This Introduction to the second of the three projected fascicles of Volume V on the personal names of Asia Minor sets out to provide a more extensive presentation of its constituent regions and their naming practices than has been the norm in previous volumes of LGPN. The much larger component of non-Greek, indigenous names recorded here needs to be set within a geopolitical and cultural context, as do the dates and circumstances in which Greek and, later, Italian names entered the stock of personal names in the various regions.

The opening section of the Introduction to LGPN V.A, which sketched the hellenization of Asia Minor in its broad outlines, was intended to be of relevance to Volume V as a whole. But in some of the regions covered here (especially Lycia and Cilicia) the process of hellenization was more patchy and slower to take hold than in those areas bordering the Aegean Sea or the Hellespont and Propontis, and greater resilience is found among the indigenous cultures in terms of the longevity of their naming practices, as well as in other cultural markers. Despite the impression given by the foundation myths which trace the parentage of many cities in southern Asia Minor (notably in Pamphylia and Cilicia) to the cities of Old Greece, in reality Greek settlement amounted along the south-west and south coasts was very sparse in the Archaic and Classical periods. Alexander’s conquests marked a crucial turning point in the hellenization of some of these regions, but this did not occur through the widespread foundation of new Greek cities. In the two centuries that followed the conquest these few in number and generally small-scale, so that there was little displacement of the indigenous populations. Urbanization in many inland areas was a phenomenon of the late Hellenistic and early Imperial periods. In Caria a small number of coastal Greek cities coexisted from an early date with cities of mixed Greek and Carian populations and with others that were predominantly or wholly Carian. In the region defined here as Lycia, Phaselis was the only city of any long-lasting importance which could trace an early Greek origin. An epichoric dialect of Greek attested in Pamphylia from the fifth century has which could trace an early Greek origin. An epichoric dialect of Greek attested in Pamphylia from the fifth century has

The Contents of the Volume

The Introduction to Volume V.A outlined the division of Asia Minor into three separate fascicles and the underlying rationale for the separation of the coastal regions from the interior. Having covered in that first fascicle the northern half of Coastal Asia Minor from Trapezous in Pontos to Priene in Ionia, this volume completes coverage of the remaining coastal regions, from Miletos in Caria to Rhosos in Cilicia, incorporating the personal names from Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, Cilicia Tracheia (Rough Cilicia), and Cilicia Pedias
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* This Introduction is a revised version of the opening section of the Introduction to LGPN V.A, which sketched the hellenization of Asia Minor in its broad outlines, was intended to be of relevance to Volume V as a whole. But in some of the regions covered here (especially Lycia and Cilicia) the process of hellenization was more patchy and slower to take hold than in those areas bordering the Aegean Sea or the Hellespont and Propontis, and greater resilience is found among the indigenous cultures in terms of the longevity of their naming practices, as well as in other cultural markers. Despite the impression given by the foundation myths which trace the parentage of many cities in southern Asia Minor (notably in Pamphylia and Cilicia) to the cities of Old Greece, in reality Greek settlement amounted along the south-west and south coasts was very sparse in the Archaic and Classical periods. Alexander’s conquests marked a crucial turning point in the hellenization of some of these regions, but this did not occur through the widespread foundation of new Greek cities. In the two centuries that followed the conquest these few in number and generally small-scale, so that there was little displacement of the indigenous populations. Urbanization in many inland areas was a phenomenon of the late Hellenistic and early Imperial periods. In Caria a small number of coastal Greek cities coexisted from an early date with cities of mixed Greek and Carian populations and with others that were predominantly or wholly Carian. In the region defined here as Lycia, Phaselis was the only city of any long-lasting importance which could trace an early Greek origin. An epichoric dialect of Greek attested in Pamphylia from the fifth century has which could trace an early Greek origin. An epichoric dialect of Greek attested in Pamphylia from the fifth century has

The Contents of the Volume

The Introduction to Volume V.A outlined the division of Asia Minor into three separate fascicles and the underlying rationale for the separation of the coastal regions from the interior. Having covered in that first fascicle the northern half of Coastal Asia Minor from Trapezous in Pontos to Priene in Ionia, this volume completes coverage of the remaining coastal regions, from Miletos in Caria to Rhosos in Cilicia, incorporating the personal names from Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, Cilicia Tracheia (Rough Cilicia), and Cilicia Pedias


1 This term is employed throughout in a neutral sense, without implying that Greek culture was imposed on non-Greek peoples, from a Hellenic centre to a barbarian periphery. It is used as a convenient shorthand for the processes of acculturation which resulted in the adoption of aspects of Greek civilization (e.g. use of the Greek language, urbanization and political/civic organization, material culture, self-representation and iconography) and the integration of these peoples within the collective Hellenic memory and narrative of the past in myth and foundation legends. See S. Hornblower’s article on ‘Hellenism, Hellenization’ in OED pp. 656–7.
Introduction

Caria

Caria is here defined as the coastal region that extends between the mouth of the Maeander to the north and the river Indos to the east of Kaunos in the south, excluding the Rhodian Peninsula (essentially the cities of the Chersonesus incorporated at an early date in the Rhodian state) whose inhabitants were included as citizens of Rhodes in LGPN I (see Introduction p. xiv). Inland its northern boundary is formed by the north flank of the Maeander valley, excluding Priene and Magnesia which were assigned to Ionia in LGPN V A, but including the remaining cities on the north side of the valley (Tralles-Seleskeia, Nysa, Mastaura, and Anineta), sometimes treated in modern scholarship as part of Lydia. On this northern side, Caria extends roughly 130 km inland just to the east of Antiocheia on the Maeander but does not include the cities on the north slopes of Mt Kadmos (e.g. Attouada and Trapopolis), above the confluence of the Maeander and Lykos, which will be included in LGPN V C as part of Phrygia. Its north-eastern and eastern boundaries are formed by the Kadmos and Salbake mountain ranges, the latter running roughly north-south for more than 50 km to the headwaters of the Indos, separating it from the Kibyratis and Lydia.

Caria is a region of considerable geographical diversity, by far the largest of those covered in this volume and the only one to include extensive inland areas, relatively remote from the sea. Its coastline is for the most part heavily indented, providing many natural ports and shelter for shipping. The northern coastal section between Miletos and Halikarnassos is characterized by relatively gentle terrain, while the southern parts bordering the Ceramic Gulf and the Knidian peninsula, as far as Kaunos, are dominated by very steep mountainous coasts producing a fragmented landscape in which isolated communities were much more dependent on maritime communications. Inland the Maender valley and the three river valleys (the Marsyas, Harpasos, and Morsynos) that join it from the south along its course were an important focus for ancient settlement in northern Caria. Of equal importance further south were the open arable lands around Mylasa and Stratonikeia and, to a lesser degree, on the upland plateau of Tabai in eastern Caria. Outside these parts and the coast, ancient settlement was generally sparse.

In origin, Caria, if defined as the area occupied by the Carian people, was a much smaller region. There is evidence for a Carian presence throughout the coastal areas from Isas to Kaunos (excluding the Knidos peninsula), as well as in the Maeander valley and the western inland parts, but there is nothing to suggest it extended east of the Harpasos valley, and perhaps no further than the Mysry. The upper Maeander valley and the Morsynos valley which joins it to the south (the site of Aphrodisias), as well as the plateau of Tabai were settled by peoples whose cultural links and stock of personal names point inland, to Lydia, Phrygia, and Pisidia. The cities of the eastern uplands were mostly late foundations as their names suggest (e.g. Aphrodisias, Apollonia, Herakleia, Sebastopolis), but, like many other cities in inner Asia Minor, they grew rapidly in political and economic importance during the Imperial period. Thus Aphrodisias provides the second largest number of named individuals (2,816) from Caria and by the time of Dioskletian it had eclipsed the older cities of the coast to become the administrative capital of the new province of Caria.

Caria was inhabited very largely by an indigenous non-Greek population with its own Carian language, attested in a small number of inscriptions here and on a larger scale in the Carian settlements in Egypt. A few of the coastal cities are Greek in all their essentials from an early date: Iomian Miletos, of course, probably from the Late Bronze Age, Dorian

---


2 The existence of an early Carian league (koinon) is often assumed, perhaps composed of the cities named in the two lists of delegates found at Sukkön (Hauts tores de Carie nos. 90-1), dated to 154/3 bc; see P. Deholl, ‘Cité grecque – village carien’, Studiellenistici 15 (2003) pp. 118-23.

3 See Robert’s comments in Études anatoliennes pp. 316-9 and in La Carie 11 pp. 18-19, 21-2, 72-9, 378-9.

4 See I. J. Adiego, The Carian Language (Boston & Leiden, 2007) on the decipherment of Carian, as well as a full corpus of the Carian texts, and his article ‘Recent Developments in the Decipherment of Carian’, in Hellenistic Karia pp. 147-76.
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Knidos, and perhaps Iasos, Myndos, and Halikarnassos, though the birthplace of Herodotos was itself evidently composed of a mixed population in which the Carian element perhaps outnumbered the Greek. Outside these few large Greek poleis the pattern of settlement in the Classical and early Hellenistic periods was characterized by a proliferation of small, apparently autonomous communities (treated as poleis by Greek writers and in documents such as the Athenian Tribute Lists), in both coastal districts and the interior. Many of these small settlements came to lose their independence and were absorbed into the territories of larger neighbours, perhaps with the encouragement of outside powers intent on controlling Caria. The process began in the fourth century with Mau solos, synoikism of many of the small communities of the Halikarnassian peninsula in his new capital at Halikarnassos. In the third century BC it was actively promoted by the new Seleucid foundations in Caria (Nysa, Stratoneikeia, Antiocheia on the Maeander, Laodikeia), some of them turned, at least in part, through the synoikism of existing settlements. The expansion of Miletos and Mylasa and the further territorial enlargement of Halikarnassos and Stratonikeia at the expense of these neighbours continued the trend in the second century. However, although many of the small poleis recorded in the fifth-century aposchali lists set up on the acropolis at Athens were perhaps deserted or subsumed into larger political entities in the course of the succeeding centuries, epigraphical discoveries show that there is still much to be learnt about their later fate (e.g. Ouranion and Kodapa recently located west of Keramos evidently survived as poleis well into the Hellenistic period). Rhodes played an important part in Caria from an early date, annexing the Chersonese as far as Kedreus and Phylskos into the so-called ‘integrated Pennia’, perhaps some time after 304 BC, and subsequently controlling large parts of southern (especially the highlands between the Ceramic Gulf and the plain of Stratoneikeia) and central Caria as part of the so-called ‘subject Pennia’ from the third century BC into the early Imperial period. For a short period between 188-167 BC Rhodes was granted all of Caria up to the river Maeander, though a number of cities remained outside its control. There is considerable disagreement whether the people styled as Τίθοι who are attested in some numbers in the subject Pennia were Rhodian settlers or members of local elites who had achieved Rhodian citizenship; those known before 1987 were included as Rhodians in LGPN 1.9

The study of the ancient historical topography of Caria has occupied scholars for many years, beginning with the travellers of the first half of the nineteenth century, and a subject of particular and recurring interest to Louis Robert. However, there is much that remains unknown or unresolved in the identification of ancient toponyms with sites on the ground, while epigraphic discoveries from time to time reveal new place-names which should be equated with settlements. Similar difficulties are faced with inscriptions found at a distance from any known ancient site. For example, in the Halikarnassian peninsula many inscriptions, mostly of later Hellenistic, Imperial, and Early Byzantine date, have been found outside the urban centres of Halikarnassos and Myndos, dating from a time when most of the other small towns that had existed in the Archaic and Classical periods (e.g. Termera, Pedasa, and Karyanda) had been deserted or absorbed by their larger neighbours. The attribution of those named in these texts to one or other city is based essentially on geographical probability. Likewise, in the absence of other named settlements, several sites on the coast east of Bargylia, which, if not piers cresantes, are perhaps from an unidentified site in the vicinity. These have been assigned with great hesitation either to the territory of Bargylia or that of Kildara.11

Miletos

The reasons for the inclusion of Miletos and its smaller neighbour Myus in Caria rather than Ionia, where they belong more naturally on cultural grounds, have been set out in the Introduction (p. xiii) to LGPN V A. Miletos possessed a large territory to the south of the Maeander, including the important oracular sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma, and from an early date asserted control over a number of the islands lying to its south-west, namely Lepsia, Patmos, and Leros, their inhabitants apparently being incorporated into the Milesian citizen-body.12 In the course of the Hellenistic period its territory was enlarged eastwards and south-eastwards at the expense of small towns such as Myous and Pidasa. At times it perhaps extended as far south as the bay of Kazihi, bordering on the territory of Iasos, a settlement of Imperial date around modern Kazikli Iskele, whose ancient name is unknown, is assigned here with a degree of uncertainty to the territory of Miletos.13 Members of the Milesian community settled at Agialae on Amorgos, attested no earlier than see N. Badoud, ‘L’intégration de la Périe au territoire de Rhodes’, in Philologus Dionysios. Mélanges offerts au professeur Denis Knoepfler, ed. N. Badoud (Geneva, 2011) pp. 533-65.


13 Of his four projected volumes entitled La Carie, only the second on the plateau of Talas and its surroundings was published, although he did also publish separate corpore of the inscriptions of Amyzon and Sinuri in western Caria.


14 See LGPN pp. 108-23.

15 In the past Teichioussa, a Milesian deme, has been placed here but it has more recently been identified with an offshore island site on the north side of the bay of Abluk occupied in the Archaic period: for older views see G. E. Bean and J. M. Cook, ‘The Carian Coast III’, BSA 52 (1957) pp. 106-10, for more recent work with revised conclusions see H. Lohmann, Ein Survey bei Kazıklı (Msto), Philologos Dionysios. Mélanges offerts au professeur Denis Knoepfler, ed. N. Badoud (Geneva, 2011) pp. 533-65.


13 Of his four projected volumes entitled La Carie, only the second on the plateau of Talas and its surroundings was published, although he did also publish separate corpore of the inscriptions of Amyzon and Sinuri in western Caria.


14 See LGPN pp. 108-23.

15 In the past Teichioussa, a Milesian deme, has been placed here but it has more recently been identified with an offshore island site on the north side of the bay of Abluk occupied in the Archaic period: for older views see G. E. Bean and J. M. Cook, ‘The Carian Coast III’, BSA 52 (1957) pp. 106-10, for more recent work with revised conclusions see H. Lohmann, Ein Survey bei Kazıklı (Msto), Philologos Dionysios. Mélanges offerts au professeur Denis Knoepfler, ed. N. Badoud (Geneva, 2011) pp. 533-65.
the second century AD, have already been entered in LGPN I under the heading of ‘Augials (Miletos)’. Miletos is a rare case where an official list of its eponymous magistrates, the *stephanephore*, was inscribed and survives in large part for most of the period from 522/1 BC to 31/2 AD. As far as the precise dating of the early part of the list is concerned (Milet I (3) 122–3), the slight downward revisions proposed by Cavaignac, recently endorsed by Rhodes, have been followed against Rehm’s original chronology.23 Likewise, the fragmentary third list (Milet I (3) 124) proposed by Wörle and supported further by Errington has been imposed.24 Although it is generally the policy of LGPN not to record the tenure of public offices for individuals, an exception is made for the Miletian *stephanephores*, on account of their relatively complete documentation and importance for local chronology.25 This office has also been recorded for its attested holders at Iasos (see below), as well as at Latmos-Heraklia, where part of a systematic list is preserved (OGIS 459),26 and several other Carian cities (e.g. Amynon). Miletos is also unusual in that more than 25% of the individuals listed under this heading (about 1,850 out of a total of 7,227) are attested as foreign residents at Athens, mostly dating from the late second century BC to the end of the second century AD.27

Iasos

As in Miletos and many other cities of Ionia and Caria, the eponymous magistrate of Iasos was the *stephanephoros*. Although a good number of stephanephores are known from the latter fourth and third centuries, from 199 BC until near the end of the second century probably all but a few of the holders of the office (not infrequently the god Apollo) are attested in a series of interconnected documents relating to the financing of an annual festival of Dionysos, in which many individuals are named.28 Although there is likely to be some gaps, the chronological sequence of the inscriptions is more or less certain and it is on this basis that a rather precise chronology for the persons recorded in them has been attempted, allowing a five-year time span for each text. For the city’s honorary decrees the chronology advanced by R. Fabiani in her doctoral dissertation (*i decreti onorari di Iasos tra cronologia e storia* (Munich, forthcoming)) has been followed.

25 Other exceptions have previously been made for the eponymous Athenian archons, the federal archons of the Boeotian League, the local archons of the Boiotian cities, and the strategoi of the Thessalian League.
27 For the ancient toponymy of Lycia the standard authorities are *TIB 8 and Neutarmen*.

**Mylasa**

The large dossier of inscriptions recording the sale and lease of property by various bodies at Mylasa (the city, tribes, and symposia) is a rich source for the prosopography of the city in the Hellenistic period.20 Recent studies have proposed that these documents span a period of some seventy-five years, dating from the last quarter of the third century to a little after the middle of the second, considerably earlier than the date originally ascribed to them; within this broad period several phases can be defined on grounds of palaeography, prosopography, and the monetary units employed.21 This revised chronology is followed here, carrying with it wider implications for raising the date of other Mylasan texts, conventionally assigned to the later second or early first centuries BC.

Lycia

As mentioned above, how Lycia should be defined, especially its northern limits, was the subject of much discussion in the preliminary stages of work and needs further clarification here.22 Its core element comprises the coastal region between Caria and Pamphylia, inhabited in the Classical period by a people who used the Lycian language.23 Inscriptions in this language and a distinctive style of funerary architecture define, for the fifth and fourth centuries BC, a Lycian cultural zone stretching along the coast from the Gulf of Patara to the Gulf of Finike, including the Xanthos valley as far inland as Araxa. The Greek city of Phaselis, an early Rhodian foundation on the Gulf of Antalya, was not part of Lycia proper.24 However, Lycia has also been used as a geographical term corresponding with Lycian cultural and political expansion that eventually incorporated its northern neighbours.25 Thus the inland regions of the Kabalas and Milyas have, rather misleadingly, been labelled in modern scholarship as northern Lycia. But, as has been emphasized in the recent publication of the Balboura survey, it is better to maintain the distinction between these regions and Lycia, on geographical and climatic grounds as well as cultural criteria.26 The Lycians occupied the river valleys, the lowlands of the coast, and their rugged hinterlands, while the Kabalians and Milyans held the upland plains of Seki (around Onounda) and Elmalı (the heartland of the Milyas, both 1300–1500 m. a.s.l., effectively isolated from the coast by the high mountain chain of the...
modern Bey Dağları, Ak Dağları, and Boncuk Dağları, reaching 3,070 m, 3,015 m, and 2,418 m respectively. In addition to the fundamental differences between the coast and highlands as far as the basis of the rural economy is concerned, the cultural ties of the Kabalisi and Milyas continued to be closely aligned with inland Anatolia well into the Hellenistic period and were cemented with the Pisidian westward expansion that led to the re-foundation of Kıbyra and the new foundations of Balbura and Termessos (πρὸς Τρέβαννα) in the Kabalisi c.200 nc.[29]

From the second century bc onwards, epigraphic evidence sheds a stronger light on relations between the Lycians and their northern neighbours, showing that regular conflict with the Balkanians in the second century bc progressively turned in their favour with the involvement of the Romans. By the terms of the treaty between Rome and the Lycian League in 46 bc, the Elmalı plain, as far north as Chonsa, and Phaselis were ceded to Lycia by the Lycian League, but not yet extended to Balbura, Oinoanda, and Onoamna. Ninety years later, it is apparent from the so-called Stadiasmus of Patara, a monument set up in honour of Claudius detailing the road network of the newly constituted province of Lycia, that the Roman province integrated Classical Lycia with Phaselis and a large part of the Kabalisi and Milyas, including Balbura, Oinoanda, probably Bouslon, and the Elmalı plain. From the early second century bc, civic elites from the Kabalisi and Milyas are found participating actively in the life of the League.

In the light of these considerations, it is justifiable to restrict the definition of Lycia to the coastal zone between the Gulf of Fethiye in the west and Phaselis in the east (including the inland part of the Çandır valley). The Kabalisi and Milyas will be included in Volume V, together with Termessos and Pisidia with which they have close onomastic links. Their separation from Lycia will serve to emphasize the cultural differences between the Lycian coastal zone and the upland plateaus.

Even within these narrow limits Lycia is not a homogenous entity. It can be divided into sub-regions in which there is considerable variation in the distribution of onomastic features. In the west, Telmessos together with the many small communities around the Gulf of Fethiye and the slopes of the Boncuk Dağları form a zone characterized by cultural interaction with its direct Carian neighbours.[30] But the Xanthos valley and Central Lycia comprise its true heartland. The broad and fertile, north-south valley of the river Xanthos accommodated a number of larger cities, Patara, Xanthos, Sidyma, Tlos, and Kadyanda. By contrast, Central Lycia is characterized by its concentrated proliferation of small settlements in the rugged Phellos–Arneai–Myra triangle.[31] Both are connected with the northern plateaus through mountainous passes. To the east of Myra, the Bay of Finike is backed by a wide alluvial plain divided between the small cities of Limyra, Korydalla, Rhodiapolis, and Gagia. Lamyra is often counted as part of Central Lycia, while the other three have been identified as Pho- dian foundations on the strength of a few early inscriptions in Doric dialect; they were, nevertheless, absorbed into the Lycian cultural sphere no later than the fifth century.[32] The remaining communities of eastern Lycia are distributed on the coastal and inland flanks of a mountainous axis, oriented south–north and stretching from Cape Chelidonia to the Çandır valley. Some and to a lesser extent associated this region, through which Pisidians threatened Phaselis in the late fourth century bc (Arr., An. i 24. 6), with the Solynoms, a people closely linked at a later date with Pisidian Termessos.[33] North of Korydalla, the Pamphylian plain was accessible via an inland route through the Alakır and Çandır valleys, whose small communities (e.g. Kitanaura, Typpalia, and Trëbenna) were distinguished by cultural and political connections with Pisidian Termessos. However, they have been included here in Lycia on account of their proximity to the sea. On the coast facing the Pamphylian Gulf, Lycia never extended further north than Phaselis (see p. xv).

The most striking feature of the onomastics of Lycia is the large body of indigenous names. These are a characteristic of all the regions treated in this volume, reflecting their shared pre-Greek Anatolian onomastic background, derived from the Hittite–Luwian language family. However, by comparison with Caria where indigenous names disappeared rapidly from the third century bc under hellenizing influences, Lycia preserved a much greater degree of continuity in its naming practices into the Roman period. There is no single explanation for this, but its relative geographical isolation, the weaker Greek implantation, and its late subjection to Roman provincial administration, together contributed to the survival of an important indigenous onomastic substrate in Lycia.

Against this background, two onomastic phases can be distinguished. The first is characterized by the prevailing use of the Lycian language along with a certain degree of Lycian–Greek bilingualism. The material in the Lycian language consists of some 180 inscriptions, mainly funerary.[34] These are conventionally dated to the fifth and fourth centuries bc and found in the main coastal centres from Telmessos to Rho- diapolis. In addition, the coinage issued by local dynasts is a valuable source for personal names in Lycia.[35] From this epichoric material we have retained the few names that are

---

27 For the identification of these chains with Maskýtos, Kragos, and Antikragos respectively, see Stadiasmus pp. 97–9.
29 The epigraphic material has been collected and commented on by D. Roussatz, De Lycke et Kahalit: La convention entre les Lyciens et Termessos (Geneva, 2010).
30 It has been inferred from its coinage that Phaselis was a member of the League for a short period after 130 bc: see R. Behrwald, Die lykischen Munzen, vol. I (1979) p. 17–25.
32 For Central Lycia see in general Zimmermann, Untersuchungen.
recognizably Greek and for which a reliable Greek rendition exists (fourteen names in total); the Lykian form of these Greek names is recorded in the final inscriptions.

Greek was already in use during this first period and there was an awareness of Greek literary styles, at least among the ruling classes, who also occasionally adopted Greek names (e.g. Perikles, dynast of Limyra).38 As the famous trilingual inscription from Xanthos (337 BC) shows, use of the Greek language was probably promoted when Lycia fell under the authority of the Hellenized satraps of Caria (SEG XXXVII 942). Two Greek inscriptions from Limyra further document the adoption of Hellenic terminology to describe Lycian political institutions by the second half of the fourth century BC.39

Funerary inscriptions are the single most important source for the onomastics of Lycia but are notoriously difficult to date. Attempts at greater chronological precision are scarce not only in the early corpora but also in more recent works.40 Advances towards more accurate dating of this substantial body of material, spanning the fifth century BC to the third century AD, have only recently been made more systematically for some cities in Central Lycia, thanks to the work of M. Wörle (Limyra) and C. Schuler (Phellos, Kyaneai, Myra).41

No texts in Lycean have so far been assigned as late as the third century AD. From this time a monolingual Greek phase begins in which the ratios of indigenous and Greek names shifted decisively in favour of the latter, at least in western and Central Lycia.42 Furthermore, a series of third-century Ptolemaic documents, mainly from Telmessos, Xanthos, and Limyra, mark the definitive incorporation of the Lycean communities into the orbit of Greek geopolitical developments.43 Apart from the north-eastern communities, for which documentation is rare or non-existent before the Roman period, this shift is certainly well advanced by the second century BC,44 in sharp contrast with the situation at Balboura in the Kabalas where indigenous names still comprise the vast majority in a second-century allotment list.45

In western and Central Lycia, the estimated proportion of indigenous names is still close to 20% when documentation increases significantly in the Late Hellenistic period.46 By the beginning of the second century AD the whole of Lycia conforms to the common Imperial epigraphic culture of the Roman East, but still preserves significant remnants of its Anatolian onomastic heritage.

**Pamphylia**

Pamphylia is the smallest of the regions covered in this fascicle. Its heartland is the rich alluvial plain, c.80 km broad from west to east and c.30 km from north to south at its widest, laid down by three rivers (Kestros, Evros, and Melas) which drain into the sea from the Psaidian mountains encircling the northern side of the plain. To the west, two arid travertine terraces stand between the plain and the steep slopes of the mountains, in the east, it gradually contracts to a narrow littoral strip, marking a zone of transition to Cilicia Trachaea.47

The most important cities of Pamphylia were all located in the plain, Side and Attaleia major maritime ports, Perge, Sillyon, and Aspendos set back from the sea. Except for Attaleia, all were early settlements, although very little is known about them before the Classical period. The earliest presence of Greek-speakers may have been contemporaneous with the arrival of Greek settlers in Cyprus at the end of the Late Bronze Age, corresponding to Greek traditions that the cities of Pamphylia were foundations of Mopsos and Kalkhos following the Trojan war; linguistic evidence suggests that this ‘Achaean’ population was later joined by Doric and Aeolic elements.48 Aspendos, Perge, and Sillyon, whose names are of Anatolian origin,49 were probably the earliest foundations and also the home of the Pamphylian dialect. The vast majority of dialectal inscriptions have been
found at Aspendos, which claimed Argive ancestry in the late fourth century BC; the size of its coinage suggests it was the most important city in the Hellenistic period. The sanctuary of Artemis Pergaia, whose cult was diffused over a wider area (e.g. Rhodes, Thera, Halikarnassos), made Perga the most important religious centre of Paphlagonia. Side, the rival of Aspendos, traced its origins to colonists from Kyme, but, besides Greek, its inhabitants spoke Sidetic, a language of Luwian origin, attested by its coinage and nine inscriptions as late as the second century BC. These documents have been linked to Arrian’s account that when Alexander reached Side in 333 BC its inhabitants spoke a barbarian language different from any other in the region, but it remains unclear whether the Paphlagonian dialect was ever used at Side.\(^{12}\)

Attaleia had a small territory, confined between the older coastal cities of Tenedos and Magydos and its larger neighbour Phyrie. Thus, Attaleia was a village attached to Perge, at least during the second century AD. To the west, Pergean territory was very likely contiguous with that of Termessos and extended far into the foothills of the Taurus; caves at Karain and Kocain, at the base of these mountains, belonged to the territory of Pisidian Pamphylia and Pisidia should be placed somewhere around the base of these mountains, belonging to the territory of Pisidian Pamphylia, and the foothills of the Taurus; caves at Karain and Kocain, at the base of these mountains, belonged to the territory of Pisidian Pamphylia and Pisidia should be placed somewhere around the base of these mountains, belonging to the territory of Pisidian Pamphylia. Hekataios furthermore put the border between Pamphylia and Cilicia in the vicinity of Nagidos, close to Cape Anemourion at the eastern limit of the Paphlagonian Gulf. This concept of an extended Pamphylia between Cape Chelidonia and Cape Anemourion may be a projection of the maritime notion of a Pamfylia that might not have extended as far as Attaleia. It is hard to define the place of the coastal region from Cape Chelidonia to Attaleia in the regional landscape of the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods. There is nothing to suggest it belonged to the cultural complex which shaped the Paphlagonian dialect; Phaselis at least preserved its pure Doric dialect. The only epigraphical evidence for Olbia is a fourth-century proxeny decree whose publisher suggests that it was an Ionian colony, so it had no impact on the structure of the onomastics of the Paphlagonian dialect. Three small cities, Thubes, Lyrnessos, and Tenedos, which lay on the narrow coastal strip between Olbia and Attaleia, have recently been proposed, on the basis of the place-names themselves, to have been Aeolic foundations. Until more is known about this cluster of small cities it cannot be determined whether the Aeolic influence on the Paphlagonian dialect emanated from them or from Side.


\(^{17}\) Coinage with legends in Sidetic script was minted during the 4th cent. BC: *Eldie* II pp. 644–6. Inscriptions: *Eldie* 81–9; Eldie 86 indicates that Sidetic was also spoken at neighbouring Lybre.

\(^{18}\) Art. loc. 16. 4. An argument against the extension of the Paphlagonian dialect to Side is the fact that Pamphylian theophoric names derived from Apollo are not to be found in Side, while in Sidetic they are based on the form Ἀπέλλα (Apollo, poliotes). These unpublished dialectal epitaphs have been recently discovered during excavations of the city’s harbour (information from M. Adak), but these stones may originate from Aspendos. C. Brixhe suggests (as per ep. 1) that the tradition which made Side a foundation of Aeolic Kyne was invented to provide it with a Greek ancestry and to conceal the fact that all the cities in Pamphylia it was the most ‘Anatolian’. This hypothesis accounts for the linguistic features mentioned above and would imply that a different explanation must be found for the Aeolic elements in the Paphlagonian dialect.


\(^{20}\) H. Brandt and F. Kolb, *Lycia et Pamphylia*. Ein römische Provinz im römischen Kleinasien (Münster, 2005) pp. 95–6. A text from the reign of Trajan prescribes payment of a fine to Artemis Pergaia (*IPerge* 57), which was probably part of the territory of Perge at an earlier date, being closer to Perge than Attaleia and having the Venus statues linking Perge to Paphlagonia pass through it. S. Jahan’s connection between the ethnic Εὐαρκή/Εὐαρκηῖζι attached to several citizens of Perge and a supposed toponym Βάρκη/Βάρκη north of modern Yarek (*IPerge* Anz. 25 (1995) pp. 20–2) is problematic; see C. Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien* (Munchen, 1998) pp. 72 n. 87 and p. 262 n. 307. Names from those two places have been entered under the heading ‘Perge, Lybrethos and ‘Perge, Elaphethos.’

\(^{21}\) Implied by dedications to Artemis Pergaia; see N. Griká and E. S. Akdogan-Azar, *Antalyas Yeni Adak Yastıkları*, *Adalya* 12 (2005) p. 269 nos. 9 and 10. Despite its wide diffusion, no dedication to Artemis Pergaia has yet been found on the territory of any other Pamphylian city.


\(^{23}\) See *Ep. Lat. 12* 2, 6 1. PGRH F 1 F 259 (Melanippion) and 266 (Nagidos); See also *PGRH* F 1 F 266 (Kypera) and 264 (Lyrenia). Phaselis is also placed in Pamphylia in the early 4th cent. By Stratoarkos (apud Ath. 330a), Plin., *HN* v. 96 and Pompon, *HN* v. 78 (exclusively) describes Phaselis as being on the *κόμη Λυσίας et Pamphylia*. In the *PGRH* F 1 F 259 (Melanippion) and 266 (Nagidos).

\(^{24}\) B. Zemanová, *Pamphylia’s western and eastern limits are more difficult to define. Ancient sources are far from unanimous on this matter, especially regarding its extent towards the west.* Strabo regarded Olbia, situated immediately north of Phaselis, as the first Pamphylian city to the west, and Kibyra Mikra and Promeamos as the last towards the east. This conventional delineation of the boundary between Pamphylia and Lycia, which is followed here, corresponds to the border of the Lycian League set in 46 BC and later of the Roman province of Lycia, so based on an administrative arrangement rather than cultural or geographical factors. An earlier demarcation, reflected in two passages of Strabo, which extends Pamphylia further south to Cape Chelidonia, can be traced back to Hekataios, who located the nearby city of Melanippion in Pamphylia. Hekataios furthermore put the border between Pamphylia and Cilicia in the vicinity of Nagidos, close to Cape Anemourion at the eastern limit of the Pamphylian Gulf. This concept of an extended Pamphylia between Cape Chelidonia and Cape Anemourion may be a projection of the maritime notion of a Pamfylia that might not have extended as far as Attaleia. It is hard to define the place of the coastal region from Cape Chelidonia to Attaleia in the regional landscape of the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods. There is nothing to suggest it belonged to the cultural complex which shaped the Paphlagonian dialect; Phaselis at least preserved its pure Doric dialect. The only epigraphical evidence for Olbia is a fourth-century proxeny decree whose publisher suggests that it was an Ionian colony, so it had no impact on the structure of the onomastics of the Paphlagonian dialect. Three small cities, Thubes, Lyrnessos, and Tenedos, which lay on the narrow coastal strip between Olbia and Attaleia, have recently been proposed, on the basis of the place-names themselves, to have been Aeolic foundations. Until more is known about this cluster of small cities it cannot be determined whether the Aeolic influence on the Paphlagonian dialect emanated from them or from Side.
For most of the earlier part of the Hellenistic period, Pamphylia was under Ptolemaic control, and for a shorter duration subject to the Seleucids, both left their traces in the form of new foundations (Ptolemais and Seleukia). For these rulers, Pamphylia was an important source of military manpower, and people from it, especially from Aspendos, were active in the military and administrative hierarchies. The most significant development in this period was the foundation of Attaleia c.150 bc during the period of the Attalid ascendancy in western Asia Minor, though nothing suggests any wider Pergamene control of the region. Pamphylia may have come under Roman rule as soon as 133 bc, first as part of the province of Asia and subsequently attached to various other provinces, until the formation of the long-lived province of Lycia and Pamphylia in the first century AD. After Servilius Isauricus’ campaigns against the pirates (78–75 bc), Attalia’s territory was confiscated as aeger publicus, providing the opportunity for the settlement of Italians who could be traced back at least to the Augustan period. The presence of Roman families is reflected in the onomastics of Pamphylian cities during the first and second centuries AD, a period of great prosperity for the region, and members of families of Italian origin were some of the first people from the Greek East to join the Roman senatorial elite.

Cilicia

Cilicia comprises the long, narrow coastal region, nowhere much more than 100 km wide, stretching for some 370 km from Pamphylia and Pisidia to the Amanos mountains bordering upon northern Syria and Commagene. To the north it is separated by the high Taurus mountain chain from Isauria, Lycaonia, and Cappadocia. Its inhabitants were regarded by Greeks as a barbarian people and referred to as Κίλικες without any further differentiation as to which part they came from. However, Strabo (xvi 5.1) made a clear geographical distinction between its intractable, mountainous western part, and the low-lying plains of the east, calling the former Κιλικία τραχαία (Late Cilicia Aspera), the latter Κιλικία πεδινή (Late Cilicia Campestris). This division has been followed here, not only on the compelling grounds of geography that impressed Strabo, but also in view of the cultural and historical differences that separate the two parts, reflected also in their onomastics. While most individuals can be assigned to a city in Trajectia or Pedias, there remain 147, some of them military personnel and slaves, designated in the sources as Κιλίξ or Cilix, for whom the general heading ‘Cilicia’ is used. Although Cilicia had a long history of literacy, there are no texts in a Cilician language later than the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions of the eighth and early seventh centuries, unlike the other indigenous peoples of the regions covered in this fascicle.

Further detail relating to the geographical definition of each part and their physical characteristics is provided in the two following sections, but some of the other factors relevant to this division may be briefly summarized. Broadly speaking, Cilicia Pedias for most of the first millennium bc lay in the orbit of centres of power situated to its east and was thus more closely oriented to the Levantine coast, Syria, and Mesopotamia than to Asia Minor. Although it shared with Cilicia Trachea a common Luwian heritage, it was subject to much more intensive external cultural influences from these regions. Thus, in the late eighth century several royal inscriptions are written both in Hieroglyphic Luwian and Phoenician and later, under Persian rule, inscriptions are written in Aramaic. Its administrative history is also revealing. Control of Cilicia by eastern powers was often limited in extent to Cilicia Pedias, as was the case under Assyrian and Babylonian rule. Following Alexander’s conquest, the Seleucids only held territory over the wider region for brief periods, but were firmly entrenched in Pedias for most of the Hellenistic period. Cilicia Trachea, on the other hand, was for most of the third century under Ptolemaic control. Roman organization of the two regions changed constantly throughout the first century bc and first century AD, with Pedias, or parts of it, at times being attached to the province of Syria, while Trachea tended to be ruled by local or regional dynasts. Cilicia had previously been united for any length of time in a single administrative unit only under the Persian empire, and it was not until 72 bc, under Vespasian, that a province of Cilicia was created which encompassed both parts and, further enlarged to include Isauria and Lycaonia in the first half of the second century AD, survived for more than 200 years. As part of the administrative restructuring of the empire that occurred in the period of the Tetrarchy, Cilicia was once again divided, this time into three parts: Trachea formed the core of Isauria, while Pedias was split between Cilicia Prima and Secunda, together forming part of the diocese Orientis.

67 It has been inferred from Strabo (xvi 4.1) that Attalia was a re-foundation of an older city called Korykos (RE s.v. Attalia (3)), but this is far from certain.
69 For discussion of the date see Brandt and Koldi (n. 54) pp. 22–4 and 42–4. It is likely that the Pontic foundation of the small city on the D yüksel ridge, which has been identified as Trachea, is the basis for this episode.
71 M. Calpurnius Rufus from Attalia was the first senator from Pamphylia and possibly the first from Asia Minor, during Claudius’ reign (Hoffmann, Senators p. 101 no. 2; RE Supplbd. 14 s.v. Calpurnius Rufus (10bc)). M. Plancius Varus from Perga was admitted to the Senate under Nero; his descendants formed one of the most illustrious families of southern Asia Minor: S. Mitchell, ‘The Plancii in Asia Minor’, JRS 64 (1974) pp. 27–39.
72 Funerary monuments of Cilicians serving in the Roman fleet and of veterans resettled in their homeland, as well as diplomats, show that Cilicia was a major recruiting ground for the Roman army and navy, as it had been in the Hellenistic period for the Seleucids and Ptolemes: see Launey pp. 476–81 and J. Russell, Cilicia-Novis Friesia: Cilicians Abroad in Peace and War during Hellenistic and Roman Times, Anabasis 4 (1974) pp. 27–39.
73 See TIB 1 pp. 30–43.
Cilicia Tracheia

Cilicia Tracheia consists of a strip of land c.240km from west to east, between the sea and the Taurus mountain range. The mountains rise abruptly into towering masses (in many parts above 2,000m asl), traversed by small rivers that have incised deep canyons through a hinterland of barren plateaus, and scattered with small valleys and basins supporting village-sized communities. The coast is dotted with small cities, perched on the sea against the backdrop of the mountains. Between Korakession and the Lamos valley, the respective western and eastern extremities of the region, only one large river, the Kalykadnos, penetrates deep into the hinterland. At its mouth, there is a small but rich alluvial plain, while its upper course carved out a large valley at the foot of the Isaurian mountains, in which existed a number of small cities, mostly of late date. This region, including the coastal cities from Anemourion to Cape Zephyrion (or the region of Xanthos), and was itself subdivided into smaller districts; Lalassa encompassed the area between Klaudiopolis and Diokaisareia, Kernatas lay around Olba, and Lakanitis around Eireneopolis.

A settled Greek presence in Cilicia Tracheia may be traced to the Archaic period. Kelenderis and Nagidos were both Samian foundations and at least three other pre-Hellenistic poleis, Anemourion, Aphrodisias, and Holmoi, are attested, but nothing is known of their date or origins; several other cities may have been Greek settlements prior to Alexander’s conquest. Greek-speakers encountered a Luvian-speaking population whose onomastic traditions are well documented in inscriptions, for the most part of Imperial date. Cilicia Tracheia, as already noted, did not experience external domination until the Persians united it with Cilicia Pedias in a single administrative entity centred on Tarsos.

Evidence for the use of Greek during the Achaemenid period is limited to the coin legends of Nagidos, Holmoi, Kelenderis, and possibly Anemourion, as well as single inscriptions from Nagidos and the region of Olba. Although there is clear evidence for the Achaemenid presence in the remarkable relief friezes from the inland site of Meydancikke, north of Kelenderis, it left no trace in the onomastic stock of Cilicia Tracheia. This region, including the coastal cities from Anemourion to Cape Zephyrion (or the region of Xanthos), and was itself subdivided into smaller districts; Lalassa encompassed the area between Klaudiopolis and Diokaisareia, Kernatas lay around Olba, and Lakanitis around Eireneopolis.

When Cilicia Tracheia after 286 BC briefly became part of the Seleucid kingdom, Seleukos I Nicator founded Seleukia at the head of the Kalykadnos delta, bringing the inhabitants of nearby Holmoi into the new city, and thereby forced a significant hellenizing thrust into this barbarian region. After his death in 283 BC, Ptolemy II Philadelphos seized control of Tracheia, and for most of the third century BC the region remained a Ptolemaic possession, with brief interludes of Seleucid rule. A legacy of this era of Ptolemaic domination was the foundation of two cities, Arsinoe and Berenike. Although Antiochos III in 197 BC expelled the Ptolemies from Cilicia Tracheia, by the terms of the treaty of Apamea he was obliged to relinquish his possessions west of the Kalykadnos. After the middle of the second century, with the decline of Seleucid and Rhodian influence in the region, the conditions were created for the rise of the pirate states which the Romans struggled to contain until their final suppression by Pompey. Throughout this period a large part of eastern Tracheia was under the control of the theocratic state centred on the temple of Zeus at Olba and administered by its priests, perhaps remaining formally independent of the Seleucids. The reconstruction of the temple of Zeus Olbios may have begun in the early third century, when a benefaction of Seleukos I paid for the costs of its roof.

Following the dissolution of the somewhat amorphous province of Cilicia in 43 BC and prior to the creation in 72 BC of Vespasian’s new province of this name, Cilicia Tracheia was subject for a time to Kleopatra and later to the indirect rule of local dynasts imposed from Rome. Two of these, Archelaos I of Cappadocia, under Augustus, and Antiochos IV of Commagene, under Nero, contributed substantially to the hellenization and urbanization of the region before the final imposition of Roman rule. Archelaos refounded Elaioussa under the name Sebaste, but Antiochos’ activities were more extensive and profound. On the coast he founded Iotape and Antiocheia on Kragos, in the Kalykadnos valley Germankopolis, Eireneopolis, and Philadelpheia. More direct imperial initiatives to stabilize the troublesome interior and secure the routes between the plateau and coast can be seen in the establishment of a Roman colony at Ninica early in the Augustan period, which later under Claudius acquired the status of a polis and a new name, Klaudiopolis. A further move in this direction occurred in 17 AD, when the territory of the Teukrid dynasty of priest-kings at Olba became a Roman possession and Tiberius founded Diokaisareia, attaching it to the sanctuary of Zeus Olbios.
From this sketch of the spread of Greek poleis in Cilicia Tracheia it is clear that hellenization proceeded at a rather slower pace than in Pedias, and, with the exception of Seleukeia, the Greek cities were insignificant in size and influence. But the potential impact even of small-scale new foundations on the hellenizing process is suggested by a decree of Nagidos relating to Arsinoe, a Ptolemaic foundation of the 270s or 260s BCE. Settlements were established in a strategic location in territory that had previously belonged to Nagidos, having expelled the barbarians who were encroaching on it, articulating a deliberate policy of promoting Greek settler interests at the expense of the indigenous population, as well as the underlying antagonism between Greek and barbarian encountered in many other Greek colonial enterprises.92 The urbanization of the interior was a phenomenon of the early Imperial period in both parts of Cilicia, promoted by the emperors and local citizens, and as a means of pacification and control.

Two inscriptions, one from Korykos on the coast, the other from Olba in the mountainous hinterland, offer another angle on this hellenizing process, at least as far as personal names are concerned. The list of priests of Zeus (or Hermes) Korykios90 has two series of names, one Hellenistic, the other Imperial. Among the 326 names of the first series, 60% are Greek and 40% indigenous; in the section of Imperial date, 80% are Greek, 16% Latin, and just 4% indigenous. The Hellenistic section, whose earliest entries may date to the 230s BCE, reveals developments in the pattern of naming that do not follow a simple linear trend but may reflect local responses to a changing geopolitical landscape. The Greek names and patronyms of the priests at the top of the list (e.g. Διόνισος, Ζηνοφάνης) have been linked to a surge of hellenization after the Macedonian conquest and during the first phase of Seleucid rule, on the assumption of a minimum age of forty for holders of the priesthood. This tendency faltered with the Seleucids’ loss of Tracheia, so that, between c. 200 and 130 BCE, the names of the priests and their patronyms are predominantly Luwian origin. Thereafter there occurs a transitional period of some thirty years in which the priests’ names are Greek and their patronyms are indigenous, before Greek names become the general rule for both father and son. This pattern has been taken as an expression of a renewed hellenizing surge in the first decades of the second century BCE, following the conquest of Tracheia by Antiochus III.91 The second inscription, a list of religious officials from Olba, substantiates the late hellenization of the interior.92 Among the forty-three names listed as priests, one is Greek, the list of rhabdouchoi inscribed in the second century BCE on the same stone has twenty-six Greek names, eight Latin, and only four indigenous.

Cilicia Tracheia formed the western part of the province of Cilicia until Diocletian’s administrative reforms created a new province called Isauria, uniting Tracheia and Isauria with its capital at Seleukeia. In these circumstances some of those attested as Ἱσαυροί, without any indication of their civic affiliation, might in fact have originated from Cilicia Tracheia. However, because they cannot be differentiated from the inhabitants of Isauria itself, they will be included in Volume VC.

Finally, it may be noted that the necropolis of Korykos provides one of the largest collections of personal names from Late Antiquity (588 inscriptions, 1,056 names), offering a precious insight into Christian and Jewish onomastics. Covering a span of some three centuries or more, it is a rich source of information relating to professions, social and economic status, as well as the movements of population between Syria and Cilicia Tracheia at the beginning of the Byzantine period.93

Cilicia Pedias94

This region comprises the fertile plain laid down by the rivers Kydnos, Saros, and Pyramos, as well as its more rugged hinterland at the foot of the great Taurus and Alman mountain ranges which separate it from the Anatolian plateau to the north and Syria to the east. Opening from a narrow coastal strip in the west, the plain, divided by a chain of hills into a western and eastern part, covers a vast area, approximately 150 km from west to east, and as much as 80 km from south to north. Included with it here is the narrow coastal strip on the western flank of the Alman mountain ranges between the Cilician Gates at Kordigas and Rhousos, enclosing the southern side of the Gulf of Issos. Ancient and modern writers variously attribute it to Cilicia or Syria.95 On geographical grounds alone it more clearly belongs to Cilicia, while in cultural terms it perhaps has more in common with Syria and the Phoenician coast to the south, Myriandros was a Phoenician port in Xenophon’s time (An. i 4. 6). The northern boundary with Cappadocia is not easily demarcated; it lies below the high Taurus somewhere to the south of the pass leading to Cappadocian Kokousos. It is anyway of minor significance as no Greek inscriptions are known from this mountainous part of the region, which is devoid of ancient cities.

Cilicia Pedias was traversed by an important ancient route linking central Asia Minor with Syria, followed by many of the armies of antiquity. This passed through the Taurus range via the Cilician Gates, and after crossing the plain reached Syria through either the northeasterly Ammanik Pyli or...
the Syria Pitylus which brought the traveller to Antioch. The much easier routes through the Amanos range contributed to Cilicia Pedias being more closely oriented to Syria than to Asia Minor. Pedias also played a significant part in maritime communications, serving as a mastering point for land and naval forces under the Persian empire, and much later as a base for the Roman navy, the timber resources in its surrounding mountains also made it a centre for shipbuilding. Many studies have recognized that its pivotal role in communications was a decisive factor in Cilicia Pedias becoming a cultural crossroad, subject throughout its history to multiple influences, Greek being but one, from neighbouring and more distant regions.

The hellenization of Cilicia Pedias occurred rather earlier than in the rest of Cilicia, though only Soloi has a credible claim to have been a Greek city earlier than the Hellenistic period; its Doric dialect may support the tradition that it was a Rhodian foundation. Among the examples of its Hittite identity, though by the late fourth century a nobleter Angive ancestry was preferred.90 Several of the cities, notably Tarsos and Adana, were much older indigenous settlements referred to in Hittite texts of the second millennium. The bilingual hieroglyphic Luwian and Phoenician inscriptions of the late eighth century bc from Karatepe (on the eastern edge of the plain) and from Çinceköy (south of Adana) in themselves and in their context give some idea of the political organization of the region and its cultural milieu at the time when Greeks first re-established contacts with this corner of the eastern Mediterranean.91 There has been much debate concerning the possible identification of the Muka / Mps named in these texts as the ancestral founder of the royal house with the Greek hero Mopsos associated with the foundation of cities in Pamphylia and Cilicia in the aftermath of the Trojan war. Likewise, the Hittites, mentioned by Herodotus (v, 91) as earlier inhabitants of Cilicia, have been identified with the people of Hiyawa, an eighth-century name by Herodotus (vii, 91) as earlier inhabitants of Cilicia, have been much debate concerning the possible identification of the Muka / Mps named in these texts as the ancestral founder of the royal house with the Greek hero Mopsos associated with the foundation of cities in Pamphylia and Cilicia in the eighth and sixth centuries bc: The Case of Soloi, in Rough Cilicia. New Historical and Archaeological Approaches, edd. M. C. Hoff and R. F. Townsend (Oxford, 2013) pp. 6–15.


99 For the period of Persian rule see Casabonne pp. 137–42, 165–85.

100 It has also been argued that the name Symmeis is a Luwian royal title misunderstood as a personal name by Greek writers: see I. Yakubovic, ‘L’ouvrage et la langue du nom “Symmeis”’, in The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia, 10,000–323 B.C.E., edd. S. R. Steadman and G. MacMullen (Oxford, 2011) p. 539. However, a recently published inscription from Iasos, dated c. 412 bc in connection with events in the Ionian War that involved the Spartans, clearly shows Symmeis being used as a personal name: G. Maddelini, Epigr. Ias. NS I p. 209–15 (SEG LVH 1048). On Oromedon see Casabonne p. 64.


102 A man named Δίκης, taken to be from Cilician Aigeai, made a payment for the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo at Delphi in 356 bc: Ωρομέδων, perhaps a hellenized form of a local Luwian name.100 By the late sixth century the dynasty was tied by marriage to a prominent Carian family (Pissar to the Anthracite period) and after 480 at Halikarnassos was given charge, perhaps for a short period, of all Cilicia. In the Classical period inscriptions in Greek have been found only at Soloi, which also inscribed its coin legends in Greek from the later fifth century. The same practice was also adopted at Mallos and, in the fourth century, at Tarsos and Issos, where Aramaics had previously been used and continued to be applied to the coins of the Persian satraps operating in Cilicia. Aramaic is also the language of a small number of inscriptions on stone of this period, perpetuating the region’s older relations with the Assyrians and Babylonians and its earlier familiarity with Phoenicians.103 Soloi and Aigeai are the only cities of Pedias whose inhabitants are attested bearing Greek personal names at this stage of its history.104 So it was not until Alexander’s conquest of Cilicia in 333 bc that a strong impulse of hellenization was felt.105 Thereafter the effects were rapid, at least in the cities closest to the coast. From the early third century a considerable number of figures prominent in literary, philosophical, and rhetorical circles emerged from these cities, while others, all bearing Greek names, appear in honorific texts, lists of victors, and on gravestones in the old centres of Greek civilization.104 This appears not to have been the result of extensive Greek settlement or the
Achaemenid period: see Casabonne pp. 70, 126–9, 178 and Kulturbegegnung or Mesopotamian counterparts both in name and iconography in the (2001) pp. 95–103, countered by J. Nollé, 'Seleukeia am Issischen Golf', Epigr. Anat. 33 or an older settlement renamed; its identification with Rhosos has not found 'Monnaies et textes grecs', 1973, pp. 201–2 (à Messine et à Plymouth', JS VII pp. 265–6) and which in spite of its pedigree was never of much importance. Aigeai is also on the onomastic record.

movements of people may be expected to have an impact resettled the depopulated cities of Pedias with people from ing the pirate wars of the early first century bc, Pompey the site of Magarsos appear as citizens of Mallos. Follow- as it was an independent; otherwise, those attested at reintegrated into the territory of Mallos. Persons are reg- from the ruling Temenid dynasty of Macedonia. Nevertheless, its pre-Greek identity was not entirely eliminated and ambiva- lence concerning its Greekness lingered into later antiquity. The persistence of indigenous cults of Hittite–Luwian origin (e.g. Tarhunt and Sandan) is clearly revealed in the theophoric names which continued in use until Late Antiquity (e.g. names based on the root θεός– and θεός–).

For most of the third, second, and early first centuries bc Cilicia Pedias lay in the sphere of Seleucid control and many of its cities were renamed after Seleucid kings. For Tarso this occurred no later than the 250s, but in most others it seems to have been a change brought about by Antiochos IV Epiphanes, which generally did not outlive the mid-second century bc. The case of Magarsos, a settle- ment with an important sanctuary of Athena, is abnormal in a number of ways and requires further explanation. For- merly the port of Mallos, Magarsos was renamed Anti- ocheia on the Pyramos, at latest towards the end of the third century. From then until the second half of the second century bc, it functioned as a polis independent of Mal- los, which apparently survived within circumscribed limits during this phase. Eventually, at a time of weaker Seleucid control of Cilicia, Magarsos lost its independence and was reintegrated into the territory of Mallos. Persons are reg- istered under the heading ‘Magarsos–Antiocheia’ as long as it was an independent polis; otherwise, those attested at the site of Magarsos appear as citizens of Mallos. Follow- ing the pirate wars of the early first century bc, Pompey resettled the depopulated cities of Pedias with people from the pirate strongholds in Cilicia Tracheia. One of these was Soloi, whose inhabitants had been earlier transported by the Armenian king Tiridates II to populate Tigranocerta, and was now refounded as Pompeopolis. Such wholesale movements of people may be expected to have an impact on the onomastic record.

The hinterland of Cilicia Pedias, including the more easterly of the two great plains, figures very little in the pre-Imperial period. The only city to produce Greek inscriptions of an earlier date is Kastabala, renamed Herapolis under the Seleu- cidae. This was the site of an important cult-place, which in the fifth century bc is known from an Aramaic inscription to have been devoted to Kubaba, the eastern goddess perhaps assimilated to an indigenous deity, later known in Greek as the Περασια and generating in its turn the theophoric name Περασιαίου. Herapolis was the centre of the kingdom of Tarkondimatos and his successors whose rule, sanctioned by Rome, extended over this landlocked plain and parts of the coast at various times in the first century bc and early first century ad. Significant urbanization did not occur here until Augustus’ refoundation of Anazarbos, whose ter- ritory encompassed large parts of the plain and later became the pre-eminent city of eastern Cilicia (Cilicia Secunda). Foundations of other cities are recorded in the first century bc; for example, Augusta to the north of Adana under Tiberius, Eireopolis in the Amanos foothills under Nero, and Flaviopolis at the north-eastern edge of the plain under Vespasian. Flavio- polis represents one of the few topographical problems in the region. It is widely assumed to have been located at modern Kadirli where many inscriptions of Imperial date have been found, but as yet none of them names the city from which they emanated. In spite of some lingering uncertainties, all those attested in these texts have been assigned to Flaviopolis. The crucial importance of Cilicia Pedias as a supply point and hub of communications in the third-century campaigns on the eastern frontier finds expression in the accumulation of honorific titles bestowed on the cities by the emperors, as one way of securing their loyalty. Mallos was made a Roman colonia, a purely honorific title which need not have involved the settlement of veterans.

Numismatics

The evidence for personal names derived from coin legends, while not insignificant, is on a much lesser scale in the regions covered here than was noted for LGPN VA (pp. xii–xiv). 1,504 names are drawn from this source, out of a total of 44,748 for the volume as a whole (3% compared with 7.5% for VA). The vast majority of these are known from the Greek


105 Soloi: R. S. Stroud (n. 50); Tarsos and Aigeai: Robert, 104; see also Scheer, ‘Romische Kolonien in Cilicia’, OMS II (1972) pp. 181–3.

106 The persistence of indigenous cults of Hittite–Luwian origin (e.g. Tarhunt and Sandan) is clearly revealed in the theophoric names which continued in use until Late Antiquity (e.g. names based on the root θεός– and θεός–).

107 It was common for these local deities to be identified with Syrian or Mesopotamian counterparts both in name and iconography in the Achaemenid period: see Cusinotte pp. 70, 126–9, 178 and Kulturbegegnung pp. 63–93, 119–25, 140–5. Subsequently the same process of assimilation with Greek gods occurs.

108 Thus Tarso became Antiocheia on the Kydnos, Adana, Antiocheia on the Saros, Mopsouhestia, Seleukeia on the Pyramos, Osmangud, Epiphanes; Issos had already been renamed Nikopolis in the time of Seleukos I.


111 For the most recent treatment of this dynasty, the subject of many studies, see N. L. Wright, ‘The House of Tarkondimatos’ A Late Hellenistic Dynasty between Rome and the East’, Anat. Stud. 62 (2012) pp. 49–88.

112 Each of those cities adopted eras that dated from their Imperial foundations.

cities of Caria (1,335—90%) where the conventions of coinage were similar to those found in Ionia, Asia Minor, and the colonial settlements in the Propontis and along the south coast of the Black Sea. Most of the names from these cities (e.g. Miletos, Iasos, Myndos, Halikarnassos, Knidos) are found on coins minted between the early fourth century and the late Hellenistic period, while on Imperial issues personal names are much better represented in the cities of inland Caria (e.g. Tralles, Nysa, Apollonia Salbake). The importance of the numismatic evidence varies greatly from city to city. The largest number of names is found on coins of Miletos (363 out of 7,227—5%), yet another element linking it more closely to Ionia than Caria, but in relative terms numismatic evidence is of greater importance for cities such as Myndos (63 out of 284—22%) and Knidos (179 out of 1,633—11%). Coins are the most important single source for the onomastics of some of the minor Carian cities, as they were in Ionia, or may have been for some of the smaller Ionian cities. For example, twelve of the nineteen individuals known for Carian Neapolis are attested on coins, and eleven of the twenty-three from neighbouring Orthosia. Even where they are proportionately not as significant, they may provide valuable evidence for periods poorly represented by inscriptions on stone. Thus fifty-four of the seventy individuals attested in the later second and first centuries B.C. for the symposium of Plataea and Aphrodisias are known from coins, and seventeen of the forty-four from Tabai of pre-Imperial date.

For the remaining regions, the numismatic evidence is generally negligible in quantitative terms, but can be locally significant. Apart from the early issues of local Lydian dynasts, Phaselis, the only Greek city in the region, was also the only one to add the names of public officials to its coinage in the third and second centuries B.C., providing almost half of the named individuals attested in the pre-Imperial period (81 out of 178—46%), a significant proportion of its overall total (32%), and going some way to substantiating its Rhodian roots. Although abbreviated names and monograms appear on the later Hellenistic coinage of Side and Aspendos in Pamphylia, they yield only three names. In Cilicia Trachaea, Seleukeia on the Kalykadnos alone inscribes the names of officials on its late Hellenistic coinage, contributing a significant proportion (fourteen out of nineteen) of the total attested before the Imperial period. The habit was more widespread in the hellenized cities of Cilicia Pedias, such as Adana, Aigeai, Mallos, Soloi, and Tarsos, but far from rich inquantity. Thus, abbreviated names, the practice was resumed on a much larger scale from the last quarter of the third century until c. 75 B.C. In this period the names of officials accompany those of the fabricants (most likely the workshop owner) in an abundant series of stamps on amphoras exported mostly to the Cyclades, Attica, Euboea, and the north-east Peloponnese, as well as to Egypt. Thereafter the system breaks down in a final phase of stamping with a single name and is finally abandoned soon after the mid-first century B.C. For the period from c.220–50 B.C. more than 2,300 different stamp types have been identified by Virginia Grace, organized in the Knidian Type (KT) series. As it remains unpublished, complete coverage of the named individuals, including those on stamps for which there is no published example, is based on a list provided by Philippa Matheson and Carolyn Koehler. Although full documentation of the KT numbers associated with each individual is not yet possible, they have been listed where known from publications that cite them.113

Several aspects of the treatment of this material require some explanation.114 Grace divided the Knidian series into seven periods (Period IV divided in IV A–B, Period VI in VI A–C), but only in Periods III to VII do names appear in full. Specific date ranges were assigned to each of the periods and their subdivisions, which have been followed here.115 Where it is uncertain whether an official held office in one period or another, he is assigned a date that covers both; likewise where a fabricant’s activity spans more than one period.

To help distinguish between homonyms among the various officials, as well as among officials and fabricants, their function is indicated in the final bracket. Thus, epon. = eponymous magistrate (most likely damosourgos except in Period IV A (188–167 B.C.)); dam. = damosourgos (the eponymous magistrate at Knidos); phr. = phrourarchos (an official named only in Period IV A, sometimes with the damosourgos); andr. = andres / andron (a pair of officials found only in Period VI, together


115 Most important see Grace’s own publication of the Knidian stamps from the House of the Comedians on Delos (EAD XXVII pp. 317–54 (1970)); R. Enste on the material from the Sanctuary of Poseidon and Amphipolis in Letoon (TAPA 104 pp. 280–82 (1982)); M. Palczewski and E. Schönberger on finds from Eretria (Eretria XII pp. 198–217 (2003)); C. Broker and J. Burrow on the small number of Knidian pieces from Pergamon (The hellenistischen Amphorenstempel aus Pergamon pp. 56–61, 110–12 (1991)); G. Johrens’ great work on part of the collection in the National Museum in Athens (Amphorenstempel im Nationalmuseum von Athen pp. 95–238, 275–93 (1999)). In addition, Johrens kindly provided references to unpublished material from the Athenian Kerameikos excavations for individuals lacking a published example, these appear as \"Unp. (Athens, Kerameikos) \"KGA’8 following by a number. Unfortunately N. Jefremov’s Die Amphorenstempel des hellenistischen Knidos (1995), the only work that attempts complete coverage and valuable for its catalogue of the Knidian stamps from the northern Black Sea region, is not entirely reliable and is not linked to the KT workshop owners, so it is not useful.

116 For further detail see Grace’s account in EAD XXVII pp. 317–24 and additional material in Hop. 54 (1985) pp. 31–5. The recent lowering of Rhodian amphora chronology will require a corresponding revision of the dates used for the Knidian series.
with the eponymous magistrate); fabr. = fabricant.

In many cases a person of the same name in the same period may be named with and without his official title (e.g. ἐνὶ δαμιοργὸν Δράκοντος and ἐνὶ Δράκοντος), normally assumed to be one and the same person. By and large, all the individuals named on the stamps are understood to be Knidian; this includes the ἰπερωνήκους, regarded by some as Rhodian mercenary commanders. The exceptions are a small number of fabricants named with an ethnic, as well as fabricants who by general consent are taken as Rhodians and have previously been entered in LGPN. In identifying individuals among the numerous homonyms, it is recognized that there are many potential pitfalls with the possibility both of over-division and of conflation; it has been our policy to follow the general consensus of opinion among the specialists, especially Grace and Jöhrens.

Pamphylia

The recent publication by C. Brixe of a corpus of Pamphylian amphora stamps has revealed a significant number of new Pamphylian names, as well as contributing more than 531 (17%) individuals to the relatively small total of 2,981 for the region as a whole. The overwhelming majority of the 762 stamps come from Alexandreia, dated approximately to a period spanning the second and first centuries BC. In the absence of evidence for amphora production in Pamphylia and a well-established typology of the amphoras themselves, the attribution of stamps to this region is based largely on dialectal traits in the names, where these are not present uncertainties about their origin may arise. In these circumstances none of the stamps can be attributed to a specific city, so all those attested on them appear under the general heading of Pamphylia. Furthermore, the stamps give no indication of the function of those they name, whether public officials or fabricants.

This material poses numerous problems. Many of the stamps are hard to read and most of the names are abbreviated. In a region where unique names form an important part of the onomastic stock, this makes their interpretation particularly difficult. Because of the abundance of new personal names attested in an abbreviated form in this material, an exception has been made to the normal LGPN policy of excluding names whose restoration is uncertain. Therefore, what Brixe calls the ‘minimal complement’ of a name has been entered as the main heading, with an indication of other possible expansions in the final brackets (e.g. Ἀβραμάς, Ἀβραμός | Ἀβρας(—) for Timbres 9–11, allowing for a name such as Αβραμάς, attested at Oinounda in the Kabilos). This avoids the loss of significant roots that are now securely attested in Pamphylia and will be a useful tool for the study of future discoveries in Pamphylian onomastics.

Where the same name appears on a number of different stamps, it has normally been assumed that they relate to the same individual, except when significant differences in spelling may indicate that different persons are involved. It is recognized that very common Pamphylian names (e.g. Πατολύς, Φυστάκιος) may conceal an unknown number of individuals.

Cities and their subdivisions, political structures, and developments

As in all previous volumes, individuals are registered under the cities where they exercised citizenship, not where they happen to be attested (e.g. a Miletian known at Athens appears under Miletos, not Athens). Where their affiliation to political subdivisions (e.g. demes, tribes, phratries, synoikismoi) within a city or to dependent communities is known, they appear under these subheadings, both to reflect their precise place in the political community and to help to distinguish homonyms from one another. Individuals named in inscriptions set up outside the immediate catchment of the urban centre and lacking further topographical indicators are entered under the name of the city or one of its dependencies followed by (terr.), to mean it belonged to its subject territory. Whenever a person is assigned to a city accompanied by a modern Turkish place-name in brackets it signifies that they are attested in a dependent settlement whose ancient name is at present unknown but may be revealed by future discoveries. Modern toponyms are avoided wherever possible because for most users of the volume they are more likely to mystify than enlighten. In the few cases where they do appear as the only indication of place, it means that the person cannot be assigned with any confidence to a known city or its territory. Whenever there is uncertainty in assigning a person to a particular ancient political community, or in judging the most likely identification of a find-spot, as in LGPN VA we have generally chosen to take a position, where necessary adding a cautionary question mark.

Political organization varies greatly from city to city in its detail and is not always fully understood. For example, Miletos in the later fifth century BC perhaps replaced its traditional six-fold Ionian tribal organization with ten tribes (a number at an unknown date raised to twelve) modelled on the Kleis-thenic system of Athens, even bearing many of the same tribal names. This was combined, at least from the Hellenistic period, with a division of the citizen-body among a small number of territorial demes (at least five, perhaps as many as seven), as well as membership of phratries which were apparently divided in turn into patries. How these civic units functioned in relationship to each other is far from clear but, as far as the evidence allows, the hierarchy of civic organization is represented in the relevant entries.

It has already been noted that there was a tendency, especially in Caria during the Hellenistic period, for small poleis attested in numbers in the fifth and fourth centuries either to be absorbed by their larger neighbours or to merge to form larger political units. These changes occurred through the processes of synoikismoi and sympolitai. The circumstances and the
motives of the participants, as far as they can be determined, were highly variable, often involving an external authority whose interests were served by these geopolitical changes. However, they were not always successful and were inherently unstable, particularly when imposed on unwilling participants. But where the change became permanent, additions to the onomastic repertoire of the enlarged entity should be expected. Thus, when Ionian Miletos incorporated the population of its smaller Carian neighbour Pidasa in the 180s BC, there would have been an influx of personal names from a different tradition. The same effect on a smaller scale was produced by the admission of foreigners as new citizens, as is also well documented for Miletos in the later third and early second centuries BC, including the mass enfranchisement of hundreds of Cretan military personnel.

Unions of this kind produced varying outcomes. Sometimes, as with Pidasa, it involved the abandonment of the settlement, the creation of an artificial identity, and the merging of its population into the citizen-body of the enlarged city. But elsewhere they gave rise to forms of civic organization that were unorthodox by the standards of mainland Greece, and further complicated by the adoption of Greek political terminology to describe unconventional situations. In some cases local political traditions, which allowed a greater part for the constituent elements in the polity in decision-making processes and the management of their own affairs, seem to have been respected, at least in the century or so after such a union.

This situation is well exemplified by Mylasa, a prominent old Carian city whose territory was enlarged after the mid-third century at the expense of previously independent small towns in its periphery (e.g. Olymos, Hydai, Kasossos?); at the old Carian city whose territory was enlarged after the middle of the 3rd century BC, including the mass enfranchisement of hundreds of Cretan military personnel.

The same eff ection on a smaller scale was produced by the admission of foreigners as new citizens, as is also well documented for Miletos in the later third and early second centuries BC, including the mass enfranchisement of hundreds of Cretan military personnel.

The situation is well exemplified by Mylasa, a prominent old Carian city whose territory was enlarged after the mid-third century at the expense of previously independent small towns in its periphery (e.g. Olymos, Hydai, Kasossos?); at the old Carian city whose territory was enlarged after the middle of the 3rd century BC, including the mass enfranchisement of hundreds of Cretan military personnel.

The same eff ection on a smaller scale was produced by the admission of foreigners as new citizens, as is also well documented for Miletos in the later third and early second centuries BC, including the mass enfranchisement of hundreds of Cretan military personnel.

The situation is well exemplified by Mylasa, a prominent old Carian city whose territory was enlarged after the mid-third century at the expense of previously independent small towns in its periphery (e.g. Olymos, Hydai, Kasossos?); at the old Carian city whose territory was enlarged after the middle of the 3rd century BC, including the mass enfranchisement of hundreds of Cretan military personnel.


128 A notable feature is the apparent existence of territorial phyla named after an indigenous ancestor, possibly as subdivisions of the demos (e.g. 40b) Kefalochia within the demos of Korazia.

129 See P. Debord (n. 3) pp. 142–74.

130 Those belonging to the smaller Carian neighbours Pidasa and Pladasa. In the mid-third century BC it comprised at least seven more smaller communities, some of them referred to as koina in slightly later texts. The fact that not only Pladasa but also one of the smaller communities (the Kolones) had been independent polis during the fourth century is revealed in the foundations of a fully independent polis and a semi-autonomous koinon subordinate to Rhodes.

City formation and urbanization was well advanced in western Caria no later than the Classical period, but occurred much later in the north-east, where Tabai alone has a claim to early origins. Even Aphrodisias, which became the most important city in Caria in later antiquity, only emerged as a city late in the Hellenistic period, initially as the junior partner in a sympletesia with neighbouring Plarasa. Those belonging to this initial phase in the city’s history are therefore entered under the heading ‘Plarasa-Aphrodisias’, but from the time Aphrodisias rose to prominence in the Augustan period and Plarasa disappeared from its official nomenclature, ‘Aphrodisias’ alone serves this purpose.

Isolated from the rest of Caria, Kaunos lay close to the boundary with Lycia. Although its Carian identity is clear, geographical factors meant that many of its connections were with the small Lycian towns on the east side of the Indus valley, duly reflected in elements of its onomastic repertoire. In its territory were a large number of subordinate settlements, probably organized as demes or their equivalent within the individual township of Aphrodisias, which was known as ‘Aphrodisia’ but lacked the full independence of a koinon. 127 In the Hellenistic period many Carian communities, some of which are later attested as poleis, are found describing themselves as koina. This status is largely confined to Rhodes’ ‘subject Pernia’ in the third to first centuries BC and evidently reflects their political subordination. Many of these were small settlements whose limited resources and populations restricted their capacity for further development, though it has been seen by some as a transitional status between village and polis. Their internal structure and institutions were modelled on those of a typical polis, as seen in the merged koinon of Psye and Pladasa. In the mid-third century BC it comprised at least seven more smaller communities, some of them referred to as koina in slightly later texts. The fact that not only Pladasa but also one of the smaller communities (the Kolones) had been independent polis during the fourth century is revealed in the foundation
the political structure of the polis. Although many cannot be located with any certainty, some were evidently in Lycian territory. Kalynda, sometimes designated as a Carian city but certainly situated in Lycia, was for brief periods under Kaunos control and at other times in dispute with it over territorial claims. Telandros too, probably located in the same area, belonged to Kaunos in the later second century BC, and the subordination of minor Lycian border towns continues in the Imperial period (e.g. Lissai). Under the Roman administration Kaunos, originally part of the province of Asia, was eventually separated from the rest of Caria when, under Claudius, it was reassigned to Lycia and from that date joined the Lycian League.

In Lycia too, clarification is needed for some of the civic subdivisions and institutional arrangements between communities (mainly of the better documented period from the second century BC to the third century AD), which have been taken into account when assigning individuals to a place. As a preliminary remark, the inscribed sarcophagi sometimes mention the city or dependent community to which fines were to be paid in the case of trespass. When erected in the countryside or in small settlements, they therefore play an important role in delimiting city territories and assigning dependent communities to their polis. Civic subdivisions called phyli are attested in many Lycian cities, sometimes bearing names alluding to a Greek heroic past (e.g. Bellerophonsteioi, Sarpedonii, and Iobateioi at Tlos and the two latter at Xanthos), or referring to the urban centre (austai or astikoi). However, at Xanthos these groups, long thought to be phyli, were apparently called demos. If this use of the term demos is confirmed, the distinction between phyli and demois as civic subdivisions and dependent communities variously called perpolis, demois, and komai needs to be emphasized. These dependent communities are attested throughout Lycia but are particularly well documented in Central Lycia between the second century BC and the third century AD. Thus, for example, Andraia, Istrada, Soura, and Tyerissios were all dependencies of Myra, one of the larger cities in the region. But even a small city such as Kyme incorporated within its territory a number of smaller nucleated settlements (Trysia, Korba, and the unrimmed sites at modern Hoyran and Tuse). Inscriptions also reveal a surprising degree of institutional development and the exercise of administrative functions. Some of these minor cities had certainly been independent at an earlier date and were the subject of disputes between more powerful neighbours. Although such changes are normally not discernible in our evidence, a new discovery reveals that the joint community (demois) of Tyerissios–Tymioiwa temporarily formed a sympoliteia with Myra. The sympoliteia was another form of association between communities, particularly frequent in Central Lycia, which allowed more scope for individual civic identity. Small and medium-sized poleis, such as Aperlai, Arneai, Akalissos, and Myra, formed sympoliteia with neighbouring communities often designated simply as demos. A certain degree of centralization is implied, among other things expressed by the use of ethnics such as Ἀκαλίσσευς ἀπὸ Μύρας ἀπὸ Κοροῶν ἀπὸ Καύνων. Because their members seem to have retained a greater degree of autonomy (e.g. Idebessos was part of the sympoliteia led by Akalissos but was called a polis), they have been treated here as independent entities. However, Onobara and Mnara, whose inhabitants are sometimes called Ἡρακλεία ἐπὶ Ὀνόβαρος and Φαράγγη ἐπὶ Μναρήν ἐπὶ Μνάρας, were recognized as independent communities. Further complication arises where political links between communities across regional borders, as has been noted above in the case of Kaunos and its possessions in western Lycia. This recurs on its north-eastern borders with Pamphylia and Pisidia. An unpublished Hellenistic treaty, perhaps establishing a sympoliteia between Phaseis and Tenedos, a small Pamphylian city west of Attaleia, elucidates a later Imperial funerary text which describes a man as Φαράγγη ἐπὶ Μναρήν ἐπὶ Μνάρας. Nevertheless, the inhabitants of Tenedos are registered here under Pamphylia. Further inland, the influence of Pisidian Termessos is felt in the Çandır valley in shared onomastic features as well as coinage of the first century BC which demonstrates the political dependency of Kitanaura on Termessos. Individuals from Tyrella, neighbours of Kitanaura, also bore the ethnic Τεμπερνοῦν ἀπὸ Τεμερνᾶς, implying close political links between the two communities. Despite these connections, the towns of the Çandır valley have been included in Lycia. Some places may be designated as independent communities simply due to the defective state of our knowledge. Arsada, for example, may have been a dependency of Xanthos or Tlos, and it is uncertain in what sense Malia was a demois of Tlos. A text from Hippokoume records more than 200 individuals, including many from neighbouring communities (the Sestoi, Lyrrnai, Kastanneis, and Pal–neis), whose exact location and civic status are largely unknown. They are taken as independent, but were very likely subordinated to the joint community.
settlements. A final difficulty of this kind lies in the location of a few places (monastery, choria, and homai) attested in the life of St Nicholas of Myra, which leaves it uncertain to which city they belonged.

Dialect

Dialect is a factor of significance in this fascicle on account of the names attested in the epichoric Pamphylian dialect, necessitating a system of cross-referencing, only ever used previously in LGPN III B. Where the Boiotian and Thessalian dialects were concerned. In other respects the situation in the regions covered here is straightforward. The Ionic dialect was of course used at Miletos and influential in other Carian coastal cities such as Iasos and Halikarnassos. As in LGPN V.A, the Eastern Ionic spelling -αιων- and -αιων- for the more familiar diphthongs -αιυ- and -αιου- is retained, as for example in the names [name replaced], [name replaced], and [name replaced]. Alphabetic υιω (Ψιου) occurs in a few early texts from Miletos and Halikarnassos and is denoted as double sigma in the relevant main name entries; the original spelling is indicated in the final bracket. The Doric dialect was used notably at Knidos, Phaselis, and Soloi, and less consistently in those parts of Caria subject to Rhodes from the third century BC. On account of its unusual characteristics and wide variations in orthography, the Pamphylian dialect and the personal names attested in it require more detailed treatment.

Pamphylian

Pamphylian is without doubt the most complex of the Greek dialects. It is documented mainly by epitaphs dating from the later third century to the end of the first century BC, amphora stamps from the second and the first centuries BC, and coins going back to 550 BC, comprising the names of some 1,250 individuals. By its very nature, this type of documentation sheds light mainly on Pamphylian onomastics with names on the roots of the noun τῶν ἡμῶν and the verb χείμω, while names formed on the root ἄγωρος and ἄνωπλος—may be derived from Doric, and names such as Φαρνης and Φαρνης betray Aeolic influence (see below).

But it would not be correct to characterize Pamphylian as a ‘mixed language’. Rather it is the product of a series of influences embodied in the dialect over a long period through its several inherited Greek components and a living Luwian substrate. Onomastic innovations gave Pamphylian an ‘exotic’ aspect, completely unlike any other Greek dialect, producing names formed on roots never or rarely used elsewhere for the generation of personal names; for example, nicknames derived from parts of human anatomy, such as Πάρειος from πάρειoς, ‘cheek’, Οισπάρειoς from ἀρέσι, ‘moon’, and ἄφη, ‘face’, an entire onomastic family constructed on ἰαρός, ‘lamb’ (Ἰαρός, Ἰαρός, Ἰαρός) Ἐρίας, Ἐρίας, Ἐρίας, formed on the verbal root ἰαρέω, ‘carry’. Τρέσις, Τρέσις, created through the extraction of a radical in -σις from the verb τρέω, ‘thrive’.

Moreover, two alphabetic letters are unique to Pamphylian: Τ and Τ, denoting the semi-consonant [t] and Τ, which probably had the phonetic value of the affricate [ts].

The internal dynamics of the Pamphylian dialect as well as the influence of home generated a rapid phonetic evolution over the four centuries it is known, reflected in a multiplicity of spellings and pronunciations of a given name; for the name Αφροδίσιος alone no less than sixteen different spellings are found. In a single inscription a person’s name can be written in two different ways over two successive generations. It was therefore decided that a system of cross-referencing was essential to help those unfamiliar with the Pamphylian dialect recognize what ‘standard’ Greek name is concealed by an ‘eccentric’ Pamphylian form. Its working requires a little explanation. All the attested Pamphylian forms of a name are listed above the entry for its ‘standard’ Greek counterpart, while above the entries for each of the dialect forms or for a group that shares a common root, reference is made to the ‘standard’ form. In order that it should not be too intrusive, forms for which the correspondence should be obvious are not cross-referenced (e.g. names in -ας which lose their nasalization and end in -ας, different versions of a name where the entries are consecutive to the heading of the ‘standard’ form). A particularly delicate problem has been the reconstruction of a nominative form for names attested only in oblique cases,

---

148 In the Stadthuysen Lyremais is mentioned as Λύρναι: Μ. Τσικαλά, Νεοσσονικές ισπατικές· Βάρη Κατσίλα, Kadmos 49 (2006) pp. 155–76.
150 For schematic modelling of the evolution of the Pamphylian dialect, see Brixhe (n. 151) p. 34.
152 For schematic modelling of the evolution of the Pamphylian dialect, see Brixhe (n. 151) p. 34.
154 For schematic modelling of the evolution of the Pamphylian dialect, see Brixhe (n. 151) p. 34.
155 For schematic modelling of the evolution of the Pamphylian dialect, see Brixhe (n. 151) p. 34.
a standard practice in LGPN, but not previously attempted with Pamphylian names. This has been done on the assumption of orthographic consistency between the oblique cases and the reconstructed nominative form. For genitives in -ους (e.g. Φορδίσιους) the temptation to reconstruct a nominative in -ους (Φορδή) has to be resisted, because such nominatives are, for a good reason, never found. When Pamphylian adopted the graphic system of the koine (ου instead of the traditional ου for the values [ου] and [οu]), the nominative termination /ou/ was already contracted to /iou/; the nominative form has therefore to be reconstructed as Φορδής (below §1. iv).

In order to account for this abundance of forms for a given name, the principal phonetic rules governing Pamphylian onomastics are presented below, indicating to which historical component of the dialect each belongs.153

1. Vowels

i) [ι]/ [εi] - neutralization of the opposition /ι/ in certain contexts: in hiatus, /ι/ becomes close to /e/ but only occasionally expressed in writing: Μνείλας > Μνείλα, Μελικής > Μελική, but Αρχέας, Μιακλίς etc.

ii) [ι] - closure of /i/ to /η/ in certain positions:
   - in absolute final position: genitives in -ιους, e.g. Αρχέας νυμίους, Αρχέας ις, Αρχέας ις. This rule is later ignored under the influence of koine.
   - in final position, in a closed syllable, initially spelled ι, then, under the influence of koine, ωριοντος / ωριοντος for ζήριοντος. Also affects oblique cases, e.g. gen. Ζήριον for "Ζήριον."

iii) [ε/ι] - in the oldest inscriptions, both /ε/ and /ι/ are written as ιε/ιε, after the closure in /ε/ long, then /ι/ of the ancient diphthong /ει/, provided a new way to write /ι/ and exceptionally /ι/.

- Diphthongs

i) [αι] and [αι] - tendency towards monophthongization, e.g. Λιμνᾶις, Λιμνᾶους for οροφάς, οροφώς 'roof' or 'ceiling'.

ii) [ει/ιε] - for the closure of /ει/ to /ιε/ long then /ι/, see §1. iii.

iii) [αι] and [αι] - the earliest texts represent these diphthongs as αι and αι under the influence of koine during the second century. Αρχέας, Μειάλεις and a possible Κειτ- ερίς thus precede Αρχέας, Μιλειάς and Κειτερίς.
3. Semivowels
- Pamphylian originally preserved the proto-Greek */e/ as */i/, written with an epigraphic digamma, Ψ. By the fourth century BC, in most positions this sound had become first a bilabial fricative and then a voiced labial fricative [v], or even in some contexts a voiceless fricative [], and it was probably to write these sounds that the panhellenic digamma, Ψ, was introduced, leaving epigraphic Ψ to represent the sound [i] that still survived as a glide after [i] or as the second element of a diphthong (e.g. Ἀρκεδώνος or Ἀρκεδός, later spelled Πελώρος and Αρκέδων). However, epigraphic Ψ continued in use in some traditional spellings, whence alternate forms such as Ψαλυ- or Ψαλύ-.

Other phonological developments affected the voiced bilabial fricative [v], which seems to have become [v] between vowels, and the voiceless aspirate occlusive [], which became [f], sometime around the middle of the third century; these developments meant that B and Θ were now also available as appropriate spellings for [v] and [f], alongside epigraphicdigamma Ψ and panhellenic doublet F, and the result was that all these letters were used interchangeably (Ἀκελός and Ακελός, Ἐρυθρός and Ερυθρός, Ζωβαλίμα and Ζωβαλίμος (koiné), Φίλος for Φίλος),—development of a glide, [v] and [f], after [i] and [e] in hiatus, fading out during the second century BC: Δεμάτριος, Ἀπελάυος then Ὠμείρας, Ἀπελίπους then Πελλάμειος (although in this case the pronunciation of the glide probably persisted).

4. Consonants
i) Liquids
- metathesis involving liquids is very common, under the influence of Luwian, e.g. forms in Φίλος- and Φίλος- corresponding to Ἀθρίνας, Περόπας > Περόπας, Περός (ethnic type personal name derived from the epigraphic form of the name of Perge; Περιγη > 'Πέρηs').
ii) Nasals
- weakening of the nasal at the end of the syllable, usually not written in this position, e.g. Ξηραές for Ξηράες, Ξηραῖος for Ξηράῖος. Within a word, the nasal did not totally disappear before a consonant even if it was not written, e.g. Ἀγίας, Ἀγιάς, Ἀγίασθαι for Ἀγίασμα. Its persistence also explains written forms like Πέραγος and Σέφων.

A negative consequence is that, in some cases, feminine names in -άη cannot be differentiated from masculines in -Ας, a form like Πέραγος may equally stand for Πέρα γος or Πέρα γος. Such names are not accepted in the main entry, the alternatives being expressed in the final brackets.
iii) Occlusives
- in intervocalic position, delta replaced by rho: Δραμάς > 'Δραμάς, Oμοφωτήριος > Ομοφωτήριος, Φιλάς > 'Φιλάς, possibly Δέκαμος > 'Δέκαμος etc.
- early spirantization of [j] between two vowels, the first being [e]: Μεγάλλης for Μεγαλάς, Μεγάλης for Μεγαλάς and Μεγάлας for Μεγάλας.
- the bilabial treatment of the Indo-European labiovelar [*j] and the cluster [*w] before [e] under the influence of the Aeolic dialect: Πελώρος, Φυρώκας, Φωράς, where a dental treatment is expected, as in all other Greek dialects: ‘Πέλορος, ‘Φυρόκας, ‘Φωράς.
- Indo-European */h/ or */w/ had a palatal or even already an affricate phonetic outcome for which a new letter had to be created: Φιράς, perhaps formed by adding diacritical marks to Φιράς. It is not at all certain that its final phonetic expression was a voiceless palatal */h/ or */w/ as initially supposed by Brixhe in 1976.104 The clearest example is provided by the title of Artemis Per poignant, Ζήνα, resulting from the evolution of Indo-European *ζηναθ-για and corresponding to the Achaean ζιήνατος. A probable Greek name, Φθραύς, would be the equivalent of an Attic Σφραύς. Indigenous names like Μαγασιϝας and Ζανθωνῆς also contain this phoneme.

iv) Geminates
- simplification of geminates: e.g. Μελλάς > Μελλής, Περάμος > Περάμος. Not one of the eight different dialectal spellings for Μελλάς retained the geminate. However, counting the trend to simplification, reinforcement of its articulation is perhaps reflected in spellings like Πελής / Πελές, Πελλάμος / Πελλάμος, Πελλάς / Πελές.

5. Other phonetic phenomena
i) Anaptyxis, especially of initial short alpha: Θανάτωρ for Θανάτωρ, Πορσόπα for Πορσόπα, Πελόνις for Πελόνις, Πελλαύρις for Πελλαύρις. Rare in Greek, this phenomenon may be attributed to Luwian influence. Found widely in Anatolia from the second millennium, it frequently affects Greek names in epigraphic texts from Lydia and Side. A further factor is the presence in Pamphylian of a tonic accent, strong enough to weaken the previous or the following vowel and eliminate it from the written form.
ii) Paraphesis: Στιγμάνος for Στειγάνος, Ιστέφανος for Ιστέφανος.
iii) Αναφηγιακή Κεφαλή instead of 'Κεφαλή (nickname formed on πέπορος with the suffix -ιον or directly from the adjectival πέπορος).

Names in non-Greek languages
It has always been the practice of LGPN to record Greek names drawn from sources written in Latin, whether literary or epigraphic, as well as in the Cypriot syllabic script. This practice was extended to include non-Greek names attested in Latin, but only where the Greek version of the name was well established (e.g. for Achaean names in LGPN IV, such as Μουκάτρας (2), (6), and (19), and Μουκάτρας (1) (1), (5), (7) etc.). In Asia Minor, the situation is further complicated by the attestation of Greek as well as non-Greek names in one or other of the indigenous languages still in use as late as the Hellenistic period. As already observed in the Introduction to LGPN V A (pp. ix and xv), Asia Minor was a multilingual region, which in the earlier first millennium was home to a number of languages of Indo-European origin, as well as later newcomers such as the Celtic tongue of the Galatian invaders of the third century BC, and the languages of its successive Persian, Greek, and Roman rulers. In the present context the relevant languages are Carian, Lydian, and Sidetic, all three descendants of or closely related to the

104 DGP p. 7. For his latest views on the question, see C. Brixhe, 'Le psi et le "trident" dans l'alphabétisation de Pamphyliens', in De Cyber à Catherine: trois mille ans de libyennes, edd. F. Poli and G. Vottéro (Nancy, 2005) pp. 59-65.
The Lycian branch of the Anatolian family of Indo-European languages. Seditio-Greek bilingual texts provide the key to recognizing the Sidetic versions of Greek names, allowing them to be identified in other monolingual inscriptions (e.g. in Lycia, Ἰθαμώρας from 'Ithamor', Ἰθαργής from 'Artmon', Αὐλίονιος from 'Ουλίας'). In both Lycian and Carian texts, the latter partially deciphered with the help of a few recently discovered bilingual inscriptions, a cautious approach has been adopted for names identified as Greek; only where there is little room for doubt have they been included (e.g. in Lycian Ιθαμώρας from τέμενας, Ἐναγός from εὔετεία, Κεδηβής from 'κέδης', Ἐνγολίς from 'ουλίας', Ἐναγόρας from 'ουλίας'). In every case the attested form is recorded in the final bracket. At one stage serious consideration was given to the idea of reproducing in Greek the indigenous names attested in these languages, where their Greek form was known from other sources. However, it was quickly realized that this would take LGPN well beyond its legitimate catchment and create all sorts of difficulties, not least that of committing the project to the same level of coverage in any future work on the Near East (Syria, Palestine, etc.) and Egypt. It would also inevitably produce a false picture of the non-Greek onomastics of these regions, privileging those names which by chance are known in their Greek form while omitting the remainder. Coverage of the non-Greek personal names attested in these languages thus remains outside the scope of LGPN and properly belongs to specialized studies related to them.

Non-Greek names and their treatment

Much has already been said in the Introduction to LGPN I.A about the occurrence of non-Greek names in Asia Minor and their linguistic and cultural background. However, as will be clear from the statistical summaries below, their frequency is far greater in the regions covered here. This is particularly true of Lycia and Cilicia Trachea, where they continued to serve as important cultural markers within a strong tradition of indigenous naming well into later antiquity. In most respects their treatment here does not differ from that in any other volume. In particular, no attempt is made to normalize the variant forms of an indigenous name where there are no means of determining what that normal form might be. Thus a single Carian name may be found in three or four different forms—Δομνος, Δομνος, and Δομνος, or Υμελαιος, Υμελαιος, Υμελαιος, and Υμελαιος—a Lycian name may have even more, and less recognizable variants—Κεβδηβης, Κεβδηβης, Κεβδηβης, Κεβδηβης—and likewise in Cilicia Trachea—Ἀγοριως, Ἐγγολις, Ἐγγολις, without being possible to assert that one is the normal form, and the rest variants of it. These variations in orthography have demanded a cautious approach to the correction of readings of indigenous names, however probable they may seem, unless independent means of verification have been available (e.g. in Lycia, Δομνος, Δομνος, Δομνος, or Κέβδηβης and Κέβδηβης, where it is tempting to think there have been misreadings of the triangular letters delta and lambda). Not infrequently indigenous names are attested only in an oblique case from which the nominative form has to be reconstructed. Wherever this happens or where there is doubt about the nominative ending, the attested form is given in the final brackets. As a general rule the nominative ending given by Zgusta in his Kleinasiatische Personennamen is accepted. However, in one important respect the treatment of non-Greek names in this volume departs from previous practice. As briefly mentioned in the opening section, non-Greek names are no longer accentuated or aspirated. Peter Fraser briefly outlined in the Introduction to LGPN I (p. xiv) and repeated in LGPN IV (p. x) his approach to accentuation in general and the reason behind the accentuation of non-Greek names. Thus, 'it is essential to indicate interpretation of gender and declension by use of the accent,' and 'We have accentted non-Greek names in the conventional manner if they show normal inflection.' Although this was once the standard approach and has been stoutly defended in more recent times by W. Clarysse from a papyrologist's point of view in the treatment of Egyptian names, it has become a minority position. Its clear advantage of denoting gender is outweighed by the opinion of most linguists and epigraphists that considers it to be arbitrary. Thus the omission of accent and aspiration in non-Greek names has become a way of indicating the fact that they are of non-Greek origin. This principle is generally accepted in most modern epigraphical publications and is now adopted here, where the application of accents to Carian, Lycian, Pisidian, and Cilician names seems especially inappropriate. In this respect the line adopted in LGPN I.A, briefly enunciated on p. xvi to follow Fraser's approach in LGPN IV, has been abandoned in the light of criticism by reviewers and our own advisors.

Application of this new policy is not without its own difficulties. Foremost among these is the requirement to make a judgement whether a particular name or group of names should be regarded as Greek or not. In the vast majority of cases this is clear enough, but there are some where it is far from certain. A good example is the family of names based on the element Μονο-, of which Μονος is by far the most common. Although included under the heading of Μονο-, of uncertain meaning, by Fick and Bechtel in 1894, their later omission in 1917 by Bechtel from his Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen leads to the assumption that he came to consider them to be non-Greek: L. Zgusta, in his Kleinasiatische Personennamen of 1964, was inclined to treat them as indigenous; in spite of their Greek appearance, he could not find a satisfactory explanation for them in this way. However, in the 'Nachtrag' at the end of his book, he...
changed his mind, largely out of deference to the authority of L. Robert who had declared them to be of Greek character (‘manifestement ionien d’Asie’), apparently on the strength of their distribution in western Asia Minor, but without any linguistic support.17 W. Blümel tacitly reassessed their non-Greek character by their inclusion in his list of indigenous personal names attested in Greek inscriptions from Caria.18 A. Morpurgo Davies, when pressed for an opinion, agreed that ‘they behave like a cluster of Greek abbreviated names with the expected suffixes and the frequent expressive gemination,’ but found no convincing Greek etymology. Recently J. Curbera has reviewed the question, emphasizing once again their distribution in the Greek cities of Ionia and Caria and arriving at the tentative conclusion that they are affectionate ‘nursery’ names originating in Greek popular vocabulary, deriving from a word unattested in written sources.19 It has been decided to treat them here as Greek, above all on the basis of the concentration of these names in southern Ionia and western Caria and adjacent regions, which had been the decisive factor for Robert.

A situation of a slightly different kind is presented by names based on a similar element in both Greek and non-Greek languages, well exemplified by the names in Κιλ- or Κλα- ‘grey’, which coexist with names of similar or identical appearance (e.g. Κιλλής, Κώδης, Κήλλης, Κληλής as well as compounds like Κολλήραμας, Κολλήριος, Κολλήρης in indigenous settings in southern Asia Minor. In judging how a particular instance of names such as these should be treated, the primary criteria have to be those of location and context. But the difficulty remains to distinguish between a genuine indigenous name form and one that was assimilated to an identical Greek name to which accent and, where necessary, aspiration may reasonably be applied.

In situations where a Greek etymology is possible but the name is otherwise unknown and the context prevailing in Asia Minor, it has more often been decided to regard them as non-Greek. In a few cases a name composed of the same string of letters is divided between a genuine indigenous name and an unaccented indigenous name, a good example being Καμάς and Καμης, which Robert distinguished as separate forms purely on the grounds of distribution and context.20 Of a similar kind is the distinction between the Latin name Maris and the Μερος of Asia Minor, and perhaps even a Greek name Μαρία derived from the word for ‘frenzy’ or ‘passion’. Such distinctions are fraught with uncertainties and involve a degree of subjective judgement.

Although there is general consensus concerning the principle not to accentuate non-Greek personal names, a number of exceptions are allowed, though by no means uniformly: Some scholars, Zgusta for example, would allow the accentuation of non-Greek names where there is a manuscript tradition in literary texts (e.g. Μαύσωλος, Πρόξες, Πυρρή, Υμημπάς, Σάκκωνες, Παρκοδικτυατος), while others, such as Brixhe and Dubois, are happy to make a similar exception for non-Greek names with a Greek or hellenized suffix (e.g. -ες, -χρη, -ώς, -αντος). However, it was decided not to alter the principle in any of these cases, with the single exception of those names with the hellenized Latin termination -άντος। Where a manuscript tradition for the accentuation of a name exists, this has been recorded in the final brackets (e.g. Μαύσωλος—μαυσωλος).

An important category are the so-called Lullnamen (affectionate baby names), favoured particularly for women. The difficulty with these names is that they cannot be seen as particular to any one region. Because of their basic simplicity (mostly composed of one word or two syllables, with repeated consonantal elements, e.g. Αμμίας, Ασίας, Αστας, Ακτις, Αμμοθης, Αμμιας, Αμμίας, Αμίας, Βρύας) and lack of inherent meaning in any language, they appear in similar or identical forms in many regions with differing language traditions, deriving from the vernacular vocabulary of the household and family, poorly documented in the written sources.21 Although they have a wide distribution within Greek-speaking areas, it is highly variable in terms of quantity. Even if terms such as these were more widely used in informal contexts, they rarely figure in official nomenclature in the ‘core’ areas of the Greek world.22 They are far more popular in what might be termed as ‘peripheral’ regions where non-Greek populations were hellenized at least to the extent of using Greek for their official records and commemorations. So they are extremely scarce in most of mainland Greece and the Aegean islands, Magna Graecia and Sicily, rather more frequent in Illyria, Epirus, and peripheral parts of Macedonia, but very numerous in Thrace and the areas bordering the north Black Sea coast. However, they are found on a much larger scale in Asia Minor than anywhere else, where they feature in much greater numbers in inland regions such as Brithynia, Lydia (which provide the greater proportion of those recorded in LGPN VA), inland Caria (from Stratonikeia eastwards), and Phrygia, as well as in those like Lycia and Cilicia where indigenous traditions survived, than in the centres of Greek polis culture such as Ephesos, Miletos, or Smyrna.23 This pattern can be correlated to the long tradition of usage of such names among the indigenous peoples of the Anatolian language group, dating back at least to the second millennium in Hittite and Luwian, and it is on these grounds that they are treated as non-Greek.24

Besides the non-Greek personal names originating in the languages spoken in Asia Minor in the first millennium BC, Iranian and Semitic names also figure in some of the regions treated here. Rather confusingly, they are treated differently

17 KP pp. 693–4; Nonn indices p. 226 with the long n. 6 documenting their distribution.
20 Bechtel, HP p. 494; Robert, Nonn indices pp. 400–1 n. 4.
21 See Curbera’s remarks in Hellenica VI p. 90 and in Nonn indices pp. 348 and 368 with n. 3.
22 Elements in vernacular Greek (cf. ΛΥΥ και διαλεκτικά, ομας, ἑττα, ἀσία, ἀκτή, ἀμμός, ἀκτής, μερις, ραχή, κεντροκεντρος, κέντρος, κέντρον, τόκος) might justify their being considered as Greek in these contexts.
23 A certain bias may exist in regions such as Lydia and Lycia where women are far better attested in itineraire memorials which often name members of the extended family.
by convention as far as accentuation is concerned, though it is
hard to find a clear justification for the practice. Accordingly,
all names of Iranian origin attested in Greek literary sources
preserve accent and aspiration to conform with the prevail-
ing usage of Iranist scholars; it would perhaps be strange to
see a name such as Μαγκόνης, so familiar in Greek, without
its accent. Those names for which no such manuscript tradition
survives are left without accent. Much the same rule applies
to the Semitic names. All those familiar in biblical texts, indeclinable names included, retain their accent, while
the remainder are left unaccented, even when just a matter
of variation in orthography (e.g. Ταχύβιος, Ταχύνῳ).

In the Introduction to LGPN VA (pp. xv–xvii), attention
was drawn to the interaction between indigenous nomenclature
and Greek language in hellenized or partly hellenized
communities in Asia Minor. Examples, such as Σπρίντος and
Ὀβριμός, were adduced to illustrate the contamination of
two or more Greek names derived from one or other of the Anatol-
ian languages through assimilation with names familiar to a
Greek ear. This onomastic phenomenon is particularly pro-
nounced in Lydus, Pamphylia, and Cilicia.235

The fundamental guide to the indigenous names of Asia Minor
is L. Zagula’s Kleinaisätische Personennamen (Prague,
1964), with his supplementary Neue Beiträge zur kleinais-
atischen Anthroponymie (Prague, 1970). For practical reasons
reference to these works is made only in exceptional cases
to avoid repetitious citations for each and every occurrence
of an indigenous name, some of which are attested in great
numbers. The reader should nevertheless refer to these works in
exceptional cases.236 Names in -ιανός (1) and
-ιανός (2), (such as the
Ταυρινιανός (Prague, 1970). For practical reasons
reference to these works is made only in exceptional cases
of an indigenous name, some of which are attested in great
names ending in -ιανός,236 numerous in Pamphylia
and Cilicia Τραχεία but much less common in Caria, Lycia,
and Cilicia Pedias. This uneven distribution pattern, which
applies mutatis mutandis to all of Asia Minor, has yet to find a
satisfactory explanation. Nor is it much easier to understand
the meaning of this Roman type of name, originally used to
signify adoption but which over time diversified so that cir-
stances other than adoption for the giving of such a name clearly
came to predominate in the long term. It has long been recognized that in the Imperial period
the suffix -ιανός was attached to personal names (Latin,
Greek, indigenous) to denote the father’s or, less frequently,
the mother’s name. This is corroborated by the numerous
instances where the father’s name is known; for example in
the case of two brothers with the name Μάρκος (1–2)
from Attalia in Pamphylia, whose father was called Μάρκος
(2). A variant of this practice is to bestow such a name on just
one of two sons, presumably the younger, as in the case of

Statistics
This fascicle contains a total of 44,748 attestations of per-
sonal names, but, as was noted in LGPN VA (p. xvi), this
figure cannot be equated with the total of individuals when
account is taken of the many people who bore more than one
name, either as nicknames (Spitznamen) or supercognit,
double names as well as occasional longer combinations of
names; the frequent combination of names with the suffix
-ιανός with other names has already been discussed (see
above). Of this total, 39,477 are masculine, 3,199 feminine;
72 cannot be assigned their gender. It is made up of 8,818
separate names, 6,606 masculine, 1,823 feminine, and 62 are
of uncertain gender, though it should again be emphasized
that some of these are no more than dialect variants or simple
shortenings of a ‘standard’ name form.239 A large proportion
of names is attested just once; 4,775 in all, of which 3,584
are masculine, 1,137 feminine, and 54 of uncertain gender;

235 For an analysis of some striking examples see C. Birks, ‘Étymologie
populaire et onomastique en pays bilingue’, RPh 1991, pp. 67–81; also see
this volume p. xxxi.

236 For names of this kind and their explanations see T. Corsten, ‘Names in
-ιανός in Asia Minor’, in Onomastique pp. 456–63, with references to
previous literature, and briefly in the Introduction to LGPN VA p. xv.


238 The discrepancy between the total number of names and the totalled
masculine, feminine, and uncertain names arises from the fact that males and
females may appear under a single name heading, undifferentiated by accent
(e.g. the various compounds in -ιανός) or, following the new convention for
non-Greek names followed in this fascicle, lacking an accent altogether.
and 7,689 names occur less than ten times (5,891 masculine, 1,736 feminine, and 62 of uncertain gender). By far the largest number of entries is derived from Caria (20,149—58%) reflecting both the size of the region, its early hellenization and adoption of the epigraphic habit, and the number of large cities within it. Lydia also makes a substantial contribution in terms of quantity (9,132—20%), while the other regions produce much smaller numbers (Pamphylia 2,981—7%, Cilicia 3,857—9%, Cilicia Pedias 2,480—6%, and 149 undifferentiated Cilicians), though these overall figures are in no way a measure of their relative importance as far as onomastics are concerned.

Among the masculine names, the commonest (taking into account dialectal variants and shortened forms) by a considerable margin are Ἀμμίας (977), Δομός (872), and Δημήτριος (793), the same three theophoric names which figured so prominently in LGPN V.A (pp. xvi-xviii). Other names deserving of mention for their frequency are Αρτέμις (411), Τάτα (389), Δάκω (338), Μένος (326), Μένιος (294) Ἑρμίας (282), Τάτα (277), δέκατος (271), Σίφω (264) Θεόδορος (232) Ερμίας / Ερμίδας (210), and Ερμίας (202). Although theophoric names continue to be a significant element in the onomastic repertoire, they are not so dominant in quantitative terms as was observed for the regions covered in LGPN V.A. Personal names derived from rivers, which figured prominently in V.A, are virtually confined to those relating to the Maeandros and Stratonikeia likewise encompasses both city and its surroundings as well as the ‘highlands’ (the hautes terres) to its south and south-east. The East refers to the cities east of the Harpasos valley and south of the Maeanander, including Aphrodisias and the plateau of Tabai.

Greek names predominate everywhere and only in Eastern Caria do they form less than 80% of the overall repertoire of names or 90% of the named individuals on record. Not surprisingly the coastal regions, notably Miletos and Knidos, appear as the most thoroughly hellenized in onomastic terms, the proportion of Greek names becoming progressively smaller the further the distance from the sea. Theophoric names are a significant component, making up a little more or less than 15% of the repertoire in all the subregions, though in the case of Kaunos it is as high as 24%. Likewise, the numbers of individuals bearing such names make up around 30% of the total in most of the subregions, the exceptions are Kaunos and the North with 36%, and Knidos with only 22%, perhaps to be explained by its Dorian heritage which differentiates it from the rest of Caria. More significant differences are to be found among the figures relating to the non-Greek names. Indigenous names, especially those of clear Carian identity, are most numerous in the area around Mylasa and in the Coastal region, with a slightly lower concentration around Stratonicea. They are much less numerous in the North, and almost entirely absent from Miletos, Knidos, and Kaunos.

For the purposes of analysing onomastic differences within Caria, it has been divided into eight subregions which may be justified and defined as follows. Miletos with neighbouring Myous, as the only Ionian cities in Caria, stand together, before the Coastal group, comprising the cities from Iasos in the north to Kalipolis at the head of the Gulf of Kerasmos. Both Knidos and Kaunos are treated separately from the other coastal cities on account of their geographic isolation by land, if not by sea. The North covers the cities of the Maeanander valley and its mountainous southern fringe (including Herakleia under Latmos), together with the major tributary river valleys of the Mysars and Harpasos. Mylasa includes not only the city and its surrounding plain but the small cities to its south, west, and north-west (e.g. Kildara and Euromos), and Stratonicea likewise encompasses both city and its surroundings as well as the ‘highlands’ (the hautes terres) to its south and south-east. The East refers to the cities east of the Harpasos valley and south of the Maeanander, including Aphrodisias and the plateau of Tabai.
in a different direction, towards Phrygia and Pisidia, a pattern that is matched by the substantial number of Lallnamen encountered here, which, apart from the region of Stratonikeia and the upper Maeander valley, are very scarce in the rest of Caria.

Names of Italian origin are widespread but apparently concentrated in the Maeander valley (Miletos included) and in the cities of Eastern Caria, many of which were foundations of the Imperial period or had their floruit in later antiquity. Semitic (predominantly Jewish) names are rare throughout and their apparent frequency in the East is based on a single inscription from Aphrodisias of Late Antiquity containing some thirty-eight Jewish names. Iranian names are equally scarce, with slightly higher figures in the Maeander valley and in Eastern Caria, perhaps areas where there had been a significant Achaemenid presence in the Classical period, and certainly closer to the centres of the Persian administration at Sardis and Kelainai.

Figures for the commonest names throw up wider differences between each of the eight subregions and the popularity of epichoric names confined to specific parts of Caria, as well as names that have a wider distribution within Caria but are uncommon elsewhere. Thus the rare Ἱεροκλῆς is the commonest male name at Kaunos, while the uncommon Ἀρταπάτης and names compounded in Εκαμύης are frequent at Knidos but nowhere else in Caria, illustrations of the rather different onomastic repertoires of these two isolated cities. Χρυσάωρ is a name closely linked with local mythology, is found almost exclusively in the region of Stratonikeia. Names based on the obscure element Μῦς are common at Miletos, with smaller numbers scattered in other parts of western Caria and Ionia. For reasons that elude us, names derived from ἤδεις ('snake') are very common in much of western Caria, but not frequent elsewhere. The same is true of two other names. Σπίρτουρ is very numerous in many of the subregions and one of the most abundantly attested names at Mylasa, but unknown in most parts of the Greek world. Ἱεροκλῆς has a much wider general distribution but is exceptionally well represented in much of western Caria, especially in the coastal cities and around Stratonikeia. Several names which are ostensibly Greek apparently owed their popularity in parts of Caria to their assimilation with indigenous names which they closely resembled; thus Οὐλιάτος, a common name in western Caria, especially around Mylasa and Stratonikeia, has been linked with the indigenous Οὐλίαδης. The group of names, Μῦς, Μυων, and Μυωνίδης, likewise common in various parts of the region, has been associated with an indigenous component (μυω- 'snake') found in names such as Ευμυων and Παμυωνίδης. Miletos’ rich assemblage of theophoric names, especially those derived from Meter and Poseidon, bind it closely to naming patterns in Ionia. For reasons that elude us, names derived from Παμυης (‘snake’) are very common in much of western Caria, but not frequent elsewhere.

Although the onomastic repertoire of Lycia, at the south-eastern margins of the hellenized Aegean world, is predominantly Greek, it is also distinguished by a relatively high proportion of indigenous names (486 names—21%, 1,571 individuals—17% for all periods). In that sense, Lycia is comparable to Pamphylia and Cilicia. But it is also evident that the indigenous background. They are certainly more numerous here than in the hellenized parts of western Caria. Italian names are distributed fairly evenly throughout Lycia. But in terms of the penetration of Italian onomastics, Lycia is perhaps more closely comparable to Caria than to Pamphylia and Cilicia. Lycia also has a slightly higher proportion of Iranian names than the other regions. Some Iranian names (Ἰάσων, perhaps Αγίων and Ζαφών) may suggest resistance by some local dynasts to the increasingly hellenizing context of the fifth and fourth centuries bc. Others (such as Ἰορνάτης at Xanthos) indicate that Persian onomastic traditions persisted in some elite families after the Macedonian conquest. Nevertheless Iranian names account for less than 1% of the individuals on record in most of its cities.

However, differences in the geographical distribution of indigenous names across Lycia are evident. The figures in Table 1 show how the overall proportion of indigenous names steadily increases between western and eastern Lycia. Thus the Gulf of Fethiye is proportionately less 'indigenous' (6%) than the Xanthos valley (12%) and Central Lycia (19%), and in turn these two subregions are less 'indigenous' than Eastern Lycia (25%). 7% of individuals at Telmessos have indigenous names, 14% at Xanthos, and 44% at Trebenna. Variations can occur in the number of indigenous names recorded in a single subregion. In the Xanthos valley, coastal Patara (6%) and Sidyma (6%) have a lower percentage of people with indigenous names than Xanthos (14%), and the inland communities of Kadyanda (11%) and Tlos (13%). In eastern Lycia, Phaselis (12%) and Olympos (11%) on the Pamphylian Gulf exhibit much lower proportions of indigenous names than their neighbours at Rhodiapolis (28%), Arykanda (30%), Idbessos (49%), and Trebenna (44%), in all of which well in excess of 25% of the individuals recorded bear indigenous names. In the cities
of the mountainous part of eastern Lycia, the frequency of indigenous names seems to match patterns attested in other isolated inland regions, such as the Kabalas and Milyas or Cilicia Tracheia. But even if those recorded in north-eastern Lycia (i.e. from Arykanda to Trebenna) are excluded from the Lycian onomastic dossier, the percentage of individuals with indigenous names remains significant (14%).

Tables 4 and 5 further illustrate gender differences in the adoption of indigenous names and Lallnamen, as well as geographical variations between the subregions of Lycia. Greek names such as Αμμια, Αντέπατρος, Ζήνων, and Μεις provide a clear link between the Gulf of Fethiye and the neighbouring Carian city of Kaunos. As already remarked, indigenous names (e.g. Αρτειμας, Ερμαης, Ερμακοτας, Καύμη, Κριτας, Ερμαπιας, Ερμαης) and Lallnamen (e.g. Αμμια, Αντέπατρος, Ζήνων, Μεις, Αμμιας) are more frequently applied to women than to men. None of the Lallnamen figures among the commonest names in Lycia. Both tables concur in marking the progressively greater use of indigenous onomastics from west to east (excepting Olympos and Phaselis). Indigenous names are not represented among the commonest names in the Gulf of Fethiye or in the Xanthos valley. Two indigenous names, derived from the Hittite–Luvian divinity Άρτης and Ερμιας, are common in central Lycia. Μεις, Τροκονδας, Λαλλας, as well as Άγρεοφών and Ραμπής are characteristic of the repertoire of the mountainous north-eastern part of Lycia, bordering on Pisidia, further corroborating the close cultural connections between the two regions, and between north-eastern Lycia and Termessos in particular. The influence of indigenous onomastic roots accounts for the popularity of the mountainous hinterland of Pamphylia, in the Greek-speaking populations of its cities. The very low figures for the Lallnamen (names—2%, records—1%) is in marked contrast to those found in neighbouring Cilicia Tracheia and, to a lesser degree, in Lycia, and are more closely comparable to the figures for the western parts of Caria. In this case, the bias introduced by chronological factors does not explain the widespread pattern, since the proportions of Lallnamen in Hellenistic Aspendos closely matches those present in the onomastic stock of the three other cities.

Cilicia

It has already been remarked that one of the reasons for separating Cilicia into two parts is the clear distinctiveness of the onomastics of the two regions. When compared with the other regions of coastal Asia Minor, both share low figures for Greek names, but in other respects there is little in common between them.

The most obvious feature that emerges from the figures for Cilicia Tracheia is the extremely high numbers of indigenous names (30%), matched with a slightly lower proportion of individual records (22%), which corresponds to the fact that many name forms are recorded only once. If the wide range of Lallnamen (9%), many of distinctive Luwian origin, and their many bearers (10%) are added, almost 40% of the onomastic repertoire is made up of indigenous ‘Cilician’ names, while about a third (32%) of individuals were named according to local traditions. With the addition of the Italian and Semitic names, Cilicia Tracheia presents itself as a region in which Greek names were actually in the minority (46%), though in terms of individual records there is approximate parity (51% Greek, 49% non-Greek). The surprisingly high number of people with Semitic names reflects a bias introduced by the large corpus of names from the necropolis of Korkyros, dating approximately from the fourth to sixth centuries BC. By contrast, in Cilicia Pedias the main points of interest are the very high numbers of Italian names (names—23%, records—27%) and the comparatively low figures for indigenous names (names—8%, records—8%), as well as for the Lallnamen (names—3%, records—2%). The proportion of Italian names is greater than in any of the other regions covered so far in LGPN V, with the possible exception of Pamphylia (above). Although Greek names are more common than in Tracheia, they nevertheless occur on a much reduced scale (64% names, 63% individual records). It is also significant how few Semitic names (names—2%, records—1%) occur in a region that borders on Syria and which at various times

---

190 Most of the occurrences of those names come from a single document from Hippiokome (TeM II 1:168 with R. van Bremen (n. 131) pp. 154–73). As further instances of the onomastics common to the Caro-Lycian border, see the distribution of the names Θηρωνίδης and Θηρωνίδης.

191 See Bruhns (n. 179) pp. 77–9.
in its history was oriented more in that direction. The high proportion of Italian names may to some extent reflect the overwhelming preponderance of evidence dating from the Augustan period onwards (more than 80%), but this cannot explain the contrast with Cilicia Tracheia where an even larger proportion (more than 85%) of the material belongs to the Imperial and early Byzantine periods. Although the settlement of Latin-speakers in the region cannot be excluded, the explanation for the adoption of Roman names should perhaps be sought in the same impulse to identify with the ruling power that had in the early Hellenistic period promoted the rapid adoption of Greek names. This is especially likely in the cities founded in the early Imperial period in the inner parts of Cilicia Pedias. Such a tendency can only have been reinforced by the region’s key position as a staging post for the movement of Roman forces to and from the eastern frontier, as a base for their winter quarters and for their supply and provisioning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Greek Theophoric</th>
<th>Indigenous Lallnamen</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Semitic</th>
<th>Iranian</th>
<th>Other**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caria*</td>
<td>4543</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26149</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletos</td>
<td>2177</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7227</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4821</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaunos</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>655</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylasa</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratonicia</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2889</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3891</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycia</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9132</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Fethiye</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>701</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthos Valley</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3549</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lycia</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2196</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Lycia</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2467</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaselis</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2981</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaleia</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspendos</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perge</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>620</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>386</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachia</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3857</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedias</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* this category, which only concerns Greek theophoric names, is a subset of the Greek names.
** included in this category are names of Celtic, Illyrian, Phrygian and Thracian origin.
*** the total for Caria includes 208 individuals who cannot be assigned to one of the sub-regions; some of these are attested as plain 'Carians'; others come from cities/towns in Caria whose location is unknown, and still others have ethnics that are incompletely preserved in the original source.
**** the total for Lycia includes 219 individuals who cannot be assigned to one of the sub-regions; some of these are attested as plain 'Lycians', others come from cities/towns in Lycia whose location is unknown, and still others have ethnics that are incompletely preserved in the original source. The figure for Eastern Lycia includes Phaselis, while the figure for Phaselis excludes the inhabitants of Phaselis’ dependent communities (e.g. Mnara).
Table 2. The commonest male names, in descending order, in the Carian sub-regions. The figures beside each heading record the total number of male names in each sub-region.

| Sub-region | Name 1 | Name 2 | Name 3 | Name 4 | Name 5 | Name 6 | Name 7 | Name 8 | Name 9 | Name 10 | Name 11 | Name 12 | Name 13 | Name 14 | Name 15 | Name 16 | Name 17 | Name 18 | Name 19 | Name 20 |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Knidos     | Διονύσιος | Λέων | Διονύσιος | Θεόδωρος | Χρήστος | Απόλλωνιος | Ευφράνωρ | Ιατροκλῆς | Θεότικος | Αριστέας | Αρέσκης | Τατιάνος | Ιατροκλῆς | Θεότικος | Αρτέμιδωρος | Ιατροκλῆς | Ηλίας | Ευστάθιος |
| North      | Διονύσιος | Θεότικος | Διονύσιος | Υψικλῆς | Πολίτης | Ιατροκλῆς | Ευφράνωρ | Διοκλῆς | Υψικλῆς | Διοκλῆς | Τατιάνος | Δεξιφάνης | Διοκλῆς | Διοκλῆς | Δεξιφάνης | Διοκλῆς | Δεξιφάνης | Δεξιφάνης |
| Mylasa     | Διονύσιος | Θεότικος | Διονύσιος | Υψικλῆς | Πολίτης | Ιατροκλῆς | Ευφράνωρ | Διοκλῆς | Υψικλῆς | Διοκλῆς | Τατιάνος | Δεξιφάνης | Διοκλῆς | Διοκλῆς | Δεξιφάνης | Διοκλῆς | Δεξιφάνης | Δεξιφάνης |
| East       | Διονύσιος | Θεότικος | Διονύσιος | Υψικλῆς | Πολίτης | Ιατροκλῆς | Ευφράνωρ | Διοκλῆς | Υψικλῆς | Διοκλῆς | Τατιάνος | Δεξιφάνης | Διοκλῆς | Διοκλῆς | Δεξιφάνης | Διοκλῆς | Δεξιφάνης | Δεξιφάνης |
### Table 3

The commonest female names, in descending order, in the Carian sub-regions. The figures beside each heading record the total number of female names in each sub-region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Female Names</th>
<th>Coastal</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Miletos</th>
<th>Mylasa</th>
<th>Knidos</th>
<th>Kaunos</th>
<th>Stratonikeia</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miletos</strong></td>
<td>Ζωσίμη</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Τύχη</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Εφεσία</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Μηνία</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Δημηνία</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αφφια</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αμμια</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knidos</strong></td>
<td>Ζωσίμη</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Τύχη</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Δημηνία</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αφφια</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaunos</strong></td>
<td>Ζωσίμη</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ηδεῖα</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North</strong></td>
<td>Ζωσίμη</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ήδεῖα</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mylasa</strong></td>
<td>Ζωσίμη</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ήδεῖα</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stratonikeia</strong></td>
<td>Ζωσίμη</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ήδεῖα</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αφφια</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td>Ζωσίμη</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ήδεῖα</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αφφια</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αμμια</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

The commonest male names, in descending order, in Lycia and its sub-regions. The figures beside each heading record the total number of female names in each sub-region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Male Names</th>
<th>Lycia 7,569</th>
<th>Gulf of Fethiye 613</th>
<th>Xanthos Valley 3,072</th>
<th>Central Lycia 1,815</th>
<th>Eastern Lycia 1,879</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lycia</strong></td>
<td>Δημήτριος</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αντίπατρος</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Δημηνία</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Τάκας</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gulf of Fethiye</strong></td>
<td>Ανδρέας</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ηλιόδωρος</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Τροκονδας</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Xanthos Valley</strong></td>
<td>Τληπόλεμος</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Πτολεμαῖος</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Lycia</strong></td>
<td>Θηρωνίδης</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ανθινάξας</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Δημηνία</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Διοτίμος</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αρτεμία</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Lycia</strong></td>
<td>Θηρωνίδης</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. The commonest female names, in descending order, in Lycia and its sub-regions. The figures beside each heading record the total number of female names in each sub-region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lycia</th>
<th>Gulf of Fethiye</th>
<th>Xanthos Valley</th>
<th>Central Lycia</th>
<th>Eastern Lycia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Αρσασίς</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Αμμα</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Αρσασίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλα</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ζωσίμη</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Αρσασίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρτεμις</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Ελπίς</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Αρσασίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νανη</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Αρσασίς</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Πτολεμαίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ζωσίμη</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ελπίς</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Άρτεμις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ελπίς</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Άρτεμις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ελπίς</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Αρσασίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρσασίς</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Νανις</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Νανη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμμα</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Χρέστος</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ελπίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμμα</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Κατα</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμμα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ηλένη</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ελπίς</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Φράκτα</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Λας/Λης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ελπίς</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ρύθμιξα</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ελπίς</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Τυχη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ξωσίμη</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Τυχη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Τυχη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Τυχη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Τυχη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Τυχη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Τυχη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Τυχη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Τυχη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμαστα</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ευτυχία</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Αφφιον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>