

PREFACE TO VOLUME II

By a curious quirk of fortune the period of preparation for this volume of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* has matched almost exactly the sixteen years needed by Johannes Kirchner to bring his monumental *Prosopographia Attica* into being. The reasons for so lengthy a gestation are manifold. Amongst them are to be numbered the vast and ever-growing wealth of the available evidence for Attica, the regular appearance of new corpora and treatments of existing evidence over the years since the inception of the task, heretical struggles by the main author over the appropriate criteria for inclusion of entries, the increasingly sophisticated demands of the computer, and the task of providing entries for other volumes of the *Lexicon* from the Attic evidence. Some of these matters will be touched upon further in the *Introduction* below. An additional and pervasive impediment to expeditious production has been posed by the extraordinary peregrinations and distractions of the main author, who began the collection of entries in the late 1970s in Lancaster (UK) and since then has continued the work in Princeton, Athens, Leuven and Melbourne, in the last of which he has been based since 1983. Perhaps uniquely for such a work, but in keeping with the current international demands upon the executive head of a large university, these words are being penned in Phnom Penh under the threat of impending civil war in Cambodia.

The key stimulus for rescuing this volume from the stagnation likely to result from my appointment as Vice-Chancellor of La Trobe University in 1990 has been the contribution of my co-author, Sean Byrne, whose association with this project commenced in the mid-1980s, when he became my research assistant. In the last few years he has undertaken the massive task of verifying the computerized entries against the evidence on file and editing the whole file for publication — a more than usually difficult task when the entries have been amassed over so long a period.

All of the epigraphical sources utilized in this volume have been quarried by the present authors and the process of evaluation was protracted by the generation of thousands of names of foreigners attested in Athens for other volumes of the *Lexicon*. We have had the considerable benefit of the card indices of *IG* 13 prepared for the *Lexicon* by David Lewis of Christ Church, Oxford, and of the sacred inventories by Tullia Linders of the University of Uppsala, and we are conscious of a deep debt of gratitude to both. In the case of the inscriptions of Delphi we are extremely grateful to Dr Audrey Griffin of the epigraphical staff of the *Lexicon* in Oxford who provided a basic array of names, and in the case of vase inscriptions we owe a considerable debt to Alan Johnston of London University, who contributed a comprehensive listing of relevant names, to Henry Immerwahr for guidance on particular points made

in correspondence with Peter Fraser, and to Anne Bowtell and the Beazley Archive in Oxford for making available their expertise and resources. A relatively small number of entries came from the compilers of other regions for the *Lexicon*, and the main author undertook a comprehensive search for Athenians attested in non-Attic inscriptions at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton in 1978. In the case of the literary and numismatic evidence the task of discovering the names has been shared by the two present authors. The general editors have scrutinized our listings with searching thoroughness and we are deeply indebted to them for their efforts to save us from error and omission. In so large a work it is, of course, inevitable that the latter concerns not so much the commission of the sin of omission as the extent of it, and the authors accept full responsibility in this regard. In inviting such blame, however, we feel bound to draw attention to the relatively restricted criteria for inclusion in this volume, an issue which is discussed further below.

One of the most time-consuming aspects of this endeavour has been that of establishing a reliable collection of computerized data, and credit for this belongs with Sean Byrne (formerly of The University of Melbourne, now of La Trobe University, Melbourne) who spent much of the late 1980s checking and feeding entries into the computer, and (from 1986–1989) his redoubtable assistant, Shelagh Hannan (of The University of Melbourne). In this general regard it is deserving of note that the database in Melbourne and the card index file from which this was established contain more than twice the number of entries printed in this volume as a result of the inclusion both of fragmentary names and of the names of foreigners attested as living in Athens.

A major complexity in respect of this database, and one which has been responsible for no little delay, has been that it was devised in Melbourne to encompass prosopographical as well as onomastic features.⁷ As a consequence, despite our intention for it to remain readily compatible with the *Lexicon* database in Oxford, the passage of years and the steady upgrading of the computing services at both ends inevitably saw the two drift apart in terms of basic structure, and the process of extracting the data in the requisite form proved lengthy and difficult. Indeed, it was only late in 1991 that the problem was solved and the transfer of the material to Oxford was able to take place, the credit for which belongs in Oxford to Elaine Matthews and Jonathan Moffett, and in Melbourne to Sean Byrne.

It is extremely encouraging to be able to report that, despite the utilitarian attitudes which have supervened in respect of research in the Humanities in recent times in both Britain and Australia, these seemingly arcane endeavours have consistently attracted the support of numerous institutions and granting agencies. The University of Lan-

⁷ For this database see M. J. Osborne, 'A Computerized Prosopography of Attica', *Actes du Colloque 'Epigraphie et Informatique'* (Lausanne, 1989).

caster (UK) provided support throughout the period 1977-1982, and in particular made possible my frequent visits to Greece to study the epigraphical material. In Athens the British School of Archaeology provided a marvellous base from which to work, and Dr D. Peppas-Delmouzou, the Director of the Epigraphical Museum, and her assistant, Mrs Chara Karapa-Molisani, and Professors Homer Thompson and T. L. Shear, successive Directors of the Agora Excavations, facilitated very regular autopsies of the inscriptions in their collections. In 1978 my endeavours were advanced decisively by the opportunity to become a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. Subsequently I made numerous further visits and I should like to record my thanks both to the Institute for its support and to the numerous scholars whose presence there contributed to this work. In 1983 I migrated to Australia and there proceeded to incur three enormous debts — firstly to The University of Melbourne, which supported my endeavours throughout the eight years of my tenure of the Professorship of Classical Studies there; secondly to the Australian Research Council which generously funded research assistance for three years; and finally to La Trobe University (Melbourne) which, at the risk of deflecting the Vice-Chancellor from his proper duties, continued its tradition of supporting research and scholarship for its intrinsic worth. It is also a great pleasure to record my gratitude to the Ancient History Section of the Katholieke Universiteit in Leuven, where I enjoyed the privilege of a visiting professorship in 1988 and so was able to profit from close association with the Section of Ancient History of that University. To these institutions and agencies I record with pleasure my gratitude for making possible my involvement in this massive and fascinating project. I can only hope that the present volume will represent an appropriate

return for such generous and unwavering support. On a personal level it may perhaps seem invidious to mention colleagues who have advertently or inadvertently helped me and encouraged me to persist with this endeavour for fear of unwitting omission. Nonetheless I could not reasonably refrain from mentioning Christian Habicht, Steve Tracy, John Traill, Homer Thompson, Ron Stroud, Sara Ale-shire, Harold Mattingly, Peter Rhodes, Yves Grandjean, Alan Johnston, Dina Peppas-Delmouzou, Chara Karapa-Molisani, Hans Hauben, Guido Schepens, and Edmund van 't Dack. Nor could I fail to single out for special thanks David Lewis, who had the dubious privilege of being my tutor in the misty past and thus set me on the epigraphical path; Peter Fraser and (the late) Willy Peremans, both of whom motivated me throughout by the example of their deep learning and scholarship; and Leon Mooren and Peter van Dessel (both of the Katholieke Universiteit in Leuven) whose persistent encouragement and assistance have been invaluable.

Two persons deserve especial mention. Firstly, I should like to remember here for his friendship and help a man whose humble employment doubtless concealed from many his epigraphical talent and whose untimely death deprived us all of a fine colleague and friend, the late Spyros Spyropoulos of the Athenian Agora.⁸ Secondly, I should like, however inadequately, to thank my wife, Dawn, both for her patience and understanding in allowing me to devote so much of the little time free from other duties to this book over the years and also for her genuine enthusiasm for my continued pursuit of these prosopographical arcana.

Michael J. Osborne
Phnom Penh
January 1993

INTRODUCTION

The present work contains the names of persons either identified as Athenians or attested as residents of Attica in antiquity and it has been structured as closely as possible to the first volume of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. The Attic material, however, presents some peculiar difficulties and a number of significant changes are briefly noted in what follows.

The source material for Attica is notoriously voluminous and, since the bulk of it is epigraphical, it has continued to grow inexorably, most recently as a result of rescue excavations and chance finds.⁹ The revived *SEG* has ameliorated the task of gathering evidence considerably, but for materials published prior to 1976 the situation remains treacherous, not the least since the contents of the

original *SEG* were eclectic and certainly fell far short of a comprehensive coverage of new inscriptions. Indeed for Attica the volumes came eventually to approximate to a history of scholarly ingenuity in the restoration of fragmentary texts to illustrate chronological predilections. It is perhaps not surprising that the briefer epigraphical testimonia, especially the tomb monuments, were the main victims of capricious omission from the original *SEG*, but it is certainly most unfortunate, since the publication of these inscriptions (the most numerous and ubiquitous in Attica) tended to span a vast array of journals, many of them quite obscure. A significant, and intensely time-consuming, problem for this volume has thus been the tracking down of the scattered materials which are not

⁸ A much deserved appreciation of his life and work is available in the *Newsletter of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* (Winter, 1984) pp. 6 ff.

⁹ The volumes of the (annual) *Archaiologikon Deltion* (B) provide an indication of the fruits of rescue operations both in the city of Athens and in Attica generally.

¹⁰ The bulk of this material is funerary and, in an effort to bring some

order into the study of Attic tomb inscriptions, the present author has brought together more than 300 such texts as a supplement in *Ancient Society* 19 (1988) pp. 5-60. The student of Attic epitaphs can thus find comprehensive coverage by adding this supplement to the combined contents of the Editio Minor of the *Corpus* (popularly known as *IG* 11²), the three supplements to that volume (W. Peek, *AM* 67 (1942) pp. 77-217; G.

included in the corpora or the supplements.¹⁰

The quest for these materials has brought to light a further problem in dealing with the Attic evidence, namely the fact that large numbers of funerary inscriptions have never come closer to revealing their contents than being cited without details of text in archaeological reports. The upshot is that much relevant prosopographical and onomastic evidence, which is known to exist, and which in some cases has been known to exist for years, is unavailable for study or use. In most cases the stone fragments in question may well be lying in an obscure repository, although to judge from past experience some at least may be 'rediscovered'.¹¹ Indeed it is even possible that unbeknownst to all some have emerged already. Quite apart from these occupants of epigraphical limbo, at least one major collection of squeezes of epitaphs from Athens and its environs exists unpublished to this day and, in view of the decades which have passed since its making and the unlikelihood of the contents ever appearing in proper published form, the names are included below.¹²

A critical issue for this volume is that of the criteria for inclusion. The first volume set out very clear guidelines, restricting the entries to names of persons native to or residing in the cities in question but banished metics of known origin to their home state. We have been constrained to adopt the same principles and so have restricted the constituents to persons who are definitely Athenian or probably Athenian (ATHENS), persons who may possibly be Athenian (ATHENS?), and persons attested at Athens (ATHENS*).¹³ The details of these designations are discussed further below. The adherence to these principles is not without drawbacks in the case of Athens, where the population is so substantially evidenced and where the resident, foreign element is so high, and the authors are conscious that such a strictly onomastic approach may disappoint historians and prosopographers who may wish to consult this volume. The key issue is that many thousands of foreigners with ethnics are attested as having resided in Attica. In addition, most of them are known from the evidence of tomb inscriptions, so that their status as long term, if not permanent, residents is assured. Occasion-

ally indeed the epitaphs carry the record of more than one generation of such families, clearly certifying permanency of residence. This notwithstanding, the presence of the ethnic is enough to repatriate such metics to their 'home' city. Arguably this constitutes an impoverishment of the onomastic record, since the length of their sojourn clearly may have had an impact locally, but a more important consideration is the likely effect of excluding these whilst including the mass of residents whose original provenance is unknown. For in practice this is to bifurcate the principle of inclusion in a way that must surely amount to a distortion, since part of the group is retained on the basis of residence whilst the other part is excluded despite having identical credentials of residence. We feel bound to draw to the attention of the reader this anomaly which acquires some significance in a city like Athens which was always teeming with foreign residents.¹⁴

1 The arrangement of the entries

This volume has been approached on the same basic principles as its predecessor, but some minor modifications demanded by the Attic evidence are inevitable and they are broached in the following.

1.1 Name

The names are entered under their normalized form broadly in accordance with the rules set out in the Preface to Volume I. Thus, for example, *Βεΐθυς* is set under the name *Βίθυς* but all examples of the spelling *Βεΐθυς* are noted in the entry. The only significant departure from the first volume is in respect of persons either known by praenomen and nomen only or bearing the tria nomina. Contrary to the stated rule in Volume I,¹⁵ we have included here both Athenians known solely by a praenomen and nomen (unless it is clear that an accompanying cognomen has been lost from the text) and persons who bear the tria nomina even when the cognomen is Roman. To have done otherwise would have been to exclude many persons who are clearly Athenians and also rendered lacunose numerous significant families of Athenians. Thus, for instance, the

A. Stamires, *AM* 67 (1942) pp. 218–229; W. Peek, *Attische Grabschriften II* (*Abh. Akad. Berlin* 1956.3 [Berlin, 1957])—all conveniently available now in *Supplementum Inscriptionum Atticarum I* (Chicago, 1976) and *The Athenian Agora* xvii, D. W. Bradeen, *Inscriptions: The Funerary Monuments* (Princeton, 1974). To these must now be added the monumental work of Christoph Clairmont, *Classical Attic Tombstones* (1993), which only appeared while this volume was being printed. This contains many names which are attested on funerary monuments in museums, private collections and sale catalogues and which hitherto for the most part have escaped the eye of epigrapher and prosopographer alike. All such names whose Attic credentials are plausible have been incorporated into the text below. It should, however, be noted that no attempt has been made to provide references to Clairmont other than for new texts, not the least since his work is concerned primarily with the tombstones as monuments rather than as repositories of onomastic data and since the presentation of the epigraphical and prosopographical evidence is in practice somewhat unreliable. It is perhaps worth noting here also that the absolute cut-off date for materials in this volume of the *Lexicon* is in respect of evidence available to the authors as of November 1993. In company with all editors of such material we are aware that the steady trickle of new inscriptions, likely to be accelerated to a stream as the result of excavations connected with the extension of the railway system in Athens, will necessarily render this book a 'snapshot' of the situation in 1993. But that is the ineluctable destiny of any work which depends

so substantially on epigraphical evidence.

¹¹See, for example, *Ancient Society* 19 (1988) pp. 46 ff. On the problems of access to archaeological materials, see now Clairmont, *op. cit.*, Introductory Volume pp. x, xiv f.

¹²The collection is in the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, and the present author was permitted to study its contents in 1978. The exact provenance of the texts is not recorded — most appear to be from the city, but a few are from Attica. The dates and circumstances of the making of the squeezes are largely obscure, but they are clearly some forty years old or even more. They are referred to below as 'Unp. (Attica, tit. sep.)'.

¹³For the sake of local cohesion it should be noted that this volume also includes the residents of Eleutherai and of the island of Salamis who otherwise have no obvious haven in the *Lexicon*. The treatment of such cases is discussed more fully below.

¹⁴One solution to this problem would have been to have a fifth category of constituent, namely Foreign Residents in Athens (vel sim.). The residents with ethnics from other cities could then have been included as a group in this volume and also listed again under their home city in the appropriate volume. Clearly this mass of foreign residents is a significant component of the Athenian population and we shall publish separately a work to be entitled *A Lexicon of Foreigners in Athens* shortly.

¹⁵Introduction to Volume I, p. xiii, item (g).C

family of Maximos of Hagnous, attested as the father of an ephebe in 163/4, would have been despoiled of three whole generations of members styled T. Koponios Maximos of Hagnous, had we adhered strictly to the principles of the first volume.

1.2 Location

For each name there are four possible categories of entry, as follows:

- i. ATHENS
- ii. ATHENS—demotic or tribal affiliation
- iii. ATHENS?
- iv. ATHENS*

The first two designations cover individuals whose citizenship is certainly or probably Athenian, the second containing the persons whose citizenship is securely certified by the knowledge of their demotic or their tribal affiliation. It is, of course, to be remembered that the demotic is not necessarily an indicator of location, although it may be. The third encompasses persons who in the authors' judgement have some likelihood of being Athenians, including the mass of individuals who are attested without demotic or ethnic.¹⁶ The fourth category comprises the residents of Attica who do not appear to be Athenian, whose place of origin is not known, but who are not slaves or merely visitors to the city. The make-up of this group is as heterogeneous as that at Delos (for which see the Preface to Volume I) and in detail it includes in Attica metics, hetairai, epengraphoi from the ephebic catalogues of the Imperial Period, the undifferentiated membership of thiasotic documents, and the small number of persons on epitaphs whose credentials are qualified by the term *χρηστός* or *χρηστή*.¹⁷ As already noted, this category is potentially anomalous (as indeed it is in the first volume) since it lacks the presence of the foreign residents whose ethnics happen to be known and who have been despoiled of their link with Attica in favour of association with a 'native' city which many of them may never have seen.¹⁸ We have taken the view that in an Attic corpus, which will serve as a sequel, albeit without biographical exegesis, to the *Prosopographia Attica* of Kirchner, it is essential that all citizens are listed by their deme when that is known.

We have not attempted to provide geographical indications of attestation within Attica, not the least since only some of the evidence, notably tombstones, is attributable to a particular (geographical) deme, and then only sometimes. In contrast to the first volume, where persons from numerous different cities are included, all of the constituents here are directly associated with Athens, which in geographical terms comprises Attica, and with two exceptions the subdivisions of the 'Location field' relate solely to the credentials of the constituents as Athenians and to the record of attributes which are important for the study of Athenians. The two exceptions to this are Eleutherai and (the Saronic island of) Salamis, both of whose residents have been included in this volume. These two places figure in the list of demes but they are set in brackets to indicate that they represent geographical indicators as opposed to 'constitutional' demes. Names attested without ethnic in Salamis or Eleutherai have been assigned to the category ATHENS?¹⁹ In accordance with the general principles espoused for the *Lexicon*, naturalized Athenians have been attributed to their city of birth if that happens to be known, although their descendants may figure in this volume if they are attested with demotics solely as Athenians.²⁰

1.3 Dates

The dating formulae employed here and their chronological arrangement are precisely as in Volume I, to which the reader is directed for details. It is already noted there that the general designation of a period precedes specific dates within that period. Thus, for example, the designation 'hell.' (denoting Hellenistic and covering the period 323–31 B.C.) precedes the specific dates within the Hellenistic period, which are given in chronological sequence. With respect to the dates of the entries these represent either the date or the parameters of attestation of individuals except in cases where the person is sufficiently well known for his or her lifespan to be determined more or less precisely. As in the earlier volume, this means that in the case of a single attestation for a father and son both are given the same date in the entry.

It is notorious that the provision of exact dates in substantial portions of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods is controversial.²¹ Where dates given here differ from

¹⁶As is obvious, there is a chance that some of these may in reality be metics, but we have attempted to restrict this category to persons whose credentials, in our view at least, support the possibility of Athenian citizenship.

¹⁷The epengraphoi and their fathers have been included here rather than in the final volume of 'Others'. This is justified by the consideration that their fundamental link with Athens was as close as that of the labourers attested at Delos, retained in Volume I, was with Delos. (Preface p. viii (c)).

¹⁸Thus, to take the example provided in Volume I (p. viii), it is perfectly reasonable to claim 'fundamental links' with Delos, and hence status as DELOS*, for 'a workman who has been hammering nails into the roof of a Delian temple for five successive years'. What is less clear is the exclusion from this volume of (say) Chrysispos of Antioch, the horsebreaker, who resided, died and was buried at Petralona in Attica (IG II² 8317).

¹⁹For the term 'constitutional deme' see J. S. Traill, 'The Political Organization of Attica', *Hesperia* Suppl. 14 (1975) pp. 73 ff. We have followed the nomenclature of Traill (op. cit. 109 ff.) for the deme names. No attempt has been made to differentiate split demes, such as Halai. In the small number of cases where the demotic is known in part only, but

the identity of the deme is unclear, we have entered the name under the preserved traces of the demotic in the listing by deme. If the beginning of the demotic is preserved, the fragmentary deme appears in its proper alphabetical position; if not, it comes at the end of the list of demes.

²⁰Thus, for example, Charidemus of Oreos, who is certainly best known, indeed almost exclusively attested, as a (naturalized) Athenian, does not figure in this volume, despite his presence in *PA* and *APF*. By contrast, the following naturalized citizens, who were formerly resident aliens or slaves and thus analogous to the undifferentiated group of residents designated ATHENS*, are included in this volume: Pasion (Osborne, Naturalization T30); Phormion and his son Archippos (ib. T48 and T49); Chairephilos and his sons Pheidon, Pamphilos and Pheidippos (ib. T75, T76, T77 and T78); Epigenes (ib. T80); and Konon (ib. T81).

²¹For the Hellenistic situation see M. J. Osborne, *ZPE* 78 (1989) pp. 209 ff. The archon dates for the third century B.C. follow the scheme delineated in that article. Thereafter, unless indicated, we utilize the scheme of B. D. Meritt, *Historia* 26 (1977) pp. 168 ff. with subsequent modifications by Chr. Habicht, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit: Hypomnemata* 73 (1982) and *Hesperia* 57 (1988) pp. 237 ff., and by Stephen Tracy in *AJAH* 9 (1984 = 1988) pp. 43 ff.

those in the published version of the citation a further reference covering this matter is included in the reference field. Thus, for example, many of the dates given for coin magistrates by Margaret Thompson in *New Style Coinage* have been amended in the light of the article of Christian Habicht in *Chiron* 21 (1991) and this further reference is noted. Two significant abbreviations of reference must be highlighted. Firstly, we have generally accepted the dates of Simone Follet (*Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle* [Paris, 1976]) for documents of the second and third centuries A.D. and, in view of the enormous number of inscriptions involved, we have only made specific reference to her work when we deviate from her chronology. Thus references to inscriptions of these two centuries are to be assumed to incorporate her dates. Secondly, and similarly, in the case of the bouletic inscriptions we assume awareness of the addenda and corrigenda to *The Athenian Agora xv* (The Athenian Councillors) collected in *Hesperia* 47 (1978) pp. 327 ff. and we do not specifically cite the latter in the entries. Any revisions and changes made subsequently are, of course, noted. The possibilities for dating Attic inscriptions of the Hellenistic period which have no indication of date in the text have been considerably improved by the important work of Stephen Tracy on lettering and hands,²² and we have generally followed his chronology. A residual problem exists in the Imperial period and in the case of sundry tomb monuments, which are mentioned in archaeological reports without further details. With regard to the former, we have, as noted above, generally followed the chronology of Follet. In the case of the latter we have occasionally been constrained to employ the designation 'inc.' (indicating our inability to find any clue to the date). For the most part, however, we have preferred to attribute broad dates on the basis of the available clues in the expectation that such errors as are thereby perpetrated will be corrected in due course.

1.4 References

In general we have attempted to restrict references to the most recent, reliable publication. In the case of inscriptions reference has been made, where possible, to the latest edition of either *IG* or *SEG* or the *Athenian Agora* publications or, in appropriate cases, a combination of these. For materials which do not figure in any of these works we have tended to refer to collections, if available (for example Pouilloux, Forteresse = J. Pouilloux, *La Forteresse de Rhamnonte: étude de topographie et d'histoire* [Paris, 1954]) rather than journals, or else to the earliest reliable publication of the text. The latter expedient is commonest in respect of the numerous funerary inscriptions which escaped the notice of *IG* and the original *SEG*. For persons known from literature we have provided a reference to

the work in question except where fame and a multiplicity of attestations (as, for example, in the case of a luminary such as Perikles) constrain us to use a modern work.²³ In addition, with respect to literary sources, the reader is asked to note that some new categories of names have been either omitted or entered selectively. In the first category belong strictly 'comic' names, mostly compound, which occur in Old Comedy and also in quantity in the later epistolographers, and which have no place in this *Lexicon*. In the second are the 'stock figures' of New Comedy who recur in the same role in different comedies. A single reference to such names (*Χαιρέας, Κλειτίας, Δάος, Δρόμων, Σωσίας*) may be regarded as sufficient testimony to their many manifestations.

The size of the Attic corpus and the presence of many homonyms in close chronological proximity have posed a particular problem. Hitherto the disposition to identify chronologically proximate homonyms has been a prevalent feature of Attic prosopography — well attested in the works of Meritt, Dow, Traill, Habicht and Davies, to mention but a few of the most distinguished prosopographers of recent times. But the observable presence of many homonyms in families, including frequently homonymous fathers and sons, where sufficient evidence is available to see these families in any detail, is, or should be, a deterrent to over-indulgence in the identification game, and we have tended to a more conservative attribution. Most of the Attic evidence in such cases is from inscriptions and we have cited all epigraphical references for each entry in order to make clear the extent of the evidence which we attribute to each individual.²⁴ This is an essential corrective, given the overwhelming propensity hitherto to aggregate all scattered references of a name to the smallest number of individuals. Naturally, it is quite possible that others will disagree with some of our attributions or dis-attributions — but the presentation of the full conspectus of epigraphical testimony for each entry is intended to facilitate independent judgement in the matter.

Although this volume is part of an onomastic enterprise it is inevitable that it will be pressed into service, temporarily at any rate, as a successor to the monumental *Prosopographia Attica* of Kirchner (with the *Nachträge* of Sundwall). The enormous interest in Athens, the volume and continued growth of the Attic epigraphical corpus, and the mass of material that has appeared since the publication of Kirchner and Sundwall ensure this, particularly since more recent prosopographical studies have been restricted in their coverage.²⁵ Kirchner, of course, did not extend his prosopography of Attica beyond the latter part of the first century B.C. and a comprehensive catalogue of Athenians in the Imperial Period has not been available hitherto. Thus, whilst this volume cannot provide accounts of the careers

²²See Stephen V. Tracy, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229–86 B.C.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1990) with references to earlier literature.

²³The standard prosopographical works for Attica are taken to be J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* (Berlin, 1901–1903), and J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford, 1971); also frequently used for this purpose are Pauly–Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*, and I. E. Stephanis, *Διονυσιακοί Τεχνίται* (Heraklion, 1988).

²⁴The exceptions to this practice occur in the case of the eponymous archons of the Classical period, for whom we refer to R. Develin,

Athenian Officials 684–334 B.C. (Cambridge, 1989) without repeating his full coverage of epigraphical and other evidence, and in the case of the massively attested members of the family of Herodes Atticus, for whom we refer to the collection of testimonia of W. Ameling, *Herodes Atticus* (Hildesheim, 1983).

²⁵Thus Davies *APF* is very limited in coverage and period, as (for example) are R. Develin, *Athenian Officials* and Stephen Tracy, *IG II² 2336, Contributors of First Fruits for the Pythais* (Meisenhein, 1982).

of the constituents such as those adumbrated by Kirchner and elaborated in Davies, in order to render it as useful as possible in the face of the current prosopographical confusion, two expedients have been adopted. In the first place, whereas the prime citation is to the original sources, except in the case of a few luminaries (as noted above), a reference to the entries in *PA* has always been made, where feasible. It is hoped that this will alleviate the problems posed by the anachronistic references in the *PA* which frequently contain directions to obscure journals which are hard to obtain. A complexity, of course, is that some Kirchnerian identities need to be bifurcated or even trifurcated, some (or parts of some) need to be coalesced with others, many are incorrectly dated, and not a few are ghosts. We have tried to signify these matters in the entries and, in the limited sense of identifying individuals with appropriate references, this work does include an update of the references upon which the *Prosopographia Attica* is founded. Naturally, testimonia additional to those in *PA* have been added and, where possible, an attempt has been made to indicate the extent of the new material. Where a reference in *PA* is expanded in *APF* this too has been noted. Thus, whilst acknowledging that our primary concern is onomastic, we hope that this volume will be of use to the student of Athens whose interest is slightly less circumscribed. A

second feature, which also differentiates this volume from its predecessor, is in respect of relationships. We have observed the restriction on the reporting of relationships to parents and children and (albeit with some reservations) excluded husbands and wives. But, because of the known size and complexity of many Athenian families, we have adopted the prosopographical practice of using a different numerical symbol to denote each homonym in a family group. To do otherwise would lead to inordinate confusion and also render difficult the cross referencing of the entries to existing prosopographical and epigraphical works. A glance at the known details of the families of (say) Ammonios of Anaphlystos, Epigenes of Melite or Xenon of Phyle—all well known in Delos in the late second century B.C.—should signalize clearly to the would-be critic of this prosopographical idiosyncrasy the potential for confusion which would obtain otherwise.

As in the previous volume, the final bracket is the repository of other relevant information, such as orthographical or dialectical variants of names, details of names which have been amended and further names, whether second names or tria nomina, the record of status or occupation in appropriate cases, and any other data regarded by the authors as significant.