, are attested only (or almost only) in Naples. This is another indication ---at Naples was a culturally mixed area with its own peculiar system of onomastics.[21]

---e do not find evidence of anything like this level of onomastic mixing in the South ---can corpus.[22] Of course, we also do not have any multi-generational tomb inscriptions ---the type found in Naples, so we would not necessarily expect to find the same amount --- evidence. However, it is possible to compare the amount of Greek names in the South ---can corpus to the Oscan corpus as a whole, and see whether there is a higher level of ---eek names being used. If South Oscan inscriptions show a considerably higher number --- Greek-derived names than were used in Oscan inscriptions from further north, then ---e would be able to conclude that there might be a higher level of contact-induced ---ange to the onomastics system in the south.

--- the Oscan corpus as a whole there is a scattering of Greek and Greek-influenced ---mes. I have already mentioned the painting of a gladiator at Pompeii labelled with a ---pinto **philíps** – probably showing the use of a Greek name for a slave. Sometimes, Greek ---mponents occur in more formal contexts, including mixed with Oscan components, so ---at we have a grave cippus from Cumae which reads **karis brit** (Cm 21), explained plau---bly by Lomas as an Oscanised form of the Greek name Chares (or Charis) with a geni---ve of the father's Oscan name – although alternative explanations are possible.[23] There ---re even several examples of names written entirely in Greek letters in the Central ---scan area – this happens in Cm 16, Cm 31, Cm 37, Po 90 (where a name is written --- both the Oscan and Greek alphabets), CAPUA 44, CUMAE 22, 23, and TEANUM ---DICINUM 25. Therefore, the use of Greek names, and even the Greek alphabet, happens ---roughout the Oscan-speaking area. However, in a corpus of around 630 personal names --- Central and Northern Oscan, there are only seven with clearly identifiable Greek ---mponents. Six of these are individual Greek names, standing alone with no Oscan ---mponent, and therefore showing only that there were some Greek immigrants into ---e area. There are two examples which, depending on interpretation, may show the ---nd of mix of onomastic components we see in Naples –**karis brit** (discussed above) ---nd ma **lev dra** (TEANUM APULUM 3), which could possible show an abbreviation of ---gnomen derived from a Greek name δρακων, though this is speculative.[24] Therefore, in ---entral and Northern Oscan, there is little evidence that there was pressure on the Oscan ---nomastic system from the Greek system – only that there were individuals (probably ---aves or other immigrants) with Greek names in this area.

--- the South Oscan corpus, there is only one recognisably Greek individual name, ---asos in Lu 42. In fact, the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* lists this as a Greek inscrip---on and a Greek name (Πλάσος)[25] – a reasonable interpretation, since Paestum is full --- Greek material, and this is the only word in the inscription. Even given the small ---ze of the South Oscan corpus, one Greek name (or perhaps none) seems a very low

---

--- LERWO 1994: 17.

--- Note, however, the use of both Greek and Oscan name components in one instance on the coinage
--- Laos (RUTTER 2001: 178). It is not clear what, if any, relationship there is between these two
--- components; but they appear on opposite sides of the coin, and were probably not conceived of as
--- belonging to the same personal name.

--- LOMAS 1995: 484.

--- CRAWFORD 2011: 1297.

--- FRASER and MATTHEWS 1997: 363.

number – but I think there may be a reason for this. Where an inscription contains only a Greek name written in the Greek alphabet, we are not in a position to say that that text is South Oscan rather than Greek – it may be that many single-name inscriptions from South Italy were written by Oscan speakers with Greek names, and have been interpreted by epigraphists as Greek-langauge inscriptions. Unfortunately, it is impossible to know where this might be the case.

As for names of mixed Greek/Oscan origin, again there is not a great deal of evidence. There is one name in the curse tablet Lu 46 – ϝιβιν βοθρονι(ον), which looks like a possible candidate. It could be derived from Greek βόθρος 'ditch'; or it could even be a compound name, with a first element *bou-*. Unfortunately, there is no similar Greek name, and it may just be the letter theta which has been borrowed (see below for a discussion of graphic and phonemic/phonetic borrowing). So despite its tantalisingly Greek appearance, it is difficult to come to any clear conclusion about '*bothronion*'.[26]

There are several instances where Oscan-style gentilicia seem to have been derived from Greek names. The second element name [γ]αϝισ φοινι[κισ] μαχιεσ (Lu 45 - a curse tablet from Roccagloriosa), if it is not a borrowed word for the ethnic 'Phoenician', can be explained as an Oscan gentilicium derived from a Greek personal name Phoinix, which is attested in the western Greek world from the fifth century onwards.[27] The gentilicium συριεσ, which appears twice in the curse tablet Lu 63 from Laos, has also been explained as a derivation from a Greek ethnic/personal name, Suros, 'Syrian', used in Greek as a personal name for both slaves and free men.[28] Both of these examples attest to Greek influence on personal names, but with a considerable degree of integration into the Oscan naming system already by 300 BC. In the case of συριεσ, in particular, it is unclear how recognisably 'Greek' this name would have been. The name φοινι[κισ], with its use of phi, may have been more recognisably Greek; it is also relevant that both of these names, as well as βοθρονι(ον), appear in curse tablets, which show more influence from Greek than other kinds of texts (see below).

It is worth mentioning briefly the possiblity that there are names that cross over the langauge barrier to become popular in both languages. There are one or two names that are common in both the Greek of Southern Italy and South Oscan – such as Gr. Νύμφιος, Νύμψιος, Osc. *Nium(p)sis*. It is not clear whether this name is originally Greek or Italic: it is probably Italic and related to Latin *Numerius*, though it is widespread in the Greek funerary inscriptons of Naples.[29] All the same, I would suggest that its origin might not always have been clear to those using it, given its frequency in both Oscan and Greek in southern Italy.[30] It is also possible that the Oscan name μαμερκοσ / μαρμακοσ is an Italic reinterpretation of a Greek name such as μνημαρκος, which was used in the area – however, it is equally likely that it is an Italic name which became popular in Greek

---

[26] Crawford (2011: 1344–46) reads this as βοφονι(ν) with a phi, without comment on the previous readings, and relates it to the Latin *Bufonius*. However, the letter in question (a circle with a dot in the centre) looks more like a theta than a phi; in addition, there are no clear examples of Greek <φ> being used for /f/ rather than /p$^{(h)}$/.

[27] Crawford 2011: 1335. Also note new reading in Crawford, with φ- rather than π-.

[28] Poccetti 2000: 756.

[29] Leiwo 1994: 164.

[30] Ibid.: 76.

because of its similarity to Greek names containing the element -*archos*.[31]

To conclude, other than one or two names which may have crossed over the linguistic boundary to become common in both Greek and Oscan, and (mainly in curse tablets) some Greek names that were fully taken into the Oscan onomastic system, it is not clear that many Oscan-speaking families were choosing to use Greek names other than in the highly Hellenized city of Naples.

(2) The order of the name components making up a personal name

In 1970, Lejeune proposed the positioning of the patronymic between the praenomen and the gentilicium – rather than after the gentilicium, as is more usual in Oscan inscriptions – as a feature of some South Oscan.[32] This idea has been picked up by multiple works over the years, and is usually cited as something which South Oscan has in common with Umbrian, perhaps preserving an older state of affairs.[33] However, an alternative point of view, first introduced by Lazzeroni, is that this could be a result of contact with Greek, rather than a preservation of the Umbrian pattern.[34] It is possible that the Italic praeno-men + gentilicium + patronym was reinterpreted as an individual name, plus an ethnic and a patronym. Since in Greek the natural order would be for the patronym to precede the ethnic or demotic, this could have affected the order in South Oscan.[35] This would not be out of the question, since the syntax of filiations has been shown to be susceptible to interference and influence in bilingual communities and families.[36] However, in his art-icle of 2002, La Regina very effectively showed that most, if not all, of the instances where the PR + PA + GE order occurs in South Oscan are actually mistakes in previous editions, or misreadings of the stones, and therefore this is now something of a non-issue.[37] I will give just a few examples here to show what has been done, as more information can be found in La Regina's excellent article, which is well supported with photographs.

The error in the interpretation of Lu 40 (below) has occurred because of editions after Vetter not indicating that the stone is broken on both sides.[38] Now that it is apparent that there are characters missing, such that there could be an abbreviated praenomen before *αλαπονισ*, it is no longer necessary to see an unusual order in the names here.

Lu 40 – Rix (2002) reading	**La Regina (2002) reading**
αλαπονισ. πακϝηισ	[...σκ]αλαπονισ. πακϝηισ[...]
οπιεσ. πιω-αισ. εκο	[...]οπιεσ. πιω-αισ. εκο[...]
σαλαϝσ. ϝαλε	[vac.] σαλαϝσ. ϝαλε [vac.]

In the case of Lu 41, there has been a simple misreading of the second letter of the gentilicium, which should be kappa. The additional advantage to this reading

---

[31] Poccetti 1988: 133.
[32] Lejeune 1970: 287.
[33] Lazzeroni 1974: 284; Lejeune 1976: 45; Rix 1979: 113; Poccetti 1979: 112; Poccetti 1988: 127.
[34] Lazzeroni 1974: 290.
[35] Poccetti 1988: 138.
[36] Adams 2003: 307, 380.
[37] La Regina 2002.
[38] Vetter 1953; La Regina 2002: 60.

is that it has clearer comparanda in other Italic languages, being found in Latin as *Scalaponius*.[39] Interestingly, the name *Plator*, usually understood to be Messapic, nevertheless betrays a more complex background to this name than many others found in the South Oscan texts.[40]

Lu 41 – Rix (2002) reading   La Regina (2002) reading
πλατορ. σι. αλαπονιεσ   πλατορ. σκαλαπονιεσ

The one inscription that still has a possibility of showing Oscan names following a Greek pattern is Me 5, from Messina. On this inscription, we have the remains of a word ending in -s, then a genitive of a praenomen, which is presumably the patronymic. Some scholars, including Crawford, have read an alpha before the -s, which would mean this would have to be a nominative of a praenomen, perhaps *maras*.[41] It is possible, therefore, that this is the only example of Oscan speakers using a Greek naming pattern of individual name + father's name in the genitive. The use of the genitive here for the name of the god is also reflective of Greek, rather than Oscan, practice: Oscan more usually uses the dative, so this may also indicate a particularly Hellenized text.[42] Since there is other evidence of strong Hellenization in Sicily (in the form of the Entella tablets, of the mid-third century BC, where Oscan-style names and mixed Oscan/Greek names are found in Greek-language inscriptions)[43] I would suggest that Oscan-speakers in Messina, like those in Naples, might have been under rather stronger Greek influence than speakers elsewhere in southern Italy.

Nevertheless, even with this one example from Messina, which is not completely conclusive, the phenomenon of Greek influencing the order of names in South Oscan was very limited, if it occurred at all – and there is no evidence of this kind of influence occuring outside Sicily. In fact, the examples from bilingual communities across the ancient world given by Adams suggest that syntactic borrowing in the name formula from the writer's L2 into their L1 is exceptional. While filiations are likely to show cross-language interference, it is much more likely to be a retention of the form of the filiation in the writer's L1 (or the L1 of the person referred to).[44] Thus, we expect the syntax of the filiation (and the order of the name components) always to reflect either the language of the inscription or the language of the writer (or that of the bearer of the name). The fact that Me 5 does not meet these conditions adds to the picture of these group of mercenaries being under exceptional pressure from Greek, even at the time when they were still writing in Oscan – a pressure not shared by the rest of the South Oscan-speaking community.

---

[39] *CIL* I² 1683 = *CIL* X 497 (Paestum); *CIL* VI 5143 (Rome); *AÉ* 1976, 675 (Colonia Archelais, Cappadocia ibid.: 59.

[40] However, this name does turn up elsewhere in Campania; what we should conclude about the family or origin of the individual named here is therefore not clear. See index of names in CRAWFORD 2011.

[41] CRAWFORD 2006: 524; however, CRAWFORD 2011: 1522 does not read an alpha preceding the sigma but still reads this as praenomen + filiation.

[42] CLACKSON *forthcoming*.

[43] Ibid.

[44] ADAMS 2003: 379. He suggests that, since the filiation belongs to a formal register and is necessarily of a fixed form, it is prone to fossilization and the retention of its form in the bearer's L1, even when the inscription is in another language.

(3) Graphic, morphological and phonological borrowing

There are, however, examples of borrowing from Greek into South Oscan onomastics below the word level – although these kinds of borrowings appear to be limited to curse tablets, we have evidence of borrowings of graphemes, and potentially morphemes and phonemes too. These types of borrowing are, unfortunately, quite difficult to tell apart.

There are a few instances of graphemic borrowing involving the use of Greek characters which are not normally employed in Oscan. The two clearest examples of this are in the curse tablet Lu 45, where xi, chi and phi are used. In the case of xi, the borrowing must be graphic rather than phonological, because the cluster /ks/ is possible in Oscan, it is just usually spelled out as <ks>.[45] In the case of the chi and phi, it is not clear whether it is just the letter or whether it is the phoneme, the aspirated consonant, that is being borrowed. On balance, it is probably preferable to see chi as a graphic borrowing based on the influence of having seen Greek names with μαχ- elements, but it is possible that the phoneme was borrowed too.[46] The phi of φοινι[κισ] may have been used because this was a recognisably borrowed Greek word, and so the spelling (and/or the aspirated pronunciation) was maintained. But the use of phi here also contributes to the overall 'Greek' look of the text, and this may have been the writer's main intention.

The majority of our examples of (possible) morphological borrowing come from just one text, which I have reproduced in full here (according to Crawford's formatting, though with the proviso that it is very difficult to know which name components are to be taken together). This text, which is a lead curse tablet from Laos, is the South Oscan text which single-handedly gives us the most name components of any text. It is also much more influenced by Greek than any other South Oscan text, although it is not clear if this reflects the language of the writer or is due to other non-linguistic motivations.

Lu 46 (LAOS 2) – lead curse tablet from Laos

Side A:	μαραεν [vac] γαϝιν
	οϝι(ν) σαβιδι(ον) νοψιν
	νοψιν [vac] μεδεκον
	ϝαρ(ιν) ϝαριε(ι)σ οψιον
	σπεδι(ν) [vac] νοψιν
	ϝιβιν [vac] σαβιδιον
	μαραειν [vac] μεδεκον
	λοικιν ϝιβιν σπελιν
RH margin:	στατιν οψιον
	μεδεκον
	ϝιβιν βοθρονι(ον)
Side B:	νοψ(ι)α(ν) ϝαριαν
	ϝιβιαν σπελ(ι)αν
	μεδεκαν αραδιαν

---

[45] Xi is also used in the name αραξ in PETELIA 2 - but since this inscription contains both Greek- and Oscan-language sections, it is not clear whether this name was intended as Greek or Oscan.

[46] Crawford (2011: 1610) also lists [μ]αχερηι, but this form is not included in this discussion, since there is some uncertainty about whether it is a name or another kind of word (Greek or Oscan).

Apart from βοθρονι(ον) (discussed above), these names are all Oscan in origin. However, where the accusative ending is written, it is always written with a nu, rather than a mu. There are other strange spellings, such as μαραεν and μαραειν for the accusative singular of the name *marahis*; and also the use of psi which, while not unknown in South Oscan, is not always used – it is not clear if these features are also related to some kind of borrowing or not.

The real question, though, is whether the apparent borrowing in the text is morphological, phonological or graphic. If it is a morphological borrowing of the accusative singular from Greek, then we can really speak of this as being a mixed-language text. If it is phonological, and reflects the writer's speech, then we might be able to say that his or her variety of Oscan was influenced by the Greek phonological rule of not having an /–m/ word-finally. Or, alternatively, this could be a purely graphic borrowing, either by someone who was more used to writing Greek, and so used the final <-N> from written Greek, or by someone who wished to increase the Greek appearance of the tablet. There is a similar situation in LAOS 4, another curse tablet from the same area, which uses the Greek morphology (nominative in -ιος rather than -ιες) for all the names listed.

In light of the fact that the texts are curse tablets, it actually seems quite likely that the goal of the word-final <-N> in Lu 45, and the nominative <-IOS> in LAOS 4, was obfuscation or increasing the magic, rather than this being an accurate reflection of the individual's speech. Since curse tablets originated in Greek-speaking communities on the Greek mainland and Sicily,[47] it is possible that Greek, or at least artificial 'Grecism', was felt to be the language appropriate to magic and curses, and thus was used where possible. It is also suggestive that both of these texts come from Laos, where there was probably still a sizeable Greek population after the Lucanian take-over.

Possible morphological borrowings in other kinds of texts include the Greek genitives of Oscan names found in the coin legends of NUCERIA BRETTIA 1 (στατιου) and ORLANOI 1 (τρεβιου ραιου). In both cases, these issues were modelled on those of Greek communities (Rhegium and Metapontum, respectively);[48] the texts may have therefore been conceived of as Greek, or produced by Greek-speakers. The other instance of Greek morphology is in POTENTIA 39, which reads: επι της νυμμελου αρχης. Despite the Oscan name, and the non-Greek appearance of this dating formula, the morphology, syntax and other lexical items are Greek; it may be better to see this text as a Greek-language text with an Oscan name, rather than a morphological borrowing into Oscan.

It seems, therefore, that morphological borrowing from Greek into Oscan (or at least into Oscan writing) occurs in very specific circumstances: coins, which we know to be heavily indebted to Greek models, and curse tablets, whose writers may also have privileged Greek as the language appropriate to the genre. Graphic/phonemic borrowing also seems to be a feature of curse tablets rather than other kinds of texts.

(4) The incidence rate of single-component names

The last kind of evidence I will consider is the relative incidence of single-component and multiple-component personal names. We know from sources external to this corpus

---

[47] GAGER 1999: 5.
[48] RUTTER 2001: nos. 2437–48; 2674.

that it was occasionally a habit of Greek-speakers to treat a Roman's praenomen as an individual name, and therefore refer to him by just one name rather than two or three. This seems to have occurred until around the first century BC, when the Aphrodisians were still referring to the proconsul as 'Quintus'.[49] A suggestion that this might have been common in South Oscan comes from Livy (27. 153), who records the names of two brothers fighting in the Hannibalic War of the third century BC simply as 'Vibius and Paccius', i.e. by their Oscan praenomina alone. It is not clear whether this is how they would be spoken about in their own community, but it raises this as an interesting possibility, first suggested by Poccetti in 1988.[50]

Obviously, there is a need to be extremely cautious with this kind of evidence – often inscriptions contain only one or two components because of damage rather than because that was the name as originally written. I have attempted to take this into account in the tables given below.

Personal names by number of name components:

Table 3: *Central and North Oscan.*[51]

All personal names: Central and North Oscan	
All	637
4 elements	17
of which:	
4 elements, damaged	0
4 elements, female	0
3 elements	200
of which:	
3 elements, damaged	7
3 elements, female	13
2 elements	258
of which:	
2 elements, damaged	62
2 elements, female	10
1 element	162
of which:	
1 element, damaged	64
1 element, female	10
1 element, gen pl	14

Table 4: *South Oscan.*

All personal names: South Oscan	
All	133
4 elements	1
3 elements	20
of which:	
3 elements, damaged	2
3 elements, female	0
2 elements	60
of which:	
2 elements, damaged	4
2 elements, uncertain	8
2 elements, female	10
1 element	52
of which:	
1 element, damaged	13
1 element, uncertain	10
1 element, female	0

SALWAY 1994: 126.

POCCETTI 1988: 128.

These totals are based on the following sections of *Sabellische Texte* (RIX 2002), plus new data for the corresponding areas in *Imagines*: Pg, MV, Fr, Sa, Hi, He, Si, Cp, Po, Cm, ZO.

Where only one name component is used, there are usually predictable reasons for this. Use of the gentilicium only tends to occur in a commercial context, and is frequent on potters' stamps.[52] Use of the praenomen only is rarer, although it does occur on a few dedications and gravestones, and (crucially) on curse tablets, where it is often very difficult to figure out which name components go together to make up one personal name.

There does seem to be a slightly higher proportion of non-damaged single-component personal names in South Oscan as compared to the rest of Oscan – around 21 % in South Oscan, if we only include the names which are definitely one-component, as opposed to around 15 % in the rest of Oscan. In fact, once you exclude the genitive plurals we find in Central Oscan gravestones, which are stand-alone names for an obvious reason that they represent the phrase 'of the X family', then the Central Oscan proportion is more like 13 %. However, I suspect that the main reason for this discrepancy is because of the large numbers of names South Oscan gets from curse tablets and other less formal texts. Central Oscan has a greater number of official texts, where magistrates and other important individuals have more invested in their name appearing in full.

V Conclusions

Having examined various possible aspects of Greek influence on South Oscan personal names, I would say we have come up with little solid evidence for extensive Greek influence. Considering how Hellenized the material culture of this area was, as well as the comparative evidence from Naples, evidence of Hellenization in South Oscan onomastics is surprisingly sparse. Whether or not our evidence has been skewed by the kinds of texts that survive, and the areas they survive from, must of course remain an open question.

However, I think the overall vitality of the Oscan-style naming system, for both men and women, and apparently all the social groups represented in the texts, in the South Oscan area should force us to consider the kinds of interactions happening between different populations at this time. It seems fairly clear, and only to be expected, that the Oscan-speakers of Lucania and Bruttium were not as Hellenized as the Oscan-speakers of Naples, at least in terms of language. I think it is also clear from this corpus that South Oscan speakers retained a considerable degree of their Oscan identity throughout the fourth and third centuries BC. In several cases, names of Greek origin have been fully absorbed into the Oscan naming system, with derived Oscan-style gentilicia. Where there is considerable influence from Greek, this seems to be limited to certain kinds of texts, such as curse tablets and coins. We might contrast this general picture of South Oscan onomastics with the Oscan-speaking mercenaries in Messina, who seem to have experienced a different level of external pressure from Greek, causing an exceptional change to the syntax of their inscriptions, and who (based on the limited amount of evidence we have) seem to have shifted to Greek reasonably quickly after their arival in Sicily. Messina and Naples seem to have been the exception rather than the rule, however, and the majority of the Oscan-speaking area, even where the Greek alphabet was used, seems to have retained its traditional Italic naming system with little overall influence from Greek.

---

[52] Lejeune 1970: 285.

Bibliography

ADAMS 2003:
  ADAMS, James Noel: *Bilingualism in the Latin language*, (Cambridge: 2003).
CATLING & MARCHAND 2010:
  CATLING, Richard & MARCHAND, Fabienne (eds): *Onomatologos. Studies in Greek personal names presented to Elaine Matthews*, (Oxford: 2010).
CLACKSON *forthcoming*:
  CLACKSON, James: 'Oscan in Sicily', in: TRIBULATO *forthcoming*.
CLACKSON & HORROCKS 2007:
  CLACKSON, James & HORROCKS, Geoffrey: *The Blackwell history of the Latin language*, (Malden / Oxford / Carlton: 2007).
CRAWFORD 2006:
  CRAWFORD, Michael: 'The Oscan inscriptions of Messana', in: VAGGIOLI 2006: 521–525.
CRAWFORD 2010:
  CRAWFORD, Michael: 'Onomastics and the administration of Italia / Víteliú', in: CATLING & MARCHAND 2010: 276–280.
CRAWFORD 2011:
  CRAWFORD, Michael: *Imagines Italicae*, (London: 2011).
FALILEYEV, GOHIL & WARD 2010:
  FALILEYEV, Alexander, in collaboration with Ashwin E. GOHIL & Naomi WARD: *Dictionary of Continental Celtic place-names*, (Aberystwyth: 2010).
FARAONE 1991:
  FARAONE, Christopher: 'The agonistic context of early Greek binding spells', in: FARAONE & OBBINK 1991: 3–32.
FARAONE & OBBINK 1991:
  FARAONE, Christopher & OBBINK, Dirk (eds): *Magika Hiera. Ancient Greek magic and religion*, (New York: 1991).
FRASER & MATTHEWS 1997:
  FRASER, Peter M. & MATTHEWS, Elaine (eds): *A lexicon of Greek personal names*. Vol. III.A: *The Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily, and Magna Graecia*, (Oxford: 1997).
GAGER 1999:
  GAGER, John: *Curse tablets and binding spells from the ancient world*, (New York: 1999).
LA REGINA 2002:
  LA REGINA, Adriano: 'La formula onomastica osca in Lucania e nel Bruzio', *Eutopia* 2(2), 2002, 57--69.
LAZZERONI 1974:
  LAZZERONI, Romano: 'Contatti di lingue e culture nell'Italia antica: il patronimico nella formula onomastica', *Studi e saggi linguistici* XIV, 1974, 275--306.
LEIWO 1994:
  LEIWO, Martti: *Neapolitana: A study of population and language in Graeco-Roman Naples*, Commentationes humanarum litterarum 102, (Helsinki: 1994).
LEJEUNE 1970:
  LEJEUNE, Michel: 'Phonologie osque et graphie grecque', *Revue des études anciennes* 72, 1970, 271–316.

LEJEUNE 1976:
  LEJEUNE, Michel: *L'anthroponymie osque*, (Paris: 1976).
LOMAS 1995:
  LOMAS, Kathryn: 'Kar[is] Brit[tius]: A reinterpretation of Vetter no. 112', *Classical Quarterly* 2 (NS 45), 1995, 481–484.
LOMAS 1998:
  LOMAS, Kathryn: 'Romanizing Naples', *Classical Review* 48(2), 1998, 409–411.
MIRANDA 1990:
  MIRANDA, Elena: *Iscrizioni greche d'Italia*, (Roma: 1990).
PACI 2000:
  PACI, Gianfranco (ed): *Epigraphai: miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini*, (Roma: 2000).
POCCETTI 1979:
  POCCETTI, Paolo: *Nuovi documenti italici. A complemento del manuale di E. Vetter*, (Pisa: 1979).
POCCETTI 1988:
  POCCETTI, Paolo: *Per un'identità culturale dei Brettii*, (Napoli: 1988).
POCCETTI 2000:
  POCCETTI, Paolo: 'Due tabellae defixionis osco-greche dalla Calabria nel museo archeologico di Napoli', in: PACI 2000: 745–771.
RIX 1979:
  RIX, Helmut: 'Review of Lejeune 1976', *Kratylos* 24, 1979, 107–116.
RIX 2002:
  RIX, Helmut: *Sabellische Texte: Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen*, Indogermanische Bibliothek, erste Reihe: Grammatiken. Handbuch der italischen Dialekte 5, (Heidelberg: 2002).
RUTTER 2001:
  RUTTER, N. Keith: *Historia Numorum – Italy*, (London: 2001).
SALWAY 1994:
  SALWAY, Benet: 'What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from *c.* 700 B.C. to A.D. 700', *Journal of Roman Studies* 84, 1994, 124–145.
TRIBULATO *forthcoming*:
  TRIBULATO, Olga (ed): *The languages of Sicily*, (Cambridge: *forthcoming*).
VAGGIOLI 2006:
  VAGGIOLI, Maria Adelaide *et al.* (eds): *Guerra e pace in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (VIII–III sec. a.C.): arte, prassi e teoria della pace e della guerra. Atti delle Quinte Giornate Internazionali di Studi sull'Area Elima e la Sicilia Occidentale nel Contesto Mediterraneo, Erice, 12–15 ottobre 2003*, Seminari e convegni (Scuola Normale Superiore) 7, (Pisa: 2006).
VETTER 1953:
  VETTER, Emil: *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*, Indogermanische Bibliothek, erste Reihe: Lehr und Handbücher, (Heidelberg: 1953).

km440@cam.ac.uk   Katherine McDonald
                                      Pembroke College, University of Cambridge