

## PREFACE

THE *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names (LGPN)*\* owes its origin, and its continued existence as a project, to a decision of the Council of the British Academy, taken in 1973, to undertake the compilation of a Greek onomastikon to replace that of W. Pape, revised by G. E. Benseler in two editions. A Steering Committee under my chairmanship was duly appointed, which has supervised the progress of the work from the outset.\*\* Justification of this project, and details of its initial stages, were given in an article by me published in 1976 in *Tribute to an Antiquary; Essays presented to Marc Fitch by some of his friends* (edd. Emmison and Stephens, Leopard's Head Press, London, 1976), pp. 73–81. Though some of the procedures envisaged there have subsequently been modified, that article still stands as a statement of the general aims of the project. In its execution one important modification was made in 1977; it was decided to abandon the historical discussions and summaries of evidence illustrated there (pp. 77 f.), and to replace them by a full record of all the evidence, on the ground that the editors of the *Lexicon* would not be in a position to determine which aspect of a name any one user would require.

This work, therefore, is more directly in the style of 'Pape' than was originally envisaged, though the decision to exclude all geographical names (unless, of course, attested as held by individuals as personal names) has been maintained, both because the work would have become unmanageable in size, and because to the discerning reader that section of 'Pape' is in some respects by no means a 'ruine dangereuse'.<sup>1</sup> Mythological and Epic names have been excluded unless they have some particular relevance to the names of the region with which they are associated (notably founders of cities whose names recur in possibly varying forms in the local onomastikon). This latter decision, by which the Homeric heroes and Hesiod's heroines are largely excluded, will no doubt attract criticism, but we hope that understanding of the difficulties of drawing straight lines on the heights of Olympus on the one hand, and the modification of that decision that we have made by the admission of oikist-heroes etc. on the other, will serve to justify our practice.<sup>2</sup> We have, however, not excluded names provided by the novelists, and by mythographers such as Conon and Parthenius, since the names they employ are normal current names; we have dated them to the date of the author but labelled them 'fictitious'.

Greek names (or probable Greek names) in non-Greek script—e.g. Mycenaean, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic—have been excluded, save for Greek names in Latin, and those in Cypriot syllabic script for which bilingual or purely Greek texts assure the true form. Non-Greek names occurring in Greek sources have been (illogically perhaps) included. It seemed clear that a *Lexicon* that did not include the substantial number of Iranian names in Greek, as well as other less easily definable foreign names—Illyrian, Thracian, Semitic—would be open to justified criticism. If *Κροίσοσ* has a place, there can be no case for excluding *Ξέρξης*, *Σκερδιλαιδας*, or *Ροιμηγάλακας*; all Grecized forms of native names.

It was not infrequently suggested to us, as our work proceeded, that we should include at some point a list of 'ghost-names'—names falsely read or expanded. Given the vast range of material covered by the *Lexicon* we have felt this to be an impossible task, and, with regret, and with some sympathy for those who are from time to time misled by such names, we decided that they must be excluded. Anyone who consults the old majuscule copies in *CIG* (to consider the epigraphical field alone) will appreciate the magnitude of such a task. That we have ourselves accidentally included (if not created) 'ghost-names' is something that we anticipate our critics will not fail to point out. We have also felt that no purpose was served by including abbreviated names (e.g. on coins), or fragmentary names, unless the expansion seemed reasonably certain. If so, we have included them as full names and, where necessary, indicated the extent of the restoration in the appropriate place.

The regional-alphabetical system, which has been employed from the outset for the collection of material, has enabled us to proceed to a systematic grouping of regions for publication. It was decided for various reasons that Volume I should comprise the Aegean Islands and Cyrenaica, and it is this that we here offer to the public. Subsequent volumes will appear, it is anticipated, in the following order:

II. Attica, the preparation of which has been undertaken by Professor M. J. Osborne of Melbourne University, but which will conform to the style of the other volumes.

III. Peloponnese and the Greek Mainland as far as, and including, Thessaly; Western Greece, including Illyria and Epirus; the Ionian and Adriatic Islands; Sicily and Magna Graecia; Western Europe; N. Africa, etc.

IV. Macedonia, the Balkan area (Thrace in Greece; Bulgaria; Scythia Minor (Rumania, including relevant material from Dacia)) and S. Russia.

V. The coastal regions of Asia Minor.

VI. Unassignable individuals (i.e. those without any known place of origin, or not attested as regular inhabitants of a single area); reverse-index; analytical tables; bibliographies, general and detailed; addenda, etc.

\* For the separate Introduction to this volume see below, p. ix. A similar regional Introduction will be prefaced to subsequent volumes.

\*\* The Committee wishes to express its gratitude for generous financial contributions over the period of preparation of this Volume to the Craven Committee of the University of Oxford (Derby Fund); the Trustees of the Jowett Copyright Fund, Balliol College, Oxford; and All Souls College, Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> Very recently a major advance has been made in the etymology and identification of the place-names of Asia Minor with the publication of L. Zgusta's *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen (Beiträge z. Namenforschung, N. F., Beiheft 21, Heidelberg, 1984)*.

<sup>2</sup> The reader may now consult H. von Kamptz's *Homeric Personennamen* (Göttingen, 1982) for Homeric names. The work is basically analytical, but the onomastic list (pp. 176 ff.) contains some historical examples of the names.

It will be understood that while the work is as up-to-date as circumstances permit, no exact 'cut-off point' can be given for either the first or succeeding volumes. Delay in access to the innumerable periodicals and other journals that are now published is inevitable. We can only hope that, for Volume I, we have not failed to discover material of any significance published before 1984. It should be stressed that, in view of the difficulty that would be presented to the user at a later stage in identifying unpublished material, we have made no effort to obtain such material, save in a few exceptional cases. When we have done so, the entry usually takes the form of 'Unp. (Myt. Mus.)', 'Unp. (coin)', etc. Omissions and addenda will be included in later volumes as necessary.

On the general scheme of the *Lexicon* some further comments are necessary:

(1) The exclusion of the west coast of Asia Minor from Volume I is particularly regrettable, in view of the historical links between the Aeolian, Ionian, and Dorian islands and the corresponding sections of the colonial sea-board. The inclusion of this material, however, would have carried with it the natural inclusion of a great deal of other material from, in particular, the remoter colonial areas of the north and south coasts of Asia Minor: much onomastic material closely allied to that of Miletos, for example, is to be found in her Black Sea colonies; would the inclusion of Miletos entail the natural inclusion of her colonies also? The inclusion of Phocaea, the inclusion of Marseilles? In fact, although the colonial and tribal (Aeolian, Ionian, Dorian) approach had historically much to commend it, it did not seem to us a feasible operation. Perhaps that will be one of the many studies which the present *Lexicon* will stimulate.

(2) The above arrangement of volumes makes no allowance for the Middle East and even further East, or for continental Asia Minor. This material (notably Syria, Palestine, and Egypt) is intended to form a second part of the whole series. The material from Syria has been completely covered by Monsieur Maurice Sartre of the University of Tours, and that from Palestine by Professor Ben Isaac of the University of Tel Aviv, while that from Egypt has been partially covered by Dr. R. Coles and Dr. J. Rea of the University of Oxford. The material in these regions relevant to Volumes I–VI has already been made available.

(3) The very large class of persons of all periods, but particularly of later Antiquity, to whom no civic or ethnic origin can be assigned (Pape's 'Andere'), constitutes a major problem. Even when experience has shown that many names could, on the basis of the cumulative evidence collected by us, with some probability be assigned to a particular city or region, we have thought it wiser in general to abstain from the tempting task of doing so. When we have done so, we have usually added a question-mark after the location. There is no certainty in such attributions to a specific region, and perusal of the material assembled here will suggest many possible instances, but none so certain, when all other relevant factors have been taken into account, that the attribution can be regarded as more than in some degree likely. Names could easily migrate, notably by marriage, for the naming of a child after his maternal grandfather is very common, the name being thereby transferred from one city or region to another, thus grafting, e.g., a Cyrenaean name, through the maternal line, on to, say, the stock of Amorgos or Naxos. A similar restraint has also been imposed by the 'naturalization' of names originally native to one region in another. This is particularly true of old Macedonian names in the Roman period, long after the emigration of their Macedonian ancestors to the Middle East or elsewhere. Consider, for example, the case of the Macedonian name Πάνταυχος, which occurs in that form and in its later cognominate form Πανταυχιανός borne by natives of Cyprus and Euboea. Such persons must be classified under the city or region where they occur as natives, and the user must interpret as he thinks best the phenomenon which the name itself represents. Correspondingly, where such a person occurs in a non-ethnic, non-civic context, we have felt obliged to regard them as regionally unattributable, and not as Macedonians.

There are, however, degrees of uncertainty in this matter, not least according to the extent to which the presence or absence of the patronymic be taken as a criterion of citizenship, and we have allowed for two less remote areas of uncertainty. There are, then, three degrees of 'Otherness':

(a) If we have concluded, on balance, that the individual was probably a native of the city where he is attested, but we cannot be certain, we have indicated this by a query after the place-name: 'Delos?'; 'Rhodes?'. These form a separate rubric under the name and place in question.

(b) Where a free individual *may* have belonged to the citizen-body of the place at which he is recorded and was active, but we have no evidence one way or the other, we have entered him under that place, with the rubric 'attested at *x*', indicated by an asterisk, e.g. 'Kos\*'. The inhabitants of Delos after 165 BC, other than Athenians or those identified by a specific ethnic, are also classed as 'attested at Delos' (see below, *Notes on Regions*. 3. Delos). These 'attested' persons, like the preceding group, stand in a rubric of their own.

Metics who carry their native ethnic are entered *under their city of origin only*, with the status 'met.'. Metics of unknown origin are listed *under the city where they occur* as 'attested at', with the status 'met.'. The fathers of this latter class, whose names are given in the final bracket, are themselves classified as 'Other'.

(c) The wholly unattributable 'Others', as indicated under (3) above, are assigned to the final Volume. These form a large and varied class. They are, broadly speaking, persons who are recorded at a particular place, or in more than one place, but whose own city of origin is wholly unknown; the same persons naturally occur also in literary texts. It would clearly be very misleading, for instance, to say of a Ptolemaic or Seleucid statesman or general honoured at Delos and perhaps elsewhere, and also known from Polybius and Livy, that he is 'attested at Delos'. He lacks those fundamental links with that island which entitle a workman who has been paid for hammering nails into the roof of a Delian temple for five successive years, or the fabricant of a Rhodian amphora whose name has not a Rhodian ring but who was certainly active in making his pots on Rhodes, to be listed as 'attested at Delos' or 'attested at Rhodes'. Slaves and freedmen who lack an ethnic (as is normally the case except in manumission records) are similarly included as 'Others'. In the Byzantine period we have assumed that bishops are not natives of the cities of which they are bishop (unless there are specific or independent indications to the contrary) and they too belong to the category of 'Other'.

(4) The ethnics that occur in documentary papyri attached to the names of persons, particularly in the Ptolemaic period, the exact significance of which is at times uncertain, have been treated as follows:

- (i) The expression *τῆς ἐπιγονῆς* ('t.e.') is taken to refer only to the individual to whose name it is attached, with the accompanying ethnic; the father, if known, is treated as a normal citizen-by-origin of the place of which his son bears the ethnic. Thus, 'x s. y, t.e.' constitutes the entry of the son, while that of the father is 'y f. x'. While it may be true that *τῆς ἐπιγονῆς* does not denote a 'successor-relationship', the patronymic does so, whatever the exact meaning of 't.e.' itself may be (cf. J. F. Oates, *YCS* 18 (1963) pp. 3-129).
- (ii) When an individual is described as a member of an ethnic military unit, without being himself designated by an ethnic, we have expressed the doubt as to his ethnic status by the use of the query: 'Crete?'
- (iii) When the name of a member of a military unit described by his ethnic is followed by the name of its 'eponym' or other commander, we have not applied the same ethnic to the latter (see *PP* 1825 ff.), though it may be that in some cases the ethnic origin was the same (as in *PP* 1870).

(5) The names of the Hellenistic kings and queens, Macedonian in origin, have been classed under the country over which they ruled: the Seleucids under Syria, the Ptolemies under Egypt. It would be excessive pedantry to class Alexander Balas and Kleopatra VII as Macedonians. Those who regard this as historically misleading should remember that Plutarch tells us (*Vit. Ant.* 27 fin.) that some of the Ptolemies could no longer speak Macedonian.

(6) Another area of great, often total, uncertainty obviously lies in the identity of homonyms. All epigraphists and papyrologists, and ancient historians in general, are familiar with this insoluble problem, and the ancients themselves were naturally well aware of it. *Πολλοὶ μὲν οἱ Ἀρίστωνες* said Lucian, 318A, and Libanius called in despair from Antioch, on receiving a letter signed uninformatively *Γερόντιος*: *Γερόντιοι μὲν πλῆθος ἐν γῆι*. (The frequency of this name may cause surprise.) In this matter no one can avoid errors both of commission and of omission, and the only responsible procedure is to take advantage of the information here collected to judge whether the name or names are sufficiently rare in any location to justify the assumption of identity. When the case seems certain, or as certain as we can hope for, we have made a 'multiple entry', i.e. we have assumed the identity and combined the references as relating to one person. When the case has seemed less certain, we have indicated the possibility/probability by the reciprocal sign  $\text{?} =$ , followed by the publication number of the homonym (e.g., (1) ...  $\text{?} =$  (2), (2) ...  $\text{?} =$  (1)). In other cases, the user must decide for himself the probabilities of the case.

(7) Greek names attested in Latin epigraphical material have not been forgotten, but we make no claim to have exhausted all possible material, not least because of the publication by Professor H. Solin of his *Die Griechischen Personennamen in Rom*, an auctarium to *CIL* VI, which contains a vast repertory of such names. When they occur in Latin the names are placed under the Greek name-heading, and the Latin form is given in the final bracket. The names from Latin literary sources are also far from exhaustive, even within the limited span we have investigated, which includes no evidence from any writer later than the fourth century.

(8) Abbreviations and their expansion will be found at the beginning of each volume. In the body of the *Lexicon* we have restricted bibliographical references for names to cases where the particular instance of the name has been established subsequently to the original publication of the inscription or other text. Other references to articles containing discussions of individual names and classes of names will eventually be found in the Bibliography (see 9 (c)(i) below). It may be added that we have only included references to the *Bulletin Épigraphique* of J. and L. Robert when this has contained material otherwise unavailable to us, or has added to the interpretation of the name.

(9) The main Index-Volume, VI, will contain:

- (a) a bare list of all names (without references) with an indication of the volume in which they occur. By this means the reader will ultimately be saved the labour of consulting each volume in turn to track down the name in which he is interested;
- (b) a reverse-index of compound names;
- (c) a Bibliography, to contain references to:
  - (i) treatments of individual names, in alphabetical order of names,
  - (ii) treatments of such subjects as slave-names, hetaira-names, etc.,
  - (iii) linguistic and morphological discussions,
  - (iv) references to standard works on Greek onomastics, which, again, we have quoted only by exception in the body of the *Lexicon*, e.g. Bechtel, *HP*; Robert, *Noms indigènes*, etc.

#### INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME I

This Volume contains the names of the persons attested as natives of the Aegean Islands (except for the Milesian Islands—Leros, Patmos, Lepsia—which will be included under Miletos, of which they were more often than not subordinate units) and Cyrenaica (with Libya), and of persons probably or possibly to be assigned to these places. Some of the islands have provided us with complicated problems of presentation, and the purpose of this Introduction is to indicate the manner in which we have treated these problems. It is, in the first place, gratifying that a number of islands have, in fact, provided no especial problem. Thus the Cyclades (except Delos), Lesbos, Chios, Samos, the majority of the Dodecanese, Cyprus, and



Crete have been for the most part straightforward. Their social and political divisions, in so far as we can perceive them at all (as at Tenos and Delos), were simple, and did not require the elaborate analysis necessary in the Rhodian and some of the Euboian material. The main problems were raised, Rhodes and its Dodecanesian Empire and Euboia apart, by Thasos, Delos, and Kalymnos.

### *Amphora-stamps*

The names recorded on amphora-stamps cause difficulty in an onomastikon based on the origin of the individual. The names of the magistrates on Rhodian and Thasian handles may safely be assigned to their respective islands, even if the interpretation of the preposition *ἐπί* is not beyond all doubt, but both on Rhodian stamps and on those of Kos there is a considerable number of 'fabricants', who, given their activity as makers of domestic pottery, may have been foreigners of metic or humbler status; and in some cases their names, too, suggest that they are not of local origin. However, neither of these two criteria can be regarded as wholly valid, and we have for the most part taken refuge in the formula 'attested at (e.g.) Rhodes' (Rhodes\*). The names on amphora-handles in Chios, supplied to us through the good offices of A. Tsaravopoulos, we have entered as 'Chios?', since the Chian origin of the handles themselves seems uncertain. With regard to the names on the handles identified provisionally as Samian by Miss Grace in *Hesperia* 40 (1971) pp. 52 ff. (the names are given in the list on p. 84 n. 82), it is to be stressed that a verbal communication from Miss Grace indicates that she has reasons for doubting this identification. We have, therefore, omitted them from this Volume. It should also be noted that the researches of Professeur Y. Garlan (*Thasiaca*, *BCH* Suppl. 5 (1979) pp. 213 ff.) have shown that some at least of the names of the 'fabricants' on Thasian stamps are probably those of civic magistrates responsible for the output of different kilns. We should add that *BCH* Suppl. 13 (1986), 'Recherches sur les Amphores grecs', which contains numerous important articles that touch directly or indirectly on names on stamped handles, reached us too late for us to be able to utilize it fully.

## I. Notes on Regions

### 1. Cyprus

The onomastikon of Cyprus presents particular difficulties arising from the frequent recurrence of names which are extremely common on the island—in some cases only on Cyprus, in other cases names of general occurrence; both categories of name are frequently repeated over two or more generations. Examples of the first category are names in *Ὀνασ-* and *Στασ-*; examples of the pan-Greek type are *Ἀρίστων* and *Ἀπολλώνιος*. Epigraphical instances of these names and pairs of names appearing on tombstones have been repeatedly published over more than a century, especially from the neighbourhood of Amathous, normally without any reference to earlier publications in which the same names appear in the same or a very similar form.

A further complication is created by the fact that the late T. B. Mitford, in supplying us with the onomastikon that provided the foundation of our own work, included many items which he labelled as 'unpublished', but which may well have been published subsequently without our being in a position to identify an 'unpublished' with a published item. For this reason we have largely omitted Mitford's 'unpublished' category (thus, in any case, following our normal practice) unless the names are sufficiently rare to make an entry particularly desirable, and the published evidence for the name is sufficiently well documented to permit a reasonable assurance that the item is not already published. The problem of identifying with certainty stones possibly published more than once seems to us insoluble in view of the incomplete descriptions of the stones in the older publications, and it may well be that we have included more, or fewer, *Ὀνάσας* I and II and *Ἀρίστων* I and II than is correct. The names are mostly very familiar and we do not think that the omission (or addition) of a few pairs of such names from the total of (mainly) Amathousian names of the Imperial period will significantly alter or distort the overall picture of Cypriot onomastics. The inscriptions particularly difficult to evaluate in this connection are those published as Le Bas-Waddington, nos. 2725–841; those in *BCH* 3 (1879) pp. 163–76; ib. 20 (1896) pp. 336–63; *Excavations in Cyprus*, p. 96; *Ἀθηνα* 1910, pp. 113–46; and in the recent volumes of *BCH* containing further material from Amathous (reproduced in *SEG* xxix 1536–70; xxx 1571–1600; xxxi 1326–46; xxxii 1318–70).

### 2. Cyrenaica

In Cyrenaica a particular problem is presented by the high proportion of Jews of the Diaspora (particularly at Taucheira-Arsinoe), who can in some cases be identified as such beyond dispute by their occurrence in synagogal inscriptions, by the presence of a Jewish symbol on their tombstones, or (with less certainty) by their interment in a predominantly Jewish necropolis. In addition, inscriptions with Hebrew formulae and bilingual Hebrew-Greek inscriptions naturally provide Jewish names. In the absence of any distinguishing criteria, the decision as to whether an individual is a Semite (and a Jew by religion) is particularly difficult, but we have been much helped by the guidance provided by G. Lüderitz in his *Corpus of Jewish inscriptions from Cyrenaica* (*Corp. jüd. Cyr.*). We have not seen the *Prosopographia Cyrenaica* by A. Laronde (thèse Paris, 1977), mentioned by O. Masson, *RPh* 1983, p. 185.

### 3. Delos

The difficulty of recording the Delian material lies not only, as at Rhodes, in the complexities of a very bulky onomastikon, but also (a) in the repetitious nature of much of the evidence (the hieropoic accounts) and (b) in the uncertainty concerning the civic status of individuals.

We have dealt with the first of these two points mainly by quoting only the earliest certain evidence for an individual and not relying on the massive accumulation of entries in the hieropoic account of 179 BC (*ID* 442 B). The editors both of *IG* xi

(2) and of *ID* have indicated subsequent entries (many restorations, but certain) in the relevant notes, and it seems to us to serve no useful purpose in this *Lexicon* to repeat the references that recur over a century or more. We have in addition simplified the references to magistrates of the period of Independence by referring to the 'Table synoptique' ('tab. syn.') at the back of *ID* 372–509. It should be noted that in some instances different dates may be assigned to individuals recorded in the same inventory. This reflects the distinction between past dedications of which no earlier trace remains and those recorded for the first time in that text.

For the second point, it is more difficult to establish a rule. The first parts of the individual hieropoeic accounts (normally A of any item) contain payments to various individuals, often homonymous, for all the humble tasks that the administration of the sanctuary required, especially in undertaking repairs, carpentry, the provision of wood, sacrificial animals, etc. Payments to these homonymous persons often occur over a considerable span of years. Very occasionally the individuals in question have patronymics, but normally they stand with their own name only. We have no means of determining whether they were *Δήλιοι* in the true sense, or foreigners, with or without metic status, or even perhaps slaves able to earn money, since the records pay no attention to such details. We have very often entered these persons, including possible slaves, as 'attested at Delos' (Delos\*), and left their precise status open. Similarly, in the records of income from sacred lands on Delos and Rheneia, the texts give no indication of the civic status of tenants, but there can be little doubt that these persons were free-born (or, in a few cases, foreigners who had obtained the right to own land); they are in many cases the same persons as, or members of the same family as, full Delian citizens who hold the higher magistracies. The fact that in one or two instances tenants etc., or their descendants, who carry no ethnic, and therefore might be presumed to be Delian, suddenly emerge, through the chance testimony of, say, a proxeny-decree, as natives of, e.g., Paros or Naxos, is an indication of the impossibility of reaching an absolutely firm conclusion in many cases. In the task of determining relationships in the period of Independence we have been much assisted by the detailed study of Mademoiselle Cl. Vial (*Délos indépendante (314–167 avant J.-C.)*, *BCH Suppl.* 10 (1984)) to whom we owe the warmest thanks for making a copy of this work available to us before publication. We have referred to her genealogical stemmata throughout, where possible (e.g. Vial St. XII (I, II, etc.)) instead of itemizing the epigraphical references.

For the period of the Second Athenian Domination the situation is still more complicated. The expulsion of the ancient population of the island in 165 BC left few of the native Delians behind, and a new population was imported. For the first few decades these were predominantly Athenian settlers, who are easily identified by the use of their Athenian demotics, and these will naturally appear in the Athenian section of the *Lexicon* (Volume II). There are, in addition, foreigners (largely orientals) with ethnics, and the large group of *Italici*—Campanians, Oscans, and others, Roman citizens (but rarely Roman) by birth—who conducted their business as *negotiatores*. We have omitted the *domini* in such cases as belonging to the onomastikon of Italy, but we have included their freedmen and slaves as 'attested at Delos' with the status 'Ital.', thus providing the user with an indication of the context.<sup>3</sup> The slaves seem, in fact, to have been often of oriental origin. We have treated the *Ῥωμαῖοι* in exactly the same way, since this term frequently seems to refer to a single bestowal of citizenship. The largest element of all consists of undifferentiated persons, without patronymics or ethnics, but apparently not of servile status. These we assume to represent the new resident population of the island, who settled there probably without previous civic status elsewhere, but, in the absence of a civic structure in the period after 165, they cannot be regarded as true Delian citizens in the same way as the inhabitants of the period of Independence. These, too, are therefore classified, according to the principle stated above (p. viii, 3. (b)) as 'attested at Delos'.

#### 4. Eretria

Eretria, prepared by Professor D. Knoepfler, has a simple deme-structure, but the tabulation of the material is complicated by the fact that some cities (e.g. Styra, Dystos) which at one time were independent were subsequently incorporated as demes into Eretria; it was therefore necessary to find a formula that could differentiate between the two phases in the life of the relevant cities. This has been achieved by entering the cities as separate units at the same level as Eretria when they were independent, but as a subordinate deme-unit in other cases (e.g. Styra appears both as the town 'Styra', and as the deme of Eretria, 'Styr.'). There is a further complication in cases where a person has no demotic, but where Professor Knoepfler has asked us to indicate the provenance of the stone. This is achieved by putting '(mod.)' after the ancient place-name, resulting in a further place-name involving Styra, among others, namely 'Eretria Styra (mod.)'. For the homonymity (as opposed to the identity) of cities of Euboeia and demes of Eretria, we have followed the interpretation provided by Professor Knoepfler.

#### 5. Kalymnos

Kalymnos, though not an important island politically, preserved a complex social structure in two respects, for both of which we felt it desirable to retain the evidence:

(a) in one or two of the catalogues and lists of the island the persons entered, together with both their parents, are registered at the same time both by their old Dorian tribe (which survived in each of the three communities of Pothaia, Orkatos, and Panormos), and by their community: 'x, of the tribe of y of the community z';

(b) the material is further complicated by the inclusion of the mother's name and tribal and communal attribution, which might in any instance be different from that of her son, who took the tribal and communal membership of his father (though his name might derive from his maternal ancestors). Sometimes, by the chance of a break in the stone, the tribe of an individual (or of his mother) is known, but not his community, and in such instances we have been able to insert only the name of the tribe (or, alternatively, of the community).

<sup>3</sup> In distinguishing the freedmen and the slaves we have followed the general rule-of-thumb by which the slave is identified by the use of his own Greek name followed by the nomen and praenomen (in the genitive) of his *patronus* (*Τρύφων Αἰδίου Λευκίου*) and the freedman by the presence of the Roman nomina followed by his own cognomen (*Αἰδῖος Αἰδίου Λευκίου Τρύφων*). Cases in which the relationship expressed by the genitive of the nomen is that of a son and not of a freedman can hardly be identified satisfactorily. We have not attempted to take account of the lasting debates concerning the juridical status of these categories of persons at Delos (cf. F. Coarelli et al., *Delos e l'Italia* (*Opuscula Inst. Rom. Finlandiae*, 2, [Rome, 1983]), *passim*).

## 6. Rhodes

The material from Rhodes is exceedingly bulky (totalling almost one-fifth of the entire volume, some 13,000 entries), and its tabular analysis has proved very difficult, particularly in respect of the 'Rhodian Islands' (Karpathos, Nisyros, Kasos, Telos) which at certain periods were incorporated as demes (or some analogous subordinate unit) in the Rhodian state, but which were earlier independent. The principle we have attempted to follow is to enter all natives of these islands under their island, e.g. Nisyros, and to distinguish those of the Rhodian period by their demotics. 'Nisyrioi', for example, indicates a Nisyrian who was also a demesman of Kamiros. Most of the evidence for the demesman category comes from inscriptions found in the city of Rhodes itself, whereas those who appear simply under the island Nisyros are either recorded as *Νισύριοι* in non-Nisyrian and non-Rhodian inscriptions, or carry no demotic or ethnic in inscriptions from Nisyros itself; these we normally regard as belonging to an independent Nisyros. Unfortunately, the date and duration of the incorporation of some of these islands into the Rhodian state cannot be fixed precisely, and the necessity of providing positive solutions on this point may have led us into error. In any case, since the names are all grouped together under Nisyros etc., the user will have the evidence to enable him to reach his own decision as to the status of an individual *vis-à-vis* Rhodes. The inhabitants of Chalke, the offshore island of Kamiros, with which it was early amalgamated, are entered as demesmen of Kamiros. Megiste, whose deme-attribution is unknown, is entered under Rhodes.

The other Rhodian demes, both those of the island itself and those of the Peraia, which were each incorporated in one of the three old cities after the synoecism of 408/7 BC, present no comparable difficulty. They are entered under their parent city, which is known in almost every case, and where the attribution is not known they appear as 'unassigned' demes. Syme, it is to be noted, has never had a demotic assigned to it satisfactorily, though the island was undoubtedly part of the incorporated Rhodian state; the inhabitants were probably part of the deme of the Kasareis, and they are entered as such, but it may well be that some future discovery will settle the matter.

It should be noted that in the Rhodian material a reference to (especially) *ILind* 1 or *TCam* 5, the lists of eponymous priests, will frequently *follow* references with a higher serial number of publication in which the earlier phases of an individual's career are attested.

## 7. Samos

The onomastic material of Samos is incomplete as presented here. The Samian material assembled by A. Rehm and others for publication as *IG* XII (6) has not been available for inclusion; this is perhaps the most serious lacuna in this volume.

## 8. Thasos

The epigraphy of Thasos is dominated by its long and complex, but incomplete, lists of *theoroi*, which have been studied in detail by successive French scholars, without absolute chronological certainty being achieved or, indeed, being possible. The problem lies in the material fact that the list exists in more than one copy, of different dates, and that a 'master-list' has to be constructed from these fragmentary apographs. We have used the lists as presented by Professor Pouilloux in his work on Thasos, modified where necessary by the review of the material by Professor Salviat, and have taken heed of the recent work of Professor A. J. Graham.<sup>4</sup> The varieties of date provided by these different reconstructions do not significantly affect our 'span-dates'.

## 9. Thera

The strictly localized late formations *av = ευ* (*Αὐφρόσωνος = Εὐφρόσωνος*, *Αὐήμερος = Εὐήμερος*) are entered separately as inscribed.

## II. Arrangement of Entries

The material of each entry is arranged in five categories or 'fields': (1) the name, (2) the location, (3) the date, (4) the reference, and (5) further information contained in the final bracket.

## 1. Name

All primary names are entered in their normalized form. The following rules have guided us in deciding what should stand as a primary name:

## 1.1 Rules

(a) All true dialect-forms are entered separately from the Attic or koine forms. We have, however, converted names of one dialect-region which occur borne by a native in a decree of another dialect-region (e.g. a Dorian honoured by an Ionian city) or in the koine, to the true, indigenous form, in contrast to normal ancient practice; the attested form is recorded in the final bracket. Since the line cannot be drawn with absolute certainty as between, e.g., Doric and Ionic in names in *-δαμος/-δημος* we may occasionally have erred; but we felt this solution to be preferable to loosing on the world such hybrids as, e.g., a Rhodian name in Boiotian dress (*IG* VII 4261, *Ἀριστήωνα Ἀριστέως Ῥόδιον*).

In literary texts we have preserved transmitted Attic forms, disregarding dialectal reversion where any doubt exists as to the original form. It is to be noted that (i) in Egypt the mixture of populations led to an early infiltration of koine-forms into dialect, and that consequently reversion to an original dialect may be incorrect there; where we judge this to be so (e.g. in graffiti and in personal documents such as Ptolemaic wills) we have retained the attested form, and (ii) when one individual

<sup>4</sup> The subsequent paper of Professor Salviat on the lists of Thasian archons (*Πρακτικά τοῦ Η' Διεθνoῦς Συνεδρίου Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Λατινικῆς Ἐπιγραφικῆς 1982* [Athens, 1984], pp. 233 ff.) appeared too late for us to make use of it.



has two references, one of which is in his own dialect and the other in a different dialect, the second form is not recorded.

(b) Syncopated forms have also been entered separately, i.e. both *Διονύσις* and *Διονύσιος*, both *Μάριν* and *Μάριον*, both *Δημήτρης* and *Δημήτριος*, as representing a more precise morphological and phonetic evolution in the language than etacism and iotacism.

(c) (i) Names with etacisms and iotacisms are normalized, and the variant syllable is noted in the final bracket, e.g., s.v. *Ἐπαφρόδιτος*, (–δει–: s. *Ἐρμαγόρας*); where the name occurs under the entry of related persons the normalized form is used, i.e. in his own entry *Ἐρμαγόρας* will be ‘f. *Ἐπαφρόδιτος*’, not ‘f. *Ἐπαφρόδειτος*’. In cases where alternative forms seem to occur with almost equal regularity, and it has not proved possible to determine the original form, we have opted to retain the earlier attested form (e.g. *Ἀριστείδης*, noting *Ἀριστείδης* as a variant); very often such names differ in spelling even within the repetition of the same individual’s name or between two homonyms in the same inscription. Similar fluctuations of course occur in forms of names transmitted by manuscripts.

(ii) Geminated and simplified forms (–λλ– for –λλ–, –σσ– for –σ–) have not been separately entered unless the two spellings represent different name-forms, but the variant is noted in the final bracket. Initial consonantal variations, rare in Volume I except for Ζμ–/Σμ–, are entered under the principal form (i.e. with sigma) on the ground that a separate alphabetical entry of the name would cause inconvenience. The variant is noted in the final bracket.

(iii) Digamma is treated as a true consonant, but the archaic rough breathing (heta) and koppa are normalized to rough breathing and kappa, the transmitted forms being recorded in the final bracket. In Cretan inscriptions we have entered the initial inscribed beta standing for digamma under *B*, the digamma being noted in the final bracket by *B(F)*.

(d) We have not considered it part of our task to indicate whether names in Greek are a translation from a Semitic or other non-Greek root. This is normally only determinable in bilingual inscriptions, as in the lists of translated names of the ‘Abd el-Melkart = *Ἡρακλείδης* variety (see, for example, Herzog, *Philol.* 56 (1897) pp. 33 ff., esp. pp. 42 ff.).

(e) As noted above, the only evidence included in this volume for names in alphabets other than Greek and Latin is that of the Cypriot syllabic script.<sup>5</sup> This we have transliterated according to the accepted rules, but omitting the intervocalic digamma in the name-field in the transliteration of the syllabic texts. We have, however, entered it in the final bracket. If the attestation is from a syllabic text only, we have added ‘syll.’.

(f) Names derived from gentilicial groups, *koïna*, etc. (in –*ῖδαι*, –*εῖοι*, etc.) have been entered in the presumed nominal form, even if this is not independently attested (e.g. at Chios: *Κλυτῆς*–*Κλυτιδαί*; Rhodes: *Ἀγήτωρ*–*Ἀγητοριδαί*, *Φίλων*–*Φιλώνεοι*). The nature of the attested form is indicated by ‘n. gent.’ and ‘koin.’ respectively. Aeolic patronymics have similarly been restored to their nominal form, even if this is only presumed, and ‘patr. adj.’ added after the attested form in the final bracket.

(g) We have excluded from the *Lexicon* the names of persons known by a praenomen and nomen only, and those bearing *tria nomina* if the cognomen is Latin. If it is Greek the cognomen alone is entered, and the full *tria nomina* are given in the final bracket, usually with the cognomen abbreviated to its initial letter. Single Latin names (*Μάρκος*, *Τέρτιος*, *Γναῖος*, *Φορτουάτος*), frequently used as single Greek names, are included.

(h) Multiple Greek names, whether linked by *ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος*, *ὁ καί*, etc., or simply recorded as two names, are entered under both names. Descriptive epithets recorded in the final bracket, e.g. *ὁ ἐπικαλ. Δολιχός*, *Μαῦρος*, do not have an entry of their own.

(i) Individual names followed by a query indicate our doubts as to the name itself. Doubts regarding the correctness of a *particular instance* of a name are expressed in the final bracket.

## 1.2 Orthography

(a) We have ignored psilosis and barytonesis in Aeolic names, and equally the occasional psilosis of E. Ionic and Cretan names. The evidence is too complex regionally and chronologically for a cut-and-dried solution, such as is required for a *Lexicon*. We have felt the more justified in this practice since variation in breathings creates separate entries in the computer, and the two forms of such names would thus be separated.

It has not proved possible to mark the original long sounds  $\epsilon = \eta$ ,  $o = \omega$  with a makron.

The particular problem as to the correct breathing of Doric names in *Αγ*– needs explanation. The form of the stem does not always indicate whether it derives from *ἄγω* or *ἀγέ(ομαι)*. In early inscriptions the problem is solved if the alphabet employs an initial *h*, but examples of this are rare. As a general rule we have accepted that all words of the second type that can be reduced to an initial alpha/eta should be aspirated (*Ἠγήμων*, *Ἀγασλόχος*). In other cases, however, such guidance is lacking, and there is little uniformity in practice among modern scholars.<sup>6</sup> We have assumed that *Ἀγι*– names derive from *ἄγω* and have uniformly left them unaspirated, but consider that *Αγε*– names have to be decided individually since a

<sup>5</sup> But we have also included the isolated names from the Assyrian list of Cypriot kings, published by R. Borger in *Inscr. Asarhaddons* (see list of Abbreviations).

<sup>6</sup> ‘Pape’ writes *Ἀγίας*, but *Ἠγίας*; *Ἀγλαός*, but *Ἠγλαός*; *Ἀγέλοχος* but *Ἠγέλοχος*; *Ἀγέπολις* and *Ἀγησίπολις*, but *Ἠγέπολις* and *Ἠγησίπολις*; *Ἀγῆσανδρος* but *Ἠγῆσανδρος*, etc., etc. Such entries indicate that he regularly took *Ἀγε(η)*– as the Doric equivalent of *Ἠγε(η)*– etc. This is no doubt because the statement of Apoll. Dysc., quoted below (n. 7), was taken as of general validity, but this is not the case. We contrast with ‘Pape’s’ practice that of Hiller in *IG XII* (1) and *XII* (3). In the Index to (1), the same distinction is observed: *Ἀγέλοχος* (no *Ἠγέλοχος* is attested in that fascicule), but in (3) the same name has become *Ἀγέλοχος* (equally, no *Ἠγέλοχος* to attest the *Ἠγε*– root); in (1) *Ἀγέμαχος* and *Ἀγίστρατος*, in (3) *Ἀγίστρατος*. In both fasc. *Ἀγίας*, in (3) alongside *Ἠγίας* (an Amorgan). In (1) and (3) all *Ἀγη*–, *Ἀγησι*– names (except *Ἀγῆνωρ* in (1) and *Ἀγητος* (*ἀγάομαι*)) are derived from *ἀγέομαι*. We may note that Rehm in *Milet* 1 (3) 34 a, 11 gives, for a Cretan, *Ἀγενίκα*, but in the Index the same person’s name is given as *Ἀγενίκα*. In general our practice agrees, save in one or two cases, with that of O. Hoffmann in the Indexes of *SGDI* (iv (3)).

derivation from either root is possible.<sup>7</sup> Since our computer system has not allowed for an initial vowel in bold-face without a breathing sign, these *Αγε-* words consequently appear as unaspirated, i.e. with psilosus.

(b) In entering names which have the patronymic termination *-ωιδης* and *-ωδης* we have followed the practice laid down in *EM* p. 438, that the correct form of the name Herodes is *Ἡρωιδης*. Thus this name is always entered in that form, even if the testimony for a single individual varies, as it does, for example, in the case of the father of the Cyrenaean sculptor Polianthes, who occurs in one inscription with an iota and in another without one.

### 1.3 Accentuation

In matters of accentuation we have followed the rules provided by H. W. Chandler in his *Greek Accentuation* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1881), and naturally have considered the canons and observations he quotes from ancient grammarians in cases where the book-traditions show variants. The accentuation of proper names is often problematical, and some editors of inscriptions, papyri, etc. have preferred to leave them unaccented. For a variety of reasons that option has not been open to us: it is essential to indicate interpretation of gender and declension by the use of the accent. In some cases, where modern practice seems incorrect, we have tacitly modified the accent accordingly, but we are well aware that numerous inconsistencies of accent inevitably remain, and that others may accent some names and forms differently. A particular difficulty arises from the fact that in many instances the genitive of a name is not known, and the nominative accentuation therefore cannot be determined by inference from that.

In many inscriptions a variety of declension, which would create different accentuation, occurs, as, for example, when nouns in *-ων* make genitives indifferently in *-ονος*, *-ωνος*, and *-ωντος*. In such cases we have accented the nominative on the basis of the genitive, and have assumed regularity when the name occurs in the nominative. In accenting adjectival name-derivatives, where the book practice differs widely and illogically and no acceptable rules exist in the grammarians, we have mostly retained the adjectival accent (especially for simple names in *-ικός*), and, unless there is firm attestation to the contrary (as in the case of *Ἀθηναίος/Ἀθήναιος*), we have retained the ethnic accent for personal names of ethnic form (*Ἀχαιός*, *Θεσσαλός*). Names of ambiguous gender which cannot be determined from the context are left unaccented. Variations in gender of identical forms in *-ις* are indicated by accent only (retraction in masc., oxytone in fem.). We have accented non-Greek names in the conventional Greek manner if they show normal inflection, e.g., Libyan names in *-αν*, gen. *-αντος*, as paroxytone in the nominative, proparoxytone in the genitive, on the analogy of nouns in *-ας* with the same inflection (Chandler, §§ 632–3). The length of the vowel is in such names uncertain, and the acute accent has been used simply to indicate that the name is masculine and has a regular inflection.

### 1.4 Brackets

The 'old' system of brackets—for which see the reasoned defence of L. and J. Robert, *La Carie* 2 pp. 9 ff.—and not that approved at Leiden in 1937 (for which see the prolegomena to the later volumes of *SEG*) is employed throughout.

## 2. Location

Every entry has a primary location. In cases of disputed origin or dual citizenship, one place is chosen as the primary location and the alternative recorded in the final bracket.

(a) The spelling of Greek place-names is normally a transliteration of the Greek, except where an accepted westernized form exists (Rhodes; Crete; but Nisyros; Kalymnos).

(b) We have used the dual nomenclature throughout for cities that acquired dynastic names. In Volume I this particularly concerns the cities of the Pentapolis, Barka-Ptolemais, Euesperides-Berenike, and Taucheira-Arsinoe, and Koresia-Arsinoe on Keos.

(c) Modern place-names, used to indicate the provenance of a stone, are followed by '(mod.)': see also above, p. xi, s.v. Eretria, for a modification of this practice.

(d) We have not recorded the essentially honorific grants of multiple citizenship (either of one city or of several) in Imperial times, which were probably rarely taken up: for instance, Antipatros of Kos, the son of Basileides, who was made a Delphian in the conventional formula (*FD* III (4) 95) *Ἀντίπατρον Βασιλείδου Κώων Δελφοὶ Δελφὸν ἐποίησαν*, is recorded only as a Koan.

(e) Two especial categories of place-names are reserved for a section of Volume VI (comparable with the 'Other' names):

(i) ethnics of places the geographical location of which is wholly unknown;

(ii) ethnics, mostly, but not entirely, of new Hellenistic foundations, which are not given a distinctive geographical label, such as *Ἀντιοχεύς*, *Λαοδικεύς*, etc. These are classed as 'Ambiguous', save in those instances in which it was felt that there could be no serious doubt, either because of geographical proximity to the place of attestation (e.g. the *Ἡρακλεῶται*, who are numerous at Miletos and are natives of Herakleia-on-Latmos), or because in certain places various considerations may be regarded as pointing to one particular place (e.g. the large number of *Ἀντιοχεύς* and *Λαοδικεῖς* at Rhodes, who, one may feel confident, are from the great Syrian cities: note the contrast expressed in *IG*

<sup>7</sup> In the absence of any significant MS evidence for most of these names, the frequent absence of comparable Attic and Ionic forms, and the scarcity of early epigraphical evidence regarding the psilosus of Doric forms of *Ἀγε(η)-*, the observation of Apoll. Dysc., *De Synt.* Δ 61, pp. 483 f. (Uhlig, quoted by Page, op. cit. below), *ἀπειράκις γὰρ τὰ Δωρικά διὰ ψιλὸν ἀντιστοίων τὰς συναλιφὰς ποιεῖται*, does not take us very far: while the phrases of Alcmān quoted by him (*PMG* fr. 87) support his statement, *Ἀγγοιχόρα* has an asper in the papyrus of Alcmān's *Partheneion* (i. 79, ed. Page; cf. ib. p. 137, where Page stresses the variation between asper and lenis in instances of one word in Laconian and other dialects). Plato's observation in *Crat.* 394C that *Ἄγεις = στρατηγός* reflects the particular aspiration of that diminutive (attested epigraphically in the Tarentine text, *IG* XIV 668 (*DGE* 60) *ἡγεις*), but *pace* 'Pape' there is no verb *ἀγέομαι = ἡγέομαι* (the Oracle quoted in [Dem.] xliii. 66 is transmitted as *ἀγμεῖνα*), and no general rules can be based on Plato's etymologies.



vii 1762, 2–5 between the ποιητής ἐπὼν/Κλιόδωρος Κλιοδώρου Ἀντιοχεύς, and the βασιμίδος Ζηρόδοτος Σωπάτρου Ἀντιοχεύς ἀπὸ Πυράμου).

### 3. Date

Here the following considerations have guided us, and must be borne in mind (for a more detailed account of the application of our system of dating see below, p. xx):

(a) We have attempted wherever possible to adhere closely to the documented date of an individual. Let us suppose that Ἀπολλοφάνης Ἀνδρίσκου is attested in a single document only; both father and son are given the date of that document. We did not feel that any greater precision would be achieved by (as one collaborator put it) 'aiming off' for the dates of the father, when in many cases the text gives no indication of the age of the son, or whether his father is living or dead. In many multiple entries the father was almost certainly dead when the son was still using the patronymic. Obvious examples of this are the records of priestly offices at Rhodes, the temple accounts at Delos, and (in Volume III) the manumission records at Delphi.

(b) Persons who are frequently referred to in literary or other sources, or whose attested careers involve both precise and more general dates, but whose absolute dates are not known, are given a wider spread of years to cover their known career in general terms: s. v BC, f. iv AD, etc.

(c) The greatest difficulty lies obviously in dating those persons who can only be dated by the letter-forms of an inscription. Here we have usually made an independent judgement when a photograph or a squeeze has been available, and otherwise we have proceeded with the necessary caution. Very often the dates are expressed in terms of half-centuries or centuries, but no less frequently we have had to resort to 'span-dates', i.e. iii–ii BC, or simply to period-dates, 'arch(aic)', 'hell(enistic)', 'imp(erial)'. All those who have to deal with epigraphical material will appreciate and, we hope, accept the uncertain element in such dating procedure. Our dates may be wrong, and we shall hope to be corrected where necessary (or possible); we have done our best, in the absence of precise evidence, to provide at least a chronological pointer. Where (worse still) only a majuscule or minuscule printed copy of a text survives, we have tried to avoid the blank uncertainty of an 'inc(ertum)', which gives no help to the user, and have, where at all possible, attempted to extract some general indication of a feasible date out of a formula, a linguistic usage, or the letter-forms of a majuscule copy. Thus, for example, 'hell.?' and 'imp.?' will be found more frequently than 'inc.'. We have used the term 'byz(antine)' to indicate the date of Christian and Pagan texts of the fourth–seventh centuries which are not precisely datable. In the absence of any internal dating-element, inscriptions of this period are frequently not chronologically distinguishable, and their date, even within a century, not of the greatest importance in an onomastikon.

### 4. Reference

Normally, all the references to an individual are given, to the most recent reliable publication; absence of a particular reference should not be taken as a sign of unawareness. In epigraphical references we have, where possible, cited *SEG* as a main reference rather than the original publication, as the shortest way of referring to the latter. Multiple entries normally follow the published sequence of the inscriptions or papyri, with the exception of the Rhodian material of (particularly) Kamiros and Lindos, where the sequence of the career of the individual takes priority. When the name of an individual mentioned more than once in a document is missing at some point owing to the state of the stone or papyrus, but can be restored with certainty, the missing reference stands *within square brackets* (e.g. *IKourion* 140, [4], 5, 10, 16).

References following ';' are further references to the same person; the separator '=' indicates that the inscriptions so joined were published independently but are now identified as the same text; '+' signifies that the following reference gives a preferable interpretation of the name from the original publication. If, for some reason, a republication of the same text is given, it is placed within brackets, e.g. *IG XII* (8) 279, 16 (*BCH Suppl.* 5 (1979) p. 116 V).

Persons who occur in Pauly–Wissowa's *Realencyclopädie (RE)* are normally designated *by that reference only*, but subsequent epigraphical or similar documentation has been added in simple cases, or replaced the *RE* reference in others. No attempt, however, has been made to bring the bulky documentation of, e.g., Antiochos III (*RE* (25)) beyond the point at which it was left by Wilcken in that article in 1896: the man is identified, not his history. Historians whose fragments are to be found in Jacoby's *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* are given their number in that work, in addition to *RE*, and the pre-Socratic philosophers their numbers in Diels–Kranz's *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. For Christian notables we have used, or added where necessary, reference to the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

### 5. Final Bracket

The final bracket may contain up to five categories of further information on place, name, relationship, status, and attribution of editorial corrections.

#### 5.1 Location

Additional or alternative locations are given, in cases of uncertain origin or dual citizenship (except for instances of Imperial date; see 2. (d) above, p. xiv).

#### 5.2 Names

In cases of incomplete or uncertain readings of names, the attested form is given. Sometimes the name is simply recorded

with diacritical markings, but, where relevant, the nature of the evidence may be indicated, a copy ('—apogr.') or the stone itself ('—lap.'). The source of the reading ('—ed.', '—J.M.R.') or the status of the attested form ('gen.', 'n. gent.', 'patr. adj.'). Here, too, are recorded orthographic or dialectal variants and further names, whether *tria nomina* or second names linked by *ὁ καί, ὁ ἐπικαλ.*, etc.

### 5.3 Relationships

Relationships are limited to those of parents and children; the husband–wife relationship is not recorded, except incidentally as the parents in their children's entries, since that relationship rarely has any direct bearing on the nomenclature of either party. Cases of adoption have been recorded in the entry of the adopted child and the adoptive parent by the formulae 's.(ad.)', 'f. (ad.)', etc. The natural father of an adopted child is 'f. (nat.)'. Thus a man who is 'f.' of one child and 'f. (nat.)' of another had two children, one of whom was adopted, the other not.

The statement of homonymy, with the use of the symbols I, II, III, etc. (corresponding to *A, B, Γ* on the stone) is confined to immediately succeeding generations, contrary to the usual modern practice, in which it includes homonyms of different degrees of relationship and descent (grandfather–grandson, uncle–nephew, etc.) but in keeping with ancient practice. We believe that the modern system would be extremely confusing in a work which only covers direct descent, and although there is certainly significance in the recurrence of a name within the larger family group, these ties are to be sorted out by the prosopographer. We record both names, and use I, II, etc. when a homonymous symbol only is used in the source, no less than when both names are given in full.

The problem of paternity and/or filiation in the innumerable cases in which the same inscription or related inscriptions produce a pattern of alternating pairs of names—*Δημοσθένης Δημοφώντος* and *Δημοφών Δημοσθένους*—is frequently insoluble. Unless there is a specific secondary indication, the resulting stemma may be either *Δημοσθένης—Δημοφών—Δημοσθένης* or *Δημοφών—Δημοσθένης—Δημοφών*. We have tried, where possible, to reach a reasonable conclusion regarding the alternative solutions, but no doubt we have often erred unintentionally. Where no certain indication presented itself, we have frequently left the pairs separate. It is a sector, however, where different contributors may have judged differently, as between combining and keeping separate such items.

### 5.4 Status and Profession

A limited number of statuses has been given (see Other Abbreviations) and two professions, those of sculptor and doctor. The choice of these professions is based on the recognized fact that in them names tend to be perpetuated from generation to generation. It is hoped that information of this type may be extended in subsequent volumes. In other cases where a modern critical list of persons in any one category exists, we have simply given the reference to this (e.g. the lists of choregoi, dramatists, and performers to be found in P. Ghiron-Bistagne's *Recherches sur les acteurs dans la Grèce ancienne* and J. Mette's *Urkunden dramatischen Aufführungen*; the publication of sculptors' signatures by J. Marcadé, etc.). The father, if attested, is usually entered with the original reference, not that of the list.

We have not entered civic or Imperial offices or careers which result from, e.g., election or nomination, and which can have no direct significance for the name: archons, priests, high-priests, consuls, etc., are not so designated, though the reference to e.g. *RE* or *PLRE* will give a direct lead to their identification and rank; so also, naturally, ambassadors, generals, and *hoc genus omne*. The only exceptions we have made to this rule have been to indicate royalty by 'king' or 'queen' and to record the offices of bishop and archbishop ('bp.' and 'archbp.').

5.5 Corrections made to name, location, or date ('name—', 'locn.—', 'date—'), the identification of two persons or two stones as the same ('ident.—'), the joining-up of two separately published stones ('link—'), or the re-reading of a stone ('reading—'), are duly credited to their author, be it a member of the *Lexicon* staff or one of our collaborators, identified by his or her initials. (Corrections, supplements, and suggestions not accredited by name are my responsibility.)

## III. *Compilation and Editing*

As already indicated in the paper of 1976, most of the work has been undertaken by the staff of the *Lexicon*, but we have also had the very great advantage of receiving contributions in all volumes from experts in the epigraphy of certain regions.

In this Volume the original slipping of the epigraphical material, which is by far the largest single item, was carried out by the following: the Cyclades, Amorgos, Samos, the Northern Islands (Lesbos, Samothrace, Thasos, etc.), and the Northern Sporades), Dr. S. M. Sherwin-White (staff, until 1977); Cyprus, the late Professor T. B. Mitford; Crete, the late Dr. L. H. Jeffery; the Dodecanese (including Rhodes, but not Kos, which was adapted from the onomastikon in Dr. Sherwin-White's *Ancient Cos*), myself; Chios, Mr. R. Hannah (staff), generously assisted by Professor W. G. Forrest; Eretria and associated demes, with additional contributions to the whole Euboian material, Professor D. Knoepfler; the remainder of Euboia, Dr. A. Griffin (staff); Cyrenaica, Miss J. M. Reynolds. The Committee wishes to express its indebtedness to these scholars for the labour they undertook in the preparation of their sections of this Volume. We also are very grateful to Dr. E. Tsirivakos, formerly Ephor of Lesbos, for allowing us to include the names on some unpublished tombstones transcribed by me in Mytilene Museum in 1980.

On the literary side, Mrs. A. Burton of Bristol University carried out the fundamental early work on authors from the first half of the alphabet, and after her resignation to take up other employment in 1976 her work was revised by Mr. J. K. Jenner, and carried on by others, notably Dr. C. Tuplin, Mrs. E. Matthews, and Dr. S. West, though many others contributed the names from individual authors with whom they were concerned. Dr. N. Key made a useful gathering of names from the more prominent Latin authors.

The Christian material (in most of which ethnic denominations rarely occur, and consequently the individuals are largely

in the 'Other' category reserved for the final Volume) has been covered by a former member of the staff, Dr. A. Crabbe, who sifted and organized a wide range of hagiographical texts, Greek and Latin, and most of the Conciliar lists. The Church historians from Eusebius to Euagrius were slipped by Professor F. W. Norris of the School of New Testament Studies at Tennessee, to whom we owe a particular debt of gratitude. Other work on Byzantine texts was done by Miss P. Armstrong and Dr. M. Whitby (Byzantine Chroniclers and the Law Codes).

The widely dispersed archaeological material has been largely collected by Dr. A. W. Johnston, whose long collaboration has been of great value to us. For the amphora-stamp names—especially relevant to this Volume—we are indebted in large part to the generosity of Miss V. Grace of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, and her staff. By providing us with the names of fabricants and eponyms on Rhodian and other handles, and by working out an agreed system of nomenclature and chronology for this difficult material, Miss Grace has enabled us to provide a detailed onomastikon of (especially) all Rhodian and Koan names. The Thasian handles were generously provided (through the kindness of Miss Grace) with updated and corrected lists of names by Monsieur M. Débidour of the École française d'Athènes, and by Professor Y. Garlan of the Université de Haute-Bretagne, II, Rennes. The Thasian material has now been reclassified by Professor Garlan in *BCH* Suppl. 13 (1986) pp. 201–76, but we have not been able to incorporate changes arising from this study.

In the numismatic field we have been well served by Mr. R. Ashton (Rhodes and the Dodecanese), Dr. P. Kinns, and Dr. M. Mays (the remainder of the area in this Volume). To Mr. Ashton, who has found time in the course of a busy diplomatic life to keep us up to date with the very latest numismatic literature, including auction-sale catalogues, we are especially indebted.

All the material in this Volume has been revised and checked by me (except for that prepared by Professor Knoepfler, and the archaeological and numismatic evidence which has been left as presented by the specialists) with the assistance of Mrs. E. Matthews and of Dr. E. E. Rice. The skill and perseverance of Dr. Rice in helping to edit especially (but not only) the extremely complex and bulky Rhodian and Delian material have been invaluable. Dr. P. A. Hansen (staff, 1978–83) revised a part of the epigraphical material (notably that of Thera), and laid the foundations of the Bibliography (now absorbed in the list of Abbreviations). Mrs. Matthews has provided, in addition to her work on the scholarly side, the essential link between the 'academic' editing and the computer-operations which have made the publication of this work possible. Her contribution to the success of the whole project has been of unique importance, and all who use this work have cause to be grateful to her. This book in a very real sense owes its existence to her. An account of the computer-operations and their relation to the form of presentation of the material follows from her pen.

P.M.F.