
Names and Epithets

By the third century B.C., gods bearing Greek names were worshipped from Spain to Afghanistan. This book is about aspects of that divine diaspora. Its particular emphasis is on names and naming, one of the two principal aspects (iconography is the other) under which that diffusion is revealed to us. Later chapters will enquire how ways of addressing and referring to gods in Greek developed outside old Greece and over time, two processes that can scarcely be kept separate. But first some account of those naming practices in the period when they were relatively isolated from such external contact is needed. The isolation was only relative because contacts always existed, but a real change occurred when use of the Greek language spread and non-Greek gods had to be named in Greek. This chapter will attempt an outline of the status quo ante.

The obvious starting point is the names of the gods themselves, but first the concept of “naming the gods” must be complicated a little. In studying divine names, one needs, at a minimum, to distinguish ways of referring to the gods from ways of addressing them.¹ Direct address brings respect and the desire to conciliate into play, often in very high degree; it may lead to avoidance of proper names in favour of respectful titles or at least the addition of such titles. But it was often necessary to refer to the gods, usually in relation to their shrines or property or priests, in a less charged but accurate manner in the third person. A dedication is perhaps halfway between these two registers: it is a direct address to the god, but there may also be concern to identify the addressee accurately. Respectful forms of naming

1. Cf. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address*, 9–12, “Lexical versus Address Meaning”; on address itself, F. Braun, *Terms of Address* (Berlin, 1988).

can also spill over from direct address into referential naming. In many ancient Near Eastern cultures, periphrastic avoidance of the actual god's name occurred in all contexts, not just in prayers, so that, for instance, we are uncertain what the real name, if she had one, of the figure referred to as "the lady of Byblos" may have been.² In Greece we find certain euphemisms similarly applied almost invariably: Demeter's daughter Persephone is Kore, "Maiden," in inventories as well as in invocations,³ and certain gods of mysteries are never referred to except by titles.

Another distinction is that between prose and verse. Many epithets are given to gods in poetry but not in cult; there are also cases such as that of Agesilas/Agesilaos ("Leader of the People"), an alternative name, probably euphemistic, for Hades which had a long life in poetry⁴ but is unattested in prose. The distinction is not between "literature" and "real belief," because, for instance, the periphrastic impulse present in Agesilaos is certainly an expression of religious feeling. It is a difference rather of register, between language that an ordinary Greek would recognise and respond to and that which he would actually use.

As a rule, gods had one name each. Though it was a title of honour for a god to be "many-named," what was meant by this was in fact "many-epitheted"; the multiple variant names of Akkadian gods lack a Greek equivalent. Phoibos and Pallas are not so much alternative as additional names for Apollo and Athena, regularly used in conjunction with the main name.⁵ Kore is not a second name for Persephone of equivalent standing, but, as just noted, a euphemistic alternative. The same is probably true of Plouton (deriving from πλοῦτος, "wealth") as an alternative name for Hades.

In contrast to some ancient polytheisms where gods are named from their functions,⁶ the names of the familiar Olympian gods and goddesses are opaque;

2. E.g., *KAI* 10; on figures to whom she was assimilated, see Bonnet, *Enfants de Cadmos*, 168.

3. So, e.g., in *IG II²* 1424a.241 and repeatedly; the ascription of the same objects there listed to "Demeter and Pherrephatte" (an Attic variant for Persephone) in *IG II²* 1437 58 is a rare exception. On Kore for Persephone, see K. Clinton, *OpAth* 16 (1986): 44; for exceptions, R. Parker, *Greece and Rome* 38 (1991): 15 n. 22. Ko-wa = Kore in Mycenaean is very controversial: Rougemont, "Noms des dieux en linéaire B," 332.

4. Aesch. fr. 406 Radt; Callim. *Hymn* 5. 130; *Anth. Pal.* 7. 545.4 (Hegesippus V in Gow-Page, *HE*); Nicander fr. 74.72; *Suppl. Hell.* 990.9; *ICI.xxii.58* 5; *IC II.v.49.2*. Note too Hesych. α 495, Ἀγῆσανδρος, ὁ Ἄιδης.

5. Epithets standing in for theonyms, especially in poetry (e.g., Eriounios for Hermes), are a different case. Deo for Demeter is probably a by-form of the same name (for the possibilities, see the note of Richardson on *Hymn. Hom. Dem.* 47).

6. S. A. Geller, in *One God or Many?* 339: "Canaanite gods are famous for being what they are called—so the god of death is Mot, that is 'death', and the sea-god is Yam, 'sea'. They don't have personal names other than that of the thing they represent. In Phoenicia also, the gods are all things; the name of it is what it is." But similar claims for other ancient polytheisms have failed to distinguish etymology from continuing semantic force: contrast S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, trans. A. Keep (London, 1973), 21 ("Almost all the gods' names can be translated and as a rule denote a characteristic feature of

none bears a speaking name with unmistakable meaning. The names of various Peloponnesian and Aeginetan figures—certainly or plausibly independent goddesses without mythological connections with the Olympian family but, within their own orbit, as important as any other—are equally obscure: Alea, Orthaia, Aphaia, Mnia, Auzesia.⁷ It is true that Greeks tried to extract meaning from the names of some Olympians by popular etymology: they heard *aphros*, “foam,” in Aphrodite, and related it to her birth from the sea; they connected Apollo, sometimes a death-dealing god, with the verb *apollumi*, “destroy”; Demeter could be analysed as *Ge meter*, “earth mother,” while the accusative case of Zeus, *Dia*, indicated that it was *dia*, “because of,” him that most processes in the world occurred.⁸ Aristotle casually alludes to use of the name “in praises of the gods”; he is presumably referring to such attempts to infer the powers of gods from their names.⁹ But these were occasional interpretations; no automatic and transparent meaning attached to any of these names. It is true also that the euphemistic names just noted for the lords of the underworld, Kore and Plouton, have transparent meanings, but their true names were obscure like any other. Sun (Helios), Earth (Ge, Gaia), and Hearth (Hestia) were physical entities as well as deities, and therefore had speaking names, but their importance in cult was modest. The one major figure with a transparent name was Mother (Meter), and even she was sometimes

their nature or function”) with J. Baines, in *One God or Many?* 29 (“Much effort has gone into the search for etymologies of divine names, but while plausible origins in nouns or domains of action can be proposed for a number of major deities, in synchronic perspective they possess proper names, and their sphere of action is not limited to what these might imply: there is altogether more to a deity than a name might encompass”).

7. I give the names of the two last as they appear in the fifth-century inventory *IG IV*² 2.787 (the *e* of Auzesia is short), not Damie and Auxêsie as in literature (e.g., *Hdt.* 5.82–83). Forms in *Azesi-* (with short or long *e*) and *Azosi-* are also attested as theonyms or in related epithets or month names (see Polinskaya, *Local History*, 274–78; particularly important is the Attic Demeter *Azesia*, *Agora XIX H* 16, 4th c. B.C.). *Auxesie* has usually been accepted as the proper form and as a speaking name, “increaser” (so, e.g., Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, s.v. αὔξω); Polinskaya considers the possibility that *Auxesia* is contrasted with an *Azosia/Azosia* deriving from ἀζαίνω (so Hesych. s.v. Ἀζήσια, “I wither,” thus a double-sided pair of deities with speaking names. But I am more inclined to see a single name underlying the *aux-* and *az-* forms. Other possible local gods: Φειλάτα, *IG IX*.I² 3.663; Πρεινάτις, *IG IX*.I² 4.1730.

8. Aphrodite: Hes. *Theog.* 197; or she could be linked with *aphrosyne*, “folly”: Eur. *Tro.* 989–90. Apollo: Macrob. *Sat.* 1.179–10, citing Archilochus fr. 26.5–6; Eur. fr. 781.11–12 (*Phaethon*). Demeter: Eur. *Bacchae* 275–76, with Dodds’s note. Zeus: perhaps Hes. *Op.* 3, and certainly passages cited by West in his note ad loc. “The earliest object of fundamental theological speculation is in all seeming the name of the god,” B. Gladigow, “Götternamen und Name Gottes,” in H. v. Stietencron, ed., *Der Name Gottes* (Düsseldorf, 1975), 13–32, at 24; for Hesiod, D. Arnould, *REG* 122 (2009): 1–14; still in the much later Orphic Hymns, A. F. Morand, in A. Bernabé et al., eds., *Orfeo y el Orfismo: Nuevas perspectivas*, www.cervantesvirtual.com, 157–76.

9. *Rhet.* 2.23, 1400b19; cf. Pernot, “Lieu du nom,” 30–34, with examples such as plays on Isis and *isos*, “equal.”

identified with the opaquely named Rhea (or Cybele). Most major heroes too have meaningless names such as Theseus or Achilles or Herakles. Gods and heroes were thus marked off from mortals, who in the historical period typically had names compounded from ordinary Greek words and thus readily comprehensible. It has indeed been argued that divine names with recognisable meanings were dissimilated from their etymological origins to render them opaque.¹⁰ And, though mortals regularly bore theophoric names based on those of a wide range of gods, they never bore divine names unadjusted (with the possible exception of Artemis) until quite a late date, even if the difference was no more than a single letter (as in Dionysios from Dionysus).¹¹

At a lower level in the divine hierarchy, speaking names do appear. The Nymphs as a group are a collectivity of brides, *nymphai*, and many female figures of that level of power have transparent names: the Praxidikai, “Justice-Exacters,” for instance, or Kourotrophos, “Child-Nurturer,” sometimes a minor independent goddess, sometimes an epithet of some larger figure. A minority of cult heroes too have names indicating a function: Matton, “Kneader,” and Keraon, “Mixer,” culinary heroes in Sparta; the Attic Sosineos, “Save Ship”; the Thessalian Poliphylax, “City Guard” (honoured by human “city guards”); and others.¹² There is also a great swarm of what we would call personified abstractions, figures such as Eros, “Sexual Desire”; Pheme, “Rumour”; Phobos, “Fear”; and many others. Some of these existed only as figures of speech or iconography, while others actually received cult, but there was no sharp division between the two groups: a personification who had only existed at a verbal or pictorial level could easily cross over to become a recipient of cult. Of personifications that received cult, a large number were closely linked with major deities whose power they expressed in some way; such

10. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 182 (but the examples depend on etymologies not universally accepted); F. Graf, “Namen von Göttern im klassischen Altertum,” in *Namensforschung*, 2:1823–37, at 1826.

11. See R. Parker, “Theophoric Names and the History of Greek Religion,” in S. Hornblower and E. Matthews, eds., *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence* (Oxford, 2000), 53–80, at 57–59. I know from conversation that the late Anna Morpurgo Davies doubted Masson’s interpretation, on which the case for the name Artemis as an exception depended (although the case was very limited, because the name was not borne by citizen Greek women). The frequency of Dionysos, Souchos, Sarapis, and Helios as personal names in Egypt is drastically reduced by W. Clarysse, *ZPE* 186 (2013): 259–66; and G. Jennes, *ibid.*, 267–69.

12. Polemon fr. 40 Preller, ap. Ath. 2.9, 39C–D, where Deipneus, “Diner,” of Achaia, and Akratopotes, “Drinker of Unmixed Wine,” of Mounichia are also mentioned. Sosineos: *SEG* XXXIII 147.50; Poliphylax: *SEG* XXVII 205. To others listed by L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero-Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford, 1921), 418–20, add, e.g., from Attica Heudanemos, “Sleep Wind” (Arrian, *Anab.* 3.16.8), Kalamites ἥρως, “Hero of the Stalk” (Dem. 18.129; Clinton, *Myth and Cult*, 106 n. 6: presumably the stalk of the growing corn); Kuamites, “(Hero) of the Bean” (Paus. 1.37.4, though Kearns, *Heroes of Attica*, 180, thinks he may have been named from the nearby bean-market); from Eretria Naustolos, “Ship Sender,” *IG* XII.9.256.

was the case of two who were linked with Aphrodite, Peitho, “Persuasion,” and Eros, “Love,” and of Athena’s associate Nike, “Victory.” But a minority had a free-standing existence in cult, most notably Nemesis, “righteous outrage”,¹³ there were also groups such as the Graces (Charites), the Seasons (Horai), and the Muses, who might be broken down into individuals who bore speaking names in turn. There is again here a difference, though of a different kind, between divine and human naming. Whereas most human names had semantic content, no one will have expected the conduct of a Philodemos, “People-Lover,” to be governed by his name; but we presume that a worshipper of “Save Ship” will normally have looked to him to do just that.¹⁴

A majority of Greek divine figures have names of one of these two types: they are either opaque, or relate directly to their powers or functions. A minority—goddesses more commonly than gods—are normally referred to by titles or by adjectival descriptions of some kind. Such replacement of name by title may once have been commoner than it became. “Mistress (Potnia) of the Labyrinth” is one of numerous Mycenaean usages of Potnia in lieu of a name (whether Wanax and Wanassa, “Lord” and “Lady,” are similarly used is controversial).¹⁵ At Perge in Pamphylia the goddess later familiar as Artemis of Perge is named on earlier coins and inscriptions simply as “Wanassa” of Perge, while Aphrodite on Cyprus is initially plain “Wanassa” of Paphos or of Golgoi.¹⁶ Somewhat similar is Alcaeus’s remarkable address to what must be Hera as “glorious Aeolian goddess, source of all things.”¹⁷

These usages occur either very early or in places on the fringes of the Greek world where older naming conventions may have survived (though external influence is also possible). Later on the mainland, titles or adjectival descriptions are usually found in relation to mystery cults or gods who inspire fear or invite euphemism in other ways;¹⁸ the two factors, unwillingness to name mystery gods directly

13. On all this, see Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 228–37.

14. But name is not a wholly reliable guide to function: Eunostos, “Fair Return,” is attested by lexicographers (Hesych.; Phot. s.v. Eunostos) as a “spirit (*daimon*) of the mill,” but no trace of that function remains in the story of the Tanagraean hero Eunostos in Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 40, 300D–301A.

15. See Rougemont, “Noms des dieux en linéaire B,” 344–60; on Wanax and Wanassa, J. T. Killen, in Killen and A. M. Davies, eds., *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, forthcoming).

16. *IPerge* 1; cf. C. Brixhe, *Le dialecte grec de Pamphylie: Documents et grammaire* (Paris, 1976), 140, 160–61, and his no. 3, line 29; Brixhe, in M. Fritz and S. Zeilfelder, eds., *Novalis indogermanica* (Graz, 2002), 50–58; on the chronology of the coins, cf. J. Nollé, *Chiron* 44 (2014): 292. (For a possible Pamphylian goddess Διφια, see Brixhe, *Dialecte grec*, 139 on no. 3, line 1.) Cyprus: M. Egetmeyer, “Sprechen sie Golgisch?,” in P. Carlier et al., *Études mycéniennes 2010* (Pisa/Rome, 2012), 427–34.

17. Αἰολίησαν κυδαλίμαν θεὸν/πάντων γενέθλαν, fr. 129.6 Voigt; that this is Hera is fairly clear from the parallel with Sappho fr. 17 Voigt; the goddess’s importance in Lesbos (cf. D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, Oxford 1955, 168) has been underlined by the new “brothers’ song” of Sappho with its prayer to “queen Hera” for salvation at sea (cf. V. Pirenne-Delforge and G. Pironti, *ZPE* 191, 2014: 27–31).

18. Plouton is identified as a euphemism for Hades inspired by fear in Pl. *Crat.* 403A.

and fear of the underworld, often coincided, as in relation to the gods of Eleusis. Despoina, “Mistress,” of Lycosura, the goddess most revered by the Arcadians according to Pausanias, presided over mysteries.¹⁹ Megaloi Theoi, “Great Gods,” are found in separate mystery cults at Andania in Messenia, and in the Aegean. There are mysteries of Megalai Theai, “Great Goddesses,” in Arcadia,²⁰ while the Eumenides, “Friendly Ones,” were those whom in Sophocles’ words “we are afraid to name, and whom we pass without looking, without sound, without speech, moving our lips in respectful silence”; they were also called Semnai Theai, “Reverend Goddesses.”²¹ A sanctuary on a hill at Pallantion in Arcadia, at which “oaths on the most important matters were sworn,” was identified simply as belonging to the “pure ones” (*katharoi*): either “they do not know the names of the gods or are unwilling to reveal them,” says our sole source, Pausanias (8.44.5–6).²²

Often the gods addressed by titles also had names known to their worshippers (Pausanias declines to tell the true name of Despoina to the uninitiated),²³ but there was always an impulse respectfully to avoid direct naming when dealing with such powers. The Erinyes/Eumenides are even described by Euripides as “the nameless goddesses,” and it is apparently this degree zero of naming that we encounter in the Eleusinian pair “God and Goddess” (presumably Hades and Persephone).²⁴ Individual gods could be known under many different periphrases. The “Reverend Goddess” (*hagnē theos*) of a fifth-century curse tablet from Selinus and a fourth-century Attic calendar is probably a further name for Persephone (we have already noted Kore and plain Goddess); she also appears in dedications (in northern Greece) as “Only Child” (Μουνογόνη, Μουνογενίη) and “Bride” (Nympe), while her husband is Despotes (“Lord”), Basileus (“King”), Klymenos

19. LSCG 68; SEG XLI 332.7; Paus. 8.37.1–10; she was for the Arcadians a daughter of Demeter and Poseidon (Paus. 8.37.9; cf. 8.25.7, Thelpousa; 8.42.1, Phigaleia), but symbolically dominated her mother (Paus. 8.37.4, a work of Damophon showing Demeter with a torch, Despoina with a sceptre); the “Despoinai” who receive IG V.2.525 (Hadrianic?) should be her and Demeter; Despoinai again at Olympia, Paus. 5.15.4, and joint cult of Demeter and Despoina on the Arcadian-Messenian border 8.35.2. IG V.2.524 is a dedication from Lycosura by “king Julius Epiphanes Philopappos” to Despoina and Soteira; Jost, *Arcadie*, 335, sees the latter as Artemis.

20. See p. 14n55.

21. Soph. OC 129–33, trans. Lloyd-Jones; Aesch. *Eum.* 1041, with A. Sommerstein’s note ad loc.

22. For the excavated remains possibly associable with them, see the commentary of M. Moggi and M. Osanna on Paus. 8.44, their lines 35–46; on the nature of the gods (unknowable), Jost, *Arcadie*, 590–91.

23. Paus. 8.37.9, with comment also on Kore-Persephone; similarly at Thelpousa, 8.25.7.

24. Nameless goddesses: Eur. IT 944 (i.e., the Erinyes, so named in 941, 963, 970); Eur. fr. 494.18: cf. A. Henrichs, “Anonymity and Polarity: Unknown Gods and Nameless Altars at the Areopagos,” *Illinois Classical Studies* 19 (1994): 27–58, at 37. Different are the famous unknown gods, ingeniously singularized into an “unknown god” by the author of Acts 17.22–23 (n. 36 below); cf. Henrichs, 29–35. “God and goddess”: see Parker, *Polytheism and Society*, 335–36.

(“Famed One”) (Paus. 2.35.9–10), and much else besides.²⁵ The resident of Colonus near Athens in Sophocles’ play, asked the “solemn name” of the “dread goddesses, daughters of Earth and Darkness” who inhabit the grove there, answers: “The people here would call them the all-seeing Eumenides; but different names are favoured in different places” (OC 42–43):²⁶ the title used, then, was seen as a locally variable euphemism for an invariable essence. Nonetheless, the use of titles could apparently lead to uncertainty and variation when the attempt was made to identify the power concerned: Pausanias has to explain that Klymenos at Hermione in the Argolid is (supposedly) a “king under the earth,” not a mortal Argive, while in the mystery cult at Andania in the southern Peloponnese the apparent sex-change of the chief honorands between the first century B.C. and the time of Pausanias from Great Gods to Great Goddesses is a standing conundrum.²⁷

About some other deities known by adjective or title we know too little to interpret with confidence. Several distinct goddesses called Parthenos, “Maiden,” are known, one from the Tauric Chersonese on the northern coast of the Black Sea, one from Leros and adjacent regions of Caria, one attested across a swath of northern Greece from Epirus to Neapolis (modern Kavalla) in Thrace.²⁸ The title may be a euphemism—among Greeks, at least, the Parthenos of the Chersonese had a dire reputation, as a supposed recipient of human sacrifice; it may (for we are outside

25. “Reverend goddess”: *IGDS* 38; *SEG* LIV 214.23, 26; cf. Paus. 4.33.4. Only Child, Nympe, Despotes: see Parker, “Theonyms in Northern Greece.” On the mysterious Τελεσσαι, “Complete Ones, Completers” (?) of Cyrene (*LSS* 116.12), perhaps Demeter and Kore, cf. *BE* 2014, no. 538. Basileus: *SEG* LVII 405 (Olympia). Klymenos: Lasus of Hermione fr. 1, *PMG* 702, ap. Ath. 14, 624E–F; Callim. fr. 285 with Pfeiffer’s note ad loc.; Paus. 2.35.9–10; *IG* IV.686–91. “Temenios,” “He of the precinct,” is probably again Hades in *IG* VI.497, 589, 608. For further mostly poetic terms for Hades, see E. Rohde, *Psyche*, trans. W. B. Hillis (London, 1925), 183 n. 6. I do not open here the difficult questions of Zeus Chthonios and (Zeus) Eubouleus. When an Athenian in Pl. *Leg.* 796b speaks of Athena as “our maiden (*kore*) and mistress (*despoina*)” he seems to be playfully juxtaposing terms contrasted in themselves and normally applied to gods other than Athena.

26. Line 41, where Oedipus speaks of their σεμνὸν ὄνομα, hints at one of the different names, Semnai.

27. Paus. 2.35.9; sex change: p. 142n55 below.

28. Chersonese: Hdt. 4.103.1–2 (said by Hdt. to be identified by the natives with Iphigeneia); *IOSPE* I² index p. 553; note esp. *IOSPE* I² 352.23 (*Syll.*³ 352): ἅ διὰ παντὸς Χερσονασιτῶν προστατοῦσα [Πα]ρθένος, *IOSPE* I² 344 = *FGrH* 807 T 1 (her ἐπιφάνεια); in imperial time she becomes θεὰ βασίλισσα Παρθένος (*IOSPE* I² index p. 553, first in no. 359. 20–21, apparently because she regularly served in the magistracy of *basileus*: *IOSPE* I² index p. 552 s.v. βασιλεύουσα Παρθένος); Strabo 7.4.2, 308 (described as δαίμων τις!). Leros: *ASAtene* n.s. 25–26 (1963–64): 304–10, nos. 2–5; Klytos of Miletos, *FGrH* 490 F 1 ap. Ath. 14, 655C (interpreted as Artemis in Ant. Lib. 2.6 and *FGrH* 475 F 2), *IG* XII.3.440 (dedication to Parthenos Leria, from Thera). Halicarnassus: *SEG* XLIII 713.2; *SGDI* 5733; note too Diod. 5.62.4 (Bybassos). Sosibios’s reference to an enkomion of the Parthenos in Sparta is isolated: *FGrH* 595 F 6 ap. Ath. 646; ἡ πάτριος ἀγνή Παρθένος in *IAssos* 26.20 (37 A.D.) is probably a late designation for Athena. Northern Greece: Parker, “Theonyms in Northern Greece.”

the Greek heartland) translate an indigenous term, or serve to label an originally anonymous goddess. Another anonymous figure from a border zone is Polystephanos, “Many-Crowned (Goddess),” worshipped at a spring near Butera in Sicily.²⁹ The “Great God,” or perhaps “Great God of the Odesitai,” known from Hellenistic coins of Odessos on the west coast of the Black Sea, reappears in later inscriptions as “Great God Derzelas/Darzasal”: such had presumably always been his name, but one initially shunned in favour of periphrasis by the Greek settlers.³⁰ Gods in Greece itself who were recurrently addressed not by a proper name were a Basileia, “Queen,” in West Locri (there was also a less prominent, perhaps euphemistic, Basile in Attica),³¹ and Kalliste, “Most Beautiful One (feminine),” sometimes paired with Ariste, “Best,” in Attica;³² there are also isolated occurrences of “Beautiful Goddess,” “Good God/s,” “Good Goddess” (this last possibly in one instance identical with Kalliste).³³ Agathos Daimon, “Good Power,” “Good Destiny,” grew from a figure toasted at symposia into a popular domestic god of Roman Egypt, often

29. *SEG XVI* 593; but her cult (as Polystephanos Soteira) is also attested by a domestic (?) altar from Acragas, *Kokalos* 13 (1967): 202–4 (*ThesCRA V* p. 237, no. 528).

30. See Chiekova, *Pont gauche*, 179–200: for “great god” (*theos megas*) without the proper name still in the Roman period, see *IGB I*² 150, 186ter; III 1855; for plain Darzasal, *IGB II* 768 (cf. probably 770, Derzes). It is ambiguous whether the genitive Ὀδεσιτῶν of coins attaches to the god’s name (so Chiekova), or just indicates the issuing polis (Mihailov in *IGB I*² p. 92). On this figure, cf. p. 142n56.

31. Basileia: see Lerat, *Locriens de l’Ouest*, 2:158–61, on *IG IX.I*² 3.659, 685, 715, arguing that she had a cult on a hilltop and might be Hera (or Artemis); on the Attic figure (figures?) linked with (a) Neleus and Kodros and (b) Zeuxippos, see H. A. Shapiro, *ZPE* 63 (1986): 134–36; Kearns, *Heroes of Attica*, 151; note too a *thea* Basileia on Thera (*IG XII.3.416*: 1st c. B.C. or later) apparently possessing a temple. Basileia is also (see Lerat, *Locriens de l’Ouest*, 2:158–61) an epithet of Hera (as in the new Sappho poem, *ZPE* 189, 2014: 32–49), Persephone (?) (cf. *SEG XLIV* 910, Mylasa), Aphrodite, and, questionably (see Lerat, on Hdt. 4.33.5), Artemis. On an apparently freestanding Basileia at Iasos, see M. Nafissi, *SCO* 61 (2015): 123–24, who sees her as the Mother of the Gods.

32. Kalliste: *IG II*² 788–89, 4665, 4667–68 (all speaking simply of Kalliste); Paus. 1.29.2 (who adds Ariste and identifies the titles as epithets of Artemis); *IG II*² 1298, found near the dedications 4665, 4667–68, is to be displayed in a sanctuary of Artemis. Note too n. 59 on Hagemone at Lykosoura and Messene.

33. “Beautiful goddess” (one each in Macedonia and Alexandria): see Parker, “Theonyms in Northern Greece.” Good gods (with Zeus Meilichios): *IG IX.I*² 3.693; cf. Lerat, *Locriens de l’Ouest*, 2:147–49. Good god: two of the Tegean “standing stelai” (Gaifman, *Aniconism*, 211–22), *IG V.2.60*, 67 (note too 59 to Agathos Daimon); votive stelai from Larisa, sometimes in association with Agathe Tyche: *SEG XLIII* 285 (2nd c. A.D.), *XLV* 618 (2nd c. B.C.); Heinz, *Thessalische Votivstelen* K 267; *IG IV*² 1.394 (186 A.D.), 406 (224 A.D.), showing a bearded figure holding sceptre and cornucopia, traversed by a snake: J. Harrison, *Themis*, Cambridge 1912, 285, fig. 75). Good goddess: *IG II*² 4589, Piraeus, ca. 300: she holds a cornucopia and is approached by two worshippers, above whom is shown a leg; *SEG LVI* 203 (3rd c. B.C.), a *synodos* dedicated to her in Athens; possible link with Kalliste: R. Parker, in J. Dijkstra et al., eds., *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity* (Leiden, 2010), 207–8. The male “valorous, excellent ones” (Ἀριστεῦσι, *SEG XXIX* 519, 1st/2nd c.) who receive a dedication at Gonnoi must be quite different.

associated with Agathe Tyche, “Good Luck.”³⁴ Anake (dual), the title by which the Dioscuri (or figures assimilated to them) were known in Attica and Argos, is a mysterious fossil: Greeks probably heard in it a variant on Anakte, “Lords,” so a title of respect.³⁵ The explanation for these expressions may vary from case to case: euphemism; replacement of the theonym by an honorific accompaniment that has become fixed; emphasis on divine attributes particularly desirable in a particular case (“beauty,” in patronesses of young girls; goodness, in the sense of friendliness to man); uncertainty about the identity of the power addressed; in the case of Anake, habitual usage.

A minor category is that of gods whose names were not yet known, acknowledged by those altars addressed to “unknown gods” out of which the apostle Paul seems to have created his altar to an “unknown god.”³⁶

THE CULTIC DOUBLE NAME

In narrative, a god is normally designated simply by a single name. It is unusual when Apollonius (*Argon.* 2.2–3) speaks of a Nymph who slept with Poseidon Genethlios (“of Begetting”), as opposed to plain Poseidon. But, in cult, divine names were typically accompanied by an epithet, to give what is called the cultic double name;³⁷ this makes the god what has been called “declinable” (“dieu décliné”). The specification added by an epithet is so important that, it has been claimed, a god’s name taken alone reveals nothing about the function a god performs in a particular context, with the single exception of Asclepius, always

34. See F. Dunand, in *LIMC* s.v. Agathodaimon.

35. B. Hemberg, *Anax, Anassa und Anakes als Götternamen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der attischen Kulte* (Uppsala, 1955). Note too the Anaktes Paides at Amphissa (Paus. 10.38.7), variously identified according to Pausanias as Dioskouroi, Kouretes, Kabeiroi. Who the Anaktors of *IEph* 719.8 (Trajanic) are is uncertain (Hemberg, *ibid.*, 24). Equally obscure are the “First Gods” of *ID* 2310, Semitic according to Plassart, Kabeiroi according to Vallois (see the commentary in *ID ad loc.*; but though the Kabeiroi were certainly viewed as primeval gods, they never receive this title); the statement in Paus. 8.31.3 that in Megalopolis the Horai, Pan, and Apollo are described in an epigram as “among the First Gods” is equally enigmatic, but probably unconnected (Jost, *Arcadie*, 475). The “thirty-day goddess” of a late inscription from Epidaurus (*IG IV*² 1.532, θεὰ τριακονθήμερος) is an isolated and mysterious figure.

36. Paus. 1.1.4, 5.14.8; Hesych. α 682; Philostr. *Ap. Ty.* 6.3.5; Tertullian, *Ad nat.* 2.9; *Adv. Marc.* 1.9.2; Paul was corrected by Jerome, *Ad Tit.* 1. 12 (*Commentarius in Epistulas Pauli Apostoli ad Titum et Philemonem*, ed. F. Bucchi, CCSL LXXVII C, Turnhout 2002, p. 30, lines 666–68): “inscriptio autem arae non ita erat, ut Paulus asseruit, ignoto deo, sed ita, diis Asiae et Europae et Africae, diis ignotis et peregrinis.” But Bickerman, *Studies*, 2:615–17, postulates a private altar set up by a pagan god-fearer to the Jewish god. The issue was famously discussed by E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig, 1913). Just what inscription the ἀνώνυμοι βωμοί supposedly set up at Athens by Epimenides (Diog. Laert. 1. 110) carried is uncertain; the reader for the press suggests they had none, that is, they could be used for any god.

37. For a searchable database of cult epithets, not yet complete, go to <http://ntarchoe2.univ-rennes1.fr/epicleses/accueil.php> (quondam <http://www.sites.univ-rennes2.fr/lahm/crescam/>).

associated with healing.³⁸ (Triple and quadruple names, i.e., theonym plus two or even three epithets, are a rarity before the Hellenistic period;³⁹ they become common later when the line between cult epithets *stricto sensu* and epithets of more celebratory type becomes blurred.) As one example out of thousands of its use one might take a dedication by an important Greek living in Egypt in the third century B.C., Apollonios the *dioikētēs* (i.e., head of the civil administration), to “Apollo Hylates (“of Hylai”), Artemis Phosphoros (“Light-Bringer”), Artemis Enodios (“in the Road”), Leto Euteknos (“of Fair Children”), Herakles Kallinikos (“of Fair Victory”): it neatly illustrates a feeling on Apollonios’s part that every god should be accorded an epithet. Heroes by contrast normally lacked epithets; the two who acquired a good set, Herakles and Asclepius, were the two who became functionally equivalent to gods.

The concept of cult epithet was already familiar in antiquity,⁴⁰ but defining it is difficult, and establishing fixed boundaries between what is one and what is not is

38. Polinskaya, *Local History*, 105. “Dieu décliné”: J. P. Albert et al., “Conclusions,” in *Dieux des autres*, 239–51, at 247. The “epithet” is occasionally not adjectival in form, and in such cases the syntactical relation between the two parts is an unexplored problem. That two names could be juxtaposed to give, e.g., Aphrodite Peitho or Zeus Trophonios is clear as a fact, if linguistically odd. But what other juxtapositions were possible? *IG* V.2.288 (5th c. B.C., Mantinea) gives Zeus Keraunos, Zeus presumably being identified with his manifestation, as in Latin *Iovi fulmini fulguri*, *ILS* 3052–53 (but M. L. West, *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*, Oxford 2007, 243–44, takes Keraunos as an old theonym; a new Arcadian inscription of ca. 500 does indeed list an offering to plain Keraunos; see J. Clackson and J. M. Carbon, *Kernos* 29, 2016: 131, who cite also *SEG* XL 1457). On Apollo Korax at Cyrene, see n. 100 below. P. Perlman, *Arethusa* 22 (1989): 127–30, interprets Artemis’s Cyrenean title Καταγωγίς from the use of καταγωγίς for a kind of tunic (Sappho fr. 22 Voigt). But the analogy she cites, Artemis Κιθώνη, is imperfect, Κιθώνη being an adjectival formation. Pausanias 4.23.10 and 6.21.4 takes the shrines of “Herakles Mantiklos” and “Asclepius Demainetos” to have been founded respectively by a Mantiklos and a Demainetos, which is linguistically bizarre: for the view that both are ordinary, though unexplained, epithets, see Jessen, in *RE* s.v. Demainetos; Kruse and Ehrenberg, in *RE* s.v. Mantiklos 1 and 2.

39. I have noted Apollo Didymaios Milesios (*SEG* XXXVI 694B, graffito, Berezan, late 6th c.); Zeus Milichios Panphylos at Megara (*JHS* 18, 1898: 332, 5th c.: a special case, Panphylos here standing in for the genitive normally found in cults of Zeus Meilichios); Ennodia Stropika Patroa (*SEG* LIV 561, Larisa, 5th c.; cf. *BÉ* 2013, no. 238); Nike Athana Polias (*Soph. Phil.* 134); Hera Argeia Heleia Basileia (*IG* XII.4.274 [*LSCG* 151 B] 5, Cos, 4th c.); Athenaia Ergane Polias and Zeus Epiteleios Philios (*IG* II² 4318 and 4627, Athens, 4th c.); Poseidon Kranaios Pylaios (*SEG* XXXV 590, Thessaly, *stoichedon*, so probably not later than the early 3rd c.); Demeter Krisaia Epidamos (*IG* VII 3213, Koroneia?, 3rd c.? [*LGPN*]; Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, 1:155); Hermes Pylios Harmateus (*IERYthrai* 201 d 31, early 3rd c.); Zeus Aristaios Ikmios (Callim. fr. 75.33–34); whether Demeter Erinys Tilphossaia (Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, 1:164) ever received all three names at once is uncertain. The reader for the press adds: “*IG* II² 5012 Ἀρτέμιδος Ὀρθωσίας Ἡγεμόνης, with the interesting echo of the Tenian 2nd c. BC *IG* XII.5.894 [Ἀρ]τέμιδος Ἀγεμονείας Ὀρθωσίας.”

40. See, e.g., Paus. 7.21.7, where it is distinguished from the poetic epithet. I seek here to complement, but only partially repeat, my article “The Problem of the Greek Cult Epithet,” *OpAth* 28 (2003): 173–83. Apollonios’s dedication: *OGIS* 53 = Bernand, *Portes du désert*, 47.

impossible. It is normal and correct to distinguish between poetic or honorific epithets and true cult epithets, though there was certainly overlap and possibility of crossover between the two classes. The cult epithet is perhaps best defined as one used in prayers and appeals to the god in prose, in dedications, and in indirect references to the god, and usually following the god's name. One cannot simply make it "an epithet used in a cult context," because hymns performed in cult often contained ornamental and honorific epithets borrowed from the poetic tradition; "in prose" is added in the definition above to exclude such cases.⁴¹ "Usually following the god's name" is added to exclude titles of respect such as *anax*, *potnia*, *despoina*, and *kurios* (all roughly meaning "master/mistress");⁴² these are common in prayers, but are not found in calendars of sacrifices, for instance; they do not individualise the god in the way that is here taken as a necessary characteristic of the cult epithet. A little different again are "acclamatory" epithets such as *meGas*, *epēkoos*, *epiphanes*, and *sōtēr* ("great," "who gives heed," "manifest," and "saviour") which celebrated the power of a god in hopes of assistance or, very often, in gratitude for assistance received. But the dividing line between acclamatory and true cult epithets is again a porous one, *sōtēr*, for instance, being frequent in both roles.

As a general rule, the "respect" epithets do not appear in dedications (though they do in prayers), and the acclamatory epithets do not appear at all, before the Hellenistic period. This absence connects with a point about the actual use of cult epithets, which in the classical period was not primarily one of glorification. Arrian's account of the explorations of Alexander in the region of Nysa (supposedly a foundation of Dionysus) in India includes a striking moment (5.2.6): visiting Mount Meros ("thigh," a name evoking the myth of Dionysus's birth from the thigh of Zeus), the troops of Alexander were delighted to see ivy once again after a long interval, and at once made themselves ivy garlands; as they did so they sang hymns to Dionysus and "called on his various names (ἑπωνυμῖαι)." Ovid similarly (*Met.* 4.11–17) has a scene in which the women of Thebes call on Dionysus by fourteen different names and "all the very many other names you have, Liber, through the peoples of Greece"; in the *Greek Anthology* (9.524) there is also an ingenious "Hymn to Dionysus" which goes through the alphabet including four epithets beginning with each letter, one letter per hexameter line. But these examples illustrate exceptions and not the rule: the early Greek cult epithet was not typically a tessera in such a mosaic of praise. Possibly this use was distinctive of the cult of Dionysus:⁴³ at all events the remains of early cult poetry contain nothing comparable to the strings of epithets found in the late Orphic Hymns or the Egyptian and

41. Cf. Z. Stewart, *JRS* 50 (1960): 40: "Poetic epithets were avoided with what appears meticulous care in dedicatory prose inscriptions." These distinctions become blurred in late antiquity.

42. Respectful and acclamatory epithets are discussed in chapter 5 below.

43. His epithets are discussed by Diod. Sic. 4.5.1–2, as if of special interest.

Babylonian honorific listings of the names of Amun and Marduk.⁴⁴ Where an accumulation is found, it is of poetic and not cult epithets,⁴⁵ and never of great length. Having many names was, it is true, a mark of a god's standing, a proof that he or she was worshipped far and wide under many aspects. A poet or orator could express doubt about which of a god's many names it was appropriate to use on a given occasion. Callimachus gives the baby Artemis a precocious awareness of the prestige of polyonymy when he shows her on her father's knee asking that she may have more names than her brother Apollo.⁴⁶ But this does not entail that Artemis was imagining a cult hymn celebrating her under all her epithets. In early dedications the norm is to have just one, if any.

The cult epithet, therefore, was not primarily honorific. It was a way of addressing or referring to the god, not a form of praise. Nor did it normally designate a particular iconographic type. The distinction is blurred (and was so perhaps in some degree for the ancients)⁴⁷ because a cult statue could have an epithet which was formally indistinguishable from what is here defined as a cult epithet (so, e.g., Athena Promachos, "Frontline Fighter"). But in Greece (in contrast to what is apparently the case in some ancient Near Eastern cultures) cult epithets did not normally refer to statues, nor were statues visual embodiments of cult epithets: Hippias, "of Horses," was a cult epithet of Athena with no corresponding visual image, Promachos a statue type with no corresponding cult. (But some god-epithet combinations such as Zeus Meilichios, "of Propitiation (?)," did have dis-

44. Hornung, *The One and the Many*, 90: "In Egypt, the cultic naming of the deity was the original form of hymnic praise"; cf. Assmann, *Search for God*, 84. Contrast too the Islamic practice (Dhikr) of reciting the names of God. It is not significant for early usage that Aristides ends his *Hymn to Zeus* with an epithet section (XLIII 30). The fragment of Orpheus's *Hymns* quoted in the Derveni papyrus (col. XXII 12) lists the names, not epithets, of different goddesses in asyndeton. An oracle addressed to the people of Tralleis probably after an earthquake urged them to call on Poseidon under five epithets (*SGO* 02/02/01, 200–250 A.D.): here, as in the Orphic Hymns, we seem to have a new application of the epithet.

45. See, e.g., *Hymn. Hom.* 2.492; 18.12; 19.1–2; 23.1–2; 27.1–3. The practice of Callimachus can be somewhat different, e.g., in *Hymn* 3.225–36; and cf. from an actual dedication, *IG* XII.I.914 (Rhodes, "3rd c BC"), cited on p. 148n94 below. Different again are the accumulations of epithets in Lycophron's *Alexandra* (excellently discussed, with much material of wider import, by Hornblower, "Cult Epithets in the *Alexandra*"): many of these are true cult epithets, but used in a distinctive, cryptographic manner.

46. *Hymn* 3.6–7; on the epithet πολώνυμος, L. Bricault, in C. Berger et al., eds., *Hommages à Jean Leclant* (Cairo, 1994), 3:69–70; Hornblower, "Cult Epithets in the *Alexandra*," 100 n. 42; Chaniotis, "Megatheism," 132 n. 84. Orator: Menander Rhetor 2.445.28–446.9 Russell-Wilson; cf. already Callim. *Hymn* 2.69–71. For the use of epithets in oratory, see Pernot, "Lieu du nom," 34–37.

47. Cf. *OpAth* 28 (2003): 174 n. 7; Pausanias does not sharply distinguish the two types of epithet. Just why different statues of the same deity within a single sanctuary (Paus. 9.16.3: Aphrodite Ourania, Pandemos, Apostrophia; 9.2.7: Hera Teleia and Numpheumene) were separately named (because of different ritual functions? different iconography?) is not clear. The statue of "gaping Apollo" seen by Polemo (fr. 71 M ap. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.38.4) was presumably given a nickname from the depiction. For Roman "iconographic epithets," see Carter, *De deorum romanorum cognominibus quaestiones*, 9.

tinctive representations; thus when Artemidorus in his dream book talks of the significance of dreaming of gods under particular epithets, he sometimes has visual images in mind, sometimes not.⁴⁸)

Though at first sight Greek cult epithets fall into numerous distinct classes,⁴⁹ their main functions can be reduced to two. One is to distinguish the god worshipped in one place from the same god worshipped in another. This was often done by simply adding a place-name or other local description in adjectival form (Apollo of Amyclae; Artemis Epipyrgidia, “on the Bastion”; Zeus Alseios, “of the Grove”), but many other epithets achieve the same effect more indirectly. Hera was identified as Aigophagos, “Goat-Eating,” at a sanctuary in Sparta (Paus. 3.15.9) not in order to convey a general truth about the goddess, but because goat sacrifice was a distinctive trait of the cult at this particular shrine. Apollo was Spodios, “Ashy,” where his altar was made from the ashes of sacrificial victims (Paus. 9.11.7); Artemis was Philomeirax, “Lover of Boys,” where her shrine abutted a gymnasium (Paus. 6.23.8). Or a singularity of the image of a god (Artemis Lygodesma, “Bound in Withies”) might give its name to the sanctuary that contained it (Paus. 3.16.11).⁵⁰ Such epithets functioned in a sense as simple addresses; they were, among other things, a practical necessity, needed to distinguish one cult site from another. So the three Poseidons who appear in the accounts of the Treasurers of the Other Gods at Athens⁵¹ are carefully distinguished as “at Sounion,” “of Kalaureia,” and “Hippios” (“of Horses”).

Cult epithets that apparently have very different origins and relations to the god all fulfill this function equally well: whether they refer to the authority that established the cult (Pythochrestos, “Decreed by Apollo”), to the funding that supports it (Demoteles, “Publicly Financed”), to a main festival celebrated at the sanctuary (Demeter Thesmorphoros, referring to the festival Thesmophoria), to rites performed at such a festival

48. 2.34–40. Artemis “Agrotera and Elaphebolos is always better for activities than one fashioned in any other way,” while “for those who have chosen a more dignified life, one more restrained in deportment is better such as the Ephesian and the Pergaian and the one among the Lycians called Eleuthera” (p. 159.19–24 Pack). Here the reference is clearly to iconographic types, as also in a discussion of different forms of Hermes (pp. 170.26–171.4). But “Apollo Delphinios,” who “normally indicates travel and movement,” must have been recognised in some other way (p. 160.11–12), since no iconographic type of Delphinios is known. Again, it is not clear iconographically how one distinguished Aphrodite Pandemos from Aphrodite Pelagia (pp. 171.13–172.5), or recognised Hekate Chthonia (p. 158.6; cf. p. 175.19). Different is the appeal to an epithet to explain an interpretation: Artemis is good for parturient women since she is called Locheia (p. 159.15–16). Here there is no suggestion that the epithet is visible.

49. See, for instance, the eight classes distinguished by Gladigow, “Gottesnamen,” 1231–32. In *OpAth* 28 (2003): 178 n. 43, I queried whether epithets were ever formed from the profession of a worshipping group, but Poseidon Nauklarios of *ID* 2483 looks like an example: any exclusion is rash.

50. Cf. *OpAth* 28 (2003): 174 n. 7; Apollo of the *petasos* (Petasites, from *petasos*, a type of cap: *ICam.* 132) looks like a case.

51. *IG* I³ 369 and 383; so too with other gods in these lists who had multiple cults, and in the Erythrai priesthood sales list (*IErythrai* 201; Parker, *On Greek Religion*, 100–102).

(Apollo Karneiodromos, “Karnea Runner”) or good things eaten at it (Demeter Megalartos, “of Great Loaves”), or are completely opaque (Athena Hellotis)—and there are many other possibilities—their primary role is differentiation, a truth that is obscured by elaborate division into different categories. Other factors too could certainly influence the choice of a name: to call Apollo Archegetes, “Leader,” for instance, commemorated his role in the early history of a colonial foundation. Epithets might or might not also convey something to the worshipper about the powers or nature of the god; writers in later antiquity sometimes made an artificial collage of those that did to create a composite portrait of a deity.⁵² But an epithet did not need to say anything important about the god to individuate the cult-place in question. This practical role is nicely illustrated by the list in a Roman legal text of nine gods who could be named as heirs under Roman law: each receives a local epithet, because the potential beneficiary was not the god at large, an impossibility, but a particular sanctuary.⁵³ We might call this the bureaucratic or administrative function of the epithet.

The second broad function of the epithet was to provide focus, to pick out one aspect or power amid the many of a god of broad powers: Poseidon of Horses, Zeus of the Oath, Hermes of Competitions. The epithet related to a particular need of the worshipper (e.g., Iatros, “Doctor”), a particular attitude the worshipper wished the god to adopt (e.g. Soter, “Saviour”) or not to adopt (Maimaktes, “Raging”), or a particular occasion on which the god was addressed (as Zeus in Attica became “Zeus Heraios” once a year at a particular festival which celebrated his marriage to Hera⁵⁴). Apollonius Rhodios, for instance, tells of the offerings made by the Argonauts at the appropriate moments to Apollo Embasios and Ekbasios (“of Embarkation” and “of Disembarkation”). At Stymphalos in Arcadia, the mythical founder Temenos supposedly divided the stages of Hera’s life, and so perhaps the stages through which Hera could guide mortal women, into three, each embodied in a separate sanctuary: child (παῖς) Hera, mature or fulfilled (τέλεια) Hera, widow (χήρα) Hera; this remarkable arrangement unfortunately was revealed to Pausanias only by local say-so, nothing of it surviving in his day.⁵⁵ Some epithets contained a

52. See D. A. Russell, *Dio Chrysostom, Orations VII, XII, XXXVI* (Cambridge, 1992), 206; cf., e.g., Plut. *Ant.* 24.4–5 on the different aspects of Dionysus/Antony, as Charidotes and Meilichios opposed to Omestes and Agrionios; Plut. *E. Delph.* 2, 385B, on epithets of Apollo.

53. FIRA II, p. 285, *Tituli ex corpore Ulpiani XXII.6, Iovem Tarpeium, Apollinem Didymaeum Miletii, Martem in Gallia, Minervam Iliensem, Herculem Gaditanum, Dianam Ephesiam, Matrem Deorum Sipylenen, Nemesim quae Smyrnae colitur, et Caelestem Salinensem Carthagini*. Or there are so-called festival coinages bearing name and epithet (Athena Ilias, Artemis Pergaia; Thonemann, *Maeander Valley*, 117–19).

54. Parker, *Polytheism and Society*, 42 n. 20.

55. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.359 (cf. 421, embarkation offerings), 966, 1186; Paus. 8.22.2; cf. V. Pirenne-Delforge and G. Pironti, “La féminité des déesses à l’épreuve des épicleses: Le cas d’Héra,” in L. Bodiou and V. Mehl, *La religion des femmes en Grèce ancienne* (Rennes, 2009), 95–109.

functional specification within their own meaning (“Doctor,” “of Horses”); we assume that others also specialized the god in some way that was conventionally understood (Apollo Delphinios, for instance, whose activities have little relation to the dolphins his epithet evokes).⁵⁶ The same focusing effect was sometimes achieved by juxtaposition of an ordinary divine name with a deified abstraction: Athena Nike, “Victory”; Aphrodite Peitho, “Persuasion.”⁵⁷ A function could be very precise, as with Zeus Kataibates (“Who Comes Down”—i.e., the thunderbolt) or Apollo Parnopios (“of Locusts”), or so general that most major gods could discharge it: thus epithets such as Polieus (“of the City”), Soter (“Saviour”), Hegemon (“Leader”), and (eventually) Ouranios (“Heavenly”)⁵⁸ came to be shared by many of the greater gods.⁵⁹ A different form of sharing was where a pair of gods who were often worshipped together shared an epithet at a particular site (as, for instance, Zeus Phe-mios and Athena Phemia, “of [Verbal] Omens,” at Erythrai in Ionia⁶⁰).

56. But on this epithet, see the doubts of Polinskaya, *Local History*, 222–23.

57. Νυκτῖ Ἀρτέμιδι in *SEG* LVI 601 (Kallipolis in Aetolia, 4th/3rd c.) would be a strange example (both in the combination and the order); the editor may be right to take them as separate powers.

58. See appendix A.

59. For Polieus (and related terms), see U. Brackertz, “Zum Problem der Schutzgottheiten griechischer Städte” (PhD diss., Berlin, 1976), table 3; and Chiai, “Medien religiöser Kommunikation,” 74 n. 49; Soter will be discussed in a forthcoming study by T. S. F. Jim. As for Hegemon, Apollo is Hegemon in Phasis in the fifth century (*SEG* L 1383; unless N. Ehrhardt is right, *ZPE* 56, 1984: 156–57, that the silver phiale in question is a forgery), and Hagetor in Laconia (*IG* VI.977, 3rd c. B.C.?); Aristophanes seems to know Hegemonios as a title of Hermes (*Plut.* 1159; cf. later *IG* II² 1496.84–85; *SEG* XXIII 547.53, and the Anubis Hegemon of *Syll.*³ 1129 [*ID* 1253], where Anubis may be assimilated to Hermes); Xenophon consults Herakles Hegemon (*Anab.* 6.2.15; cf. 4.8.25) and envisages Zeus Hegemon as a password (*Cyrop.* 3.3.58 and 7.1.10; cf. *Anab.* 4.8.25), while Spartan campaigns begin with sacrifice to Zeus Hagetor (*Xen. Rep. Lac.* 13.2); in the third century appear Artemis Hegemone (perhaps Callim. *Hymn.* 3.227, and certainly often later: see the summary in *SEG* LVIII 745) and Aphrodite Hegemone (τοῦ δήμου): *IG* II² 2798; *IRhannous* 32.33, 35.8–9; in the second century, Dionysus Kathegemon (Ohlemutz, *Kulte in Pergamon*, 90–122). The meaning seems to develop from a literal “leader” to “patron”; eventually προκαθηγεμών (τῆς πόλεως) becomes a general title meaning “chief divine patron” of a city (L. Robert, *Études Anatoliennes*, Paris 1937, 27: e.g., Apollo: *LSAM* 53.6–7, Miletus; *ASAten* 22–23, 1944–45: 165, no. 145, Kalymnos). The newly attested “goddess Hagemona” of *SEG* XLI 332.18 (Lykosoura) is presumably Artemis Hegemone (Paus. 8.37.1); the preference for title is perhaps influenced by the proximity at Lykosoura of Despoina (mentioned in the same decree, *SEG* XLI 332.7). The same title appears in *SEG* XLI 352 (Messene) and has hitherto been related to Messene because her father Triopas apparently shared the monument (see, e.g., P. Themelis, *Praktika* 1989, 110–12).

60. *Erythrai* 201 c 47–48: the same list of priesthoods offers Zeus Apotropaios and Athena Apotropaia b 8–9, Apollo Kaukaseus and Artemis Kaukasia c 40–41. On shared epithets, see Gladigow, “Gottesnamen,” 1229; P. Brulé, *Kernos* 11 (1998): 30–31. As well as those shared by many gods (previous note), a few indicated a more specialised function shared, if in different ways, by few (Hippios, shared by Poseidon and Athena; Lysios, shared by Dionysus and Artemis, *IG* IV² 1.162, 275). Some related to features of a sanctuary (e.g., location on a high place, Akraios; in a grove, Alseios) that might be common to many cults without connecting the gods concerned. About Koria, supposedly an Arcadian epithet of both Artemis and Athena (Jost, *Arcadie*, 389–90), nothing secure can be said.

The distinction between the two functions of the epithet—to identify sites on earth, to focus divine powers⁶¹—is often blurred. A focusing epithet can, it is true, be used without any reference to a place on earth. In a famous passage of Herodotus, Croesus reproaches Zeus in three different aspects in each of which, the king claims, the god has let him down: as Zeus Katharsios, “of Purification”; as Zeus Epistios, “of the Hearth”; and as Zeus Hetaireios, “of companionship” (1.44).⁶² Aeneas Tacticus speaks of watchwords to be used in different circumstances: for hunting it will be Artemis Agrotera, “Huntress”; for trickery, Hermes Dolios, “Tricksy” Hermes (24.15). To judge from Aristophanes, appeals to figures such as Hermes Agoraios, “of the Marketplace,” or Apollo Apotropaïos, “Averter (of Evil),” were common in everyday speech. Evening, says a speaker in Plutarch, belongs to Lysios (“Releaser”) Dionysus, morning to Ergane (“Worker”) Athena and Hermes Agoraios (*Quaest. conv.* 3.6.4, 654F). But a particular sanctuary could also belong to a god bearing a focusing epithet: Poseidon Hippios, “of Horses,” at Colonus, as it might be, or Poseidon Asphaleios, “of Safety,” in many places; gods received such epithets in the prayers of worshippers, wherever they might be, but they were also inscribed on particular altars. So even a focusing epithet could discharge the bureaucratic role, as the identifier or address of a particular cult. And, as we have seen, some epithets that formally count as focusing are so vague that in effect they are little more than identifiers.

Conversely, one has only to contemplate the figure of Artemis of Ephesus to appreciate that an epithet that is formally topographic can also identify what was for the worshipper a distinctive form or manifestation of the god. Within topographic epithets, one might distinguish between a bureaucratic or practical function and an ontological one that classifies that form of the god as a distinct existent entity. Perhaps some topographic or equivalent epithets never got beyond the bureaucratic role: it may be that worshippers never invoked or made dedications to, say, “Apollo of Saberidai” or “Goat-Eating Hera” under those names, rather than as plain Apollo or Hera. But it was extremely common for a god invoked under a particular topographic epithet to acquire a distinctive identity. That is why, on the one hand, worshippers might use the topographic epithet where it was

61. At Lousoi both were in use: the same god was known topographically as Lousiatis and functionally as Hemera, “Gentle”—or just as Artemis (*IG V.2.397–403*). According to Pausanias (8.23.6–7), at Kaphyae an unfortunate event caused an epithet of Artemis to change from a toponym, Kondyleatis, to a speaking epithet, ἀπαγχομένη, “being strangled.” That epithet is related to small images of gods hung in trees by Jost, *Arcadie*, 400–402, an explanation which does not fully account for the choice of verb; and to the sensation of strangulation supposedly experienced by *parthenoi* suffering trouble at menarche by H. King (in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt, *Images of Women in Antiquity*, London 1983, 113–20), an explanation which would be easier if comparable mirrorings of human sufferings in divine epithets were attested.

62. Cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.1123–33, an appeal in the name of Zeus Eposios, Xeinios, and Hikesios.

unnecessary, addressing, for instance, Artemis as Artemis Patmia even when bringing an offering to her on Patmos (*Syll.*³ 1152),⁶³ or could drop the god's own name and address him or her by the local epithet alone, so that Apollo of Amyclae could become "the Amyclaeon"; it is also why a god plus toponym combination could be exported far from the original place that gave the name, why Delian Apollo or Ephesian Artemis or Cyprian Aphrodite could become ubiquitous presences in the Mediterranean world. (This did not, however, lead to the kind of double toponym occasionally found for Hittite gods, such as "Ḫebat of Aleppo of Ḫattuša," i.e., the cult at Ḫattuša of "Ḫebat at Aleppo.") From all this (this and the multiplication of functional epithets) arises the issue so troublesome to us, and so straightforward, or merely uninteresting, to the ancients, of determining whether a theonym associable with, say, ten epithets describes one god or ten.⁶⁴

Epithets that fulfilled one of these two functions were so common that a certain sense developed that in a cult context the divine name was incomplete without one (though there were always exceptions of cults without epithets). Ariston, who was sent by Ptolemy to explore the coast of Arabia, founded an altar to Poseidon Pelagios, "of the Sea," at the southern tip of the peninsula of Sinai (Diod. Sic. 3.42.1). There was no need to distinguish this sanctuary of Poseidon from any other in this remote region, nor to specify that the Poseidon here in question was he of the sea. But the epithet added dignity. We noted earlier the dedication by Apollonios the *dioikētēs* to five gods with five epithets. This dignifying role needs to be added as a modest supplement to the two main functions discussed above. Some of the epithets we meet in Pausanias may have been "filled in" by antiquaries for sanctuaries which lacked, or had lost, one handed down by tradition.⁶⁵

63. For similar cases, see *IG* V.2.397, 399, dedications from Lousoi to Artemis Lousiatis or at Lousoi; *IG* I² 985 from Brauron, to Artemis Brauronia; *IG* IX.1²4.822–83, 826, from Korkyra, to Apollo Korkyraios; *SEG* XXXV 371, presumably from Stymphalos, to Demeter at Stymphalos; *OGIS* 164–66, dedications from Paphos to Aphrodite Paphia, by the Cypriot *koinon* (164–65) and the polis of Paphos (166); cf. *IG* XII.8.361, a *horos* of Zeus Agoraios Thasios from Thasos. (On Thasian Herakles, see appendix E.) According to H. Seyrig, *BCH* 51 (1927): 369–70, such toponymic epithets originate with visitors to the sanctuary from abroad, and are taken up by locals by a "bounce back" ("choc en retour"); the distinction cannot unfortunately be checked in the cases just cited except the Paphian, but for locals using the local epithet in relation to their own deity, see Robert, *Hellenica* IX, 21–22. The crew of the warship Demeter, landed on Paros, where Demeter had a celebrated cult (*Hymn. Hom. Dem.* 491; *RE* s.v. Demeter, 2723), took the opportunity to dedicate to Demeter Paria (*SEG* XXXIII 684). But Apollo becomes Aeginetan only outside Aegina: Polinskaya, *Local History*, 207.

64. See, above all, Versnel, *Coping with the Gods*, 60–87, 517–26, whose answer is "both—in different contexts." Many texts bring out the paradox, e.g., *SEG* LIX 1418 (nr. Hadrianoi, in Mysia, 2nd/3rd c. A.D.): "Zeus Anabatenos dedicated this to Zeus Kersoullos." Allen, *Splintered Divine*, studies the same problem for the ancient Near East, and argues resolutely that different epithets create different gods. Hittite double toponym: Allen, 206.

65. Cf. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, 2:12–13, on the Herakles Hippodetes of the Teneric plain and Herakles Rhinokoloustes of Thebes.

SONDERGÖTTER AND SEMIAUTONOMOUS EPITHETS

The great student of Greek divine names, Hermann Usener, famously argued that most of the focusing epithets had originally been independent deities, what he called *Sondergötter*, “special gods.”⁶⁶ According to Usener, primitive man’s first gods had all been *Sondergötter*, that is, gods with closely circumscribed functions indicated by speaking names. Gods with personalities and broad functions were a secondary development that only became possible once the meaning of originally transparent speaking names was no longer understood; these great gods then recovered contact with specific functions by capturing *Sondergötter* as epithets. There had originally, for instance, been a goddess Korotrophos, “Child-Nurturer,” whose name revealed her powers; later she declined into an epithet for which “a whole series of goddesses”⁶⁷ competed. The theory might be correct in a few cases. The reduction (occasional or permanent) of a name to an epithet is a well-attested phenomenon,⁶⁸ and though the clearest cases involve coalescence of two equally opaque theonyms (e.g., Enyalios and Ares), the process postulated by Usener of an obscure theonym attracting a speaking name is actually easier to envisage. Korotrophos is just one of a number of figures who are apparently attested both on their own and as epithets of major deities (others include Ennodia, “[Goddess] in the Road”; Pasikrata, “Ruler over All” (feminine); Tychon, “Lucky Strike”), and it is quite possible that some of these began as independent figures. But the direction of travel was not necessarily the one that Usener supposed: Ennodia, for instance, though functioning as an independent goddess with her own iconography in Thessaly and Macedonia,⁶⁹ is adjectival in formation and appears early as an epithet of other deities; she might rather be an epithet that acquired independence. As for many other adjectival formations claimed by Usener⁷⁰ as quondam *Sondergötter*, such as Megalartos, “Big Loaves” (epithet of Demeter), or Panoptes, “All-Seeing” (of Zeus), there is no reason to think that they had ever had an independent existence. More generally, Usener’s evolutionary approach has long been

66. On Usener, see *Hermann Usener filologo della religione*; M. Espagne and P. Rabault-Feuerhahn, eds., *Hermann Usener und die Metamorphosen der Philologie* (Wiesbaden, 2011) (*non vidi*); Konaris, *Greek Gods in Modern Scholarship*, 180–94; on reactions to *Götternamen*, see p. 173n1 below.

67. Usener, *Götternamen*, 122–28. But the case as presented fits the theory imperfectly, since on Usener’s own showing the main claimant to Korotrophos as an epithet was Earth, Ge, a goddess with a still transparent name.

68. See p. 21 below.

69. Cf. Parker, “Theonyms in Northern Greece” (also *ibid.* on Pasikrata and Tychon). Erwin Rohde in a letter thanking Usener for the gift of *Götternamen* (1/6/1896, cited by Mette, “Usener und seine Schule,” 88–90) already insisted that epithets could become *Sondergötter*, as well as vice versa; for possible Roman instances, see Carter, *De deorum romanorum cognominibus quaestiones*, 11–15; for the reverse process, 26.

70. Usener, *Götternamen*, 218.

deeply out of fashion. In its own terms, the attempt to build a general theory of “religious concept formation” (*Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung*, subtitle of his book) on three Indo-European case studies would have been overoptimistic even if they had proved less open to criticism than they did;⁷¹ Usener seems never to have explained why he ignored the Egyptian documentation that was already available to him, and great amounts of evidence for early divine name-giving have become available since his time, from Sumerian, Akkadian, Hittite (which is Indo-European), and many less-known ancient languages and dialects besides.

But it has been pointed out in relation to Roman religion that if one abandons Usener’s evolutionary and generalizing perspective, his ideas can be usefully redeployed;⁷² and this is also true of Greece, in several ways. Usener postulated a historical progression from innumerable special gods with transparent names to a small number of major gods with opaque names. But one can apply the contrast between opaque and transparent not in terms of evolutionary progress but of hierarchy. As we have seen, at the top level, the level of greatest power, are gods with obscure names. The more one moves downward in terms of power, the greater is the frequency of transparency, whether of nymphs and heroes with speaking names, of personified abstractions, or of cult epithets. The cult epithets belong to gods, the personified abstractions are often very closely attached to them: the god is thus broken down into smaller, more specific, more comprehensible elements. This is the power in terms of religious psychology of the cult-epithet system, the way in which it associates the great high god, the figure of broad power, a reality not an abstraction, with something more down to earth and local, perceptibly close to the worshipper’s specific need.

A second, related value of Usener’s perspective is his theory of the original autonomy of the epithet. Again one needs to substitute for a postulated historical process a lasting condition, the permanent tendency of the epithet to achieve at least quasi autonomy. Worshipers constantly chose to address a god by epithet alone, whether that epithet was a local or functional one: not Apollo Iatros, “Doctor,” but just Iatros; not Zeus Meilichios, “of Propitiation,” but Meilichios; or (to take a local example) not Zeus Pelinnaïos, “of (Mount) Pelinna” (on Chios), but Pelinnaïos;⁷³ such abbreviations occur in third-person references to gods as well as direct addresses to them. Several instances of such epithets without theonyms

71. The decisive criticisms of Usener’s use of Lithuanian and Roman evidence are cited by A. Momigliano, in *Hermann Usener filologo della religione*, 18.

72. See J. Scheid and J. Svenbro, “Les Götternamen de Hermann Usener: Une grande théogonie,” in *Nommer les dieux*, 94–104.

73. Iatros (in the form Ietros): *SEG* XXX 880; XXXII 737, 801. Meilichios: n. 90 below. Pelinnaïos: Graf, *Nordionische Kulte*, 37–39 (with discussion of the phenomenon).

have been detected among the archaic rock-cut inscriptions from Thera.⁷⁴ In a particular sanctuary the epithet can completely efface the divine name, so that, for instance, it is only from figurines found in the same Spartan sanctuary that the goddess addressed merely as Kyp(h)arissia, “of Cypresses (?)”, in six dedications can be identified as a form of Artemis.⁷⁵ It remains controversial whether the continued appearance of a “Maleatas” alongside Apollo Maleatas, “of (Cape) Malea,” attests an originally independent *Sondergott*, or a familiar abbreviation; it is often unclear what proper name if any is to be associated with a given reference or dedication to Soteira, “(female) Saviour.”⁷⁶ The uncertainty was not necessarily ours alone in such cases: according to Pausanias, ordinary people of Phigalia in southwest Arcadia took the “Eurynome” of a local shrine for an epithet of Artemis, whereas antiquaries thought she was a daughter of Ocean.⁷⁷ So the preference is often for the function over the name, or the more specific and local over the more general, and in that sense an intuition of Usener is proved correct.

A fifth-century inscription from Selinus in Sicily accompanying a dedication for victory shows theonyms and what are apparently semiautonomised epithets put in exact parallel:

Because of the following gods the Selinuntines conquer. We conquer because of Zeus and because of Fear and because of Herakles and because of Apollo and because of Poseidon and because of the Tyndaridai and because of Athena and because of Malo-

74. Hikesios: *IG* XII.3.402–4; Stoichaios: 376; Delphinios: 537a; Lykeios: 551; cf. A. Inglese, *Thera arcaica: Le iscrizioni rupestri dell'agora degli dei* (Tivoli, 2008). Cf. Delphinios on a sixth-century graffito from Berezan, *SEG* XXXII 739; *IG* IX 1² 4.862, a sacred *horos* τῆς Ἀκρίας, apparently Hera. See now J. Clackson and J. M. Carbon, *Kernos* 29 (2016): 131, on (Zeus) Keraunos and (Ares?) Theretas in an Arcadian calendar of ca. 500 B.C.

75. *SEG* L 395–405: the identification is supported by “Agrotera Kypharissia” in *IG* VI.1.977. So there is no connection with the Messenian Athena Kyparissia (*SEG* XXIII 209–10, XLIII 143–44), where the epithet is topographic (cf. Paus. 4.36.7; N. Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians*, Cambridge 2008, 275–76). Cf., e.g., Kolainis: *IG* II² 4731, 4817, for the Artemis Kolainis of *IG* II² 4791, 5140. Herodotus speaks indifferently of Ἀθηναίη Προνηίη at Delphi with and without the theonym (1.92.1; 8.37.2; 8.39.1). Cf. pp. 30–31n112 below on Aphrodite Kas(s)alitis, Hearing Goddess.

76. Maleatas: contrast, e.g., Kruse in *RE* and C. Auffarth in *Brill's New Pauly* s.v. Maleatas. Maleatas appears without theonym, e.g., in *IG* V.1.927 and 929, and receives an offering separate from Apollo's in *IG* II² 4962. Soteira: see T. S. F. Jim, “Can Soteira Be Named?,” *ZPE* 195 (2015): 63–74. In *CIG* 1798–99 (Ambracia), a dedication to Σωτήρι, Διὶ Ἀφοροδείτῳ, the word Σωτήρι should apparently (O. Picard ap. P. Cabanes, *BCH* 109, 1985: 755–57) be taken as a reference to the Ambracian Apollo Soter known from *Ant. Lib. Met.* 4.4 (= Athanadas, *FGrH* 303 F 1), and probably *SEG* XXXV 665 B 45; if so, an epithet in lieu of theonym was combined with two theonyms.

77. 8.41.4–6. Pausanias himself supposes Taraxippos of Olympia, taken as a hero by most Greeks, to be an epithet of Poseidon (6.20.15–19); Paus. 3.15.7 may imply similar uncertainty about Hipposthenes vis-à-vis Poseidon. Some ancients held Priapos to be the same as Dionysus, being just an epithet; *Ath.* 1.54, 30A–B (cf. H. Herter, *De Priapo*, Giessen 1932, 303).

phoros (Apple-Bringer) and because of Pasikrateia (Ruler over All) and because of the other gods, but most of all because of Zeus. (*IGDS* 78, ML 38)

Zeus, Apollo, and Athena bear their simple names without epithets; Malophoros is an epithet of Demeter in Selinus's mother city, Megara (Paus. 1.44.3), but here and in another Selinuntine dedication (*IGDS* 54) it stands alone, irrelevant though the function indicated is to military success; Pasikrateia is probably an epithet standing in euphemistically for Persephone.⁷⁸ The divinised abstraction Fear rounds out this illustration of the diverse types of divine power and diverse ways of naming them in early Greece.

An opposite but complementary phenomenon to the epithet that acquires quasi autonomy is the divine name that partially surrenders its autonomy by being juxtaposed to that of another god. Enyalios, Pai(aw)on, and Eleuthia/Eileithyia, which in the second millennium in Linear B stood on their own, in the first millennium sometimes still appear as names of independent gods, but sometimes serve as epithets or alternative names for, respectively, Ares, Apollo, and Artemis.⁷⁹ Similarly, it is generally believed that Artemis Ortheia/Orthosia, Artemis Diktynna, and Athena Alea emerged through the permanent coalescence of local figures Ortheia/Orthosia, Diktynna, and Alea (who are often so named, without any other theonym) with Artemis and Athena; in their places of origin these goddesses retain their independence, but when they travel, or are viewed from outside, tend to be assimilated to the Panhellenic figure.⁸⁰ We noted above combinations of

78. Commentators compare *Hymn Hom. Dem.* 365, where Hades promises her "rule over everything." She may be distinct from the Pasikrata of northern Greece (n. 69 above). A late dedication is still made θεῆ Μαλοφόρῳ, *IGRB* I. 370bis, perhaps from the Megarian colony Mesambria.

79. Cf. Rougemont, "Noms des dieux en linéaire B," 332–35 (who also mentions Enesidaon as a possible precursor of similar epithets of Poseidon, and e-ri-nu/Demeter Erinys); for a possible link between Linear B di-ri-mi-jo and Apollo's epithet Δρύμας, see Hornblower, "Cult Epithets in the *Alexandra*," 107. On Pai(aw)on, see I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans* (Oxford, 2001), 11 and 385 n. 12. Rutherford notes that in poetry the name is "usually a substitute for (Apollo's) name rather than a true epithet," but in cult it is already an epithet of Apollo in *IG* I³ 383.163–64. It can be applied to other gods (Rutherford, *ibid.*), though not apparently as a fixed cult title. In Homer, Enyalios too seems to serve as an alternative name for Ares (see *Il.* 20.69 with 21.391–92) rather than an epithet (though see *Il.* 17.210–11); even in cult the combination Ares Enyalios is rare and late (*IG* IV.717; *IG* II² 1072.5; Enyalios Ares in *IG* V.2.343.44–45 [*DGE* 665 C 16–17] is not a clear instance, given Zeus Ares just above); rather, Enyalios either stands alongside Ares (so in the Athenian ephebic oath, RO 88.17, where Enyo too appears; similarly *IG* XII.5.913.12–13, a Delphic response) or on his own (for early instances, see *LSS* 85; *SEG* LVI 470), probably in that case being seen as the same god differently named (Nilsson, *Geschichte*, 517–19; cf. *Aen. Tact.* 24.2).

80. "Ortheia/Orthosia" (in fact always written with an initial digamma, and in very varying forms) is always freestanding in Spartan inscriptions until the first century A.D. (J. A. Davison, *From Archilochus to Pindar*, London 1968, 169–72), as in Xen. *Resp. Lac.* 2.9; outside Sparta (for refs., see B. Kowalzig, *Brill's New Pauly* s.v. Orth[e]ia) it is an epithet of Artemis (except in Pind. *Ol.* 3.30), already in Hdt. 4.87 and *IG* I³ 1083. Diktynna is freestanding in Crete (e.g., *IC* II.XI.3.30) but outside Crete usually treated

deified abstractions with goddesses such as Athena Nike and Aphrodite Peitho, and the reduction of possible *Sondergötter* to epithets; other gods too can come together to give forms such as Artemis Hekate or Zeus Ares.⁸¹

The phenomenon is complex and can probably not be given a single explanation. The precondition for an assimilation such as Artemis Eileithyia was a functional overlap: Eileithyia's sole function, care for childbirth, coincided with one of the functions in Artemis's more varied portfolio. So Artemis Eileithyia was Artemis seen in relation to birth. A similar overlap between gods of different gender created comparable but grammatically distinct double names: Athena Areia, "of Ares," was Athena in her martial aspect; Athena Hephaistia was the technological Athena. A Greek who spoke of Athena Hephaistia did not believe that Hephaistos was merely an aspect of Athena, and by analogy a Greek who prayed to Artemis Eileithyia did not necessarily disbelieve in the separate existence of Eileithyia. The structure of the cultic double name invited expressions such as Artemis Eileithyia, but did not require a decision about the ontological status of the two elements. It is a mistake to agonise over such questions, when the point that we should retain from Usener is the ebb and flow of the relation between divine name and epithet. Different are the puzzling cases where a theonym is combined with what in other contexts is attested as the name of a hero or heroine: Poseidon Erechtheus, Zeus Agamemnon, Zeus Eubouleus, Artemis Iphigeneia, Artemis Andromeda.⁸² We have already noted the epithet that acquires quasi autonomy, and it is arguable that Poseidon Erechtheus, say, and Artemis Iphigeneia preexisted the heroes Erechtheus and Iphigeneia; the process here would be one of division, not amalgamation.⁸³ Different again is the spasmodic emergence in the

as an alternative name or epithet of Artemis (though still independent in *I Amyzon* 14.3, joint cult with Zeus Kretagenes, and Callim. *Hymn* 3.198): see *Nommer les dieux*, 223 n. 34; *IG II*² 4688; *IG IX*.1.5; cf. 4. On Alea, see M. Jost, in *Nommer les dieux*, 393. Britomartis and Aphaia resisted reduction to epithets in cult, though in Hellenistic narrative (*Ant. Lib. Met.* 40.4; cf. Paus. 2.30.3) Aphaia became a name for Britomartis: for independent Aphaia, see *IG IV*² 2.1024, 1038.1 (cf. Polinskaya, *Local History*, 177–96); for Britomartis, A. Chaniotis, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in hellenistischer Zeit* (Stuttgart, 1996), 71 n. 387, Bruneau, *Cultes de Délos*, 203.

81. On all this, see Parker, "Artemis Ilithyē." On gods "inhabiting" and "determining" other gods in Egypt, see D. Kurth, "Götter determinieren Götter," *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 5 (1977): 175–81; J. Baines, in *One God or Many?* 31–36; on juxtapositions in Phoenician, with comparative material from other ancient polytheisms, P. Xella, "'Divinités doubles' dans le monde phénico-punique," *Semitica* 39 (1990) [*Mélanges M. Szymer* II]: 167–75.

82. For the first four (and some others), see in brief Parker, "Artemis Ilithyē," 223–24; for Artemis Andromeda, *ILindos* 220. At Megara there is Dionysus Dasyllios (Paus. 1.43.5), in the Megarian colony Kallatis an apparently freestanding Dasyllios (*SEG XLV* 911 A 4): see the refs. in *SEG*, loc cit.; and Chiekova, *Pont gauche*, 87–88.

83. But in regard to Iphi-, Linear B i-pe-me-de-ja (Iphimedeia: Rougemont, "Noms des dieux en linéaire B," 338) might suggest a yet more complex process whereby two theonyms coalesced (cf. Hes. fr. 23a.15–26), and one then split off as a heroine; Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 184, takes Poseidon Erectheus as by origin a combination of theonyms.

Hellenistic period of expressions such as Zeus Amphiaraios or Zeus Trophonios, where the point is not (as with Artemis Eileithyia) to focus Zeus via Trophonios, but rather to elevate Trophonios by association with the supreme god. Such expressions had an important future: the elative use of the name of Zeus in combination with innumerable other theonyms became very common in the Greek East in the Roman imperial period.⁸⁴ What made them possible was the elasticity of the cultic double name; that elasticity, in which the logical/theological relation of the two elements was always opaque, was crucial to practical polytheism.

Usener drew attention, through the concept of the *Sondergott*, to the way in which help was sought from divine powers with very specialised tasks. The advantage of abandoning his schema of historical progress is once again that we can see how uncertainly the powers in question continued to be conceptualised. At Olympia the flies that clustered around sacrificial animals were dispelled by Zeus Apomuios, “Away with Flies,” and Strabo lists a string of gods bearing “pesticide” epithets, such as Apollo Pornopion, “of Locusts.” But at Aliphera, southeast of Olympia, the difficulty with flies was met by a preliminary sacrifice to a hero Mu(i) agros, “Fly-Catcher,” while Aelian claims that at Cape Leucas on Leucas sacrifice was made to the flies themselves.⁸⁵ We encounter at Cyzicus in Bithynia Zeus Chalazios Sozon, “of Hail, Protector”; at Amaseia in Pontus the exotic variant Aither Alexichalazos, “Hail-Averting Ether”; but Kleonai in the Peloponnese was notorious for its special “hail wardens,” who sacrificed small animals or even a little of their own blood directly to the destructive force.⁸⁶ As late as the Roman period one could not bring a “thank-offering from the quartan (*tetartaios*)” only to “Asclepius Saviour,” but do the same to Tetartaios itself.⁸⁷ In different places Sosineos, “Save Ship,” and Sosipolis, “Save City,” were epithets and independent agents.⁸⁸ At Lebadeia in Boeotia the figure commonly known as (Zeus) Meilichios was named, in roughly the same period (3rd–2nd c.), Daimon M(e)ilichios (three times), Meilichios (once), Zeus Milichios (once); at Thespiiai in Boeotia Zeus Milichios

84. See p. 94 below.

85. Olympia: Paus. 5.14.1; but Pliny, *NH* 10.28.75 speaks of a god perhaps called Myiacores; Strabo 13.1.64, 613 (but the interpretation of Apollo’s epithet Smintheus as “Mouser” was judged “unseemly” by Aristarchus, who preferred to see it as toponymic, surely rightly: see Σ Hom. *Il.* 1.39, with Erbse’s note ad loc.); Aliphera: Paus. 8.26.7; Aelian, *NA* 11.8.

86. Cyzicus: Cook, *Zeus*, 3:880–81, with 875–81, much further information about hail aversion; Amaseia: Cook, 879; *SEG* XLVI 1608–9; Cleonai: Sen. *Nat. quaest.* 4b.6.2–7.2; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6.3, p. 446.11–15 Stählin. But in a passage of Proclus referring to the Theban *Daphnephoria* where Apollo’s epithet varies in the MSS, Galaxios is preferable to Chalazios (Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, 1:48).

87. *IStrat.* 1122; *Haute terres* no. 30; cf. the altar of Tetartaios, *IG* XII.6.536, and the dedication to θεός πυρετός, *SEG* XXXVII 1503 (Kastabala in Cilicia).

88. Sosineos: *SEG* XXXIII 14750 (hero); *CIRB* 30 (epithet of Poseidon, Roman period; cf. νηοσσός for Artemis and Apollo; Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.570, 2.927). Sosipolis: *IGB* 5. 5103 (hero); *LSA* 32.48 (epithet of Zeus); Paus. 6.20.2 (α δαίμων ἐπιχόριος).

was associated with a feminine Miliche (much later in Crete a Hera Melichia appears). (Similar ambiguities attach to Epidotes, “Extra Giver”: the word occurs as an epithet of Zeus, but there is also a collective of Epidotai.⁸⁹) It has often been supposed that Meilichios was in origin an independent god of the underworld, a *Sondergott* only secondarily attached to Zeus.⁹⁰ But the attachment, if attachment it was, had already occurred in some places by the fifth century, and the appearance of Daimon M(e)ilichios in Lebadeia centuries later cannot be dismissed as a mere survival; it must attest continuing or new uncertainty about the status of the figure addressed. The uncertainty did not matter, however; what mattered was to secure the assistance of the power in question, not the theological status of that power.

Function also prevailed over individual identity when appeals and dedications were made to anonymous clusters of gods: “the gods of aversion” (*apotropaioi* or *alexikakoi*), “saviour gods” (*sōtēres*), “gods who give heed” (*epēkooi*), “gods of boundaries” (*enorioi*).⁹¹ These or closely similar titles were born individually by several gods, and it may be that in a particular case the worshipper who dedicated thus anonymously would have been able to name the specific gods he or she had in mind. But the frequency of such expressions suggests that nonspecificity may have had its attractions. The very numerous dedications to, for instance, *theos/thea epēkooos*, “god/goddess who gives heed,” are different, in that, as with simple dedications to “god,” the identity of the god will have been obvious from the place

89. Epithet: *SEG* XI 1002 (6th c.); *SEG* LIX 422 (both Messenia); *IG* V.2.270; and Paus. 8.9.2 (Mantineia), probably the “phiale of Epidotas” in an inventory of the Argive Heraeum, *IG* IV.526; collective Paus. 2.27.6; cf. *IG* IV² 1.108.158, and possibly *SGDI* 342 near Pagasai. Paus. 3.17.9 speaks of Epidotes as a daimon in Sparta who averts divine wrath over Pausanias’s murder (though for Hesych. s.v. Epidotas it is a Spartan title of Zeus); there is also (Paus. 2.10.2) Hypnos Epidotes at Sicyon. For an ‘Ἐπιδώτειον at Epidaurus, see W. Peek, *Neue Inschriften aus Epidaurus* (Berlin, 1972), no. 23.

90. For all the attestations, see M. H. Jameson, D. R. Jordan, and R. D. Kotansky, *A lex sacra from Selinous*, *GRBM* 11 (Durham, N.C., 1993), 81–91 (for Lebadeia and Thespiei 84). At Selinous Meilichios is commoner than Zeus Meilichios (five instances to one), but the proportion is reversed elsewhere, and even at Selinous the Zeus Meilichios is on received datings as early (6th c.) as the first Meilichios without the theonym. Unnamed Meilichioi: Paus. 10.38.8; *IG* IX.2.1329. Underworld god: J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1908), 17–20, taken up, e.g., by G. Murray, *Five Stages of Greek Religion*, Thinker’s Library (London, 1935), 14–15.

91. *Theoi sōtēres*: e.g., the inscription by the architect of the Pharos at Alexandria; Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 62; *SEG* XLVIII 1331, Halicarnassus; *Gephyra* 10 (2013): 133 (Pisidian Conana); Ronchi, *Lexicon theonymon*, 1068. *Apotropaioi*: e.g., Aesch. *Pers.* 203; Xen. *Symp.* 4.33; Hippoc. *Vict.* 4.89; Pl. *Leg.* 854B. *Theoi apotropaioi kai alexikakoi*: *IByzantion* 12 (2nd/3rd c. A.D.; epigraphically references to individual *apotropaioi* are commoner). *Theoi epēkooi*: Weinreich, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 1:150–51. *Theoi enorioi*: Robert, *Noms indigènes*, 358 (Apameia/Apollonia frontier in Pisidia). *Themelioi* (“of foundations,” anti-earthquake gods): *BÉ* 1968, no. 465. *Meilichioi*: previous note. The *theoi prokuklioi* of *IERYthrai* 201 d 18, 23, have not been securely explained (Graf, *Nordionische Kulte*, 365–66); the epithet may be topographic, not functional. On groups, see too Polinskaya, *Local History*, 80–81.

where the offering was made. But still the emphasis is placed on the function rather than on the name. A pair of dedications from Patara in Lycia is interesting. One altar is dedicated (*TAM* II.403) to “Theos Soter (Saving God) Hedraios Asphales and Poseidon Hedraios and Helios Apollo.” The main preoccupation of the dedicator becomes obvious from Asphales, “Safe,” and the repetition of Hedraios, “with a Firm Base”: it is protection from earthquakes. The other (*TAM* II.404) is for Zeus Soter Hedraios: the same god as on the other altar, but with Zeus here replacing Theos. Was the dedicator of the first altar thinking of this Zeus Soter Hedraios? Or did he feel the identity of the greatest protector against earthquakes to be unknowable and leave it deliberately vague? The example chosen comes from Anatolia in the imperial period, but the drift toward vagueness is an important fact of Greek religious psychology at all periods.⁹²

We can conclude this section with the god Pylon, “Gateway,” who emerges in eastern Pontos and Cappadocia in (to our observation) the second century A.D., worshipped by the *beneficarii consularis*; these were a kind of police officer often, as it seems, having their headquarters, for obvious reasons, near city gates. Another dedication from eastern Pontos by a *beneficiarius* was made to a Zeus Propylaios, “of the Gateway,” no doubt envisaged as very similar to Pylon himself.⁹³ The late emergent *Sondergott* Pylon, with his very specialised group of worshippers, shows how the impulses located by Usener at the origins of polytheism persisted in its latest stages.

THE CREATION OF EPITHETS

The epithets confront us in the thousands,⁹⁴ but in the main we have no precise information as to how they were created; they are just there. We can see rather better how they were diffused, because we know that oracles often advised a city to introduce a god under this or that title, and we can even identify titles that they favoured in such prescriptions, such as Poseidon Asphaleios, “of Security,” Zeus Hypatos, “Highest,” Apollo Prostaterios, “Protector,” Artemis Orthosia, “Who Sets

92. Cf. Mitchell, “Theos Hypsistos,” 102, on the choice between Theos Hypsistos and Zeus Hypsistos as conscious, not arbitrary; Chaniotis, “Megatheism,” 129–31, on *SEG* L 1222 (Iuliopolis in Bithynia, 2nd/3rd c.), an enthusiastic dedication to an unnamed “best greatest listening saviour god . . . lord of the kosmos”; W. Wischmeyer, *ZAC* 9 (2005): 156, on “anonymisation.” For *theos* Olbios and Zeus Olbios in the same cult(s) in Hellepontine Mysia, see L. Robert, *Collection Froehner*, vol. 1, *Inscriptions grecques* (Paris, 1936), 58–61, with *Hellenica* II, 152–53 (and in brief *BE* 1972, no. 368); note too, e.g., “the god who lightens and thunders,” *TAM* V.1.585; the “goddess good to meet” (εὐάντητος), *TAM* V.2.1185.

93. See T.M. Mitford, “The God Pylon in Eastern Pontus,” *Byzantion* 36 (1966): 471–90; one Cappadocian example (Kırşehir) is published, and another (Nigde) mentioned, by D. French, *EpigAnat* 28 (1997): 118.

94. For a useful overview of those of Thessaly, see Mili, *Ancient Thessaly*, 304–24.

Straight (?)”⁹⁵ Only very occasionally can we observe the creation of an epithet. The most reliable case must be one for which we have a king’s own word: Eumenes II of Pergamum explains in a letter to the Coans concerning his festival Nikephoria that he has “named her [Athena] Nikephoros (Victory-Bringer), considering this title ([προσω]νυμία) the fairest and most appropriate.”⁹⁶ Herodotus tells us that when in 480 the Greeks received news of the providential storm that had wrecked much of the Persian fleet, they “prayed and made libations to Poseidon Soter (Saviour)” and have “used the title (ἑπωνυμία) of Poseidon Soter ever since from then to this day” (7.192.2). Such a naming would both commemorate a victory and express a hope for continued saving in the future, that is, for a function; such a blend of the retrospective and the prospective is found in some titles in Catholicism, such as Madonna della Salute, “of Health” (relating to help in a time of plague), and Madonna della Pace, “of Peace” (relating to a particular peace). This was not in fact a case of the creation of an epithet, but of its first application to a particular god; we hear similarly of occasions when Asclepius was acclaimed (for the first time in that place?) as Soter in Sparta, Herakles by the same title in Kassope in Epirus, Artemis Leukophryene as Nikephoros, “Victory-Bringer,” in Magnesia on the Maeander.⁹⁷ Later the Mantineans founded a temple of Aphrodite Symmachia, “of Alliance,” which may be an authentic new coinage, “as a memorial of their fighting alongside the Romans at Actium” (Paus. 8.9.6).

Most other claims are anecdotal and unreliable. According to a story, Sophocles founded a sanctuary of Herakles μῆνυστής, “informer,” when the hero revealed to him in a dream the identity of a thief who had stolen a golden crown from his shrine (or from the Acropolis). The epithet is so singular that some such occasion seems necessary to explain it, but perhaps not one involving so well-known a figure as Sophocles. We can perhaps believe Plutarch when he tells us that Themisto-

95. See, e.g., the responses H 19, 28, 29, 39, 50 and 74 in J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle* (Berkeley, 1978), with LSA 87 = *IKaunos* 31 (identified as an oracle by E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law: a Collection of New Documents*, Leiden 2004, 35 n. 162). The Delphic oracle SGO 02/02/01 (Tralleis) lists five titles under which Poseidon should be invoked as protector against earthquakes. Late in the third century A.D., the prophet of Apollo at Didyma, Damianos, having secured the god’s permission to establish an altar of Soteira Kore, then asks the god to prescribe her εὐφημος καὶ ὑμνικὴ προσαγόρευσις; the god recommends μείλιχος (*IDidyma* 504.19–31).

96. K. Rigsby, *Asylia* (Berkeley 1996), no. 176.5–6; cf. 177.17–19. The epithet has a later history: the goddess becomes “Polias and Nikephoros,” apparently via an intermediate stage, coinciding, it has been argued, with the end of the monarchy and a perception that she no longer brought victory (H. Müller, *Chiron* 33, 2003: 443–44), in which she was Polias alone.

97. Isyllos of Epidauros 82 (Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, p. 135); *SEG XXXVI* 555.6; *IMagnesia* 100 b 41 (householders of the city are urged to set up altars bearing this title on the occasion of the inauguration of the city’s Parthenon—the Athena Nikephoros of Pergamum doubtless brought the epithet into view, though its popularity on Hellenistic Delos among worshippers of Egyptian gods [*ID* 1230, 1304] may relate to local circumstances: see Roussel on *ID* 1304).

cles caused annoyance by naming Artemis Aristoboule, “of Best Counsels,” in disguised celebration of his own excellent strategy (another commemorative/functional blend if so),⁹⁸ we should surely not believe that Aphrodite Kallipygos, “Fair Buttocked,” in Syracuse owed her name to two young women grateful for the social advancement that their own fair buttocks had brought them (Ath. 12.80, 554C-E). Royal authority doubtless counted for much: we have seen Eumenes’ creation of the title Nikephoros for Athena, and it was under the same impulse that the cult of Dionysus under the name Kathegemon, “Leader,” radiated out so widely from Pergamum.⁹⁹

Many titles must have been products of particular circumstances that we can only guess at. We can understand why Apollo was called Korax, “Raven,” on an early graffito dedication from Cyrene, though the form of the double name—simple juxtaposition of a god’s name and an animal’s—is unusual: the epithet obviously evokes the myth that in the form of a raven he guided Battos and the first settlers when they arrived in Libya.¹⁰⁰ But the circumstances that caused the mythical detail to become an epithet (if it was regularly so used) escape us. At Eretria on Euboea ca. 340 a decision was taken to hold a musical competition at the Artemisia τῆ Μεταξὺ καὶ τῆ Φυλάκει, probably to be translated “for the One in Between and the Guardian,” most unusual titles of, we assume, Artemis; they commemorated, it has been argued, her role as intermediary and conciliator in a recent civil war.¹⁰¹ There was scope for creativity and individual choice. In the mid-second century, during a revolt in Syria against Demetrios II Nikator, the badly defeated army of Demetrios’s general Sarpedon was saved when the enemy, pursuing them along the shore, were engulfed by a great wave. Sarpedon’s men sacrificed a great mass of fishes also deposited by the wave to Poseidon Tropaios, “of Route.” Poseidon receives that title, normal in the cult of Zeus, here only; it was probably a nonce invention by Sarpedon’s troops to celebrate the paradoxical routing of an army on land by the god of the sea (*FGrH* 87 F 29). But the process can usually not be reconstructed. As a result, we do not know with any precision—to take a handful of examples at

98. Informer: *Vit. Soph.* (= Sophocles T 1 Radt) 12; and Cic. *Div.* 1.54 (T 167a Radt). Of Best Counsels: Plut. *Them.* 22. 2; cf. Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 155.

99. Ohlemutz, *Kulte in Pergamon*, 90–116. Alexander supposedly proclaimed that the Apollo of Tyre suspected of treachery in his favour by the Tyrians should be dubbed Philalexandros: Diod. Sic. 17.46.6 (cf. 17.41.7–8). It is not clear how seriously this was meant, or whether it had any effect.

100. *SEG* XLIV 1541, no. 1; cf. Callim. *Hymn* 2.65–68. For such a juxtaposition, cf. Artemis πῶλος in Paros and Thasos (*IG* XII Suppl. p. 106, no. 202; p. 160, nos. 382–83).

101. D. Knoepfler, in M. H. Hansen, ed., *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community* (Copenhagen, 1997), 376–77, on RO 73.6. Before Knoepfler the expression τῆ Μεταξὺ καὶ τῆ Φυλάκει had been understood as a designation of place or time. Speaking of the epithets “of Hera and King and of Concord” given to Zeus in RO 85.6–7, V. Pirenne-Delforge and G. Pironti, *ZPE* 191 (2014): 30, write: “Les officiels de la cité ont construit une configuration panthéonique de circonstance.” Cf. *Keltische Götternamen*.

random from Pausanias—why Herakles is Parastates, “Comrade in Arms,” in Elis (5.8.1); Dionysus Aisymnetes, “Magistrate,” in Patrai (7.20.1); Artemis Hymnia, “of Hymns (?)” throughout Arcadia (8.5.11); Aphrodite Melaina, “Black,” near Mantinea (8.6.5); Dionysus Polites, “Citizen,” at Heraia (8.26.1); Aphrodite Machanitis, “Deviser,” in Megalopolis (8.31.6); Apollo Epikourios, “Helper,” at Bassai (8.41.7); Ares Aphneios, “Wealthy,” in the territory of Tegea (8.44.7–8); Dionysus Aigobolos, “Goat-Shooter,” at Potniai in Boeotia (9.8.1–2); or Hermes Kriophoros and Promachos, “Ram-Carrier” and “Frontline Fighter,” at Tanagra (9.22.1–2). Still obscurer is the origin of the many epithets the meaning of which is unknown.

AN OUTLINE HISTORY OF THE DOUBLE NAME

A form of the cultic double name is common in Linear B, though not quite of the type familiar in later Greece: most commonly it consists of Potnia, “Lady, Mistress,” preceded or followed by specifications of various kinds: Potnia of Atana (or Athena Potnia), Potnia of Asia, Potnia of Horses (a remarkable preoccurrence of the familiar epithet), Corn Potnia or Potnia of Corn, and several Potnia plus toponym combinations, most notably Potnia of the Labyrinth; there is also Diktaian Zeus, of Mount Dikte.¹⁰² Cult epithets appear in Greek literature and inscriptions from the earliest times, if not in great numbers; a good early instance is Alcaeus’s account of how the Lesbians named the gods of their great central sanctuary “Zeus Antiaos (‘of Suppliants?’) and you, Aeolian glorious goddess, origin of all, and third this κερμήλιον [not understood] Dionysus Omestes (‘Raw Flesh Eater’)” (fr. 129.5–9 Voigt). In classical texts the system is unfolded more clearly to our view, but not changed. Change, or at least a change in the language of dedicatory inscriptions, occurred in the Hellenistic period with the growing importance of acclamatory/supplicatory epithets applicable to several gods, such as “Saviour” or “Who Heeds Prayers.” A tendency also arose to see the ordinary cult epithet less as an identifier than as a glorifier: where a single epithet suffices to identify, a heaping up of glorifiers heaps up glory; these two developments together could lead to the multiplication of epithets, occasionally to an extreme degree.¹⁰³ All this will be discussed in a later chapter. With the assimilation of mortals to gods in ruler cult, monarchs and their families too acquired variants of the cultic double name;¹⁰⁴ henceforth there

102. See Rougemont, “Noms des dieux en linéaire B,” 344–60. The interpretation of u-po-jo Potnia is disputed (p. 354). Rougemont concludes (360): “The functioning of the epithets is identical to that known in the classical period.”

103. Scholars and educators also became interested in epithets in the period: see *OpAth* 28 (2003): 174, and the list of epithets of Zeus inscribed (on a gymnasium wall?) in Miletus perhaps in the second century A.D. (*SEG* XLV 1612 = *IMilet* VI.3.1395).

104. See, e.g., the striking list of Alexandrian street names based on titles of Arsinoe II in Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1:35.

was a certain interaction between royal titlature and divine. But these changes in the language of dedication are not reflected in Pausanias: in him, there is no trace of the acclamatory use of the epithet: it continues to identify, and is extended to identify, not merely individual sanctuaries but also individual cult images within them. Nor did all dedications adopt the new style: the intense and moving devotion of many Phrygian peasants in the second/third centuries A.D.¹⁰⁵ was addressed to simple combinations of Zeus and one epithet. The old system met a need, and proved remarkably durable.

NAMING MEN AND NAMING GODS

Onomastic science has pursued the psychology of naming into unexpected areas: one can inform oneself about how people name pleasure boats, pharmacies, race-horses . . .¹⁰⁶ But it is not easy to find theoretical reflection on the special issues involved in the naming of gods (a different matter from the naming of God, on which there is an abundant devotional literature going back at least to *On Divine Names* of Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite). In some respects naming of gods follows principles found in human naming or other aspects of ordinary language use: titles can replace names in addressing both human and divine superiors; euphemisms veil feared conditions as they veil feared gods. But we noted earlier that divine names tend to be either more opaque (e.g., Asclepius) or more transparently related to a function (e.g., Hygieia, "Health"), than those of mortals. And it is hard to think of analogues in secular usage for the cultic double name. For the topographic epithet one might compare "the Rokesby Venus" or the "Marks and Spencers in Summertown," but in these cases the noun refers to a class via an unstated term (images of Venus; branches of a chain store), whereas Artemis of Ephesus is not reducible to "the sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesus," though grounded in that. For the functional epithet I can think of no analogue. The various ways in which a theonym can be replaced by an epithet (theonym omitted completely; theonym replaced by *theos/thea*; singular named god replaced by anonymous group) move us into a sphere in which the object of address is not a person but a power, a danger to be averted, a benefit to be secured. Also unthinkable in human terms are conflation of related beings such as Artemis Eileithyia, however one chooses to parse the precise relation of the two names in that expression.

"We know nothing about the gods, neither about them in themselves nor about the names by which they call one another": this famous remark of Plato's Socrates

105. Those studied in *Phrygian Votive Steles*: the simplicity is stressed by Chiai, "Medien religiöser Kommunikation," 71.

106. *Namenforschung*, 2: sec. 18.

(*Crat.* 400D) explains some of the singularities of the phenomenon.¹⁰⁷ There is a problem in naming that which one cannot see, or know. (In a very different religious context, a quondam archbishop of Canterbury writes of the “challenge” of referring to “what is not an object among others or a definable substance that can be “isolated” and examined.”¹⁰⁸) Uncertainties about where one god ends and another begins (Artemis Eileithyia), about who is a god and what is a mere epithet, about whether a particular minor power is an individual or a group,¹⁰⁹ are one product of this fundamental unknowability; so too are vague and anonymised forms of expression that stress the good to be secured rather than the name. The cultic double name is an attempt, by contrast, to stop the gods slipping away like water through the hands. It roots them in the places visibly consecrated to them and in the urgent needs which worshippers bring to them, and which they are believed to have satisfied in the past. But it also fragments the god into pieces, so that the question arises, for us at least, whether Greeks prayed to one Zeus or several hundreds.¹¹⁰

Socrates continues, in the passage just quoted, “just as in prayers it is conventional for us to pray them as ‘whoever and from wherever they like to be named,’ so too we should address them, since we know nothing else” (*Crat.* 400E). From such formulae (an attested but by no means universal feature of Greek prayers) it has often been inferred that the danger of addressing a god by the wrong name was a source of anxiety for the Greeks, a danger they guarded against by such catchall formulae.¹¹¹ Little in the epigraphic evidence supports that view. What is striking is the variety of ways in which gods are named, not just in different places but within the same sanctuary. Artemis at Gonnoi in Thessaly is addressed as Artemis Eileithyia repeatedly, but also quite often as Artemis Genetaira, “of Begetting,” and occasionally as Artemis (Eu)lochia, “of (Easy) Birth,” or Artemis Euonymos, “of Auspicious Name”; all these dedications are likely to come from the same precinct.¹¹² There are many comparable examples; fixed and regulated forms of address

107. Cf. T. Harrison, *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2000), 191 nn. 31 and 33; 258 n. 29.

108. R. Williams, *The Edge of Words: God and the Habits of Language* (London, 2014), as cited in the *Times Literary Supplement*, Feb. 6, 2015, 28. The *Cratylus* position was often echoed in antiquity, e.g., *Deorum vera nomina nemo novit*, a view mooted in Serv. ad *Aen.* 4. 577; it does not matter what name is given to the supreme being, Celsus ap. Origen *C. Cels.* 1.24, 5.41 (a position rejected by Origen himself, *C. Cels.* 1.24).

109. On figures such as Pan occasionally attested as plurals, see F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cites grecques, Supplément* (Paris, 1962), 95, with references; for Eileithyiai, *BÉ* 2015, no. 574.

110. Cf. n. 64 above.

111. For exposition and critique of this view, see S. Pulleyn, *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1997), 96–115.

112. See B. Helly, *Gonnoi* (Amsterdam, 1973), 1:31 and 148, on inscriptions 161–96 of his vol. 2; the most questionable provenance is perhaps that of Euonymos. The sanctuaries of Artemis at Lousoi (nn. 61 and 63 above), Artemis at Blagana (M. Hatzopoulos, *BCH* 111, 1987: 397–401), Zeus at Baitokaike

evidently did not exist, and it looks as if worshippers sometimes improvised and innovated. Names and epithets were imperfect human instruments for gaining contact with the divine; fortunately they worked, and there was no need to seek an unattainable precision.

ENDNOTE: THE ALTARS AT OLYMPIA

One of the most remarkable illustrations of the varieties of Greek divine naming in a single context is Pausanias's list (5.14.4–15.10) of the sixty-five altars within the sacred precinct at Olympia on which the Eleans made offerings each month (5.14.4, 15.10), listed, as he stresses (5.14.4, 10), in the order in which the offerings were made.

It is the following: Hestia; Zeus Olympios; <Zeus Laoitas and Poseidon Laoitas>;¹¹³ Artemis; Athena Leitis; Ergane; Alpheios (*the river*) and Artemis; Alpheios; Hephaistos or Zeus Areios; Herakles Parastates; Epimedes; Idas (or Akesidas); Paionaios; Iasos (the last four all heroes); Zeus Herkeios; Zeus Keraunios; Zeus Olympios; “unknown gods”; Zeus Katharsios; Nike (Victory); Zeus Chthonios; “all the gods”; Hera Olympia; Apollo and Hermes; Homonoia (Concord); Athena; Mother of the Gods; Hermes Enagonios; Kairos (Right Moment); Kouretes or Herakles; Ge (Earth); Themis (Divine Order); Zeus Kataibates; Dionysus and Charites (Graces); Muses; Nymphs; “all the gods”; Aphrodite; Horai (Seasons); Nymphai Kallistephanoi; Artemis Agoraia; Despoinei (Mistresses); Zeus Agoraios; Apollo Pythios; Dionysus; Moiragetas; Moirai (Fates); Hermes; Zeus Hypsistos (bis); Poseidon Hippias; Hera Hippias; Dioscuri; Ares Hippios; Athena Hippias;¹¹⁴ Tyche Agathe (Good Fortune), Pan and Aphrodite; Nymphai Akmenai; Artemis; River Kladeos; Artemis; Apollo; Artemis Kokkoka; Apollo Thermios; Pan; Artemis Agrotera; Pan.

The number of gods named without epithets may surprise, but we are dealing here with altars, not separate sanctuaries; there was therefore less “bureaucratic” pressure for distinguishing epithets. Among the epithets, almost none are toponymic, except Olympios; the reason again is that these are altars within a confined space, not sanctuaries dispersed through a territory. Moiragetas was inscribed without an accompanying theonym, but Pausanias explains that anyone “who

(p. 123 below), Apollo Lairbenos in Phrygia (see the references in *SEG* LX 1440–43), Aphrodite Kas(s)alitis Hearing Goddess at Anazarbos, where various selections and combinations of those four names, most commonly just “Hearing Goddess,” are found (*IAnazarbos* 29–38), and spectacularly of Asclepius at Salda and Zulfudra in Thrace (*IGB* II, index p. 247; and III.1, index p. 295), provide further examples. On personal choices by persons of some culture, see, e.g., L. Robert, *Hellenica* IX, 61–63; K. Rigsby, “A Greek Dedication at Sidon,” *Tyche* 22 (2007): 143–50. Cf. n. 101 above.

113. Supplied from 5.24.1.

114. The sudden rush of Hippias epithets occurs because we are entering the hippodrome; Hermes Enagonios and Kairos are distinctively sporting too.

understands the affairs of men” will recognise here an epithet of Zeus; Ergane too presumably lacked a theonym, since Pausanias gives none, but here he perhaps finds it unnecessary to explain that Athena is meant. (The doubts about the ownership of two altars—Hephaistos or Zeus Areios, Kouretes or Herakles—seem to show that they were uninscribed or had lost their inscription; they received offerings all the same.) A large number of the epithets will have borne their meaning on their face for any Greek: Ergane, “Worker”; Areios, “of Ares”; Parastates, “Comrade in Arms”; Herkeios, “of the Courtyard”; Keraunios, “of the Thunderbolt”; Katharsios, “of Purification”; Chthonios, “of the Earth”; Enagonios, “of Competitions”; Kataibates, “Who Comes Down” (as the thunderbolt); Kallistephanoi, “with Fair Garlands”; Agoraios, “of the Marketplace”; Moiragetas, “Leader of the Fates”; Hypsistos, “Highest”; Hippios/a, “of Horses”; Agrotera, “Huntress.” A few are more *recherché*. Leitis, “of the Spoil,” is a good Homeric epithet for Athena (*Il.* 10.460), but Laoitas would suggest no more than a vague link with *laos*, “people”; and it would have taken a very good scholar to connect the Nymphai Akmenoi with a word occurring once in Homer where it apparently means “flourishing” (*Od.* 23.191). Pausanias speculates that Thermios is equivalent to Attic Thesmios, “of Laws”—the word was therefore not transparent for him—but was unable to learn any explanation of Artemis’s epithet Kokkoka (5.15.7). We are reminded how wrong it is to suppose that epithets needed to convey meaning in order to remain in use.