

Introduction

ELAINE MATTHEWS AND SIMON HORNBLOWER

Artem inveniendi cum inventis adolescere posse, statuere debemus

Bacon, *Novum Organon* finis

The Lexicon [E.M.]

THE SUGGESTION THAT PETER FRASER'S 80TH BIRTHDAY might be celebrated by a colloquium devoted to exploring the value of Greek personal names came from Simon Hornblower. It was an inspired suggestion, for by shifting the overt focus of the event to a field of study to which he has devoted a large part of his energies during the two last decades through the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, it cleared the way for the honorand not only to agree to be honoured, but even, as the last paper in this volume shows, to contribute.

That the suggestion became reality is due in large part to the encouragement of Peter Brown, the Secretary of the British Academy and a long-serving member of the Lexicon Committee. With his encouragement, application was made to the Meetings Committee of the Academy, which agreed that the meeting should be adopted as a British Academy Colloquium. This duly took place at the Academy on 11 July 1998, in a packed Lecture Room, before a large and apparently indefatigable audience. Thanks are due to all participants, audience as well as speakers, for making the occasion all one could have wished as a tribute to Peter Fraser; to the British Academy, and in particular to Rosemary Lambeth, for the excellent arrangements and hospitality on the day; and to James Rivington, Publications Officer of the Academy, who has steered this volume of papers through to publication.

Like the colloquium from which it arose, this volume has the purpose of honouring Peter Fraser by exploring the value of personal names in the

Proceedings of the British Academy, 104, 1–14. © The British Academy 2000.

study of ancient Greek (as indeed of any) society, through contributions from distinguished scholars in various branches of classical scholarship. It is published as the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* reaches the half-way point in its publication programme, having made available the onomastic material from the Aegean Islands, Magna Graecia, and most of the Greek mainland (in excess of 200,000 individuals, with nearly 30,000 names). Olivier Masson, in his review of *LGPNI*, expressed the belief that it would produce a renewal of interest in Greek names and related studies;¹ we hope that this volume will contribute further to that renewal. To say this is not to ignore the long and distinguished tradition of the scholarship surrounding names, whose practitioners include great figures of classical scholarship; and certainly contributors to the present volume include those who were at work with names long before *LGPNI* was published. But the easy access, through the *Lexicon*, to large amounts of evidence, which for so long was disparate and had to be hunted down in many places, may justify a restatement (for there is nothing new), at the start of this volume, of some of the issues involved not only in compiling but also in using an onomastic dictionary.

Modern awakening to the potential of personal names to provide hitherto and otherwise unavailable insights into ancient Greek society dates from the early years of the nineteenth century, and was closely linked to the discovery and publication of documentary evidence, above all inscriptions. It would not be easy to find the earliest expression of this awareness,² but the case was argued with great elegance and cogency by the French scholar J.-A. Letronne, who will be invoked more than once in the following pages, in a memoir notable for the identification of an ancient cult on the basis of nomenclature alone (see below, 67, 86 n. 16). But this demonstration forms only a small part of a long paper concerned to analyse and illustrate the principles of name-formation, and to show how knowledge of these principles, applied critically to literary and documentary texts alike, can aid the classical scholar. The paper begins with an appeal to historians of language, history and religion to descend from the heights of ‘questions de la critique’ and to pay attention to the details provided by documents: the effect would be like that of taking up a magnifying glass and seeing, for the first time, teeming

¹ *Gnomon* 62 (1990), 103 n. 7.

² The discovery ‘par hasard’ by O. Masson of the call by Gottfried Hermann, in 1813, for personal names to be included in dictionaries, quoted in Brugmann-Thumb, *Griechische Grammatik*⁴ (1913), 723, is perhaps an indication of the complexity of the trail: see *Verbum* 10 (1987), 253 = *OGS*, 593.



J.-A. LETRONNE

life invisible to the naked eye. Pursued this way, classical studies would be inexhaustible.³

Already at this early stage, Letronne identified three specialized areas of activity upon which the exploitation of names depended: the collection and publication of basic source material; the etymological analysis of names; and the collection and publication of names in specialized dictionaries. The authors of such works were praised (but could also receive criticism)⁴ for providing a valuable service ‘en épargnant beaucoup de recherches pénibles’. In the first category, he naturally named A. Boeckh, editor of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, the first volume of which had appeared in 1828, the second in 1843, but he spoke with the authority of one who was himself the author of a regional epigraphical corpus.⁵ In the second category also he placed Boeckh, who had included a study of Boeotian names in *CIG* I, and of names from the Black Sea area in *CIG* II; he also refers to the *Analecta Epigraphica* (Lips. 1842) of K. Keil, a brilliant epigraphist who had helped Boeckh with many suggestions for *CIG* II, and who was to continue to play an important role in the publication of inscriptions and the study of names. In the third category, he named Crusius and the editors of the new French edition of Stephanus’ *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*,⁶ but he was thinking primarily of the work of W. Pape.⁷

³ Reference here is to the paper entitled ‘Observations philologiques et archéologiques sur l’étude des noms propres grecs’, published in the *Annales de l’Institut Archéologique* 17 (1845), 251–346; the version referred to by R. Parker and D. Knoepfler (below, 54 n. 6, 81 n. 3) is that entitled ‘Sur l’utilité qu’on peut retirer de l’étude des noms propres grecs pour l’histoire et l’archéologie’, *Mémoires de l’Institut National de France, Académie des Inscriptions* 19. 1, 1–139, republished in *Oeuvres choisies* III. 2 (Paris, 1885), 1–126.

⁴ E.g. the attack on Pape for admitting ‘noms barbares’ (255), and the more fundamental attack on the competence of Mionnet (257); for Letronne’s severity, see the appreciation of him after his death, by M. Egger, reproduced in *Oeuvres choisies*, 1st ser. 1 (1881), vii–xvii; and the assessment by L. Robert, *L’Épigraphie grecque au Collège de France. Leçon d’ouverture donnée le 25 avril 1939*, 7–15, at 12.

⁵ *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l’Égypte* I (1842); II (1848), unfinished at Letronne’s death.

⁶ G. C. Crusius, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch der mythologischen, geographischen Eigennamen* (Hannover, 1832) (*non vidimus*); the French revision of Stephanus’ *TLG* by B. Hase and W. and L. Dindorf (1831–1866); the inclusion of names was new.

⁷ For a full description of the evolution of ‘Pape-Benseler’, see the study of O. Masson, ‘Pape-Benseleriana VIII. Remarques sur le Wörterbuch de W. Pape et G. E. Benseler (1863–1870)’, *ZPE* 42 (1981), 193 ff. = *OGS*, 363 ff.; M. includes a detailed assessment of the influence of Letronne, K. Keil, S. Koumanoudes and others.

In 1836 W. Pape had published his *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache zur Übersicht des Wortbildung nach den Endsylben*, in which compounds were entered under their root-forms which were themselves in alphabetical order, and each item given a German translation. Six years later, in 1842, he published a three-volume *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*, in which he abandoned the etymological method of his earlier dictionary in favour of an alphabetical listing of words. (The issue of etymological vs. alphabetical organization was, and remained, an issue among lexicographers.)⁸ The third volume of this *Handwörterbuch* was a *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, and it is this that we refer to as the first edition of ‘Pape’. It naturally followed the alphabetical principle of its companion volumes, but Pape included an analytical section, *Übersicht über die Bildung der Personennamen*, providing an analysis of names by roots and terminations. In his second (and rare, in the UK at least) edition of the *Wörterbuch* (1850), he removed this analytical section, believing that it would be more useful if developed and published elsewhere.

Pape died in 1854. The *Wörterbuch* was substantially revised by G. E. Benseler, and published, as the third edition of ‘Pape’, in four quartos between 1862 and 1870; after Benseler’s death in 1868 the last of these was published by his (almost) homonymous son G. Benseler, who completed the work though with less rigour than his father.⁹ G. E. Benseler did more than simply revise. He introduced German translations of the names (considered but rejected by Pape, Pref. vi) and restored (unchanged) the analytical section which Pape had withdrawn in 1850. His largest contribution, however, was to incorporate new material. It is a measure of Benseler’s achievement, and of the growth in documentary sources, that what had been in its first/second editions a 424/426-page work became in its third edition 1710 pages; to take a more precise measure, the occurrences of the name Apollonios had grown from 11 to 31. Behind that difference in size lie the publication of more epigraphical corpora, the growing impact of papyri, and the studies and critical reviews of other scholars (Letronne himself, K. Keil, and many others, who are named by Benseler in his Preface and Bibliography).

⁸ See, e.g., the justification for abandoning the etymological model, in the French edition of the *TLG* (above, n. 6), at 8 f.; and the critical comments of Stuart Jones in the 1925 Preface to Liddell-Scott, iii–iv, on the retention of the etymological model by the English revision of the *TLG*.

⁹ Masson, *op. cit.*, 197 = *OGS*, 367.

Thus, the work, which rolls off the tongue as ‘Pape-Benseler’, was the creation of strictly speaking three, and in substance two, men, and was published in three editions before reaching the form in which it survived for more than a century as the standard work. It bears the marks of its evolution in its three Prefaces: W. Pape’s of 1842, G. E. Benseler’s of 1862, and G. Benseler’s of 1870. The programmatic statements in those Prefaces bear testimony to the issues at the heart of making a name dictionary—the choice between the etymological and the alphabetical approach, selective illustration as opposed to exhaustive listing—and also to the steadily growing body of documentary evidence, and the importance of the work, criticisms, and collaboration of other scholars.

In the ensuing century, during which Pape-Benseler remained in use as the only comprehensive name dictionary, the activities outlined by Letronne continued and flourished. Collections of inscriptions (and increasingly of papyri, as well as coins, and artefacts) continued to be published; indeed, the role of the editor of the corpus was paramount in determining the quality of the readings to be used by others. Different traditions of publication developed,¹⁰ and of approaches to names; etymological studies were developed by A. Fick, and his pupil F. Bechtel, and remain indispensable today. Regional studies grew, especially in the productive areas of the Balkans, South Russia, and Asia Minor. Brief though this survey is, it is impossible to move on without acknowledging here the genius of Louis Robert who, in his mastery of epigraphy and onomastics, stands unapproachably in first place. There were very few aspects of antiquity that did not provoke cogent and stimulating reflections from him, and names, Greek, Latin and Turkish, played a leading role in these reflections. His method was not lexicographical;¹¹ he chose to expand rather than compress his researches; but because of the range of his vision there is scarcely an aspect of onomastics that he did not illuminate.

The *LGN* which Peter Fraser proposed to the British Academy in 1973 was to be a successor to Pape-Benseler as far as personal names were concerned.¹²

¹⁰ See the comments of L. Robert (above n. 4), 10, on the approach of Letronne compared with that of *Inscriptiones Graecae*; they are, as always, illuminating; also his defence of individual choice against imposed uniformity.

¹¹ His scepticism as to the feasibility of achieving an onomasticon worthy of use is well known (see below, 99); the pitfalls he pointed out are remembered daily by those engaged in the activity.

¹² For the aims, methods and exclusions (of heroic and geographical names), see ‘A New Lexicon of Greek Personal Names’, in *Tribute to an Antiquary. Essays presented to Marc Fitch* (London, 1976), 73 ff.; *LGN* I Preface, vii; an extract from the text of the original proposal to the Academy can be found at the Lexicon website <http://www.lgnp.ox.ac.uk>.

His proposal expressed the importance of names for classical studies, the vigour of scholarship in this field, and the correspondingly urgent need for a new name dictionary. Once under way, the new lexicon, like its predecessor, evolved: the single volume originally envisaged became, under the weight of the evidence, a series of regional volumes, and the original plan to provide summaries of the more common names was soon abandoned in favour of exhaustive listing of all examples. It thus became ‘more directly in the style of ‘Pape’ than was originally envisaged’.

In the task of providing a comprehensive listing, the difficulties of scale are obvious. If it was already a problem in the time of Pape and Benseler to keep up with and control the growing body of evidence, the problem is all the greater now (Apollonios now stands at 1284, and rising). Publications, like the sources themselves, proliferate; texts may be published in journals not easily accessible, and in languages not easily read; and there must always be a fresh and critical reading of the sources (an index based on indexes would indeed be a poor instrument), and not only the primary sources, but also the secondary sources where readings and related issues of chronology and location are considered. For the individual scholar these can be almost insuperable problems, and even for the Lexicon, dedicated to the task, they are challenging.

It is as well to state immediately that the task cannot be done perfectly. Even if, by a superhuman effort, comprehensiveness could be achieved, it would be short-lived. It is the fate of lexicographers to be out of date as soon as they are published, especially when their work is built on the shifting foundations of new discoveries and reinterpretations provided by a vigorous scholarly community.¹³ It is their dilemma to live with this knowledge, to balance the natural wish to pursue completeness with the importance of releasing material, so that (in the case of the Lexicon) the overall onomastic picture can be enriched.

In any case, the notion of ‘perfection’ is inappropriate in a work which incorporates so many judgements—about textual readings, chronology, identifications and location, and about what to omit as much as what to include. There are many uncertainties, genuine puzzles and downright insoluble problems. Furthermore, these judgements must be passed on to the user in the distilled form imposed by a dictionary format. There is not the luxury of

¹³ For the impact on the lexicographer of new readings of texts, see 1925 Preface to Liddell and Scott, viii n. 2; xii with n. 1.

explanation, or a *non liquet*; and if something is omitted, who is to know that it is not a mistake rather than a rejection of a ‘ghost name’? In this situation, the question mark becomes heavy with significance.¹⁴

The computer deserves a small mention. Though it has never been allowed to play a part in the compilation of the Lexicon, its role in making it available, through the typesetting of individual volumes, has been crucial. In the future, information technology may play an even more constructive role in making it possible to transcend two decisions which were made at an earlier stage. First, it can unify material which, for publication purposes, was separated into regional fascicules. Second, by electronic analysis it is possible to study the names according to their roots and terminations. The reverse indexes published in *LGPN II–IIIB* were a step in this direction; with full exploitation of electronic resources, the etymological analysis abandoned by Pape 150 years ago becomes once more a possibility.

When describing the new lexicon, Peter Fraser talked of a ‘fully documented list’ of names, or, as it later became, of the individual bearers of those names. Other terms have been applied, ‘inventory’, ‘collection’, ‘index’, even ‘telephone directory’, to describe what the Lexicon aspires to be; there is something in all of them, but ‘index’ is perhaps the most appropriate—not in the limited sense of being an index *of* names, but rather that it has the function of an index. Just as, in a book, the index directs the reader to the pages of interest, so the Lexicon points to the source(s) for a particular name. Though if the Lexicon is an index in this sense, the ‘book’ is all the written evidence from the ancient Greek world.

How should *LGPN* be used? In so far as it is itself a work of research—as one contributor¹⁵ kindly says, a ‘primary source’—embodying scholarly judgements, it should be treated critically.¹⁶ In so far as it is an index, it should be used as a pointer back to the original sources. The Lexicon has been compiled from a study of the sources, in their historical context; the user of the Lexicon needs to start the journey back to a critical examination of those sources. To adopt Letronne’s imagery, we have started with the teeming life on the ground and moved up to the heights for the overview. The user should benefit from the view, but must make the descent and examine the details afresh for any item which is of particular concern.

¹⁴ Cf. Masson (n. 8 above), 196 = *OGS*, 366 on Bensele’s prudent use of the ‘?’.

¹⁵ Robert Parker, 54.

¹⁶ As below, 36 n. 50, 86 n. 15, 127 n. 37.

The descent is signposted, the landscape well marked by the main routes of place and time. Place, in particular, has always been understood to be fundamental to understanding and exploiting names; Pape knew it, and *LGPN* reflects it in the organization of the material in the volumes. The accumulation of evidence does nothing to undermine, but only reinforces, the differences between cities and regions: Apollonios may multiply, but not equally everywhere (not many at Delphi, for example, that great centre of the cult of Apollo). These differences help us to see what separates, as well as what unites, the ancient Greeks.

The Lexicon has from the outset depended on international collaboration. Just as Peter Fraser turned to scholars in many countries to participate in its compilation, so now we turn for help and advice to those with greater expertise than ours, in various fields within the large range covered by our evidence. So large an enterprise could not be undertaken, let alone achieved, without making ‘the sacrifice of taking some things on trust’.¹⁷ It was a particular pleasure that the audience on 11 July included some from whom we have taken things on trust, including Michael Osborne, Editor of *LGPN II*, and contributors to *LGPN I*, Joyce Reynolds and Denis Knoepfler, the latter of whom later contributed a paper to this volume.

With that exception, the contributors to the volume were the speakers on the day. In issuing the invitations to speakers we were sensitive to the personal nature of the occasion as a tribute to Peter Fraser, the desire to reflect the international dimensions of the Lexicon, and the broad spectrum of classical scholarship in which onomastic evidence plays a part. We hoped to illustrate how onomastic material can provide a means of enlarging our understanding of the different ways in which the Greeks responded to, and created, their environment. We are grateful to our speakers for doing just that so splendidly.

This book [S.H.]

This book,¹ like the Lexicon which underlies it, is a contribution to social history and the history of beliefs. It is above all concerned with the vital

¹⁷ Egger, *op. cit.* (n. 4 above), xvi, on Letronne, who could not do it.

¹ I am grateful to Robert Parker for comments on an earlier, shorter draft of this section of the Introduction.

question of where people come from. In any society, ‘Who are you?’ tends to be the first, and ‘Where do you come from?’ the second, question put to any new arrival (cf. Hom. *Od.*, 7.238). The answer to the first will usually be a name. But ‘where do you come from?’ is really another way of saying ‘who are you?’ Conversely and more subtly, to state your name in answer to the question ‘who are you?’ is often to supply an answer to ‘where are you from?’ That is, names are informative in themselves. This was particularly true in ancient Greece. The idea that Greek personal names could provide evidence about where people come from is no longer a hypothesis based on impressions about frequency; the Lexicon has made it a testable fact. The diversity of Greek culture, and the acute Greek awareness of the difference between themselves and their Greek or non-Greek neighbours, means that, as Letronne realized, it is very important to be able to identify origins. The early twentieth-century science of prosopography studied origins and marriage-connections as indicated by personal names. Prosopography started with Roman history, because the local affiliations of Italian personal names were at that time better studied and understood.² The vast Greek world has resisted organized collection until now, at the end of the same century. Greek prosopography, hitherto tried out only on finite areas and periods like Alexander’s entourage or the inhabitants of Athens,³ can now begin, and it need not and should not be as political as its Roman counterpart.

The chapters in this book are, then, concerned with where people come from and with the differences which that made. P. M. Fraser’s paper on ‘ethnics used as personal names’ investigates the limiting case of names which are informative about local connections, though not (usually) actual origins: that is, the intriguing set of cases where an ethnic (a generalized indicator of origin) actually does duty as a personal name. An example is the Mysian in Xenophon who ‘also had the name Mysian’ (Mysos): below, 154. But, as Fraser shows, this is an unusual example of the use of a topical ethnic as a

² W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte Lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1933, originally 1904) provided the key for investigators like F. Münzer, *Römischer Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart, 1920), R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), and H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics* (Oxford, 1951).

³ H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographische Grundlage* (Munich, 1926); W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander’s Empire* (London, 1992). J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* (Berlin, 1901); J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford, 1971; new edn in preparation). *LGPN* is not a prosopography, but the fullness of the material in *LGPN* II means that it has for many purposes replaced Kirchner. On prosopography generally see Hornblower and Spawforth in *OCD*³, 1262 f.

personal name within the city or region represented by the ethnic. It is interesting that Xenophon signals it as unusual; for another example of his interest in personal names see below, 131 n. 4 on an item from the *Memorabilia*.

The Greek world was already old when Xenophon's Mysian got his name. But the process of onomastic investigation can be used to illuminate surprisingly early periods in Greek history. Two of our chapters show that from the surviving name-pool, which for reasons to do with the rediscovery of writing is necessarily no older than the archaic age, conclusions can be drawn about the prehistoric and pre-literate period. Miltiades Hatzopoulos demonstrates from onomastic evidence that the Hesiodic account of the origins of the Macedonians, according to which they came from a region identifiable as Perrhaebia and the area round Mount Olympus, was correct. Again, Anna Davies' investigation of 'Greek personal names and linguistic continuity' shows that on the whole personal names show a very high degree of linguistic continuity, though she concludes that one of her case studies (names in *-εὐύς*) indicates a clear discontinuity between the Mycenaean and Greek periods. Laurent Dubois, in his wide-ranging study of 'horse' names i.e. those in Hipp- or -hippos, shows that they became far commoner after the Mycenaean period, when they were very rare; this change can be directly linked to the spread down the social scale of horse-owning and horse-breeding, although 'horsey' names were always aristocratic in their connotation and symbolism. But in some areas the early morning mists of Greek history are impenetrable. Robert Parker, in his study of Greek theophoric names (those usually compound names in which a god's name is part of the compound) is able to trace the spread of the goddess Hekate, who was at home in Caria; also, though less confidently, the spread of the Mother goddess and of Leto. Theophoric names derived from the major Olympians, however, are not informative in this way: these gods 'were probably all present in all regions far too long before our evidence begins' (below, 71).

Dubois also offers a discussion which bears on the origins of a cult. He tackles a very old problem, the exact meaning of the name 'Hippolytus', whose mythical bearer was a recipient of cult at Trozen and Athens⁴ and the subject of a famous play by Euripides. That the prefix of this name has something to do with horses is clear enough; but there agreement stopped.⁵

⁴ For Hippolytus' cult see the commentaries of W. S. Barrett (Oxford, 1964), 3 f. and M. Halleran (Warminster, 1995), 21 ff. The Attic cult is a shadowy affair.

⁵ W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley, 1979), 112.

Dubois shows that the name must mean ‘he whose horses are unyoked’ and that the name may also have come to be understood as meaning ‘unyoker of horses’. It remains very likely that Euripides and other ancient writers took the name to mean ‘loosed by [i.e. torn apart by] horses’,⁶ but it now seems clear that this view has no sound philological basis. Students of Greek religion and literature will need to take account of Dubois’ philological conclusions. The intriguing modern suggestion that names in -hipp- are specially used for mythical youths who (like Hippolytus) are connected with initiation⁷ is certainly compatible with the new findings.

It has been suggested that the cult of Hippolytus was originally Near Eastern.⁸ If so, this is an example of peaceful cultural diffusion, the kind of thing social historians are concerned with. Much of the content of the ancient Greek historians is taken up with wars, diplomacy, political settlements and so forth, after which the narratives tend to move on. The literary sources tell us less about how communities co-existed after the great convulsions. Ethnographically minded historians like Herodotus correct this tendency up to a point, but even their insights are static, not concerned with social evolution and what would now be called intercommunal relations (his account of Cyrene at 4.148 ff. is a partial exception). Hatzopoulos offers a fine example of the way onomastic evidence can illuminate social processes arising from political and military events. Diodorus (16. 8. 2) describes Philip II of Macedon’s annexation of Amphipolis in 356, adding in a single word that apart from exiling his political enemies he treated the population ‘kindly’, *φιλανθρώπως*. From the personal names we can see that this was true: the Macedonian names penetrate after 356, and we know, from a precious list of trierarchs in Arrian’s *Indike*, the names of some of the grandest of them (18. 4; cf. Hornblower’s paper, below, 140). But at the same time

⁶ See M. Halleran (n. 4 above), 21: the name ‘may very well refer to the circumstances of his death—“loosed by horses”.’ In n. 2 he refers to Burkert and acknowledges that the ‘actual etymology may have been different’ but suggests that Euripides ‘may well have interpreted it in this way’ i.e. as ‘torn apart’. See also C. Segal, *Interpreting Greek Tragedy* (Ithaca, 1986), 203 and n. 48.

⁷ For the point about -hipp- names see J. Bremmer, *OCD*³ under ‘initiation’, and for the initiatory aspect of Hippolytus in particular see F. Zeitlin, *Playing the Other* (Chicago, 1996), 222 f., and P. Vidal-Naquet, ‘The Place and Status of Foreigners in Greek Tragedy’, in C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford, 1997), 109–19 at 117.

⁸ Burkert (above n.5), 114–18. For such oriental imports generally see Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution* (Cambridge MA, 1992) and M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford, 1997).

we can be sure that there was no wholesale eviction and that that one single word of Diodorus was importantly right. See Hatzopoulos (below, 111) for the persistence of persons bearing Ionic and even ‘native’ names in positions of prestige and power, and for evidence of commercial transactions conducted between them and the Macedonians on an equal footing.

Such gradual social penetration, this time the result not directly of conquest but of ritualized friendship, marriage, and naturalization, is the subject of Christian Habicht’s paper on foreign names at Athens, as revealed by onomastic evidence. From the historians of antiquity we learn of the *rules* imposing citizen exclusivity at Athens; but from the personal names we see that the *reality* was more catholic and flexible. One of Habicht’s likely foreigners at Athens, Kaikosthenes, has a name typical of Mytilene on Lesbos (below, 126); the name is a compound of the river-god Kaikos, whose home was on the Asia Minor mainland with an estuary opposite Lesbos. Parker shows how frequent river-names were generally (60 n. 26) and it is, for the social historian, a great advantage that the gods underlying such names are (unlike many other categories of gods) topographically located in a pleasingly precise way. Hence the confidence with which we can speak of Kaikosthenes. Denis Knoepfler’s paper also concerns a theophoric name derived from the name of a river, a name which also features briefly in Parker’s chapter (below, 55). Knoepfler elegantly demonstrates that behind ‘Oropodoros’, a name which is restricted to Oropos itself and to one part only of the Euboean city of Eretria, we must posit a river-god Oropos, who is none other than the well-known river Asopos, transmuted by *krasis* and a well-attested linguistic shift.⁹ The names Asopodoros and Oropodoros are thus, in effect, one and the same. This is a good example of the way in which local cults and local topography and history can be mutually illuminating.

Habicht’s paper is a sustained exercise in the identification of names by the criterion of regional frequency or infrequency; the results prove that hellenistic Athens was a rainbow of Greek nationalities. Such a picture derives its vividness from brilliance of accurate detail, and this (Hornblower’s paper suggests) is a type of vividness relevant to the study of the ancient Greek historians but too often neglected in that study. Where the historians call a man from, for instance, Cyrene or Thessaly, by a name which we can say, on the basis of epigraphic evidence in bulk, was typical of those regions, we have a

⁹ ML p. 252: ‘the substitution of rho for intervocalic sigma is characteristic of Eretria and Oropos’.

valuable control on the accuracy of their narratives. But there is no historical technique which cannot also be exploited by the novelist or fictional writer in search of local colour: as literary critics from Henry James to Roland Barthes have recognised, the ‘reality effect’, in Barthes’ phrase, is often achieved by richness of particularization, what Henry James called ‘solidity of specification’ (see below, 141 n. 51). Michael Crawford’s intriguing paper shows that Phlegon of Tralles, a writer of memorabilia or tall stories, took trouble over his choice of the name Bouplagos, and Crawford suggests that it is ‘more likely to have occurred in a historical narrative than to have been pulled out of the air’. In other words, the writer of fiction is parasitical on the historian, whose accuracy (Hornblower, 143) is in turn confirmed by the inscriptions which are the heart of the *LGPN* project.

Abbreviations

- BE* J. and L. Robert and others, *Bulletin Épigraphique* (in *Revue des Études grecques*, 1938–)
- Bechtel, *HP* F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle, 1917)
- CEG* P.A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, vol. 1, *saeculorum VIII–V a. Chr. n.*; vol. 2, *saeculi IV a. Chr. n.* (Berlin, 1983, 1989)
- FD* *Fouilles de Delphes* 1– (Paris, 1909–)
- Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions* M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, 2 vols (Meletemata 22; Athens, 1996)
- Hatzopoulos-Loukopoulou, *Recherches* M.B. Hatzopoulos and L. Loukopoulou, *Recherches sur les marches orientales des Téménides*, i (Meletemata 11; Athens, 1992)
- Letronne, *Oeuvres choisies* *Oeuvres choisies de J.-A. Letronne, assemblées, mises en ordre et augmentées d'un index par E. Fagnan* (Paris, 1881–5: 1 sér. *Égypte ancienne*, 2 vols, 1881; 2 sér. *Géographie et cosmographie*, 2 vols, 1883; 3 sér. *Archéologie et philologie*, 2 vols, 1883–5)
- LGPN* *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names I, The Aegean Islands, Cyprus and Cyrenaica*, eds P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews (Oxford, 1987); II, *Attica*, eds M.G. Osborne and S.G. Byrne (Oxford, 1994); IIIA, *The Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily and Magna Graecia*, eds P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews (Oxford, 1997); IIIB, *Central Greece*, eds P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews (forthcoming, 2000)
- LIMC* *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae* (Zurich and Munich, 1981–97)
- LSAG*² L.H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, 2nd edn, with supplement by A.W. Johnston (Oxford, 1990)
- ML* R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC*, revised edn (Oxford, 1988)
- OCD*³ S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds), *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd edn (Oxford, 1996)
- OGS* O. Masson, *Onomastica Graeca Selecta*, ed. C. Dobias and L. Dubois, 2 vols (Paris, 1990)
- Osborne, *Naturalization* 3–4 M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, 3–4 (Brussels, 1983)

- PA* J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*, 2 vols (Berlin, 1901)
- Pape-Benseler W. Pape and G.E. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Braunschweig, 1863–70)
- Parker, *Athenian Religion* R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford, 1996)
- Robert, *OMS* L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta: Épigraphe et antiquités grecques*, 7 vols (Amsterdam, 1969–90)
- SEG* *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, eds J.E.E. Hondius and A.G. Woodhead, 1–25 (Leiden, 1923–71); eds H.W. Pleket and R.S. Stroud, 26–7 (Alphen, 1979–80), 28– (Amsterdam, 1982–)
- SGDI* H. Collitz, F. Bechtel and others, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, 4 vols (Göttingen, 1884–1915)
- Sittig E. Sittig, *De Graecorum nominibus theophoris* (diss. Halle, 1911)