Alaya Palamidis

The Names of Greek Gods. Divine Signs or Human Creations?

Abstract: Where do the names of Greek gods come from? Do the names used by the Greeks to address their gods correspond to their "true" names, taught to the Greeks by the gods themselves? Or are they mere conventions that please the gods? Leaving aside philosophical debates, and especially Plato's views, which are already well-known, this contribution will not only consider the famous Herodotean passages that explicitly address the question of the origin of the gods' names, but will also take into account other sources that implicitly hint at their origin. How are divine names treated in Homeric and Hesiodic poetry? In foundation myths of sanctuaries, found in Pausanias and other sources, who names the gods? What role do oracles play in establishing new divine names for later cult foundations? In the case of divine epiphanies, how are the deities recognised and their name determined?

In a famous passage from Plato's *Cratylus*, Socrates states that "we know nothing about the gods, neither about them nor about the names (ὀνομάτων), by which they possibly call themselves; for it is clear that they call themselves using the true (τἀληθῆ) names".[1] Socrates refuses to speculate about these "true" divine names,[2] since their knowledge is inaccessible to humans. Instead, he is willing to discuss the names given to the gods by the Greeks, as such an endeavour does not provoke the wrath of the gods (ἀνεμέσητον). However, these names are not mere conventions (ξυνθήματα/ξυνθήκη).[3] A name is correct (ὀρθός) when "it shows of what sort the thing (named) is" (οἷόν ἐστι τὸ πρᾶγμα)[4] and the correctness of a name can be evaluated by an etymological enquiry.[5] According to Socrates, Zeus has been very beautifully (παγκάλως) named, Hestia correctly (ὀρθῶς), Ares' name is fitting (πρέποι), while etymology reveals that Demeter's daughter should correctly (ὀρθῶς) be named

1 Pl. *Cra.* 400d–e. On divine names in the *Cratylus*, cf. Bonnet 2020, 20–27; Bonnet 2019, 601, and Padovani in this volume with previous bibliography.

2 In this paper, the expression "divine names" always refers to the names of the gods in general.

3 *E.g.* Pl. *Cra.* 433e.

4 Pl. *Cra.* 428e; cf. 422d.

5 On etymology as a means of access to knowledge about the gods, see Padovani in this volume.

Note: This publication has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 741182). I would like to thank Corinne Bonnet, Thomas Galoppin, Sylvain Lebreton, Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge, and all the participants in the MAP workshop, especially Nicole Belayche and Francesco Padovani, for their precious remarks.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111326511-031

Pherepapha rather than Persephone.[6] The names that are used by custom (νόμος) also have "a second kind of correctness (ὀρθότητος)"[7] since they obviously please (χαίρουσιν) the gods.[8]

In a no less famous passage, Herodotus writes that the Greeks learnt the names of most gods from the Egyptians, but that some gods such as Hera or Hestia "were named (ὀνομασθῆναι) by the Pelasgians",[9] while it is Hesiod and Homer who "gave the gods their *eponumiai*".[10] These texts by Plato and Herodotus have been much discussed; however, aside from them, Greek views about the origin of divine names have received surprisingly little attention in modern scholarship.[11] Did the Greeks consider them mere conventions or fitting names that pleased the gods? Or, rather, did they think that they came from the gods themselves? In the latter case, how did the Greeks know the names of their gods? Unfortunately, there are hardly any texts that directly address these questions, but we still have many sources that indicate how individual deities received their names.[12] These sources, I will argue, suggest that the Greeks attributed various origins to the gods' epithets, but that they usually interpreted their theonyms as their "true" names, in the Platonic sense.[13]

1 Divine Names in Homeric and Hesiodic Poetry

A few passages in the Homeric poems refer to things that are named differently by the humans and by the gods.[14] In particular, in the first book of the *Iliad*, Achilles mentions one of Ouranos' and Gaia's sons, "whom the gods call (καλέουσι) Briareus, but all men call Aigaion".[15] These divine words, that are used in specific narrative situations, reveal a knowledge about the things they refer to that is inaccessible to humans.[16] These passages concerning divine words are cited by Plato in his *Cratylus*;[17] they seem to have directly influenced the views represented by Socrates on the origin

6 Pl. *Cra.* 395e (Zeus); 401c (Hestia); 407d (Ares); 404d (Pherepapha).

7 Pl. *Cra.* 400e.

8 On names that are pleasing to the gods, see Herrero de Jáuregui in this volume.

9 Hdt. 2.50.

10 Hdt. 2.53. On the meaning of *eponumiai*, see below.

11 See mainly Borgeaud 1996, 26–27. van den Berg 2006 deals mostly with late Antique texts.

12 These questions deserve a much more thorough investigation but I would already like to offer a few preliminary thoughts.

13 I only take into account onomastic attributes that are used to identify (the deity of a particular place or a particular aspect of a deity), and I leave aside onomastic elements whose function is to glorify the gods. On this distinction, see Parker 2017, 9–17.

14 See in particular Brouillet 2013.

15 Hom. *Il.* 1.403–404.

16 Brouillet 2013, especially 158–162.

17 Pl. *Cra.* 391e–392a.

of human language and the names given to the gods by the Greeks,[18] which are "correct" (*orthos*) while the names that the gods use for themselves are "true" (*alethes*).[19] Modern scholars often refer to these divine words as a "language of the gods", but this expression is inappropriate.[20] It is not a language, with verbs, a grammar and a syntax, and there is no indication that the gods have different words for each thing or living being.[21] In the epics, the gods speak the same language as the humans and only a few words are exclusive to them. Moreover, some of these words are divulged to Achilles and Odysseus, who have a particularly close relationship with the gods.[22] For instance, Achilles has often heard his mother, the goddess Thetis, tell the story of how she helped Zeus by summoning Briareus and this is presumably how he knows the name by which the gods call Aigaion.[23] In the poems, Achilles and Odysseus are not expected to keep knowledge of divine words to themselves, they are, in fact, free to share it with the other Greeks.[24] Contrary to what is suggested by Plato, these "words of the gods" cannot be taken as an indication that divine names are inaccessible to the mortals.

Apart from Briareus, all divine beings are always called by the names known to humans. Among themselves, the gods use the same names as the Greeks: for example, in the *Iliad*, Athena addresses her father as "Zeus", while the latter calls his sister and wife "Hera".[25] It is also by these names that the gods call themselves when they speak to the mortals. For instance, to Odysseus, who does not recognise her, the goddess who appears to him when he reaches Ithaca reveals that she is "Pallas Athena, daughter of Zeus".[26] It is a revelation of the goddess' identity rather than her name, which is already known to the Greeks. But in the logic of the epics, similar divine apparitions would perhaps have allowed the distant ancestors of the heroes who fought in Troy to find out the names of gods for the first time.

In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the use of the same names by the mortals and the gods could be seen as nothing more than a narrative strategy. But in the *Theogony*, Hesiod is more explicit when he mentions the goddess that "gods and men call (κικλήσκουσι)" Aphrodite or Kythereia, and the goddesses that "both the immortal gods and the humans who walk on earth call (καλέουσιν) the Graiai".[27] These names were chosen

18 Le Feuvre 2019, 97–103.

19 Pl. *Cra.* 401c; 404d; cf. 400e (*orthos*); 400d–e (*alethes*).

20 As shown by Brouillet 2013, 157–158. On these passages, cf. Chiron 2017 and Le Feuvre 2019, who do not cite M. Brouillet's study.

21 Cf. also Le Feuvre 2019, 88.

22 Brouillet 2013, 165.

23 Hom. *Il.* 396–406.

24 Brouillet 2013, 167–168.

25 *E.g.* Hom. *Il.* 5.421 (Athena); 1.545 (Hera).

26 Hom. *Od.* 13.300. Likewise, Demeter, Apollo or Dionysos indicate their names to mortals in the so–called *Homeric hymns* dedicated to them: *h.Cer.* 268; *h.Ap.* 480; *h.Bacch.* 56.

27 Hes. *Th.* 197; 271–272.

by the gods, as suggested by the example of the deities whom "their father, the great Ouranos, called (καλέεσκε) with the byname (ἐπίκλησιν) Titans".[28] These passages occur in the part of the poem that refers to the period before the separation between human and divine speech, when gods and humans still interacted:[29] it is presumably because of their former proximity with the gods that the Greeks knew the names of Aphrodite or the Graiai. However, the use of present tense in these passages suggests a continuity rather than a break. These names would have been transmitted from generation to generation from a distant past up to Hesiod's day.

The so-called *Homeric hymns* also attribute a divine origin to the names of the gods. According to the poet of the *Hymn to Pan* – who plays with the name of the eponymous god that supposedly derives from the word πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν ("all") – it is the immortals who "called (καλέεσκον) him Pan, because he delighted the heart of all".[30] In the *Hymn to Apollo*, the god appears to the Cretans he has chosen as his future cult attendants and declares that they shall "pray to [him] as Delphinios"[31] – an example that shows that it is not only the gods' theonyms, but also their epithets, that may have been chosen by the deities themselves and dictated to the mortals in a distant past.

At the same time, both Homer, Hesiod and the poets of the so-called *Homeric hymns* present themselves as intermediaries between the gods and their audience at a time when communication between mortals and immortals has been broken. In the *Iliad*, the poet asks the Muses to tell (ἔσπετε) him about the Trojan war, as they "know (ἴστέ) everything".[32] Hesiod, in his *Theogony*, writes that it is the Muses who taught (ἐδίδαξαν) him his song.[33] In particular, the poet asks them to "tell (εἴπατε) how in the first place gods and earth were born", and "how [the gods] divided their wealth and distributed their honours".[34] About a third of the so-called *Homeric hymns* also start with an invocation to the Muses. If the events narrated in the Homeric epics, the *Theogony* and the hymns have been taught by the gods, and especially the Muses, the divine names used by the gods themselves in these poems may be considered part of this knowledge of divine origin. It is noteworthy that Hesiod refers to Briareus by the name which according to Homer is used by the gods and not by the name Aigaion, by which the mortals call him.[35] The poets imply that they use the "true" names (in the Platonic sense) of the gods in their poetry, some of them apparently transmitted from generation to generation from a distant past, others perhaps revealed to them by the

28 Hes. *Th.* 207–208.

29 Leclerc 1993, in particular part 3 and 274–275.

30 *h.Pan.* 47.

31 *h.Ap.* 499. Cf. Herrero de Jáuregui in this volume (p. 114) about the *ich–Stil*.

32 Hom. *Il.* 2.484–493 2.485. About the Muses in Homeric poetry, see in particular Semenzato 2017, 14–55.

33 Hes. *Th.* 22–23; cf. *Op*. 662 and Hom. *Od.* 8.479–481 and 487–491. On the role of the Muses in Hesiodic poetry, see Leclerc 1993, part 4; Semenzato 2017, 56–109.

34 Hes. *Th.* 108; 112. Transl. G.W. Most (*LCL*).

35 Hes. *Th.* 149; 617; 714; 734; 817; cf. Leclerc 1993, 265.

Muses.[36] Is this idea specific to the poetic genre, or does it reflect a widespread idea? While the views of most Greeks are inaccessible to us, the works of Herodotus and Pausanias constitute useful starting points to reflect on this question.

2 Herodotus on Divine Names

Herodotus believes (δοκέω) that "almost all the names (οὐνόματα) of the gods came (ἐλήλυθε) from Egypt to Greece",[37] not directly but through the Pelasgians, a people supposed by the Greeks to have lived in various regions of the Greek world in ancient times.[38] As all the examples he cites in this passage[39] suggest, what he refers to as names (*ounomata*) probably corresponds to the gods' "theonyms". Herodotus possibly means that the Greeks learnt the names of the gods from the Egyptians and the Pelasgians and subsequently adapted them into their own language. For instance, if the author writes that the Scythian name of Zeus, Papaios, is "most correct" (ὀρθότατα),[40] it is presumably because he explains the name Papaios through the Greek word *pappas*, the father, and because he considers the name to express the same idea as the Greek name "Zeus", whom he may have understood as the god "producing life" or as "the cause of life".[41] Herodotus may have considered both Greeks and Scythians to have adapted the Egyptian name of Zeus into their own language.

But did the Egyptians create these divine names based on their knowledge of the deities, or did they also learn them? Herodotus writes that, except for the gods who were named by the Pelasgians, "the Egyptians have always had (αἰεί κοτε [. . .] ἐστὶ) the names (οὐνόματα) of the other gods in their land"; as for the Libyans, they "possessed (ἔκτηνται) the name (οὔνομα) of Poseidon from the beginning".[42] Herodotus thinks (δοκέω) that the Egyptians "have existed forever, from the time when humankind came into being".[43] This implies that the Egyptians possessed the names of the gods from the moment that humankind came into being; they did not create them or acquire them little by little. This suggests a great proximity with the divine.

36 Cf. Leclerc 1993, 291.

37 Hdt. 2.50. I have developed my analysis of Herodotus' passages on divine names in an article, to which I refer (Palamidis forthcoming).

38 On the Pelasgians, see McInerney 2014.

39 Hdt. 2.49–52.

40 Hdt. 4.59.

41 As did Aeschylus (*Supp.* 584–585: φυσιζόου) and Plato (*Cra.* 396a: αἴτιος [. . .] τοῦ ζῆν). Cf. Munson 2005, 44–45 and n. 68.

42 Hdt. 2.50.

43 Hdt. 2.15.

According to the Egyptians, in a very remote past, "those who ruled in Egypt were gods, who dwelled together with the humans".[44] As usual, when referring to a distant past when gods perhaps interacted with humans, Herodotus only reports what people allege and does not express a personal opinion.[45] But he also fails to rule out that the first rulers of Egypt may have been gods. Therefore, when he writes that the Egyptians always had the names of the gods in their land, he seems at least to acknowledge the possibility that the Egyptians learnt the divine names from the gods themselves when they were ruled by them. Whatever the case, it is noteworthy that the oracle of Dodona consulted by the Pelasgians "ordered [them] to use (χρᾶσθαι) the names (οὐνόματα) that came (ἥκοντα) from the barbarians",[46] and it is the knowledge of these divinely approved names that the Pelasgians passed on to the Greeks.[47] As for the gods who were unknown to the Egyptians, "those, it seems to [Herodotus], were named (ὀνομασθῆναι) by the Pelasgians".[48]

Does this mean that, unlike the names of all the other gods, whose origin may be divine, the names of the Dioscuri, Hera, Hestia, Themis, the Charites and the Nereids are simply human conventions? It is likely that, according to Herodotus, the Pelasgians consulted the oracle of Dodona to validate these names, as they did before with the divine names that came from Egypt, even though it is not explicit in this passage. Moreover, in a fragment of Aeschylus' *Aetnaeans* that concerns the birth of the Palikoi,[49] to the question "what name (ὄνομα) will the mortals establish (θήσοντα) for them", the answer is "Zeus orders to call them (καλεῖν) the venerable Palikoi". Likewise, in his *Periegesis*, Pausanias writes that Pieros "changed (μεταθέσθαι) the names (ὀνόματα)" of the Muses, but then adds that he may have done so "in accordance with some oracle" (κατά τι μάντευμα).[50] As these examples show, the fact that a divine name was established by humans does not exclude the possibility of a divine command. In fact, in this passage, Herodotus is not interested in the precise creation process of the divine names attributed to the gods by the Pelasgians but rather in the identity of the first people to use these names that were unknown to the Egyptians. In the end, it seems that Herodotus' inquiry left him unable to form a precise opinion on the origin of divine names, but there is nothing in his work to suggest that he considers them all to be human conventions.

Unlike divine *ounomata* that came from the Egyptians and other peoples, it is Hesiod and Homer "who gave (δόντες) the gods their *eponumiai*", according to Herodotus'

44 Hdt. 2.144: θεοὺς εἶναι τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἄρχοντας οἰκέοντας ἅμα τοῖσι ἀνθρώποισι (according to Wilson's edition, but other editions read οὐκ ἐόντας instead of οἰκέοντας).

45 Darbo–Peschanski 1987, 25–35.

46 Herodotus 2.53.

47 Cf. Borgeaud 2006, 91–92.

48 Hdt. 2.50.

49 Fr. 6 Radt.

50 Paus. 9.29.

own hypothesis (ἐγὼ λέγω, "I say").[51] In the *Histories*, *eponumie* can be translated as "eponymous name", that is, a name given after someone or something, a meaningful name. *Eponumiai* are names, *ounomata*, but while the word *ounoma* stresses the function of a name, the word *eponumie* insists on its etymology. It probably has the same meaning in this passage. Here, it is unlikely that the author is referring to "cult epithets", which are very rare in the works of Hesiod and Homer, and what Hesiod and Homer gave to the gods is more probably their poetic names and epithets.

But what does Herodotus mean when he writes that they "gave" (δόντες) these *eponumiai* to the gods? When referring to the attribution of a name, ancient authors never use *didomi*, but this verb can be translated as "to offer" when its object is a gift, a sacrifice or honours.[52] This suggests that, according to Herodotus, Hesiod and Homer gave the *epomumiai* to the gods as an offering to please them. If they are thought to please the gods, it is perhaps because they are not just *ounomata*, but rather *eponumiai*, meaningful names that praise them by reflecting their characteristics. And if the poets are able to describe the characteristics of the gods in words, it is perhaps because they are inspired by the Muses, whose presence in this passage is suggested by other elements. The divine *eponumiai* may stem from an exchange with the gods, who inspire the poets and allow them to create names that they in turn give to the gods as an offering. They may be divinely-inspired human creations. As for the other *eponumiai* mentioned by Herodotus, the gods' cultic epithets, the author does not explain how they were chosen.

3 Divine Names in Pausanias

As an avid reader of the *Histories*,[53] Pausanias must have been aware of these Herodotean passages. Unfortunately, he does not share his own thoughts with his readers, but a few passages in his work reveal his views about the origin of divine names.[54]

3.1 Cult Epithets

When Pausanias narrates the foundation myth of a sanctuary to explain the origin of a deity's cult epithet (*epiklesis*), he rarely explicitly indicates who chose this *epiklesis*. When he does, in most cases, the gods are named by the mortals. They are, in particular,

51 Hdt. 2.53.

52 *E.g.* Hom. *Il.* 7.450; 12.6; 20.299; Hom. *Od.* 1.67; Hes. *Op.* 138–139; E. *Ba.* 342.

53 See in particular Pirenne–Delforge 2008, 25–32; Hawes 2016, with previous bibliography.

54 On divine names in Pausanias, see Pirenne–Delforge 2008, 263–271; Gaertner 2006; Palamidis in preparation a.

great heroes of the past, such as Herakles who "named (ὠνόμασεν) Asklepios 'Kotyleus' ('Of the hip-joint')" in his sanctuary near Sparta; heroes known from the Homeric poems; or local heroes such as the Athenians Theseus and Kekrops or two sons of Pelasgos, one of the first Arcadians.[55] Besides these names attributed by mortals, there are three explicit references in Pausanias' text to *epikleseis* chosen by oracles. Near Kaphyai, there was an old sanctuary of Artemis Kondyleatis, but the name of the goddess was changed (μετονομασθῆναι) and at the time of Pausanias, the inhabitants "call (καλοῦσιν) the goddess who is in Kondyleai 'Apanchomene' ('Strangled')", in accordance with an oracle, as they say (φασι).[56] The author also narrates a "Lesbian story" (λόγον Λέσβιον): some fishermen found a face made of olive wood in their nets and asked the Pythia "of what god or even hero the image is"; in reply, the oracle "ordered them to honour Dionysos Phallen ('Made of olive wood')".[57] In Troizen, Pausanias also mentions an altar dedicated to "Dionysos with the *epiklesis* (ἐπίκλησιν) Saotes ('Saviour') in accordance with an oracle".[58]

In most of these cases, as is common in Pausanias' work, the gods' *epikleseis* are linked to circumstances of the cult's foundation.[59] It is only when the *epikleseis* reveal the particular competences of the gods that the author considers the deities to have been "most correctly" (ὀρθότατα) named.[60] The author seems to recognise the authority of the heroes of the past, but does not attribute them any religious expertise, as they did not give the gods particularly correct names. Therefore, it must have seemed unlikely to him that *epikleseis* reflecting the cult's mundane history were given by oracles. This is probably why, in his works, the gods' *epikleseis* are usually attributed by mortals. In two of the three exceptions where he mentions an oracle, the cases of Artemis Apanchomene and Dionysos Phallen, the *epiklesis* is also linked to the cult's history; however, in these cases, Pausanias merely reports what the locals say without indicating whether he believes the tale or not.

On the other hand, he expresses no doubt about the fact that Dionysos was named "Saviour" by an oracle, probably because this *epiklesis* says something about the god, not about the cult's history. He seems willing to accept that some *epikleseis*, but not all of them, were chosen by the gods themselves. As we saw, for Pausanias, the fact that a mortal established a name for a deity does not exclude a divine origin for this name. Therefore, in other passages where the name reflects the deity's compe-

55 Paus. 3.19.7 (Herakles); 3.12.4–5; 8.14.5 (Odysseus); 4.35.8 (Diomedes); 3.13.5 (the Greeks who made the Trojan horse); 2.31.1 (Theseus); 8.2.3 (Kekrops); 8.2.1 and 8.22.2 (Lykaon and Temenos, two sons of Pelasgos; about Pelasgos, cf. 8.1.4); 1.41.3 and 2.21.3 (other heroes); cf. 1.24.3 (the Athenians); 1.44.3 (shepherds).

56 Paus. 8.23.6–7.

57 Paus. 10.19.3. On the god's epithet, see Casevitz/Frontisi-Ducroux 1989.

58 Paus. 2.31.5.

59 Pirenne–Delforge 2008, 269–270.

60 Paus. 3.19.6 (Dionysos Psilax); 8.31.6 (Aphrodite Machanitis).

tences, for instance, when he writes that the Athenians "first surnamed (ἐπωνόμασαν) Athena 'Ergane' ('Worker')",[61] a divine command is perhaps not excluded.

3.2 Theonyms and Collective Names

There are fewer passages in Pausanias' work that deal with the origin of divine theonyms. The author writes that, in Olympia, the Eleans witnessed the epiphany of a deity who helped them win a victory over the Arcadians, and "gave (τίθενται) the god the name (ὄνομα) Sosipolis ('Saviour of the city')".[62] Pausanias also tells us that

> the sons of Aloeus held that the Muses were three in number, and gave (ἔθεντο) them the names (ὀνόματα) of Melete ("Practice"), Mneme ("Memory") and Aoede ("Song"). But they say that afterwards Pieros, a Macedonian [. . .], came to Thespiae and established nine Muses, changing (μεταθέσθαι) their names (ὀνόματα) to the present ones.[63]

As for the Charites,

> the Boeotians say that Eteocles was the first man to sacrifice to [them]. Moreover, they know (ἴσασιν) that he established three as the number of the Charites, but they do not remember (οὐ μνημονεύουσιν) the names (ὀνόματα) he gave (ἔθετο) them. The Lacedaemonians, however, say that the Charites are two, and that they were instituted by Lacedaemon, son of Taÿgete, who gave (θέσθαι) them the names (ὀνόματα) of Kleta ("Glorious sound") and Phaenna ("Flash of light").[64]

According to the author, the first poet known to have sung about the Charites is Pamphos, but he mentioned "neither their number, nor their names (ὀνόματά)";[65] Pausanias may have thought that the poet did not know them. The Greeks agreed on the collective names of the Charites and the Muses, but their individual names were apparently unknown, as even their precise number could not be determined. This may explain why, according to Pausanias, different persons or groups gave different "speaking" names – that is, names whose meaning is immediately understandable – to the individual Charites and Muses. As for Sosipolis, Pausanias alternatively calls him a god (θεῷ) and a local *daimon* (ἐπιχώριος δαίμων).[66] According to the author, he is not a Panhellenic god, but rather a god that the Eleans had not yet encountered until that

61 Paus. 1.24.3.
62 Paus. 6.20.5.
63 Paus. 9.29.2–3. Transl. W.H.S. Jones (*LCL*).
64 Paus. 9.35.1 (cf. 3.18.6). Transl. W.H.S. Jones (*LCL*), modified; the translation of the Muses' names is taken from Calame 2018, 183.
65 Paus. 9.35.4.
66 Paus. 6.20.5; 6.20.2. On the word *daimon*, usually referring to an acting divine power, see Pirenne-Delforge forthcoming.

time,[67] and they would have ignored his name when they witnessed his epiphany. Therefore, they would have given him a name that alluded to the circumstances of his intervention, "Saviour of the city".

The author does not explain how the name of Sosipolis was chosen but he considers three different hypotheses for the origin of the names Pieros gave to the Muses.[68] He may have chosen them because it seemed wiser (σοφώτερά) to him; Pausanias probably means that the names seemed appropriate (ἐοικότα), as the Lacedaemonian and Athenian names of the Charites are in the author's eyes.[69] Pieros may also have learnt (διδαχθεὶς) these names from the Thracians, whom the author considered an authority in religious matters. And finally, Pausanias evokes the possibility that Pieros established these names because he was instructed to do so by an oracle.

There are cases, however, where the names of the gods remain unknown; Pausanias may have thought that nobody possessed the required expertise and authority and that, for some unspecified reason, no oracle was consulted. In Pallantion, he sees a sanctuary of gods (θεῶν) "whose *epiklesis* (ἐπίκλησις) is Katharoi ('the Pure')".[70] According to the author's conjecture, they are so called (κληθῆναι) because Pallas, the eponymous hero of the city of Pallantion, sacrificed to them in a pure way, unlike his father Lykaon who sacrificed a newborn to Zeus Lykaios.[71] Pausanias adds that "the names (ὀνόματα) of the gods either they do not know (οὐκ ἴσασιν), or knowing will not divulge".[72]

Elsewhere, the author opposes the *epiklesis*, the collective name of a divine collectivity, and the *onomata*, the individual names of the deities who are part of this collectivity.[73] At first sight, the plural ὀνόματα suggests that Pausanias is referring to the individual names of the Pure Gods in Pallantion too. But collective names can also be called *onomata*[74] and the passage makes it clear that the collective name of the gods is also included in the names that may be unknown. When he first refers to the sanctuary, he does not call it "the sanctuary of the Pure Gods", but "the sanctuary of some gods" (θεῶν ἱερόν). It seems that he does not know their precise identity. Neither does the *epiklesis* say anything about this identity: according to Pausanias, it only testifies

67 The god's iconography in his sanctuary on the agora of Elis suggests that Sosipolis is conceived as a local and young form of Zeus (Platt 2011, 268–270; Pirenne/Pironti [2016] 2022, 160). However, Pausanias seems to have been unaware of this identification.

68 Paus. 9.29.3. It is the only case where the author reflects on the naming process when an *epiklesis* is chosen by a mortal. It is perhaps because, in this case, he feels the need to explain why the names of the Muses were changed.

69 Paus. 9.35.2: "These are appropriate names for Graces, as are those given by the Athenians". Transl. W.H.S. Jones (*LCL*).

70 Paus. 8.44.6.

71 Paus. 8.2.3.

72 Transl. W.H.S. Jones (*LCL*), modified.

73 Paus. 6.22.7.

74 Paus. 8.37.5 (Titans); cf. 1.31.4 and 2.11.4, where the verb ὀνομάζω is used.

to the sacrifices offered to them by the hero Pallas. Therefore, when the author opposes (μὲν . . . δὲ) the names that are unknown or secret and the *epiklesis* Katharoi, by which the gods are "called" (κληθῆναι), he seems to imply that "Pure Gods" is not the proper collective name of the gods, but rather a surname, and that their "true" name may be unknown.

Pausanias may have thought that the Pure Gods were a local divine collectivity and that the Pallantians were unable to find out their name. But another possibility is that they were unable to identify to which well-known Panhellenic collectivity they corresponded. The author considers both possibilities when he mentions the altars of "those called Heroes" (Ἡρώων καλουμένων) in Charadra, to be either the Dioscuri, or local heroes (ἐπιχωρίων [. . .] ἡρώων).[75] Likewise, the author writes that, in Amphissa, the inhabitants

> celebrate the mysteric rituals of the so-called Children Lords (Ἀνάκτων καλουμένων παίδων). Their accounts as to who of the gods the Children Lords are do not agree; some say they are the Dioscuri, others the Kouretes, and others, who pretend to have fuller knowledge, hold them to be the Cabiri.[76]

According to Pausanias, "Children Lords" is only the name by which the gods are called (καλουμένων) because the inhabitants of Amphissa are unsure about their identity. This may also be how Pausanias interpreted the altars dedicated to "Unknown Gods" (Ἀγνώστων θεῶν), that he sees in Phaleron and Olympia but upon which he does not comment.[77]

In Phaleron, he refers to them as "the gods who are named Unknown" (θεῶν [. . .] ὀνομαζομένων Ἀγνώστων). Elsewhere, he mentions the Dioscuri, who are "named" (ὀνομάζουσιν) "Great Gods" by the inhabitants of Kephale.[78] Even though Pausanias opposes *onoma* and *epiklesis* when commenting on the Pure Gods,[79] he still considers "Great Gods", "Pure Gods" or "Unknown Gods" to be names, as the verb ὀνομάζω indicates.[80] But he apparently establishes a distinction between names by which the gods

75 Paus. 10.33.6–7. However, this case is problematic as Pausanias mentions altars in the plural (βωμοί), while he always uses the singular to refer to sanctuaries, temples or an *alsos* dedicated to the Dioscuri (1.18.1–2; 2.22.5; 2.36.6; 3.14.6; 3.20.2; 7.22.5; 8.21.4). The plural number of gods does not seem to explain the plural βωμοί, and it seems that there was more than one altar. Did Pausanias consider the possibility that the inhabitants of Charadra had one altar for Castor and a separate altar for Polykdeukes?

76 Paus. 10.38.7. Transl. W.H.S. Jones (*LCL*), modified.

77 Paus. 1.1.4 (Phaleron); 5.14.8 (Olympia). On the Unknown Gods, see below.

78 Paus. 1.31.1.

79 Cf. 8.37.9, where Pausanias writes that Despoina is the *epiklesis* of the goddess of Lykosoura but refuses to reveal her *onoma*.

80 In the perspective of the MAP project too, "Great Gods", "Pure Gods" or "Unknown Gods" *are* their names: see Bonnet *et al*. 2018.

are called, that the humans can give them when their identity is uncertain or unknown,[81] and names that express their identity.

The names of the unidentified collectivities, the individual Muses and Charites and perhaps Sosipolis apparently belong to the category of names given by humans because their "true" name was unknown or uncertain.[82] Does this mean that Pausanias adheres to Socrates' theory according to which all divine names are human conventions that please the gods? It is noteworthy that these examples concern either local deities or collectivities. The names of local deities could not be determined when they manifested themselves for the first time. The Muses and the Charites usually appear as a group and this is why their individual names are unknown.[83] Given that their individual figures are not precisely defined, several divine collectivities with similar characteristics can be mixed up; this explains why, according to Pausanias, the identity of the Pure Gods and the Children Lords is uncertain and why they are called by their *epiklesis* only. On the other hand, Pausanias never attributes a human origin to the "proper" names of collectivities such as the Dioscuri, Cabiri, Kouretes, Muses or Charites, transmitted from generation to generation from a distant past.[84]

Likewise, Pausanias never writes that the theonyms of major deities, such as Zeus, Athena, Apollo or Artemis, were chosen by humans. In his work, when they are named by the Greeks, the gods always bear "speaking" names, unlike the "Olympian" gods. Although the sample may be too small to verify this observation, this may not be a coincidence. In Pausanias' perspective, the Greeks would not have given names to the gods that had no meaning or whose meaning they did not understand. Did the author think that those names were created in a very distant past and that their etymology was forgotten with the passing of time?[85] Or could he have thought that they had a divine origin? It is possible that this last hypothesis seemed at least likely in his eyes. According to him, "the men of those days [i.e. the age of heroes], because of their righteousness and piety, were guests (ξένοι) of the gods, eating at the same

81 Cf. 8.44.5: οὐκ ἴσασιν.

82 Unless these names were attributed by an oracle, as Pausanias suggests in the case of the Muses.

83 For instance, since according to Pausanias, the Boeotians did not remember the names Eteocles gave to the individual Charites (9.35.1), they apparently prayed to the three Charites (9.35.3) using only their collective name.

84 It is true that the collective name (*epiklesis*) of the Ionides is typologically similar to names that Pausanias sees as human creations, since these Nymphs are named after the hero Ion, as "they say", and not after their own characteristics (Paus. 6.22.7). But the case is not exactly comparable to that of the Muses and the Charites as the author does not write that the individual *onomata* of these Nymphs were chosen by a mortal. In fact, it is said by Nicander (fr. 74 Gow/Schofield *apud* Ath. 15.681d and 683a-b) that Ion encountered the Nymphs in the region of Elis: therefore, he would have learnt their names from the goddesses themselves and they were supposedly known by their individual names before they received their collective name.

85 Cf. 3.15.5 and 8.41.2, where he mentions words used by the Ancients that had disappeared by his time.

board (ὁμοτράπεζοι)".[86] Pausanias also cites local traditions concerning deities visiting human cities.[87] Therefore, in the past, the Greeks had the opportunity to learn their names from the gods themselves. Moreover, as we saw earlier, the author acknowledges that some names can be dictated by the gods themselves through oracles, as suggested by the passage about Pieros and the Muses. It seems therefore that Pausanias did not attribute the same origin to all divine names: some "speaking" names were human creations, but the Greeks may have used the "true" names of some other gods, especially in the case of names whose etymology was uncertain.

4 Divine Epithets and Theonyms in Other Sources

4.1 Divine Epithets

While Pausanias more often attributes a human than a divine origin to the gods' epithets, the opposite is true when we look at other sources. Two different versions of the foundation myth of a sanctuary may attribute different origins to the deity's name. For example, various sources indicate that the epithet of Apollo Smintheus, who had a sanctuary in the Troad, comes from the word *sminthos* ("mouse"). Polemo writes that after Apollo put an end to an invasion of mice, Krinis, the priest of the local Apollo, founded a sanctuary dedicated to the god, calling (προσαγορεύσας) him Smintheus.[88] The human agency of the priest is highlighted, even though the text does not exclude the possibility that he was simply obeying a divine command. On the other hand, it is said in Aelian that, after the invasion of mice, the inhabitants of the region consulted the oracle of Delphi, which "said that they must sacrifice to Apollo Smintheus".[89]

Apart from such texts concerning mythical times, I only know of two sources in which the creation of a divine epithet is attributed to a human. Plutarch tells us that Themistokles "offended the multitude also by building the temple of Artemis, whom he called (προσηγόρευσεν) Aristoboule ('Best Counsellor'), intimating thus that it was he who had given the best counsel to the city and to the Hellenes".[90] In letters to the Coans and to the Iasians, king Eumenes II of Pergamon writes, using the majestic plural, that

> we honour Athena above all the other gods on account of the numerous and great successes that she bestowed upon us in every kind of circumstances, and we named (προσηγορεύκαμεν) her

86 Paus. 8.2.4. Transl. W.H.S. Jones (*LCL*).
87 Pirenne–Delforge 2008, 249 and n. 36.
88 Polemo fr. 31 Preller *apud Schol. D. Il.* 1.39.
89 Ael. *NA* 12.5.
90 Plu. *Them.* 22. Transl. B. Perrin (*LCL*), modified.

> "Nikephoros", since we consider this surname ([προσω]νυμίαν) to be the most beautiful (καλλίστην) and most appropriate for her.[91]

On the other hand, oracles can be consulted to determine the name by which a deity should be called in a cultic context. The late 3rd-century–CE prophet of Apollo in Didyma who wants to establish an altar of Kore Soteira asks the god to be an "establisher of customs" (l. 27: νομοθέτην) and to indicate the "laudatory and hymnical appellation" (l. 25–27: τῆς εὐφήμου καὶ ὑ|μνικῆς [. . .] προσαγορεύ|σεως) by which she should be called. Apollo replies that the prophet should celebrate (l. 29: κλῄζωμεν) Soteira as Meilichos ("Mild") "to the music of very holy songs" (l. 29–30: ὑπ' εὐιέροι|σι βοιαῖσι).[92] Probably in the same century, a representative of the city of Tralles consults an oracle of Apollo Pythios (in Delphi?) concerning protection against earthquakes, as can be inferred from the fact that the consultant dedicated an altar to Seisichthon ("Earth-Shaker"), that is, Poseidon. After prescribing sacrifices, Apollo commands that the god shall be "called (καλείσθω) Einalios ("Dwelling-in-the-sea"), Temenouchos ("Who-holds-the-temenos"), Apotropos ("Averter"), Hippios ("Of-horses"), Arges ("Bright")",[93] and orders the city to celebrate him in hymns (l. 12, ὑμνεῖτε). Here, the oracle avoids the epithet Asphaleios which most frequently qualifies Poseidon when he is associated with earthquakes.[94] While the epithets Apotropaios (here in the form Apotropos) and Hippios are widely attested, Einalios is rare[95] and Arges may be unique. As for Temenouchos, it is not only unique as an epithet,[96] but also almost unique as a word; it only appears once in a fragment tentatively attributed to Callimachus[97] and can thus be considered a highly learned epithet.

---

91 *IG* XII.4, 251 = *DB MAP* S#15585, l. 2–8: τὴν Ἀ[θηνᾶν μὲν τιμῶμεν] | μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων θε[ῶν διὰ τὸ πολλὰς καὶ] | μεγάλας ἡμῖν περιτεθε[ικέναι εὐημερίας ἐν] | παντοδαπαῖς περιστάσ[εσιν καιρῶν, Νικηφόρον] | τε προσηγορεύκαμεν, [καλλίστην νομίζον]|τες εἶναι καὶ οἰκειοτάτη[ν αὐτῆι τὴν προσω]|νυμίαν ταύτην; *I.Iasos* 6 = *DB MAP* S#16581, l. 17–19. This inscription has puzzled scholars since it is often considered that Athena's epithet was introduced under Eumenes' father and predecessor Attalos I (*e.g.* Agelidis 2014, 105). However, the reading of the epithet on inscriptions dating to his reign (in particular *I.Pergamon I* 35 and 52 = *DB MAP* S#10504 and #11471) is highly uncertain (see Palamidis in preparation b). Moreover, Polybius (16.1.6) mentions the existence of an extra–urban Nikephorion already in 201, under Attalos I (see Rigsby 1996, 364 n. 13), but Filippo Coarelli (2016, 222–234) has convincingly argued that the extra–urban Nikephorion is not the same as the sanctuary of Athena Nikephoros. Therefore, there is no reason to reject Eumenes' claim that he is the one who named Athena.

92 *I.Didyma* 504 = *DB MAP* S#12966, l. 17–31. On gods as *nomothetai*, see Belayche 2007.

93 *I.Tralleis* 1, l. 9–10: καλείσθω | εἰνάλιος, τεμενοῦχος, ἀπότροπος, ἵππιος, ἀργής. On this inscription, see Thély 2016, 226–228.

94 Thély 2016, in particular 32–33; 218–220; 306 map 3.

95 Until this day, it appears only once in the MAP database and refers to Thetis (*I.Colosse Memnon* 62, l. 2 = *DB MAP* T#4849).

96 The restoration of the adjective in *IG* XII.7, 254, l. 1 = *DB MAP* T#18388 is very dubious (θεῶν τ[εμενούχων]).

97 Apud A.D. *Synt*. 2.87 (18). On this fragment and its attribution, see Lehnus 1994.

The inscriptions from Didyma and Tralles belong to a period when the practice of singing hymns had become much more important[98] and these oracles reflect the concern surrounding choosing the right names for the gods in hymns. But oracular responses in which the gods indicate the names of the deities to be honoured exist in all periods, as attested in particular by the epigraphical evidence. Even though such inscriptions mainly list names of well–known deities, they occasionally demonstrate a great deal of inventiveness. Around 460–450 BCE, according to a fragmentary inscription, Apollo, probably the Delphian god, in an oracle, prescribes sacrifices to the Moirai, Zeus Moiragetes, Ge, and perhaps other deities, to be accomplished by the Athenian *genos* of the Praxiergidai.[99] The inscription does not indicate if these deities were already worshipped together by the *genos* or if these sacrifices are, in fact, an innovation by the oracle. Much later, Pausanias sees statues of the Moirai, Zeus Moiragetes and Apollo Moiragetes in Delphi,[100] and it is not impossible that the god was already honoured with this epithet there in the 5th century. And "since Delphi had a habit of foisting its favourite deities on inquirers",[101] it is possible that Apollo prescribed the introduction of the cult of these deities. Even if Zeus is already associated with the Moirai in Archaic poetry, this is the first attestation of the epithet Moiragetes, not only in Athens but in the whole Greek world.[102] Zeus Moiragetes appears in a few other sources starting in the 4th century BCE, but his epithet is attested only seven or eight times throughout antiquity, counting both epigraphical and literary sources. In this case, it is likely that most Athenians had never heard of the epithet and that it appeared as a true divine innovation.

The example of Dionysos Hygiates ("Health-giver") may represent a similar case. Athenaeus, whose source is Mnesitheus of Athens, a 4th-century-BCE physician, writes that the Pythia told some Greeks to honour Dionysos as a physician and to call (καλεῖν) him Hygiates.[103] The word ὑγιάτης is a *hapax* and divine epithets related to health are rarely built on the word ὑγίεια ("health").[104] The link between Dionysos and health is first attested in Delphi precisely in the 4th century and the god's name is likely to be another Delphic innovation.[105] In Lebadeia, an imperial-era inscription records a dedication to Dionysos Eustaphylos ("Rich-in-grapes") by oracular command

98 Cf. Belayche 2013, 20–35.

99 *CGRN* 24 = *DB MAP* S#840.

100 Paus. 10.24.4.

101 To quote Robertson 2004, 117.

102 See Lebreton 2013, 253–254 and n. 705 for the sources, to which we should add a 3rd-century-BCE inscription from Atrax (*I.Atrax* 93 = *DB MAP* S#16502), and a very uncertain attestation in Eleusis in the Imperial period (*I.Eleusis* 489 fr. a–b, 56 = *DB MAP* T#3997). On Zeus Moiragetes in Athens, cf. Lebreton/Marano in this volume.

103 Ath. 1.22e; 2.36b.

104 See Prêtre in this volume.

105 Vamvouri Ruffy 2019.

of Zeus Trophonios.[106] The adjective εὐστάφυλος is a *hapax* in epigraphy and is only attested seven times in literary sources.[107] It appears twice in Nonnos' *Dionysiaca*,[108] in the 5th century CE, but does not designate Dionysos himself. In a 5th or 6th-century papyrus, a fragmentary address to the Nile apparently inspired by Nonnos' work mentions "Dionysos in Naxos rich in grapes (ἐϋσταφύλωι)".[109] Even if the adjective appears in a Dionysiac context in late Antiquity, it is only ever attested as an epithet of Dionysos in the dedication from Lebadeia.

Although oracular prescriptions generally show little originality, these examples suggest that, in the eyes of the Greeks, such oracles not only told them which gods to worship among a set of deities already known to them, but also could establish divine epithets that were hitherto unknown. The Greeks would not have considered the gods mere imitators of mortals when it came to attributing such names and it is likely that, according to them, most divine epithets that were traditionally used in their cities had also been revealed by oracles in a distant past.

As we saw earlier, in myths, the choice of an epithet can be attributed to a mortal, but it is usually someone with special authority. In the case of Apollo Smintheus, it is the local priest of Apollo; in the examples cited by Pausanias, heroes such as Herakles or Theseus. On the other hand, humans in the historical period very seldom took credit for the invention of a new epithet; the choice is more frequently attributed to an oracle. This may be a matter of authority too. Eumenes has the authority of a king, but he also justifies the choice of the name Nikephoros ("Victory-Bringer") for Athena: it is most appropriate (οἰκειοτάτην) – since the goddess helped the Attalids win many wars – and most beautiful (καλλίστην), so that it would please Athena. On the other hand, Themistokles gave Artemis a name which was not appropriate as it served only his own political agenda and he lacked enough authority to have it accepted by his fellow Athenians. The appeal to a higher authority, that of the oracle, would have prevented such debates about the appropriateness of names.

4.2 Divine Epiphanies

At the same time, it appears that the Greeks did not appeal to a divine authority when it came to the names of the gods who manifested themselves.[110] Accounts of mortals who witness an epiphany without recognising the deity are mostly restricted to poetic

106 *IG* VII 3098 = *DB MAP* S#15772: Διονύσῳ Εὐσταφύλῳ | κατὰ χρησμὸν Διὸς | Τροφωνίου.
107 As indicated by a search in the *TLG*.
108 Nonn. *D*. 12.334 and 357.
109 *APHex I*, 43.7: Διόνυσσον ἐϋσταφύλωι ἐνὶ Νάξωι.
110 On epiphanies, see in particular Platt 2011; Petridou 2016; Lipka 2022.

texts or mythical accounts.[111] Among the rare exceptions, the story of Ptolemy who fails to recognise that it is Sarapis who appears to him in his dreams has been shown to be an invention of the imperial period that draws on Graeco-Roman and Egyptian literary *topoi*.[112] On the other hand, most of our sources that concern "historical" epiphanies do not give any indication as to how the deity is recognised. When Zeus appeared to a certain Dionysios in Lydia in the Hellenistic or Imperial period,[113] how did the dreamer know that the god wanted to be honoured with the epithet Eumenes, which is only attested as an epithet for Zeus in Selinous in the 5th century BCE and in Tralles in the Hellenistic and Imperial period?[114]

Some epiphanies consist in natural phenomena interpreted as divine signs, such as a storm, an earthquake or a dream; the historicity of others is doubtful or clearly excluded. Whatever the case, these accounts of epiphanies never try to justify the identification of the deity. When the epiphany is supposed to have been witnessed by a group,[115] all witnesses are presented as unanimous and our sources never mention any debate concerning the deity's identity. But gods manifest themselves more frequently to single individuals.[116] When the epiphany concerns a whole city, the deities always manifest themselves to an authority figure, such as a priest or a priestess, a magistrate or a general.[117] But as we saw with the case of divine epithets, the authority of the gods is almost always preferred to the authority of a mortal. Thus, when the epiphany is used by a city as an argument to support the claims to certain privileges for the deity's sanctuary – as in the case of Artemis Leukophryene in Magnesia-on-the -Maeander –,[118] we would expect the validation of an oracle to strengthen the city's case. Yet oracles are never consulted to indicate or confirm the identity and name of a god after an epiphany.[119] When oracles are mentioned, it is only to ask what the

111 Cf. Lipka 2022 on the differences in the representation of epiphany according to the type of sources, and especially between "poetic" and "historical" epiphanies.

112 Tac. *Hist.* 4.83–84; Plu. *Isis and Osiris* 28 (*Mor.* 362A). See Borgeaud/Volokhine 2000; Barat 2010.

113 *TAM* V 3, 1539, in particular l. 2–12 = *BD MAP* T#15464. Cf. de Hoz 2017.

114 Selinous: *CGRN* 13, A l. 8 = *DB MAP* T#2464. Tralles: *I.Tralleis* 23, l. 29; *I.Tralleis* 8; cf. Daubner 2008, 177–180 for a mention of a 3rd-century–BCE coin from Tralles bearing the epithet, and a discussion about its meaning. On dream epiphanies, see Platt 2011, chap. 6; Petridou 2016, *passim*; Koch Piettre 2020.

115 On collective epiphanies, see Graf 2004.

116 Petridou 2016, 343.

117 *Ibid.*, 341–343.

118 Cf. Paul 2013.

119 In the books by Platt, Petridou and Lipka about epiphanies (Platt 2011; Petridou 2016; Lipka 2022), I only found three mentions of oracles revealing a name after an epiphany. But two cases concern heroes and not gods (Paus. 1.32.5 and 1.36.1: Echethralios and Kychreus). In the third example (*Suid.* s.v. Μέλαν [M 451]), after the daughters of Eleuther see an epiphany of Dionysos, an oracle commands to honour Dionysos Melanaigis. But the oracle is not consulted by the daughters who witnessed the epiphany and who are driven mad, but by their father who seeks the cause of their madness and is probably unaware that his daughters saw the god.

epiphany of the already identified deity means.[120] Therefore, all our sources seem to imply that when a god manifests himself, his identity and name are obvious and need neither to be debated nor to receive divine confirmation.

This is easy to explain for deities already honoured in a specific place. For example, the goddess who appears in dreams to Lindian priests or magistrates in the so-called "Lindian Chronicle"[121] is obviously the main goddess of Lindos, Athena Lindia. But what about cases when the deity's epithet is new? In dream epiphanies, the epithet of the deity can be revealed through direct speech. For instance, Aelius Aristides saw himself calling Asklepios "Moironomos" ("Dispenser of fate") while, on another occasion, a dream came to him from Dionysos, "advising to address (προσειπεῖν) the god as 'Oulokomes' ('With curly hair')".[122] At the same time, dreamers often recognise the persons who appear in their dreams because they "just know" who they are, even if their appearance is different.[123] In a similar way, it is possible that gods appearing in dreams were recognised because the dreamer "just knew" who they were.[124]

In Hellenistic inscriptions, the word *epiphaneia* used to refer to a divine manifestation allows for emphasis of the deity's will to appear, unlike a word like *opsis* ("vision"), which highlights the viewer's experience.[125] Moreover, in some inscriptions, divine epiphanies are described using the adjective *enarges* or the noun *enargeia*.[126] The adjective first appears in the Homeric epics, where it indicates that the gods are clearly visible and that they have already been recognised as gods.[127] Thus, when the epiphanies are described as *enargeis*, this may imply that the gods choose to manifest themselves leaving no doubts about their divine nature. They reveal themselves and this revelation may also include their precise identity. How exactly did the witnesses of epiphanies know for certain that they had seen a divine manifestation and which deity was concerned? The Greeks perhaps considered that it was possible to "just know" who the deity was, just as they may have "just known" the identity of a person or god seen in a dream.

120 For instance, in the inscription *I.Magnesia* 215a = *DB MAP* S#9289, the Magnesians ask the oracle in Delphi what they should do after Dionysos manifested himself in the form of a statue. When Artemis Leukophryene manifests herself, the oracle of Delphi prescribes the enhancement of her honours and the inviolability of their territory (*e.g. I.Magnesia* 16 = *DB MAP* S#9469, l. 1–10).

121 *I.Lindos* 2 = *DB MAP* S#7317.

122 Aristid. *Sacred Tales* 2 (*Or.* 48), 31; 4 (*Or.* 50), 40.

123 According to recent studies, such cases may represent from about 15% to almost 45% of all cases where a character is recognised by name in a dream: Skrzypińska/Słodka 2014; Kahn *et al.* 2000.

124 It is also possible to recognise the deity not during the dream but when one wakes up. See the Chinese account of a dream epiphany cited by Jim in this volume (p. 71): the dreamer encountered "a white–bearded old man", then he "woke up and knew that the old man was Hu Taigong".

125 As noted by Platt 2011, 150.

126 Chaniotis 2013, 176–177.

127 Piettre 1999; Brouillet 2016, 33–37.

Peter Struck has recently proposed linking divination with "surplus knowledge", that is, the things we know without knowing how we know them – something similar to what we would nowadays call "intuition".[128] In particular, one way of "just knowing" something is through divine inspiration. This is made clear by Hesiod when he insists that he has no experience in seafaring and yet is able to teach about navigation and Zeus' will concerning navigation, because the Muses taught (ἐδίδαξαν) him.[129] Plato, in his *Laws*, suggests that when it comes to the gods, their sanctuaries and the name of their sanctuaries, three main authorities are recognised: oracles, "visions" (φασμάτων) – that is probably epiphanies[130] –, and divine inspiration (ἐπιπνοίας).[131] The author seems to distinguish between epiphanies and inspiration, but they are explicitly associated in the case of poetic inspiration,[132] and also in a decree concerning the festival for Artemis Leukophryene in Magnesia-on-the-Maeander. The text mentions the "divine inspiration (ἐπιπνοίας, literally 'breathing upon') and manifestation" of the goddess.[133] Here, the inspiration does not concern the name of Artemis Leukophryene, which was already known. But in other cases, it is their names that the gods may have revealed by inspiration when they manifested themselves through epiphany – a form of unsolicited divination –, just as they could teach their name by inspiration in their oracular sanctuaries.[134] If the name is thought to have been dictated through divine inspiration, then it is already validated by the highest possible authority; this may explain why the word of the witnesses of epiphanies is never questioned and why oracles are never consulted.

The few altars dedicated to "Unknown Gods" (ἄγνωστοι θεοί) in the Imperial period, mainly in Athens,[135] may constitute exceptions to the rule according to which gods reveal their identity when they manifest themselves. According to the most wide-

128 Struck 2016, chap. 1.

129 Hes. *Op*. 648–662.

130 On the meaning of *phasma*, see Petridou 2016, 64–71; Koch Piettre 2020, 75–78; Lipka 2022, 196–197.

131 Pl. *Lg*. 5.738c.

132 See Petridou 2016, chap. 4.

133 *CGRN* 200 = *DB MAP* S#9356, l. 12: θείας ἐπιπνοίας καὶ παραστάσεως.

134 Cf. Kindt 2018, who shows that epiphanies and inspired divination work in similar ways.

135 Paus. 1.1.4 and Poll. 8.118–119 (Phaleron); Philostr. *VA* 6.3.5 and *Act.Ap.* 17.23 (Athens); Pausanias (5.14.8) also saw an altar dedicated to the Unknown Gods in Olympia. Could it be an Athenian dedication? As for the restoration Θεοῖς ἀγν[ώστοις] in a Pergamene inscription (Hepding 1910, 454–457 no. 39 = *DB MAP* S#15401), it is highly uncertain. The reading ἁγιωτάτοις seems excluded because the fourth letter can hardly be an *omega*, as recognised by Hepding and confirmed by a better photograph (https://arachne.dainst.org/entity/421242/image/421242, Arachne ID 421242, consulted on 2023/02/25). van der Horst 1988, 26 also argued against the reading ἁγνοτάτοις, because the epithet is too rare. But in the Imperial period, the superlative of ἁγνός qualifies Athena in Delphi (*F.Delphes* III.2, 106), Artemis in Sidyma (*Steinepigramme* 17/08/01, 79–80) and Leto in Egypt (*I.Egypte Nubie Louvre* 36, 7 = *DB MAP* T#2876). Thus, it is more frequent than ἄγνωστος, which is never attested in epigraphy.

spread interpretation, the function of these altars is to ensure that no deity is neglected.[136] However, the Unknown Gods of Phaleron – whose altar Pausanias saw –[137] were the Argive heroes returning from Troy who were slain by Demophon, as Hesychios writes.[138] Pollux adds that the Argives were killed by mistake by the Athenians who failed to recognise them and that in accordance with an oracle, "they were called Unknown" (ἀγνῶτες προσηγορεύθησαν).[139] This story is already mentioned by the 4th-century-BCE writer Phanodemos, but in this fragment, the Argives are not called Unknown Gods.[140] It also appears in Pausanias, who does not establish a connection between these Argives and the altar of Unknown Gods mentioned earlier in his text.[141] It seems therefore likely that the tradition linking the altar and the heroes returning from Troy only emerged in the Imperial period to explain the existence of a cult dedicated to Unknown Gods.

Nevertheless, the passages by Pollux and Hesychios, as well as the fact that Pausanias calls them "the Gods named Unknown" (θεῶν [. . .] ὀνομαζομένων Ἀγνώστων), suggest that the Unknown Gods of Phaleron were perceived as a specific divine collectivity rather than the sum of all unknown gods. The myth concerning the Argive heroes also underlines the problem of recognition as they were slain because they were not recognised. Therefore, the "Unknown Gods" were probably particular deities who manifested themselves without being recognised.[142]

In Philostratos' *Life of Apollonios of Tyana*, the eponymous philosopher advises not to "be at variance with any one of the gods (ὀντιναδὴ τῶν θεῶν)", not even Aphrodite, but rather to "speak well of all the gods (πάντων θεῶν)"; as an example of piety, he cites the Athenians who have "altars of unknown *daimones*" (ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων βωμοὶ).[143] Here, as the context indicates, the author is not recommending that all gods be honoured collectively so that none is forgotten; he rather advises not to scorn any god, no matter who it is and even if their name is unknown. The fact that he calls them *daimones* and not "gods", *theoi*, may support this hypothesis. In Greek, the two words can act as quasi-synonyms, but *daimon* is used specifically to denote a manifestation on earth of the power of a deity, that is not always recognisable.[144] In the *Life*

136 See in particular the discussion in van der Horst 1988; Henrichs 1994, 28–36; Ackermann 2010, 95–103.

137 Paus. 1.1.4.

138 Hsch. s.v. ἀγνῶτες θεοί (A 682).

139 Poll. 8.118–119.

140 *BNJ* 325 F 16.

141 Paus. 1.28.9 (Argives); 1.1.4 (altars of the Unknown Gods).

142 In some cases, ἄγνωστος can mean "unrecognised", as in a passage of the *Odyssey* (2.174–176) concerning the return to Ithaca of Odysseus, "unrecognised by all" (ἄγνωστον πάντεσσιν) after twenty years of absence. Cf. among other examples Paus. 5.17.11 (where ἄγνωστος can be translated as "unrecognisable").

143 Philostr. *VA* 6.3.5.

144 Pirenne–Delforge forthcoming.

of Apollonios of Tyana too, when it does not refer to a demon, the word is used to indicate the earthly manifestations of the gods, identified or unidentified,[145] while it is always the word *theos* that is used when humans honour the gods or discuss them.[146] Therefore, the unknown *daimones* honoured in Athens may be deities who manifested themselves on a certain occasion but were not recognised by the Athenians. At the beginning of his *Life of Apollonios of Tyana*, Philostratos writes that various deities manifested themselves to Pythagoras, including Apollo, who revealed his identity, and other deities who did not, such as Athena, the Muses, and "other gods, whose appearance (εἴδη) and names (ὀνόματα) the humans did not know (γιγνώσκειν) yet".[147] The text implies that Pythagoras was able to recognise Athena and the Muses even though they concealed their identity; however, unlike the philosopher who had a special relationship with the gods, the Athenians may have witnessed divine epiphanies without recognising the deities' identity, but the fact that they still honoured them is good evidence of their piety, according to Philostratos.

The author mentions altars of Unknown *daimones* in the plural (βωμοὶ). There were possibly several altars dedicated to unknown gods in the city. He may have specifically had in mind the altar in Phaleron, but also the altar of the "Unknown God" (ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ) mentioned by Paul in Luke's *Acts of the Apostles*.[148] In this speech, Paul argues that the god who is unknown to the Athenians is actually the Christian God. By comparison with the other sources concerning such altars, some scholars have suggested that the author was in actual fact referring not to an altar dedicated to a single Unknown God, but rather to Unknown Gods in the plural.[149] But if no altar dedicated to an Unknown God in the singular existed, Paul's argumentation would have been considerably weakened, and although we cannot rule out Luke having been mistaken, if he did not see the altar himself, such a correction is absolutely not necessary. The fact that some altars were dedicated to Unknown Gods in the plural does not exclude the possibility that others were dedicated to an Unknown God in the singular.[150] If such an altar really existed in Athens, this supports the idea that such dedications were not addressed to the sum of all unknown gods but to some particu-

145 Philostr. *VA* 1.4; 1.18; 1.19.2; 2.19.1; 6.26.2.

146 *E.g.* Philostr. *VA* 1.1.1; 1.2.3; 1.10.1; 1.12.1; 1.16.3; 1.25.3; 1.32.2. The exception is 6.20.5, where the word *daimon* is used to refer to a foreign deity.

147 Philostr. *VA* 1.1.2. Cf. also 6.11.6.

148 *Act.Ap.* 17.23.

149 *E.g.* Henrichs 1994, 31–32; Ackermann 2010, 97–98.

150 Cf. van der Horst 1988, 42. Likewise, when Jerome corrects Paul, saying that the Athenian altar was not dedicated to an Unknown God, but to "the gods of Asia and Europe and Africa, the unknown and foreign gods (*diis ignotis et peregrinis*)" (*Ad. Tit*. 1.12, ed. Bucchi p. 30, l. 668–668), it is not excluded that such an altar really existed, but it does not follow that the altars simply dedicated to Unknown Gods were addressed to foreign gods too.

lar deity or deities who manifested themselves without being recognised.[151] If the Greeks witnessed a divine sign, they may have attributed it to an unknown god in the singular or to unknown gods in the plural, according to the cases; the plural perhaps expresses incertitude about the number[152] and gender of the deities.

If this interpretation of the altars is correct, it suggests that, exceptionally, the gods had chosen not to reveal their identity. The dedicants of the altars may have thought that they were well-known gods who had not been recognised, or new deities whose name was completely unknown.[153] But why did they not consult oracles to find out the identity of these gods, as could be expected? Is this a naming strategy intended to underline the limits of human knowledge? Unfortunately, we do not know any more about these altars and the possibility that they emerged in a philosophical context cannot be excluded. However, Pollux indicates that an oracle was in fact consulted and that the people of Phaleron were ordered to call the deities "Unknown Gods".[154] Even though his account concerns the Argive heroes honoured as "Unknown Gods" and is clearly a later reconstruction, it is possible that an oracle was indeed consulted. If so, the choice of the name is coherent with the idea according to which gods usually reveal their identity and name when they manifest themselves: if, exceptionally, a deity chooses not to do so during an epiphany, oracles can be expected to respect this refusal, the name of the deity remaining unknown. But the fact that such altars dedicated to Unknown Gods are exceptional, as they are only attested in Athens and Olympia, seems to confirm that, most of the time, the gods who manifested themselves were easily recognised.

151 Diogenes Laertius (1.10.110) also mentions "anonymous altars" (βωμοὺς ἀνωνύμους) that still existed up to his time and that were allegedly founded by Epimenides, the archaic Sage whose biography is clearly marvellous (*BNJ* 457 T 1). It is unlikely that the author is simply referring to uninscribed altars, since such altars were common in Greek sanctuaries (Henrichs 1994, 35–37; Mylonopoulos 2019, 234–235). They have been variously interpreted as dedications to the *Semnai Theai*, called "anonymous goddesses" by Euripides (Henrichs 1994, 37–39 with references; Johnston 1999, 279–281), as altars simply bearing a dedication θεῷ, "to a god" (van der Horst 1988, 23), or as the same altars dedicated to Unknown Gods mentioned by other sources (Ackermann 2010, 99 and n. 46). If this latter hypothesis is correct, it is noteworthy that these altars are described as "memorials" (ὑπόμνημα) of the propitiation that was achieved by making sacrifices in various places to "the related god" (τῷ προσήκοντι θεῷ), in the singular.

152 Cf. Polinskaya 2013, 80.

153 Cf. above about Pausanias on the Pure Gods and the Children Kings.

154 Poll. 8.118–119.

4.3 Theonyms

It is noteworthy that the dedicants of these altars did not create a name for these unknown deities, whatever the reason.[155] But it does not mean that attributing a theonym to a deity is a prerogative of the gods. As we saw above, Pausanias writes that it is the Eleans who gave (τίθενται) Sosipolis his name.[156] Although the author does not seem to rule out the possibility that an oracle was consulted, the phrasing suggests that there was no unwritten norm prohibiting the mortals from attributing a theonym to a deity. In fact, the problem probably never presented itself as the Greeks first encountered most of their deities in a distant past. When new cults were introduced, they never concerned deities that were completely unknown to humanity, but rather gods worshipped by other peoples (such as Isis or Sarapis whose cult came from Egypt) or other cities (like Asklepios, welcomed to Athens at the end of the 5th century BCE).[157] Sosipolis is probably a local version of Zeus,[158] who is also called Zeus Sosipolis in Magnesia-on-the-Maeander.[159] Glykon, whose cult is well-attested by various sources,[160] may represent a similar case. According to Lucian, it is a false god created by a false prophet, Alexander of Abonoteichos. However, the author does not present Glykon as an entirely new deity, but as a form of Asklepios: at first, an oracle of Apollo announces the arrival of Asklepios in Abonoteichos and the god is called Asklepios more than once.[161] However, it is said that he is born twice, once as Asklepios and once as Glykon, he calls himself "the New Asklepios" (Ἀσκληπιὸς νέος) and he refuses to reveal if he is the same god as Asklepios or a different one.[162] Our few external sources do not allow us to verify whether Glykon was indeed seen as a form of Asklepios or if Lucian is only ironising about the cult's lack of originality.

Whatever the case, it is noteworthy that, according to the author, the name Glykon was attributed to the god by divine command (θείου προστάγματος), the god having revealed his name through the mouth of his prophet Alexander.[163] Is this simply a matter of authority, one of Alexander's tricks addressed to the gullible crowd, according to Lucian, or does it also suggest that divine names were normally conceived as having a divine origin? Outside poetry, philosophical texts or Herodotus' *Histories*, it is difficult to find sources concerning the origin of the theonyms that were already known in a distant past. As we saw, Pausanias writes that the individual names of the

155 If we consider the name "Unknown Gods" to be a mere substitute for their "true" name, as Pausanias probably did: see above.

156 Paus. 6.20.4–5.

157 On the introduction of new cults, see Garland 1992; Parker 2011, 273–277; Anderson 2015.

158 See above, n. 67.

159 *CGRN* 194 = *DB MAP* S#9354, l. 48 and 51–52.

160 On Glykon, see among others Petsalis–Diomidis 2010, chap. 1.

161 Luc. *Alex.* 10; 14–15.

162 Luc. *Alex.* 14; 38; 43.

163 Luc. *Alex.* 18.

Muses and the Charites were attributed by mortals, but he raises the possibility that they were given by command of an oracle and he never writes that their collective names were also chosen by mortals. I do not know of any other source attributing a human origin to any divine name, let alone to all divine names.

Most Greeks probably never wondered where theonyms that were transmitted from generation to generation came from. However, given the important impact of the poetry of Homer and Hesiod on Greek representations of the divine, they may have taken for granted that the gods used these names themselves. If, like Pausanias, they believed that the gods interacted with some mortals in the heroic age, they would probably have considered that the Greeks could have learnt the names of the gods during such interactions. Moreover, if they thought that the oracles were able to prescribe divine epithets, there is no reason why they could not have also revealed the theonyms of the major Greek deities in a distant past.

On the other hand, it has been suggested that the idea according to which divine names cannot be known was widespread in Antiquity. In a few ancient texts, a deity is addressed using a formula such as "if you like to be called (by this name)",[164] and some scholars have argued that this reflects a common concern of the Greeks.[165] However, such a formula is only found in a handful of tragedies, hymns and philosophical texts.[166] We can perhaps recognise a philosophical influence in all these passages. For instance, the hymn to "Zeus, whoever he may be, if it pleases him to be so called (κεκλημένῳ)" in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*[167] may have been influenced by Xenophanes' views on the unknowability of the divine.[168] Even if we accept that the formula was more widespread than it appears to be in our sources and that it was a common concern, it does not follow that the Greeks were unsure whether the divine names they used were correct or if they were displeasing the gods. Greek deities were characterised by their *polyonymia*, their multiple names. Thus, whether it was actually used in prayer or it was only a literary *topos*, this formula may rather indicate the speaker seeking to choose the precise name that will please the deity most in a specific context.[169] At the same time, such a formula can be understood as a way to glorify the god.[170] The same effects are achieved by Aelius Aristides when he praises Zeus in a hymn by listing some of his epithets, "all these great names (ὀνόματα) that he himself invented (αὐτὸς εὗρε) and that are suiting (πρέποντα) for him".[171] They are rhetorical devices and they do not allow us to draw general conclusions about the origin of divine names.

164 Pulleyn 1997, 103–105. On philosophical occurrences of the formula, see Rowett 2013.
165 Versnel 2011, 49–52; Rowett 2013.
166 Pulleyn 1997, 101–102.
167 A. *Ag*. 160–161. Transl. A.H. Sommerstein (*LCL*).
168 Pinel Martínez 2020, 283.
169 Versnel 2011, 49–57; Herrero de Jáuregui in this volume.
170 See Pulleyn 1997, 100–107.
171 Aristid. *Or.* 43 (*Hymn to Zeus*), 30. On divine names in rhetorical texts, see Pernot 2005.

If most Greeks thought that divine names came from the gods themselves, how can this idea be reconciled with the practice of *interpretatio*? Why do the gods have different names in different languages? First of all, as we saw with Herodotus, the different names of a deity in various languages were sometimes thought to be different versions of the same name. A second point to be noted is the heterogeneity of Greek views on the names of foreign gods. Not all of our sources consider the gods honoured by different peoples to be the same as the Greek gods but with different names. Some instead see them as equivalent to, but distinct from Greek gods,[172] in which case their different names in different languages are easy to explain.

Likewise, we should not expect all Greeks to have similar ideas concerning the origin of divine names. Even if some people only considered divine names to be fitting names that pleased the gods, as Socrates does in the *Cratylus*, there is little doubt that a great number of Greeks thought that they were actually used by the gods themselves. Among our literary sources, reflecting the views of an educated elite, Socrates' hypothesis was not unanimously accepted, as Pausanias' example suggests. Even some Late Antique philosophers known as Neoplatonists attributed a divine origin to divine names.[173]

5 Conclusion

Although Socrates' claim that divine names are human creations that please the gods has attracted a lot of attention from scholars, there is nothing to suggest that it reflects the views of most Greeks, including "intellectuals". If the Greeks asked themselves about the origin of divine names, they may have perceived them as names revealed by the gods themselves, through oracles or epiphanies, to either the Greeks or foreign peoples; they may have thought that they had been created by a person of authority with or without a particular expertise, with or without validation by an oracle; they may also have seen them as human creations inspired by the deities; or mere conventions that pleased the gods; or they may have considered these names to be so ancient that it was impossible to know anything about their origin. There is no unique answer; the same individual may have attributed different origins to different names.

However, we should perhaps establish a distinction between epithets and theonyms. While the epithets were more often dictated by the gods themselves, whose authority was greatest, they could also be created by humans, especially in the mythical past. On the other hand, there is no indication that the Greeks – except for some philosophers – ever perceived a theonym to be a human creation. The majority of them would most probably have taken for granted that these were the "true" names of the

172 Parker 2017, 52–64.

173 van den Berg 2006.

gods as suggested by Homer and Hesiod. In this sense, divine names should probably be seen as signs, revealed by the gods.[174] Just like any sign sent from the deities, they had to be decoded, and in the eyes of the Greeks, this might have explained why the meaning of some theonyms was obscure and debatable. If so, it is not surprising that etymological enquiries on divine names were so important throughout antiquity.[175]

Bibliography

Ackermann, Delphine (2010), "L'*Hagnè Theos* du dème d'Aixônè en Attique: réflexions sur l'anonymat divin dans la religion grecque antique", in: *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 12, 1, 83–118.

Agelidis, Soi (2014), "Vom Palladion zur Nikephoros. Der Kult der Athena im Kontext der Herrschaftslegitimation im spätklassischen und hellenistischen Pergamon", in: *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 64, 75–128.

Anderson, Ralph (2015), "New Gods", in: Esther Eidinow / Julia Kindt (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion*, Oxford, 309–324.

Barat, Claire (2010), "L'origine romaine des relations imaginaires entre le Sérapeum d'Alexandrie et Sinope", in: Laurent Lamoine / Clara Berrendonner / Mireille Cébeillac-Gervasoni (eds.), *La Praxis municipale dans l'Occident romain* (Collection Histoires croisées), Clermont-Ferrand, 127–142.

Belayche, Nicole (2007), "Les dieux « nomothètes ». Oracles et prescriptions religieuses à l'époque romaine impériale", in: *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 224, 2, 171–191.

Belayche, Nicole (2013), "L'évolution des formes rituelles: hymnes et *mystèria*", in: Laurent Bricault / Corinne Bonnet (eds.), Panthée. *Religious Transformations in the Graeco-Roman Empire* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 177), Leiden, 17–40.

van den Berg, Robbert M. (2006), "Does it Matter to Call God Zeus? Origen, *Contra Celsum* I 24–25 against the Greek Intellectuals on Divine Names", in: George H. van Kooten (ed.), *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses. Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity* (Themes in Biblical Narrative 9), Leiden / Boston, 169–183.

Bonnechere, Pierre / Pirenne-Delforge, Vinciane (2019), "Réflexions sur la religion grecque antique: comment appréhender le polythéisme ?", in: Bernard Collette-Dučić / Marc-Antoine Gavray / Jean-Marc Narbonne (eds.), *L'esprit critique dans l'Antiquité* I. *Critique et licence dans la Grèce antique*, Paris, 57–97.

Bonnet, Corinne (2019), "« De l'inattendu, le dieu a découvert la voie ». La polyonymie comme mode de connaissance des dieux", in: *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 2019, 2, 595–619.

Bonnet, Corinne (2020), *Les trois yeux de Zeus, les mille noms d'Isis. Les dieux antiques dans et en dehors de la caverne*, Rome.

Bonnet, Corinne / Bianco, Maria / Galoppin, Thomas / Guillon, Élodie / Laurent, Antoine / Lebreton, Sylvain / Porzia, Fabio (2018), "« Les dénominations des dieux nous offrent comme autant d'images dessinées » (Julien, *Lettres* 89b, 291 b). Repenser le binôme théonyme-épithète", in: *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 84, 567–591.

Borgeaud, Philippe (1996), "Manières grecques de nommer les dieux", in: *Colloquium Helveticum* 23, 19–36.

174 On the notion of revelation applied to Greek polytheism, see Bonnechere/Pirenne–Delforge 2019, 73–79.

175 See Padovani in this volume.

Borgeaud, Philippe (2006), “Variations grecques sur l’origine (mythique) du langage”, in: *Le genre humain* 45–46, 73–100.
Borgeaud, Philippe / Volokhine, Youri (2000), “La formation de la légende de Sarapis: une approche transculturelle”, in: *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 2, 1, 37–76.
Brouillet, Manon (2013), “Que disent les mots des dieux ?”, in: *Mètis* n.s. 13, 147–181.
Brouillet, Manon (2016), *Des chants en partage. L’épopée homérique comme expérience religieuse*, PhD thesis, EHESS, Paris.
Calame, Claude (2018), “Pre-Classical Sparta as Song Culture”, in: Anton Powell (ed.), *A Companion to Sparta*, vol. 1 (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Hoboken, NJ, 178–201.
Casevitz, Michel / Frontisi-Ducroux, Françoise (1989), “Le masque du « Phallen ». Sur une épiclèse de Dionysos à Méthymna”, in: *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 206, 2, 115–126.
Chaniotis, Angelos (2013), “Staging and Feeling the Presence of God: Emotion and Theatricality in Religious Celebrations in the Roman East” in: Laurent Bricault / Corinne Bonnet (eds.), Panthée. *Religious Transformations in the Graeco-Roman Empire* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 177), Leiden, 169–189.
Chiron, Pierre (2017), “Le nom des dieux, la langue des dieux chez Homère”, in: Luciana Gabriela Soares Santoprete / Philippe Hoffmann (eds.), *Langage des dieux, langage des démons, langage des hommes dans l’Antiquité* (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 26), Turnhout, 29–51.
Coarelli, Filippo (2016), *Pergamo e il re. Forma e funzioni di una capitale ellenistica* (Studi ellenistici. Supplemento 3), Pisa / Roma.
Darbo-Peschanski, Catherine (1987), *Le discours du particulier. Essai sur l’Enquête hérodotéenne* (Des travaux), Paris.
Daubner, Frank (2008), “Der pergamenische Monatsname Eumeneios”, in: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 41, 174–180.
Gaertner, Jan Felix (2006), “Die Kultepiklesen und Kultaitia in Pausanias’ *Periegesis*”, in: *Hermes* 134, 4, 471–487.
Garland, Robert (1992), *Introducing New Gods. The Politics of Athenian Religion*, Ithaca.
Graf, Fritz (2004), “Trick or Treat? On Collective Epiphanies in Antiquity”, in: *Illinois Classical Studies* 29, 111–130.
Hawes, Greta (2016), “Pausanias and the Footsteps of Herodotus”, in: Jessica Priestley / Vasiliki Zali (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden / Boston, 322–345.
Henrichs, Albert (1994), “Anonymity and Polarity: Unknown Gods and Nameless Altars at the Areopagos”, in: *Illinois Classical Studies* 19, 27–58.
Hepding, Hugo (1910), “Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1908–1909 II. Die Inschriften”, in: *Mitteilungen des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 35, 401–493.
van der Horst, Pieter Willem (1988), “The Unknown God (Acts 17:23)”, in: R. van der Broek / T. Baarda / J. Mansfeld, (eds.), *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World* (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’Empire romain 112), Leiden, 19–42.
de Hoz, María-Paz (2017), “The Regulations of Dionysius in the So-Called *Lex Sacra* from Philadelphia in Lydia. Elevated Strict Moral Code or Current Civil Behavioural Norms?”, in: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 50, 93–108.
Johnston, Sarah Iles (1999), *Restless Dead. Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*, Berkeley *et al*.
Kahn, D. / Stickgold, R. / Pace-Schott, E.F. / Hobson, J.A. (2000), “Dreaming and Waking Consciousness: a Character Recognition Study”, in: *Journal of Sleep Research* 9, 317–325.
Kindt, Julia (2018), “Revelation, Narrative, and Cognition: Oracle Stories as Epiphanic Tales in Ancient Greece”, in: *Kernos* 31, 39–58.
Koch Piettre, Renée (2020), “ὄναρ/ὕπαρ, φάσμα/εἴδωλον : du lexique à la pragmatique des visions rêvées en Grèce ancienne”, in: *Semitica et Classica* 13, 63–78.

Le Feuvre, Claire (2019), “Language of Gods, Pythian Apollo and Plato’s *Cratylus*”, in: Stéphanie Anthonioz / Alice Mouton / Daniel Petit (eds.), *When Gods Speak to Men. Divine Speech According to Textual Sources in the Ancient Mediterranean Basin* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 289), Leuven, 81–104.

Lebreton, Sylvain (2013), *Surnommer Zeus. Contribution à l’étude des structures et des dynamiques du polythéisme attique à travers ses épiclèses, de l’époque archaïque au Haut-Empire*, PhD thesis, Université Rennes 2, Rennes.

Leclerc, Marie-Christine (1993), *La parole chez Hésiode. À la recherche de l’harmonie perdue* (Collection Études anciennes), Paris.

Lehnus, Luigi (1994), “Antichità cirenaiche in Callimaco”, in: *Eikasmos* 5, 189–207.

Lipka, Michael (2022), *Epiphanies and Dreams in Greek Polytheism. Textual Genres and ‘Reality’ from Homer to Heliodorus* (MythosEikonPoiesis 13), Berlin / Boston.

McInerney, Jeremy (2014), “Pelasgians and Leleges: Using the Past to Understand the Present” in: James Ker / Christoph Pieper (eds.), *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World* (Mnemosyne. Supplement 369), Leiden, 25–55.

Munson, Rosaria Vignolo (2005), *Black Doves Speak. Herodotus and the Languages of Barbarians* (Hellenic Studies Series 9), Washington DC.

Mylonopoulos, Ioannis (2019), “The Power of Absent Text: Dedicatory Inscriptions on Greek Sacred Architecture and Altars”, in: Andrej Petrovic / Ivana Petrovic / Edmund Thomas (eds.), *The Materiality of Text. Placement, Perception, and Presence of Inscribed Texts in Classical Antiquity* (Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy 11), Leiden / Boston, 231–274.

Palamidis, Alaya (forthcoming), “Οὐνόματα and ἐπωνυμίαι. Knowledge of Divine Names in Herodotus”.

Palamidis, Alaya (in preparation a), “Le vocabulaire des noms divins chez Pausanias”.

Palamidis, Alaya (in preparation b), “Did Eumenes II name Athena *Nikephoros*?”.

Parker, Robert (2011), *On Greek Religion* (Townsend Lectures 60), Ithaca / London.

Parker, Robert (2017), *Greek Gods Abroad. Names, Natures, and Transformations* (Sather Classical Lectures 72), Oakland.

Paul, Stéphanie (2013), “Manifestation du divin et reconfiguration des panthéons à la période hellénistique”, in: Philippe Borgeaud / Doralice Fabiano (eds.), *Perception et construction du divin dans l’Antiquité* (Recherches et rencontres 31), Genève, 237–259.

Pernot, Laurent (2005), “Le lieu du nom (τόπος ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος) dans la rhétorique religieuse des Grecs”, in: Nicole Belayche *et al.* (eds.), *Nommer les dieux. Théonymes, épithètes, épiclèses dans l’Antiquité* (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 5), Turnhout, 29–39.

Petridou, Georgia (2016), *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature & Culture*, Oxford.

Petsalis-Diomidis, Alexia (2010), *Truly Beyond Wonders. Aelius Aristides and the Cult of Asklepios*, Oxford.

Piettre, Renée (1999), “Les dieux crèvent les yeux : l’*enargeia* dans la représentation du divin”, in: Dominique Mulliez (ed.), *La transmission de l’image dans l’Antiquité* (Ateliers 21), Lille, 11–21.

Pinel Martínez, Pablo (2020), “Negative Theology and its Interpretation as an Atheistic Attitude in 5th Century Athens”, in: *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 23, 2, 277–290.

Pirenne-Delforge, Vinciane (2008), *Retour à la source. Pausanias et la religion grecque* (Kernos. Supplément 20), Liège.

Pirenne-Delforge, Vinciane (forthcoming), “Des « petits dieux » en Grèce ancienne ? Réflexions préliminaires sur le *daimōn*”, in: Francesca Prescendi / Françoise Van Haeperen (eds.), *Les petits dieux romains et leurs voisins. Réflexions sur les hiérarchies divines*, Turnhout.

Pirenne-Delforge, Vinciane / Pironti, Gabriella [2016] (2022), *The Hera of Zeus. Intimate Enemy, Ultimate Spouse*, Cambridge (translated by Raymond Geuss).

Platt, Verity (2011), *Facing the Gods. Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*, Cambridge.

Polinskaya, Irene (2013), *A Local History of Greek Polytheism. Gods, People and the Land of Aigina, 800–400 BCE* (Religions in Graeco-Roman World 178), Leiden / Boston.

Pulleyn, Simon (1997), *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford Classical Monographs), Oxford.
Rigsby, Kent J. (1996), *Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 22), Berkeley *et al*.
Robertson, Noel (2004), "The Praxiergidae Decree (*IG* I^3 7) and the Dressing of Athena's Statue with the *Peplos*", in: *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 44, 111–161.
Rowett, Catherine (2013), "On Calling the Gods by the Right Names", in: *Rhizomata* 1, 2, 168–193.
Semenzato, Camille (2017), *À l'écoute des Muses en Grèce archaïque. La question de l'inspiration dans la poésie grecque à l'aube de notre civilisation* (MythosEikonPoiesis 9), Berlin.
Skrzypińska, Dagna / Słodka, Monika (2014), "Who are the People in My Dreams? Self-awareness and Character Identification in Dreams", in: *International Journal of Dream Research* 7, 1, 23–32.
Struck, Peter T. (2016), *Divination and Human Nature. A Cognitive History of Intuition in Classical Antiquity*, Princeton / Oxford.
Thély, Ludovic (2016), *Les Grecs face aux catastrophes naturelles. Savoirs, histoire, mémoire* (BEFAR 375), Athènes.
Vamvouri Ruffy, Maria (2019), "Couronnes de lierre et de fleurs au banquet: Dionysos médecin et le *Péan* de Philodème", in: Ariadni Gartziou-Tatti / Athanassia Zografou (eds.), *Des dieux et des plantes. Monde végétal et religion en Grèce ancienne* (Kernos. Supplément 34), Liège, 249–260.
Versnel, H.S. (2011), *Coping with the Gods. Wayward Readings in Greek Theology* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 173), Leiden.