

INTRODUCTION*

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 hellenization¹ 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 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 were 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 affinities with Arcadian and Cypriot dialects, suggesting that it may be derived from Greek-speakers who settled there at the end of the second millennium BC. In Cilicia several Greek cities were apparently established from East Greece in the Archaic period, in a region much more receptive to Oriental influences and perhaps pivotal in their transmission to the Greek world. But in spite of the early impact of Greek material culture and iconography and the clear hellenizing impact on receptive local elites, such as the Hekatomnid

dynasty in Caria, many aspects of indigenous culture were preserved, most conspicuous being the survival into the late fourth and early third centuries BC of written indigenous languages, such as Lycian and Carian. Sidetic (attested only at Side and in its environs in Pamphylia) continued as the language of official documents for perhaps a century longer. No written records in a Cilician language are extant and the personal names of Luwian origin may be the best evidence for its conjectured existence.

An important innovation of *LGPN* V.A was the inclusion of individuals bearing the Roman *tria nomina* in which the *cognomen* was Latin, a practice that has been continued here. Further innovations in this fascicle relate to the indigenous names and the attestation of personal names in the scripts of the Anatolian languages referred to above. Put briefly, the policy followed in all previous volumes of *LGPN* of accentuating non-Greek names which adhere to normal rules of Greek inflexion has been abandoned to conform to the current general practice of linguists and epigraphists which omits both accents and breathings. It has also been decided to incorporate the Greek personal names attested in the indigenous languages of the region. Thus we have included names such as 'ktais', from a Carian-language inscription, since it is simply the Carian phonetic rendering of the Greek name *Ἐκαταῖος*, and likewise 'tēnagure', from a coin with a legend in Lycian script, being the Lycian for the Greek name *Ἀθηναγόρας*. However, we have not thought it appropriate to go beyond this to include the non-Greek names attested in monolingual texts in the same languages even where their rendition in Greek is known from other sources. So, for example, the Carian name 'šarušoλ', which in several Greek texts is rendered as *Σαρυσσωλλος*, and the Lycian 'ija-mara', attested in Greek as *Ιαμαρας*, have not been included. See below pp. xxvii–xxix for fuller details concerning these two innovations.

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

* The editors acknowledge with gratitude the help and advice of Richard Ashton, Riet van Bremen, Robert Parker, John Penney, and Peter Thonemann in writing this Introduction.

Abbreviations used in addition to those found in the *Abbreviations of Sources Used* on pp. xxxix–lvi:

ANRW: Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt edd. G. Temporini and W. Haase (Berlin & New York, 1972–)

Balbours survey: J. J. Coulton *et al.*, *The Balbours survey and settlement in highland Southwest Anatolia*. 1, *Balbours and the history of highland settlement* (London, 2012)

Casabonne: O. Casabonne, *La Cilicie à l'époque achéménide* (Paris, 2004)

IACP: M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford, 2004)

Scheer, *Mythische Vorväter*: T. S. Scheer, *Mythische Vorväter. Zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte* (Munich, 1993)

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 *OCD*⁴ pp. 656–7.

(Plain Cilicia). In geographical terms Caria means the large block of land in south-west Asia Minor that joins up with the southern limits of Ionia and Lydia, the remainder of the southern coastal regions essentially comprising a rather narrow coastal strip to the south of the Taurus mountains from the Xanthos valley in the west to the Amanos mountain range that divides Asia Minor from Syria in the east; the only region falling within this defined space that has not been included here is Pisidia. The precise configuration of the contents was the subject of much discussion in the initial stages of work, especially regarding our definition of Lycia and the possible inclusion of Pisidia. Pisidia, a notoriously troublesome region, not only faces the sea on the south side of the Taurus mountains and could thus be better described as coastal than, for example, the cities on the plateau of Tabai in north-eastern Caria, but it was also receptive to hellenizing influences in its political and institutional organization, urban development, and general cultural identity from the second half of the fourth century at the latest.² In the event, the close cultural links between the Kabalis and Milyas with Pisidia made it desirable that they appear in the same volume, and practical reasons of time and scale meant they had to be reserved for Volume V.C.

Although this volume is very much the result of a joint effort by its four co-editors and their many collaborators, principal responsibility for its constituent regions is as follows: Caria—Catling and Marchand; Lycia—Balzat; Pamphylia and Cilicia Tracheia—Chiricat; Cilicia Pedias—Catling. No additions were made to its contents after the end of December 2012.

Each of the regions covered in this fascicle is described in what follows, particular attention being given to the reasons for their definition, in full awareness that, depending on the period in question, the borders could have been drawn differently.

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 *Peraia* (essentially the cities of the Chersonesos incorporated at an early date in the Rhodian state) whose inhabitants were included as citizens of Rhodes in *LGPN* I (see Introduction p. xii). 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-Seleukeia, Nysa, Mastaura, and Anineta), sometimes treated in modern scholarship as part of Lydia. On this northern side, Caria extends roughly 130km 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. Attouda and Trap-

ezopolis), 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 50km to the headwaters of the Indos, separating it from the Kibyrtis and Lycia.

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 Maeander 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 Iasos 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 Marsyas.³ 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.⁴ 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 Diocletian 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.⁵ A few of the coastal cities are Greek in all their essentials from an early date: Ionian Miletos, of course, probably from the Late Bronze Age, Dorian

² Peter Fraser's summary, quoted in *LGPN* V.A (p. xi, n. 12), allowed for the inclusion of Pisidia as part of the coastal zone. See also M. Waelkens and L. Vandeput, 'Regionalism in Hellenistic and Roman Pisidia', in *Regionalism in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, edd. H. Elton and G. Reger (Bordeaux, 2007) pp. 97–105; K. Vandorpe and M. Waelkens, 'Protecting Sagalassos' Fortress of the Akra. Two Large Fragments of an early Hellenistic Inscription', *Ancient Society* 37 (2007) pp. 121–39 (*SEG* LVII 1409).

³ 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 Sekköy (*Hautes terres de Carie* nos. 90–1), dated to 354/3 BC; see P. Debord, 'Cité grecque – village carien', *Studi ellenistici* 15 (2003) pp. 118–25.

⁴ See Robert's comments in *Études anatoliennes* pp. 336–9 and in *La Carie* II pp. 18–19, 21–2, 72–9, 378–9.

⁵ 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.

Knidos,⁶ 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.⁷ 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 Mausolos' 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, Stratonikeia, Antiocheia on the Maeander, Laodikeia), some of them formed, 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 their neighbours continued the trend in the second century. However, although many of the small *poleis* recorded in the fifth-century *aparchai* 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 Chersonesos as far as Kedraei and Physkos into the so-called 'integrated *Peraia*', perhaps some time after 304 BC, and subsequently controlling large parts of southern (especially the highlands between the Ceramic Gulf and the plain of Stratonikeia) and central Caria as part of the so-called 'subject *Peraia*' from the third century BC into the early Imperial period.⁸ 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 *Ῥόδιοι* who are attested in some numbers in the subject *Peraia* were Rhodian settlers or members of local elites who had acquired Rhodian citizenship; those known before 1987 were included as Rhodians in *LGN I*.⁹

The study of the ancient historical topography of Caria has occupied scholars for many years, beginning with the travel-

lers of the first half of the nineteenth century, and a subject of particular and recurring interest to Louis Robert.¹⁰ 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 Halikarnassos, which have yielded finds no earlier than the Imperial and Early Byzantine periods, have been treated tentatively as lying within Halikarnassian territory. Equally troublesome are the handful of inscriptions found in an area south-east of Bargylia, which, if not *pierres errantes*, 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 Myous in Caria rather than Ionia, where they belong more naturally on cultural grounds, have been set out in the Introduction (p. xiii) to *LGN 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 Kazıklı, bordering on the territory of Iasos; a settlement of Imperial date around modern Kazıklı İskele, 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 Aigiale on Amorgos, attested no earlier than

⁶ Knidos is better conceived of as an island like Kos, given the topography of the Knidian peninsula which isolated it culturally from the rest of Caria, being barely more than 1 km wide at its narrowest point.

⁷ Halikarnassos is a curious case of a city which traced a Doric lineage from its founding city, Troizen, was a founding member of the *Hellenion* at Naukratis in the early 6th cent. and originally one of the Doric *hexapolis*, and yet all its early inscriptions are not only in Ionic dialect but reveal a thoroughly mixed population of Greeks and Carians, as well perhaps as Persians.

⁸ See P. M. Fraser and G. E. Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea* (Oxford, 1954); G. Reger, 'The Relations between Rhodes and Caria from 246 to 167 BC', in *Hellenistic Rhodes. Politics, Culture, and Society*, ed. V. Gabrielsen (*Studies in Hellenistic Civilization*, 9. Aarhus, 1999) pp. 76–97; A. Bresson, 'Les intérêts rhodiens en Carie à l'époque hellénistique', in *L'Orient méditerranéen de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée. Cités et royaumes à l'époque hellénistique*, ed. F. Prost (Rennes, 2003) pp. 169–92; R. van Bremen, 'Networks of Rhodians in Karia', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22 (2007) pp. 113–31. For the date of the annexation of the incorporated *Peraia*

see N. Badoud, 'L'intégration de la Pérée au territoire de Rhodes', in *Philologos Dionysios. Mélanges offerts au professeur Denis Knoepfler*, ed. N. Badoud (Geneva, 2011) pp. 533–65.

⁹ For a well-balanced discussion of the problem see H.-U. Wiemer, 'Structure and Development of the Rhodian Peraia: Evidence and Models', in *Hellenistic Karia* pp. 427–35.

¹⁰ Of his four projected volumes entitled *La Carie*, only the second on the plateau of Tabai and its surroundings was published, although he did also publish separate corpora of the inscriptions of Amyzon and Sinuri in western Caria.

¹¹ See W. Blümel, 'Zu den Inschriften von Bargylia und Umgebung', *Epigr. Anat.* 44 (2011) pp. 126–7.

¹² See *LACP* pp. 1082–3.

¹³ In the past Teichoussa, 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 Akbuk occupied in the Archaic period: for older views see G. E. Bean and J. M. Cook, 'The Carian Coast III', *BSA* 52 (1957) pp. 106–16; for more recent work with revised conclusions see H. Lohmann, *Ein Survey bei Kazıklı (Muğla)* (Möhnesee, 2005).

the second century AD, have already been entered in *LGPN I* under the heading of 'Aigiale (Milesioi)'.

Miletos is a rare case where an official list of its eponymous magistrates, the *stephanephoroi*, 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.¹⁴ Likewise, the six-year upward dating of the fragmentary third list (*Milet I* (3) 124) proposed by Wörrle and supported further by Errington has been imposed.¹⁵ Although it is generally the policy of *LGPN* not to record the tenure of public offices for individuals, an exception is made for the Milesian *stephanephoroi*, on account of their relatively complete documentation and importance for local chronology.¹⁶ This office has also been recorded for its attested holders at Iasos (see below), as well as at Latmos-Herakleia, where part of a systematic list is preserved (*OGIS* 459),¹⁷ and several other Carian cities (e.g. Amyzon).

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.¹⁸

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 *stephanephoroi* are known from the later 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.¹⁹ Although there are 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 honorific 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.

Mylasa

The large dossier of inscriptions recording the sale and lease of property by various bodies at Mylasa (the city, tribes, and *syngeneai*) 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 Fethiye 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 Kabalis 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 Oinoanda) and Elmalı (the heartland of the Milyas, both 1300–1500 m. asl), effectively isolated from the coast by the high mountain chain of the

¹⁴ Rehm's chronology in *Milet I* (3) pp. 117–29; Cavaignac's revisions in *Revue des études historiques* 90 (1924) pp. 311–14, restated by Rhodes in *ZPE* 157 (2006) p. 116; see also *Milet VI* (1) p. 166.

¹⁵ Wörrle in *Chiron* 18 (1988) pp. 431–7; Errington in *Chiron* 19 (1989) pp. 285–8; see also *Milet VI* (1) pp. 166–7.

¹⁶ Other exceptions have previously been made for the eponymous Athenian archons, the federal archons of the Boiotian League, the local archons of the Boiotian cities, and the *strategoï* of the Thessalian League.

¹⁷ See further M. Wörrle, 'Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos II. Das Priestertum der Athena Latmia', *Chiron* 20 (1990) pp. 27–9.

¹⁸ See T. Vestergaard, 'Milesian Immigrants in Late Hellenistic and Roman Athens', in *The Epigraphy of Death*, ed. G. Oliver (Liverpool, 2000) pp. 81–109.

¹⁹ These choregic texts appear as *Iasos* 160–215 with important additions and revisions made by C. V. Crowther in *The Greek Theatre and Festivals*, ed. P. Wilson (Oxford, 2007) pp. 294–334 (*SEG* LVII 1092–4); further additions to the dossier were simultaneously published by G. Maddoli in 'Epigrafi di Iasos. Nuovi supplementi' (*Pdelp* 62 [2007]) pp. 353–61 nos. 27.1–3 (*SEG* LVII 1088–90), adding to others published in *Pdelp* 56 (2000–1) pp. 23–32

nos. B.1–3 (*SEG* LII 1044–6).

²⁰ *IMylasa* 200–32; 801–54; 904–6; *Sinuri* 46–72; *SEG* XLII 999–1001; XLV 1538–54; LIV 1094–7; LVII 1101–2.

²¹ R. Descat and I. Pernin, 'Notes sur la chronologie et l'histoire des baux de Mylasa', *Studi ellenistici* 20 (2008) pp. 285–314, building on R. Ashton and G. Reger, 'The Pseudo-Rhodian Drachms of Mylasa Revisited', in *Agoranomia. Studies in Money and Exchange presented to John H. Kroll*, ed. P. van Alfen (New York, 2006) pp. 125–50.

²² For the ancient toponymy of Lycia the standard authorities are *TIB* 8 and *Stadiasmus*.

²³ For pre-Classical Lycia see Bryce, *Lycians* pp. 1–41 and I. Yakubovich, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian language* (Leiden & Boston, 2010) pp. 126–40.

²⁴ See *IACP* pp. 1140–1.

²⁵ Evidence for early Lycian northerly expansion is so far documented by a single Lycian text and Lycian tombs: K. A. Gay and T. Corsten, 'Lycian Tombs in the Kibyrtis and the Extent of Lycian Culture', *Anat. Stud.* 56 (2006) pp. 47–60 and *Balboura survey* pp. 55–8.

²⁶ *Balboura survey* p. 10.

modern Bey Dağları, Ak Dağları, and Boncuk Dağları, reaching 3,070 m, 3,015 m, and 2,418 m respectively.²⁷ 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 Kabalis 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 Kibyra and the new foundations of Balboura and Termessos (ἡ πρὸς τοῖς Οἰνοάνδοις) in the Kabalis c.200 BC.²⁸

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 Kabalians in the second century BC progressively turned in their favour with the involvement of the Romans.²⁹ By the terms of the treaty between Rome and the Lycian League in 46 BC, the Elmalı plain, as far north as Choma, and Phaselis were ceded to Lycia but it did not yet extend to Boubon, Balboura, and Oinoanda.³⁰ 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 Kabalis and Milyas, including Balboura, Oinoanda, probably Boubon, and the Elmalı plain. From the early second century AD, civic elites from the Kabalis 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 Kabalis and Milyas will be included in Volume V.C, 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 homogeneous entity. It can be divided into sub-regions in which there is considerable variation in the distribution of onomastic features. In the west, Termessos 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.³¹ 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 prolif-

eration of small settlements in the rugged Phellos–Arneai–Myra triangle.³² 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 Gagai. Limyra is often counted as part of Central Lycia, while the other three have been identified as Rhodian 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.³³ The remaining communities of eastern Lycia are distributed on the coastal and inland flanks of a mountainous axis, orientated south–north and stretching from Cape Chelidonia to the Çandır valley. Some ancient traditions associated this region, through which Pisidians threatened Phaselis in the late fourth century BC (Arr., *An.* i 24. 6), with the Solymoi, a people closely linked at a later date with Pisidian Termessos.³⁴ North of Korydalla, the Pamphylian plain was accessible via an inland route through the Alakır and Çandır valleys, whose small communities (e.g. Kitanaura, Typallia, and Trebenna) 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.³⁵ These are conventionally dated to the fifth and fourth centuries BC and found in the main coastal centres from Termessos to Rhodiapolis. In addition, the coinage issued by local dynasts is a valuable source for personal names in Lycian.³⁶ From this epichoric material we have retained the few names that are

²⁷ For the identification of these chains with Masikytos, Kragos, and Antikragos respectively, see *Stadiasmus* pp. 97–9.

²⁸ *Balboura survey* pp. 61–7.

²⁹ The epigraphic material has been collected and commented on by D. Rousset, *De Lycie en Cabalide. La convention entre les Lyciens et Termessos près d'Oinoanda* (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, *Der lykische Bund. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung* (Bonn, 2000) pp. 107–8. The Customs Law of Asia shows that in 75 BC it was more closely aligned with the Pamphylian cities. The Lycian side of the Gulf of Antalya also played a role as a base for piratical activities during the early 1st cent. BC, Olympos being held by Zeniketes and Phaselis being involved in plundering activities along with the Cilicians (Olympos: Str. xiv 5. 7; Phaselis: Cic. *In Verr* II iv. 10. 21).

³¹ See Tietz, *Golf von Fethiye* pp. 107–15.

³² For Central Lycia see in general Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*.

³³ M. Adak, 'Die dorische und äolische Kolonisation des lykisch-pamphyliischen Grenzraumes im Lichte der Epigraphik und der historischen Geographie', in *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien* pp. 41–9.

³⁴ J. J. Coulton, 'Homer and the Solymians', in *Essays in Classical Archaeology for Eleni Hatzivassiliou 1977–2007*, edd. D. Kurtz et al. (Oxford, 2008) pp. 17–25.

³⁵ Mainly published in *TAM* I and G. Neumann, *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901* (Vienna, 1979).

³⁶ See O. Mørkholm and G. Neumann, *Die lykischen Münzlegenden* (Göttingen, 1978) and O. Carruba, 'Dynasten und Städte. Sprachliche und sonstige Bemerkungen zu den Namen auf den lykischen Münzen', in *Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposions, Wien, 6–12. Mai 1990*, vol. I, edd. J. Borchhardt and G. Dobesch (Vienna, 1993) pp. 11–25.

recognizably Greek and for which a reliable Greek rendition exists (fourteen names in total); the Lycian form of these Greek names is recorded in the final brackets.

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).³⁷ 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 Hekatomnid satraps of Caria (*SEG XXVII* 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 (*SEG XLI* 1379–80). To this period also belongs a small series of bilingual funerary inscriptions in which indigenous names predominate (eleven out of forty-eight are Greek).³⁸ Monolingual Greek funerary inscriptions, almost exclusively from Limyra, have also been dated as early as 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. Wörrle (Limyra) and C. Schuler (Phellos, Kyaneai, Myra).⁴¹

No texts in Lycian have so far been assigned as late as the third century BC. 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 Lycian 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 Balbura in the Kabalis 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, Eurymedon, and Melas) which drain into the sea from the Pisidian 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 Tracheia.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 contemporary 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 Kalchas 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

³⁷ M. Wörrle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens IV. Drei griechische Inschriften aus Limyra', *Chiron* 21 (1991) pp. 206–9.

³⁸ This figure also takes into account the trilingual text from Xanthos.

³⁹ The texts from Limyra are gathered in M. Wörrle, 'Die griechischen Sepulkralinschriften von Limyra', in *Limyra. Studien zu Kunst und Epigraphik in den Nekropolen der Antike*, edd. J. Borchhardt and A. Pekridou-Gorecki (Vienna, 2012) pp. 411–57.

⁴⁰ Such as A.-V. Schwyer, *Les Lyciens et la mort. Une étude d'histoire sociale* (Paris, 2002).

⁴¹ See, for example, Wörrle (n. 39) pp. 411–57 and C. Schuler, 'Inschriften aus dem Territorium von Myra in Lykien: Isthada', *Chiron* 36 (2006) pp. 395–451.

⁴² S. Colvin, 'Names in Hellenistic and Roman Lycia', in *Greco-Roman East* pp. 51–3.

⁴³ See M. Domingo Gygax, *Untersuchungen zu den lykischen Gemeinwesen in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit* (Bonn, 2001) pp. 123–41 and M. Wörrle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens VIII. Ein ptolemäisches Prostagma aus Limyra über Mißstände beim Steuereinzug', *Chiron* 40 (2010) pp. 359–96.

⁴⁴ Cau treats north-eastern Lycia, Olympos and Phaselis with the Kibyrtis and Milyas: N. Cau, 'Nuovi antroponomi indigeni nelle iscrizioni greche della Licia di età ellenistico-romana II', *Studi ellenistici* 16 (2005) pp. 377–421.

⁴⁵ A. S. Hall and J. J. Coulton, 'A Hellenistic Allotment List from Balbura in the Kibyrtis', *Chiron* 20 (1990) pp. 109–58.

⁴⁶ C. Schuler, 'Einführung: Zum Stand der griechischen Epigraphik in Lykien. Mit einer Bibliographie', in *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien* p. 15.

⁴⁷ X. de Planhol, *De la plaine pamphylienne aux lacs pisidiens* (Paris, 1958) p. 27.

⁴⁸ *DGP* pp. 147, 159, 163, 191; W. Leschhorn, *Gründer der Stadt: Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1984) pp. 383–5. For a more sceptical position, see Scheer, *Mythische Vorväter* pp. 213–16. For recent archaeological evidence of a Mycenaean presence in Pamphylia in the 12th cent. in the form of locally produced Mycenaean pottery at Perge, see M. Recke, 'Pamphylien zwischen Ost und West. Die Ausgrabungen von Perge als Fallbeispiel', in *Der Orient und die Anfänge Europas: Kulturelle Beziehungen von der Späten Bronzezeit bis zur Frühen Eisenzeit*, edd. H. Matthäus et al. (Wiesbaden, 2011) pp. 172–3. A connection between *Δίφια*, attested in a 4th cent. inscription from Sillyon, and a divinity known in Linear B texts has been proposed by C. Brixhe, 'Achéens et Phrygiens en Asie Mineure: approche comparative de quelques données lexicales', in *Novalis Indogermanica, Festschrift für G. Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*, edd. M. Fritz and S. Zeilfelder (Graz, 2002) pp. 49–73.

⁴⁹ Perge figures as *Parha* on the river *Kastraya* (Kestros) in a Hittite document of c.1235 BC: H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tutḫalijas IV* (Wiesbaden, 1988) p. 61. Brixhe (*DGP* p. 193) suggests the epichoric form for Aspendos, **Εστφεδvs*, may originate in the name of a ruler of Cilicia Pedias, *Asitawada-/Asitiwata-*, founder of *Asitiwati-* (mod. Karatepe), parallel to the Greek tradition found in Hellanikos that the city was founded by a homonym Aspendos.

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.⁵⁰ The sanctuary of Artemis Pergaia, whose cult was diffused over a wider area (e.g. Rhodes, Thera, Halikarnassos), made Perge the most important religious centre of Pamphylia. 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.⁵¹ 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 Pamphylian dialect was ever used at Side.⁵²

Attaleia had a small territory, confined between the older coastal cities of Tenedos and Magydos⁵³ and its larger neighbour Perge. Thus, *Λυρβωτῶν κώμη*, 12 km north of Attaleia was a village attached to Perge, at least during the second century AD.⁵⁴ To the west, Pergean territory was very likely contiguous with that of Termessos and extended far into the northern part of the Pamphylian plain.⁵⁵ The border between Pamphylia and Pisidia should be placed somewhere around the foothills of the Taurus; caves at Karain and Kocain, at the base of these mountains, belonged to the territory of Pisidian Termessos and the Ossienoi respectively.⁵⁶ Pamphylian influence was evidently felt beyond this natural border. From the end of the fifth until the beginning of the second century, the Pisidian city of Selge minted coins of a type identical to those of Aspendos and, until c.300 BC, their legend was in Pamphylian dialect (the epichoric form of the ethnic, *Στλεγγυς / Εστλεγγυς*), making it likely that this was the dialect of Greek originally spoken there.⁵⁷ Slight influence can also be detected in eastern Lycia, where the father of a local, early fourth-century dynast from the area of Olympos bore a purely Pamphylian dialectal name, *Ελλάφιλος*.⁵⁸

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.⁵⁹ Strabo regarded Olbia, situated immediately north of Phaselis, as the first Pamphylian city to the west,⁶⁰ and Kibyra Mikra and Ptolemais as the last towards the east.⁶¹ 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.⁶² This concept of an extended Pamphylia between Cape Chelidonia and Cape Anemourion may be a projection of the maritime notion of a *Παμφύλιος κόλπος* to the land. 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 Pamphylian dialect; Phaselis at least conserved its pure Doric dialect. The only epigraphic evidence for Olbia is a fourth-century proxeny decree whose publisher suggests that it was an Ionian colony;⁶³ if so, it had no impact on the structure or the onomastics of the Pamphylian dialect. Three small cities, Thebes, 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.⁶⁴ Until more is known about this cluster of small cities it cannot be determined whether the Aeolic influence on the Pamphylian dialect emanated from them or from Side.

⁵⁰ R. S. Stroud, 'An Argive Decree from Nemea Concerning Aspendos', *Hesp.* 53 (1984) pp. 193–216 (*SEG* XXXIV 282). *DGP* pp. 194–200; M. Arslan et al., *Greek Coin Hoards in Turkey: the Antalya Archaeological Museum and the C.S. Okray Collection* (Ankara, 1999) pp. 28–36.

⁵¹ Coinage with legends in Sidetic script was minted during the 4th cent. BC: *ISide* II pp. 644–6. Inscriptions: *ISide* S1–9; *ISide* S6 indicates that Sidetic was also spoken at neighbouring Lyrbe.

⁵² Arr., *An.* i 26. 4. An argument against the extension of the dialectal area to Side is the fact that Pamphylian theophoric names derived from Apollo use the root *Ἀπῆλλα-* while in Sidetic they are based on the form *Ἀπόλλο-* (*porodor*, *poloniw*). Three 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 (*per ep.*) that the tradition which made Side a foundation of Aeolic Kyme was invented to provide it with a Greek ancestry and to conceal the fact that of 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 Pamphylian dialect.

⁵³ On Magydos see M. Adak and O. Atvur, 'Die pamphyliche Hafenstadt Magydos', *Epigr. Anat.* 31 (1999) pp. 53–68.

⁵⁴ H. Brandt and F. Kolb, *Lycia et Pamphylia. Ein römische Provinz im Südwesten Kleinasiens* (Mainz, 2005) pp. 95–6. A text from the reign of Trajan prescribes payment of a fine to Artemis Pergaia (*IPerge* 77). It was probably part of the territory of Perge at an earlier date, being closer to Perge than Attaleia and having the Via Sebaste linking Perge to Pisidia pass through it. S. Şahin's connection between the ethnic *Ἐλαιβάριος / Ἐλαιβάρης* attached to several citizens of Perge and a supposed toponym *Bāros / Bāris* north of modern Varsak (*Epigr. Anat.* 25 (1995) pp. 20–2) is problematic; see C. Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und*

römischen Kleinasien (Munich, 1998) p. 72 n. 87 and p. 262 n. 307. Names from these two places have been entered under the heading 'Perge?, Lyrbotai' and 'Perge, Elaibabeis'.

⁵⁵ Implied by dedications to Artemis Pergaia: see N. Gökalp and E. N. Akdoğan-Arca, 'Antalya'dan Yeni Adak Yazıtları', *Adalya* 12 (2009) 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.

⁵⁶ Karain: S. Şahin, 'Bemerkungen zu lykischen und pamphyliischen Inschriften', *Epigr. Anat.* 17 (1991) pp. 126–32, dedications to Meter Oreia containing typical Pisidian names. Kocain: *SEG* VI 686–717; L. Robert has shown that the eirenarchs mentioned in the texts were officials of the Pisidian city of the Ossienoi (*OMS* I pp. 868–80).

⁵⁷ *DGP* pp. 287–90.

⁵⁸ *BE* 1999, no. 501.

⁵⁹ See W. Ruge, *RE* s.v. Pamphylia cols. 354–9.

⁶⁰ Str. xiv 4. 1. The same view in Ptol. v 5. 2. For the siting of Olbia at Kemer, see S. Şahin, 'Olbia und einige andere Küstenorte bei Kemer in Westpamphylien', *Epigr. Anat.* 33 (2001) pp. 145–51 and especially M. Adak, 'Olbia in Pamphylien—die epigraphische Evidenz', *Gephyra* 3 (2006) pp. 1–28.

⁶¹ See J. Nollé, 'Pamphyliche Studien', *Chiron* 17 (1987) pp. 245–8 for the location of these two cities.

⁶² Str. xi 12. 2; xiv 2. 1; *FGrH* I F 259 (Melanippion) and 266 (Nagidos). See also *FGrH* I F 260 (Idyros) and 261 (Lyrnateia). Phaselis is also placed in Pamphylia in the early 4th cent. by Stratonikos (*apud* Ath. 350a), Plin., *HN* v 96 and Pompon. i 78. Livy (xxxvii 23) describes Phaselis as being *in confinio Lyciae et Pamphyliae*.

⁶³ M. Adak (n. 60) pp. 1–6, dates it to the second quarter of the 4th cent. BC.

⁶⁴ M. Adak (n. 33) pp. 44–7.

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 Seleukeia).⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ Pamphylia may have come under Roman rule as soon as 133 BC,⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ After Servilius Isauricus' campaigns against the pirates (78–75 BC), Attaleia's territory was confiscated as *ager publicus*, providing the opportunity for the settlement of Italians who can be traced back at least to the Augustan period.⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹

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 (xiv 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 τραχέια* (Lat. Cilicia Aspera), the latter *Κιλικία πεδιάς* (Lat. 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 Tracheia or Pedias, there remain 147, some of them military

personnel and slaves,⁷² designated in the sources as *Κίλιξ* 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 Tracheia 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.⁷³ 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 Tracheia, on the other hand, was for much 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 Tracheia tended to be ruled by local or regional dynasts.⁷⁴ 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 AD, 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: Tracheia formed the core of Isauria, while Pedias was split between Cilicia Prima and Secunda, together forming part of the *dioecesis Orientis*.

⁶⁵ For the period of Ptolemaic control see A. Meadows and P. Thonemann, 'The Ptolemaic Administration of Pamphylia', *ZPE* 186 (2013) pp. 223–6.

⁶⁶ Launey pp. 466–71; C. P. Jones and C. Habicht, 'A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia', *Phoenix* 43 (1989) pp. 336–46.

⁶⁷ It has been inferred from Strabo (xiv 4. 1) that Attaleia was a re-foundation of an older city called Korykos (*RE* s.v. Attaleia (3)), but this is far from certain.

⁶⁸ S. Mitchell, 'Geography, Politics and Imperialism in the Asian Customs Law', in *The Customs Law of Asia*, edd. M. Cottier et al. (Oxford, 2009) pp. 188–92. Opinions differ as to whether Pamphylia belonged to the province of Asia in the 120s BC.

⁶⁹ For discussion of the date see Brandt and Kolb (n. 54) pp. 22–4 and most recently M. Adak and M. Wilson, 'Das Vespasiansmonument von Döşeme und die Gründung der Doppelprovinz Lycia et Pamphylia', *Gephyra* 9 (2012) pp. 1–40.

⁷⁰ Cic., *Leg. agr.* I 5; II 50; cf. *RE* Supplbd. 12 s.v. Attaleia, cols. 111–13.

⁷¹ M. Calpurnius Rufus from Attaleia was the first senator from Pamphylia and possibly the first from Asia Minor, during Claudius' reign (Halfmann, *Senatoren* p. 101 no. 2; *RE* Supplbd. 14 s.v. Calpurnius (110a)). M. Plancius Varus from Perge 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 Misenum fleet and of veterans resettled in their homeland, as well as *diplomata*, 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 Ptolemies: see Launey pp. 476–81 and J. Russell, 'Cilicia–Nutrix Virorum. Cilicians Abroad in Peace and War during Hellenistic and Roman Times', *Anatolia Antiqua* 1 (1991) pp. 283–97.

⁷³ See *TIB* 5 pp. 30–43.

⁷⁴ On the absence of a Roman administrative identity for Cilicia before 72 AD, see H. Elton, 'Geography, Labels, Romans and Kilikia', in *Regionalism* (n. 2) pp. 25–31.

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 massifs (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.⁷⁵ The coast is dotted with small cities, perched on the sea against the backcloth of the mountains. Between Korakesion and the Lamos valley, the respective western and eastern extremities of the region,⁷⁶ 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, forms the so-called Kietis (*Kῆτις* or *Kιῆτις*),⁷⁷ and was itself subdivided into smaller districts; Lalassis encompassed the area between Klaudiopolis and Diokaisareia, Kenatis lay around Olba, and Lakanitis around Eirenopolis.⁷⁸

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.⁷⁹ Greek-speakers encountered a Luwian-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.⁸⁰ 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.⁸¹ Although there is clear evidence for the Achaemenid presence in the remarkable relief friezes from the inland site of Meydancikkale, north of Kelenderis, it left no trace in the onomastic stock of Cilicia Tracheia.

When Cilicia Tracheia after 296 BC briefly became part of the Seleucid kingdom, Seleukos I Nikator founded Seleukeia 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.⁸² After his death in 281 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.⁸³ 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 in 67 BC. 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 external rulers of Cilicia. 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.⁸⁴

Following the dissolution of the somewhat amorphous province of Cilicia in 43 BC and prior to the creation in 72 AD of Vespasian's new province of this name, Cilicia Tracheia was subject for a time to Kleopatra⁸⁵ 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 Germanikopolis, Eirenopolis, and Philadelphiea.⁸⁶ 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.⁸⁷ 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 to it the sanctuary of Zeus Olbios.⁸⁸

⁷⁵ *ICilicie* pp. 7–9; *MAMA* III pp. 90–101.

⁷⁶ Str. xiv 5. 2 and 6.

⁷⁷ Attested in literary and numismatic sources: Ptol. v 7, 3 and 6; cf. *TIB* 8, 1 s.v. Kētis; T. B. Mitford, 'Roman Rough Cilicia', in *ANRW* II 7.2 pp. 1245–6. The name *K(i)ῆτις* has been connected to the ancient toponym Qedi, which in Egyptian sources refers to a region of southern Asia Minor with a Luwian-speaking population: Casabonne pp. 84–5.

⁷⁸ *TIB* 8 p. 18.

⁷⁹ On all these cities see *IACP* pp. 1213–14, 1217–20. Kelenderis and Nagidos are generally thought to have been founded in the 7th cent.: G. Shipley, *A History of Samos 800–188 BC* (Oxford, 1987) pp. 41–2.

⁸⁰ Casabonne p. 185.

⁸¹ Coinage: Casabonne pp. 110–11; Nagidos: C. P. Jones and J. Russell, 'Two New Inscriptions from Nagidos in Cilicia', *Phoenix* 47 (1993) pp. 293–304 from the second half of the 4th cent., perhaps predating the Macedonian conquest; Olba: Heberdey-Wilhelm, *Reisen in Kilikien* 117. Only six individuals can be assigned to the 4th cent. BC, three from Nagidos being awarded citizenship at Samos (*IG* XII (6) 59).

⁸² Str. xiv 5. 4. See also M. H. Sayar, 'Historical Development of Urbanization in Cilicia in Hellenistic and Roman Periods', in *Tra oriente e occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore*, ed. G. Urso (Pisa, 2007) pp. 247–56.

⁸³ See C. P. Jones and C. Habicht (n. 66); M. H. Sayar (n. 82) p. 251.

⁸⁴ Heberdey-Wilhelm, *Reisen in Kilikien* p. 86; cf. M. H. Sayar (n. 82) pp. 250–1; K. Trampedach, 'Tempel und Großmacht: Olba in hellenistischer Zeit', in *La Cilicie: espaces et pouvoirs locaux (2^e millénaire av. J.-C.—4^e siècle ap. J.-C.)*, edd. É. Jean, A. M. Dinçol, S. Durugönül (Istanbul, 2001) pp. 269–88.

⁸⁵ Str. xiv 5. 3; Plu. *Ant.* 36. 2; her rule was confined to the region from Korakesion to Anemourion.

⁸⁶ Cf. T. B. Mitford (n. 77) pp. 1243–4.

⁸⁷ See S. Mitchell, 'Iconium and Ninica: Two Double Communities in Roman Asia Minor', *Historia* 28 (1979) pp. 409–38, esp. 426–35.

⁸⁸ See E. Kirsten, 'Diokaisareia und Sebaste, zwei Städtegründungen der frühen Kaiserzeit im kilikischen Arbeitsgebiet der Akademie', *Anz. Wien* 110 (1973) p. 356. For a more sceptical view, see U. Gotter, 'Tempel und Großmacht: Olba und das Imperium Romanum', in *La Cilicie* (n. 84) pp. 289–325, esp. 319–21.

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 BC. Settlers 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.⁸⁹ The urbanization of the interior was a phenomenon of the early Imperial period in both parts of Cilicia, promoted by the emperors and local client kings 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 BC, 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 (*c.*235 to 200 BC) 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 BC, the names of the priests and their patronymics are predominantly of 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 BC, following the conquest of Tracheia by Antiochos 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 dated to the first century BC, only one is Greek; the list of *rhabdouchoi* inscribed in the second century AD 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 *Ἰσαυροί*, 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 V.C.

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 life, 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 Amanos 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 Amanos mountains between the Cilician Gates at Kodrigai and Rhosos, enclosing the southern side of the Gulf of Issos. Ancient and modern writers variously attribute it to Cilicia or Syria.⁹⁵ On geographical grounds 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 Tauros range via the Cilician Gates, and after crossing the plain reached Syria through either the more northerly *Amanikai Pylai* or

⁸⁹ C. P. Jones and C. Habicht (n. 66) p. 321 ll. 21–4 with comm. p. 324; the 'barbarians' were perhaps the Kietai of the upper Kalykadnos valley. Another, earlier inscription of Nagidos seems to imply its participation in the foundation of one of the Antiocheias, early in the 3rd cent. BC: C. P. Jones and H. Russell (n. 81) pp. 297–304.

⁹⁰ Heberdey-Wilhelm, *Reisen in Kilikien* 155; also *ICilicie* pp. 45–6.

⁹¹ Houwink ten Cate pp. 205–6. His explanation does not account for the fact that none of the Greek names in the earlier cluster belong to the group suggestive of an *interpretatio graeca* of local Luwian theophoric names, as do many of those attested in the later group, from 130 BC onwards (e.g. *Διώνικος*, *Ζηροφάνης*, *Ἐρμιππος*, *Ἐρμιοκράτης*, *Τεύκρος*, *Χειροκράτης* (a *hapax*)—commemorating the mythical battle between Zeus, Hermes and the giant Typhon). The occurrence

of several typical Macedonian names and one Thracian name (*Βίθως*) in the early section might indicate that people from these regions were settled there, who, for a time, were able to dominate the charge of this office.

⁹² *ICilicie* 11.

⁹³ *MAMA* III 200–758; cf. Patlagean, *Pauvreté* pp. 158–70.

⁹⁴ An excellent introduction to Cilicia Pedias in the pre-Hellenistic period by M. Meyer may be found in *Kulturbegegnung* pp. 7–17.

⁹⁵ Strabo (xiv 5. 19) implies that it lies outside Syria, while Ptolemy (v 14. 2) places it firmly in Syria. In the 4th cent. BC, Theopompos (*FGI* 115 F 254 b) designates Rhosos as part of Syria. For the views of modern writers, see T. B. Mitford (n. 77) pp. 1232–3 n. 10 and A. Raggi, *Seleuco di Rhosos* (*Studi ellenistici* 18. Pisa, 2006) pp. 203–4.

the *Syriai Pylai* 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 mustering 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 any 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, perhaps dating to the Archaic period, though by the late fourth century a nobler Argive ancestry was preferred.⁹⁶ 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 Çineköy (south of Adana) in themselves and in their content 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.⁹⁷ There has been much debate concerning the possible identification of the Muksa / MPŠ 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.⁹⁸ Likewise, the Hypachaioi, mentioned by Herodotos (vii 91) as earlier inhabitants of Cilicia, have been identified with the people of Hiyawa, an eighth-century name for the region, itself derived from the well-known Ahhiyawa named in Hittite texts referring to a Late Bronze Age kingdom in the Aegean. Whatever the merits of the case, and it seems highly likely that the person recorded in the Cilician bilingual texts gave his name to the Cilician cities Mopsouhestia and

Mopsoukrene, any settlers of Aegean origin during the turbulent times of the end of the Late Bronze Age seem to have been fully assimilated into the local population in culture and language by the eighth century BC. For much of the periods of Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian domination from the late eighth century until the later fourth century, the region seems to have been ruled by local dynasts tributary to their imperial overlords.⁹⁹ From the early sixth century at the latest, a dynasty based at Tarsos became pre-eminent, under Persian rule acquiring authority over all Cilicia and, perhaps, Pamphylia, in a manner that recalls the part played by the Hekatomnid dynasty as satraps of Caria and Lycia. The names of the ruling family are all indigenous; at least three were called *Συννεσις*, the latest having a wife *Επναξα*; the father of the second, killed at Salamis in 480, is named by Herodotos as *Ἵρομέδων*, 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 (Pixodaros of Kindye), and after 480 a Halikarnassian 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 Aramaic 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 Phoenician.¹⁰¹ Soloi and Aigeai are the only cities of Pedias whose inhabitants are attested bearing Greek personal names at this stage of its history.¹⁰²

So it was not until Alexander's conquest of Cilicia in 333 BC that a strong impulse of hellenization was felt.¹⁰³ 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 grave-stones in the old centres of Greek civilization.¹⁰⁴ This appears not to have been the result of extensive Greek settlement or the

⁹⁶ *IACP* p. 1220; R. S. Stroud (n. 50) p. 195 line 7 with pp. 201–2 (*SEG* XXXIV 282); the linguistic effects of its cultural isolation are discussed by G. Salmeri, 'Hellenism on the periphery: the case of Cilicia and an etymology of *soloikismos*', in *Greco-Roman East* pp. 199–203; see too Casabonne pp. 89–90. Recent excavations at Soloi seem to confirm an East Greek presence from the 7th cent., perhaps as one element in a mixed community: R. Yağcı, 'Problematizing Greek Colonization in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Seventh and Sixth Centuries BC: The Case of Soli', in *Rough Cilicia. New Historical and Archaeological Approaches*, edd. M. C. Hoff and R. F. Townsend (Oxford, 2013) pp. 6–15.

⁹⁷ Karatepe: H. Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş. The Inscriptions (Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions II)*. Berlin & New York, 1999); Çineköy: R. Tekoğlu, A. Lemaire *et al.*, 'La bilingue royale louvito-phénicienne de Çineköy', *CRAI* 2000, pp. 961–1007.

⁹⁸ See, for example, Casabonne pp. 74–7 and N. Oettinger, 'The Seer Mopsos (Muksas) as a Historical Figure', in *Anatolian Interfaces. Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbours*, edd. B. J. Collins, M. R. Bachvarova, and I. C. Rutherford (Oxford, 2008) pp. 63–6. For more sceptical views see Scheer, *Mythische Vorväter* pp. 222–71 and R. Lane Fox, *Travelling Heroes* (London, 2008) pp. 224–39.

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

¹⁰⁰ It has also been argued that the name Syennesis is a Luwian

royal title misunderstood as a personal name by Greek writers: see I. Yakubovich, 'Luwian and the Luwians', in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia, 10,000–323 B.C.E.*, edd. S. R. Steadman and G. MacMahon (Oxford, 2011) p. 539. However, a recently published inscription from Iasos, dated c.412 BC in connection with events in the Ionian War that also involved the Spartans, clearly shows Syennesis being used as a personal name: G. Maddoli in *Epigr. Iasos. NS I* pp. 209–15 (*SEG* LVII 1040). On Oromedon see Casabonne p. 64.

¹⁰¹ See Casabonne pp. 67–73; 241–9; on the use of Phoenician in Cilicia see A. Lemaire, 'L'écriture phénicienne en Cilicie et la diffusion des écritures alphabétiques', in *Phoinikeia Grammata. Lire et écrire en Méditerranée*, edd. C. Baurain, C. Bonnet, and V. Krings (Namur, 1991) pp. 133–46.

¹⁰² A man named *Σθένων*, taken to be from Cilician Aigeai, made a payment for the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo at Delphi in 356 BC: *CID* II 10 C, 2. Aigeai later claimed both a link with Argos and Macedonia.

¹⁰³ The relative insignificance of Greek influences before this date is well captured by G. Salmeri (n. 96) pp. 181–206.

¹⁰⁴ See Str. xiv 5. 13 for his famous comment on Tarsos' great reputation for its devotion to learning. There is an almost complete lack of Greek inscriptions earlier than the 1st cent. BC everywhere except at Soloi and Mallos / Magarsos; all those in them bear Greek names.

foundation of new cities in Cilicia Pedias.¹⁰⁵ In a region with such a long history of receptiveness to foreign cultural influences and identification with the dominant power, it is perhaps not surprising that local populations, at least at the elite level, should have adopted Greek names so quickly. Most of the cities were quick to see the advantages of asserting a noble lineage from an ancient Greek metropolis, Argos being the preferred choice, presumably as the supposed ancestral home of the ruling Temenid dynasty of Macedonia.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, its pre-Greek identity was not entirely eliminated and ambivalence 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 *Ταρκ*— and *Σανδ*—).¹⁰⁷

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.¹⁰⁸ For Tarsos 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 settlement with an important sanctuary of Athena, is abnormal in a number of ways and requires further explanation. Formerly the port of Mallos, Magarsos was renamed Antiocheia 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 Mallos, 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.¹⁰⁹ Persons are registered 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. Following 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 Tigranes II to populate Tigranocerta, and was now refounded as Pompeiopolis. 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 Hierapolis under the Seleucids. 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 *θεὰ Περασια* and generating in its turn the theophoric name *Περασιόδωρος*.¹¹⁰ Hierapolis was the centre of the kingdom of Tarkondimotos 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.¹¹¹ Significant urbanization did not occur here until Augustus’ refoundation of Anazarbos, whose territory encompassed large parts of the plain and later became the pre-eminent city of eastern Cilicia (Cilicia Secunda). Foundations of other cities followed in the first century AD; Augusta to the north of Adana under Tiberius, Eirenopolis in the Amanos foothills under Nero, and Flaviopolis at the north-eastern edge of the plain under Vespasian.¹¹² Flaviopolis 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.¹¹³

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* V.A (pp. xiii–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 V.A). The vast majority of these are known from the Greek

¹⁰⁵ The only certain new foundation was that of Alexandria by Issos which in spite of its pedigree was never of much importance. Aigeai is also generally regarded as a Macedonian foundation, and its name perhaps harks back to its illustrious Macedonian namesake: see L. Robert, ‘De Cilicie à Messine et à Plymouth’, *JS* 1973, pp. 201–2 (*OMS* VII pp. 265–6) and ‘Monnaies et textes grecs’, *JS* 1978, pp. 145–50 (*OMS* VII pp. 277–82). It is unknown whether Seleukeia on the Gulf of Issos was a new foundation or an older settlement renamed; its identification with Rhosos has not found acceptance: see R. Ziegler, ‘Seleukeia am Golf von Issos’, *Epigr. Anat.* 33 (2001) pp. 95–103, countered by J. Nollé, ‘Seleukeia am Issischen Golf’, *Chiron* 33 (2003) pp. 79–92.

¹⁰⁶ Soloi: R. S. Stroud (n. 50); Tarsos and Aigeai: Robert, *DAM* pp. 46–90 (repr. of *BCH* 101 (1977) pp. 88–132); Mallos: Arr., *An.* ii 5. 9; Str. xiv 5. 16, location of the tomb and oracle of the Argive hero Amphilochos, whose association with Cilicia in Greek mythology is much older (Hes. fr. 279; Hdt. iii 91); see also Scheer, *Mythische Vorfäter* pp. 273–305.

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 Casabonne 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 Tarsos became Antiocheia on the Kydnos; Adana, Antiocheia on the Saros; Mopsouhestia, Seleukeia on the Pyramos; Oinoandos, Epiphaneia; Issos had already been renamed Nikopolis in the time of Seleukos I.

¹⁰⁹ See in detail I. Savalli-Lestrade, ‘Antioche du Pyrame, Mallos et Tarse / Antioche du Kydnos à la lumière de *SEG* XII, 511: histoire, géographie, épigraphie, société’, *Studi ellenistici* 19 (2006) pp. 119–247, esp. 129–86.

¹¹⁰ See A. Dupont-Sommer and L. Robert, *La déesse de Hiérapolis Castabala (Cilicie)* (Paris, 1964); *Kulturbegegnung* pp. 107–19.

¹¹¹ For the most recent treatment of this dynasty, the subject of many studies, see N. L. Wright, ‘The House of Tarkondimotos: A Late Hellenistic Dynasty between Rome and the East’, *Anat. Stud.* 62 (2012) pp. 69–88.

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

¹¹³ R. Ziegler, ‘Wann wurde Mallos zur römischen Kolonie?’, in *Studien zum antiken Kleinasien* II (*AMS* 8. Bonn, 1992) pp. 181–3.

cities of Caria (1,355—90%) where the conventions of coining were similar to those found in Ionia, Aiolis, 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 *LGPN* V.A 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 BC for the *sympoliteia* of Plarasa 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 Lycian 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 BC, 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 Tracheia, 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 in quantity. Nevertheless, for a poorly represented city such as Adana (Antiocheia on the Saros) the eleven names represent a sizeable proportion of the forty-one individuals attributed to it, and even more so

for the Hellenistic period where nine out of sixteen appear on coins.

Amphora Stamps

Knidos

Of the 1,633 individuals assigned to Knidos, a substantial proportion (532—33%) is attested on stamps applied to the transport amphoras produced in its territory throughout the Hellenistic period. Earliest are the so-called *Schiffsbug* or ‘Prow’ stamps (c.320–280 BC) bearing a single name, often abbreviated.¹¹⁴ After an apparent interval of about sixty years, to which only a few stamps are attributed, mostly with heavily abbreviated names, the practice was resumed on a much larger scale from the last quarter of the third century until c.75 BC. In this period the names of officials accompany those of the fabricants (most likely workshop owners) in an abundant series of stamps on amphoras exported mostly to the Cyclades, Attica, Euboeia, 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 BC. For the period from c.220–50 BC 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.¹¹⁵

Several aspects of the treatment of this material require some explanation.¹¹⁶ 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.¹¹⁷ 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 *damiorgos* except in Period IV A (188–167 BC)); dam. = *damiorgos* (the eponymous magistrate at Knidos); phr. = *phrouarchos* (an official named only in Period IV A, sometimes with the *damiorgos*); andr. = *andres* / *andron* (a pair of officials found only in Period VI, together

¹¹⁴ Their Knidian origin has been proved by the discovery of a number of workshops at Reşadiye near Datça (*Anatolia Antiqua* 1 (1991) p. 43 and *Production et commerce* pp. 109–10), thus confirming the hypothesis of C. Börker in *Recherches sur les amphores grecques* (Athens & Paris, 1986) pp. 473–8.

¹¹⁵ Most important are Grace’s own publication of the Knidian stamps from the House of the Comedians on Delos (*EAD* XXVII pp. 317–54 [1970]); R. Étienne on the material from the Sanctuary of Poseidon and Amphitrite on Tenos (*Ténos* I pp. 240–52 [1986]); M. Palaczyk and E. Schönerberger on finds from Eretria (*Eretria* XII pp. 198–217 [2003]); C. Börker and J. Burow on the small number of Knidian pieces from Pergamon (*Die hellenistischen Amphorenstempel aus Pergamon* pp. 56–8, 110–12 [1999]); G. Jöhrens’ 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, Jöhrens kindly provided references to unpublished material from the Athenian Kerameikos excavations for individuals lacking a published example; these appear as ‘Unp. (Athens, Kerameikos) KGA’ followed by a number. Unfortunately N. Jefremow’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 series.

¹¹⁶ For further detail see Grace’s account in *EAD* XXVII pp. 317–24 and additional material in *Hesp.* 54 (1985) pp. 31–5.

¹¹⁷ 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. ἐπὶ δαμουργοῦ Δράκοντος and ἐπὶ 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 *phourarchoi*, regarded by some as Rhodian mercenary commanders.¹¹⁸ The exceptions are a small number of fabricants named with an ethnic,¹¹⁹ as well as fabricants who by general consent are taken as Rhodians and have previously been entered in *LGNP* I.¹²⁰ 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. Brixhe of a corpus of Pamphylian amphora stamps has revealed a significant number of new Pamphylian names, as well as contributing more than 511 (17%) individuals to the relatively small total of 2,981 for the region as a whole.¹²¹ The overwhelming majority of the 762 stamps come from Alexandria, 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 *LGNP* policy of excluding names whose restoration is uncertain.¹²² Therefore, what Brixhe 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. *Αρδασ*?, (*Αρδα*(*s*)?), *Αρδα*(—) for *Timbres* 9–11, allowing for a name such as *Αρδαμωας*, attested at Oinoanda in the Kabalis). 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. *Πελλόνις*, *Φορδίσις*) 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 Milesian known at Athens appears under Miletos, not Athens). Where their affiliation to political subdivisions (e.g. demes, tribes, phratries, *syn-geneiai*) 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 (territ.), 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. Wherever 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 *LGNP* V.A 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 Kleisthenic 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 *phratriai* which were apparently divided in turn into *patriai*.¹²³ 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 *synoikismos* and *sympoliteia*.¹²⁴ The circumstances and the

¹¹⁸ Koehler and Matheson take them to be Knidians (*Transport Amphorae* pp. 165–9), against P. M. Fraser and G. E. Bean (n. 8) p. 93.

¹¹⁹ They are *Ἀγαθίνος Απολλωνιάτας*, *Ἀπολλώνιος Πισίδας*, *Καρνεάδας Μύνδιος*, *Λέων Λυδός*.

¹²⁰ *LGNP* I s.vv. *Ἀριστοκλῆς* (90), *Δαμοκράτης* (32), *Δαμοσθένης* (20).

¹²¹ C. Brixhe, *Timbres amphoriques de Pamphylie* (Alexandria, 2012).

¹²² Some alternative readings and restorations have been proposed. Names whose reading is uncertain continue to be omitted.

¹²³ See M. Piérart, ‘Athènes et Milet. I, Tribus et demes milésiens’, *Museum Helveticum* 40 (1983) pp. 1–18; N. F. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece* (Philadelphia, 1987) pp. 320–7.

¹²⁴ For an excellent discussion of the subject see G. Reger, ‘*Sympoliteiai* in Hellenistic Asia Minor’, in *Greco-Roman East* pp. 145–80.

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 Pidasas 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 Pidasas, it involved the abandonment of the settlement, the eradication of its official 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 same time, it also gained control, not without resistance, of the important sanctuary of Zeus at Labraunda and that of the indigenous god Sinuri.¹²⁵ These communities nevertheless maintained their identity, as well as elements of their former civic organization (e.g. at Olymos), and at times acted with a marked degree of autonomy in local affairs. Arrangements of this kind are reflected as far as possible by the presentation of the individuals concerned within these local structures but under the overall heading of Mylasa. Likewise, individuals associated with the settlements around the sanctuaries appear under the headings of 'Labraunda' and 'sanct. Sinuri'.

Stratonikeia illustrates an evolution of a different kind. It was founded in the 260s or 250s, one of the few new cities in Caria in the Hellenistic period, as a settlement of Macedonian colonists and strengthened by the synoikism of several small Carian *poleis* (notably Hierakome, Koarendas/Koranza, Koliorga). Following their incorporation, they retained a political identity as demes of the new city, as well as a physical presence on the ground.¹²⁶ Given over to Rhodes by its

Seleucid patrons soon after its foundation and remaining in this state until 167 BC, Stratonikeia was unable to assert control of the sanctuary at Panamara until the mid-second century when it expanded its territory, at least temporarily, towards the south and south-east. Until that date Panamara continued to function in many ways as an autonomous community, but as a *koinon* lacked the full independence of a *polis*.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 *Peraia*' in the third to first centuries BC and evidently reflects their political subordination.¹²⁸ 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 Pisyra 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 Koloneis) had been independent *poleis* during the fourth century is revealing about the fluctuations in political status and affiliation in this period.¹²⁹ These changes are recognized in the headings under which individuals appear, as far as the narrow framework of *LGNP* allows, but it is not possible to register clearly the fine distinction between 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 *sympoliteia* with neighbouring Plarasa.¹³⁰ 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 dominance 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 Indos valley, duly reflected in elements of its onomastic repertoire.¹³¹ In its territory were a large number of subordinate settlements, perhaps organized as demes or their equivalent within

¹²⁵ See G. Reger (n. 124) pp. 164–8; id., 'Mylasa and its Territory', in *Hellenistic Karia* pp. 43–57.

¹²⁶ A notable feature is the apparent existence of territorial *phylai* named after an indigenous ancestor, possibly as subdivisions of the demes (e.g. *φυλή Κοβόλδου* within the deme of Koranza).

¹²⁷ See R. van Bremen, 'The Demes and Phylai of Stratonikeia in Karia', *Chiron* 30 (2000) pp. 389–401; ead., 'Leon Son of Chrysaor and the Religious Identity of Stratonikeia in Caria', in *Greco-Roman East* pp. 207–44; ead., 'La communauté de Panamara entre Rhodes et Stratonice de Carie: autour de la date d'un décret des Panamaréens dans le Fonds Louis Robert', *CRAI* 2011, pp. 1405–20.

¹²⁸ E.g. Laodikeia was probably founded as a *polis* by the Seleucids but reduced to a *koinon* under Rhodian domination: see R. van Bremen, 'Laodikeia in Karia', *Chiron* 34 (2004) pp. 367–99 and also H.-U. Wiemer (n. 9) pp. 424–7.

¹²⁹ See P. Debord (n. 3) pp. 142–74.

¹³⁰ See J. Reynolds, 'The Politeia of Plarasa and Aphrodisias', *REA* 87 (1985) pp. 213–18.

¹³¹ See R. van Bremen, 'From Aphrodisias to Alexandria with Agroitas and Agreophon (via Hippoukome, Kalynda and Kaunos)', in *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*, ed. R. Parker (Oxford, 2013) pp. 154–73.

the political structure of the *polis*.¹³² 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 Kaunian control and at other times in dispute with it over territorial claims.¹³³ 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.¹³⁴

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*.¹³⁵ Civic subdivisions called *phylai* are attested in many Lycian cities, sometimes bearing names alluding to a Greek heroic past (e.g. Bellerophonteioi, Sarpedonioi, and Iobateioi at Tlos and the two latter at Xanthos), or referring to the urban centre (*astai* or *astikoi*).¹³⁶ However, at Xanthos these groups, long thought to be *phylai*, were apparently called *demoi*.¹³⁷ If this use of the term *demos* is confirmed, the distinction between *phylai* and *demoi* as civic subdivisions and dependent communities variously called *peripolia*, *demoi*, and *komai* needs to be emphasized.¹³⁸ 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, Andriake, Istlada, Soura, and Tyberissos were all dependencies of Myra, one of the larger cities in the region. But even a small city such as Kyaneai incorporated within its territory a number of smaller nucleated settlements (Trysa, Korba, and the unnamed sites at modern Hoyran and Tüse).¹³⁹ 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 (*demos*) of Tyberissos–Timioussa temporarily formed a *sympoliteia* with Myra.¹⁴⁰

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 *sympoliteiai* with neighbouring communities often designated simply as *demoi*.¹⁴¹ A certain degree of centralization is implied, among other things expressed by the use of ethnics such as *Ἀκαλισσεὺς ἀπὸ Ἰδεβησσοῦ* or *Ἀρνεάτης ἀπὸ Κοροῶν*.¹⁴² 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 *Τρεβεννάτης ἀπὸ Ὀνοβάρων* and *Φασηλίτης ἀπὸ Μνάρων*, are usually regarded as dependent communities.¹⁴³ Further complication arises where political links between communities cross 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 Phaselis and Tenedos, a small Pamphylian city west of Attaleia, elucidates a later Imperial funerary text which describes a man as *Φα(σηλίτης) ἀπὸ πόλεως [Τ]ενέδου*.¹⁴⁴ 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.¹⁴⁵ Individuals from Typallia, neighbours of Kitanaura, also bore the ethnic *Τερμησσεὺς ἀπὸ Τυπαλλίων*, implying close political links between the two communities.¹⁴⁶ 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 *demos* of Tlos.¹⁴⁷ A text from Hippoukome records more than 200 individuals, including many from neighbouring communities (the Sestioi, Lyrnitai, Kastanneis, and Pal—neis), whose exact location and civic status are largely unknown. They are taken as independent, but were very likely subordinated

¹³² See C. Marek's discussion in *IKaunos* pp. 79–90.

¹³³ *IKaunos* 90. The site of Kalynda has not been conclusively identified; see *IKaunos* p. 84; *Stadiasmus* pp. 152–7.

¹³⁴ *IKaunos* pp. 101, 215; B. Takmer, 'Lex Portorii Provinciae Lyciae', *Gephyra* 4 (2007) pp. 172–3.

¹³⁵ Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen* pp. 142–67.

¹³⁶ The term *phyle* is only documented at Kadyanda (*TAM* II (2) 650; 661; 663–4; 666; 674) and Arykanda (*IArykanda* 54).

¹³⁷ *SEG* LV 1502 comm.

¹³⁸ On the dependent communities see C. Schuler, 'Politische Organisationsformen auf dem Territorium von Kyaneai', in *Chora und Polis*, ed. F. Kolb (Munich, 2004) pp. 87–102.

¹³⁹ Archaeological survey has revealed their physical remains: F. Kolb, *Burg, Polis, Bischofssitz: Geschichte der Siedlungskammer von Kyaneai in der Südwesttürkei* (Mainz, 2008).

¹⁴⁰ C. Schuler, 'Augustus, Gott und Herr über Land und Meer. Eine neue Inschrift aus Tyberissos im Kontext der späthellenistischen Herrscherverehrung', *Chiron* 37 (2007) pp. 383–403. It should be noted that

since the term *demos* was used in Lycia to denote the separate communities forming *sympoliteiai*, it is possible that these dependent communities also formed *sympoliteiai*. For Trysa see C. Schuler, 'Sympolitien in Lykien und Karien', in *Hellenistic Karia* pp. 396–7.

¹⁴¹ Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen* pp. 123–41 and C. Schuler (n. 140) pp. 393–413.

¹⁴² *TAM* II (3) 844 and 765.

¹⁴³ See *Stadiasmus* pp. 218–21 and 236–7.

¹⁴⁴ See M. Adak and C. Güzelyürek, *Beldibi von der Steinzeit bis heute* (Istanbul, 2005) pp. 85–6 and M. Adak (n. 60) pp. 8–10.

¹⁴⁵ J. Nollé, 'Kitanaura. Münzen und Geschichte einer kleinen Stadt in den ostlykischen Bergen', *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 46 (1996) pp. 7–29. A splendid funerary monument at Kitanaura belonged to a family whose members were active at Termessos: *TAM* II (3) 1224 and S. Cormack, *The Space of Death in Roman Asia Minor* (Vienna, 2004) pp. 280–4.

¹⁴⁶ *SEG* LI 1839 with *Stadiasmus* p. 231 and C. Schuler (n. 140) p. 400.

¹⁴⁷ *TIB* 8 p. 709.

settlements.¹⁴⁸ A final difficulty of this kind lies in the location of a few places (monastery, *choria*, and *komai*) 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 *LGN 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 *LGN V.A*, the Eastern Ionic spelling *-eo-* and *-ao-* for the more familiar diphthongs *-eu-* and *-au-* is retained, as for example in the names *Εδαγόρης*, *Αδοκλής*, *Γλαδκος*, and *Μολπέος*. Alphabetic *sampi* (*T*) 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 c.500 BC, comprising the names of some 1,250 individuals. By its very nature, this type of documentation sheds light mainly on Pamphylian onomastics, toponymy, and some morphological features of the dialect. Just two inscriptions, from Sillyon and from Aspendos, yield longer texts documenting Pamphylian syntax and vocabulary.

Pamphylian is the product of a long-term evolution of four linguistic components, Anatolian, Achaean (i.e. the dialect spoken by post-Mycenaean populations, ancestor also of Arcado-Cypriot), Doric, and Aeolic. The Greek presence was established in a region with a Luwian-speaking population, though it is unclear how many indigenous languages were originally spoken in the Pamphylian plain. Sidetic is attested at Side and Lyrbe, and one or more Pisidian languages were spoken in the mountainous hinterland, as indicated by epichoric texts from Selge and Timbriada.¹⁴⁹ The post-Luwian languages constantly influenced the Pamphylian dialect through the integration of Anatolian populations from the mountains and perhaps the surrounding countryside. The occurrence of Anatolian names throughout the documented period of the

dialect and their alternation with Greek names within a single family suggests that people of indigenous origin played a continuous role in Pamphylian society and exerted a constant influence on the phonetics of the local Greek dialect, without changing its structure or core features.

The components of the Pamphylian dialect are consistent with the foundation legends of the cities of this region. It shared isoglosses with the Arcado-Cypriot, as well as with the Doric and Aeolic dialects.¹⁵⁰ The Achaean element endowed Pamphylian onomastics with names on the roots of the noun *φάναξ* and the verb *φέχω*, while names formed on the root *ιαρός* and *Ἀπελλ-* may be derived from Doric, and names such as *Φηριᾶς* and *Φιράρας* betray Aeolic influence (see below).

But it would not be correct to characterize Pamphylian as a ‘mixed language’.¹⁵¹ 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.¹⁵² 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 *πάρειος*, ‘cheek’, or *Μεινόπα* from *μήν*, ‘moon’, and *ὄψ*, ‘face’; an entire onomastic family constructed on *φαρήν*, ‘lamb’ (*Φάρνεις*, *Φαρνιω*, *Φάρνοπα*); *Φέχεις*, *Φεχιᾶς*, formed on the verbal root *φέχ-*, ‘carry’; *Τρεσάρας*, *Τρέσις*, created through the extraction of a radical in *-s* from the verb *τρέω*, ‘flee’.¹⁵³ Moreover, two alphabetic letters are unique to Pamphylian: *Ϻ* *ι*, denoting the semi-consonant /*z*/ and *Ϸ* *ψ*, which probably had the phonetic value of the affricate /*ts*/.

The internal dynamics of the Pamphylian dialect as well as the influence of *koine* 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 *Ἀφροδίσιος* 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 *-ων* which lose their nasalization and end in *-ω*; 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 *Stadiasmus* Lyrnai is mentioned as *Λύρναι τῆς Ὀκταπόλεως*: *Stadiasmus* pp. 148–51.

¹⁴⁹ C. Brixhe and M. Özşait, ‘Nouvelles inscriptions pisidiennes et grecques de Timbriada’, *Kadmos* 40 (2001) pp. 155–76. A fourth Pisidian inscription from Selge is still unpublished.

¹⁵⁰ *DGP* pp. 145–7; *DGP Suppl.* 5 pp. 52–3.

¹⁵¹ C. Brixhe, ‘De la filiation à l’héritage. Réflexion sur l’origine des

langues et des dialectes’, in *Peuplements et genèses dialectales dans la Grèce antique*, ed. G. Vottéro (Paris & Nancy, 2006) pp. 31–6.

¹⁵² For schematic modelling of the evolution of the Pamphylian dialect, see Brixhe (n. 151) p. 34.

¹⁵³ C. Brixhe, ‘Réflexions sur l’onomastique personnelle d’une vieille terre coloniale: la Pamphylie’, in *Des dialectes grecs aux lois de Gortyne*, ed. C. Dobias-Lalou (Nancy, 1999) pp. 39–43.

a standard practice in *LGNP*, 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.¹⁵⁴ For genitives in *-iov* (e.g. *Φορδισίου*) the temptation to reconstruct a nominative in *-iους* (*Φορδισιους*) has to be resisted, because such nominatives are, for a good reason, never found. When Pamphylian adopted the graphic system of the *koine* (*ov* instead of the traditional *v* for the values /*ū*/ and /*ū̄*/), the nominative termination /*īōs*/ was already contracted to /*ī̄*/; the nominative form has therefore to be reconstructed as *Φορδίσις* (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.¹⁵⁵

1. VOWELS

i) /*ē̄*/

- neutralization of the opposition *ē̄*/*ī̄* in certain contexts:

in hiatus, /*ē̄*/ becomes close to /*ī̄*/ but only occasionally expressed in writing: *Μεαλίνα* > *Μιαλίνα*, *Μεακλῖς* > *Μιακλῖς*, but *Λεωνίδας*, *Ἀρχέας* etc.

/*ē̄*/ > /*ī̄*/ before a nasal: *Ἀθιμεύς* for *Ἀνθεμεύς*, a phenomenon attested in Arcadian and Cypriot. In theophoric names derived from Artemis, the root is usually *Ἀρτιμι-* (e.g. *Ἀρτιμιδώρις*, *Ἀρτιμιδώρα* etc.). The existence, in Asia Minor, of an indigenous root *Artim-* perhaps strengthened this phenomenon, but its explanation may lie entirely in Pamphylian phonetics.¹⁵⁶

ii) /*ō̄*/

- closure of /*ō̄*/ to /*ū̄*/ in certain positions:

in absolute final position: genitives in *-av*, e.g. *Ἀρχέαν*.

in final position, in a closed syllable; initially spelled *v*, then, under the influence of *koine*, *ov*: *Ἀριστυς* / *Ἀριστους* for *Ἀριστος*. Also affects oblique cases, e.g. gen. *Ζόφιτυς* for **Ζώφητυς*. This rule is later ignored under the influence of *koine*: *Θανάδωρος*, *Παίονος* (gen.).

possibly in internal position, when the closing of /*ō̄*/ occurs in *sandhi*, at the junction of two roots: this may be the best way to explain the alternation *Ὀροφατέρας* / *Ὀρουφατέρας*.¹⁵⁷

closure of /*ō̄*/ to /*ū̄*/ is found in other Greek dialects, especially Arcadian and Cypriot, but in Pamphylian it becomes systematic in final position and was probably influenced by the presence of only one posterior vowel, /*u*/, in the substrate Luwian languages.

iii) /*ī̄*/ and /*ī̄̄*/

- in the oldest inscriptions, both /*ī̄*/ and /*ī̄̄*/ are written as *iota*; after the closure in /*ē̄*/ long, then /*ī̄̄*/ of the ancient diphthong

/*ē̄*/, *ει* provided a new way to write /*ī̄̄*/ and exceptionally /*ī̄*/: *Εἶρας* (**Ηρας*), *Εἰράδορος*, *Εἰαρεύς*, *Μεάλεις* (*Μεγάλλης*); for the original /*ī̄̄*/, besides *Φορδίσις* and *Φορδισία* forms like *Φορδείσις* and *Φορδείσεις* occur.

iv) /*ū̄*/ and /*ū̄̄*/

- both short and long /*u*/ maintained their original pronunciation. In the oldest texts, /*ū̄̄*/ is always written as *upsilon* (*Ἀπελάμυρις*, *Ἰρυμάλια*, *Διφονύσις*), as well as its short counterpart (e.g. *Ἀφορδίσις*). The spelling *ov* appears in Hellenistic texts, coexisting with the original long and short /*u*/: *Διφονούσις* and *Εὔτυχος* / *Εὔτυχους* / *Εὔτουχος* / *Εὔτουχους*.

- closure of /*ō̄*/ to /*ū̄*/ gave thematic terminations like *-us* (nom.), *-v* (gen.); the clusters /*īōs*/ and /*īōn*/ were also written *-uus* and *-uv*, due to a glide [y] before the vowel (see 3. Semivowels). Graphic suppression of the glide produces names in *-iws* and *-iv*. From the end of the third century, /*īū̄̄*/ reduces to a single phoneme, written *ι* or *ει* through the assimilation of /*īū̄̄*/ to /*ī̄̄*/ and contraction, [iγī̄] > [ī̄̄], producing nominatives *Ἀφορδίσις*, *Φορδίσις* and *Φορδείσεις* corresponding to earlier *Ἀφορδίσις*, *Φορδίσις*, *Ἀφορδίσις*. See also the phonetic succession *Διφονύσις*, *Διφονύσις*, *Διφονούσις*, *Διφονύσις*, *Διφονύσεις*.

v) /*ē̄*/ and /*ē̄̄*/

- the two long vowels /*ē̄*/ (open) and /*ē̄̄*/ (closed), found together early,¹⁵⁸ closed to /*ī̄̄*/, written as *ι* (e.g. *Φάρνις*, *Μινάδορος*) or *ει* (e.g. *Μένεις*, *Εἰράδορος*). Sometimes, as a graphic anachronism from a time before the introduction of the Ionic alphabet, *epsilon* is used for long /*ē̄̄*/ (*Μειάλῆς*, *Φῆριᾶς*). Use of *eta* is rare: e.g. *Φηριάς*. Spellings like *Πηλώνις* instead of *Πελώνις* are hypercorrections.

vi) /*ō̄̄*/

- the opposition *ō̄̄*/*ō̄* tended to diminish, so that /*ō̄̄*/ was more often written as an *omicron* than an *omega*: *Ἀπελάδορος*, *Ἀπελόνηις*, *Ἀρτιμιδώρα* etc., due in part to the probable existence in Pamphylian of an intensity accent which automatically lengthened any tonic vowel.¹⁵⁹

2. DIPHTHONGS

i) /*ai*/ and /*oi*/

- tendency towards monophthongization, e.g. *Ἀφάσις* for *Ἡφαίστιος*, *Λιμνάους* or *Λιμνάις* for *Λιμναῖος*, *Εὔποιός* for *Εὔποιεύς*.¹⁶⁰

ii) /*ei*/

- for the closure of /*ei*/ to /*ē̄̄*/ long then /*ī̄̄*/, see §1. iii.

iii) /*au*/ and /*eu*/

- the earliest texts represent these diphthongs as *au* and *eu*,¹⁶¹ replaced by *av* and *ev* under the influence of *koine* during the second century. *Ἀθιμεύς*, *Ορουμνεύς* and a possible [*Κεσ*]-*κεύς*¹⁶² thus precede *Ἀθιμεύς*, *Ορουμνεύς* and *Κεσκεύς*.

¹⁵⁴ The addition of an asterisk to indicate a reconstructed nominative is, regrettably, incompatible with *LGNP*'s IT system.

¹⁵⁵ This presentation is based on the seminal work of C. Brixhe, *Le dialecte grec de Pamphylie. Documents et grammaire. Première partie—La langue*. (Paris, 1976) pp. 3–150, its subsequent *Supplémenta* and the amphora stamps recently published in his *Timbres amphoriques de Pamphylie* (Alexandria, 2012).

¹⁵⁶ Nevertheless, in Mycenaean there are forms both in *a-te-mi-* and *a-ti-mi-*, and it is now generally supposed that the *e/i* fluctuation points to the non-Greek origin of the name: R. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden & Boston, 2010) p. 142.

¹⁵⁷ Brixhe (*Timbres* p. 166) proposes the most likely etymology:

the suffix *-ίδας* appended to a hypocoristic in *-âs*, *-âτος* of a name like *Ὠροφάνης*. An alternative explanation of Heubeck depends on the unattested name **Ὠροφᾶς*, based on *ὄροφος*/*ὄροφή* 'roof' or 'ceiling'.

¹⁵⁸ *DGP* §21.22 and 21.221.

¹⁵⁹ *DGP* §21.23 and 21.231.

¹⁶⁰ *DGP* §21.53 and 21.57; inscriptions attest it only for /*ai*/ before a consonant, but the amphora stamps prove that it was a more widespread phenomenon: Brixhe, *Timbres* 2, 161, 232.

¹⁶¹ E.g. the long inscription from Sillyon, *DGP* 3.

¹⁶² An accent on a sign which is a semivowel is not possible, so no accent is supplied.

3. SEMIVOWELS

- Pamphylian originally preserved the proto-Greek */w/ as [w], written with an epichoric *digamma*, Υ . 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 [f], and it was probably to write these sounds that the panhellenic *digamma*, F φ , was introduced, leaving epichoric Υ to represent the sound [w] that still survived as a glide after [u] or as the second element of a diphthong (e.g. $\text{\AA}\pi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\rho\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ or $\text{\AA}\theta\iota\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, later spelled $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\rho\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ and $\text{\textit{A}}\theta\iota\mu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$). However, epichoric Υ continued in use in some traditional spellings, whence alternate forms such as $\text{\textit{I}}\alpha\nu\alpha\xi\text{-}$ or $\text{\textit{F}}\alpha\nu\alpha\xi\text{-}$. Other phonological developments affected the voiced bilabial occlusive /b/, which seems to have become [v] between vowels, and the voiceless aspirate occlusive /p^h/, which became [f], sometime around the middle of the third century; these developments meant that B and Φ were now also available as appropriate spellings for [v] and [f], alongside epichoric *digamma* Υ and panhellenic *digamma* F , and the result was that all these letters were used interchangeably ($\text{\textit{I}}\alpha\nu\alpha\xi\acute{\iota}\omega$ and $\text{\textit{F}}\alpha\nu\alpha\xi\acute{\iota}\omega$, $\text{\textit{E}}\chi\varphi\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega$ and $\text{\textit{E}}\chi\phi\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega$, $\text{\textit{Z}}\omega\varphi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$ and $\text{\textit{Z}}\omega\beta\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$ (*koine*), $\text{\textit{F}}\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{F}}\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$).

- development of a glide, [y] and [w], after /i/ and /u/ in hiatus, fading out during the second century BC: $\text{\textit{D}}\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ then $\text{\textit{D}}\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\iota\upsilon\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{A}}\pi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\rho\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ then $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\rho\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ (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 $\text{\textit{F}}\omicron\rho\omicron\delta\text{-}$ and $\text{\textit{A}}\phi\omicron\rho\omicron\delta\text{-}$ corresponding to $\text{\textit{A}}\phi\omicron\rho\omicron\delta\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$; $\text{\textit{P}}\omicron\rho\omicron\delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha$ < $\text{\textit{P}}\rho\omicron\delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha$, $\text{\textit{P}}\rho\epsilon\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ (ethnic type personal name derived from the epichoric form of the name of Perge, $\text{\textit{P}}\rho\epsilon\gamma\alpha$ > $\text{\textit{P}}\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha$).

ii) Nasals

- weakening of the nasal at the end of the syllable, usually not written in this position, e.g. $\text{\textit{S}}\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi\acute{\iota}\omega$ for $\text{\textit{S}}\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$, $\text{\textit{T}}\rho\acute{\upsilon}\phi\omega$ for $\text{\textit{T}}\rho\acute{\upsilon}\phi\omega\nu$. Within a word, the nasal did not totally disappear before a consonant even if it was not written, e.g. $\text{\textit{A}}\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{A}}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{L}}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\delta\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{L}}\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$. Its persistence also explains written forms like $\text{\textit{P}}\alpha\nu\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$ and $\text{\textit{S}}\alpha\nu\beta\acute{\iota}\omega$.

A negative consequence is that, in some cases, feminine names in $\text{-}\acute{\omega}$ cannot be differentiated from masculines in $\text{-}\omega\nu$; a form like $\text{\textit{A}}\rho\tau\epsilon\mu\omega$ may equally stand for $\text{\textit{A}}\rho\tau\epsilon\mu\acute{\omega}$ or $\text{\textit{A}}\rho\tau\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omega\nu$. Such names are not accented in the main entry, the alternatives being expressed in the final brackets.

iii) Occlusives

- in intervocalic position, *delta* replaced by *rho*: $\text{\textit{D}}\rho\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ < $\text{\textit{D}}\rho\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{O}}\rho\omicron\phi\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ < $\text{\textit{O}}\rho\omicron\phi\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{F}}\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ < $\text{\textit{O}}\theta\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\varsigma$, possibly $\text{\textit{D}}\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ < $\text{\textit{D}}\acute{\iota}\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ etc.

- early spirantization of /g/ between two vowels, the first being /e/: $\text{\textit{M}}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{M}}\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{M}}\epsilon\alpha\kappa\lambda\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{M}}\epsilon\gamma\alpha\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ and $\text{\textit{M}}\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{M}}\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$.

- the bilabial treatment of the Indo-European labiovelar */k^w/ and the cluster */ghw/ before /e/ under the influence of the Aeolic dialect: $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{F}}\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{F}}\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\varsigma$, where a dental treatment is expected, as in all other Greek dialects: $\text{\textit{T}}\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{O}}\theta\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{O}}\theta\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\varsigma$).

- Indo-European */k(h)j/ or */tw/ had a palatal or even already an affricate phonetic outcome for which a new letter had to be created: $\text{\textit{P}}$ ψ , perhaps formed by adding diacritical

marks to *tau*. It is not at all certain that its final phonetic expression was a voiceless sibilant /s(s)/, as initially supposed by Brixhe in 1976.¹⁶³ The clearest example is provided by the title of Artemis Pergaia, $\text{\textit{I}}\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\mu\alpha$, resulting from the evolution of Indo-European $\text{\textit{*}}\textit{wanak-y\ddot{a}}$ and corresponding to the Achaeon $\text{\textit{*}}(\text{\textit{f}})\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$. A probable Greek name, $\text{\textit{P}}\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, would be the equivalent of an Attic $\text{\textit{*}}\text{\textit{S}}\eta\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. Indigenous names like $\text{\textit{M}}\alpha\gamma\alpha\sigma\iota\psi\varphi\alpha\varsigma$ and $\text{\textit{I}}\lambda\nu\iota\psi\varphi\alpha\varsigma$ also contain this phoneme.

iv) Geminates

- simplification of geminates: e.g. $\text{\textit{A}}\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ > $\text{\textit{A}}\pi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{P}}\acute{\upsilon}\rho\rho\omicron\varsigma$ > $\text{\textit{P}}\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. Not one of the eight different dialectal spellings for $\text{\textit{M}}\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma$ retained the geminate. However, countering the trend to simplification, reinforcement of its articulation is perhaps reflected in spellings like $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ / $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ / $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\delta\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\iota\varsigma$ / $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\delta\acute{\omega}\nu\iota\varsigma$.

5. OTHER PHONETIC PHENOMENA

i) *Aphaeresis*, especially of initial short *alpha*: $\text{\textit{O}}\nu\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{A}}\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{A}}\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{F}}\omicron\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\upsilon\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{A}}\phi\omicron\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\upsilon\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{P}}\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\iota\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{A}}\pi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\iota\varsigma$. 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 epichoric texts from Lycia 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) *Prothesis*: $\text{\textit{I}}\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{S}}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\text{\textit{I}}\sigma\varphi\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ for $\text{\textit{S}}\varphi\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$.

iii) *Anaptyxis*: $\text{\textit{K}}\omicron\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ instead of $\text{\textit{*}}\text{\textit{K}}\omicron\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ (nickname formed on $\text{\textit{k}}\omicron\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ with the suffix $\text{-}\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ or directly from the adjective $\text{\textit{k}}\omicron\pi\rho\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$).

Names in non-Greek languages

It has always been the practice of *LGNP* 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 Thracian names in *LGNP* IV, such as $\text{\textit{M}}\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\nu\iota\varsigma$ (2), (6), and (19), and $\text{\textit{M}}\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\alpha\lambda\iota\varsigma$ (1)–(3), (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 *LGNP* 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, Lycian, and Sidetic, all three descendants of or closely related to the

¹⁶³ *DGP* p. 7. For his latest views on the question, see C. Brixhe, 'Le *psi* et le "trident" dans l'alphabet grec de Pamphylie', in *De Cyrene à Catherine: trois mille ans de libyennes*, edd. F. Poli and G. Vottéro (Nancy, 2005) pp. 59–65.

Luwian branch of the Anatolian family of Indo-European languages. Sidetic-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 Sidetic, *Ἀθηνόδωρος* from ‘*thandor*’, *Ἀρτέμων* from ‘*art-mon*’, *Διονύσιος* from ‘*diYneziw*’). 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 *Ἀθηναγόρας* from *tēnagure*, *Ἐκαταῖος* from *eχeteija*, *Ἰητροκλῆς* from *ijetruχle*; in Carian *Ἐκαταῖος* from ‘*ktais*’, *Οὐλιάδης* from ‘*uliade*’, *Υβρέας* from ‘*ybrs*’). 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.¹⁶⁴

Non-Greek names and their treatment

Much has already been said in the Introduction to *LGPN* V.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 Tracheia, 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.¹⁶⁵ Thus a single Carian name may be found in three or four different forms—*Ἀρισσις*, *Ἀρρισις*, and *Ἀρρισσις*, or *Υσαλδωμος*, *Υσσαλδωμος*, *Υσσελδωμος*, and *Υσσαλλωμος*; a Lycian name may have even more, and less recognizable variants—*Κεδδηβης*, *Κεδηβης*, *Κενδεβης*, *Κενδηβης*, *Κενθηβης*—and likewise in Cilicia Tracheia—*Αινγολις*, *Εγγολις*, *Ενγολις*, without it 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, *Δαπαρας*, *Δαπασας*, *Λαπαρας* or *Καρταδης* and *Καρταλις*, 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 reasoning 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 accented 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.¹⁶⁶ 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.¹⁶⁷ 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* V.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 *Μινν-*, of which *Μιννίων* is by far the most common. Although included under the heading of *Μινο-*, of uncertain meaning, by Fick and Bechtel in 1894,¹⁶⁸ 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.¹⁶⁹ However, in the ‘Nachtrag’ at the end of his book, he

¹⁶⁴ For the personal names attested in Carian see I.-J. Adiego (n. 5) pp. 328–44; for names in Lycian see N. Cau, ‘Onomastica licia’, *Studi ellenistici* 16 (2005) pp. 346–66 and G. Neumann, *Glossar des Lykischen* (Wiesbaden, 2007).

¹⁶⁵ A partial attempt was made for Thracian names in *LGPN* IV (p. x); see also the critique of D. Dana, ‘Les noms de facture thrace dans *LGPN* IV: les noms fantômes et d’autres corrections’, *ZPE* 157 (2006) p. 128.

¹⁶⁶ ‘Greek Accents on Egyptian Names’, *ZPE* 119 (1997) pp. 177–84. It is tacitly followed in other recent publications, e.g. M. B. Hatzopoulos

and L. D. Loukopoulou, *Recherches sur les marches orientales des Téménides* (Athens, 1992–6).

¹⁶⁷ Among others by W. Blümel, C. Brixhe, L. Dubois, O. Masson, L. Robert, and L. Zgusta.

¹⁶⁸ F. Bechtel and A. Fick, *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt* (Göttingen, 1874) p. 209.

¹⁶⁹ *KP* p. 318 with n. 226 in which he reports the similar opinion expressed in a letter by O. Masson, who seems never to have discussed these names in print.

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.¹⁷⁰ W. Blümel tacitly reasserted their non-Greek character by their inclusion in his list of indigenous personal names attested in Greek inscriptions from Caria.¹⁷¹ 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.¹⁷² 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 *Κιλλ-*. The adjective *κιλλός* ('grey') underlies a scarce but widely distributed group of Greek names (e.g. *Κίλλη*, *Κίλλης*, *Κίλλος*, *Κίλλων*),¹⁷³ which coexist with names of similar or identical appearance (e.g. *Κιλλη*, *Κιλλίς*, *Κιλλυας*, *Κιλλως* as well as compounds like *Κιλ(λ)αραμωσ*, *Κιληνδος*, *Κιλλορτης*, *Κιλωρασις*) 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 prevalingly indigenous (e.g. *Γη*, *Κουρος*, *Ορειος*), it has more often been decided to regard them as non-Greek. In a very few cases a name composed of the same string of letters is divided between an accented Greek name and an unaccented indigenous name, a good example being *Σάμος* and *Σαμος*, which Robert distinguished as separate forms purely on the grounds of distribution and context.¹⁷⁴ Of a similar kind is the distinction between the Latin name *Μανία* and the *Μανια* of Asia Minor, and perhaps even a Greek name *Μανία* 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*, *Βρύαξίς*, *Πίγρης*, *Έρμαπίας*, *Συέννεσις*, *Ταρκονδίμοτος*), 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. *-âs*, *-ίδας/-ίδης*, *-ούς*, *-υλλος/α*). 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 *-ιανός/ή*. Where a manuscript tradition for the accentuation of a name exists, this has been recorded in the final brackets (e.g. *Μαύσωλος* —mss.).

An important category are the so-called *Lallnamen* (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 or two syllables, with repeated consonantal elements, e.g. *Αμμια*, *Απφη*, *Βα(ς)*, *Βαβης*, *Δαδα*, *Λα(ς)*, *Νανα*, *Παπιας*, *Τατα*) 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.¹⁷⁵ 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.¹⁷⁶ 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, Epeiros, 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 Bithynia, Lydia (which provide the greater proportion of those recorded in *LGNP* V.A), 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.¹⁷⁷ 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.¹⁷⁸

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

¹⁷⁰ *KP* pp. 693–4; *Noms indigènes* p. 226 with the long n. 6 documenting their distribution.

¹⁷¹ 'Einheimische Personennamen in griechischen Inschriften aus Karien', *Epigr. Anat.* 20 (1992) p. 19.

¹⁷² See his 'Onomastic Notes' appended to D. Bosnakis' *Ἀνέκδοτες Ἐπιγραφές τῆς Κῶ* (Athens, 2008) pp. 193–5.

¹⁷³ Bechtel, *HP* p. 494; Robert, *Noms indigènes* pp. 400–1 n. 4.

¹⁷⁴ *La Carie* II pp. 77–8.

¹⁷⁵ See Robert's remarks in *Hellenica* VI p. 90 and in *Noms indigènes* pp. 348 and 368 with n. 3.

¹⁷⁶ Elements in vernacular Greek (cf. *LSJ* s.vv. *ἀμμά/ἄμμάς*, *ἄμμία*, *ἄππα*, *ἄπφά*, *ἄπφός*, *ἄττα*, *μάμμη*, *μαμμία*, *μάμμιον*, *νάννας/νάννα/νάννη*, *πάππος/πάπας*, *παππίος*, *πάππος*, *τατά* (voc.), *τατί*) might justify their being considered as Greek in these contexts.

¹⁷⁷ A certain bias may exist in regions such as Lydia and Lycia where women are far better attested in funerary memorials which often name members of the extended family.

¹⁷⁸ See E. Laroche, *Les noms des Hittites* (Paris, 1966) pp. 239–46; Adiego (n. 5) p. 340; C. Brixhe, 'The Personal Onomastics of Roman Phrygia', in *Roman Phrygia: Culture and Society*, ed. P. Thonemann (Cambridge, 2013) p. 58.

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 prevailing usage of Iranist scholars; it would perhaps be strange to see a name such as *Μιθριδάτης*, 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. *Ἰακώβ*, *Ἰακω*).

In the Introduction to *LGPN* V.A (pp. xv–xvi), attention was drawn to the interaction between indigenous nomenclature and Greek language in hellenized or partly hellenized communities in Asia Minor. Examples, such as *Ἐρμαῖος* and *Ἵβριμος*, were adduced to illustrate the contamination of non-Greek names derived from one or other of the Anatolian languages through assimilation with names familiar to a Greek ear. This onomastic phenomenon is particularly pronounced in Lycia, Pamphylia, and Cilicia.¹⁷⁹

The fundamental guide to the indigenous names of Asia Minor is L. Zgusta's *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (Prague, 1964), with his supplementary *Neue Beiträge zur kleinasiatischen 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 two works where indigenous names are concerned. The same rule also applies to L. Robert's *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine* (Paris, 1963), though reference is sometimes made to his discussion and elucidation of individual names.

Names with the suffix -ιανός/ιανή

As in *LGPN* V.A, the present fascicle contains a large number of names ending in *-ιανός*,¹⁸⁰ numerous in Pamphylia and Cilicia Tracheia 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 circumstances 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 *Ταυρινιανός* (1–2) from Attaleia in Pamphylia, whose father was called *Ταυρίνος* (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

Σεουηριανός (2), whose father and brother were both called *Σεουήρος* (10 and 11). A case can be made for taking such names simply as patronymic adjectives and denying them an entry in their attested form, but their frequent use as single names (e.g. *Τελεσφοριανός* (1) with his father *Τελεσφόρος* (2) and his brother *Τελεσφόρος* (3)) demand that they should be treated as 'real' names in their own right.

In many cases involving the *tria nomina* (such as the *Ταυρινιανός* and *Σεουηριανός* just mentioned) names in *-ιανός* were used as *cognomina* and thus had the value of 'patronymic *cognomina*', indicated as 'patr. cogn.' in the final brackets. However, a good number of individuals, such as the brothers *Ταυρινιανός* mentioned above, had two *cognomina*, the second of which follows a name in *-ιανός*. Here the chances are good that even where the father's name is not known, such a 'patronymic *cognomen*' (one not derived from a Roman *nomen gentile*) preceding a 'normal' *cognomen* is derived from the father's name. However, since names of this type could also be 'inherited' and refer to family members of an earlier generation, this possibility has been indicated with a cautionary question mark as 'patr. cogn.?'. Much more often the background to a name in *-ιανός* is unknown, so no indication is given that it could be derived from a parental or ancestral name.

In some instances a name in *-ιανός* is apparently derived from an element of the mother's name (e.g. *Δημητριανός*, son (?) of *Ἀὐρ. Βωτιανή Δημητρία* or *Τιβ. Φλ. Σαβινιανός* (2) *Διομήδης Μένιππος*, son of *Τ. Φλ. Διομήδης* and *Κλ. Λεοντίς ἡ καὶ Σαβίνα*); such names are accordingly marked as 'matr. cogn.' in the final brackets.

Names in *-ιανός* seem to have alternated in some families. For example, at Cilician Kolybrassos, a man called *Ἀὐρ. Ἵβριμιανός* (2) *Πολέμων νέος* has a son *Ἀὐρ. Πολεμωνιανός* (1) *Ἵβριμος νέος*. It can be inferred that *Πολέμων* and *Ἵβριμος* alternated in the family as did the names *Πολεμωνιανός* and *Ἵβριμιανός* derived from them.¹⁸¹ Names of this category are indicated by 'patr. cogn.?' in the final brackets.

Statistics

This fascicle contains a total of 44,748 attestations of personal names, but, as was noted in *LGPN* V.A (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 *supernomina*, double names as well as occasional longer combinations of names; the frequent combination of names with the suffix *-ιανός/ή* with other names has already been discussed (see above). Of this total, 39,477 are masculine, 5,199 feminine; 72 cannot be assigned their gender. It is made up of 8,418 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.¹⁸² 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;

¹⁷⁹ For an analysis of some striking examples see C. Brixhe, 'Étymologie populaire et onomastique en pays bilingue', *RPh* 1991, pp. 67–81; also see this volume p. xxxiii.

¹⁸⁰ For names of this kind and their explanation see T. Corsten, 'Names in *-ιανός* in Asia Minor', in *Onomatologos* pp. 456–63, with references to previous literature, and briefly in the Introduction to *LGPN* V.A p. xv.

¹⁸¹ Cf. Corsten (n. 180) p. 461.

¹⁸² 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 *-πολις*) 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 (26,149—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. Lycia 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 Tracheia 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 *Ἀπολλώνιος* (977), *Διονύσιος* (872), and *Δημήτριος* (793), the same three theophoric names which figured so prominently in *LGPN V.A* (pp. xvi–xvii). Other names deserving of mention for their frequency are *Ἀρτεμίδωρος* (411), *Ίάσων* (389), *Λέων* (336), *Μένανδρος* (326), *Μένιππος* (294), *Τεροκλήης* (282), *Διογένης* (277), *Ἀλέξανδρος* (271), *Ζήνων* (264), *Θεόδωρος* (232), *Ἐρμίας / Ἐρμείας* (210), and *Ἐρμαῖος* (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 *LGPN V.A*, are virtually confined to those relating to the Maiandros and attested for the most part at Miletos. Month-names, themselves based on the titles of religious festivals, are a fertile source of personal names (e.g. *Ἀνθεστήριος*, *Ἀπατούριος*, *Ἀρτεμισίος / Ἀρτεμισία*, *Βαδρόμιος*, *Θ(Τ)αργήλιος*, *Λήναιος / Ληναῖς*, *Μεταγείτνιος*, *Ποσίδεος*) but here largely restricted to Caria. *Lallnamen* are relatively infrequent for men; only *Παπίας / Παπῖς* is found in large numbers (111). They are, however, much more common as feminine names (*Ἀφφια / Αφφία / Αφφία* (67), *Αμμία / Αμμία* (65), *Ναυα / Νανη / Ναυνα / Ναννη* (64), *Αφφίον / Αφφίον / Αφφίον / Αφφίον* (58), *Ταπία* (52), *Λαλλά* (43)). Another important category of feminine names are those based on substantives derived from abstract concepts with positive values (*Ἐλπῖς* (68), *Νίκη* (37), *Τύχη* (32), *Εἰρήνη* (29)), common throughout the Greek-speaking world in the later Hellenistic and Imperial periods. Nevertheless, the commonest feminine name is theophoric, *Ἀρτεμισία* (86), and several others are also prominent (*Ἀρτεμῖς* (59), *Δημητρία* (37), *Ἀφροδισία* (27), *Ἀρτεμώ* (26)). The commonest feminine name in *LGPN V.A*, *Στρατονίκη*, is much less frequent here, in spite of the strong Seleucid influence in several of the regions it covers.

However, these overall figures are potentially misleading and should not be regarded as being of equal validity throughout the regions covered here. In terms of culture and history, there is a much lesser degree of coherence in this volume than its predecessor; Caria, for example, has little in common with either Pamphylia or Cilicia, and not much to do even with neighbouring Lycia. For an analysis to have any value, each of the regions needs to be studied separately. Even then, such

an analysis will remain rather crude without introducing a chronological dimension. However, in spite of its limitations, it is not without interest in pointing to significant regional differences, as well as differences within a large region such as Caria. In what follows the figures take into account dialectal, orthographic, and shortened variations of a name, treating them as one (e.g. *Ἀθάναιος*, *Ἀθήναιος*, *Ἀθήναις* or *Νεομήνιος*, *Νευμήνιος*, *Νουμήνιος*, *Νουμήνις*, *Νυμήνις* or *Αφφίον*, *Αφφίον*, *Αφφίον*, *Αφφίον* or *Ναυα*, *Νανη*, *Ναννα*, *Ναννη*).

Caria

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 Kallipolis at the head of the Gulf of Kerasos. 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 Maeander valley and its mountainous southern fringe (including Herakleia under Latmos), together with the major tributary river valleys of the Marsyas 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 Stratonikeia likewise encompasses both city and its surrounds 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 Maeander, 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,¹⁸³ with a slightly lower concentration around Stratonikeia. They are much less numerous in the North, and almost entirely absent from Miletos, Knidos, and Kaunos.¹⁸⁴ This pattern corresponds closely to other evidence which locates the heartland of the Carian people in the south-west of the region, with its centre around the old Hekatomnid capital at Mylasa. The indigenous names in the East, though few in number, point

¹⁸³ The high figures for the Coastal region are heavily influenced by a single inscription from Halikarnassos of the late 5th/early 4th cent. (most recent edition in *SEG XLIII* 713) in which almost exactly one half (156) of the 310 names which can be read or restored with some plausibility are Carian, the remainder mostly Greek and several Iranian.

¹⁸⁴ This probably gives a false picture of Kaunos before the Hellenistic period, when most of its known inhabitants bore Carian names (see *Hautes terres de Carie* 91–2—all but one of the nine named Kaunians has a Carian name) and where public documents in Carian have been found.

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 *Άγροφών* is the commonest male name at Kaunos, while the uncommon *Δεξιφάνης* and names compounded in *Εύφρ-* are frequent at Knidos but nowhere else in Caria, illustrations of the rather different onomastic repertoires of these two isolated cities. *Χρυσάωρ*, a name closely linked with local mythology, is found almost exclusively in the region of Stratonikeia. Names based on the obscure element *Μινν-* are common at Miletos, with smaller numbers scattered in other parts of western Caria and Ionia. For reasons that elude us, names derived from *δράκων* ('snake') are very common in much of western Caria, but not frequent elsewhere. The same is true of two other names. *Ίατροκλήης* 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. *Τεροκλήης* 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 *Ούλιάδης*, a common name in western Caria, especially around Mylasa and Stratonikeia, has been linked with the indigenous *Ολιατος / Υλιατος*,¹⁸⁵ and the group of names, *Μύς*, *Μύων* and *Μυωνίδης*, likewise common in various parts of the region, has been associated with an indigenous component (*μυυα-*) found in names such as *Εκαμυης* and *Παναμυης*.¹⁸⁶ Miletos' rich assemblage of theophoric names, especially those derived from Meter and Poseidon, bind it closely to naming patterns in Ionia. The inland regions of Mylasa and Stratonikeia share many features in their onomastics, not least the rather restricted range of names attested in them, by comparison with other parts of western Caria, and the high frequencies of banal, colour-

less names such as *Άριστέας*, *Ίάσων*, *Λέων*, *Μέλας*, *Μένιππος*, and *Φανίας*, which also figure prominently in adjacent regions to the north and west. But the most marked contrast, which tends to confirm the indications of other parameters, is found in the East, where some of the most popular names (e.g. *Άδραστος*, *Άτταλος*, *Μαρσύας*, *Παπίας*, and *Ύψικλήης* as well as the numerous female *Lallnamen*) are infrequent in the rest of Caria, while many names common in other parts of the region are scarce or altogether absent there.

Lycia

Although the onomastic repertoire of Lycia, at the southeastern 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 Tracheia where a faithful loyalty to their Luwian onomastic heritage is also evident. Although *Lallnamen* do not exceed 3% of the total of the names on record in Lycia, the relatively even distribution of the 319 individuals is perhaps better interpreted against 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 (*Άρπαγος*, perhaps *Αρβινας* and *Γεργις*) may suggest resistance by some local dynasts to the increasingly hellenizing context of the fifth and fourth centuries BC. Others (such as *Άρταπάτης* 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.¹⁸⁷ 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.¹⁸⁸ 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%), Idebessos (49%), and Trebenna (44%), in all of which well in excess of 25% of the individuals recorded bear indigenous names. In the cities

¹⁸⁵ See Masson, *OGS* 1 pp. 28–30 and W. Blümel (n. 171) pp. 20 and 26.

¹⁸⁶ Robert, *Hell.* VIII pp. 33–4.

¹⁸⁷ For the delineation of the subregions used in the tables, see p. xiii. Places which lie on the border between subregions have been assigned as

follows: Kadyanda to the Xanthos valley; Nisa and Limyra to Central Lycia; Arykanda to Eastern Lycia.

¹⁸⁸ In interpreting these figures account must be taken of the much smaller number of individuals recorded in the Gulf of Fethiye (702) than in the other subdivisions of Lycia.

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 Kabalis 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 *Άγρεοφών*, *Άντίπατρος*, *Ζήνων*, and *Μηνόδωρος* provide a clear link between the Gulf of Fethiye and the neighbouring Carian city of Kaunos.¹⁸⁹ As already remarked, indigenous names (e.g. *Άρσασις*, *Μεις*, *Ερπιδαση*, *Παναση*, *Ερμαστα*) and *Lallnamen* (e.g. *Αμμια*, *Δαλλα*, *Ναν(ν)α/η/ις*, *Απφια* / *Αφ(φ)ια*) are more frequently applied to women than to men. None of the *Lallnamen* figures among the commonest male 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–Luwian divinity Arma, *Ερμαπιας* and *Ερμακοτας*, are common in Central Lycia. *Μολης*, *Τροκονδας*, *Αρτειμας*, as well as *Άρτειμς* and *Ερμαίος* 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 in this region of Greek names such as *Άρτειμς* and *Ερμαίος*.¹⁹⁰

Pamphylia

In interpreting the statistics for Pamphylia, attention should be drawn to the important differences in the nature of the documentation between Aspendos and the other three main cities. The body of onomastic material from Aspendos is by far the most important (1,037 records out of 2,322; the total excludes those who cannot be assigned to a particular city) but is overwhelmingly representative of the Hellenistic period. The material from Attaleia, Perge, and Side, on the other hand, dates almost exclusively from the Imperial period. The bias is obvious if the proportion of Italian names from Aspendos (2% of the records) is compared with the average figure for Pamphylia as a whole (11%) and even more so with the other major Pamphylian cities (30% at Attaleia, 23% at Perge, 16% at Side). People bearing names of Italian origin thus constitute an extremely important element in the population of Attaleia and Perge, exceeding even the high numbers documented in Cilicia Pedias (below). These figures tend to corroborate other evidence for the settlement of Italians at Attaleia and the presence of important families of Italian extraction at Perge.

The proportion of Greek names (names—66%, records—73%) is comparable with the overall percentages for Lycia, but, as noted above, the predominantly pre-Imperial date of the onomastic material from Aspendos, combined with the

names attested on the later Hellenistic Pamphylian amphora stamps, has a strong bearing on these figures. It is probable, but obviously not certain, that a more balanced chronological distribution within the sets of data would have produced in the totals a reduced percentage for the Greek names and a higher one for the Italian and indigenous names. The relatively high proportion of indigenous names, almost constant between Hellenistic Aspendos and Imperial Attaleia, Perge, and Side, suggests a continuing process of integration of individuals of Luwian extraction, perhaps originating in the mountainous hinterland of Pamphylia, in the Greek-speaking populations of its cities. The very low figures for the *Lallnamen* (names—2%, records—1%) are 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 Pamphylian 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 distinction in 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 are the extremely high numbers of indigenous name forms (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 Korykos, dating approximately from the fourth to sixth centuries AD.

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

¹⁸⁹ Most of the occurrences of these names come from a single document from Hippoukome (*TAM 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 *Θήρων* and *Θηρωνίδης*.

¹⁹⁰ See Brixhe (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 1. Distribution of names by category across the regions and their sub-regions. The two sets of figures and percentages relate to the totals recorded first for the number of name forms, and second for the number of individuals.

		Greek	Theophoric*	Indigenous	<i>Lallnamen</i>	Italian	Semitic	Iranian	Other**
Caria***	4543	84%	11%	7%	1%	8%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%
	26149	91%	30%	3%	2%	4%	0.3%	0.1%	<0.1%
Miletos	2177	91%	13%	1%	0.6%	7%	0.3%	<0.1%	0.1%
	7227	94%	28%	0.5%	0.3%	5%	0.2%	<0.1%	<0.1%
Coast	1422	85%	14%	9%	0.6%	5%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%
	4821	91%	33%	6%	0.3%	3%	0.1%	0.2%	<0.1%
Knidos	879	96%	16%	0.5%	0.2%	3%	—	0.2%	—
	1633	98%	22%	0.2%	0.1%	2%	—	0.1%	—
Kaunos	283	91%	24%	3%	0.7%	5%	—	—	0.3%
	655	95%	36%	2%	0.5%	3%	—	—	0.2%
North	890	85%	18%	3%	2%	7%	0.1%	1%	0.6%
	2571	92%	36%	2%	2%	4%	<0.1%	0.5%	0.2%
Mylasa	593	80%	18%	12%	2%	6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%
	2254	90%	31%	7%	1%	2%	<0.1%	<0.1%	0.2%
Stratonikeia	745	83%	18%	7%	3%	6%	0.1%	—	—
	2889	90%	27%	4%	4%	2%	<0.1%	—	—
East	935	77%	14%	3%	4%	13%	2%	0.9%	0.2%
	3891	84%	30%	1%	7%	7%	1%	0.3%	<0.1%
Lycia****	2350	69%	10%	21%	3%	6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%
	9132	75%	21%	17%	3%	3%	0.2%	0.7%	0.3%
Gulf of Fethiye	325	83%	22%	9%	2%	4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
	701	89%	32%	6%	2%	2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.6%
Xanthos Valley	1095	73%	12%	16%	3%	7%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%
	3549	79%	19%	12%	4%	4%	0.1%	0.8%	0.3%
Central Lycia	877	69%	12%	23%	3%	4%	0.6%	0.8%	0.1%
	2196	76%	21%	19%	3%	2%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%
Eastern Lycia	949	72%	12%	18%	3%	6%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
	2467	67%	21%	25%	4%	3%	<0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Phaselis	191	90%	21%	6%	2%	2%	—	—	—
	258	84%	23%	12%	1%	2%	—	—	—
Pamphylia	1205	66%	11%	16%	2%	14%	0.7%	0.2%	0.3%
	2981	73%	24%	15%	1%	11%	0.3%	<0.1%	0.1%
Attaleia	185	54%	12%	9%	3%	29%	0.5%	—	0.5%
	279	56%	20%	11%	2%	30%	0.4%	—	0.4%
Aspendos	508	62%	13%	16%	4%	4%	0.8%	—	0.4%
	1037	79%	24%	13%	2%	2%	0.3%	—	0.1%
Perge	377	66%	16%	7%	2%	26%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%
	620	69%	26%	6%	1%	23%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%
Side	291	66%	17%	10%	2%	20%	1%	—	—
	386	71%	25%	11%	1%	16%	0.8%	—	—
Cilicia									
Tracheia	1453	46%	9%	30%	9%	12%	2%	<0.1%	0.1%
	3857	51%	14%	22%	10%	11%	6%	<0.1%	<0.1%
Pedias	1117	64%	13%	8%	3%	23%	2%	0.8%	0.4%
	2480	63%	25%	8%	2%	27%	1%	0.4%	0.2%

* 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.

Miletos 1,710	Coastal 1,265	Knidos 746	Kaunos 259	North 712	Mylasa 536	Stratonikeia 555	East 773
Διονύσιος 179	Διονύσιος 112	Διονύσιος 21	Άγρεοφών 28	Άπολλώνιος 124	Άριστέας 89	Λέων 131	Άπολλώριος 172
Άπολλώνιος 153	Δημήτριος 106	Άπολλώριος 15	Ζήνων 25	Διονύσιος 117	Μέλας 84	Διονύσιος 89	Ζήνων 155
Δημήτριος 147	Γεροκλής 74	Ευφράνωρ 13	Δημήτριος 21	Άρτεμίδωρος 74	Μένιππος 84	Γεροκλής 84	Άδραστος 99
Ποσειδώνιος 53	Άπολλώνιος 73	Ευβουλος 12	Μένανδρος 21	Δημήτριος 53	Γατροκλής 82	Άριστέας 67	Μένανδρος 99
Άρτέμιος 46	Άπολλωνίδης 57	Άπολλόδωρος 11	Μηρόδωρος 21	Μένανδρος 45	Διονύσιος 80	Μένιππος 63	Διονύσιος 98
Ζώσιμος 45	Έκαταίος 54	Δεξιάφνης 11	Άντίπατρος 18	Μένιππος 42	Λέων 75	Άρτεμίδωρος 61	Άπταλος 97
Άλέξανδρος 43	Θεόδωρος 43	Άπολλωνίδας 10	Άπολλώνιος 15	Γεροκλής 42	Άπολλώνιος 73	Δημήτριος 52	Διογένης 88
Μένανδρος 41	Δράκων 42	Καλλικράτης 10	Άπολλωνίδης 13	Άθηνάγωρας 30	Ίάσων 56	Ίάσων 50	Παπίας 78
Έπίγονος 39	Λέων 40	Διοκλής 8	Άρτεμίδωρος 13	Γατροκλής 30	Δημήτριος 54	Μένανδρος 50	Άρτεμίδωρος 74
Θεόδωρος 39	Άρτεμίδωρος 38	Ευφρων 8	Διονύσιος 9	Έρμίας 28	Έρμίας 37	Χρυσάωρ 43	Υψικλής 43
Άντίπατρος 37	Έρμίας 38	Ίάσων 8	Θήρων 9	Μενεκράτης 27	Εύρηταιος 35	Φανίας 37	Δημήτριος 39
Έστιαίος 37	Μένιππος 38	Φιλίνος 8	Νέων 8	Ίάσων 26	Πολίτης 30	Έκαταίος 32	Άθηνάγωρας 36
Άθηνάιος 36	Γατροκλής 36	Άθηνάιος 7	Γατροκλής 7	Διογένης 23	Θαργήλιος 30	Έπαίειτος 31	Μηρόδοτος 34
Διογένης 35	Μελάνθιος 34	Έπίγονος 7	Μενώνδης 20	Μενώνδης 20	Έκαταίος 29	Έκαίων 30	Γλύκων 32
Μητρόδωρος 35	Άριστέας 31	Ευκράτης 7	Άριστέας 18	Ουλιάδης 29	Ουλιάδης 29	Άπολλώριος 29	Μένιππος 32
Έκαταίος 34	Ίάσων 31	Ευφραγόρας 7	Ήρακλείδης 18	Φανίας 29	Φανίας 29	Μουνίδης 23	Άλέξανδρος 29
Άντίοχος 33	Άπολλόδωρος 29	Μόσχος 7	Ζήνων 17	Πρωτέας 25	Πρωτέας 25	Θεόδωρος 22	Μαρσάς 26
Έρμίας 31	Μενεκλής 28	Πτολεμαίος 7	Ουλιάδης 16	Διογένης 23	Διογένης 23	Μέλας 22	Καλλικράτης 24
Άπολλόδωρος 30	Διόδωρος 28	Σώστρατος 7	Λέων 15	Γεροκλής 22	Γεροκλής 22	Δράκων 20	Άπελλίδης 23
Άσκληπιάδης 30	Μενεκράτης 28	Σύμμαχος 7	Παυσανίας 15	Μένανδρος 21	Μένανδρος 21	Άντίοχος 18	Κάλλιππος 23
Ζώπυρος 30	Άρτέμιος 27	Θεύδοτος 7	Εκατομνος 19	Εκατομνος 19	Γατροκλής 18	Γατροκλής 18	Μενεσθεύς 23
Άφροδίσιος 29	Έρμόφαντος 27		Υβρέας 18	Διομήδης 17	Υβρέας 18	Διομήδης 17	Περίτας 23
Μενεκράτης 29	Θεόδωρος 27		Άντίπατρος 27	Μενεκλής 17	Άντίπατρος 27	Μενεκλής 17	Τατιανός 23
Άρτεμίδωρος 28	Διογένης 24		Δράκων 17	Μενεκράτης 17	Δράκων 17	Μενεκράτης 17	Έρμιογένης 21
Γεροκλής 27	Μέλας 24		Διόδοτος 16	Αινείας 16	Διόδοτος 16	Αινείας 16	Ίουλιανός 21
Ίσίδωρος 27	Έστιαίος 23		Άρτεμίδωρος 15	Άλέξανδρος 16	Άρτεμίδωρος 15	Άλέξανδρος 16	Άντίοχος 20
Μιννίων 26	Ήρακλείδης 22		Μενεκράτης 15	Φαίδρος 16	Μενεκράτης 15	Φαίδρος 16	Άρίστιον 20
Άπατούριος 25			Έστιαίος 13	Διοκλής 15	Έστιαίος 13	Διοκλής 15	Μύων 20

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.

Miletos 470	Coastal 159	Knidos 133	Kaunos 24	North 110	Mylasa 56	Stratonikeia 187	East 161
<i>Ζωσίμη</i> 19	<i>Ἀρτεμισία</i> 16	<i>Τύχη</i> 6	<i>Ἀρτεμισία</i> 3	<i>Ἥδεια</i> 5	<i>Ἀρτεμισία</i> 12	<i>Αἰφίον</i> 26	<i>Αμμία</i> 30
<i>Ἀρτεμισία</i> 16	<i>Ἀρτεμώ</i> 6	<i>Ἐπαγαθώ</i> 4	<i>Δημητρία</i> 3	<i>Αἰφίον</i> 4	<i>Μηνιάς</i> 5	<i>Λεοντίς</i> 13	<i>Αφφία</i> 30
<i>Ἀπολλωνία</i> 12		<i>Εὐτυχία</i> 3	<i>Διονυσία</i> 2	<i>Ἀρτεμισία</i> 4	<i>Αβα</i> 4	<i>Τατίας</i> 12	<i>Μελιτίνη</i> 25
<i>Ἀρτεμώ</i> 12		<i>Εὐτυχίς</i> 3	<i>Ἥδίστη</i> 2	<i>Ἐλπίς</i> 4	<i>Αδα</i> 4	<i>Τατία</i> 11	<i>Τατία</i> 25
<i>Ἀφροδισία</i> 10		<i>Ζωσίμη</i> 3		<i>Στρατονίκη</i> 4	<i>Αβας</i> 3	<i>Ἀρτεμισία</i> 9	<i>Ἀτταλίσ</i> 10
<i>Διονυσία</i> 10		<i>Φιλίς</i> 3			<i>Αδας</i> 3	<i>Μαμαλον</i> 9	<i>Ἐλπίς</i> 8
<i>Εἰρήνη</i> 10					<i>Πώλλα</i> 3	<i>Ἀρτεμις</i> 8	<i>Ἰουλιανή</i> 5
<i>Ἰσιάς</i> 10						<i>Δρακοντίς</i> 8	<i>Παυλίνα</i> 5
<i>Νίκη</i> 10						<i>Μελιτίνη</i> 7	
<i>Βερενίκη</i> 9						<i>Μενεστράτη</i> 7	
<i>Ἐλπίς</i> 9						<i>Ἐλπίς</i> 6	
<i>Μητροδώρα</i> 9						<i>Μοῦσα</i> 6	
<i>Τρυφέρα</i> 9						<i>Αμμία</i> 5	

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.

Lycia 7,569	Gulf of Fethiye 613	Xanthos Valley 3,072	Central Lycia 1,815	Eastern Lycia 1,879
<i>Δημήτριος</i> 197	<i>Ἀντίπατρος</i> 19	<i>Ἀπολλώνιος</i> 95	<i>Δημήτριος</i> 79	<i>Ἐρμαῖος</i> 110
<i>Ἀπολλώνιος</i> 173	<i>Ζήνων</i> 14	<i>Ἰάσων</i> 81	<i>Ἰάσων</i> 60	<i>Μολῆς</i> 88
<i>Ἐρμαῖος</i> 166	<i>Μηνόδωρος</i> 14	<i>Δημήτριος</i> 55	<i>Ἀπολλώνιος</i> 47	<i>Τροκονδας</i> 58
<i>Ἰάσων</i> 158	<i>Δημήτριος</i> 13	<i>Τληπόλεμος</i> 55	<i>Ἀλέξανδρος</i> 35	<i>Δημήτριος</i> 47
<i>Μολῆς</i> 99	<i>Ἀπολλώνιος</i> 12	<i>Ἀλέξανδρος</i> 52	<i>Πτολεμαῖος</i> 24	<i>Διότιμος</i> 40
<i>Ἀλέξανδρος</i> 98	<i>Ἀπολλωνίδης</i> 12	<i>Πτολεμαῖος</i> 43	<i>Ερμαπίας</i> 22	<i>Αρτεϊμας</i> 25
<i>Τροκονδας</i> 81	<i>Διονύσιος</i> 11	<i>Διονύσιος</i> 31	<i>Ἐρμαῖος</i> 21	<i>Ἀπολλώνιος</i> 24
<i>Διονύσιος</i> 78	<i>Ἀγρεοφών</i> 10	<i>Ἐπαφρόδιτος</i> 31	<i>Ερμακοτας</i> 19	<i>Ζωσιμάς</i> 24
<i>Πτολεμαῖος</i> 74	<i>Διογένης</i> 10	<i>Ζώσιμος</i> 31	<i>Ζώσιμος</i> 19	<i>Πιγρῆς</i> 21
<i>Ζώσιμος</i> 73	<i>Ἡλιόδωρος</i> 10	<i>Δημοσθένης</i> 3	<i>Ἐπαφρόδιτος</i> 18	<i>Ζώσιμος</i> 19
<i>Τληπόλεμος</i> 68	<i>Ἀνδρέας</i> 9	<i>Εἰρηναῖος</i> 29	<i>Νικόστρατος</i> 17	<i>Εὐτύχης</i> 17
<i>Ἐπαφρόδιτος</i> 65	<i>Διόφαντος</i> 9	<i>Ἀνδρόβιος</i> 28	<i>Διονύσιος</i> 16	<i>Εμβρομος</i> 16
<i>Εὐτύχης</i> 60	<i>Ἐρμαῖος</i> 9	<i>Ἐρμαῖος</i> 26	<i>Εὐτύχης</i> 15	<i>Κολαλημῆς</i> 16
<i>Διότιμος</i> 58	<i>Εὐτύχης</i> 9	<i>Λεωνίδης</i> 26	<i>Φίλιππος</i> 15	<i>Πολέμων</i> 16
<i>Αρτεϊμας</i> 44	<i>Ἰάσων</i> 9	<i>Ἀτταλος</i> 25	<i>Μόσχος</i> 14	<i>Διονύσιος</i> 15
<i>Ερμακοτας</i> 41	<i>Ἐπαφρόδιτος</i> 8	<i>Εὐφρόσυνος</i> 25	<i>Σαρπηδών</i> 14	<i>Ορειος</i> 15
	<i>Θηρωνίδης</i> 8			

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.

Lycia 1,531	Gulf of Fethiye 88	Xanthos Valley 473	Central Lycia 365	Eastern Lycia 576
<i>Αρσασις</i> 60	<i>Αμμια</i> 7	<i>Λαλλα</i> 37	<i>Αρσασις</i> 30	<i>Άρτεμις</i> 30
<i>Λαλλα</i> 43	<i>Ζωσίμη</i> 6	<i>Αρσασις</i> 26	<i>Ναννη</i> 15	<i>Ερμαστα</i> 21
<i>Άρτεμις</i> 39	<i>Έλπίς</i> 4	<i>Ναννη</i> 14	<i>Ζωσίμη</i> 9	<i>Αφφια</i> 15
<i>Ναννη</i> 37		<i>Αφφιον</i> 11	<i>Πτολεμαΐς</i> 8	<i>Έλπίς</i> 10
<i>Ζωσίμη</i> 30		<i>Έλλάς</i> 8	<i>Ερπιδαση</i> 7	<i>Ζωσίμη</i> 10
<i>Έλπίς</i> 26		<i>Έλπίς</i> 8	<i>Άρτεμις</i> 6	<i>Ναννη</i> 10
<i>Αφφια</i> 22		<i>Έλένη</i> 7	<i>Λαλλα</i> 5	<i>Πανα</i> 10
<i>Ερμαστα</i> 21		<i>Ναννις</i> 7	<i>Λυκία</i> 5	<i>Τατια</i> 10
<i>Αφφιον</i> 21		<i>Χρύσιον</i> 7	<i>Παναση</i> 5	<i>Αμμια</i> 9
<i>Αμμια</i> 18		<i>Τατα</i> 6	<i>Πλατωνίς</i> 5	<i>Αμμαρους</i> 9
<i>Λυκία</i> 16		<i>Ζωσίμη</i> 5	<i>Αφφια</i> 4	<i>Ζωσιμοῦς</i> 8
<i>Έλένη</i> 15		<i>Μεις</i> 5	<i>Αφφιον</i> 4	<i>Εὐτυχία</i> 7
<i>Πανα</i> 15		<i>Πρόκλα</i> 5	<i>Έλπίς</i> 4	<i>Λας/Λης</i> 7
<i>Πτολεμαΐς</i> 15			<i>Εὐτυχία</i> 4	<i>Ναρις</i> 7
			<i>Ζωτική</i> 4	<i>Νικαινέτη</i> 7
				<i>Τύχη</i> 7