Although overall the geographical method and chronological framework of this volume remain essentially the same as those of its predecessors, the material has been differently treated in some significant respects, and, in particular, a different chronological upper limit has been applied in the entries relating to Byzantion. These anomalies have been imposed on us by the nature of the evidence, as, we hope, the following pages indicate.*

The contents of the volume

In the vast region covered by the volume, from Mount Olympus through Macedonia, Thrace and the western and northern shores of the Black Sea, the hellenization of the non-Greek element, indicated in the present context by the use of the Greek language for non-Greek names, had been in progress from the classical period onwards. During the Roman period the region passed through numerous fundamental political and social changes, the product of the establishment of Roman provincial rule in the Balkans, which resulted in intermittent alterations of provincial definition and consequent nomenclature: of the area covered by this volume, only the northern shore of the Black Sea, east of Tyras, was largely excepted from this administrative development.

The whole process of Romanization, especially from the time of Trajan's campaigns onwards, and, in due course, the establishment of the new capital at Constantinople, affected every aspect of society; the impact on individuals, their social environment and hence their names, were all part of this universal change, and we have had to modify our procedures to take account of this new world. This wide-ranging metamorphosis is discussed, in so far as it is relevant to the *Lexicon*, under separate headings below.

Provincial divisions and nomenclature

The first region, as the *Lexicon* continues its journey northwards from Thessaly, is Macedonia, understood as extending from the Vale of Tempe in the south to the Scardus range in the north, and to the river Nestos in the east. This region presented two possible topographical patterns for the *Lexicon*. The first, historically the best adapted to the overall growth of Macedonia as a nation-state, was by the use of the traditional tribal regions, approximately twenty in all, from the classical period onwards dominated by urban communities, which formed the focal point of social and

administrative development, after the whole region had become subject to Roman rule. The alternative was to start at mid-point of our journey, and take as our basic topographical formula the Macedonia which formed the Roman province of that name, divided first into four, and, some twenty years later, into six 'parts', μερίδες, each with its own Roman administration and accompanying military units. The decision to adopt the first alternative has enabled us to codify the name-structure of far smaller units than would have been possible by the adoption of the second, though the latter would certainly have been easier to implement and perhaps presented a more readily accessible corpus of material for the user in terms of topography.

In determining how far to extend our boundaries for this volume, we decided to adopt the divide provided by the Scardus range (the modern Stara Planina) and the upper course of the Danube, westwards of Ratiaria and the river Almus (the Lom of today).[1] The Lexicon therefore does not include the Romanized provinces of Dacia, Moesia Superior, Pannonia and Dalmatia (except for the Grecized coastal zone which was included in volume IIIA).

The continental area thus excluded had no single name before the imperial period; it was scantily and variously populated by a large number of tribes, the names of which are known mostly from Strabo,[2] Pliny and Ptolemy, and from Latin inscriptions of the imperial period. The inhabitants were racially predominantly Scythian, Thracian/ Getic, Illyrian, Dardanian and Celtic, of whose languages no significant remains survive except for place-names and personal names almost entirely attested in Latin, not Greek, documents. The first two of these, the Scythians and Thracians, were known in general terms to Herodotus and Thucydides, and the area was recognised as tribal, without civic centres, as, in effect, empty of all except such loosely defined tribes and their sub-divisions.[3] And so it remained, on the whole, through the Macedonian and hellenistic periods, until it came within the administrative scope of the imperial system. It will be of assistance here to describe briefly the changes in names and boundaries that the Balkan provinces underwent, since that has affected the names we have used for the regions included in the *Lexicon*, and consequently the local attribution of individuals resident in them.

The Roman authorities found it necessary to alter and subdivide the provinces on both sides of the Danube as military requirements, dictated by tribal movements and

---

* Citations which occur in abbreviated form can be found in the List of Abbreviations.

[1] The significance of this divide is summarised by A. Mócsy in *Pannonia and Upper Moesia* (London, 1974) pp. 63 f. and 260. Of its consequences for the onomastic evidence he writes (63): 'There is only sporadic epigraphic evidence for names, and to make matters more difficult, it is not always clear whether the non-Latin names on the inscriptions are those of native local inhabitants or of natives of some other Balkan area.' We confine ourselves here to quoting the relevant ancient literary sources, and for details refer to Mócsy's work and to that of J. J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia* (London, 1969). A massive amount of relevant material is already quoted by M. I. Rostovtsev,

Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire[2] (Oxford, 1963) pp. 641 f. See also F. Papazoglu, *The Central Balkan Tribes in pre-Roman Times* transl. M. Stansfield-Popović (Amsterdam, 1978).

[2] Strabo 304, speaking of the consequences of the defeat of Boirebistas, says οἱ δὲ διαδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐς πλείω μέρη διέστησαν, καὶ δὴ καὶ νῦν, ἡνίκα ἔπεμψεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς στρατείαν ὁ Σεβαστὸς Καῖσαρ, εἰς πέντε μερίδας, τότε δὲ εἰς τέσσαρας διεστῶτες ἐτύγχανον· οἱ μὲν οὖν τοιοῦτοι μερισμοὶ πρόσκαιροι καὶ ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοι.

[3] Hdt. iv 1-144, his Σκυθικοὶ λόγοι, especially ch. 93: οἱ δὲ Γέται πρὸς ἀγνωμοσύνην τραπόμενοι αὐτίκα ἐδουλώθησαν, Θρηίκων ἐόντες ἀνδρηιότατοι καὶ δικαιότατοι. Cf. Thuc. ii 96. 1, on the campaign of Sitalkes in 429/8.

revolts, demanded, and since boundaries were uncertain and moveable, it was, as Strabo indicates,[4] difficult for ancient geographers to give clearly-cut lines of demarcation. At the western end of the line, Dalmatia, though tribal in structure, was, apart from the Greek colonial area on the coast, entirely Romanized. The region east of the Drina, which was originally (like Illyricum) described only in tribal geographical terms such as 'Dardania', was formed into a large province, originally called simply 'Moesia',[5] which stretched from the eastern frontier of Dalmatia, approximately along the line of the Drina (w. of Belgrade/ Singidunum) to the Black Sea, between the Haemus range and the Danube.[6] In A.D. 86 Domitian divided Moesia into two, Superior and Inferior, roughly along the line of the Kiambros (Cibrica) river,[7] that is east of Ratiaria. As for the Dacians, the full effect of Roman conquest was not felt until the campaigns of Trajan from A.D. 101 to c. 105, by which the Romanization of the whole Balkan area was assured, though local rebellions by the native population on both sides of the Danube led to further military intervention by Marcus Aurelius, with demographic consequences. In c. 274, Roman legions were withdrawn from Dacia Traiana by Aurelian, who created a new province out of most of Moesia Inferior, which he called Dacia Ripensis, and at the same time Moesia Superior became Moesia Prima.[8]

A good deal of our onomastic evidence belongs to this later phase of Roman settlement and administration. Numerous legions were settled on the land in the whole region, and the legionaries, veterans and their families, whose origins were very varied and included a considerable oriental element, formed a substantial part of the population, residents of *vici* and *canabae*, together with time-expired auxilia etc. and Italian traders, and gave it its essentially Romanized character, with Latin as the *koine*. This sedentary population was early increased by very substantial transferences of population, consisting of Daci-Getae from north to south of the Danube, which fundamentally affected the demographic, and hence the onomastic, pattern. Strabo tells us that as early as A.D. 5 Aelius Cato transferred to Thrace fifty thousand Getai, 'speaking the

same language as the Thracians',[9] and fifty-five years later Plautius Silvanus Aelianus transplanted a further hundred thousand from the same area across the river,[10] along with their rulers. Finally, after overcoming further Dacian and associated resistance, which continued for much of his reign, Marcus Aurelius transported twelve thousand 'free Dacians' into the Dobrudja.[11] The main consequence of this changing racial and administrative situation of Dacia was the Latinization of the region, which, in principle places it, and the other Romanized provinces, beyond the express range of the *Lexicon*.

In treating the different regions we have confined ourselves to the use of general terms, such as 'Thrace', 'Scythia Minor' and so on, and within those limits to following the practice of individual current editions of inscriptions. Thus, for Bulgaria, including its coastal colonies, we have used 'Thrace'; and for Romania we have followed the practice prescribed by the titles of the relevant epigraphical series, 'Scythia Minor', a term already used by Strabo to designate the 'marshlands' of the Dobrudja,[12] though its use as a provincial title to cover the hinterland was due to Diocletian. To distinguish this region from the 'historic' Skythia of the northern Black Sea area, with its Greek colonies, we have spelt it in its Latin form 'Scythia', and not in transliteration from the Greek, Ἡ μικρὰ Σκυθία in the usage of Strabo.

The onomastic evidence is assigned to a location in a number of ways. That provided by the early Greek colonies and associated settlements, mainly in the coastal zones, is treated as in previous volumes: under the city in question, or with the designation '(nr.)' if attribution to the χώρα is uncertain. In the case of the substantial, largely non-Greek, population of the countryside, more especially during the imperial period, the find-spot of many stones (which themselves have often long since disappeared) is unknown, and that of many others is recorded under variant 'modern' names, which may have changed on several occasions from Ottoman times onwards, before reaching a stable modern Greek, Romanian or Slavonic form. In part because of such uncertainties, but also to avoid unnecessary fragmentation

---

[4] Strabo 313 f. gives a detailed account of the whole region from the Adriatic to the Euxine; cf. 629 (n. 5 below). Cf. Wilkes, *Dalmatia* pp. 78 f., 153 f.

[5] Pliny, *NH* iii 149: 'provincia quae appellatur Moesia'. The province was established by Tiberius in A.D. 15. 'Moesia' is the Latinized form of Μυσία, and Strabo and Pliny make it quite clear that they regard the tribal name Μυσοί (Mysi), which gave its name to the region, as originally the same as that used of Μυσία and the Μυσοί in Asia Minor, and Ptolemy (writing in ca.110) calls the Danubian province Μυσία. It is to be noted that Strabo (628) blamed the Roman administration for the general confusion regarding provincial boundaries and names: speaking of Asian Mysia he says, τὰ δ' ἑξῆς ἐπὶ τὰ νότια μέρη τοῖς τόποις τούτοις ἐμπλοκὰς ἔχει μέχρι πρὸς τὸν Ταῦρον, ὥστε καὶ τὰ Φρύγια καὶ τὰ Καρικὰ καὶ τὰ Λύδια καὶ ἔτι καὶ τὰ τῶν Μυσῶν δυσδιάκριτα εἶναι, παραπίπτοντα εἰς ἄλληλα· εἰς δὲ τὴν σύγχυσιν ταύτην οὐ μικρὰ συλλαμβάνει τὸ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους μὴ κατὰ φῦλα διελεῖν αὐτούς, ἀλλὰ ἕτερον τρόπον διατάξαι τὰς διοικήσεις, ἐν αἷς τὰς ἀγοραίους ποιοῦνται καὶ τὰς δικαιοδοσίας.

[6] For the Drina and Drila, see Ptolemy ii. 6–7, with Müller's note ad. loc. In A.D. 57 Moesia was extended beyond the Dobrudja as far as Tyras, but this boundary was later retracted, although the whole of the north shore of the Black Sea as far as the Cimmerian Bosporos remained subject to the governor of Moesia until the time of the Germanic and other conquests.

[7] Ptolemy iii 10.1.

[8] The corpus published by F. Papazoglu and others, *Inscriptions de la Mésie Supérieure* (Belgrade, 1976–), is confined to that province, while the collective corpus of Latin inscriptions found in Jugoslavia between 1902 and 1970, republished by A. and J. Šašel in *Situla* (cited as Šašel, *IL*),

comprises parts of Macedonia, Moesia Superior, Dalmatia, Pannonia Inferior and Superior and Noricum.

[9] 303: μετώικησεν ἐκ τῆς περαίας τοῦ Ἴστρου πέντε μυριάδας σωμάτων παρὰ τῶν Γετῶν, ὁμογλώττου τοῖς Θραιξὶν ἔθνους, εἰς τὴν Θράικην. The racial identification of the Dacians and the Getai as 'Scythians' (not Thracians) is stressed by Pliny iv 80: 'ab eo (i.e. from the mouths of the Danube) in plenum quidem omnes Scytharum sunt gentes, variae tamen litori apposita tenuere, alias Getae, Daci Romanis dicti'. The scholiast on Ptolemy iii 8, where the heading is Δακίας θέσις, says Δακίας θέσις. Δάκαι καὶ Γέται οἱ αὐτοί εἰσι.

[10] *ILS* 986, Silvanus' lengthy funerary monument (ll. 9 f.): legat. pro praet. Moesiae in qua plura quam centum mill. ex numero Transdanuvianor. ad praestanda tributa cum coniugib. ac liberis ac principibus aut regibus suis transduxit. For Silvanus (cos. suff. A.D. 45 and 74) see *PIR²* P 480.

[11] See Cassius Dio books 71–3 for the prolonged preoccupation of Marcus with the Danube frontier from 168 onwards.

[12] 311: καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο ἡ χώρα πᾶσα αὕτη, σχεδὸν δέ τι καὶ ἡ ἔξω τοῦ ἰσθμοῦ μέχρι Βορυσθένους, μικρὰ Σκυθία· διὰ δὲ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐνθένδε περαιουμένων τόν τε Τύραν καὶ τὸν Ἴστρον καὶ ἐποικούντων τὴν γῆν καὶ ταύτης οὐκ ὀλίγη μικρὰ προσηγορεύθη Σκυθία, τῶν Θραικῶν τὰ μὲν τῆι βίαι συγχωρούντων, τὰ δὲ τῆι κακίαι τῆς χώρας· ἑλώδης γάρ ἐστιν ἡ πολλὴ αὐτῆς. Cf. his description of the advances made by the Triballoi (318): ἐπὶ τοσοῦτόν γ' ηὐξήθησαν ὥστε μέχρι τῶν Ἰλλυρικῶν καὶ τῶν Παιονικῶν καὶ Θραικίων προῆλθον . . . μετὰ δὲ τὴν Σκορδίσκων χώραν παρὰ μὲν τὸν Ἴστρον ἡ τῶν Τριβαλλῶν καὶ Μυσῶν ἐστιν, ὧν ἐμνήσθημεν πρότερον, καὶ τὰ ἕλη τὰ τῆς μικρᾶς καλουμένης Σκυθίας τῆς ἐντὸς Ἴστρου· καὶ τούτου ἐμνήσθημεν.

in the presentation of the onomastic material, we have tried to keep the use of 'modern' nomenclature to a minimum, and have preferred, where possible, to designate approximation to an identifiable ancient locality, often by the designation '(area)'.[13]

During the imperial period, when a city acquired the status of 'colonia' (Philippoi is a classic example), a very considerable area may have been included within its 'territorium' (superseding at times the χώρα of one or more older Greek communities), and when that is known to be the case we have added the designation '[territ.]'.[14] If, however, an old Greek coastal settlement was later included in the 'territorium' of a colonia or other Roman urban unit, we have kept the item under its original name. Our practice of denoting a dubious assignation of an individual to a location by a question mark or an asterisk remains unchanged.

Chronological Limits

A major difference of treatment in this volume concerns the chronological limit imposed on the material from Byzantion itself. The foundation of the new Rome in 323, followed in 330 by the naming of the city as Constantinople, superseded the old Megarian colony of Byzantion, and the changes between the two worlds, with the corresponding triumph of Christianity, are marked in every field of activity. The foundation of Constantinople inaugurated a new era, which has its own current scholarly activity in every field of archaeology and history, not least in prosopography and onomastics in general, and also in the field of epigraphy.[15] Like others in this field,[16] we have therefore excluded onomastic material of Byzantine date from Byzantion itself. Nevertheless, since in dealing with individuals whose years of birth and death are unknown, it is not possible to draw the straight line provided by an historical event, we have chosen a middle course, and have included names of persons, Christian and pagan, who can reasonably be supposed to have lived across the divide of the third and fourth Christian centuries, from the reign of Aurelian to that of Constantine; these, unless specifically dated, are given as 'iii–iv A.D.' It does not need emphasizing that the difficulty of dating with any precision inscriptions (especially private inscriptions) of the later imperial period on their letter-forms alone, in the absence of any historical or onomastic link, has as a consequence that many of the dates indicated by such century-spans are themselves frequently far from certain. Names of a later date (up to vi A.D.) attested outside Byzantion and its

territory are included. We are conscious that the chronological segregation of Byzantion creates an overall anomaly in the volume, but to cut the whole volume off at the early fourth century did not seem a viable option.

Treatment of non-Greek names

The volume contains a very large number of Thracian and other indigenous names written in Greek, and also, in the north Euxine region, of names in Greek based primarily on Iranian and associated roots. Our treatment of these names does not differ in principle from that of the previous volumes, in which we have included names of foreign etymology which occurred in Greek; but in this volume we have encountered them on a scale and in a degree of complexity which we have not encountered before. The number of such names is large (Bithus, Aulouzenis, Moukatralis rank among the more common names); they occur in contexts where they are by no means certain to be borne by indigenous people; and they also occur outside our region, in Italy, Egypt and elsewhere. We have therefore had to make some difficult decisions about inclusion and exclusion.

One special point of general principle concerns the inclusion of Thracian individuals, and Thracian names, attested in Egypt and elsewhere beyond the Thracian homeland. We are not the first to face this problem, which, on a lesser scale, also arises with regard to Macedonians.[17] Briefly, we may say that where there seems no reason to doubt the genuine Thracian origin of the bearer of the Thracian name we have included the entry under the regular rubric, 'Thrace', but that when the ethnic is possibly or certainly associated with non-Thracian persons, essentially with parents bearing Egyptian names, as is the case from the later second century B.C. onwards, we have usually omitted them, or, in marginal cases, added a question-mark after the ethnic identification, according to the individual circumstances.[18] Thracian and kindred names also occur in Anatolia throughout the hellenistic and imperial periods unaccompanied by ethnics, that is, as borne by the native population, which in the course of centuries had settled in Asia. Though these may be normal Thracian names such as Moukaporis, they are also excluded from this volume, to be included in due course in their own geographical context.

In the context of Thracian and other non-Greek names, three items require particular explanation: accentuation, the treatment of variant spellings of a single name-form, and the treatment of Thracian names in a Latinized form.

---

[13]There are, nevertheless, cases where stones cannot be assigned, however loosely, to a known ancient settlement. A different level of uncertainty may exist, as in, for example, Paionia, where the identification of modern remains with known ancient settlements is the subject of much disagreement. Our debt to F. Papazoglu's *Les Villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine* is far greater than the number of citations in the volume would suggest.

[14]The model for this practice will be found in G. Mihailov's *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria Repertae (IGB)*. Mihailov also made use of the wider denomination 'regio', mainly to cover settlements on the courses of, and between, rivers.

[15]To name but the salient works: the post-Constantinian volumes of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, and the *Prosopography of the Byzantine World* (http://www.kcl.ac.uk/humanities/cch/PBE/), in the course of preparation. On the epigraphical side, in addition to D. Feissel's *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de Macédoine du IIIe–VIe siècle*, see the excellent bibliographical summary of the earlier history of Constantinopolitan epigraphical researches by C. Mango, *AJA* 55 (1951) pp. 52–66,

and the publication by I. Shevchenko and C. Mango in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 32 (1978) pp. 3 f. A corpus of inscriptions is now in preparation by C. Mango and D. Feissel. For the texts in the Theodosian Walls, B. Meyer-Plath and A. M. Schneider, *Die Landmauer von Konstantinopel* (Berlin, 1943); C. Mango, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IVe–VIIe siècles)* (Paris, 1985); id. *Studies on Constantinople* (Aldershot, 1993), and the reassessment by W. D. Lebek, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 25 (1995), pp.107–53.

[16]See, most recently, A. Lajtar, *Inschriften v. Byzantion (IByz)* which stops at A.D. 330. Similarly, B. Latyschev's *IOSPE* I², and V. V. Struve et al., *CIRB*, end with the fourth century.

[17]See A. B. Tataki, *Macedonians Abroad*, who places all the Macedonians attested in Egypt with the regional appellation, datable after 150 B.C., in a separate Appendix (I), on pp. 471 f.; cf. pp. 508 f. The number of possibly 'apocryphal' Macedonians in Egypt is much fewer than that of Thracians.

[18]We have made reference throughout to the publication of C. A. La'da, *Foreign Ethnics in Hellenistic Egypt*; V. Velkov and A. Fol, *Les Thraces en Égypte gréco-romaine* pp. 97 f., give the general historical background for Egypt.

Accentuation

This volume brings us back abruptly to the thorny problem of the accentuation of non-Greek names, which are not naturally adapted to the application of the Greek accentual system. The general principles adopted in the *Lexicon* for the accentuation of personal names were set out in *LGPN* I (p. xiv), where the principle upon which we have (in that and succeeding volumes) extended accentuation to non-Greek names is also given. This volume differs only in the quantity of such names, and in the diversity of their linguistic origins, notably, but not only, Thracian.

We have followed the practice of the ancient scribes in placing accents according to Greek rules on Thracian, Iranian and other names which occur in literary texts.[19] We have extended this practice, where a reasoned justification can be found, to the many such names which are not attested in literary sources, and have, therefore, not followed the practice of D. Detschev in his invaluable Thracian onomasticon[20] (and of most scholars before and after him), in which a Thracian name is accented *only* if it occurs in a literary source. We are aware that our decision, more frequent in an earlier generation than now, does not match the practice of many modern corpora, though we note that we are by no means alone in our approach.[21]

Differences of opinion about the accentuation of personal names are not, of course, limited to non-Greek names, and we have faced a number of difficult choices on all fronts. One pivotal principle in accentuation—to be guided by the form of the genitive—has not proved a comprehensive aid in this volume, where we have often encountered different genitives for what is essentially the same name. If the *Lexicon* retained a different accent for the nominative in all cases, there would be a separate entry for each accented name, which would, we believe, not be helpful to users of the volume (or users consulting all volumes together).

Our work would undoubtedly have been much easier if we had refrained from placing accents at all; it is a bruising experience to wrestle with these problems within the constraining framework of a lexicon, where detailed justification is not possible, and presentation within a reasonably consistent framework essential. We have, however, often been assured that readers consult the *Lexicon* for accents—even when it is conceded that we may get it wrong. The first Reverse Index, in *LGPN* II, appeared unaccented, but the accents were, by 'popular' request, restored for succeeding volumes.

Identification of variant forms of non-Greek names

We have tried, where possible, to subsume under a single entry variant spellings of non-Greek names, which may vary by a consonant or a simple or complex vowel-unit, in one or more element of the name. There is no reason to suppose that any variation of genuine linguistic tradition or usage lies behind such different spellings, some of which are purely etacistic, but others of which were surely determined by pronunciation not etymology. Thus, to take but one out of many examples, we have entered the various forms of the Thracian name Αὐλού/ώ/ό-πορις under the diphthongal form alone, while recording the variants in the final brackets. We hope that this type of entry, which occurs especially with Thracian names but also (to a lesser degree) with Iranian derivatives in the northern Black Sea region, will not be regarded as an over-simplification. Where the name or its root are not common enough for us to know which is the basic form, we have tended to leave the variant forms free-standing: for example, Ἑπτά-, Ἑπταί-, Ἑπτέ-, Ἑπτή-τραλις. Because of the wide variety of name-forms attested in these regions, we have not attempted a cross-reference system in this volume.

Latin forms of non-Greek names

Our general practice is to include single Latin names (i.e. Roman names such as Publius or Gaius, used in the 'Greek manner') if they are attested in Greek. Greek names attested in Latin are also included, listed under the Greek form with the attested Latin form recorded in the final bracket. (In such cases, any relatives will appear in Greek if they themselves secure an entry in the *Lexicon*, and in Latin if they are truly Latin and do not secure an entry of their own.) This system, most plentifully illustrated in the material from southern Italy recorded in *LGPN* IIIA, has the overriding advantage of preserving the attestation of a Greek name.

In this volume, however, the matter is complicated by the presence of large numbers of Thracian and other non-Greek names recorded in Latin, frequently in oblique cases which allow no certainty as to how the nominative would have been spelt in the Greek (and, indeed even in the Latin) form. It may indeed be argued that Thracian names in Latin are not the business of a Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, or alternatively, that Latin forms of names attested in the region should stand *pari passu* with their Greek counterparts. As a compromise, we have included Thracian names attested in Latin for which there is an attested or *easily assimilated* Greek version of the name.

Finally, a brief word about information technology. In the first volume, a section of the Introduction was devoted to an explanation of the technological developments which made it possible for us to produce our volumes and to provide statistics derived from the contents of each volume. Over time, the need for such explanations has receded. This volume has been produced by the same methods which have served us well in the production of its predecessors. For statistical information, and much else concerning the project and its publications, it is now more appropriate to direct the reader to http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk.

P.M.F
E.M.

---

[19]As recorded in H. W. Chandler, *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation* (Oxford, 1881²; repr. New Rochelle, N.Y., 1983). Allowance has, of course, to be made for disagreement between ancient grammarians, and also for falsely transmitted forms and scribal errors. Both categories were, as far as was possible for him, listed by Chandler, whose dense notes contain lively and caustic comments, e.g. his remark (p.92), apropos of Stephanos of Byzantion's accentuation of Πάραισος· 'This [proparoxytone accent] is one out of a host of accentual blunders in the same author'.

[20]*Die thrakischen Sprachreste* (Vienna, 1957)

[21]See, for example, M. B. Hatzopoulos and L. D. Loukopoulou, *Recherches sur les marches orientales des Téménides (Anthémonte–Kalindoia)* 2 pp. 209 f.