Oropodoros: Anthroponomy, Geography, History*

DENIS KNOEPFLER

In a chapter of his *Etudes épigraphiques et philologiques* (1938) Louis Robert emphasized the extremely local character of a large number of Greek personal names, especially theophoric (or ‘herophoric’) names in -δωρος, throughout antiquity down to the Christian period:1 ‘on peut raisonnablyment supposer’, he wrote, ‘qu’il n’y a guère eu d’Aletodôros qu’à Corinthe et dans ses colonies,2 de même que les Πτωιόδωρος, Ὠγχηστόδωρος (ou Ὠγχηστίων), Ἀβαιόδωρος sont des Béotiens, les Ὄρωπόδωρος des Béotiens ou des Eubéens’. And while for some of these names, such as Ptoiodoros, he was able to refer to the old, but still instructive memoir of J.-A. Letronne ‘sur l’utilité qu’on peut retirer de l’étude des noms propres grecs pour l’histoire et l’archéologie’,3 he was forced to be satisfied for Oropodoros with a reference to the dissertation of E. Sittig, *De Graecorum

* Peter M. Fraser himself undertook the translation from the French of the text of this paper which is contributed in his honor (*honos, onus*!). I thank him most warmly for this act of friendship, and also Elaine Matthews for dealing with the footnotes, and for the original invitation to the colloquium in July 1998.


2 Robert cited this anthroponym on the basis of H. Gelzer, *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina* (Leipzig, 1898), XLII, who emended it from the corrupted name of the bishop of Kerkyra. But now we have the evidence of *LGPN* IIIA (1997), which gives no Ἀλητόδωρος (the example under discussion, if accepted, would belong in *LGPN* VI, ‘Others’). A re-interpretation of this text would remove a potentially awkward exception to the apparent rule (as we shall see below) that theophoric names in -δωρος did not have as first element the name of a founding hero.

3 *Oeuvres choisies* III. 2 (Paris, 1885), 50–1.

nominibus theophoris (1911); for this anthroponym and the other names formed on the root Ωρωπ(ο)- only appeared in inscriptions at the end of the nineteenth century (in 1886 at Oropos and 1887 at Eretria, to be precise): still unknown to Pape-Benseler (1870), they only became part of the onomastic repertoire from the publication of the collection of Fick-Bechtel a little more than a century ago.⁴

The material now available—readily accessible, in all essentials, thanks to the publication of the first three volumes of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*—wholly confirms Robert’s judgement: all persons of this name are exclusively Boeotians (in the widest sense of the term) and Euboeans. As far as the Aegean islands are concerned, there is no trace of an Oropodoros or of any kindred name (for instance Oropiades, Oropines, Oropion, Oropichos, or Oropokles, all attested at Eretria) except in Euboea (see *LGPN* I). It is very remarkable that these names, which one might have expected to meet in the Athenian demes closest to Oropos, are wholly absent from Athens and Attica (see *LGPN* II) and also (less surprisingly) from the Peloponnese, western Greece and the western Greek world (see *LGPN* IIIA). However, if that is a striking confirmation, there is also evidence of a singular fact, hitherto unremarked: these anthroponyms are neither pan-Boeotian nor pan-Euboean.

In Boeotia, only the city of Oropos has provided instances, in very limited number as we can now see (while awaiting the appearance of *LGPN* IIIB) from the Index of the monumental corpus of Oropian inscriptions of Vassilis Petrakos.⁵ Even in the two Boeotian cities nearest to Oropos, namely Tanagra and Thebes (for the onomastic lists of which we have the recent prosopographies of D. W. Roller and S. N. Koumanoudes respectively⁶) there is no trace of such names to date. In other words, we should no longer describe them as ‘Boeotian’, since Oropos (notwithstanding its political membership of the Boeotian Confederacy from the end of the fourth century) was never, at the level of dialect, a Boeotian city.⁷

---

⁵ Οἱ ἐπιγραφὲς τοῦ ᾿Ωρωποῦ (Athens, 1997), 543 and 560 (index nominum s.v.; cf. below n. 61).
⁶ D. W. Roller, The Prosopography of Tanagra in Boiotia (Tanagran Studies II; Amsterdam, 1989) and *Boeotia Antica* 4 (1994), 31–4; S. N. Koumanoudes, Thebaike Prosopographia (Athens, 1979). On these two catalogues see D. Knoepfler, *Chiron* 22 (1992), 458–63 nos 87–8 (Tanagra); 413 no. 5 and 441 no. 53 (Thebes).
⁷ In this connection, see the interesting observations of A. Morpurgo Davies, ‘Geography, History and Dialect: The Case of Oropos’, in *Dialectologica Graeca. Actas del Il Coloquio*
The evidence from Euboea is no less interesting in this respect. Names of this family are found exclusively in Eretrian epigraphy, a fact which can hardly be fortuitous, even granting that Eretrian inscriptions far outnumber those of Chalcis, Carystus and Histiaeia-Oreus. What is more, if we look at the situation more closely we observe that, even within the πόλις Ἑρετριέων, the derivatives and compound forms in Ὄρωπ(ο)- are not attested indiscriminately. To take the tombstones and dedications, essentially private monuments erected near the residential districts of those named on them, the area of dispersion corresponds, very precisely, to the urban area and the triangular plain which extends eastwards for some ten kilometres, as far as the likely site of the great sanctuary of Amarynthos; that is to say, the city and its immediate neighbourhood facing the territory of Oropos. No attestation comes from the southern part of the chora of Eretria (it is noteworthy that these names do not occur at all on the famous plaques from Styra, the onomastics of which were recently studied by the late Olivier Masson), nor from the northern region (which extended from the modern Avlonari to Koumi).

Moreover, if we consider the great catalogues of hellenistic date, all of which were admittedly compiled at Eretria, but which are nevertheless of great interest in that they give us the demotics of the citizens whose names are recorded, we note that Oropodoros, Oropiades, Oropichos etc., are enrolled in only a very few demes—fewer than ten out of the total of some sixty or seventy civic communities which must have been comprised within this vast

---

8 For a recent survey of new discoveries on Euboea, see my report in the proceedings of the XI Congresso Internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina, Roma 1997 (Rome, 2000), 213 ff. The appearance of a name in Orop(o)- at Chalcis cannot, of course, be ruled out.

9 The city of Eretria itself and its immediate environs have produced three tombs with Ὄρωτοσκλής (IG XII (9) 665, 772, 773; note that Ὄρωτοσκλής (sic) in LGPN I should be suppressed), to which can be added a fragment of a stele with Ὄρωπ[- - -] found recently in the excavations of the Gymnasion by Elena Mango (Eretria Museum inv. M 1186); otherwise, a dedication with Ὄρωπιάδης (IG XII (9) 142 = 143), re-used in the church of the village of Ano Vathia, certainly came originally from the sanctuary at Amarynthos (cf. D. Knoepfler, CRAI 1988, 413–14 with n. 123); and in the neighbouring village of Kato Vathia/Amarynthos in 1971 I discovered a fourth-century stele with anthemion (now in Eretria Museum) with the two names Φιλίνος and ὘ρωπίνης.

10 BCH 116 (1992), 61–72; cf. also Dialectologica Graeca (above n. 7), 229–32 (‘Noms ioniens à Styra’).
region. The relevant demes, in alphabetical order, are: Aphareus, Boudion, Dismaros, Karkinous, Komaiëis, Phallas, Phlieus, and Raphieus (which does not of course mean that these names did not occur in other demes). Now, in a recent paper, 11 I showed that far from being a village close to the borders of Carystus, as had been supposed since the study of W. Wallace, Dismaros is to be placed—with the whole of District (χῶρος) I to which it belonged—in the western part of the chorα, not far from the city of Eretria. For the villages of Komaiëis and Boudion 12 various locations from south to north of Eretrian territory have been proposed, but on no sound basis. In fact, at least one of them could be moved towards the region of Vathia/Amarynthos. As for Aphareus and Raphieus, there are good reasons for placing them in the neighbourhood of the modern Aliveri, in the southern sector of the central area of Eretrian territory, where it appears we should also look for the three remaining demes (Karkinous, Phallas/Phallarioi and Phlieus), 13 whose location remains uncertain (see Figure 1).

From all of the above it emerges that names in Ἄρωπο- enjoyed an area of diffusion even more limited than one thought in the light of the fundamentally correct view of L. Robert. On the mainland, they never travelled the short distance across the frontier of Oropia to spread into the neighbouring regions of Attica and Boeotia; on Euboea itself they remained confined to a single city, Eretria, and within that city to a single (admittedly important) portion of territory, that which, across the Euboeic Gulf, was in direct contact with Oropos.

But what significance are we to give to Ἄρωπόδωρο-? In the long series of anthroponyms in -δώρος a distinction must be made, at the semantic level, between two types: those of which the first element is a more or less common word-form, which may form part of a large group of other Full Names or ‘Vollnamen’ (for instance, Ἀντίδωρος, Δημόδωρος, Εὔδωρος, Ἔνδωρος,

---

12 For Boudion, see the location suggested op. cit., 380 and 436 n. 223. The case of Komaiëis is more difficult; certain indications point towards ‘district’ V (deme Teleidai), ib., 370 and n. 153. That is where I have tentatively placed it on the map (Fig. 1).
13 Op. cit., 371 and 382 with n. 235 (Aphareus); 368–9 with n. 135 (Raphieus). On the toponym *Phallas/Phallantos, of which Phallarios would be the rhotacized adjectival form, cf. ib., 361.
Figure 1. The territory of Eretria with its five choroi and the distribution of names in Orop(o) - on the island and on the mainland (inner circle = certain area; outer circle = possible extension).
Εὐθύδωρος, Μηνησίδωρος, Τελέδωρος, Τιμόδωρος etc.), and those of which the first element is clearly a proper name, whether a theonym (for example, alongside the very common Αθηνόδωρος, Απολλόδωρος, Άσκληπιόδωρος, and Ζηνόδωρος, to cite only a few, the more remarkable Άδρανόδωρος, Βενδίδωρος, Μανδρόδωρος, Παρθενόδωρος, Ολυμπιόδωρος, Όμολωϊόδωρος). To this category (on which the reader may with profit consult the paper by Robert Parker in the present volume) clearly belong anthroponyms derived from the name of a hero, for example, Αἰαντόδωρος, Αρισταιόδωρος, Αχιλλόδωρος, Μελαμπόδωρος, Πολτύδωρος. Also included are a fair number of names with a geographical association, in which the first part of the name corresponds to a toponym: names of mountains as in Υπατόδωρος and Πτωϊόδωρος (Mount Hypaton and Mount Ptoion in Boeotia), Μηκιστόδωρος (Mekistos, a mountain and locality in northern Euboea), and, above all, names of rivers, as in Αχελωϊόδωρος, Ίσμηνόδωρος, Κηφισόδωρος, Στρυμόδωρος, Καϊκόδωρος and so on (note also Ποταμόδωρος).

It is to be noted that these toponyms are never the names of cities (though the names Κορινθότιµος and Καρυστόνικος are attested, we know of no *Κορίνθιοδωρος or *Καρυστιοδωρος). In other words, the heroes with whom these anthroponyms are associated are the forces of nature, not mythical founders of cities, whether eponymous heroes or not (so that one will probably never come across a *Καδμοδωρος, although the heronym Kadmos and its derivatives are attested as personal names). The exceptions to this rule turn out to be no more than apparent: for example, the name Ογχηστόδωρος (Tanagra) certainly suggests the toponym Onchestos (and

---

14 See the list in Bechtel, HP, 144–7, together with the reverse indexes of LGPN II and IIIA.
15 This name, which is that of a Syracusan statesman in Polybius 7. 2. 1 (Άδρανόδωρος codd., corretix Letronne, the correction not noted in LGPN IIIA s.v.) is to be associated with a god Adrianos attested in Sicily: cf. L. Robert, Et. épigr. et phil. (cf. above, 55 n. 11), 214 (where he also discusses the name Εὐμηλιόδωρος and a god of animal herds, Eumelios, on Kos).
16 As is well known, Letronne, taking this family of names as his starting point, deduced the existence in Anatolia of a god Mandros. Since 1931 we have had direct evidence of this god at Kyme: cf. L. Robert, Loc. cit. and OMS 3, 1679; also O. Masson, Journal des Savants 1985, 21 n. 29 = OGS, 479, and Mus. Helv. 45 (1988), 6 = OGS, 604–5. (But see above, 68 n. 55.)
17 This last name has appeared only very recently at Ainos in Thrace (SEG 36, 665); it confirms the existence there of a hero Polytis, cf. O. Masson and L. Dubois, BE 1987, no. 355.
18 For this name, which has remained a hapax since its appearance a century ago at Eretria, cf. D. Knoepfler in M. Bats and B. d’Agostino (eds), Euboica. L’Eubea e la presenza euboica in Calcidica e in Occidente (Naples, 1998), 107.
the epiclesis Onchestios bestowed on Poseidon), but the point of reference is a sanctuary, and more precisely a sacred grove (ἄλσος), not a village and still less a city.19 The hero Onchestos was certainly not a divine ktistes: he was simply the genius loci,20 probably associated with a spring.

The consequence of this for the interpretation of Ὄρωπόδωρος is evident: in this compound we should not expect to find the name of the city, but, quite clearly, that of a god or a hero associated with a mountain or, even more likely, a river. In fact there is a piece of evidence, whose significance has strangely been overlooked up to now, for the existence of such a hydronym. This is the description given by Philostratus, in the first book of his Imagines, of a picture representing the seer Amphiarao in his chariot, at the precise moment when he is being swallowed up in an opening in the earth. The author emphasizes that the painting also showed Oropos in the form of a young man in the midst of some azure women, representing the seas (1. 27. 3: γράφει δὲ καὶ τὸν Ὄρωπόν νεανίαν ἐν γλαύκοις γυναικोῖς - τὰ δὲ ἐστὶ θάλασσαι). No one ever seems to have thought that Oropos here could be anything but the city of that name,21 and at one time this text was freely adduced as proof that the city of Oropos was on the sea-shore.22 But on reflection this interpretation causes great difficulty. First because, in general terms, a νεανία is not an appropriate figure to represent a city, which is normally personified as a woman;23 second, and most importantly,
because the natural position of the city of Oropos does not provide the setting needed for this mythical episode. The young man, as the story shows us, should represent the mouth of a river, since he is described as being accompanied by γλαύκα γύναια specifically identified with the θάλασσαι (this plural can be justified, it may be noted in passing, by the fact that Boeotia, qualified as τρίποληττος by Ephorus ap. Strabo, is at that point precisely in contact with two 'seas' regarded as quite distinct by the ancient Greeks). In any case, there is nothing exceptional in a river-god being represented as a νεανίας.

The notion that the toponym Ορωπός might originally have referred to a river is by no means new. As long ago as 1929 the Greek philologist A. C. Chatzis maintained this view in a note which remained unobserved for a long time, until its value was recognized in recent years. Without invoking the witness of Philostratus, he put forward three arguments in favour of his view:

1. The name ‘Oropos’ has the same termination in -όπος as several other hydronyms, namely ‘Asopos’ (the name of several rivers in the Peloponnesian and central Greece), ‘Inopos’ (the Delian stream) and ‘Europos’ (another


24 That is to say, both parts of the Euripos, the northern and southern Aegean: cf. most recently R. Baladié, *Strabon. Géographie, livre IX* (C.U.F., 1996), ad 9. 2. 2 C 400 = Ephorus, *FGrHist.* 70 F 119.

25 For the emergence of this type in the mid-fifth century, following the animal or hybrid figures of archaic art, see C. Weiss, *Griechische Flussgottheiten* (above n. 20), 102 ff. There are numerous examples in Attic and Italiote pottery: cf. H. Metzger, op. cit., 272, on the seated figure of the river-god Strymon depicted on the Talos vase from Ruvo (cf. *LIMC* VII s.v. ‘Strymon II’), which ‘n’a apparemment d’autre raison de figurer ici que de tenir le rôle dévolu ailleurs à Délos ou à Eleusis’. For the coinage, cf. L. Robert, *BCH* 105 (1981), 350–2 = *Documents d’Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1987), 260–2, referring to an article by F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Nomisma* 6 (1911), 2–3, in which Imhoof-Blumer cites another passage from the same *Imagines* of Philostratus.


27 This element of the name has been explained in a variety of ways: see F. Sommer, *Zur Geschichte der gr. Nominalkomposita* (Munich, 1948), 1 ff. and especially 7, where, for Asopos, the reader is referred to Krause, *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachw.* 67 (1947), 211 ff. with this reservation: ‘Ein -οπ(ο)- Wasser scheint mir zu viel Undeutbares übrigzulassen’.
name for the Thessalian Titaresios, the tributary of the Peneus); and one could add, with a different vocalization, the Aisepos, the river of Cyzicus, the name of which has produced some interesting epichoric anthroponyms.28

2 Ὄρωπὀςζ is generally masculine (cf. Thucydides 8. 95. 1 et passim; Xenophon, Hell., 7. 4. 1; Theopompos ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Ὄρωπποςζ = FGrHist. 115 F12; Demosthenes, Megal., [16] 18; Euphantus ap. Diogenes Laertius 2. 141; Nicocrates, FGrHist. 376 F1). This is remarkable for the name of a city, since these are almost invariably feminine (in the case of Oropos, the feminine gender seems of late origin, since it is attested only by Pausanias 7. 11. 4; cf. Steph. Byz. loc. cit.). However, the masculine is easily explained if the name originally designated a ἄκως.

3 An inscription indicates that there was also a river called Oropos in Thesprotia: this was evidently the ancient name of the Louros, which flows into the Ambracian Gulf; on the banks of this river presumably lay the homonymous city to which Steph. Byz. refers, s.v. (καὶ πέντη ἐν Ṭεσπρωτίαι). The two cities, on this view, received their name from that of an adjacent river.

The two first reasons put forward by Chatzis seem to me to preserve all their validity, and, combined with the existence of the anthroponym Ὄρωπποςζ (of which he did not fail to appreciate the interest for the question under debate), they suffice to make it almost certain that before being applied to a city the name Oropos was that of a river and of a fluvial deity, whose existence is attested in addition by the ἐκφρασις of Philostratos, once it has been correctly interpreted.

On the other hand, the argument drawn from the toponymy of Thesprotia is wholly without foundation—a fact not without significance for the development of the argument. The inscription found near Nicopolis in Epirus, which Chatzis thought he could use as evidence on the basis of a very old (and unique) copy of W. M. Leake,29 does not at all prove the existence of an ancient name Ὄρωπποςζ for the Louros (ΩΡΩΠΠΟΣΠΟΤΑΜΩ[--]ΚΑΘΙΕΠΘΩΑΝΕΥΧΑ[--]); at the most, if the reading is correct, it relates to a

28 The names Αἰσηπόςζ et Αἰσηποῡςζ (still unknown to E. Sittig) are attested at Cyzicus: see L. Robert, BCH 102 (1978), 456 with n. 25 = Documents (above n. 25), 152. For the name of the river, which is well attested in literature, cf. J. Tischler, Kleinasiatische Hydronymie. Semantische und morphologische Analyse der griechischen Gewässernamen (Wiesbaden, 1977), 22 (reviewed by O. Masson, Bull. Soc. Ling. Paris 74 (1979), 161 ff.).

29 Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, 2nd ser. 2 (1847), 236 (non vidi).
dedication made by a certain Potamon (cf. LGPN IIIA s.v.) and another person to a hero Oropos(?)\textsuperscript{30} Moreover, the city of this name which, according to the Ethnika, was located in Thesprotia is evidently identical with the city that Strabo (7. 7. 9 C 327) calls \textit{Εὔρωπος\textgreek{c}}, and which he situates on the frontier between Epirus and Thessaly (identification of the site has not yet proved possible).\textsuperscript{31}

In fact, contrary to what has been accepted hitherto, there never was any other city homonymous to the Boeotian Oropos. The Byzantine grammarian wrongly enumerates, s.v. \textit{Ὠρωπός\textgreek{c}}, four or five cities of that name. The supposed Oropos in Macedonia is the same as one of the two cities called Eropos in this region, namely that in Amphaxitis, already mentioned by Thucydides (2. 100. 3), and long since identified with Achiklar on the right bank of the Axios; the other, which according to Pliny (\textit{NH}, 4. 35) and Ptolemy (3. 12. 21) lay in Almopia, has not been identified.\textsuperscript{32} Consequently, even though the form \textit{ἐν Ὀρωπῶι} appears, surprisingly, in the Macedonian section of the great Delphic list of \textit{thearodokoi},\textsuperscript{33} the idea must definitely be abandoned that a city named Oropos is identifiable east of Pella, as was maintained for a long time by so excellent an authority as N. G. L. Hammond,\textsuperscript{34} on a site which in fact is that of Ichnai, as other specialists of Macedonia have recently shown.\textsuperscript{35}

With it must also disappear the supposed cities named Oropos in the hellenistic East, which were accepted for far too long on the basis of the list in Stephanus;\textsuperscript{36} these, by the same token, are all cities named Eropos, for under

\textsuperscript{30} See N. G. L. Hammond, \textit{Epirus} (Oxford, 1967), 708, who gives a new edition of the inscription (SEG 24, 425) and in the commentary states: ‘C. F. Edson has pointed out to me that Oropos is probably a hero . . . ; but it is far from certain that the hero is the hero of the river, or that there was a like-named town near the sources of the Louros’. See 98 below, Post Scriptum.


\textsuperscript{32} For these two homonymous cities, the prime reference is F. Papazoglou, \textit{Les villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine}. \textit{BCH} Suppl. 16 (Paris, 1988), 172–3 (Eropos in Almopia) and 180–1 (Eropos in Amphaxitis).

\textsuperscript{33} A. Plassart, \textit{BCH} 45 (1921), 17, line 62 (we await the new edition of this text by J. Oulhen, in the \textit{Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes}).

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{A History of Macedonia}, I (Oxford, 1972), 168–9 (cf. map 14), and again in his \textit{Atlas of the Greek and Roman World in Antiquity} (Park Ridge, 1981), map 12.

\textsuperscript{35} F. Papazoglou, op. cit., 180 n. 43; and earlier, L. Gounaropoulos and M. B. Hatzopoulos, \textit{Les milliaires de la voie égnatienne entre Héraclée des Lyncestes et Thessalonique} (Meletemata 1; Athens and Paris, 1985), 59 n. 4 (not cited by Papazoglou), who refer to C. Edson, \textit{Classical Philology} 50 (1955), 187 n. 68.

\textsuperscript{36} S.v. \textit{Ὠρωπός\textgreek{c}} (p. 711, 4–10 Meineke): ἐστι καὶ τρίτη ἐν Ἔσσηὶ κτισθεῖσα ὑπὸ Νικάτορος, περὶ ὶς ὅ Πολυσσωρ ἐν τῶι περὶ Ἔσσηί; φηαὶ οὖτως Ἑνοφῶν ἐν ταῖς
the descendants of Seleukos Nikator, who was himself a native of the Europs on the banks of the Axios, this toponym ‘a essaimé en Médie et en Syrie, sur les bords de l’Euphrate’. It is also extremely doubtful whether a place of this name ever existed in the Argolid, even in Argos itself: ἐν Ἀργεί (Steph. Byz. loc. cit.). Knowing Stephanus’ manner of working, we shall have no difficulty in accepting that he derived this from an account which described the disappearance ‘at Oropos’ of the Argive hero, Amphiaraos. Again, the Oropos of Euboea (ἄλλη ἐν Εὐβοίαι) results from a confusion, stigmatized long ago, between Orobiai / Orope in Euboea and Oropos. On the other hand, as we shall see shortly, it is certain that an Eretrian deme bore the name of Oropos (Ὀρωπόθεν, Ὀρώπιοι), closely linked historically with the mainland city.

It remains for us to identify this river Oropos, which gave its name to the settlement established near its banks. Chatzis suggested, in the article already mentioned (see n. 26), that it was the stream (ποταμίον), the ancient name of which is not known, which has left traces of its existence at Skala Oropou, the site of ancient Oropos. This view was revived in recent years, on the basis of far more extensive archaeological evidence, by the late Alike Dragna, and yet more recently by the best authority on Oropian antiquities, Vassilis Petrakos.


38 This mention of an Oropos in Euboea has, moreover, been considered an interpolation since Saumaise, because it does not fit into Steph. Byz.’s enumeration of the five allegedly homonymous cities: cf. A. Baumeister, Topographische Skizze der Insel Euboia (Lübeck, 1864), 52 n. 35. I cannot discuss here the question of Orope/Orobiai in Euboea, which is linked to the problem of the identification of the sanctuary of Apollo Koropaioi by the scholiasts on Nicander of Colophon (Ther., 612–14).

40 Ib., 46. cf. Oi ἐπιγραφὲς τοῦ Ὀρωποῦ (above n. 5), 488: ‘more plausible [than the hypothesis of Knoepfler, see below] is the view of A. Chatzis ..., who believes that the city took its name from the neighbouring river, which was called the Oropos’ (transl. from the mod. Greek). In his survey of 1968 (above n. 22), 19 n. 1, Petrakos took account of the view of Chatzis
In their view, it was after the floods which covered the entire geometric and archaic city (situated to the west of the Skala) with a deep deposit of soil, towards the middle of the sixth century BC, that the stream in question was divinized. This explains how it came about that the new settlement took its name from that of the stream, which was quiet enough in normal circumstances but could from time to time pose a threat to the houses, if not the inhabitants, of the settlement.

Whatever may be the interest of this explanation in the context of the new excavations and investigations in the city of Oropos, I must, I believe, remain faithful to the view that I expressed some fifteen years ago in a popular article (‘Oropos, colony of Eretria’) which did not escape the notice of these two archaeologists. It seems to me that the river Oropos cannot have been a ‘xeropotami’, however swollen and threatening it might have become in the rainy season. In the light of parallels provided by other names in - doros, and taking account of what one may surmise about the cult of river-gods in the Greek world, we should postulate here a river with a regular rate of flow, which played a permanent, and usually beneficent, part in the life of the city. The rivers that were deified in antiquity were always important, because of the volume of water that they carried, or at least because of their length: in Attica the two Kephisoses (with a sanctuary known for one of them); in Boeotia (and Phokis) another Kephisos or Kaphisos, as well as the Asopos, the Ismenos, the Melas and the Pammelas; at Delphi the Pleistos; in Akarnania and elsewhere the Acheloos; in Thessaly the Peneos; in Thrace the Strymon and the Nestos; in Asia Minor the Maeander, the

but did not adopt it, on the grounds that the small stream which would, on this theory, have given its name to the city was almost unknown.

41 *Histoire et Archéologie. Les Dossiers* 94 (May 1985), 50–5, especially 52.

42 On this cult, in addition to the old article by O. Waser, *RE* VI (1909) col. 1774–2815 s. v. ‘Flussgötter’, see for example W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1985), 175–6; for the iconography, see above n. 25.

43 For this sanctuary, located near Neon Phaleron, cf. A. Mantis, *LIMC* VI s.v. ‘Kephisos I’.

44 That this river in the vicinity of Thespiae was the object of a cult is evident from Περμάσιχος, Πέρμον (Bechtel, *HP*, 558) and other Boeotian anthroponyms: cf. G. Vottéro, ‘Milieu naturel, littérature et anthroponymie en Béotie’, in *Dialectologica Graeca* (above n. 7), 355; cf. 350 ff. for names derived from ‘hydronym’ in general. It is to be noted that Vottéro does not take into account the name Oropodoro, either because he does not consider it Boeotian, or because he does not think that one of its elements is a hydronym. For names in Περμ-, cf. further Ch. Müller, *BCH* 121 (1997), 100 (two new examples at Haliartos).

45 The cult of Nestos is well attested on Thasos by such anthroponyms as Νέστογένης, Νέστοκλῆς, Νέστοκράτης, etc. (no example of Νέστόδωρος yet, to judge by *LGPN* I). There
Hermos, the Cyzicene Aisepos, the Rhyndakos and its tributary the Penkalas of Aizanoi, etc.

I believe, therefore, that—difficult though this identification appears at first glance—one can hardly fail to think of the only near-perennial river of this region, namely the Asopos, which, once it has crossed the line of hills where ancient Tanagra lies, irrigates the plain of Oropos before reaching the sea not far from the coastal village of Khalkouts. The wide delta which it has created in the Euboeic Gulf bears witness to its strength. Moreover, its bed must once have been far closer to the site of the ancient city, for it is the delta itself which seems to have forced the river to move its estuary continuously westwards. Alexander Mazarakis Ainian, the specialist in archaic architecture and current excavator of Oropos, has recently taken up a position on this subject, by showing that an arm, at least, of the Asopos could very well have run in the immediate vicinity of the settlement uncovered west of the Skala Oropou. And he concludes provisionally: ‘Thus, even if Chatzis’ opinion appears at first sight more credible, we should not dismiss Knoepfler’s theory until we obtain the results of the geological studies which have been planned for the near future in the area’.

This forthcoming geological study is bound to be of interest for the ancient topography of the area of Oropos, a sector which is also the object of survey by a team of the University of Manitoba. It is important to stress in any case that even if it should prove necessary to admit that the mouth of the Asopos was, in antiquity, some distance from the town, this relative distance would not be a very serious obstacle to the hypothesis advanced here, since the most important factor of all is to find a river forming part of the chor of the city, and no one disputes that the lower reaches and the estuary of the


On these, see the fine article by L. Robert, ‘Fleuves et cultes d’Aizanoi’, *BCH* 105 (1981), 331–60 = *Documents*, 241–69; for the Aisepos, cf. above n. 28.


L. Robert rightly stressed this point: ‘Répétons encore que ce qui importe pour une cité antique, c’est la ville et son territoire; la ville est très rarement située sur le fleuve même . . .; ce qui compte seul, c’est que le fleuve—du moins sur une partie de son cours—soit dans le territoire de la ville’, in *A travers l’Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1980), 88, with many examples.
Asopos were part of the territory of Oropos. A more serious objection might be based on the fact that the name of this long river, unlike that of the small urban stream, is well attested under the name Ἀσώπος. However, it is generally recognized that one and the same river might simultaneously have two names (either slightly or completely different from each other), one applying to its upper reaches, the other to its lower; there is more than one example of that in Greece, ancient and modern.\(^{50}\) Concerning the Asopos itself a traveller of the early nineteenth century, no less an authority than Colonel W. M. Leake, drew attention to a difference in the pronunciation of the name then borne by this river. Having indicated that the village of Sykamino ‘stands exactly at the opening of the ravine through which the Asopos finds its way from the plain of Tanagra’, he added, ‘The channel is now quite dry; the modern name, which in the interior is Vuriemi, is here pronounced Vuriendi.’\(^{51}\) Still more noteworthy is the fact that, as V. Petrakos has lately reminded us, the name ‘Oropos’ is expressly attested for the river by a Greek map dated from the years between the two world wars.\(^{52}\) It is therefore worth our while to ask if the names ‘Asopos’ and ‘Oropos’ are not, when all is said and done, variants of one and the same hydronym.

The first thing to strike us is that the two names have the same trisyllabic form, the same element -opos and the same accentuation. Now, if the form Ἀσώπος is clearly very old—we find it already in the Odyssey (11. 211), and it has what one may call a panhellenic character—the same cannot be said of the toponym Ὄρωπος. It has been established that the form is unique (once we have eliminated the series of pseudo-Oropos in the north of Greece and the hellenistic East); at the same time it is not attested before the fifth century

---

\(^{50}\) A good example from antiquity is provided by Pausanias, who records that the river which crossed Gortys in Arcadia was called Lousios ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν περὶ τὰς πηγὰς but οἱ δὲ ἀπωτέρω τῶν πηγῶν called it Gortynios (8. 28. 2, with the commentary of M. Jost (C.U.F., 1998), ad loc.). For modern times it is enough to refer to the statement of L. Robert, op. cit., 379 n. 19: ‘ces désignations locales d’un fleuve, souvent selon les villages ou villes qui sont sur telle partie, sont la règle en Turquie’.

\(^{51}\) Travels in Northern Greece, 2 (London, 1835), 440; cf. V. Petrakos, Oropos (above n. 22), 16–17.

\(^{52}\) Petrakos, op. cit., 19 n. 1. The map on the scale 1:100,000, produced by Eleftheroudakis (1923), gives the name Ωρωπός in brackets after the name Βουριένη. Our friend and colleague Petrakos also cites the testimony of W. Vischer, Erinnerungen und Eindrücke aus Griechenland (Basel, 1857), 679; but the Swiss traveller does not seem to have used this name for the Asopos, for, after reaching ‘das Thal des Asopos’, he notes: ‘der Fluss war ziemlich wasserreich; sein Thal, das weiter aufwärts bei den Ruinen des alten Tanagra sich eng zusammenzieht, erweitert sich unweit der Mündungen zu einer mehr als eine halbe Stunde breiten Niederung’. It is true that he goes on to talk about Oropos, but the place not the river.
(Herodotus, Thucydides, Lysias, the inscriptions of Attica), 53 since no archaic poet mentions it, not even the author of the Homeric Catalogue, who only knows Graia (ll. 2. 498), a city which, according to Aristotle, 54 was situated on the coast in the immediate vicinity of Oropos, and whose eponymous heroine, according to Corinna of Tanagra, was the daughter of Asopos (Pausanias 9. 20. 1). In other words, nothing prevents us from thinking that the form Ὠρωπός made its appearance at a fairly late date, for instance c. 500 BC. It would then be perfectly possible that the rho in place of the sigma given by the form Ἀσωπός is simply a result of the famous Eretrian rhotacism, since this linguistic phenomenon, native to the Ionic dialect spoken on either side of this sector of the Euboeic Gulf, begins to appear precisely towards the end of the sixth century. 55

But how are we to explain the alteration of the initial vowel? Today, as previously, it seems to me that the solution must be sought in the field of syntactical phonetics: the original name of the settlement founded by the Eretrians (for I see no reason whatever, either on archaeological evidence or on that of dialect, to doubt the testimony of the historian Nicocrates, who made Oropos a κτίσμα Ἐρετριέων (FGrHist. 376 F1) 56) could have been τὸ...
ἐµπόριον (vel simile) τὸ παρὰ τῶι ᾿Ασωπῶι, and its inhabitants some sort of Parasopi in the same way as other communities on the shores of this river and elsewhere. As a result of the combined effect of rhotacism and a krasis (another well-attested phenomenon in the Ionic dialect: for very similar phonetic phenomena cf., for instance, τὠντήνορος = τὸ Ἀντήνορος vel τὠπόλωνι = τῶι Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι, etc.), this linguistic feature should evolve into παρὰ τῶρωπῶι, whence the variant ᾿Ωρωπόδωρος would quite naturally develop (among the Eretrians of the metropolis, in the first place) as the name both of the city itself and of the adjacent river.

One of the advantages of this hypothesis is that it best takes into account, in my opinion, the astonishingly limited diffusion of the anthroponym ᾿Ωρωπόδωρος. If I am right, this name and others of the same family could not have occurred before the beginning of the fifth century, that is to say, at the time when, as I believe, the Eretrians lost control of Oropos and its territory to the Athenians. That would account for the fact that even at Oropos the diffusion of these names was, seemingly, so limited, the number of instances being no more than two or three all told (and indeed the Oropodoroi in question may well have been members of a single family of Eretrian origin).

57 The locus classicus for Parasopia and Parasopians in Boeotia as elsewhere is Strabo 9. 2. 23–24 C 408. In Phokis Parapotamioi are attested on the banks of the Kephisos (cf. especially Herodotus 8. 33–4).
58 Cf. F. Bechtel, Die gr. Dialekte, 3. Der ionische Dialekt (Berlin, 1924, 2nd edn 1963), 98. The rarity of examples from Euboea is due to the small number of archaic inscriptions found there to date.
59 For the first example, found on an inscription on an Ionian kouros in the Louvre, cf. J. Bousquet, RA 1967, 491–4 (cf. BE 1968, no. 69); the second is attested in many dialects (for an Ionian text, cf. Syll. 3 1121).
60 Until there is proof to the contrary, I remain of the opinion that the Athenians were not able to gain control of Oropos before the 470s, and that they did so most probably in 457 at the same time as they took control of the whole of Boeotia: cf. D. Knoepfler, in A. Jacquemin and E. Frézouls (eds), Les relations internationales (Paris, 1995), 310 with n. 4. This opinion seems now to be shared by A. Mazarakis Ainian (above n. 47), 214 with n. 176; cf. also S. Hornblower, A Commentary on Thucydides, 1 (Oxford, 1991), 279, who dates the conquest between 507 and 431 and not, as was generally believed, in 506.
61 The Oropodoros who is priest in the decree 3 for the building of the city wall, Syll. 3 544 (L. Migeotte, L’emprunt public dans les cités grecques (Paris and Quebec, 1984), no. 9; V. Petrakos, Ὄλι ἐπτυγραφές τοῦ ᾿Ορωτοῦ (above n. 5), no. 303) is very likely to be the grandfather of the homonymous priest in the decree IG VII 308 (Petrakos, no. 84), who is probably to be identified with the rogator ᾿Ορωτόδωρος Ὁκεζοτόου (cf. Petrakos, no. 69). What is certain is that, contrary to the chronology still maintained by the most recent editor, these two priests Oropodoros must be kept separate, as there is a gap of a good half-century between them: cf. D. Knoepfler, Chiron 22 (1992), 454 no. 81.
remarkable fact, which has not hitherto received sufficient emphasis, that the onomasticon of Oropos, in contrast with that of Eretria, provides no other derivative of this theonym/hydronym. The Index Nominum of Petrakos now establishes that Oropos has no example of Oropion, Oropichos, Oropines, or Oropiades. It is at Eretria, and not at Oropos, that the name Oropokles was created, in association perhaps with struggles for the defence or recovery of the mainland market (we know of a Skyrokles and a Karystonikos at Athens).  

Political reasons apart, the factor most responsible for restricting the growth of these anthroponyms must have been that the local form of the name of the river, Oropos, was powerfully rivalled by the form Asopos, which was at one and the same time pan-Boeotian and panhellenic. In fact we encounter names in Asop(o)-, such as Ἀσώπων and Ἀσώπος (if not the actual compound Ἀσωπόδωρος, frequent though that is elsewhere) at Oropos, as also at Thebes, Tanagra, and elsewhere in Boeotia. Such names, although common enough outside Boeotia (for example in Attica, see LGPN II s.v.), are totally unknown at Eretria. It is as if the Eretrians remained far more attached than their former ‘colonists’ (who were subject more directly to the influences of neighbouring Boeotia and Attica) to the epichoric name of this river-god, who, by all and sundry—except them!—was called Asopos. On the other hand, the name of the market-place that they had established close to the mouth of the river (at a date that archaeology does not yet enable us to fix precisely, but which, in any case, cannot be later than the sixth century), never returned to the common form of which it was phonetically the product, for the regulatory force of the latter was not able to affect the name of the city, as it had naturally done in the case of the dialectal hydronym. Here the Eretrian form imposed itself so completely that the new toponym was adopted without delay, it appears, by both the Athenians and the Boeotians. Not long after, the name Oropos established itself in Euboea with the creation of a homonymous Eretrian deme, which probably resulted from

---


63 Because the phenomenon of rhotacism is not attested before this date. In fact, archaeology now makes it possible to push back the Eretrian colonization of Oropos to the establishment, towards the end of the eighth century, of the artisan quarter revealed in recent excavations, or at any rate to the re-occupation of the site after the great flood at the beginning of the sixth century: on all this see the article by A. Mazarakis Ainian cited above n. 47.
the establishment there of Oropian refugees after the Athenian seizure of the territory of Oropos in 371, or perhaps later in 33564 (we must stress in passing that none of the Eretrians domiciled in this deme bore a name in Oropo-). This toponym became so familiar to the Greeks as a whole that they occasionally used it in error when they were speaking of cities actually called Europos (see above for the confusion at Delphi over the Macedonian city of this name). This is no doubt what concealed its unique character and, at the same time, its specifically Eretrian origin.

At all events, the theophoric name ᾿Ωρωπόδωρο seems to provide a particularly vivid example of what Greek anthroponyms can bring to the knowledge of local cults closely related to regional topography and history. The onomastic evidence which forms the basis of such studies is now readily available to us through the splendid enterprise initiated and directed by the man we are honouring in this volume.

Post Scriptum

The question of the etymology of the name ᾿Ωρωπός has recently been reconsidered by Luisa Del Barrio Vega, ‘Toponimia dialectal. El caso de ᾿Ωρωπός’, in Katà Dialekton. Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale di Dialettologia Greca (Napoli, 25–8 sett. 1996), Annali dell’ Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli 19, 1997 (1999), 553-73, where she adopts the hypothesis outlined by me in 1985: ‘El topónimo beocio ᾿Ωρωπός es probablemente una variante dialectal de ᾿Ασωπός. Como hemos visto, la evolución lingüística ᾿Ασωπός > ᾿Ωρωπός es verosimil’ (p. 570). At the same time she demonstrates, as I have done, that no other Greek city bore this name, despite Stephanus’ assertion to the contrary. Moreover, in another recent article in BCH 122, 1998 (2000), 501–9, she proposes a new reading for the inscription from Nikopolis published by Leake (see above, 89 n. 29), which finally demolishes all claims for this text as evidence for the existence of a river and a city Oropos in southern Epirus.

64 On this chronology, see provisionally D. Knoepfler, Chiron 16 (1986), 89 ff. It is very probable that, as at Samos, the Athenian occupation of 371 was accompanied by the expulsion of at least part of the local population (at any rate, Oropian exiles, supported by the ‘tyrants’ of Eretria, were active during the affair of 366, which deprived the Athenians of this territory until 335).
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