

Introduction

This volume of the *Lexicon*, for reasons explained in the Introduction to III.A, forms the second part of a divided volume III, and contains the onomastic material from E. and W. Locris, Phocis, Doris, Boeotia with Megara, and Thessaly, which we have collectively called Central Greece. Each region of Greece presents its own special features, and in our Introductions we attempt to set those features within the context of the *Lexicon*; in this volume the overriding challenge has been how to handle the North-West Greek and Aeolic dialects.

1 Cross-references

In the Introduction to III.A, we expressed the hope that it would prove possible to introduce in III.B cross-references between standard Attic and dialect forms. We signalled that such an exercise is not without its hazards, and having now devised and implemented such a system, we can confirm that it is indeed full of pitfalls, both for those attempting to create it, and for the unguarded user. We offer, therefore, some explanation of what is, inevitably, a somewhat improvised system.

First, its general purpose is to enable the reader to find dialect and standard versions of a name; it is not to provide an etymological analysis of names, even less an etymological analysis of all the names. More specifically, the cross-references are intended as a guide to the use of *this volume*. That is to say, connections are made only where the dialect forms exist in this volume, and no attempt is made to cover names from previous volumes. Nor do we flag the alternations of Attic-Ionic η with the long a of all other dialects (*Μητρόδωρος* *Ματρόδωρος*, *Αισχίνης* *Αισχίνας* etc.), which are found in every volume.

The cross-references are reciprocal (i.e. standard \rightarrow dialect, and dialect \rightarrow standard), and usually have the function of headings. Thus, 'Στρατ-' see also Στροτ-' and 'Στροτ-' see also Στρατ-' will usually cover Στράτιππος, Στρατίων etc., for which there may or may not be exact parallels in Στροτ- in every case. The cross reference is usually limited to the stem of a simple name, or the first element of a compound name, and does not cover terminations, which are readily accessible through the Reverse Index. However, in difficult cases we have taken as much of the name as is needed to avoid ambiguity, and have not been bound by specific elements. Sometimes, perhaps most conspicuously in names in *Ἀσκληπ-*, *Διονυσ-* and *Ὀλυμπ-*, the many dialectal variations affecting the medial element are recorded. Complete names are given very occasionally, where necessary to avoid the suggestion that the range of the cross-reference is wider than in fact it is. We have usually refrained from supplying a cross-reference where dialect and standard forms stand side by side on the page, or where doubt exists whether two forms are related.

The *Lexicon* practice is to give names in the form in which they occur on home territory, and to restore them, where appropriate, to their dialect form if they occur externally, whether in texts from another city (in a different dialect or in koine) or in literature; in such cases, the attested form is recorded in the final brackets. The application of this rule to Boeotian and Thessalian material, however, is delicate since such retroversion involves complex topographical and chronological factors; the impact of the adoption of the Ionic alphabet and the spread of koine was uneven. In Boeotia, Oropos and Plataia near the Attic border were never heavily dialectal, and the same is true of some regions of Thessaly, for example Magnesia.

There is also the risk of oversimplifying a complex situation. Spellings which are dialect in one area may be orthographic variants in another, or indeed in the same area at a later date. An additional factor is the orthographic inconsistency of the Greeks themselves: even when dialect is involved, one text can produce two versions of a name (thus, the Thessalian recorded as both *Σήραμβος* and *Σείραμβος* in *BGU* 1274); and similarly at Delphi it is not uncommon to find the same individual recorded in two variant spellings (e.g. *Καλλικράτεια* (6); compare *Μεσατεύς* (1), a bouleute of the early hellenistic period, whose name occurs in two genitive forms).

2 Dialect forms

The following brief notes serve as an aide-memoire to the main dialect features found in the cross-references, with reference to Boeotian and Thessalian. They are not exhaustive, and further variations, and fuller explanations, should be sought in the handbooks on Greek dialects. Changes in spelling, most striking in vowels although consonants were also affected, reflected changes in pronunciation; as noted above, these did not occur uniformly and consistently.

2.1 Boeotian

- i. earlier $αι$ \rightarrow $αε$ or later (after the introduction of the Attic alphabet) η
(*Ἀβαιόδωρος* \rightarrow *Ἀβαεόδωρος*, *Ἄβηόδωρος*; *Αἰσχίνας* \rightarrow *Ἥσχίνας*)
- ii. $ει$ \rightarrow $ι$
(*Ἀμείνιχος* \rightarrow *Ἀμίνιχος*)
- iii. diphthong $οι$ \rightarrow $οε$ or $υ$
(*Κοίρανος* \rightarrow *Κοέρανος*; *Θοίναρχος* \rightarrow *Θύναρχος*)
- iv. early $\bar{\epsilon}$ \rightarrow $ει$ (Attic η)
(*Ἀγεῖσις* \rightarrow *Ἀγεισίς*, Attic *Ἥγησις*; cf. *Εἰρόδοτος*, Attic *Ἡρόδοτος*)

- v. archaic *v* (long or short) can be expressed with *o*, but the normal spelling, after the adoption of the Attic alphabet, was *ou*; after δ , θ , λ , ν , *-iou-* is often found.

(*Ἀμύντας* → *Ἀμόντας*, *Ἀμούντας*; cf. *Οὔπερμενίδας*; *Διονύσιος* → *Διονιούσιος*; *Εὐθύδαμος* → *Εὐθιούδαμος*; *Λυσίας* → *Λιουσίας*; *Τύχων* → *Τιούχων*)

- vi. ϵ before *a* or *o* tends to be replaced by *i*

(*Θεάγγελος* → *Θιάγγελος*; *Θεογείτων* → *Θιογίτων*)

- vii. Initial Δ and medial $\delta\delta$ may correspond to Attic *Z*, ζ

(*Δεύξιππος* = *Ζεύξιππος*; *Πολύδδαλος* = *Πολύζηλος*)

- viii. labials π , β , ϕ may correspond to Attic dentals τ , δ , θ

(*Πειλέμαχος* = *Τηλέμαχος*; *Βελφίς* = *Δελφίς*; *Φετταλός* = *Θετταλός*)

2.2 Thessalian

- i. archaic \bar{o} → *ou* (Attic and Boeotian ω)

(*Ξένων* → *Ξένουον*, Attic and Boeotian *Ξένων*)

- ii. archaic $\bar{\epsilon}$ → *ei* (Attic η); cf. iv above

(*Ἀγῆτῶρ* → *Ἀγείτουρ*, Attic *Ἠγήτωρ*)

- iii. ϵ before *o* → *i*; cf. vi above

(*Θεόζωτος* → *Θιόζωτος*; *Θεόδωρος* → *Θιόδουρος*)

- iv. the combination consonant + *i* + vowel tends to assimilate the *-i-* to the preceding consonant; but *-i-* is sometimes retained with gemination of the consonant

(*Μνησίας* → *Μνάσσας*; *Παυσανίας* → *Παυσαννίας*)

- v. labials π , β , ϕ may correspond to Attic dentals τ , δ , θ ; cf. viii above

(*Πετθαλός* = *Θετταλός*; *Φιλόφειρος* = *Φιλόθηρος*)

Thessalian and Boeotian, like Lesbian, may use the patronymic adjective in place of the standard patronymic genitive. These adjectives mainly end in *-ιος* in Boeotian and *-ειος* in Thessalian (*Ἀριστοδάμιος*, *Ἀριστοδάμειος*, 'son of *Ἀριστόδαμος*'; *Λουσώνιος*, *Λουσούνειος*, 'son of *Λύσων*'), except for those with a termination in *-ας*, which make *-αιος* in Thessalian, *-ῆος* in Boeotian (*Αἰσχίναιος*, *Ἡσυχῆος* 'son of *Αἰσχίνης*'). In the text of the *Lexicon*, the main name form is extrapolated from the adjective, and the adjectival form recorded in the final brackets.

3 The Regions

3.1 The Megarian

The only strictly Dorian community to appear in this volume, Megara is also the smallest both in size and in the number of entries (1,631). This once powerful city has left few traces of itself either on the ground or in the form of inscriptions. Indeed, the northern Megarian colonies, which will appear in volume IV, are in many ways more fertile onomastically than the mother city. The single richest source of names of Megarians, providing approximately one fifth of the total of Megarians known, comes from outside Megara, from the list of Megarian dikastai arranged by Dorian tribes, which was erected at Epidaurus (*IG* IV (1)² 71).

3.2 Boeotia

The cities and territory of Boeotia have been excavated and surveyed over many generations, and the onomastic yield is correspondingly large (16,793 entries, almost half from Thespiāi and Thebes), the largest, indeed, Attica excepted, that we and our readers are likely to encounter. In preparing our onomasticon, therefore, we have had to contend, alongside problems of dialect, with the sheer bulk and complexity of the material. We have built on the work of predecessors and contemporaries, above all Lolling, Dittenberger, Keramopoulos and Roesch; Denis Knoepfler, *amicus curiae*, has given freely of his advice, especially on chronological matters, and Dr B. Petrakos generously provided us with the onomastic material of Oropos, long before the publication of his splendid *Ἐπιγραφές τοῦ Ἰρωποῦ*. But Boeotian studies are an ever-open field in which scarcely a year passes without the appearance of new finds, and corrections to existing material. We have done our best to take all this material into account, although we are aware that there are collections of Boeotian (and also Thessalian) material which we have not been able to study.

For the third and second centuries BC, the chronological framework adopted is that established by R. Étienne and D. Knoepfler in *Hyettos de Béotie*, and in articles by the latter in *Chiron*. In order to limit the bulk of the entries, we have cited these works only under the eponymous magistrate, whether federal or local archon or, at Oropos, the priest of Amphiaros, and have not repeated it for every individual named in the relevant documents.

For the coins of Boeotia we have had the expert help of Jennifer Cargill Thompson (who also dealt with Megarian coinage), and through her that of Robert Hepworth for the chronology of the fourth-century Boeotian stater series. We thank her for her long and valued collaboration.

3.3 Phocis and E. Locris

Our first duty here is to put on record our debt to Dr K. Hallof, Director of *Inscriptiones Graecae*, for giving us access to the manuscript of the late Gunther Klaffenbach, due to be incorporated in the relevant fascicule of *IG* IX (1)², which will replace that of Dittenberger (1897). This manuscript marks the consummation of the life-work of one of the leading figures in epigraphical studies in the century now past. The corrections made by Klaffenbach to texts previously published in *IG* IX (1) and elsewhere are indicated in the final brackets by e.g. 'reading — G. Kl.', whereas wholly unpublished material is cited as 'Unp. (G. Kl., *IG* arch.)'. We should also thank Professor P. Siewert and Dr R. C. S. Felsch for sending us unpublished names from the excavations at Kalopodi (E. Locris).

For *Delphi*, as stated in the Acknowledgments to III.A, we owe to D. Mulliez new readings resulting from his revision of the manumission texts previously published in *SGDI*, *Fouilles de Delphes* and elsewhere, and to J. Oulhen new readings from his revised text of the 'List of Theorodokoi' originally published by A. Plassart in *BCH* 45 (1921). We take this opportunity to repeat our appreciation of the generosity of these two scholars. In addition it was of great interest to us to see, through the good offices of

Dr K. Hallof, the Delphian notebooks of H. Pomtow, now in the archives of *Inscriptiones Graecae* in Berlin.

Delphi (7,180 entries) presents particular problems which we have had to resolve in preparing the onomasicon. Prime among them are questions of chronology. G. Daux's *Chronologie Delphique*, now more than forty-five years old, remains fundamental, but his dates have been modified over the years in the light of specialised studies. The evidence from Delphi has ramifications far beyond its own borders, and while re-interpretations of evidence at Delphi can affect the dating of individuals throughout the Greek world, its own chronological framework is in its turn adjusted in the light of prosopographical and other studies carried out in relation to other regions. Advances achieved by these methods affect particularly the third-century chronology, and will be incorporated by F. Lefèvre in his edition of the third-century decrees to be published as *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes* IV. Lefèvre's summary presentation of results as far as the Amphictyonic decrees are concerned was published in *BCH* 119 (1995) pp. 161 ff. (see also *Topoi* 8 (1998)), where the opening pages set out the limitations and difficulties of the enterprise, and the collaborative nature of the elucidation of the chronology (p. 161 n. 1).

It is regrettable that we must go to press before the new chronologies are fully published: the fourth century is already covered by *CID* II and has been taken fully into account, but the chronology of the third century is, as stated, in preparation by F. Lefèvre, and that of the second by D. Mulliez for *CID* V. Consequently, unless Daux's date has been positively disproved, we have retained it alongside any proposed new dates which have been published. The adjustments often involve a shift of only a year or two (Delphic dates tend to be of the '261 or 259 BC' variety); sometimes they are certain, but often they remain conjectural and mutually dependent. We were not able to take advantage of the concordance published by Lefèvre to provide references to *CID* IV ahead of publication, except under the archons.

Another distinctive feature of the Delphic evidence is the large number of references which may be attached to a single individual. In most other regions, an individual attested thirty times or more would probably have merited an entry in a general reference work such as *RE*, but at Delphi this is not so. A striking feature of this volume, consequently, is the presentation of long strings of references attached to single names (see under *Ἀβρόμαχος* and *Ἀθαμβος*). The retention of all the references seemed the only unambiguous (if burdensome) way to present the material, and a service to readers who may wish to pursue their own path through this complex evidence.

The identification of homonyms is particularly difficult at Delphi, especially in the second century BC, when names may recur repeatedly, most commonly as manumissors or witnesses in the manumission texts. An extreme example is *Μένης*, which occurs more than 100 times in the second century, 37 times in the 160's alone. Some attempt can be made at the identification of individuals (for example, when the name recurs in the same group of manumissors or witnesses), but such an exercise belongs properly to Delphic specialists, not the compilers of a general onomas-

icon, and we have tended to refrain from making identifications.

The foundations of our work on Delphi were laid many years ago, when Dr R. E. Allen compiled a concordance, on the basis of which Dr Audrey Griffin, with meticulous care, compiled the Delphic file, which was the basis of our work for this volume. We wish to express our recognition of their valuable work.

3.4 Thessaly

For this formidable terrain (13,155 entries), we have had the privilege of assistance from the C.N.R.S. team at the Institut Fernand-Courby in Lyon, whose work, under the leadership of B. Helly, has created a new approach to Thessalian topography and epigraphy. Members of the team, from whom we must single out the exceptional help and advice provided by J.-Cl. Decourt on epigraphical matters and on political geography, have always responded to requests for information, and have made unpublished material and papers available. G. Lucas made available his unpublished thesis on the inscriptions from the cities of the upper Titaesios valley.

We owe to their deep knowledge of the landscape of Thessaly the possibility of giving more exact references to the find-spots of inscriptions in terms of modern topography and possible identifications with ancient sites. In Thessaly, more than in most regions, uncertainties remain about the location of some ancient cities, or the correct attribution of inscriptions from a particular site. In such cases, we have given the modern find-spot of the inscription, either in association with the likely ancient city (e.g. Phalanna? (Damasi (mod.)), or on its own if the identification is too uncertain. For Meliboia, for example, whose ancient location is contested among several modern sites, we have given only the modern find-spot of each inscription, reserving 'Meliboia' for instances where the ancient ethnic is attested.

New epigraphical discoveries are constantly adding to the stock of Thessalian names. It is a matter for real regret that, due to the pressures of our own publication programme, we were unable to take advantage of the generous offer of J.-Cl. Decourt, made with the agreement of A. Tziafalias, to make available to us names from the many unpublished inscriptions from Atrax, a city which is proving a rich source of rare names.

Fortunately we were able to include the names from what we have come to call the 'Menandridai inscription' (cited as 'Unp. (Stählin ect.)'). This text from Kranon lists more than 250 people, almost half of them in the form of patronymic adjectives, under the headings 'Menandridai', 'Olympiadaï' etc. We first examined it when Dr K. Hallof put at our disposal a squeeze taken by Fr. Stählin, together with a transcription of the squeeze made by Professor C. Habicht in 1966. Professor Habicht also studied the inscription in Larisa Museum in 1967, when he took a squeeze of an additional list on the side of the stone, which was not included on Stählin's squeeze; we are indebted to him for making these, and his additional notes and observations, available to us. More recently, J.-Cl. Decourt made available his new edition of the text, which he will publish in the near future. We are extremely

grateful to all these scholars for enabling us to include this rich onomastic treasure, which brings new names to the onomasticon of Thessaly.

M.-E. Zachou-Kontogianni generously provided a copy of her improved edition of manumission texts from Larisa from her unpublished doctoral dissertation; and A. Kontogiannis provided new readings from his edition of particular inscriptions from towns in the Spercheios valley.

Finally, it has become customary for us to reveal a few statistics about each volume: this one contains 43,454 indi-

viduals (38,749 male, 4,620 female, and 85 indeterminate), and 9,602 primary names. Together with the 43,261 individuals recorded in III.A (36,848 male, 6,335 female, 78 indeterminate), they bring to over 215,000 the total of individuals covered so far by the published Lexicon. Many more such statistics elicited from the database which lies behind the volumes, including distribution by location and a searchable amalgamated index of names, may be found at <http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk>.

P. M. F.
E. M.