MORE GREEK PERSONAL NAMES

P. M. FRASER, E. MATTHEWS: A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. Volume IIIB. Central Greece from the Megarid to Thessaly. Pp. xxii + 478. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000. Cased. ISBN: 0-19-815293-0.

LGPN IIIB covers the non-Attic right hand side of mainland Greece between the ${}^{\prime\prime}T\sigma\theta\mu\sigma\sigma}$ (Thespiae, ?first century A.D.) and $Ma\kappa\epsilon\delta\sigma\nu\prime a$ (Larisa, A.D. 117). Like previous volumes, it is attractively presented (the ugly quasi-ligature of rough breathing and capital rho aside) and easy to use. The list of abbreviations omits 'ect'.—as in 'Unp. (Stählin ect.)', an unpublished Krannon text, highlighted in the introduction—but the clientele will doubtless be undisturbed, and not much turns on why $\nu\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\sigma$ and $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\dot{\nu}\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\sigma$ are abbreviated in Greek script, but $o\iota\kappa\sigma\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\sigma$ in Latin.

Readers of LGPN are used to meeting name-forms which diverge from Attic normality, and in a volume dominated by Boeotia and Thessaly they arise often: the first entry, $A\beta \alpha \epsilon \delta \delta \omega \rho o s$, is a case in point. $K\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \iota s$ is pointedly non-Attic; Άμφικτιούων, Άμφικτίων, and Άμφικτούων show it is not only modern undergraduates who have trouble with the word. (There are also names that are just plain odd, e.g. Ithoulaa, Mogea, Thiththe, Thoga.) The insertion of broad cross-references between 'ordinary' and dialect forms (e.g. ' $\Theta \epsilon_0$ - see also $\Theta \epsilon_- \Theta \epsilon_0$ - $\Theta \epsilon v - \Theta \iota o - \Theta \iota o v - \Theta o - \Theta v - i)$, envisaged in IIIA, is now a reality, though they only apply within IIIB, not across all volumes. Users doing (too) hasty a sweep in search of a particular name have always risked missing pertinent entries-and even now they will not necessarily be directly alerted; nothing adjacent to $\Theta\epsilon \delta \mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \sigma s$ (p. 192) reminds one that $\Theta_{i\delta\mu\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\sigma\sigma}$ (p. 199) is relevant, since the cross-reference above appears on p. 188, and succinct categorization of dialect differences appears on pp. vii-viii. To include cross-references in every individual entry would, of course, be unrealistic: the optimistic computer-barely-literate may fantasize that a proper search function in some future electronic version will crack the problem effortlessly, but for now one must simply be vigilant: it is not true that three fourth-century Phocian mercenary-generals (Philomelos, Phalaikos, and Phayllos) are included but the fourth is not: he is simply masquerading as ' $O\nu \psi\mu a\rho \chi os$.

The introduction reports that 43,454 individuals are included, and there are 1,631 Megarian, 16,793 Boeotian, 7,180 Delphic, and 13,155 Thessalian entries. One is left wondering how the other regions of central Greece share the remaining 4,695 entries—quite a large figure for what is apt to be seen as a Cinderella region. Another curious fact is that IIIB contains 193 more individuals than IIIA but 1,715 fewer females. (A promise of more statistics at www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk [p. x] is currently unfulfilled.) Geographical arrangement is not a perfect fit: Megara appears here, but a full impression of Megarian onomastics requires data from her northern colonies that will only be available in LGPN IV—a happy event which is closer now than it would have been had this review had been submitted on time.

The delay is due neither to tests of completeness (a chimera: material accumulates continuously, and the volume was incomplete when printed) nor substantive investigations: I have no rabbits to pull from the onomatological hat, just some random frivolities—enough to prove I have not merely taken it on trust (as one plainly could) that it is another stage in the construction of one of the great monuments of exact scholarship.

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

Casual number-crunching reveals regional variations in onomastic habit: among the top sixty commonest names in IIIB, Amyntas, Antigenes, Arkhelaos, Asandros, Kaphisias, Kaphisodoros, Menes, Mnason, Homoloikhos and Timokritos did not make the top 100 in I or IIIA. Apollonios and Aristodemos (high scorers in I and IIIA) are (roughly) fortieth and sixtieth in IIIB, whereas Demon, Eukleides, Dion and Timon (in the top thirty or so in IIIB) are way down the list in I and IIIA. More locally, names barely known in I–IIIA (Athambos, Babyl[I]os, Herus, Iatadas, Kalleidas, Laiadas, Menes) make a striking showing at Delphi, with a thin scatter elsewhere in central Greece, though (cf. p. ix) the figures may overstate the number of different individuals. The presence of horse-riding Thessalians in the volume does not result in any greater presence of Hippo- or -ippos names.

In an epic work one might look for epic names, but though Boeotia is home to a major cycle, there seems little onomastic impact: no Kadmos (Harmonia turns up in Megara), Alkmene (Herakles appears twice in Thessaly), Teiresias, Laios, Oidipous (Agathopous is found, in Boeotia and Thessaly), Iokaste, Pentheus, Agaue (only a Phocian Agauos), Haimon (one Thessalian), Eteokles, or Polyneikes, and only a single Antigone (as against twelve elsewhere), Kreon (two more in Thessaly), and Ismene (a possible second is marked 'fals.?'). The 'Boeotian pig' of Attic stereotype is also missing, though there is a Thessalian Khoiros. Personal interest made me check Iranian names, but there are few relevant items (a generous list includes Arsakes, Kyros, Darikos, Maidates, Medos, Mithridates, Pharnakes, Perses, Persides, Persis), and only a mid-classical Thessalian (Orminion) Perses might count as vaguely interesting. (Hesiod's brother cannot have anything to do with Persians.) Purely Greek names can have a quasi-philosophical colour (Hairesis, Aisthesis, Arete, Boule, Gnome, Doxa, Eupraxis, Kairos, Mnamosuna, Metabole, Homonoia, Oikonomia) or represent discourse (Logos, Dithyrambos, Ainos, Epainos, Historia-and its muse, Klio—Mousike)—both may enjoy Parrhesia (Lebadeia, ?first century A.D.), something unpalatable to Turannos or T(o)urannis (several examples), presumed perpetrators of Hubris (Phthiotic Thebes, hell.-imp) and perhaps to be associated with Barbaros (Larisa, second to third century A.D.)-or derive from locations (Thalamos, Thesauros, Kapos, Hippodromos, Isthmos, Kosmopolis, Asia, Europe) or body-parts (Mastos, Boupuga). We find Onomastos, Agathonumos, and Euonumos, but not the disturbed Anonumos; still, on the psychological front, Emautos, Pantoios, Aoios, and Pais ($\Pi a\hat{s}$) ό παίς Παιδός?) may have something to offer (the first two are also found in LGPN) II–IIIA), as also $\Delta \hat{\eta} \tau a$ of Anthedon—a man of particularly ironic posture, perhaps? But Outis of Thespiai (A.D. 169–72), we may hope, took pride in Odyssean heritage, in a city which 400 years earlier had two bearers of the name Odysseidas.

University of Liverpool

CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

DIPLOMATIC GESTURES

S. KNIPPSCHILD: 'Drum bietet zum Bunde die Hände'. Rechtssymbolische Akte in zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen im orientalischen und griechisch-römischen Altertum. (Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 5.) Pp. 223, pls. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002. Cased, €50. ISBN: 3-515-08079-1.

This book, a revision of the author's Heidelberg dissertation, is a useful addition to