

times). At times, Abbadi's interpretation and Marcato's interpretation differ significantly: where Abbadi reads *qdm'hw[by]* ('Er geht seinen Brüdern voran,' and two other close alternatives), Marcato reads *sr'n* ('flat-nosed,' from the plene spelling of the Syriac *srāmā* [91]); other times, the differences are minor yet impact the meaning of the name nevertheless. Five sections display data for easy reference, whether starting from Marcato's text or Abbadi's text.

Marcato should be commended for eloquently updating Abbadi's work, adding new names to the corpus, expanding on onomastic issues, referring to the latest West Semitic onomastic research, and publishing the results in an open access series. This volume concisely summarizes all attestations of Hatran personal names in terse entries that prove accessible to English readers who may not otherwise read the many languages necessary to explore the personal names from Hatra. Because the entries are presented in transliteration, only a knowledge of Aramaic alphabetic order is necessary to navigate the catalogue. Of course, the pronunciation of these ancient names is not typically indicated as their vocalization is not necessarily preserved in the otherwise consonantal texts. I would thoroughly recommend this volume to both onomasticians studying Semitic languages and those studying personal names that appear in the corpora of multi-cultural communities. In terms of its function as an onomastic reference volume, Marcato's work serves as an excellent example of a technical, yet accessible, onomastic resource of a well-defined corpus and people of a specific geographic locale.

Boston University

BRANDON SIMONSON



Changing Names: Tradition and Innovation in Ancient Greek Onomastics. Proceedings of the British Academy, 222. Edited by ROBERT PARKER. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2019. Pp. 289. \$105. ISBN 978-0-19-726654-0.

J. S. Mill was very helpful in noting that we use names to refer to individuals within a class of things, which is to say that names do not refer to the attributes that define a category. However, we need to recognize that the linguistic structures of names do have significance. A common linguistic structure of names is a combination of specific and generic elements, such as a given name and family name, or maybe a given name and a habitation, or maybe an occupation. The elements may also be varied in their order, as in place names we find *Hudson Bay* and *Lake Michigan*, and the elements are sometimes singular, as in *Denali* or the hypocorisms among personal names.

Our interests in personal names, scholarly as well as popular, often focus on the variable meanings and fashions of names, but the patterns of structure in large numbers of names, as this book demonstrates, can show in a tangible way the shifting values within cultures, the effects of inter-cultural contacts, and the chronology of cultural changes. These are important issues for historians, anthropologists, linguists, and many others, and this book makes a substantial contribution to onomastic studies and to our historical understanding of antiquity by tracing the structural as well as some semantic changes in Greek personal names from early Mycenaean times to the time of Justinian (527–565 CE).

This book has a very useful introduction by the esteemed editor, Robert Parker, followed by eleven essays by distinguished scholars that describe changes in different geographical areas and through overlapping historical periods. All of the essays rely heavily on the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, which is a continuing compilation of ancient Greek personal names (including non-Greek names recorded in Greek, and Greek names in Latin), drawn from all available sources (literature, inscriptions, graffiti, papyri, coins,

vases, and other artifacts). The *LGN* is headquartered in Oxford and funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the British Academy, and the Academy of Athens. This particular book is the fifth volume published so far analyzing the accumulating data, and a sixth will be ready soon. The *LGN* is available online and provides a solid empirical basis for the study of Greek names, a type of study that cannot be replicated for current names because of the vastness of accumulating data and its continuing changes. An understanding of Greek is very helpful in understanding these essays but not essential.

Even though historical data are fixed to a time, this book is not an exhaustive survey because it does not focus on any one area or any single period of time. The different essays describe how Greek naming changed in salient ways, especially in terms of their linguistic structure, in different areas and through selective periods of time. The result is a series of intelligent illustrations of cultural changes giving the reader a general sense of the legacy that arose from the Greek language. The following paragraphs are brief summaries of these eleven essays.

The Greek legacy began with the Mycenaean culture that flourished during the late Bronze Age (c. 1600–1100 BCE). It was centered on the mainland of Greece but was strongly influenced by the Minoan culture on Crete. The Mycenaeans borrowed their script from the Minoans, and the main sources of names are the brick tablets recovered amid the ruins of Pylos and a few other sites. As described by Torsten Meissner in the first of the essays, fourteen signs of the Linear B script have not been deciphered, which makes precise distinctions of form and meaning difficult. For example, it is sometimes hard to tell when one name might refer to two people, or when two names might refer to one person. The tablets clearly refer to commercial transactions, but the apparent names do not make the administrative organization clear. The simple distinction “between an agent noun/name of a profession and a personal name is blurred” (29). There appear to be almost 2,000 names in the Linear B tablets, of which 1760 are male and 170 female, but the use of the Minoan script makes it difficult to identify the names that are distinctly Greek rather than typically Minoan. Meissner concludes “that there is a clear case for treating Mycenaean apart from 1st-millennium Greek” (46). It is certainly clear that the Greek legacy stems from the much later invention of the Greek alphabet (probably for the recording of Homer’s poetry about 750 BCE or later) that mothered Greek thought and the development of other alphabets throughout the world.

Subsequent essays are better able to identify the linguistic patterns of typical Greek names because etymologies can be traced through the Greek alphabet. It is easier therefore to describe the types of changes over time and the amount of inter-cultural contacts and exchanges in other times and areas. In the second of these essays, Miltiades Hatzopoulos shows how two cities in Macedonia, Aigeai and Pella, make good examples. Following the conquests of Philip II and Alexander, the Macedonians forcefully spread Greek culture to other areas of the known world. As a result, Macedonia became a mix of natives, foreigners who had moved in, and Macedonians who returned from abroad with new habits as well as treasures. After Roman armies plundered the cities of Aigeai and Pella, epigraphs remained as records of a diverse culture marked by a variety of name types. Hatzopoulos includes extensive lists of epichoric, panhellenic, foreign, and a few unclassifiable names.

Denis Knoepfler pursues a much different strategy in analyzing the names in Boeotia, and especially Thespiiai. He includes only “the citizen population” and excludes “metics and slaves (to say nothing of women, whose names will unfortunately be seldom mentioned, since female names are the exception in the majority of surviving lists)” (73). He focuses more narrowly than the other essays on changes within one distinctive ethnic group over four long periods of time, i.e., Classical, 5th-4th C. BCE; Hellenistic, 330–170; Late Hellenistic to the Principate of Augustus; and Empire to the “Crisis of the Third

Century” (95). Knoepfler uses many examples from lists of military recruits and describes the names of the early period as typical of the region, such as specific theophoric names, a paucity of references to horses (“the element *hippos*”), and “the introduction of the patronym alongside the individual’s name” (75, 77). During the “High Hellenistic Period,” Boeotia prospered, its army grew stronger, and the patronymic element added to names shifted within a mere twenty years from an adjective form to the “systematic use of the genitive” (78, 79). This shift parallels both “a reform of the Boeotian army” and increasing emphasis on lineal descent (80). Knoepfler hesitates to give a definite reason for such a swift shift, but it suggests the rising importance of male lineage in family structure. He also points to a decline of structures in the names of later Boeotian periods, e.g., the use of hypocorisms and “an accelerated banalisation” (90). As in other Greek areas, the last period of Boeotian onomastics shows more “openness to the linguistic fashions of the day and the influence of the Roman environment,” such as Latin suffixes (e.g., *-ianus*) attached to Greek roots (99).

The fourth essay differs in yet another way from the other essays by not describing changes in linguistic structures but instead by analyzing the meanings of names, specifically of satyr names found mainly in “the minute inscriptions written beside the figures” on Attic vases, numbering about 120 (100). Jaime Curbera argues that such names should *not* be viewed as “purely mythical or artistic interpretation” but as reflections of traditional folk customs (100). The names are lexically descriptive and “good for shouting out in the midst of a crowd” (101). Thus, the images on the vases were *not* just decorative but depictions of civic festivals in which mummers interacted with and taunted the crowd. Many of these satyr names are metonymic references, perhaps to recognizable people, and most do not describe the images that are actually represented on the vases. They are “short (usually two-syllable) and sonorous” words that refer to an audience that was itself “busy with dance, masks, music, wine, and sex” (103, 105). The second half of Cabrera’s essay analyzes 36 of these names in detail. These analyses are individually interesting, but any interpretation of these names is limited by our inability to really know the local context and the possible ironies in the references of any of these names.

In the fifth essay, Thomas Corsten describes three types of changes made to the names of individuals throughout the ancient world: “(1) those of slaves (‘passive’); (2) cases of a change in status and, in connection with this ... ‘individual Hellenisation’ and ‘individual Romanisation’ (‘active’); and (3) other name changes of free-born people (139).” When slaves were sold, their new owners generally changed those names to suit their own convenience. Often the new name simply designated the ethnic origin of the slave, unless the owner bought slaves from the same region. Of course, some names described assigned tasks, but stories of whimsical naming abound, such as the naming of slaves by the letters of the alphabet so that the owner’s child would learn the alphabet more readily. When freed, a slave would usually assume a name typical of the dominant social environment. By contrast, free-born people generally did not abandon their original names but added to them by using a nickname, translating one’s name into Greek, adding a Greek name for transactional convenience, or adding Latin elements when becoming a Roman citizen. The exceptions, few in number, came among gladiators and hetaerae and were analogous to modern stage names adopted by individuals for a desired public image. Usually they were lexically descriptive and very clear. Corsten chooses to sidestep three famous classical examples, *Stesichorus*, *Plato*, and *Theophrastus*, which ancient sources say are not names “received from their parents,” as the editor notes in his Introduction, and have been long in debate by scholars (4).

Another much debated name, *Demokrates*, is the sole subject of the sixth essay. It was found on “a surviving funeral *stele* ... [for] an Athenian citizen” born about 460 BCE (153). Aeschylus’s plays and particularly his trilogy, the *Oresteia* (first performed in 458 BCE), are generally interpreted as praising the democratic forms of government invented

in Athens, especially its replacement of retributive justice with civic justice. The *Oresteia* won first prize in the Dionysian Festival, and later playwrights, i.e., Sophocles and Euripides, often refer to it when critiquing Athenian society. Thus, as Stephen Lambert notes, some scholars, specifically M. H. Hansen, have argued that this name “is one of our earliest pieces of positive evidence, perhaps even the earliest, for the language of ‘democracy’” (154). However, Lambert argues that both of the two elements of the name, *Demo* and *Krates*, are interchangeable with other elements and that together the reference can be ambiguous, i.e., to “‘possess power *over, through, [or] among* the people” (165). Lambert concludes that we cannot know the meaning of the name because we cannot know motive of the name giver nor the many ways in which the name might have been interpreted by other Athenians. Obviously, it is a bit easier to know the linguistic structures of names than to know their meanings.

Greek naming patterns affected naming patterns in regions far and wide and were in turn affected by the cultures in those other regions. A good illustration, described by Dan Dana, is in the general region of Thrace, a large and diverse area to the north that was predominantly a dialectical area of Greek. The Hellenistic period shows the influence of southern Greeks in the suffixation added to names, especially to hypocorisms. Later, the Roman domination is shown in similar additions. However, Thracian effects are also seen in the names of their southern neighbors. There is a sharing of theophoric names, and Thracian myth became popular throughout the Greek world, especially the story of Orpheus.

Additional cultural interaction can be seen just across the Dardanelles in Asia Minor. Christof Schuler describes four layers of Lycian onomastics – indigenous, Persian, Greek, and Roman. The first stage is actually theoretical because “we find a few Greek names almost from the start” (199). Also, Persian names were always small in number, and even during Greek dominance, “some Lycian families adopted Persian names within an atmosphere of general interest in both Persian and Greek culture” (203). The Greek dominance begins to be clear by 200 BCE, and the dominance is much more clear among men than women, a distinction which likely indicates “that politically active men would have felt a greater need or pressure to carry a Greek name” (206). Equally interesting is the fact that the names of women are known because of their positions as priestesses, “as owners of tombs, or as initiators of honorary monuments of their male relatives” (206–207). The Roman influence is shown by the use of “sprechende Namen,” mainly for slaves, the addition of Latin names, and the avoidance of indigenous names by priests of the imperial cult. Indigenous names declined steadily, but the frequency of Greek forms declined very little. Schuler concludes that Lycian names reflect a culture that was relatively flexible and adaptive.

The interaction of the Greek and Roman cultures is well represented in the Greek naming patterns from 200 BCE to 200 CE. Most of the data, as described by Jean-Sébastien Balzat, come from the remaining epigraphy of the cultures, but after Sulla’s devastation of Athens in 86 BCE, Greek epigraphy declined sharply, and so the data come more from tribal lists and catalogs of epebes (young inductees to citizenship) and demotics (commoners). The interaction of the cultures is shown mainly in how the Greeks began to add Latin forms to signal status, especially after Caesar began granting citizenship to civic elites, but also how Roman immigrants sometimes adopted Greek forms. In fact, the word *Atticus*, referring to the area around Athens, became used by Romans as a reference to ‘excellence.’ Greek traditions remained strong, but Roman citizenship drove onomastic changes even as the Romans emulated the Greeks in limited ways. In 212 CE, Caracalla granted citizenship to all free people, and new Greco-Roman naming practices spread throughout the empire.

In the tenth essay, Athanasios Rizakis describes important cultural values reflected in the changes in Greco-Roman onomastics. Specifically, Greek names expressed

individuality more than the Roman names, which emphasized the specific clan heritage. For Romans, the “*praenomen* was simply used to distinguish between individual members of a family” (238). *Cognomen* were added for further precision, but the principal identifying element was the *nomen gentilicium*. However, before Sulla sacked Athens, Romans who settled in Athens generally used only their *praenomen*, “regardless of their status” (240). Thus, we can see a shift to the Greek emphasis on individual names. After Sulla, the structure of Roman names clearly becomes more frequent in all Greek-speaking areas, but in Athens men commonly substituted their original individual names for the *cognomen* in the Roman *tria nomina*, thus maintaining their Greek identity. At the same time, Romans living in Athens “did not highlight their Roman origin” but frequently adopted Greek nicknames (251). Thus, Rizakis describes a general “onomastic homogenisation in the Mediterranean world” that was leaning toward the use of “individual Greek and Roman names” (257).

Christianity contributed significantly to the rising use of individual names in Mediterranean cultures. At the same time, the influence of the Greek language is hard to overestimate. Sylvain Destephen illustrates this change with great clarity in the cultures of Asia Minor. These cultures were first Hellenized by Macedonian conquests and were then evangelized in Greek because that language was already understood in those cultures and because the gospels were written in Greek. Destephen notes that epigraphy that was distinctly Christian arose a bit earlier in the provinces of Asia Minor with remnants of indigenous languages than in the native Greek provinces, possibly because of the previous acculturation made changes more acceptable. The types of changes are also very clear. Christian names were far less heterogeneous and more standardized than earlier naming patterns. They repeat biblical and saints’ names. The narrow range of names is illustrated by the fact that five of the female names account for half the total number of female names, and five of the male names account for 15% of that total. After the legalization of Christianity and the era of Theodosian popes (379–450 CE), the names of clergy are very well documented, the standardization of names becomes more pronounced, and names from pagan deities vanish. We find no *nomen gentilicia* or patronymics for church officials. We see “a progressive disappearance of local or regional names” and a broad globalization and simplification of naming in all the regional cultures (272). The few new names that came into use late in antiquity were mostly the names of soldier-saints. Life was full of insecurities, and “whatever their status or position” people sought protection by honoring heroes (274).

In summary, this volume illustrates the tangible utility of linguistic structure in understanding the patterns of onomastic change and the real value of onomastics in understanding cultural history.

Eastern Washington University

GRANT W. SMITH

