

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY · 104

# GREEK PERSONAL NAMES

## Their Value as Evidence

Edited by  
SIMON HORNBLOWER & ELAINE MATTHEWS

*Published for* THE BRITISH ACADEMY  
*by* OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

*Oxford University Press, Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP*

*Oxford New York  
Athens Auckland Bangkok Bogota Bombay  
Buenos Aires Calcutta Cape Town Dar es Salaam  
Delhi Florence Hong Kong Istanbul Karachi  
Kuala Lumpur Madras Madrid Melbourne  
Mexico City Nairobi Paris Singapore  
Taipei Tokyo Toronto Warsaw*

*and associated companies in  
Berlin Ibadan*

*Published in the United States by  
Oxford University Press Inc., New York*

*© The British Academy, 2000*

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
without the prior permission in writing of the British Academy*

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available*

*ISBN 0-19-726216-3  
ISSN 0068-1202*

*Typeset by J&L Composition Ltd,  
Filey, North Yorkshire  
Printed in Great Britain  
on acid-free paper by  
Creative Print and Design Wales  
Ebbw Vale*

# Greek Personal Names and Linguistic Continuity

ANNA MORPURGO DAVIES

## The linguistic study of personal names

THE STUDY OF PERSONAL NAMES does not always arouse enthusiasm among historical linguists. Most onomastic work is seen as etymological in nature and consequently flawed, since personal names are even more difficult to etymologize than normal nouns. Yet it is easy to identify important linguistic work on the subject that is not etymological and carries a high degree of linguistic credibility. A crucial question concerns the way in which the diachronic development of personal names differs from that of other lexical items. Though at first sight the question seems to be of interest only to the linguist, I want to argue that an answer can be helpful for the historian too. There are risks in the enterprise: on the one hand we require a set of generalities which may seem either woolly or dull or both (and will not be new for the linguist), on the other all general statements must be supported with very detailed information which comes close to pedantry.

## Personal names vs. lexical items

Historical linguists are trained to study the phonological, morphological, and syntactical changes incurred by words and combinations of words through time. They also study meaning changes, i.e. they look at the contexts in which words occur in different periods and from those contexts extract

information which allows them to establish the meaning of the word and, if possible, to date the various stages of its semantic development. A linguist will be interested, for instance, in observing that the Old English form of the word 'soon' was *sōna* and that it meant 'at once', rather than 'soon'.

Here we meet a first contrast with the study of personal names. It would be odd to ask in so many words whether the meaning of the name Elizabeth has changed between the time of Elizabeth the First and that of the present queen. On the other hand it is reasonable to ask how the name Elizabeth was pronounced and/or spelled in the sixteenth century. In other words, though we cannot discuss in the same way the meaning and meaning change of personal names and common nouns, the phonological shape of names normally changes together with the phonological shape of other elements of the lexicon. Here too, however, there are differences. We normally expect any sound or sound sequence to alter in a way which is paralleled in other words: if Old English *sōna* [so:na] becomes *soon* [su:n], we also expect to find that OE *mōna* [mo:na] and OE *fōda* [fo:da], if continued, become *moon* [mu:n] and *food* [fu:d], as they in fact do. The pattern is clear and regular and it involves replacement. Different individuals may alter their pronunciation in different ways and at different speed, but normally, in the same language or dialect, after a period the old and the new form do not co-exist: we do not say both [so:na] and [su:n]. But if we look at an Old English name like *Æðelþryd*, by the end of the nineteenth century this seems to be continued by three different names: *Audrey*, *Ethel*, and *Etheldreda*. We do not find this altogether surprising, but we would think it much odder if OE *sōna* was continued by e.g. \**so*, *soon* and \**sonar*.

## Structure and evolution of personal names

Personal names may differ from other lexemes both in their structure and in their evolution pattern. Before asking why this is so we ought to explore some of these differences. The best way to do it is to look at real examples (some of which may look unbearably trivial) and consider what they teach us. My exemplification is based on Greek and starts with questions of word-formation.

Consider first two adjectives, both found in the same late Thessalian inscription (IG IX (2) 517, Larisa, late third century BC): *λίθιος* 'made of stone'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In Attic, where the equivalent of Thessalian *λίθιος* is *λίθινος*, adjectives of material are formed either with an inherited \*-εγο- suffix (cf. *χρυσούς* < *χρυσέος*) or with an -ινο- suffix as in *λίθινος*.

and *Εὐνόμειος* 'son of Eunomos'; they are both synchronically derived from thematic words (*λίθος*, *Εὐνομος*) with two productive suffixes, -ιος and -ειος. We have every reason to believe that, for the patronymic adjective too, the original suffix was -ιος, but patronymic adjectives which end in -ειος and not in -ιος are not limited to this inscription. In Thessalian in general, -ιος was replaced with -ειος in the derivatives from most personal names but not in the derivatives from common nouns.

Secondly, consider frequent names such as *Θεόδοτος* or *Διόδοτος*. Both names are wholly transparent and fit in the general category of -δοτος compounds; indeed we have evidence for a straightforward adjective *θεόδοτος* 'god-given'. However, while the -δοτος compounds are two-termination words, i.e. they do not have different forms for masculine and feminine, next to the personal name *Θεόδοτος* we find a feminine name *Θεοδότη* and next to *Διόδοτος* a feminine *Διοδότη*. In other words, the standard rules of Greek word-formation are broken for this type of personal name. Similarly, and again in contrast with the standard derivational pattern, we find feminines like *Θεοδώρα* next to *Θεόδωρος*, *Γλαυκίπη*, *Ξανθίπη* next to *Γλαυκίππος*, *Ξάνθιππος*, *Καλλίκλεια* next to *Καλλικλῆς*, *Μενεκράτεια* next to *Μενεκράτης*, etc. These feminines are old, since in the second millennium BC we find at Mycenae (V 659) *te-o-do-ra* (*Θεοδώρα*) and *a-re-ka-sa-da-ra* (*Ἀλεξάνδρα*), and Homer has names like *Ἀμφιγένεια* and *Εὐρυκλέεια*. However, here too compound adjectives of the *πολύδωρος*, *μελάνιππος*, *φίλανδρος*, *εὐγενής* type do not normally form separate feminines.<sup>2</sup>

The next question concerns both phonology and morphology. Short forms like Jim for James or Dick for Richard are found in a number of languages. In Greek at all stages, from Mycenaean to the *koine*, compound names can be replaced by abbreviated forms: in the *Iliad* one and the same man, Achilles' charioteer, is called *Ἀλκιμος* (*Il.*, 19. 392; 24. 474, 574) and *Ἀλκιμέδων* (*Il.*, 16. 197; 17. 467 etc.). This is not a standard type of phonological change and Greek does not abbreviate all words in this manner. We have here a shortening process which is typical of personal names: the abbreviated form and the full form may co-exist and be treated as identical and perhaps interchangeable (as Tom and Thomas in English), or may acquire separate status and eventually be treated as different names.

<sup>2</sup> In the ancient *locus classicus* about feminines, Aristophanes (*Clouds*, 658 ff.) does not refer to this specific point, but comments on the feminine gender of *κάρδοπος* 'kneading trough' and the possible female referent of *ἀλεκτρυών* 'cock and hen', while mentioning the feminine names *Σωστράτη* and *Κλωνύμη*.

There is a link between these *Kurzformen* and a phonological process which is far more common in names than elsewhere: expressive gemination tends to affect the abbreviated forms rather than the full compound. To take the standard example always quoted: one and the same person, a fourth-century tyrant of Methymna, is referred to by Theopompus (*ap. Athen.*, 10. 442) as *Κλεομένης*, but appears in an inscription in which he is honoured by the Athenians (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 284) as *Κλέομις* and is quoted by Isocrates (*Ep.*, 7. 8 f.) as *Κλέομμυς*;<sup>3</sup> we would not expect to find \**Κλεομμένης*. The examples provided by Vottero for the geminated forms of Boeotia<sup>4</sup> confirm this view: cf. for example, *Δάμασσις* (*IG* VII 1908a), presumably from a *Δαμασι-* compound (e.g. *Δαμάσιππος*). It is impossible to know if, in actual speech acts, other lexical items underwent gemination with the same frequency, but, if they did, this was not indicated in writing and presumably did not impinge on the standard lexicon. In other words, in phonological processes such as shortening, gemination, etc. personal names behave differently from common nouns.

Now comes a question of meaning. Composition is one of the standard means by which Indo-European (IE) languages in general, and Greek in particular, enrich their vocabulary. It is a basic rule of thumb that new compounds yield new meanings and that these are normally predictable from the meaning of the component elements. Greek, as Indo-European, frequently forms names from compounds, but there is a fundamental difference between lexical compounds and onomastic compounds. The latter may overlap with the former (as in the case of *Θεόδοτος*) but need not; there are onomastic compounds which would not be acceptable as lexical compounds for the simple reason that they make no sense. Solmsen gives as examples words like *Λυσίκριτος* or *Λυσίμνηστος*.<sup>5</sup> Masson follows Bechtel in assuming that some at least of what he calls 'noms irrationnels' (*Κλεοφοῖνις* is an example) arise because the basic aim is to continue traditional family elements in the name.<sup>6</sup> As Solmsen had noticed, Aristophanes' account in the *Clouds* (60 ff.) of how Strepsiades' first son was named fits with this pattern. Strepsiades' wife wanted a *-ππος* name: *Χάριππος* or *Ξάνθιππος* or *Καλλιπιδής*, but Strepsiades himself preferred *Φειδωνίδης*, i.e. a normal

name built on that of his own father *Φείδων*. The compromise is *Φειδιππίδης*, not a particularly meaningful compound in spite of Homeric *Φειδιππος* (*Il.*, 2. 678) and of the Homeric phrase *ἵππων φειδόμενος* (*Il.*, 5. 202).<sup>7</sup>

Another feature of onomastic compounds, as contrasted with lexical compounds, is the reversibility of the order of the elements. Next to Hippostratos (attested in Athens from the sixth century), we have in fourth-century Athens Stratippos.<sup>8</sup> Masson pointed out the equivalence of the banal *Ὀνασί-μβροτος* and the rare fifth-century name *Μορτ-όνασος* from Thera.<sup>9</sup> Here too it remains obscure what the meaning of a compound with reversed order would be, but in fact the question of meaning hardly arises.

### Function and use of personal names

The facts listed above are well known; they are rehearsed here in order to provide concrete evidence for the assumption that the history of personal names requires a type of analysis which partly overlaps and partly contrasts with that of other words. But why is this so? Why do personal names show a different pattern of development from other lexical items? The answer in my view is to be found on the one hand in the role and function of personal names in contrast with the rest of the lexicon, and on the other in the way in which personal names are assigned to individuals.

### Identification

Names identify individuals, often in situations in which the linguistic context does not help. Even when hearing is difficult, it is unlikely that a sentence like 'the table has a broken leg' would be understood as 'the cable has a broken leg', but 'Tim just broke a leg' could easily be heard as 'Kim just broke a leg'. If we return to my original question about the different derivation in Thessalian of *λίθιος* 'made of stone' and *Εὐνόμειος* 'son of Eunomos', we

<sup>3</sup> See most recently O. Masson, *BSL* 81 (1986), 217–29 at 223 = *OCS*, 549–61 at 555.

<sup>4</sup> G. Vottero, 'Procédés d'expressivité dans l'onomastique personnelle de Béotie', in *La Béotie antique* (Paris, 1985), 403–17.

<sup>5</sup> F. Solmsen, *Indogermanische Eigennamen als Spiegel der Kulturgeschichte*, hsg. und bearbeitet von E. Fraenkel (Heidelberg, 1922), 117.

<sup>6</sup> O. Masson, *Philologus* 110 (1966), 253 f.; *Rev. Num.* 24 (1982), 22 f. = *OCS*, 88 f., 404 f.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. for the Homeric evidence H. von Kamptz, *Homerische Personennamen* (Göttingen, 1982), 9 f., 63.

<sup>8</sup> For the references see *LGPN* II, 238, 406.

<sup>9</sup> O. Masson, 'Quelques noms grecs à l'Agora d'Athènes', in G. Cardona and N. H. Zide (eds), *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald* (Tübingen, 1987), 255–9 at 256 = *OCS*, 567–71 at 568.

may explain how the difference arose through a mixture of purely linguistic facts and functional reasons.<sup>10</sup> At an earlier stage, patronymic adjectives and other nominal derivatives must have ended in [-aios] when they derived from *a*-stems (*Μνασίαιος* from *Μνασίας*), [-Cios] when they derived from consonantal stems (C = any consonant) or thematic stems (\**Ίασόνιος* from \**Ίάσων*, \**Εὐνόμιος* from *Εὐνομος*), and in [-eios] when they derived from *s*-stem (-γένειος < \**-genes-ios* from names ending like Attic *Διογένης*). The early change of Thessalian [ei] to [ē] led in effect to the co-existence of two suffixes [-ēos] and [-ios], whose original identity was no longer clear. In patronymic adjectives [-ios] was preserved in [-aios] but replaced by [-ēos] elsewhere. Why [-ēos] in preference to [-ios] and why only in patronymics? Two reasons can be mentioned. First, [-ēos] allowed the creation of unambiguous patronymics to names which ended in -ιος; hence Thessalian *Ραδιείος* from *Ράδιος*, *Δικαιείος* from *Δίκαιος*, etc.; it would have been impossible to add -ιος to something which ended in -ιος. Secondly, and crucially, in Thessalian a sequence such as [-Cios] through a palatalization process tended to be replaced by [-CCos] or [-Cos] while [-Cēos] was preserved. In other words, phonological attrition made the original patronymic formation opaque so that the basic name was not always recoverable. In normal words, the need for unambiguous formations was far less strong since the context could disambiguate the form — hence the preservation of -ιος in *λίθιος*.

### Classificatory function

The primary role of personal names is to identify individuals, but personal names are also endowed with a strong classificatory function: 'names can classify a person according to his or her sex, ethnic origin, family status, social status, and, in those societies which give different names to children at different stages of their life cycle, by age.' The quotation comes from a book about names and naming in early modern England;<sup>11</sup> the assumption is that different languages and cultures will fix on different classificatory features. Clearly from a Greek point of view classification according to sex is a primary consideration. Hence the creation of Athanippe, Theodora, Diodote.

<sup>10</sup> The evidence is discussed in full in an early article of mine ('Thessalian Patronymic Adjectives', *Glotta* 46 (1968), 85–106), which obviously would need updating, though I still accept its conclusions.

<sup>11</sup> S. Smith-Bannister, *Names and Naming Patterns in England 1538–1700* (Oxford, 1997), 15.

The gender of an adjective (including a compound in adjectival function) is disambiguated by the syntax of the sentence in which it occurs, but this is not necessarily true for a personal name, certainly not true in one of the main uses of names, as forms of address,<sup>12</sup> and not true in an important form of written document, the list. In the history of Greek over a long period, a combination of factors, including iconic factors, tends to introduce a formal marking of gender in all nominal inflection, but the phenomenon occurs first in personal names, so that the sex of individuals may be formally marked. A name like Athanippe is particularly striking if we remember that it is a compound of *ἵππος* and that *ἵππος*, which can be preceded by both the masculine and the feminine article, indicates both a stallion and a mare.<sup>13</sup>

The classificatory function of names also explains the peculiar 'meaningful' and 'meaningless' nature of some onomastic compounds. The primary function is not connotative or descriptive; in the so-called 'irrational' names the original function of composition, that which leads to the creation of the name, is not to describe the mental or physical characteristics of an individual but to identify him or her; in addition, the name may mark his or her position within a community or a kinship group.<sup>14</sup> At a later stage the re-use of the 'irrational' name is determined by the desire to continue a name which was associated with a particular individual or, once again, a particular group. This lack of concern for connotative/descriptive meaning is also a precondition of the creation of abbreviated names, though it obviously does not prompt it.

<sup>12</sup> Forms of address need not have been the primary motivation for the formal marking of gender; here too the obvious reference is to Socrates' complaint in Aristophanes' *Clouds* (685 ff.) that the vocative *Ἀμυνία* sounds like a feminine. The point is that in forms of address the 'addresser' is in general likely to know the sex of the 'addressee'.

<sup>13</sup> Some women's names in Greek are neuter, but this need not count as an exception to the general need for marking sex differences. Men's names are never neuter.

<sup>14</sup> I deliberately avoid the current philosophical discussion about the nature of proper names, but the contrast between connotation and denotation, hinted at in my text, refers to John Stuart Mill's influential (even if endlessly criticized) distinction between denotation and connotation (see e.g. *A System of Logic Ratiōative and Inductive* (1843), in John Stuart Mill, *Collected Works* (Toronto and London, 1973), VII, I ii § 5). For Mill a connotative 'name' like 'man' denotes an indefinite number of individuals who possess certain attributes (corporeity, animal life, rationality, etc.); the name denotes the individuals but connotes the attributes. Proper names, by contrast, 'are not connotative: they denote the individuals who are called by them; but they do not indicate or imply any attributes as belonging to those individuals' (ib., 33). It follows for Mill that 'whenever the names given to objects convey any information, that is, whenever they have properly any meaning, the meaning resides not in what they *denote*, but in what they *connote*. The only names of objects which connote nothing are *proper* names; and these have, strictly speaking, no signification.' (ib., 34).



### Use, abbreviated forms and archaic forms

Names are widely used as forms of address and practical reasons may lead to the abbreviation of long compounds. Child-language is also relevant. The so-called *Lallnamen* (Mimi, Nini, Loulou, to take French examples), with their characteristic reduplication, originate in child-language and then remain in use for adults. Child-language may also be responsible for the frequent gemination which we find, for instance, in Italian names like Memmo (for Domenico), etc. The need for abbreviated forms is easy to understand, but the modality of the creation of *Kurznamen* is less clear. Greek has definite rules about the parts of the compound which can be lost, about the suffixes which can replace the second element of the compound, and so on: Δεξέας, Δεξεύς, Δεξιάς, Δέξις, Δεξίων are all found in the Peloponnese (LGPNI 3A s.vv.), and can plausibly be interpreted as abbreviated forms of names like Δεξιθεός, Δεξιμαχος, Δεξιππος, Δεξιφάνης, etc. Possibly Δέξων and even Δέξιος could be added to the list of abbreviated forms.<sup>15</sup> Yet not everything is allowed: \*Ξίων, \*Εξιάς would be unlikely.<sup>16</sup> Admittedly we do not know for certain what is possible and what impossible in the formation of abbreviated names; further study is definitely needed. We know even less about how and when these rules were defined; clearly we must assume some complex processes of grammaticalization, but their origins are so far unknown. Three facts are important:

1 the rules for the creation of abbreviated forms are not the same in all dialects and at all periods. As we shall see, a form like Δεξεύς is found once at Argos, while equivalent hypocoristics like Δεξιάς are more frequent. In contrast with the Peloponnese, Attic has only Δέξις (as well as Δέξιος and Δέξων), while the full compound names are the same as in the Peloponnese;

2 rules exist from our first evidence and we can establish such rules for Mycenaean;

<sup>15</sup> A second-century Athenian called Δέξων is the father of a Δεξίωχος (cf. LGPN II s. vv.), which confirms that synchronically a link existed. On the other hand, Δέξιος could be a sobriquet based on the adjective δεξιός.

<sup>16</sup> The normal form of abbreviation preserves the first part of a compound (e.g. in Δέξις mentioned above) and may or may not preserve the beginning of the second part (as in Πάτροκλος vs. the original Πάτροκλέης). There are rare examples of abbreviated forms which cut the first part of the compound; Masson, *ZPE* 37 (1980), 111 ff. = *OCS*, 353 ff., supports the explanation of the rare masculine Χάρις as an hypocoristic of compounds like Ἀνδρόχαρις, Ἀυτόχαρις, Τιμόχαρις, etc.

3 abbreviated forms and non-abbreviated forms normally co-exist, but it is possible for the latter to replace the former in their entirety.

When a name exists both in its full compounded form and in one or more abbreviated forms, the choice of the one or the other form by the parents at birth must have been deliberate, even if later it is possible for the child to be known by more than one name. In general, a form of the name which sounded more archaic than the current one must have been due to a precise choice. In this way we account for the multiple continuations of a name like *Ædelþryd*. Audrey seems to be the normal phonological development, but in a literate society (or for that matter in a society which is rich in oral poetic performances) older forms of words may be recorded in writing or in the poetic tradition. In the case of names, the incentive to resurrect them or to continue them in the original form may be stronger than for other lexical items. The choice of a specific form establishes a link with a specific person or period; in other words, once again it introduces a definite form of classification. Etheldreda is a typical product of nineteenth-century fashion.

### The intentionality of naming and its consequences

A general point emerges from these apparently disconnected observations. I shall call it rather grandly the intentionality of naming. Speakers are more aware of what happens to names than of what happens to other lexical items. There are various reasons for this, including the fact that there are times in life when parents must choose names for their children. In the modern world publishers find it useful to keep in print dictionaries of personal names, which are avidly perused by expectant parents. This has consequences. If in the course of the history of English *sāna* becomes *soon* just as *māna* becomes *moon* and *fōda* becomes *food*, it seems likely that we are dealing with a phonetic change which is unconscious and mostly gradual. This type of unconscious phonological development also affects personal names, but for personal names speakers are capable of retrieving or preserving older forms. Consider, for instance, the name of King Nikoklews of Paphos in Cyprus, who died c. 309 BC. He belongs to a period when intervocalic [w] tends to disappear. One of his syllabic inscriptions (*ICS*, no. 90) has the form *ne-a-se* (i.e. *νέας*) and not the expected *\*ne-wa-se*; in another (*ICS*, no. 91), his father is

given the title (in the genitive) of *pa-si-le-o-se* (i.e. βασιλῆος) and not *pa-si-le-wo-se*. Yet all his syllabic inscriptions have the form *ni-ko-ke-le-we-se* or, in the genitive, *ni-ko-ke-le-we-o-se* (KOUKLIA, no. 237).<sup>17</sup> To the linguist it looks as if phonological change has been deliberately suspended, but that is not the case; sound change goes on, but an older form of the name has been preserved or revived.<sup>18</sup> The same principle may apply in the case of dialect shift. If a community, for instance, abandons its dialect in favour of a new standard (as the Greek regions did for the *koine*), two possibilities are available for proper names: they may be retained in the dialect form or they may be replaced by new names, which in their turn may be entirely new or may simply be the old names adapted to the new standard.<sup>19</sup> Such decisions are not unconscious but deliberate.

There are two consequences of this state of affairs: one more specific, the other of greater generality. First, it is now linguistically justified to use in the study of personal names data which stretch over a much longer period than is sometimes possible for other lexical items. Thus, for instance, scholars interested in the Greek dialects will stop studying Arcadian inscriptions after the third century or so since the dialect is no longer written, but in doing so they may miss the dialect information provided by the onomastics of the later inscriptions. A name like *Καλλικρέτεια*, with the archaic vocalism of the second element of the compound (*-κρέτεια* for *-κράτεια* of the *koine*), is attested in the second/first century BC in Arcadia (LGPN IIIA s.v.) but shows an old pattern typical of the dialect.

Secondly, a study of personal names may be highly revealing if we are interested in the cohesion and cultural continuity of a specific community. It tells us something not only about the natural preservation or otherwise of onomastic characters, but also about a set of deliberate choices in

<sup>17</sup> The references are to O. Masson, *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1983) = *ICS*; O. Masson and T.B. Mitford, *Les inscriptions syllabiques de Kouklia-Paphos* (Konstanz, 1986) = *KOUKLIA*.

<sup>18</sup> It is of course a moot point whether we are dealing with a fact of the written language or of the spoken language, and a decision may not be possible.

<sup>19</sup> I owe to Dorothy Thompson the reference to a splendid article by Willy Clarysse ('Ethnic Diversity and Dialect among the Greeks of Hellenistic Egypt', in A.M.F.W. Verhoogt and S. P. Vleeming (eds), *The Two Faces of Greco-Roman Egypt. Greek and Demotic and Greek-Demotic Texts and Studies Presented to P. W. Pestman* (Leiden, 1998), 1–13), which traces the survival of Greek dialects in Egypt. Where I partially disagree with the method is when the author implies that the survival of names with non-Ionic-Attic long *ā* implies the survival of the dialect. This may well be the case but it would be conceivable that *koine*-speakers kept the old forms of the personal names.

name-giving and name-preserving that, in their turn, reflect specific attitudes to language but also to community life, kinship, continuity, etc. In a cultural context characterized by linguistic variety, such as that of pre-*koine* Greece, personal names may throw new light on the cultural diversity between different regions in a way which goes beyond the purely linguistic and merges with the analysis of attitudes or mentality.

### Personal names and the *koine*

If these assumptions are correct, can we use them to enlighten real data? I now turn to more specific work which has recently become possible thanks to LGPN and to the accumulation of new data which it has provided. As in an earlier article,<sup>20</sup> I concentrate on Arcadia but keep in mind data from other regions; I shall occasionally look at Cyprus because I subscribe to the fairly general view that the dialects of Cyprus and Arcadia continue a single original dialect. When the two dialects diverge this is doubly interesting because it is clearly due to an innovation. It goes without saying that most of what I have to say depends on the availability of the relevant volumes of the LGPN.

It is well known that at some stage the dialectal variety of Greek is replaced — in writing at least — by a sort of standard language, the Attic-based *koine*. The exact period varies from region to region but at some point from the late fourth century onwards we begin to observe that inscriptions in dialect are replaced by inscriptions in *koine*.<sup>21</sup> Often inscriptions in dialect and inscriptions in *koine* co-exist; sometimes the choice of language depends on the content or style of the inscription: public documents may be in *koine* while private documents are in the local dialect, but vice versa is also possible. How do we distinguish the *koine* from the local dialect? There are obviously a

<sup>20</sup> A. Morpurgo Davies, 'The Morphology of Personal Names in Mycenaean and Greek: Some Observations', in *Florent Studia Mycenaea, Proceedings of the Tenth Mycenaean Colloquium* (Vienna, 1999), 389–405.

<sup>21</sup> It is not easy to define features and distribution of the *koine*. For an assessment of the problems one may refer to the two volumes edited by Claude Brixhe, *La Koiné grecque antique*. I, *une langue introuvable?* (Nancy, 1993); *La Koiné grecque antique*. II, *La Concurrence* (Nancy, 1996); and to one of the concluding remarks of the article by Brixhe and Hodot in the first of these volumes (p. 20): 'En définitive, la seule langue qui mérite réellement le nom de koiné est le registre supérieur de la langue écrite (prose littéraire, documents diplomatiques, décrets municipaux...)'.



number of features which can be used, but the omnipresent one is phonological: the presence of a long *e*-vowel for an inherited long *a* (the contrast is that between Attic and Ionic μήτηρ vs. μάτηρ of the other dialects). Onomastics may take part in the change, and suddenly in a given place we are presented with Δημήτριος and Φιλόδημος instead of the earlier (or contemporary) Δαμάτριος and Φιλόδαμος. The phenomenon naturally does not apply to Arcadia only and is generalizable for all non-Attic-Ionic areas. Yet there is regional diversity not only in the speed at which the *koine* progresses but also in the way in which it progresses: onomastics is a case in point.

### *The replacement of ā with η in Arcadian names*

A glance at a list of Arcadian names reveals that forms with η for α are less frequent than one might have expected. I support this statement with the analysis of a few nominal types and of the figures for their attestation extracted from *LGNP* IIIA.

#### *ā-feminines*

The majority of feminine names end in -ā in all dialects except for Ionic-Attic and the *koine*. If at any stage in Arcadia *koine* onomastics had taken over, we would expect a reasonable number of η-nominatives. In fact *LGNP* IIIA offers ninety-nine different Arcadian feminine names which end in -ā vs. seventeen which end in -η. In themselves these figures are not significant because the α-names include names which in Attic and in the *koine* would also end in -α, either because the final vowel is short or because it is long but follows ε, ι, ρ (as in Μεγάκλεια, Διονυσία, Κλεοπάτρα). We are then left with some forty-five names which could have been replaced by η-names but are not. Yet even this figure is not very significant because, naturally enough, many of the names belong to texts which are not written in *koine*. More striking is, on the one hand, the analysis of the seventeen η-names and, on the other, the distribution of some specific α-names. Of the η-names two are doubtful readings (Ἡδύμ[η], Λυσι<ο>δίκη); two are only attested in literature (Ἀνύτη, Δημοδίκη listed under Δαμοδίκη in *LGNP* IIIA); two occur in elegiac distichs with clearly poetic language (Κλεαρίστη, Τόλη); and seven are very late and mostly belong to the second century AD

(Ζωσίμη, Καλλιτύχη, Νικομάχη, Σίγη, Φιλίππη, Φοίβη, Τύχη; Ἡδύμ[η], if correct, and Τόλη could also be mentioned here).;

The remaining four names (Εὐάνθη, Ὑλη, Ἐπιγόνη and Ἀθανίππη) may require some additional discussion. Epigone is interesting: she is honoured as a benefactor by Mantinea-Antigoneia between the end of the first century BC and the beginning of the first century AD; the text (*IG* V (2) 268) starts in *koina*, i.e. it has ā-forms like ἃ πόλις, ἐν αὐτᾷ, but then includes a florid decree in Attic (or *koine*), which Wilamowitz thought was an example of Asianic style. All through, including the first part, the name is quoted as Ἐπιγόνη. To judge from the three published volumes of *LGNP*, the name is late (imperial period) and does not normally appear with final -α.<sup>22</sup> The obvious conclusion is that the woman in question was in fact called Ἐπιγόνη, either because in Arcadia there was no equivalent Ἐπιγόνα or because, if such a name existed, her parents and/or she herself preferred the η version. In either case the presence of this name with its η, both in the part of the text which refers to ἃ πόλις in the *koina* and in that which refers to τὴν πόλιν in the *koine*, indicates that an alternation of dialect forms in a text does not automatically imply an alternation in the form of the names.

Ὑλη is even more problematic. The Greek evidence quoted for it in *LGNP* I–IIIA is limited to an occurrence in a text, dated to the third–second centuries BC, with only three words: Ἐπίδοξον Ὑλη χαίρει; the first word is written somewhat differently and may have been added later. It is not certain, in my view, that we are dealing with a feminine nominative rather than with a masculine or feminine vocative, but if the name is a feminine, it may have been a literary name which conceivably was derived from a place-name.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Pape-Benseler refers to three instances of Ἐπιγόνα in Boeckh, *CIG*; in fact one (II 1957) is a wrong quotation; two (III 4287 and IV (sic but III) 6433) have the name in the η- form. There is, however, an instance of a first-century AD Ἐπιγόνα in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 9558 (*CIG* I 706) which most incongruously is the name of a Milesian woman, i.e. presumably of an Ionic woman for whom we would expect an η-name. If this is correct it demonstrates that an α-name existed, but offers no evidence for the fact that the name was created with an α- rather than an η-ending. It seems likely that the Arcadian woman in question was called Ἐπιγόνη with a name which had reached Arcadia in that form. As for the other inscription the question remains of why a Milesian woman would have an α-name.

<sup>23</sup> The text is edited by Te Riele, *BCH* 89 (1965), 584–9, who proposes two alternatives for Ἐπίδοξον: either an honorific title like ἐνδοξον or a woman's name. However, if the word was added later, an interpretation ought to start with Ὑλη χαίρει; given the rarity of Ὑλη as a personal name (as a city's name the word is well known), various possibilities are open. It could be the vocative of a masculine name, in which case we could think of a non-attested \*Ὑλης, a possible Arcadian equivalent of \*Ὑλεός, which is both an ethnic and a personal name

Practically nothing can be said about Ἀθανίππη of Stymphalos.<sup>24</sup> It is one of only three -ιππη names attested once each in the Peloponnese; the other names are all late, and it is difficult to believe in an early date for Ἀθανίππη. The editor does not provide any information about date or letter-shape but simply says that we are dealing with a funerary stele; the second α of Ἀθαν- in my view is not sufficient to define the inscription as hellenistic, and since we cannot check the reading it is difficult to trust the text. Finally, Εὐάνθη occurs once at Thelphousa in the second or first century BC<sup>25</sup> and contrasts with Εὐάνθα found once at Megalopolis (*IG* V (2) 479, 9) presumably after the late third century BC. The name may well be literary in origin, and the -ανθη feminines are reasonably well attested in Attica from an early date.<sup>26</sup>

In general it is unlikely that we shall reach firm conclusions which provide a rationale for the use of these four names, if they are all real, but it seems clear that, before the late imperial period, there is no tendency in Arcadia to replace final -α with -η in the feminine names; if this happens at all it is exceptional.<sup>27</sup>

### The δαμο- compounds

The compounds of δᾶμος/δῆμος are omnipresent in Greece; Ionic–Attic and the *koine* naturally use δημο- forms. Arcadia has some thirty-nine different

(cf. Apollodorus 1. 8. 2 and 6) as well as a dog-name (cf. Xenophon, *Cyn.*, 7. 5, and see Perpillou (below n. 45), 211); for the alternation see Arcado-Cypriot *ἱερής* vs. *ἱερεύς*. More plausibly perhaps we could think of a vocative of the *koine* equivalent of the masculine \*Υλας, which is not frequent but is attested (Bechtel, *HP*, 577). A feminine Υλη is very rare (Pape-Benseler s.v.; *LGN* IIIA s.v.) and I have found no evidence for a Υλα form. The conclusion is that the interpretation of Te Riele's text is not clear, nor is it clear why the name appears with a final -η; in any case we are not in a position to say that, in this instance, an Arcadian *ᾱ*-name has acquired a *koine* -η.

<sup>24</sup> Quoted by A.K. Orlandos in *Praktika* 1929, 92; no epigraphical information is provided about the size of the monument, the lettering, etc.

<sup>25</sup> *SEG* 11, 1125.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. O. Masson, *Rev. Phil.* 58 (1984), 101 = *OGS*, 453, with the reference to F. Bechtel, *Die Attischen Frauennamen* (Göttingen, 1902), 5. The formation is certainly attested but the feminine counterpart of the -άνθη names ought to be -άνθεια, which is in fact well attested, or -ανθίς and not -άνθα or -άνθη (the -άνθος compounds seem to be late). We may wonder whether -άνθη is a secondary formation directly built on the -άνθη names, though this would not explain the two examples of -άνθα names in *LGN* IIIA.

<sup>27</sup> Though I do not have as yet any clinching evidence, I would not exclude the possibility of the reverse phenomenon: an Attic name in which -η is replaced by -α to make the name more archaic. I do in fact wonder whether Εὐάνθα is a case in point.

compound names which have Δαμ(ο)- as first element,<sup>28</sup> and some thirty-one whose second element is -δαμος. It has no instance of Δημ(ο)- or -δημος compounds, though such compounds are in fact attested in other parts of the Peloponnese, and though names like Δαμοκράτης, Δαμοξένα, Δαμόστρατος belong to our era.<sup>29</sup>

### Derived names in -ίδας

Finally, a broad-range test can be conducted on the numerous names which end in -(ι)δης in Attic–Ionic and in the *koine*, but in -ιδας elsewhere (cf. Νικίδας, etc.). *LGN* IIIA lists more than 130 Arcadian names of this type vs. only nine ending in -(ι)δης. Of these, two occur in literary sources (Ἀκεστορίδης,<sup>30</sup> Πυλάδης), one in an Egyptian papyrus (Ἡρακλείδης), and one in an Egyptian inscription where it appears in the genitive only (Ἀσκληπιάδου), so that we cannot be absolutely certain about the nominative. The remaining six (Ἀριστείδης, Διοσκουρίδης, Ἡρωίδης, Λεωνίδης, Μιλτιάδης, Σωτάδης (twice)) all belong to the second or third centuries AD. The exception is the third instance of the name Σωτάδης which is reported to appear in an Attic inscription of the first century BC or first century AD where it refers to the father of a Λυκίσκα, a woman from Alipheira. However, the name is in the genitive (Σωτάδου) and we cannot be certain of the nominative form.

### Summary: the replacement of α with η in names

A quick check of the other names (not many) which seem to have η where the dialect form would require α reveals a similar picture to that described above: most of them are only attested in literary sources, or outside Arcadia, or in very late inscriptions.<sup>31</sup> The one interesting form is Αἰσχύτης, the name of a δαμοργός from Kleitor listed in a proxeny from the fourth century (*IG* V (2) 1). It is the only name in a list of forty-nine which has an unexpected η. Hiller von Gaertringen accents Αἰσχυτῆς without an explanation; unless

<sup>28</sup> I have excluded hypocoristics like Δαμέας, Δᾶμις because I cannot entirely exclude that they belong to different roots; Δαμάτριος obviously does not belong here.

<sup>29</sup> For Δημοδίκη, attested only in literature, see above under 'ā-feminines'.

<sup>30</sup> Listed under Ἀκεστορίδης in *LGN* IIIA s.v.

<sup>31</sup> Some of the apparent exceptions have already been mentioned. In addition I can only list from *LGN* IIIA Βόηθος vs. Βοάθοος (once in the imperial period, once in *IG* V (2) 190, a restored text from the second–first century BC with only this name); Δημήτριος, once in the imperial period and once in a third–second-century text (*SEG* 39, 391), Νικηφόρος, once in the imperial period and once in the second–first century BC in a single-word text (*IG* V (2) 197).

it is a misprint he may have thought of a contraction of *-έας* (otherwise not found in Arcadian). However, the name is found in Euboea and in Attica (I know of no evidence for *Ἀσχύτας*) and it is conceivable that the future demiourgos was given an Attic name. It is not conceivable that the names were automatically adapted to the *koine* since none of the others is.

To put it more succinctly, Arcadia did not, before the second and third centuries AD, i.e. a few centuries after the introduction of the *koine*, modify its names to fit with the prevailing linguistic forms. A good demonstration of the phenomenon comes from *IG V* (2) 11, a proxeny decree for a Thessalian written in spotless *koine* in the second part of the third century BC. The first line has *θεός τύχη* and the last *ἱερεὺς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς*. Yet the list of *στρατηγοί* (sic) at the end has standard Arcadian names in the standard Arcadian forms; *Εὐδοξίδας* is not replaced by *Εὐδοξίδης*. In other words, the names are not adapted to the *koine*, nor is the title of the magistrates, but everything else is. Even more striking is the earlier proxeny *IG V* (2) 1 to which we have already referred. The proxeny is for an Athenian; it dates from 369–361 and is written once again in good Attic, but the last line of the decree before the list of magistrates is: *δαμιοργοὶ οἶδε ᾗσαν*. As in the later text the magistrates' title is in the local form even if the verb is not. The names, as we have seen, are not in the Attic form (with the possible exception mentioned) and one of them still preserves a digamma. In other words, personal names and titles of magistrates in the fourth and third centuries are preserved in the original form even when the dialect gives way to Attic or the *koine*; in some sense, then, in Arcadia personal names and titles have the same 'technical' status.

### *Syllabic script vs. alphabetic writing in Cyprus*

We may well think that this tendency to preserve the original forms of names is normal, but the region which is linguistically close to Arcadia, Cyprus, does not support this view. There we have texts both in the local syllabic script and in the Greek alphabet. The former are regularly in the local dialect, the latter almost exclusively in the *koine*. Thus, in an honorific inscription dated by the editor to c. 190 BC,<sup>32</sup> where it would be conceivable to have traces at least of the epichoric dialect, we have instead:

Φιλῖνος καὶ Μέντωρ καὶ Ὀνήσιλος  
Μέντορα τὸν ἑαυτῶν πατέρα  
Ἀπόλλωνι ν ν Υλάτη

By contrast the epichoric forms of both the name (Onāsilos) and the god's epitheton (Hylatās) are preserved in the syllabic inscriptions.<sup>33</sup>

The use of *koine* forms is not limited to second-century texts; in the alphabetic part of one of the rare digraphic and bilingual syllabic inscriptions from fourth-century Amathous we find: *Ἡ πόλις ἡ Ἀμαθουσίων Ἀρίστωνα Ἀριστῶνακτος εὐπατρίδην*.<sup>34</sup> But the most striking texts are the digraphic dedications from Kafizin. These are on pots offered by artisans to the Nymphaeum of Kafizin in east Cyprus at the end of the third century BC.<sup>35</sup> We have sixty-six syllabic texts and two hundred alphabetic texts including some thirty-two digraphic texts. Once again the alphabetic texts are all in *koine*, the syllabic texts in the local dialect with clear *koine* influence. However, as far as the clearest marker of the *koine* is concerned, viz. the presence of *η* where the local dialect would have [ā], the two forms of writing are internally consistent: the syllabic texts have only *-a-* and the alphabetic texts have only *η* or the *ε* with which occasionally it alternates. This applies to all words concerned, including gods' names and personal names. The dedications are made to *nu-pa-i* or *nu-mu-pa-i* in the syllabic script but to *Νύμφη(ι)* (once *Νύμφει*) in the alphabetic. The recurrent name of the *δεκατηφόρος* / *δεκατεφόρος* or *te-ka-ta-po-ro-se* is *Ὀνησαγόρας* in the alphabetic but *o-na-sa-ko-ra-se* or *o-na-a-ko-ra-se* in the syllabic script. After Kafizin the syllabic script disappears and the alphabetic forms with *η* take over. The contrast with Arcadia could not be greater.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Cf. A. Hintze, *A Lexicon to the Cyprian Syllabic Inscriptions* (Hamburg, 1993), s.vv. *o-na-si-lo-se*, *u-la-ta-i*; M. Egetmeyer, *Wörterbuch zu den Inschriften im kyprischen Syllabar* (Berlin, 1992), s. vv. *o-na-si-lo*, etc.; *u-la-ta-i*, etc.

<sup>34</sup> Masson, *ICS*, no. 196. The syllabic text is in Eteocypriot, so that we have a difference both of language and of script.

<sup>35</sup> For the texts see T.B. Mitford, *The Nymphaeum of Kafizin. The Inscribed Pottery*, Suppl. II to *Kadmos* (Berlin and New York, 1980); O. Masson, 'A propos des inscriptions chypriotes de Kafizin', *BCH* 105 (1981), 623–49; C. Consani, *Persistenza dialettale e diffusione della KOINH a Cipro* (Pisa, 1986).

<sup>36</sup> One should note, however, that not all alphabetic names have *η* where the *koine* would have it. Below (n. 40) I refer to an alphabetic *Στασι-* vs. the expected (and more frequent) *Στησι-*; similarly, while a stem *Ὀνησι-* is frequent in the alphabetic texts, we also find (more rarely) alphabetic names which start with *Ὀνασι-*. The general rule, nevertheless, is that the syllabic script has no names with *-ē-* from *-ā-*, while the alphabetic inscriptions mostly (though not always) have *-η-* from *-ā-*.

<sup>32</sup> T.B. Mitford, *The Inscriptions of Kourion* (Philadelphia, 1971), no. 49.

### *Arcadia vs. Cyprus*

The evidence from Cyprus is not so easy to interpret, since the role of the two scripts is still imperfectly understood and the contrast is unparalleled elsewhere in Greece. Yet all the evidence which we have, and the Kafizin evidence in particular, tells us that dialect-speakers at some (late) stage had acquired a set of mental equivalences between dialect and *koine* forms, and in the written language at least they were prompted by the script used to choose one or the other member of the equation. We cannot know what happened in the spoken language. In Arcadia, however, the position is different: apparently an Arcadian writer and presumably a speaker had to decide whether the dialect or the *koine* were the preferred means of expression, but for personal names they had little choice: they preserved the original form. And yet there must have been a number of names, particularly compounds, which were wholly transparent. Anyone proficient in the *koine* would have known suitable equivalents: an Arcadian name like *Φιλόδαμος* is a transparent compound of *δᾶμος*. There are plenty of Arcadian texts in which *δῆμος*, the *koine* form, is preferred, but even so *Φιλόδαμος* keeps its *-α-* form. The data then support the view that in Arcadia personal names had a special status due to their function, and that this special status is responsible for the linguistic conservatism which we observe; at the same time it becomes clear, partly because of the contrast with Cyprus, that this special status is a cultural phenomenon which cannot be generalized from region to region.

### *The -κρέτης/-κράτης compounds in Arcadia and Cyprus*

Those who find it difficult to understand the consistency of some Cypriot spellings with *η* (*ε*) in the alphabetic texts vs. *-α-* of the syllabary may wish to argue that we are not dealing with conscious decisions, but simply with writing or spelling techniques. Just as a French-speaker knows that in the written language the plural of *homme* (and numerous other words) is written with a final *-s* (*hommes*) even if this is not pronounced, or just as non-native speakers of English are taught to write the singular *man* differently from the plural *men* even if often they cannot hear that they are pronounced differently, so a Cypriot may have been taught to write *da-mo* in the syllabic script and *δῆμος* in the alphabet, without necessarily pronouncing the two vowels differently. The suggestion is counter-intuitive (largely because of the alternations *η/ε* in the alphabetic forms), but in any case all doubts are dispelled

by the analysis of other instances of differing alphabetic and syllabic texts for which a similar explanation based on spelling is not possible.

In the early Arcadian and Cypriot inscriptions (as well as in the Lesbian inscriptions) the standard Greek compound names of the Socrates type appear with a second element *-κρέτης* instead of *-κράτης*. This is the older form of these compounds; cf., for example, the numerous Homeric compounds in *-πενθής* (*πολυπενθής*, etc.) next to the unique *αἰνοπαθής*, which exemplifies the pattern which will dominate later.<sup>37</sup> In both Arcadian and Cypriot we tend to find *-κρέτης* in the earlier texts, while the late texts tend to have *-κράτης*. Yet we are not necessarily dealing here with an intrusion of the *koine*. The process through which *-κρέτης* is replaced by *-κράτης*, and the noun *κρέτος* (attested in Alcaeus) is replaced by *κράτος*, may well have happened independently in the various dialects; the model is provided by adjectives like *κρατύς*, *κρατερός* where the *-α-* vocalism is expected. The distribution of *-κρέτης/-κράτης* in personal names is nevertheless interesting. *LCPNI* lists for Cyprus twenty-six different *-κράτης* names, including *Κράτης* (which is presumably a back-formation from the compounds), and eleven different *-κρέτης* names; new readings etc. bring the number of *-κρέτης* names to fourteen or even fifteen.<sup>38</sup> In Arcadia there are twenty-nine different *-κράτης* names vs. fifteen different *-κρέτης* names. The former are distributed through all periods, the latter start in the fifth century but do not go beyond the hellenistic period. Dr Torsten Meißner has pointed out to me that in *IG V* (2) 38, a long third-century Tegean catalogue of citizens and metics, the two metics with this type of name have *-κράτης* names (*Σωσικράτης* and *Δεξικράτης*) while two of the eponymous priests and one citizen have *-κρέτης* names (*Σωκρέτης*, *Τιμοκρέτης*, *Εὐρυκρέτης*), and no citizen or priest has a *-κράτης* name. In other words, the *-κρέτης*

<sup>37</sup> Cf. e.g. E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1974), 78 f., 82.

<sup>38</sup> The Cypriot names in *-kretēs* are: Aristokretēs (syll.) vs. *Ἀριστοκράτης*; Menokretēs vs. Menokratēs (both syll.); Minokretēs (syll.); Onāsikretēs (syll.) vs. *Ὀνησικρέτης* (o-na- si-ka| in *ICS*, no. 246, 3 could be Onāsikratēs but also Onāsikharis); Pasikretēs (syll.) vs. *Πασικράτης*; Philokretēs (syll.) vs. *Φιλοκράτης*; Sōkretēs (syll.) vs. *Σωκράτης*; Stāsikretēs (syll.) vs. Stāsikratēs (x2, syll.), *Στασικράτης*, *Στησικρέτης*; Timokretēs (syll.) vs. *Τιμοκρέτης*; Timukretēs (syll.); Zōwokretēs (syll.). The names in question are fewer if we identify Menokretēs with Minokretēs and Timokretēs with Timukretēs (all of them written in the syllabic script). Additional names to those listed in *LCPNI* are the somewhat fragmentary Kuprokretēs and Wikretēs from syllabic texts of Golgoi (Masson, *Kadmos* 18 (1989), 159, 162), the compound *Itokretēs* (perhaps Pnutokretēs) from Abydos (Masson, *ICS*, no. 409), and the fragmentary genitive *k|reteas*, also syllabic, from early Kouklia (*KOUKLIA*, no. 1).



names are likely to be the traditional ones and there may be, though so far this has not been demonstrated, a social class distinction between -κρέτης and -κράτης names. The latter eventually prevail.

In Cyprus, however, there is a further distinction: the syllabic texts have a clear preference for -kretēs but also have some examples of -kratēs (Menokratēs and Stāsikratēs), while the alphabetic texts have no examples of -kretēs at all.<sup>39</sup> Here we cannot explain the presence of -κράτης in the alphabetic texts as due to purely graphic factors (the Cypriots pronounced [kretēs] but learned to write -κράτης in the alphabet), since the syllabic texts make it clear that all Cypriots must have known both, for instance Stasikretēs and Stasikratēs, and that the syllabary could indicate the difference. It looks as if, once again, the Cypriots simply adopted for the alphabetic texts the *koine* form of their names.<sup>40</sup>

### Arcadian vs. Cypriot attitudes and their explanation

In contrasting the Arcadian and the Cypriot attitude, one may well ask whether the difference is partly the result of the different ethnic situations in Arcadia and in Cyprus: on the one hand, a fundamentally homogeneous linguistic area and on the other, an island where at least three different and non-mutually intelligible languages were spoken—Greek (both as Cypriot and as *koine* at a later stage), Phoenician and Eteocypriot. Onomastic adaptation from one language to the other is documented for both Phoenician and Eteocypriot and is indeed what we would expect.<sup>41</sup> The extension of the same principle to the local dialect and the *koine* should not be surprising.

<sup>39</sup> There is, however, a feminine Κρετώ (the daughter of a Κλέων) at the end of the third century BC (LGPNI s.v.).

<sup>40</sup> An interesting case is that of the syllabic name Stasikretēs, which is also written in the syllabary as Stasikratēs, while in the alphabet it has the forms Στασικράτης and Στσηικρέτης. The form with η in the first syllable is expected in the alphabetic writing while the preservation of ā in Στᾱσικράτης is unexpected, but not unparalleled, in the word-stem (as contrasted with the ending).

<sup>41</sup> For Phoenician cf. e.g. ICS, nos 215–16 from fourth-century Tamassos, where the Phoenician names mnḥm bn bnhḏs and 'bdssm are rendered with *ma-na-se-se o-no-me-ni-o-ne* and *a-pa-so-so-mo-se*, i.e. *Mnasēs ho Nōsmeniōn Apsasōmos* respectively. Mnasēs' father carries a Greek name which is obviously a calque from the Phoenician. Masson thought that *Mnasēs* was a second name (Greek in origin) carried by *mnḥm*, but other interpretations would be possible. For Eteocypriot cf. e.g. ICS, no. 196 from Amathous (fourth century), where the Greek Ἀρίστων Ἀριστώνακτος corresponds to *a-ri-si-to-no-se a-ra-to-wa-na-ka-so-ko-o-se*, and see Masson's commentary.

### Continuity and discontinuity in personal names

Both in the title of this paper and in parts of what precedes reference is made to linguistic continuity as shown by onomastics or, more specifically, by personal names. The fact that place-names survive changes in culture and even language is well documented; for personal names the position is somewhat different, but the evidence adduced ought to demonstrate that, owing to the way in which they are transmitted, personal names may show a higher level of formal continuity than other elements of the lexicon. In what follows I would like to return to some work which I have done in recent years about Arcadian and Mycenaean names and to consider, first, an example of discontinuity and second, an example of apparent discontinuity which in fact turns out to provide evidence for structural continuity.<sup>42</sup>

#### The εὐς-names

We associate names like Ὀδυσσεύς, Ἀχιλλεύς etc. with epic language and with heroic personalities: there are some fifty such names in Homer. Yet names of this type play a very limited, practically non-existent role in Greek onomastics. Thus, to give some figures, of the 8,306 different names listed in LGPNII (Attica) only sixty-nine (i.e. 0.83 %) end in -εὐς, in LGPNI 0.69 % (ninety-eight out of 14,150), and in LGPN IIIA 0.77 % (eighty-one out of 10,423).<sup>43</sup> In Arcadia, to come down to lower figures, five names out of 1,880 (i.e. 0.26%) end in -εὐς. If, instead of looking at different names, we look at different individuals who have an εὐς-name, the picture is not very different; in Attica, out of 62,360 individuals whose name we know, some 236 (i.e. 0.38 %) have an εὐς-name. An obvious reaction is to treat the Homeric names as purely poetic invention and to assume that Greek parents did not like poetic names, but this is no longer possible after the decipherment of Linear B. In Mycenaean there are at least 130 different *eus*-names out of c. 1,800 names, i.e. 7.26 %. These are names of real individuals, not heroes and not gods. It follows that from this point of view the onomastics of epic language matches to a certain extent that of Mycenaean, but the later language is different.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Cf. A. Morpurgo Davies, 'The Morphology of Personal Names in Mycenaean and Greek' (above n. 20).

<sup>43</sup> Note that Ἀλεξεύς quoted in LGPN IIIA is a *vox nullius* and must be read Δεξεύς; see below n. 50.

<sup>44</sup> For part at least of its evidence. Perpillou, *Les substantifs grec en -εὐς*, e.g. at 223 f. is aware of the scarcity of the post-Mycenaean data, but without the volumes of LGPN, the contrast between Mycenaean and alphabetic documentation was not quantifiable.

There is discontinuity here and we would like to know what prompted it. It cannot be due to phonological or morphological considerations because, for instance, ethnics in *-εύς* and common nouns in *-εύς* survive and to a certain extent multiply.<sup>45</sup> Heroic epic names may have been avoided, but it would have been possible to create new names to compensate for this gap.<sup>46</sup> Why this did not happen – or did not happen frequently enough – remains mysterious.

### *Hypocoristics in -σεύς*

In spite of the gap mentioned above, there are some other forms of continuity which involve *εύς*-names. One of the functions which *-eus* has in Mycenaean is that of creating hypocoristics from personal names built on compounds of the so-called *τερψίμβροτος*-type. A name like Mycenaean *a-re-ke-se-u*, i.e. Alexeus, is in all likelihood an abbreviated form of names like *Ἀλέξανδρος*, *Ἀλεξίμαχος*, etc.<sup>47</sup> Similar formations are *de-ke-se-u*: Dexeus, *ka-ri-se-u*: Khariseus, *o-na-se-u*: Onaseus, *pa-ra-ke-se-we* (dative): Praxeus.<sup>48</sup> The type in general has disappeared from Greek, but there are isolated survivals, as pointed out by Masson:<sup>49</sup> *Μνησεύς* occurs in Plato and twice in inscriptions, once in Chios and once in Chalcis; *Δεξεύς* occurs once, or possibly twice, at Argos.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>45</sup> The standard work of reference is J.L. Perpillou, *Les substantifs grecs en -εύς* (Paris, 1973). The productivity of the suffix increases in the classical and immediately post-classical periods but seems to diminish in our era.

<sup>46</sup> In the late imperial period some of the heroic names become fashionable again: the twenty-seven Athenians called *Θησεύς* all belong to the second or third century AD, as do the ten called *Νηρεύς* and the five called *Περσεύς*. Similarly, in the three volumes of *LGNP* published so far the attestations for *Ἀχιλλεύς* are mostly very late.

<sup>47</sup> *a-re-ka-sa-da-ra*, i.e. *Ἀλέξανδρα*, is actually attested in Mycenaean.

<sup>48</sup> Note that strictly speaking forms like *Ἀλέξανδρος*, *Ἀλέξιππος*, *Ἀλεξίμαχος*, etc., which lie behind (are at the origin of) hypocoristics like *Ἀλεξεύς* or *Ἀλεξίς*, do not count as *τερψίμβροτος*-compounds since they are built on the stem of *ἀλέξω*. A similar formation is probably that of Mycenaean *a-we-ke-se-u*, which is normally understood as Awekseus and compared with Homeric *ἀ(φ)έξω* and Attic *αὔξω*, *αὔξάνω*. Mycenaean has a large number of names ending in *-se-u* (listed by Perpillou, 222 f.) but it is far from clear that they are all abbreviated forms of compounds. For the names quoted above we may refer to compounds such as *Δέξανδρος*, *Δεξίμαχος*, *Δεξικράτης*, etc. or *Ὀνάσανδρος*, *Ὀνασικράτης*, *Ὀνασικλῆς*, etc., or *Πραξαγόρας*, *Πραξίδαμος*, *Πραξιτέλης*, etc.

<sup>49</sup> *SMEA* 2 (1967), 36 ff. = *OCS*, 106 ff.; cf. also Perpillou, 223 f.

<sup>50</sup> Masson, loc. cit., 37 = *OCS*, 107 points out that the Argive fourth-century inscription (*CEG* 2, 816), where the editor read *Ἀλεξεύς*, in fact has the name *Δεξεύς*. *Ἀλεξεύς* should therefore be removed from *LGNP* IIIA. *LGNP* IIIA also mentions an unpublished instance of *Δεξεύς*, also from Argos.

The more normal hypocoristics from this type of compounds are *i*-stems like *Ἀλεξίς*, *Δέξίς*, *Ὀνασίς*, *Ζεῦξίς*, etc., a type unknown to Mycenaean. Arcadian is rich in hypocoristics which end in *-ίς* (*Ἀρετίς* father of *Ἀρετακλῆς*, *Εὔθις* vs. e.g. *Εὐθύδαμος*, *Εὐθυκλῆς*, etc.) but has no *-ίς* forms nor, as we have seen, *-σεύς* forms. This does not exclude the presence of hypocoristics; there are no less than three suffixes which are exploited for this purpose: *-ίων*, *-ίας* and *-έας*. Thus, in correspondence with *Μνασίλαος*, *Μνασίδαμος*, *Μνασίστρατος*, *Μνασιτέλης* Arcadian does not have *Μνᾶσις*, but has *Μνασίων*, *Μνασίας* and *Μνασέας* (cf. *LGNP* IIIA s.vv.). If we add up all the instances, the following list gives an idea of the frequency of different names formed in this way:

*-σίας/-ξίας*: twenty different hypocoristics (e.g. *Ἀγασίας*, *Ἀλεξίας*, *Δεξίας*, *Πραξίας*, *Μνασίας*, *Πασίας*, *Πανσίας*);

*-σίων/-ξίων*: ten different hypocoristics (e.g. *Ἀλεξίων*, *Πραξίων*, *Μνασίων*, *Πανσίων*);

*-σέας* (no *-ξέας*): six different hypocoristics (*Ἀγασέας*, *Γνωσέας*, *Θρασέας*, *Μνασέας*, *Μοισέας*, *Πασέας*).<sup>51</sup>

Once again Mycenaean *Alexeus*, *Praxeus*, *Dexeus* should be compared with *Ἀλεξίας*, *Πραξίας*, *Δεξίας*.

There is no clear evidence that allows us to establish whether the three hypocoristic types arose at different times. It would be possible to suggest that *-ίας* is derived from *-έας*, since in Arcadian [e] is often raised before a central vowel, but this too cannot be certain and the two suffixes may have a separate origin. One could also assume that the least frequent suffix is perhaps the one on its way out and consequently the oldest. If so, we may wish to argue that in Arcadian *-έας* replaced the *-εύς* suffix which was used in Mycenaean to form hypocoristics from *τερψίμβροτος*-compounds. This is speculation. Further speculation might remind us of the existence of an *-e-wa* suffix in Mycenaean which could count as the antecedent of *-έας* and

<sup>51</sup> Note that not all these names are strictly speaking hypocoristics of *τερψίμβροτος*-compounds, which have a verbal first element. I suspect, however, that synchronically all compounds with internal *-σι/-ξι-* before the second element were treated in the same way from the point of view of word-formation. Hence all compounds which began with *Πασι-* or *Θρασι-* (like *Πάσιππος* or *Θράσιππος*) behaved in the same way as e.g. *Παύσιππος* or *Μνάσιππος*. One name may not belong here, *Μοισέας* of Thelphousa, where the root points to a literary form of the word; see Masson, *REG* 94 (1981), 543 = *OCS*, 390.



might plausibly be taken as a derivative of *-εύς*. One small bit of evidence may support a link between the two suffixes. Pausanias (6. 11. 4) refers to a *Δρομεύς* from Mantinea who was Olympic victor in 480 BC; about the same period one of the oldest Mantinean inscriptions, concerning a crime in the temple (*IG V* (2) 262), refers to a *Δρομέας*. Could this be the same name or even the same person?<sup>52</sup>

Whatever the answer, it looks as if Arcadia created hypocoristics from *τερψίμβροτος*-compounds or their equivalents in a way which avoids the usual *-σις* termination and exploits instead *-έας*, *-ίας*, *-ίων*. The crucial point is that Arcadian, like Mycenaean, treats these compounds somewhat differently from the others and uses a special suffix to form their hypocoristics. Cypriot, on the other hand, has a name like *Όνασις* which is clearly based on compounds of the *Όνασίκυπρος* type. From this point of view we find, once again, conservatism in Arcadia and innovation in Cyprus.

## Conclusions

Linguistic conservatism and cultural or institutional or political conservatism do not always go hand in hand. Much depends on what attitude the members of a specific group take to their own language, and on how much they are aware of linguistic facts. Onomastics creates further difficulties; it is conceivable that speakers who take a cavalier, non-purist attitude to their language are nevertheless conservative in their onomastics—or, of course, vice versa. A rapid semantic shift in the lexicon is often a sign of rapid cultural change, but this may happen without any clear impact on personal names. On the other hand, a change in personal names also indicates substantial cultural change, though not necessarily of the same nature. The decision to preserve or abandon one's own family names or their traditional form is normally deliberate and is significant. That the Arcadians started to write in *koine* but did not choose to alter the title of their magistrates or the form of their personal names is important for an understanding of how the

Arcadians saw themselves; the different choice made by the Cypriots, who linked the form of their personal names, like that of other lexical items, to the script in which they were writing, is equally significant and requires interpretation.

The linguist who investigates these matters cannot be given a simple set of instructions, but must observe and interpret each case in its own terms, remembering that a purely linguistic approach may not be sufficient. Thanks to the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* we now begin to have the basic data for a study which can both go deep and range widely; it is our good fortune that we can witness, and perhaps participate in, the opening of a new field of enquiry.

<sup>52</sup> The origin of *-έας* is far from clear, partly because we do not know if we can or cannot take it back to an *[-ēās]* form, with a long *e*-vowel which would then speak for a straight derivation from the *eu*-stems where the *e*-vowel was originally long (cf. Homeric *βασιλῆος*, etc.). The fact that we know of a third-century Arcadian called *Θηρηάς* (*FD III* (1) 83,14) with a name which may match exactly the Mycenaean name *qe-re-wa*, may or may not be significant.