

XIII.—The Significance of Ethnic Classes in Greek and English

SAUL LEVIN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

English ethnic names are limited to the inhabitants of countries and of those few towns and states where the people are thought to have strong solidarity, a peculiar dialect, or some other uniqueness, physical or moral. On the same principle, the citizens of every Greek *polis* had an ethnic name. Although Greek could form such derivatives much more easily than English, there were few in Homer, for society was still tribal. In the age of the *polis*, some demes of Attica were too insignificant to have ethnica. The same holds for most places in Hellenistic Egypt, with its mixed population.

Both a grammarian and a logician may be interested in the syntactical distinction between

a Viennese doctor	and	a doctor from Philadelphia,
a Philadelphia lawyer	and	a lawyer in Trenton,
Argentine beef	and	beef from Wyoming,
a New Yorker	and	a man from Peoria.

If I say, for instance, "A Viennese doctor, named Koenig, gave me this prescription," you will understand that there is something special about Viennese doctors. What it is may be too complicated for a grammarian to discuss. It is enough for him to observe that to English-speaking people it does matter whether a doctor is from Vienna, and that they are inclined to express it by employing an ethnic (or gentile) adjective before the substantive *doctor*.¹

Of course, I could also say, "A doctor from Vienna, named Koenig, gave me this prescription," and my voice — or the context alone — might tell you that Dr. Koenig has superior competence or prestige, and accordingly his prescription is better. The adjective *Viennese* conveys the same notion, but does it by syntax, which is more dependable than context or vocal inflection. "From Vienna" might allow you to suppose that my reference to Dr. Koenig's city is no more significant than if I said, "A doctor from Philadelphia, named King, gave me this prescription." "From Philadelphia" is a mere detail that I throw in, perhaps to help identify Dr. King, perhaps to suggest why you may not have heard

¹ "Local" might be a more accurate term than "ethnic," but I follow customary terminology.

of him. Only in that part of the country that looks to Philadelphia as the nearest big city would the context be such that you would take the phrase "from Philadelphia" to imply that I was raising Dr. King into a special class of doctors. In that case I could readily say "a Philadelphia doctor."

It follows that (1) *from* (or *in*) indicates a casual, irrelevant connection between a person or thing and a place, unless the context or the tone of voice shows that a more significant connection is intended; (2) an adjective or substantival adjunct² referring to the place necessarily implies that the connection is significant, not casual. Both parts of the rule require qualification. I do not claim it is observed as rigorously in poetry, in newspaper and government phraseology, or even in standard literary prose, as it is in everyday speech. I am focusing upon the vernacular norm of English, that which is common to nearly all of us and expresses the most widespread thought habits.

From the linguistic standpoint, a significant class is one that people think is significant, regardless of scientific or philosophical correctness.³ Argentine beef is a significant class, not because anyone can tell it apart from other beef, but because the importation of beef from Argentina has been a political issue. The oftener we talk about "beef from Argentina" or "lobbyists in Washington," the more likely that these classes, which were at first casual, will acquire enough associations, in our thinking, to become significant. As that happens, we adopt a way of expressing it syntactically, "Argentine beef," "Washington lobbyists."

The average reporter carries this practice to extremes, because of the pressure on him to be brief, as well as his ingrained habit of ascertaining what place so-and-so comes from. He will write, for example, "several Massachusetts Congressmen," whereas most of us, who are unfamiliar with this class of legislators, find "several Congressmen from Massachusetts" a more natural expression. But each of us knows of certain classes that are not within the ken of some users of the language, and toward these classes each of us is in the same privileged position as the reporter was toward the Massachusetts Congressmen. People in Chicago can speak of "those Winnetka millionaires," who in turn talk of "shopping in

² This term, of which *Philadelphia* in "a Philadelphia lawyer" is a good example, comes from Otto Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar*, 2^d (Heidelberg 1927) 310.

³ Many pamphlets against "racism" would be more trenchant if they recognized that popular terminology has a logic of its own, separate from science.

the Chicago stores"; but if you live far from that area, you would be more inclined to say "the stores in Chicago" and "those millionaires from Winnetka."

So far I have treated the adjective in "a Viennese doctor" and the substantival adjunct in "a Philadelphia lawyer" as semantically parallel, but why should some place-names have an ethnic adjective in general use while most of them do not? They may be analyzed, not exhaustively, but for our purpose adequately, as follows:

1. In the oldest group, the adjective is formed, not from the place-name, but by adding *-ish* (OE. *-isc*) to the name of the people: *English*, *Scottish* (replacing an earlier form *Scyttisc*), *French*, *Danish*, *Finnish*, *Turkish*, *Moorish*, etc. In every such case, the people were at least partly nomadic when they received a name in English; their country, being either ill-defined or else of little interest to the English, remained unnamed till later.

2. Many more adjectives are derived from place-names.

a. Of these, very few are formed with the native *-ish* suffix: e.g., *Kentish*, *Spanish*.⁴

b. The great majority are adapted from a foreign language (most often, Latin or French), whose morphology they reflect: *Italian*, *European*, *Spartan*, *Mexican*, *Parisian*, *Neopolitan*, *Moabite*, *Maltese*, *Piedmontese*, *Chinese*. Normally, as in the original language, the same word stands also for an inhabitant of the town, island, or country. Furthermore, the suffixes *-n* (*-an*, *-ian*), *-ite*, *-ese* have been employed as living morphemes in English: e.g., *Latvian* (coined as recently as 1920), *Chilean*, *Ecuadorian*,⁵ *Hittite* (from the Hebrew ethnicum *ḥitti* + *-ite*), *Burmese*. Ethnic adjectives (and substantives) thus formed have become standard, pro-

⁴ But in OE. the country is given as *Spáneum*, *Spénum* — dative plurals — so that *Speónisc* may have been felt to be derived from the name of a people rather than a country; Bosworth-Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (Oxford 1898; suppl., 1921). My other examples taken from English have been verified in *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (Oxford 1888–1933); *The Century Dictionary* (New York 1889–1909); Gösta Langenfelt, *Toponymics or Derivations from Local Names in English* (Uppsala 1920); or Jespersen, 6 (Copenhagen 1942) 234, 321–23, 331–32, 359–63, 445. For American usage in the past, my authority is Craigie-Hulbert, *A Dictionary of American English* (Chicago 1938–44). H. L. Mencken, *The American Language*⁴ (New York 1938) 548–53, should be read with caution; being a journalist, he collected the ethnica used in newspapers, without indicating whether they really belong to the ordinary man's vocabulary.

⁵ The Spanish forms are *chileno* (rarely *chileño*), *ecuatoriano*; the Real Academia Española, *Diccionario de la lengua española* (17th ed.; Madrid 1947), agrees with all other lexicographers I have consulted.

vided they refer to foreign countries. This limitation shows that the suffixes are not fully vernacular.⁶

3. For practically all towns in Great Britain, the English-speaking dominions, and the United States, adjectives have never been current. If coined from time to time, they do not catch on. The same applies, with minor exceptions, to states and counties. Examples of *Devonian*, *Cantabrigian*, *Alabamian*, etc., can readily be dug out of books and newspapers, but in real life they do not compete with the substantival adjuncts *Devonshire*, *Cambridge*, *Alabama*. *Philadelphian* entails even less strain upon English morphology; yet, while Craigie and Hulbert supply quotations of it from 1775 on, their list of expressions

Philadelphia brick
Philadelphia flour
Philadelphia greenlet (= vireo)
Philadelphia lawyer
Philadelphia porter

proves that the substantival adjunct has always been preferred to this artificial adjective.

If all these place-names in everyday use get along well with a substantival adjunct instead of an ethnic adjective, nevertheless many of them do need an ethnic substantive, a name for their inhabitants.

1. The suffix *-er* is sparingly used for this purpose: *Londoner*, *New Englander*, *New Yorker*.⁷

2. For the counties of England, we resort to the substantival adjunct followed by *man*: "a Wiltshire man," "a Lancashire man," etc.⁸ Except for "a Maine man," this practice is unusual in America. It is applied, however, to certain colleges: "a Harvard man," "a Princeton man," etc.

3. A few derivatives, of foreign origin or modeled on foreign prototypes, are securely established as substantives, such as *Cal-*

⁶ Cf. Jespersen, 6.361; Langenfelt, p. 140; G. Wendt, *Syntax des heutigen Englisch*, 1 (Heidelberg 1911) 111-12.

⁷ Contrast its free use in German: *Berliner*, *Wiener*, *Römer*, *Pariser*, *Warschauer*, *Engländer*, *Italiener*, *Amerikaner*.

⁸ In *Yorkshireman*, the latter element loses its stress, so that the expression becomes one compound word.

*fornian, Virginian, Bostonian, Texan.*⁹ Unlike *Italian, American, Spartan*, etc., these seldom serve as adjectives. Instead we say "a California rancher," "a Virginia aristocrat," "Texas grapefruit," "Boston baked beans."

4. Even as substantives, most ethnica coined in English from names of cities or states fall flat. We pronounce the words *New Yorker* or *Texan* without embarrassment, but not *Ohioan, Minnesotan, Buffalonian, Dallasite, Pittsburgher, Baltimorean*. Thousands of abortive words like these are fostered by local newspapers, but so far in vain. We may see why, if we contrast them with the handful that have thriven.

The failure of most ethnica like *Ohioan* may in part be due to the fastidiousness of purists, or rather of average people with conservative feelings about language, who instinctively dislike the morphology of these neologisms. But the main cause must lie elsewhere, for from that standpoint the successful derivatives are sometimes no better. Still, they commend themselves to us because they signify more than "a man from such-and-such a place." *New Yorkers* have certain characteristics — an accent, mannerisms, ways of behaving; they are not just "people from New York." But *Pittsburgher* signifies no more than "a man from Pittsburgh"; and we avoid such a word, because it implies that the people there do have distinct traits, while actually, to the best of our knowledge, they do not. The citations of Craigie-Hulbert indicate that authors now and then recognized a certain character in the "Pittsburg(h)ers," but it has not been enough to impress the public at large, which has accordingly not taken up the word that would express it. Similarly, it is abnormal to call the present inhabitants of Rome "Romans," as William C. Bullitt did in an influential article.¹⁰ The people of Rome, Athens, Syracuse, Alexandria, etc.,

⁹ Anglicized from *tejano, texano*, by which the Mexicans designated the Indians of the Texas area and their language; Francisco J. Santamaría, *Diccionario general de americanismos* (Mexico City 1942). A morphological analysis of American ethnica according to the final of the place-name is given by George R. Stewart, Jr., "Names for Citizens," *American Speech* 9 (1934) 78-79, and accepted with modifications by Mencken, pp. 548-49. They deal indiscriminately with a handful of vernacular and a mass of journalistic words. Were the two classes separated, the former would be too small to show much of a pattern; and the latter, if I may apply Gaston Paris's criticism of Isak Collijn, *Les suffixes toponymiques dans les langues française et provençale*, would deserve study mainly as "une curiosité plutôt qu'une recherche vraiment scientifique" (*Romania* 32 [1903] 312).

¹⁰ "The World from Rome," *Life*, Sept. 4, 1944, pp. 94 ff.

have ethnic names in English which bespeak their ancient uniqueness, and which have not descended to the undistinguished occupants of those places today, who are regarded as casual agglomerations, like the people of most other cities, both here and abroad.

The genius of the language favors the coinage and employment of ethnica not for casual but only for significant classes of persons or other objects. This may be seen even more clearly in the following predicates:

He is a Spaniard. ¹¹	He is from Oregon.
He is a Texan.	He is from Nebraska.
He is a New Yorker.	He is from Rochester.

I could also say "from Spain," "from Texas," "from New York," but these would mean less. "He is a Spaniard" lets you infer something about him — his speech, complexion, emotional qualities, etc. None of this need be implied in "He is from Spain," which is indeed the predicate I would have to use of someone who had lived there as a

¹¹ Between this sentence and "He is Spanish," the semantic difference is so minute and uncertain that I leave it for a footnote. We might prefer "He is a Spaniard," to emphasize the man's nationality or birthplace, whereas "He is Spanish" focuses attention rather on his ancestry and culture. My hypothesis about the distinction between the adjective and the substantive derives some corroboration from the form of hyphenated national names: e.g., "They are Irish-Americans."

Observe that we say, "Those ships are American," but "We are Americans." The statement made earlier will be recalled, that *Texan* and other ethnica derived from place-names in the United States are not normally used as adjectives. We never say, "He is Texan." (*New Yorker* is, of course, excluded by its morphology from being an adjective.) "He is a Texan" implies that the man, being a native or a long resident of Texas, has certain characteristics that mark the people of that state. But "He is Texan" would imply characteristics that might be preserved for generations outside of Texas. We can freely use *German* or *Chinese* as an adjective, since the Germans who emigrated to Russia long ago are still German, and the Chinese in America are still Chinese. Other nationalities, perhaps on less evidence, are credited with the same tenacity; but some are not, and it shows in our avoidance of the predicate adjective in speaking of them. We say, "He is a Belgian," more readily than "He is Belgian." In the attributive position, however, the adjective is quite idiomatic: "a Belgian glass-blower," "Belgian money," etc. *American*, like *Belgian*, is on a plane between *Texan* and *German*. This fact of language, as interpreted here, scarcely proves that at heart we do not believe ourselves to be in the fullest sense a nation, for all our professions of national pride. It only testifies that we have not found our qualities to be such as persist indefinitely abroad.

Four degrees of ethnic significance can be expressed in vernacular English: (1) no ethnicum: "He is from Nebraska"; (2) ethnic substantive only: "He is a Texan"; (3) ethnic attributive adjective: "He is an American engineer"; (4) ethnic predicate adjective: "He is German." In the fourth class, which gives us a free choice between substantive and adjective, we are inclined to reserve the former for men, and say, "She is German," "She is Spanish," rather than "She is a German," "She is a Spaniard."

foreigner. Texans and New Yorkers have characteristics not so pronounced as Spaniards, but distinct enough to constitute significant classes. In all such cases, there may be persons who are in the place but not of it, who are presumed not to share the attributes of the people properly so designated. We would say of a Negro or a Mexican, "He is from Texas," not "He is a Texan." Even if he and his ancestors lived there for generations back, they have not belonged to the society known as *Texans*.¹²

From "He is a Texan," you can infer that he has a ten-gallon hat, or he likes to talk big, or something like that. But "He is from Oregon" permits virtually no inference whatsoever. Now suppose I said, "He is an Oregonian." The form would lead you to imagine that I intended some inference from the word *Oregonian*, but there is no content behind it. We associate nothing special with people from Oregon; so they remain "people from Oregon," not *Oregonians*.

No doubt the by-word "I'm from Missouri" has occurred to every reader by now. The inference is always, "I'll believe that when I see it proved." We no longer connect this attitude, or anything else, specifically with people from Missouri. But at one time the connection was vivid; and by my theory, it ought to have been expressed in some ethnic substantive derived from *Missouri*. Nevertheless, *Missourian* — which is attested as early as 1820 — never became standard; other formations, while conceivable, were apparently not even tried.

The morphological resources of English — or at any rate, of its most vernacular stratum — are meager enough to discourage the coinage of ethnica, although it does have other resources that help fill the gap. *Hoosier* is not derived from *Indiana*, nor *Tarheel* from *North Carolina*; but they will do instead of ethnica, except in dignified or official phraseology. Most states, however, no more have a nickname in frequent use than an ethnicum. Another possibility has been noted before: "a Maine man"; but we do not make it a model for other place-names in this country. Rather than "I'm an Ohio man," we say, "I'm from Ohio." *Man* is a

¹² Likewise, *Bostonian* has such connotations — of wealth, ancestral pride, stuffiness, refinement without elegance — that it sounds right if applied to the Boston "Brahmins," the old families, but not the Boston Irish or most of the other inhabitants of the city. Craigie-Hulbert: "1897 FLANDRAU *Harvard Episodes* 18 You are not a Bostonian. . . . When I say 'a Bostonian,' . . . I mean of course a Bostonian that one knows."

word of more limited currency in ordinary American speech than in literary English, and is avoided when possible in this context, as in most others.¹³ On the other hand, "My wife is an Ohio girl" is perfectly colloquial. It implies less than "My wife is a Virginian," but a little more than "She lived in Ohio before I knew her." "An Ohio girl," "a Milwaukee girl," etc., occur mostly as predicates, and stand between significant ethnic classes like *Virginian* and expressions of mere provenance like "from Ohio."

My hypothesis was: The presence of an ethnicum in vernacular English indicates that the population so named is regarded as a significant class; the absence of an ethnicum indicates the contrary. The following qualification is necessary: We could find use for more ethnica than we have, if only we had the morphemes to make them. Missouri is doubtless not unique in lacking an ethnic derivative solely because the people who have to use the word react unfavorably (1) to most long words; (2) to any learned suffix, including *-an*, when employed as a living morpheme; (3) even to the native morpheme *-er*, if it yields an ugly combination. Now euphony is a treacherous key to the mysteries of language; but it cannot be ignored, for it surely plays some role in restricting the coinage of words by analogy. A new combination of base + morpheme may be semantically desirable, but it will seldom be accepted unless it produces a sound-pattern fairly similar to one already familiar. For instance, *Hollywood-er* sounds too unlike *Londoner*, *Southerner*, etc., to get into the English vocabulary, while *New Yorker* is close enough to be satisfactory.

How much then are our habits of thought and expression controlled by morphology, or by mere phonetics? A comparison of our language with classical Greek will throw light on this perplexing question, and may confirm my hypothesis as it now stands, by

¹³ *Man* is more conspicuous in the female vocabulary than in the male, where it serves to emphasize the man's sex, or his job: "I'm a married man"; "We need one more man." Thus it is associated with the powers that true males are supposed to have: "I wish there was a man running the show in Washington"; "He's a good man" (cf. *virtuoso*). To shift the meaning to moral goodness, we must stress *good* much more heavily than *man*. Most times, we either resort to a different construction, like "I'm from Ohio," or else adopt a surrogate for *man*. A *fellow* is a man from the standpoint of some companion, male or female, close or casual: "A fellow gave me a lift." A *guy* used to be a man that the speaker did not respect; but the word is losing that connotation. "He's a wonderful guy" contains a hint that he is still plain enough so that you can get close to him, whereas "He's wonderful" or "He's a wonderful man" are words of worship, mostly feminine.

showing that the distinction between significant and casual ethnic classes recurs in languages of very different structure. But in order to know what was the normal Greek idiom and not a literary refinement or deformation, we cannot rely on our own *Sprachgefühl*, as we could in English. The best method we can follow is to select the more vernacular monuments of the ancient Greek language, and cite the rest only with great caution. Poetry is suspect; but the Homeric epics, besides being indispensable as the oldest specimens of Greek, must be closer to the spoken idiom than either lyric or tragedy, at least to the degree that the epic vocabulary consists of formulae, which had to satisfy the taste not of one author but of a long series of bards. For the Fifth and Fourth Centuries, on which we will concentrate, we have comedy, Ionic and Attic literary prose, and inscriptions. We will only glance at Hellenistic Greek — papyri, inscriptions, and the New Testament; literary prose in that age is no longer close to the spoken language.¹⁴

At first sight, Greek seems too different from English to be comparable. Its morphology allows an ethnic derivative to be easily formed from any place-name; and no city, however small, lacks one. A few cities have the same name as their people: *Delphoi*, *Thourioi*, *Leontinoi*; but normally the city's name clearly comes first, and the people's is derived.¹⁵ Larger areas, on the contrary, are more often named after their inhabitants, who in some cases may have been *Thessaloi*, *Boiôtoi*, *Iônes*, etc., before they occupied their permanent territory (Thucydides 1.2.3–6, 1.12.3–4; Herodotus 1.143–46).

Homeric usage differs from Attic mainly in not having many *derived* ethnica. *Argeioi* is much the most frequent, and with minor exceptions (*Il.* 6.159, 19.122) refers to Argos in the broadest sense — all of Greece.¹⁶ Certain islands and important cities on

¹⁴ A. Méillet, *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*³ (Paris 1930), pp. 175, 208, 216, 221, 228–34, 258–62, etc. I obtained my material first by checking the proper-name indices to authors and to inscriptions, especially *IG* 1².

¹⁵ We have no reason here to imagine back-formation. For the doctrine of Herodian, see Stephanus Byz., s.v. *Ἀιωνία*. The fullest treatment of Greek ethnica, especially their morphology, is W. Dittenberger, "Ethnika und Verwandtes," *Hermes* 41 (1906) 78–102, 161–219; 42 (1907) 1–34, 161–234. Now and then I cannot help going briefly over the ground already scrutinized by him; but otherwise I avoid duplication. To reduce printing costs, I have transliterated much of the Greek—regretfully, as transliteration has many disadvantages.

¹⁶ Noted by W. E. Gladstone in the course of his long and on the whole futile disquisition upon Argos and *Argeioi*; *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age* (Oxford 1858) 1.402.

the mainland have similar derivatives: *Rhodioi*, *Ithakêsioi*, *Taphioi*, *Athênaiοi*, *Pylίοi*. But more prominent are the national or tribal names, of obscure origin and with no corresponding place-name: *Danaοi*, *Myrmidones*, *Abantes* in Euboea (2.536), *Sinties* in Lemnos (1.593-94). Or else the place-name is secondary: *Achaίοi*, *Trôes*, *Krêtes*. Neither a tribal nor a civic name is mentioned, in the Catalogue of the Ships or elsewhere, for the inhabitants of Lacedaemon and vicinity, Orchomenus (later included in Boeotia), Salamis, and most districts of northeastern Greece. While I do not argue from silence that the poet knew of no special names for these peoples, we certainly should not expect many civic names to be in use before Greece became a land of city-states. Where the poems fail to use even a tribal name, it is because they reproduce or at least imagine an age when Achaeon national feeling rivaled or surpassed narrower tribal sentiments. Thus, the inhabitants of Ithaca and neighboring parts speak of themselves sometimes as *Ithakêsioi* or *Kephallênes*, but much oftener as *Achaίοi*.¹⁷

Achaίοi and similar primary names, national or tribal, are the main groupings known to us from the oldest period of Greek. Poetic epithets like *chalkoknêmides Achaίοi* (*Il.* 7.41), *Danaοi tachypôloi* (8.161, etc.), *Iaones helkechitônes* (13.685), *Sidones polydaidalοi* (23.743),¹⁸ *Karôn . . . barbarophônôn* (2.867), *Phoinikes nausiklytoi* (*Od.* 15.415) indicate that the bard and probably his audience too perceived definite though not necessarily unique characteristics in these peoples. Derived ethnica like *Argeίοi* are rarely coupled with epithets, and (according to Parry's list)¹⁹ never with an epithet reserved for one people. They may have entered the vocabulary more recently, or were felt to be not quite proper nouns.

Our analytical method of learning Greek by way of the nominative singular pervades modern dictionaries and disguises from us the

¹⁷ The passages may be quickly checked in Henry Dunbar, *A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey and Hymns of Homer* (Oxford 1880). In most of them *Achaίοi* (or an oblique case of it) comes at the end of the line, where the Homeric language is apt to be most formulaic: e.g., *κάρη κομώντες Ἀχαιοί* (20.277; cf. 1.90, 2.7); *ἐγκρήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς* (2.72, 20.146). Formulae are the most ancient but not in origin the most uncolloquial part of the poet's vocabulary. They do not invalidate my method of using the poetic language to make cautious deductions about the culture in which it arose. See Milman Parry, "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making, II," *HSCP* 43 (1932) 6 ff.

¹⁸ *Σιδόνες* anomalously looks something like a plural of the city's name, *Σιδῶν* (*Od.* 15.425).

¹⁹ *L' épithète traditionnelle dans Homère* (Paris 1928) 121.

fact that the masculine plurals *Achaioi*, *Trôes*, *Phoinikes* are full-fledged proper nouns no less than *Achilleus*, *Priamos*, *Hektôr*. Their singulars might be given as personal names; and for some of them, we find an eponymous hero mentioned quite early, like Tros (*Il.* 5.265, etc.). These uses of the singular are occasional; the plural is constant. Without asserting positively that the plural form of *Trôes*, etc., existed first, we can take for granted that normally a Greek child would learn it before the singular. *Trôes* are not a class in the sense that a Greek said to himself, "Hector is one *Trôs*, Priam another, Paris a third, and they along with many others make up the *Trôes*." On the contrary, the singular *Trôs* meaning "a Trojan," is not found in Homer, or to my knowledge in any Greek author before Aelian.²⁰ *Achaios anêr* does occur rarely (*Il.* 3.167, 226) and is more likely to be a departure from *Achaioi* than *vice versa*.²¹ Another departure is the formula for Achaeen women, ἐνπλοκαμίδες Ἀχαιαί (*Od.* 2.119, 19.542); neither word is otherwise known. *Achaiïdes* is commoner; its genitive, being metrically unsuitable, is replaced by *Achaiïadôn*.

Aristotelian logic has canonized the viewpoint that nothing is so well known to us as the individual, ὁ τῆς ἀνθρωπος — Socrates, Callias, Coriscus — or ὁ τῆς ἵππος (*Cat.* 5.2A.11–19). It does not follow that in earlier antiquity an individual man was felt to be more definitely known or to have more distinctive, more recognizable looks and personality than a people or a god; certainly most individual men were less permanent and less memorable. The early Greek language treated the name of a people as a substantive analogous to the name of a person or a city. These substantives come at one end of the noun spectrum, for they seldom show more than one gender and number; at the other end are the typical adjectives with three genders and three numbers.²²

²⁰ *Anim.* 14.8. However, it appears earlier as a loan-word in Latin: "Tros Rutulusne fuit nullo discrimine habeo" (Vergil *Aen.* 10.108, etc.).

²¹ "Die Sprachgebrauch spricht nicht für die Zurückführung ethnischer Gruppen auf einen Heros eponymos"; Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, 2 (completed by Albert Debrunner; Munich 1950) 45. Also 1 (1939) 421, and Jacob Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*² (Basel 1928) 1.87.

²² Between the extremes lie nouns of many kinds; and in Homeric Greek, it is pointless to insist on classifying them all as either substantives or adjectives. In Attic a line can be drawn: a noun (i.e., any word that undergoes declension, or case-inflection, provided it has no case-endings peculiar to pronouns, like ἄλλο from **alīod*) is a substantive if it can take the same modifier in either the first or the second attributive position: e.g., ὁ ἐμὸς πατήρ, ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐμὸς. *ἐχθρός* began as an adjective in all three genders; but τοὺς ἐμὸν ἐχθροὺς and τῶν ἐχθρῶν τῶν ἐμῶν (*Ar. Equ.* 845, *Andoc.* 1.1)

The *-io-* morpheme usually produces full-fledged adjectives like *patrios*, *anankaïos*,²³ but the ethnica of this family are employed (1) in the singular, chiefly to identify a person by his city: *Mykênaïon Periphêtên*, *Eurybatês Ithakêsios*,²⁴ (2) much oftener as independent masculine plurals, especially *Argeïoi*, a synonym for *Achaïoi*.²⁵ The singular doubtless goes far back, for it occurs in epic formulae, *Hêrê t' Argeîê* (*Il.* 4.8 = 5.908), *Argeîê(n) Helenê(n)*, *Odysseus Ithakêsios* (*Od.* 2.246, 22.45). In *Lêthoio Pelasgou* (*Il.* 2.843, 17.288) the same formulaic use is made of a primary tribal name in the singular. All in all, Homer treats primary and derived ethnica virtually alike in the overwhelming majority of instances.

In post-Homeric times, the primary names remain, the *-ioi* family of ethnica grows immensely, and is joined by new families, of which *Μεγαρεῖς*,²⁶ *Συβαρίται*, *Ἀβυθῆνοι* are typical. The same two inherited principles apply to all families:

1. By preference, ethnica are employed in the masculine plural. The article is not required and is most times omitted.
2. Ethnica are not freely employed as adjectives.

prove that it also became a substantive, at least in the masculine plural. Where the passages in which a Greek noun is preserved do not enable us to apply this canon, we may usually call it an adjective if it is more flexible in gender or number than another noun with which it agrees in case.

In any event, the term "adjective" ought not to obscure the realities of usage. In *πολλές . . . Ἀρκάδες ἄνδρες*, "many Arcadians" (*Il.* 2.610–11), the true nexus is distorted if we take both *πολλές* and *Ἀρκάδες* for adjectives dependent on *ἄνδρες*. *Ἀρκάδες* is the group name of certain men; the singular of it is little used. It is less, not more, like an adjective than *τέκτονες*, "carpenters," which is similarly accompanied by *ἄνδρες*, functioning as a sort of indefinite article (6.315, 13.390 = 16.483; *Od.* 9.126). *Ἀρκάδες ἄνδρες* means "Arcadians," but not "the Arcadians," not the whole people. *Hêrôes Achaïoi* (*Il.* 15.219, etc.) is a formula analogous to *hêrôs Prôtesilaos* (2.708). *Hêrôs* by itself is a masculine noun corresponding to the English substantives *nobleman*, *hero*; but it should be taken as an epithet when it accompanies a proper noun. It is not intended to distinguish the noblemen from the rest of the Achaeans, but applies to all. Thetis says, "Call the noble Achaeans to assembly"; and all the Achaeans come (19.34, 54).

²³ C. D. Buck and Walter Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago, n.d.) 43–44.

²⁴ *Il.* 15.638, 2.184. In Homeric Greek, the man's name often comes second (21.43, *Od.* 10.492, etc.); in the Attic period, regularly first: *Thoukydidês Athênaios* (1.1.1).

²⁵ *Messênioi andres* (*Od.* 21.18) parallels *Arkades andres*.

²⁶ One of this family, *Doulíchieus*, occurs in the *Odyssey*, only in the singular (18.127, 395, 424).

Now for details:

1. In the absence of full-fledged hereditary surnames among the Greeks, the ethnicum which follows a man's name helps to identify him. The article may come in between, but it makes little or no semantic difference: *Κάλλιππον τὸν Θετταλὸν*, "Callippus the Thes-salian," but *Καλλίππο Θετταλὸ* in the heading of the same inscription.²⁷ Xenophon writes *Sophainetos Stymphalios* without the article in *An.* 2.5.37, 4.4.19; with it at 1.1.11.²⁸ Observe that whereas we say "Thales of Miletus," like "Dr. King of Philadelphia," in Greek it is "Thales the Milesian" (*Hdt.* 1.74.2).

2. With the plural, a writer is least likely to leave out the article when he is thinking not of the whole people but of those who represent it at a battle, a parley, or a celebration: *μετὰ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων* (*Hdt.* 5.72.4), "with the Lacedaemonians (those occupying the Athenian acropolis)"; *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔλεγον τοιαύδε* (*Thuc.* 1.72.2), "The Athenians (those sent to Sparta as ambassadors) said the following." *Hellênes*, even when it means the whole Greek people, appears regularly with the article in Attic prose and comedy. With other ethnica, Thucydides uses the article more than Xenophon, the orators, and Aristophanes. Attic inscriptions omit it almost invariably, but it is optional in the official phraseology of many other cities.²⁹

3. Since the masculine plural by itself designates either a whole people or its representatives, some word must be added to show when mere individuals are meant. Thus, *andrôn Korinthiôn* means "some Corinthians"; *andres Thêraioi*, "some Theraeans."³⁰ When those same individuals are mentioned again, the article replaces *andres*. "Etearchus said that some Nasamonians (*Nasamônas andras*) once came to his place. This tribe is African (*Lybikon*) and lives upon the Syrtis and the country not far to the east of the

²⁷ *IG* 2-3².27. K. Meisterhans distinguishes between the catalogue style, which drops the article, and the decree style, which retains it; *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* (3d ed., rev. by Eduard Schwyzler; Berlin 1900) 225.

²⁸ Gildersleeve and Miller, *Syntax of Classical Greek* (New York 1900-11) 2.231-32, suppose that the article reenforces the distinction between this Sophanetus and Sophanetus the Arcadian (1.2.9). But E. C. Marchant thinks it is the same man; *Xenophon's opera omnia* (Oxford, n.d.) III, index. Stymphalus is in Arcadia.

²⁹ See the treaties between Argos and Lacedaemon, quoted in Doric by Thucydides (5.77, 79); scattered inscriptions in Hermann Collitz (ed.), *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften* (Göttingen 1884-1915); Gildersleeve-Miller 2.230-31; Meisterhans-Schwyzler, p. 225.

³⁰ *Hdt.* 1.24.2, 5.42.2. Cf. *ιδιώται ἄνδρες*, 1.32.1, 70.3. *Κορινθίων ὑπὸ φωτῶν*, Pindar *Nem.* 2.20.

Syrtis. When the Nasamonians (*tous Nasamōnas*) arrived and were asked whether they could tell any more about the deserts of Africa, they said . . ." (Hdt. 2.32.1–3). For one individual, the construction is *anēr Halikarnêsseus*, "a Halicarnassian," *anēr Argilios* (1.144.3, Thuc. 1.132.5), which have good Homeric precedent in *Dardanos anēr* (*Il.* 2.701). *Anēr* is a necessary prop, with scarcely more meaning than an indefinite article. It is a purely optional prop, however, when the man's name is given: *Philippon andra Lakedaimonion*.³¹ In the vocative, where distinctions of definite and indefinite are neglected, *andres* begins as a prop-word of courtesy, if *ō* is omitted.³² But the two props came to be coupled — *ō andres 'Aθηναῖοι* — which carries perhaps a more deferential ring; at any rate, the *omission* of both is most peremptory: *ληρέϊτ', 'Aθηναῖοι*.³³

4. While in a Greek city no individual stood out enough to eclipse the people, it was so characteristic of certain barbarian nations that the Greeks could often speak of them as *ὁ Μῆδος*, *ὁ Πέρσης*, *ὁ Λυδός*: "When the Mede retreated" (Thuc. 3.62.4); "The Persian crossed over to invade Greece" (Xenophon *Ag.* 1.8; cf. Xenophanes fr. 22.5, Hdt. 1.141.4). Among the barbarians, the king typified the people he ruled; among the Greeks, it was barely conceivable that a single man should similarly stand for the whole citizenry. Hermocrates of Syracuse, in a passage of unparalleled empathy, said to the people of Camarina, "If anyone imagines the Syracusan (*τὸν Συρακόσιον*) but not himself to be at war with the Athenian (*τῷ 'Aθηναίῳ*), and is indignant about fighting for *my* country, let him reflect that *in* my country he will be fighting not primarily *for* mine but for his own just as much" (Thuc. 6.78.1). The idiom may have come into Greek through the influence of some Oriental language.³⁴ At any rate, Herodotus uses it to give an exotic color to a message from Croesus: "The god directs me to make the Greek (*τὸν 'Ελληνα*) my friend" (1.69.2).

5. The Greeks constantly took notice of the office a man held among his people; but whereas our idiom is "the Athenian general,"

³¹ Thuc. 8.87.6. Very frequent in Herodotus. Gildersleeve-Miller, 2.232, note that it is not found in the severe official style, which for full identification of a man chooses the form *Μεγακλῆς Μεγακλέος 'Αλοπεκειεύς* (*IG* 1².237.56, a. 429/8), not *Ξειναγόρης ὁ Πρηξίλειω ἀνὴρ 'Αλικαρνησσεύς* (Hdt. 9.107.2).

³² Cf. Andoc. 2.14; 3.1, 13; J. Enoch Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge 1938) 27, 385.

³³ Dem. 8.31; *ō andres* add. uulg. See Gildersleeve-Miller 1.7.

³⁴ Wackernagel, *Syntax* 1.93–94.

they expressed the same relation by means of the genitive plural: στρατηγὸς ὁ Ἀθηναίων, "the general of the Athenians"; τοὺς Ἰώνων τυράννους, "the tyrants of the Ionians" (8.75.2; 4.98.1). Occasionally, the Greek idiom matches the English: e.g., "the Corinthian general," ὁ Κορινθίος στρατηγός; "the Lacedaemonian commander," ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος ἄρχων (8.59; Thuc. 3.52.2). κήρυξ Δουλιχειεύς, "the Dulichian herald" (*Od.* 18.424), shows that this usage was known to Homer. It is noteworthy that in subsequent Greek also the ethnicum tends to agree with κήρυξ, instead of going into the genitive plural as with most other substantives.³⁵

6. The Greeks spoke but seldom of significant classes *within* a people, like "Persian generals," Πέρσαι στρατηγοί, or "Crotoniate doctors," Κροτωνιῆται ιητροί, who might of course have moved from Croton to practice elsewhere (Hdt. 5.116, 3.131.2; cf. 3.132.2). However, *xenoi*, strangers or friends from another place, were regularly distinguished by the ethnicum, handled as an adjective: ὁ ξείνος ὁ Σάμιος, τῷ Ἑλληνι ξείνῳ, παρὰ ξένων Τεμεδίων (9.91.1, 2.115.6, [Demos-thenes] 50.56). Samian strangers or Greek strangers were a significant class. On the other hand, in expressions like *ándres* Ἕλληνες, the significant class is Greek *men* no more and no less than if we leave out *andres*. Either way, the women do not count. A messenger from the Ionians appeals to Leotychidas and the other generals "to rescue Greeks (*andras Hellénas*) from slavery and drive the barbarian away" (Hdt. 9.90.2). Thucydides wrote (2.27.1): "That same summer, the Athenians (*Athēnaioi*) expelled the Aeginetans (*Aiginētas*) from Aegina — them and their women and children (*αὐτοὺς τε καὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας*). The women are a subordinate, inactive stratum of the Aeginetans. With ethnica, *anēr* is a prop-word, not intended to emphasize the sex of the person;³⁶ that is shown by the ending of the ethnicum anyhow. At most, *anēr* invests the man with an air of dignity, while *anthrōpos* connotes paltriness: ὁ ξυνεργὸς Ἀργεῖος ἄνθρωπος, "the accomplice, an Argive" (Thuc. 8.92.2).

7. From Homer on, primary tribal names like *Trōes* and many derivatives like *Athēnaioi* apply only to men. Nouns, whether neuter or grammatically masculine, that do not designate persons, call for an adjective of different morphology: *Trōioi hippoi*, "Trojan horses" (*Il.* 5.222 = 8.106); *Hellēnikos polemos*, "a Greek war"

³⁵ Hdt. 1.22.1, 83, 153.1; 6.77.3, 111.2; Thuc. 4.97.2. With the genitive plural, however, in 4.68.3, 99, and Hdt. 9.55.1.

³⁶ A rare exception in Hdt. 1.198.

(Lys. 2.48); *ἔθνος* . . . τὸ Καυνικόν, "the Caunian nation" (Hdt. 1.172.1); τοῦ Κορινθιακοῦ κόλπου, "the Gulf of Corinth" (Xen. *Hell.* 6.2.9).³⁷ This rule is often neglected in lyric and tragic poetry, but seldom in prose.³⁸ Some *-ios* words, however, like *Aigyptios*, *Babylōnios*, *Samios*, are freely used for both persons and things; and a derivative in *-kos*, although properly "possessive," may be applied to men:

a. It is resorted to as a surrogate for the genitive plural of the normal ethnicum, such as *Ἑλλήνων*, to avoid ambiguity: "Not one of the other Greek tyrants (*τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλληνικῶν τυράννων*) is fit to be compared with Polycrates in magnificence" (Hdt. 3.125.2; cf. 9.102.4). The class Polycrates belongs to is *Ἑλλήνων τύραννοι*, not *Ἑλληνες τύραννοι*, although in English we can hardly distinguish the two. Vulgar expressions like "a Swede janitor," "a Jew peddler" resemble *Ἑλληνας ἱητροῦ* (3.131.2) at least formally, but they do not belong to normal English. In Greek, if the ethnicum was put into the genitive plural, it emphasized the man's *position* with respect to the people; but if it agreed in number and case with him, then it emphasized his *membership* in that ethnic group. Ambiguity arose when the substantive designating the position was itself genitive plural. Then, instead of the ethnicum in the genitive plural, a "possessive" adjective (*κτῆτικόν*) might be substituted.³⁹ Once the model was established, the *-kos* adjective could eventually be used with naturally masculine substantives not in the genitive plural: *τοῖς Περσικοῖς βασιλεῦσιν*, "the Persian kings" (Appian *Mith.* 83.373), in place of *τοῖς Περσῶν βασιλεῦσιν* (cf. Xen. *Oec.* 4.4).

b. Since *Athēnaioi* and *Lakedaimonioi* mean the citizens of Athens and of Lacedaemon, *Attikoi* and *Lakōnikoi* stand for other men connected with those cities but not necessarily citizens: "When . . . Anaxibius was just coming down with the Laconians (*τοῖς Λακωνικοῖς*),

³⁷ The Scholia Marciana to Dionysius Thrax distinguish between *Phryx*, which is *ethnikon*, and *Phrygios*, which is instead *κτῆτικόν*, "possessive" (393.6 ff., 370.21 ff. Hilgard).

³⁸ E.g., *Ἕλληνα στρατὸν, Φρὺξ τριγῶνος, τὸ Θεσσαλὸν* . . . *σόφισμ'* (Pindar *Nem.* 10.25; Soph. *Mysii* fr. 378 N²; Eur. *Phoen.* 1407-8). *ὁμιλὸς τε πολλὸς μὲν Ἕλλην*, "a large Greek population" (Hdt. 5.23.2), occurs in a flowery speech put into the mouth of a Persian. W. Pape, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (3d ed., rev. by G. E. Benseler; Brunswick 1884), wrongly construes *τῶν Ἀθηναίων λιμένων* (Dem. 8.45). It is not "the Athenian harbors," but "the Athenians' harbors." Pape-Benseler make the same mistake with *τῶν Ἀθηναίων κοινῶν* (9.44), imagining that in the nominative Demosthenes would have said *τὰ Ἀθηναῖα κοινά*!

³⁹ I deduced this from passages supplied by Dittenberger, *Hermes* 42 (1907) 20.

Iphicrates then called out his men from ambush and made a dash at him" (*Hell.* 4.8.37). οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ῥήτορες (*Arist. Rhet.* 3.1413B.1) include Lysias and other Attic orators who were not Athenians. For schools of philosophy, the "possessive" became standard: e.g., οἱ Μεγαρικοί, "the Megarian school" (*Met.* Θ.1046B.29).

c. In the vulgar language of comedy, *Acharnikoi* is freely interchanged with *Acharnês* (*Ar. Ach.* 177, 180). Aristophanes consistently gives *Megarês* in the plural and *Megarikos* in the singular.⁴⁰ Apart from this, his choice between the standard ethnicum and the "possessive" surrogate remains unexplained.

8. In the feminine, unlike the masculine, the same ethnicum will generally do for persons and things: Κορινθιαὶ γυναῖκες, "Corinthian women," τὴν Κορινθίαν, "the territory of Corinth," ἡ Κορινθία ναὺς "the Corinthian ship" (*Eur. Medea* 212; *Thuc.* 4.42.1, 3.74.3); Περσίδος γυναῖκός, γῆν Περσίδα, τῆς Περσίδος γλώσσης (*Isoc.* 5.66, *Hdt.* 7.8.γ.1, *Thuc.* 1.138.1). *Persis* and *Persikê* are interchangeable; and in general there is no semantic difference between the feminine ethnicum in *-is* and the "possessive" in *-ikê*. When the country has a separate name derived from that of the people — e.g., *Phoinikê*, *Karia*, *Iônia* — even then, grammatically feminine substantives take the same adjective (*Phoinissa*, *Kaeira*, *Ias*) as those naturally feminine.⁴¹

So far, our discussion of ethnica in Greek, while revealing many peculiarities, has not shown cases where ethnica are simply lacking (as so often in English), where the inhabitants of a place have no name at all. Morphology was never an obstacle in Greek. Whenever an ethnic name was desired, it could be easily coined. In Homer we saw no sign that most places already had ethnica. On the contrary, we can even cite οἱ δ' ἐκ Δουλιχίου, "those from Dulichium," in the *Iliad* (2.625); the ethnicum *Doulichierus* first appears in the *Odyssey* (see note 26). But in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries, all Greek cities had ethnica.

They were, of course, nothing like American cities. In Greece, you could often tell a man's city by his dress — e.g., *Argeioi linothôrêkes* (*Anth. Pal.* 14.73 = *Sch. Theocritus* 14.48–49) — or else by his dialect. In America, most of us can recognize only New

⁴⁰ Dunbar, *A Complete Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments of Aristophanes* (Oxford 1883); O. J. Todd, *Index Aristophaneus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1932).

⁴¹ Examples in Pape-Benseler. *Κατὰ γλῶσση* (*Hdt.* 8.135.3) is an anomaly. See Dittenberger, *Hermes* 42.171 ff., 223.

Yorkers and Bostonians by their speech, which explains in part why we have given ethnic names to them and no others. But every Greek city either had its own dialect or shared one with a small number of other cities. Dozens of dialects can be distinguished on inscriptions, which even so iron out certain local differences that must have been perceptible to the ear.⁴²

Furthermore, each city had its own laws, legends, wars, religious cults, ways of bringing up children, and affiliations with some major branch of the Greek race, such as the Dorians or Ionians. All this gave the citizens of a *polis* qualities that they and others were conscious of. In a word, they had a sense of being one body, even though split into factions or scattered in exile. No other place could be home to them. Metics and slaves were outside this body; and while they sometimes looked and dressed like citizens, they were not known by the civic name. The Old Oligarch of Athens wrote: "If it were lawful for a freeman to beat a slave, a metic, or a freedman, he would often hit an Athenian, taking him for a slave (*οἰηθεὶς εἶναι τὸν Ἀθηναῖον δοῦλον*), for the common people here are dressed no better than the slaves and metics, and are no better looking either" ([Xenophon] *Ath.* 1.10).

To the Greeks, many if not all ethnic names evoked sure associations of sympathy or distaste. Thucydides tells us that the Lacedaemonians "adhered to the behavior customary among themselves, of not being quick to make any irreparable decision about a Spartan (*περὶ ἀνδρὸς Σπαρτιάτου*) without indisputable proof" (1.132.5). A speaker in the *History* says, "Do not put off giving aid to the Potidaeans (*Poteideatais*), who are Dorians (*Dôrieusi*) besieged by Ionians (*Iônôn*) — it used to be the other way round" (1.124.1). Darius is advised not to "allow a shrewd and cunning Greek (*ἀνδρὶ Ἑλληνι δεινῷ τε καὶ σοφῷ*) to found a city in Thrace" (Hdt. 5.23.2).

Before we correlate an ethnic name in Greek with group character and consciousness, we must show that it was not an invariable habit to derive one from any and every place-name, no matter how insignificant. Evidence comes from the demes of Attica. To the Greek world at large, Xenophon spoke of his teacher as "Socrates the Athenian," *Σωκράτει τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ* (*An.* 3.1.5); but among Athenians, he was "Socrates from Alopece," *Σωκράτης . . . ὁ Ἀλωπεκῆθεν*

⁴² Herodotus observed four dialects within the twelve Ionian cities of Asia Minor (1.142.3-4). He may have based his division on popular vocabulary and on intonation, neither of which can be verified from inscriptions; H. W. Smyth, *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects: Ionic* (Oxford 1894) 15-26.

(Plato *Gor.* 495D). His full legal name was Σωκράτης Σωφρονίσκου 'Αλωπεκῆθεν.⁴³ The last served almost as the Athenian male citizen's surname.

Demotic surnames follow four main patterns:

1. Most of them are ordinary masculine ethnica in *-eus* or *-ios*, derived from a place-name: *Sounieus*, *Rhamnousios*. The place-name is not always attested: e.g., Φρεάρριος.⁴⁴ Deme ethnica with these endings have the same morphology as city ethnica, *Megareus*, *Korinthios*, etc. The villages of Attica were not without local character and tradition. Strabo wrote, "Most if not all [of the Attic demes] have many legends and histories" (9.1.17). But little of this has come down to us.⁴⁵ The temper of the men of Acharnae, which was the most populous deme,⁴⁶ is immortalized in Aristophanes' play. The demotic surname is regularly *Acharneus*, "Acharnian," but 'Αχαρνῆθεν, "from Acharnae," is also attested after a man's name on an ostrakon (*IG* 1².911.2, a. 444/3). Likewise Φλυῆθεν, Κριῶθεν sporadically replace the normal *Phlyeus*, *Krideus* (1².359.18–19, 335.52).

2. For certain demes, surnames in *-the(n)* are regular. In this group, the districts and suburbs of greater Athens are well represented: 'Αγκυλῆθεν, Βατῆθεν, 'Εστιαῖοθεν, etc.⁴⁷ Such demes can hardly have had peculiarities of dialect or anything else. The outlying demes that take the *-then* suffix are small and perhaps insignificant, the most populous being Cephale. "From Bate," "from Cephale," etc., may indicate that membership in these demes, while no less hereditary than membership in other demes, did not imply any group character or solidarity.⁴⁸ It will be remarked, however, that the suffix is added mainly to oxytone nouns of the

⁴³ Diogenes Laertius 2.5.19 (40). Cf. Πυθέαν Σωσιδῆμον 'Αλωπεκῆθεν, *IG* 2–3². 338.17–18.

⁴⁴ Löper's complete list of demes gives the place-name rather than the ethnicum wherever possible; "Die Trittyen und Deme Attikas," *MDAI(A)* 17 (1892) 431–33. Von Schoeffer, in *RE* s.v. Δήμοι, 35–122, conveniently lists both in great detail; B. Haussoullier more briefly in *DS* 2.89–91.

⁴⁵ Haussoullier, *La vie municipale en Attique* (Paris 1884) 180 ff.; J. B. Edwards, *The Demesman in Attic Life* (Johns Hopkins diss., 1916). For the economic life of the demes, see Karl Scherling, "Quibus rebus singulorum Atticae pagorum incolae operam dederint," *Leipziger Studien* 18 (1898) 1–97.

⁴⁶ I judge from Thuc. 2.19.2, and from the number of men listed under each deme in the "Conspectus demotarum" of Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* 2.493–630. See also indices in *IG* 1² and 2.4.

⁴⁷ See maps by Löper, *MDAI(A)* 17, plate 12, and by Walther Judeich, *Topographie von Athen* (Munich 1931) 171.

⁴⁸ On the inheritance of deme membership, see von Schoeffer, *RE* 5.6.

first declension, whereas Ἀφιδνα(ι) forms Ἀφιδναῖος, Παλλήνη Παλληνεύς, and Ἰκαρία Ἰκαριεύς.⁴⁹ The properispomenon -ῆθεν was a productive suffix in Attic, much more than the proparoxytone, and invaded the second declension: Κολωνῆθεν is the customary demotic surname "from Colonus," with the alternate ἐκ Κολωνοῦ.⁵⁰ Yet in some of the -ῆ demes, including the larger ones Alopece and Cephale, we can detect a minor tendency to form ethnica in -εύς besides the usual -ῆθεν words (*IG* 1².237.56, 370.7). In catalogues, this becomes a major tendency: a demotic plural like Βατέῖς (-ῆς), Κολωνῆς, Ἀλωπεκῆς above a list of personal names, is more frequent than Ἀλωπεκῆθεν, etc. We can suspect some semantic factor in this puzzling choice of morphemes, as purely phonetic causes will not explain why many oxytones of the first declension, such as Παιανιά, Αἰζωνή, consistently show demotic surnames in -εύς, never in -ῆθεν.⁵¹

3. Several demes of miscellaneous declension (none, however, in -ῆ or -αι), usually take no suffix at all but simply the preposition ἐκ, "from," which — like the suffix -θεν — imparts an ablative sense: ἐκ Κεραμέων, Κηδῶν, Κοίλης, Μυρρινούττης, ἐξ Οἴου. Several of these begin with *K-*. Otherwise the rationale of the group is hidden.⁵²

4. Many small demes have clan- rather than place-names: *Kothôkidês, Thymaitadês*. The villages themselves were nameless. A location in them was expressed by ἐν with the *genitive*: ἐν Κοθωκιδῶν.⁵³ In this group, the choice never presented itself between an ordinary ethnicum like *Kephaleus, Koileus* and an "ablative" expression like *Kephâlêthen, ek Koilês*.

Limiting ourselves, therefore, to the first three groups, we can speculate whether *ek* and *-then*, like "from" in English, imply mere

⁴⁹ For the accentuation of some place-names and ethnica, data are lacking or inconsistent, as when the manuscripts of Stephanus Byzantius do not agree with the statements of Herodian *Pros. cath.* (Lentz). Arcadius contributes little, and Stephanus is suspected of fabricating some of his ethnica. See Louis Robert, *Hellenica* 2 (Paris 1946) 66 ff.; Honigmann in *RE* s.v. "Stephanos (Byzantios)," 2392-93.

⁵⁰ E.g., *IG* 1².370.11; 2-3².840.34. Since κολώνη "mound" (Sophocles *El.* 894), seems foreign to the normal Attic vocabulary, it can hardly account for the η in Κολωνῆθεν.

⁵¹ Von Schoeffer, *RE* 5.39, 91, etc.; Meisterhans-Schwyzler, 146-47.

⁵² A woman did not have a demotic surname, although Stephanus reports *Athmonis*, which is not attested on inscriptions. Most often, her name was followed by the genitive of her father's (or husband's) and then by the genitive of *his* demotic surname: Μυρτώ Χαρίν[ο] Μελιτῶς (*IG* 1².1077). But if his name was omitted, and occasionally even if it was supplied, Attic usage would resort to "ablative" constructions with -θεν or ἐκ: Ῥοδύλλα Ἰκαριόθεν, Μησαρέτη Φιλινίδα ἐν Μυρίνης (*IG* 2.2114; *IG* 1².1041). In Roman times the ἐκ construction became common; reference listed in von Schoeffer's table.

⁵³ *IG* 2-3².1597.5, 17, 21. Other examples in Meisterhans-Schwyzler, 215.

provenance from a certain place, while the derivatives in *-eus*, *-ios* are significant classes of men. For the first half of this generalization, the evidence is naturally negative: such demes were small or were just neighborhoods within the city and on its outskirts. Furthermore, they were not, to our knowledge, the subject of any comedies, although comedians might well be expected to *exaggerate* whatever qualities a deme had. We have positive evidence that they did make fun of other demes, which have ethnica in *-ios*, *-eus*, and *-idēs* (*-adēs*).⁵⁴ And they were not the only ones to find something noteworthy in several of the demes. Plato's *Laches* (197c) retorts as follows to a jest of his friend Nicias: "I could say something to that, but I won't, for fear you'll say I really *am* an Aexonian (*Aixōnea*)," and the scholiast explains that the *Aixōneis* "were lampooned for being nasty talkers."

Semantic data thus afford considerable though not overwhelming support to a broad distinction between the well-marked demes, whose male inhabitants were known by a regular ethnic derivative, and the insignificant ones, where instead we find a label with *ek* or *-then*. My confidence in the distinction is tempered by indications, mentioned before, that phonetic rather than semantic factors may have been decisive in certain instances. Yet, whether we emphasize semantics or phonetics, the demes do not present a uniform picture like the city-states, which all have an ethnicum with full case-inflection. In comparison, the demes are varied and inconstant, as though Athenians were sure it did mean something to belong to a city, but less sure whether in reality a person belonged to a deme or merely came from there.

A glimpse at Hellenistic Greek shows that ethnica tended to lose ground to prepositional phrases. Whereas Herodotus wrote *ἄνδρα Μεμφίτην*, "a Memphian" (2.112.1), a British Museum papyrus from 163 B.C. gives an unclassical circumlocution, *Νεφοριτος των απο Μεμφεως* "Nephoris, of those from Memphis" (1.24.5, p. 32). *τῶν ἀπὸ* is common in Greek documents from Egypt, in which most place-names receive a Greek declension but no ethnic derivative: *ὁ οἰπογεγραμμένοι ἄνδρες τῶν ἀπὸ Τεβτύνεως*, "the undersigned (οἱ = υ) men of those from Tebtunis"; *παρὰ Τρύφωνος Διονυσίου τῶν ἀπ' Ὁξύρυχων πόλεως*.⁵⁵ *τῶν* is sometimes omitted: *παρὰ Διογένης Λιμναίου ἀπὸ κώμης Καρανίδος* (*PMich.* 6.369.2-3), just as in *Ἰωσήφ* (ὁ add. plerique)

⁵⁴ Haussoullier, *La vie municipale* 196-200.

⁵⁵ *PMich.* 5.244.2-3; *POxy.* 1.38.23. More examples in Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, 2.1 (Berlin 1926) 14.

ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, "Joseph from Arimathaea" (John 19:38). Other prepositions are not so common, either in papyri or in the New Testament: Πολέμωνος τοῦ ἐκ [Τα]λάου, "Polemon from Talaë";⁵⁶ "to all the saints in Christ Jesus that are in Philippi" (τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις, Phil. 1:1).

The period after Alexander is famous for mingling of populations, the decline of local dialects and cultures, and the spread of Hellenistic cosmopolitanism, at least on the surface. As local populations became more heterogeneous and less distinctive, the need for ethnica might well decrease. When the Rosetta Stone speaks of "the debts to the king which those in Egypt (οἱ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ) and those in the rest of his kingdom owed,"⁵⁷ the inhabitants of Egypt can no longer be referred to as *Egyptians*, *Aigyptioi*, because that would not include the large and privileged minorities settled there since the Macedonian conquest. In the age of the great city-states, the ethnic name belonged not indeed to the whole population of a city, but at any rate to that element which was politically and culturally, if not always numerically, predominant. Under the Ptolemies, however, the indigenous Egyptians were, in their own country, inferior to the immigrants in every respect except numbers.

For our purpose, it is enough to observe that prepositional expressions gained over ethnica in Hellenistic times. However, just as the city-state was not extinguished, so the ethnica did not disappear. Innumerable gravestones found in Athens from the Fourth Century B.C. to the Roman Empire period show no trend away from the standard ethnica of classical Greek (*IG* 2.3, 3.2). And in Egypt, especially the Egypt of the early Ptolemies, classical idioms are often preserved, even though they involve native names: e.g., Ἐκτεῦρις Πάσιτος Μεμφίτης (*PHib.* 1.98.14).

To sum up, Greek usage parallels English enough to support the conclusion that ethnica are not employed to indicate mere residence in a certain place, or provenance therefrom. If no more than that is intended, both languages have prepositional expressions, or the equivalent. Ethnica imply membership in a class thought to have recognizable traits, physical or moral. The phonetics and the morphological resources of both languages interfere with this rule only to a minor degree. Free handling of suffixes in Greek perhaps encouraged the use of ethnica even for insignificant local popula-

⁵⁶ *PHib.* 1.157. The genitive form is discussed at 1.36.

⁵⁷ *CIG* 4697.13. According to the notes of the editor, Johannes Franz, the Greek text was not translated from the Egyptian.

tions, while the unwieldiness of English morphology restrains us from adopting ethnica for certain regional or municipal groups that we really regard as more than random assemblages. But where we lack an ethnic adjective, we can use the place-name itself or a substantival adjunct, as in "a Philadelphia lawyer"; and if we avoid the ethnic substantive "a Philadelphian," it is for virtually the same reason that the Greeks said ἐκ Μυρρινούττης, "from Myrrhinutta."

The words we use every day point startlingly to a belief among us, established but unacknowledged, that the people of most cities and most states, not excluding our own, have no distinction, no character. They seem to stand on the same plane of insignificance as the deme of Myrrhinutta. They are governmental entities or economic centers, most of them settled recently by a mixed and highly mobile population, with laws and customs so uniform on the whole that it is no hardship for a newcomer to make himself at home. A comparatively old city, like Philadelphia, has long since lost whatever uniqueness its inhabitants may once have had. Miscellaneous immigrants have taken over the city, without becoming "Philadelphians," just as outsiders took over Egypt in the Hellenistic age, without becoming Egyptians. In contrast, a new city of the Fifth Century, such as Thurii, might draw its population from all over Greece, but it was not founded, like an American city, to be a center which people would move to and from as opportunity prompted them. The colonists of Thurii, all together, were to assume a new civic personality in place of their various affiliations from the past; at any rate, they did adopt a new set of laws,⁵⁸ and it was possible for Herodotus to be called *Thourios*, although he was by birth *Halikarnêsseus*.⁵⁹

The norm of contemporary English recognizes just a few civic ethnica like *New Yorker*, although *Chicagooan* and a number of others may be on the threshold of admittance into normal speech. For a newspaperman to call people *Peorians*, *Pittsburghers*, etc., may be truly a vain affectation today when neither he nor we know of any qualities to associate with them. But in time, if local peculiarities are deliberately nurtured (as in Thurii), or if they develop imperceptibly (as in the older Greek city-states), under conditions of less mixing and more isolation than at present, then many American ethnica may enter the everyday vocabulary, which is sure to reflect, in any era, the world as people see it.

⁵⁸ Diodorus 12.11.3-4, if his testimony here is trustworthy.

⁵⁹ Citations in Jacoby, *RE*, suppl. 2, s.v. "Herodotos," 205-13.