

With this first of three projected fascicles of Volume V, which will cover the personal names of Asia Minor, the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* enters territory that differs in several ways from most of those so far covered. Very broadly put, before Alexander the Great's conquests, the Greek presence in Asia Minor was essentially a coastal phenomenon and thus the largest part of this land mass became hellenized comparatively late.¹ For our purposes the most significant aspects of hellenization are the employment of the Greek language and script for inscriptions of various categories and the adoption of Greek personal names by indigenous communities. Before the Hellenistic period the vast majority of Greek settlements in Asia Minor occupied coastal locations with territories that did not extend far inland, even if some were large by the standards of mainland Greece. And in this period there are perhaps just as many signs of the impact of indigenous cultures on the Greeks of western Asia Minor, where in the Archaic period the interior had been dominated successively by the Phrygian and Lydian kingdoms and other smaller powers before becoming subject to Persian rule in 546 BC.² The Persian empire came to incorporate all the Greek cities, many of which on the Aegean coast had already progressively fallen under Lydian control from the middle of the seventh century. In the two-hundred years of Persian domination, Achaemenid imperial culture left a strong mark and was readily absorbed by the indigenous élites of Anatolia, not least in those areas adjoining the territories of the Greek cities, and the more that is learnt of this important phase the stronger this impression becomes.³ This is not to deny the evidence for the diffusion of Greek cultural influences and patterns of civic life in the fifth and fourth centuries, especially in Caria, where Greek was widely adopted for inscriptions of a public and private nature, and, to a much lesser degree, in Lycia, as well as in other areas adjacent to the territories of the old

Greek cities of Asia Minor and the later seventh and sixth-century foundations in the Hellespont, Propontis and Black Sea, and along the south coast between Phaselis and Tarsos.⁴ But this process was intensified on a far greater scale following Alexander's conquests, with the destruction of the Achaemenid order, the settlement of Greek colonists and veteran soldiers and the foundation of new cities in parts of inland Asia Minor, for the most part under the political control of one or other of the Hellenistic royal dynasties. However, these conditions of Greek colonization and political control were in themselves not prerequisite for the process of hellenization as is shown by the adoption of Greek and other norms of Greek civic life in regions such as Bithynia and Cappadocia which were not conquered by Alexander, did not succumb for more than brief periods to any of the successor kingdoms and saw little, if any, new Greek settlement.⁵ The effects of hellenization were, therefore, by no means uniform nor overwhelming, varying from region to region and leaving many traces of the indigenous cultures and populations to be found thriving many centuries later, thus giving Greek culture in Asia Minor a very distinctive and varied flavour. Prior to Alexander's conquests, western Asia Minor had been home to a number of indigenous languages (e.g. Lydian, Phrygian, Carian, Lycian, Pisidian and Sidetic), besides the Aramaic of the Persian administration, as part of what has been characterized as a multilingual empire.⁶ For some of these poorly documented languages, personal names are one of the most important sources of evidence and, more generally, are valuable indicators for the mapping of indigenous populations, as well as the survival of both people and language in the long periods of Greek and Roman cultural domination.⁷

As is widely acknowledged, the use of Greek personal names is by itself no more a sign of the thorough absorption of Greek culture than the use of indigenous names is of a

* In writing this Introduction the editors would like to acknowledge with gratitude the valuable help, advice, suggestions and comments given and made by R. van Bremen, C. Crowther, S. Hornblower, J. Ma, S. Mitchell, A. Morpurgo Davies, R. Parker, M. Riel and P. Thonemann. We further wish to emphasize that the bibliographical references provided here are intended as a guide to a much wider literature and are by no means comprehensive.

¹ This term is used for the sake of brevity, while we are well aware of its shortcomings, especially in the context of Asia Minor; see in brief S. Hornblower's article on 'Hellenism, Hellenization' in *OCD*³ pp. 677–9.

² This is the conventional date for the Persian capture of Sardis, which is perhaps more likely to have taken place between 539 and 530; see N. Ehrhardt, 'Die Ioner und ihr Verhältnis zu den Phrygern und Lydern', in E. Schwertheim and E. Winter (edd.), *Neue Forschungen zu Ionien (Asia Minor Studien, 54)*, Bonn, 2005) p. 106 n. 108.

³ See in general P. Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire* (Winona Lake, Indiana, 2002) pp. 697–713 and in particular E. R. M. Dussinberre, *Aspects of Empire in Achaemenid Sardis* (Cambridge, 2003) pp. 196–217; P. Briant, 'L'Asie mineure en transition', in P. Briant and P. Joannès (edd.), *La transition entre l'empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques* (Paris, 2006) pp. 309–51; I. Delemen (ed.), *The Achaemenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in Anatolia (Sixth-Fourth Centuries BC)* (Istanbul, 2007).

⁴ See for example on Caria: S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (Oxford, 1982) pp. 332–51; P. Debord, *L'Asie Mineure au IV^e siècle (412–323 a.C.)* (Bordeaux, 1999) pp. 178–81; Lycia: D. Asheri, *Fra ellenismo e iranismo. Studi sulla società e cultura di Xanthos nella età achemenide* (Bologna, 1983); M. Wörle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens IV: Drei griechische Inschriften aus Limyra', *Chiron* 21 (1991) pp. 203–34; P. Thonemann, 'Lycia, Athens and Amorges', in J. Ma, N. Papa-

zarkadas and R. Parker (edd.), *Interpreting the Athenian Empire* (London, 2009) pp. 167–94 draws attention to a strong strain of Lycian nationalism and Asiatic identity among the dynasts of later fifth-century Lycia; Pisidia: S. Mitchell, 'The Hellenization of Pisidia', *Mediterranean Archaeology* 4 (1991) pp. 119–45; K. Vandorpe and M. Waelkens, 'Protecting Sagalassos' Fortress of the Akra. Two large fragments of an early Hellenistic Inscription', *Ancient Society* 37 (2007) pp. 121–39. L. Robert's comment on a list of priests from Simuri in southwest Caria encapsulates the process, 'Les dix derniers noms sont des noms grecs... Au contraire, les cinq premiers noms sont indigènes. Cela est caractéristique de la croissante hellénisation du pays': *Le Sanctuaire de Simuri près de Mylasa. I, Les inscriptions grecques* (Paris, 1945) p. 19 no. 5. On the hellenization of indigenous communities in the pre-Hellenistic period more generally see M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (edd.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford, 2004) pp. 150–3. For a study of the process further afield in Phoenicia see F. Millar, 'The Phoenician Cities: a Case-Study of Hellenisation', in *Rome, the Greek World, and the East. Vol. 3, The Greek World, the Jews, and the East*, edd. H. M. Cotton and G. M. Rogers (Chapel Hill, 2006) pp. 32–50.

⁵ However, the kingdom of Bithynia from the third century BC incorporated many Greek cities, such as Kios, Myrleia-Apameia, Nikomedeia and Nikaia.

⁶ See P. Briant (above n. 3) pp. 507–10; *id.*, 'Inscriptions multilingues d'époque achéménide: le texte et l'image', in D. Valbelle and J. Leclant (edd.), *Le décret de Memphis* (Paris, 1999) pp. 91–115.

⁷ Phrygian, despite a hiatus in the written evidence between the end of the third century BC and the first century AD, continued to flourish well into the Roman Imperial period, while Lydian, Carian and Lycian do not survive in written texts after the late fourth century BC.

Aegean effectively make Lydia impossible to disentangle from Ionia.¹² For some of the ancient writers, notably Herodotos (i 142), the Ionian cities between the Maeander and Kaikos could be designated as being in Lydia, while those to the south were part of Caria. It is indeed the case that the great western plain of Lydia, containing important urban centres such as Sardis, Thyateira and Magnesia by Sipylos, was much more accessible to the sea and also hellenized at an earlier date than, for example, the inner parts of Mysia where recognizable forms of Greek civic life are barely attested before the second century AD. Moreover, at its height in the reign of Alyattes (c.610–560 BC), the Lydian kingdom embraced many of the regions settled by Greeks, contributing among other things to its early exposure to Greek influences and wider contacts with the Greek world.

Each of the regions that are included in this fascicle will be described briefly in what follows. In so doing, we are fully aware that, depending on the period, the borders of the various regions could have been drawn differently and that alternative regional headings were possible. As a rule, the regions have been defined along geographical lines, conforming closely to the headings found, for example, in *SEG* and the *Bulletin épigraphique*, in contrast to the division by the provinces established under the late Republic and Roman empire (as in *L'Année épigraphique*), whose boundaries were anyway flexible and subject to a number of reforms. Given the wide range of possibilities available, we hope that the pragmatic arrangement followed here seems rational and commands broad agreement.

Pontos

For the purposes of this fascicle, the heading 'Pontos' has been used to designate a relatively narrow coastal strip which makes up the largest part of Asia Minor's north coast. It begins in the east with Trapezous and extends as far west as Herakleia Pontike. In its western two-thirds, between Herakleia and Amisos, it is identical with the Pontic part of the double province of *Pontus et Bithynia* established in 63 BC by Pompey, to which the territories of Kerasous and Trapezous have been attached. The reason for this deviation from the Roman provincial organization is that in this way the old Greek colonial cities of the coast are clearly separated from the much later foundations such as Amaseia or Pompeiopolis in the hinterland, which will be included in *LGPN V.C.*, divided between the regions of 'Paphlagonia' and 'Inner Pontos'.

A special mention is required for the city of Herakleia. It has here been assigned not to Bithynia, as is often the case, but to Pontos. The reason for this is that the city was never subjected by the Bithynian kings and was later in the Pontic part of the double province of *Pontus et Bithynia*.¹³ Attestations of *Ἡρακλεῶται* abound in the Mediterranean, being particularly numerous at Athens,¹⁴ but it is in most cases difficult to decide which of the many cities called Herakleia was meant. As a general rule, we have followed W. Ameling's *Prosopographia Heracleotica* (in *IHeraclea* pp. 115–68; cf. his remarks pp. 116–19). This means that we have, with some exceptions,¹⁵ applied a rather strict policy of excluding those individuals whom there are no compelling reasons to attribute to the Pontic city of this name. Those who cannot be attributed with reasonable confidence to one of the many Herakleias of the ancient world will be included along with others bearing ambiguous ethnics (e.g. undifferentiated citizens of Alexandria, Antioch, Apamea, Apollonia, Seleukeia and such like) in *LGPN VI*.¹⁶

Bithynia

This region corresponds to the Bithynian or western part of the Roman double province of *Pontus et Bithynia*, and is more or less identical with the extent of the kingdom of Bithynia before it was taken over by the Romans in 74 BC. Its westernmost limit is the mouth of the river Rhyndakos; the southern frontier runs from there around the south of Mt. Olympos to the bend of the river Sangarios, separating the country from Mysia and Phrygia (the latter treated in *LGPN V.C.*).

The definition of the territory of the two largest Bithynian cities, Nikaia and Nikomedea, requires some comment. Both were exceptionally large, but some controversy as to their exact boundaries remains. The territory of the latter, the capital of the kingdom and, subsequently, of the Roman province, seems to have extended almost up to Kalchedon in the west, and in the east the modern town of Adapazarı has been included, which has otherwise tentatively been attributed to Prusias ad Hypium.¹⁷ For the territory of Nikaia the definition in *INikaia* has been followed,¹⁸ with the addition to the east of the region called Modrene in antiquity, around the modern town of Mudurnu.¹⁹

Mysia

At its northeast limit Mysia bounds with Bithynia at the mouth of the Rhyndakos, from there extending eastwards around the western fringes of Mt Olympos and south of the upper reaches of the Rhyndakos to the headwaters of the river Makestos; its southern boundary lies to the south of

¹² Fraser's fundamental division between a 'coastal-zone' and the continental interior was based on the clear differences in their respective histories, topography, geography and climate. His definition of the 'coastal-zone' is expressed in a brief summary that he penned at an early stage of work on Volume V: 'Along the south shore of the Black Sea the mountains which separate Anatolia from the hellenized coastline are a continuous barrier for ordinary cultural purposes. The mountains are, as history has shown, a very effective barrier. In the regions on the west coast, the situation is less clear-cut, as the hinterland of Mysia, Aiolis, Ionia and, to a lesser degree, Caria, is rendered accessible by the rivers which flow from the plateau to the Aegean. Here we would extend our 'coastal zone' further into the interior, up the river-valleys. Lycia and Pamphylia are different in this respect, since the mountains (especially the Taurus) come close to the coast but we would not be violating our concept of the 'coastal zone' if we included the cities on the south face of the Taurus (Termessos, Selge, Sagalassos, etc.).'

¹³ Str. xii 3. 6; C. Marek, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (Tübingen, 1993) pp. 33–6.

¹⁴ See M. J. Osborne and S. Byrne, *The Foreign Residents of Athens* (Louvain, 1996) pp. 72–98 where 618 *Ἡρακλεῶται* are enumerated.

¹⁵ E.g. *IG VII* 1177 which may, on the basis of the names Attalos and Eumenes, refer to Pontic Herakleia.

¹⁶ For ambiguous ethnics see P. M. Fraser, *Greek Ethnic Terminology* (London, 2009) pp. 179–200, esp. p. 181 f. for the places called Herakleia.

¹⁷ For the assignment of Adapazarı to Nikomedea see M. Adak and N. E. Akyürek Şahin, 'Katalog der Inschriften im Museum von Adapazarı', *Gephyra* 2 (2005) pp. 134–5. W. Ameling (*IPrusias* p. 5) preferred its attribution to Prusias ad Hypium.

¹⁸ *INikaia* I pp. ix–x; II pp. 3–38.

¹⁹ S. Şahin, 'Studien über die Probleme der historischen Geographie des nordwestlichen Kleinasien', *Epigr. Anat.* 7 (1986) pp. 142–3; C. Marek, 'Grab-, Ehren- und Weihinschriften aus der Gegend von Modrene (Mudurnu) in Bithynien', *Epigr. Anat.* 28 (1997) pp. 81–4.

resistance to it.⁸ The same applies to Latin names: a person with the Roman *tria nomina* was not necessarily 'Roman', except perhaps in a strictly legal sense. *LGNP* practice so far has been to include persons bearing Latin *praenomina*, *nomina* and *cognomina* attested in Greek as simple names (e.g. Γάϊος or Μάρκος, Ίούλιος or Κλαύδιος, Κέλσος or Σεουήρος), and those with *tria nomina* whose *cognomen* is a Greek name, while excluding those with a Latin *cognomen*. In Asia Minor, whose resources and affluence had been an irresistible attraction to Italian merchants and other businessmen from the second century BC, the adoption of the Roman style of nomenclature is encountered on an altogether larger and wider scale than in the regions covered by previous volumes. This is particularly true among the urban élites, many of whom participated in the administration of the empire, with a few achieving the pinnacle of consular rank, and it reflects the competition for imperial favour among the larger cities best exemplified in their ambitions to achieve the status of warden of the imperial cult (νεωκόρος). Faced with this situation, a radical change of policy has been implemented in favour of the inclusion of people with purely Latin *tria nomina* (e.g. Μ. Αὐρ. Σεουήρος), as long as their bearers could be distinguished from members of the imperial administration and attributed to the citizen body of one of the cities in the regions under consideration.⁹ Our previous approach would in far too many cases have had the unsatisfactory result that some members of families in which names of both Greek and Roman types were used would be included while others would have been omitted.

This and the two fascicles that follow it will also include large numbers of non-Greek personal names attested, for the most part in inscriptions, written in the Greek alphabet which are derived from the various indigenous populations of Asia Minor—Thraco-Bithynians, Paphlagonians, Mysians, Lydians, Phrygians, Carians, and Lycians, to name but a few of the many. For these indigenous names, the fundamental guide is L. Zgusta's *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (Prague, 1964) and it remains an essential tool. However, for practical reasons reference to it is made only in exceptional cases to avoid repetitious citations for each and every occurrence of an indigenous name, some of which are attested in great numbers. Accordingly, the reader is here referred to that work once and for all. The same rule also applies to L. Robert's *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine* (Paris, 1963), though reference is frequently made to his discussion and elucidation of individual names.

The Contents of the Volume

On account of the large numbers involved, the personal names from Asia Minor have been divided among three fascicles, the first two (V.A and B) comprising the coastal

regions and the third (V.C) the interior. This design reflects the basic distinction between those coastal parts of Asia Minor settled by Greeks between the eleventh (if not earlier) and sixth centuries BC, and the inland regions (Phrygia, Galatia, Paphlagonia, inner Pontos, Cappadocia, Pisidia, Isauria, Lykaonia) where there was no Greek settlement before the Hellenistic period and where the degree of hellenization diminishes the further inland one progresses and the continuity of non-Greek culture is correspondingly more obvious. It also recognizes the important geographical and climatic differences between the Mediterranean and Pontic coasts and the continental regime of the Anatolian plateau. From a more practical perspective, the epigraphic material from the coastal areas has been the subject of much fuller publication than that from the interior, though there are promising signs that this will change in the near future.

In most of the regions covered in this fascicle, the fundamental unit of civic organization was the city (the *polis*) in its classic form, normally an urban centre with a well-defined, if frequently contested, dependent territory (*chora*), as encountered in most other parts of the Greek world.¹⁰ It served also as the model for the new foundations and colonies of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods in inland Asia Minor where urban settlements had previously been few and far between. Prior to this and surviving until the end of antiquity alongside the *polis*, the typical form of settlement in inland regions was the village (*kome* or *katoikia*), often associated with a sanctuary or cult centre, some of which eventually acquired the status of cities. These are encountered in large numbers in inland parts of Bithynia, Mysia and Lydia, often incorporated into the civic territory of a *polis* (e.g. Nikomedeia, Kyzikos, Pergamon, Sardis, Philadelpheia) but also surviving as more loosely organized communities united around shared cults, notably in the Katakekaumene district and upper Kaystros valley in Lydia. This settlement pattern and type of communal organization and its non-Greek origins are reflected in the toponomy of these villages, often containing the element *κώμη*, sometimes the element *ἱερόν*, and very frequently of obvious non-Greek derivation.¹¹

In certain key respects the contents of this fascicle reflect the views of P. M. Fraser on what regions should be included and how they should be defined. Broadly designed to encompass the north half of the coastal districts of Asia Minor, it comprises its Black Sea and Propontine coasts (Pontos, Bithynia, Mysia), the northern and central part of the west coast fringing the Aegean (Troas, Aiolis, Ionia), and Lydia. Inclusion of the latter, an essentially landlocked region whose eastern parts have much in common with neighbouring Phrygia, was justified in Fraser's view on geographical grounds, in the sense that the great river valleys that drain the western Anatolian plateau (the Maeander, Kaystros, Hermos and Kaïkos) in the direction of the

⁸ See for example M. Sartre, 'The Ambiguous Name: the Limitations of Cultural Identity in Graeco-Roman Syrian Onomastics', in E. Matthews (ed.), *Old and New Worlds in Greek Onomastics* (Oxford, 2007) pp. 199–232.

⁹ In the case of people with *tria* (or *duo*) *nomina*, we follow the *Lexicon* rule established from the outset to the effect that only the *cognomen* has its own entry, while the remaining elements of the name are recorded in the final brackets.

¹⁰ For comprehensive documentation of the pre-Hellenistic cities of the regions covered here, see the relevant sections by A. Avram *et al.* on 'The Black Sea Area' (pp. 924–73), A. Avram on 'The Propontic Coast of Asia Minor' (pp. 974–99), S. Mitchell on 'Troas' (pp. 1000–17), L. Rubinstein on 'Aiolis and South-western Mysia' (pp. 1033–52) and

'Ionia' (pp. 1053–107) in M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (above n. 4). Most of the cities and smaller settlements named here may be conveniently located in the *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, (ed.) R. J. A. Talbert (Princeton, 2000), Maps 51–2, 56, 61–2, 65 and 86–7 combined with the corresponding parts of its companion *Map-by-Map Directory*.

¹¹ See in general C. Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien* (Vestigia, 50. Munich, 1998). A recently published, second-century BC list of cult-delegates from fifteen villages in the upper Kaystros valley and slopes of Mt Tmolos well illustrates the situation: P. Herrmann and H. Malay, *New Documents from Lydia* (Vienna, 2007) no. 97.

versially and against the general consensus, Miletos and its smaller neighbour Myous have been assigned to Caria (*LGN V.B*), although both were certainly members of the Ionian *dodekapolis* and participated in the Panionion, and in terms of their foundation myths, dialect, early alphabet and institutions were distinctively Ionic. This separation of Miletos from Ionia was determined by P. M. Fraser in accordance with the authority of some of the ancient sources²⁷ as well as the basic principles of the organization of the *Lexicon* along geographical lines. As the Maeander is taken to be the boundary between Ionia and Caria, and all of Miletos' large territory lay to the south of it, this arrangement was in some senses inevitable, even if regrettable in many other respects, but perhaps no more so than the separation of the islands of Samos and Chios (*LGN I* with p. viii) from their Ionian brethren on the mainland. Eventually, once the whole of the *Lexicon* database becomes available as an electronic resource online, the inconveniences caused by divisions such as these will become less perceptible.

In most of the region the divide between the territories of the Ionian cities and Lydia is demarcated by the mountain ranges that separate the coastal areas from the plain of western Lydia formed by the Hermos and its tributaries. However, to the south the territory of Ephesos was greatly enlarged, at least in later Hellenistic and Roman Imperial times, not only to absorb many of the smaller coastal *poleis* such as P(h)ygela and Marathesion, but also to extend well inland along the Kaystros valley into former Lydian territory, at least as far as Thyaira (mod. Tire), so that, to the north of the river, Ephesos shared a boundary with the Lydian city of Hypaipa.

No attempt has been made to distinguish the inhabitants of Notion from those of Kolophon, two cities with inextricably linked histories which were eventually united; the only exceptions are the two epigraphic attestations of the second half of the fourth century of persons identified as citizens of Notion (*SEG XXIII* 189 II, 7; *XXXVI* 331 II, 44–5). Thus all the people known from the inscriptions found at the sanctuary of Apollo at Klaros and in its vicinity (including the site of Notion itself) have been assigned to Kolophon regardless of their date. In the same way we have not attempted to distinguish the inhabitants of the two communities of Kolophon designated as inhabitants of the Old City, located some 15 kilometres inland, and the new city of 'Kolophon by the sea', whose origins, history and organization have been discussed by P. Gauthier.²⁸

During the third century BC, several Ionian cities were renamed by their respective Hellenistic rulers. Among others the newly refounded Ephesos was given the name Arsinoeia by Lysimachos (c.294) in honour of his wife and Lebedos was renamed Ptolemais, probably when it came under the control of Ptolemy III Euergetes some time after 246. These names figure on coins and in some epigraphic texts. Whereas it has been standard practice of the *Lexicon* to

refer to cities whose names changed in the course of time by a double name (e.g. Potidaia-Kassandria in *LGN IV* or Kios-Prousiás in this fascicle), in these instances we have refrained from using such double designations for the people concerned, mainly because the length of time in which these new names were current was rather short, no more than fourteen years in the case of Ephesos and less than fifty years for Lebedos.²⁹

Lydia

The reasons for the inclusion of Lydia in a fascicle devoted to the coastal regions of Asia Minor have been outlined above. As to its extent, we have followed the geographic delineation which forms the basis of *TAM V* as represented on the maps in *TAM V* (2) p. 533 and *V* (3) p. 349. The inclusion in Lydia of Blaundos, which in the ancient sources is attributed either to Lydia or to Phrygia, is mainly based on the fact that the city belonged to the *conventus* of Sardis in the Imperial period, an arrangement which may hark back to the internal organization of the Attalid kingdom.³⁰ For the problem of the overlap between northeast Lydia and Mysia Abbaeitis, see the section on Mysia above.

In Lydia, to a greater extent than in any other part of this fascicle, serious problems are encountered in the attribution of inscriptions to the territory of one city or another, where as often as not they are found in modern villages outside the ancient urban centre. Wherever possible it has been the policy to take a position on these issues, but it is freely acknowledged that doubts still remain concerning the extent of civic territories in a number of cases (e.g. Sardis vs. Philadelpheia, Iulia Gordos vs. Attaleia, Maionia vs. Kollyda and Nisyra, Silandos vs. Tabala and so on), and the necessary element of uncertainty is conveyed by the question marks that follow many place names. In a few cases where the identification of the ancient community itself is contested, the modern place name has also been added (e.g. Iulia Maíboza? (Gölmarmara (mod.))), but as a rule we have chosen not to encumber the entries with modern toponyms which in the past century may have passed through as many as three mutations. In making these difficult decisions of attribution, the sound and wise advice of H. Malay has been followed for the most part, even if we have chosen to include in Lydia some cities (e.g. Apollonia on the Maeander [Apollonia-Tripolis], Apollonos Hieron, Blaundos and Sala) which he would have preferred to exclude.

Numismatics

While inscriptions on stone, as in almost every region of the Greek world, provide the vast majority of the onomastic evidence that makes up this fascicle, the evidence derived from coins makes a much greater contribution here than in any of the previous volumes. Thus 3,794 names are attested on coins out of a total of 51,293 for the fascicle (7.5%). This is largely due to the happy circumstance that, from the end

²⁷ Hekataios of Miletos, as reported in Stephanos of Byzantion, (*FGrH I F* 240) calls Miletos 'πόλις ἐπιφανής ἐν Καρίαι τῶν Ἴωνων'. Likewise Herodotos (i 142) 'Μίλητος μὲν αὐτέων πρώτη κέεται πόλις πρὸς μεσαμβρίην, μετὰ δὲ Μυοῦς τε καὶ Πιρήνην. αὐταὶ μὲν ἐν τῇ Καρίῃ κατοίησενται...'; in i 146 he locates the Ionian settlers' seizure of Carian wives at Miletos. The presence of Carians in southern Ionia is reiterated by their contemporary Pherekydes: *FGrH 3 F* 155.

²⁸ 'Le décret de Colophon l'ancienne en l'honneur du Thessalien Asandros et la sympolitie entre les deux Colophon', *JS* 2003, pp. 61–100; P. M. Fraser, *Greek Ethnic Terminology* p. 151.

²⁹ See G. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor (Hellenistic Culture and Society, 17* [Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford, 1995]) pp. 177–83, 188–91; P. M. Fraser, *Greek Ethnic Terminology* pp. 346 f., 364.

³⁰ For an overview of the different attributions see A. Filges in *Blaundos. Berichte zur Erforschung einer Kleinstadt im lydischen-phrygischen Grenzgebiet* (Tübingen, 2006) p. 3 with nn. 15 and 16, and F. von Saldern, *ibid.* p. 22.

the valley of the Kaïkos. Between the valleys of the Hermos and Kaïkos, Mysia is separated from the Aegean coastline by Aiolis, while the sparsely settled region extending from Atarneus to Adramyteion is here assigned to Mysia. In the northwest it is separated from the Troad by the river Granikos, reaching further south to the head of the Gulf of Adramyteion. To the south of the Kaïkos and the upper Makestos the region borders on Lydia and east of the Makestos up to Mt. Olympos on Phrygia. The cities of Ankyra Sidera, Synaos and Kadoi located in the poorly defined borderlands between Mysia, Lydia, and Phrygia, have here been included in Mysia. This region, the ancient Mysia Abbaeitis, which overlaps southeast Mysia and northeast Lydia and exhibits strong Phrygian characteristics, cannot easily be given due recognition within the fixed geographical constraints of the *Lexicon*. In the second and first centuries BC, its people (the *ethnos* of the *Μυσοὶ Ἀββαεῖται*) acquired a federal organization and are found acting as an otherwise conventional political community in a number of places divided here between Mysia (at Kadoi) and Lydia (at Gordos and Silandos), as well as issuing coins in their name.²⁰ In all likelihood they formed part of the population of the cities established in these regions in the Imperial period.

No attempt has been made to distinguish the two nuclei of population within the region, separated from one another by sparsely settled, forested and montane districts, which had largely different histories and orientations. One occupies the south side of the Propontis, which together with the western part of Bithynia is sometimes referred to as Hellenistic Phrygia, the other lies in the Kaïkos valley, an area which looks towards the Aegean, was subject to Aiolic influences from an early date, and later became the heart of the Attalid kingdom.

As in other parts of Asia Minor, where some of the larger cities greatly expanded their territories, mainly in the Hellenistic period, at the expense of their smaller neighbours, northern Mysia came to be dominated at a relatively early date by Kyzikos. The enlargement of Kyzikene territory apparently began in the fourth century BC, and came to absorb the entire Arktonnesos peninsula, the islands of Prokonnesos, Halone and Besbykos and much of the coast to east and west of the city, to which the inland territories of the old satrapal capital at Daskyleion and Zeleia were perhaps added in the third century. By the time of Strabo its territory was bounded to the west by Priapos, to the east by Apollonia on the Rhyndakos and to the south by Miletoupolis and Poimananon.²¹

A few words have to be added concerning those soldiers designated as 'Mysoi', most notably in the long honorific decrees of c. 208 BC set up at Delphi by the city of Lilaia in Phokis.²² While the names of several of them point to an east Macedonian origin, as O. Masson has suggested, they were presumably garrisoned and settled in Mysia. Their Mace-

donian origin may well go back several generations, and so it has been decided to include them under the heading 'Mysia?'

Troas

The Troad is defined here as the area bounded by the river Granikos in the northeast and extending south around the eastern foothills of Mt Ida to the head of the Gulf of Adramyteion, including Antandros but placing Adramyteion in Mysia.

The city of Alexandria Troas, originally named Antigoneia by its founder Antigonos Monophthalmos and renamed after 301 BC by Lysimachos, became the dominant city of the central and southern Troad, absorbing many of the smaller cities of the coast (Kolonai, Larisa and Hamaxitos) and the hinterland (Neandreaia and, initially, Kebren and Skepsis). From the time of its foundation, inscriptions from most of these formerly independent cities are treated as being from the territory of Alexandria, although there are some uncertainties regarding the date of the absorption of Hamaxitos (and thus the important sanctuary of Apollo Smintheus).²³ Skepsis quickly re-established itself as an independent city thanks to the intervention of Lysimachos (much as the people of Kolophon, and perhaps Lebedos, recovered their former status thanks to Prepelaos after their forced enrollment into Lysimachos' new city of Ephesos)²⁴ and there are some indications that Kebren too may have periodically reasserted its independence.²⁵

Aiolis

This heading refers to the small coastal area around the Elaitic Gulf between the valleys of the Hermos and Kaïkos, corresponding closely to Herodotos' definition of the region (i 149). With the exception of Kyme, most of the cities were small compared with the Ionian cities to its south. Aiolis is linked by its dialect with the southern and central parts of the Troad, as well, of course, with the islands of Lesbos and Tenedos (*LGN I*).²⁶ Smyrna, originally by tradition an Aiolian city, whose inhabitants were supplanted by Ionian settlers, is assigned to Ionia.

Ionia

The boundaries of Ionia are generally straightforward. The region starts with Phokaia in the north, an Ionian outlier north of the Hermos, and extends as far south as the Maeander valley. It includes several cities, most notably Magnesia on the Maeander and Metropolis, which did not belong to the ancient Ionian *dodekapolis* or participate in the Panionion. However, they share many characteristics with the other Ionian cities (not least in their dialect and onomastics) and are conventionally grouped in Ionia on geographical grounds by modern writers. Perhaps contro-

²⁰ Kadoi: *OGIS* 446; note also the Mysians attested at Kadoi in 165/4 BC in Herrmann and Malay (above n. 11) no. 32 A, 18; Gordos: *SEG* XXXIV 1198; Silandos: *SEG* LIII 1357. See also J. and L. Robert, *BE* 1984, no. 384; P. Debord, 'La Lydie du nord-est', *REA* 87 (1985) pp. 345–57.

²¹ See A. Avram's article (above n. 10) pp. 983–4; L. Robert, *Monnaies grecques. Types, légendes, magistrats monétaires et géographie* (Geneva and Paris, 1967) pp. 15–22 on the fate of Prokonnesos.

²² *FD* III (4) 132 = L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche II* (Florence, 1975) no. 81; cf. O. Masson, 'Les 'Mysiens' de Lilaia', *REG* 106

(1993) pp. 163–7 (summarized in *SEG* XLIII 223); P. M. Fraser, *Greek Ethnic Terminology* pp. 94 f.

²³ See M. Riel's introduction to *I Alex* pp. 1–11; on Hamaxitos see A. Bresson, 'Hamaxitos en Troade', in J. Dalaison (ed.), *Espaces et pouvoirs dans l'antiquité de l'Anatolie à la Gaule. Hommages à Bernard Rémy* (Grenoble, 2007) pp. 139–58.

²⁴ See L. and J. Robert, *Claros. I, Décrets hellénistiques* (Paris, 1989) pp. 77–85.

²⁵ As indicated by *I Assos* 4.

²⁶ See R. Hodot, *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie. La langue des inscriptions, VIII^e s. a.C.–IV^e s. p.C.* (Paris, 1990).

Forms of Names, Dialect, Spelling, and Orthographic Variants

Complexities of dialect are of minor importance in the regions covered by this fascicle, dominated in the earlier period by the Ionic dialect of Ionia and the Ionian colonies on the Hellespont, Propontis and Black Sea coast, and to a lesser degree by the Aiolic dialect of Aiolis and much of the central and southern Troad, where it survived into the early Imperial period. Doric is encountered only in the area of Kalchedon and the Byzantine *peraia* in the area of modern Yalova. Here attention need only be drawn to the decision to keep in the main entries the Eastern Ionic spelling *-εο-* and *-αο-* for the more familiar diphthongs *-ευ-* and *-αυ-*, as for example in the names *Εὐμήδης* and *Ἀδτόνομος*, or *Γονεός*.³⁴

Names with shortened or syncopated endings (e.g. *-ις* from *-ιος* and *-ω* from *-ιον*) occur with much greater frequency in the regions covered in this volume than any of its predecessors, well exemplified by names such as *Ἀπολλώνις* and *Τάτω*. However, for reasons of consistency, the principle enunciated in *LGPNI* (p. xiii) governing their presentation as distinct name forms has been followed, even though their declension differs from that of the standard names only in the nominative case.

In a comparable way, names ending in *-ιανός* occur with increasing frequency in inscriptions from Asia Minor in the Imperial period. This termination was modelled on the Latin termination *-ianus*, originally used to indicate adoption. But a name with this ending could, in the course of time, also be derived from the father's name, as a sort of patronymic,³⁵ and this not only from Latin but also from Greek names. It appears that these names very quickly lost their exclusively patronymic value and could be used as names in their own right. Since we do not always know the father's name of a given person, it is not always possible to be certain about the function of a name in *-ιανός*. Where, however, it can be said with reasonable confidence that a name of this type has the value of a patronymic, we have not entered it under its attested form (i.e. a form ending in *-ιανός*) but under the name from which it was derived. The attested form has been added in the final bracket with the indication 'patr. adj.' (see for example *Ἀσκληπιόδοτος* (49)).

The indication 'estate' in the final brackets means that the name has been reconstructed from the name given to an estate which was itself derived from a personal name.

Non-Greek Names and their Treatment

Many of the problems concerning non-Greek names in the present fascicle have previously been encountered in *LGPNI* IV, so that what has been said on pp. ix-x in its Introduction is, with few exceptions, also valid for this book and need not be repeated.

As already mentioned above, western Asia Minor was a multilingual area and we expect to find, in addition to Greek

personal names, names hellenized to a greater or lesser degree which originated in different languages either spoken in the area or spoken by people who had contacts with it. The local Indo-European languages in the first millennium BC mostly belonged to the Anatolian branch, such as (Hieroglyphic) Luwian, Lydian, Lycian, Carian, and Pisidian, but there were also Phrygian and perhaps Thracian, as well as more recent intruders like Iranian, a relic of the long Achaemenid presence in the region, Celtic, introduced by the Galatian invasions of the third century BC, and eventually Latin. Besides these linguistic groups, there must have been residual elements of the local non-Indo-European languages for which there is evidence from the second millennium (Hatti and Hurrian) and from the first millennium BC (Uratian) as well as of Semitic languages which were clearly known in some areas (Assyrian, Phoenician, Aramaic).³⁶ Names which fall into these categories are naturally included here whenever they are found written in Greek and can be attributed with confidence to a local civic community, in accordance with long-standing *Lexicon* policy. In cases where the Greek rendition of an indigenous name is well known, examples attested in Latin have also been incorporated, as is the practice with Greek names written in Latin. However, where the Greek form of a name of this type is unknown, the name has, regrettably, to be omitted.

In some cases it is not immediately obvious whether a particular personal name is Greek or a sort of translation of an indigenous name. This practice is well attested, though it is not always clear which is a translation of which. For example, there is the splendid fourth-century BC, bilingual, Lydian and Greek dedication to Artemis at Sardis by a certain Nannas son of Bakivas, rendered in Greek as *Νάννας Διονυσίκεος*, where the man was probably a Lydian. Less easy to judge is the situation found in Lycia where close correspondances between Lycian and Greek names occur, for example in the great Lycian, Greek and Aramaic trilingual text from Xanthos of the late fifth century, where one of the two Lycian *archontes* appointed by the satrap is called 'Natrbbijēmi' in the Lycian version and *Ἀπολλόδοτος* in the Greek; the Lycian element '-pijēmi' (here spelt '-bbijēmi') closely corresponds to the Greek '-δοτος' and 'Natr-' must somehow match Apollo.³⁷ Greek personal names may also be hellenized forms or assimilations of indigenous names. A good example is *Ἐρμαῖος*, whose popularity in Lycia may be accounted for by its similarity in sound to an indigenous personal name derived from the Luwian god Arma.³⁸ In the same way, in Cilicia, Pisidia and Lycia the Greek name *Ὀβριμος* was assimilated with an indigenous name based on the element 'uppara', which also lies behind the indigenous name rendered in Greek as *Οπραμοας*, as well as several others.³⁹ A further example is provided by the names which relate to Artemis,⁴⁰ many of them apparent adaptations of Anatolian personal names attested especially in Lycia, Pisidia and Caria, the origin of which is not

³⁴ See C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* (Chicago and London, 1958) p. 33.

³⁵ See, among others, G. Daux in H.-G. Pflaum and M. N. Duval, *L'onomastique latine. Actes du colloque international sur l'onomastique latine, organisé à Paris du 13 au 15 octobre 1975* (Paris 1977) pp. 410-11; C. Dobias and L. Dubois, 'Introduction' in O. Masson, *Onomastica Graeca Selecta I* (Paris 1990) p. v.

³⁶ For a concise summary of the linguistic situation see A. Morpurgo Davies' article on 'Anatolian languages' in *OCD*³ pp. 81-2.

³⁷ G. Neumann, *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901* (Vienna, 1979) no. N320 a, 4 and b, 3.

³⁸ See P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (Leiden, 1961) pp. 131-4; C. Brixhe, 'Étymologie populaire et onomastique en pays bilingue', *RPh* 65 (1991) pp. 78-9.

³⁹ P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate (above n. 38) pp. 162-4; C. Brixhe (above n. 38) pp. 73-6.

⁴⁰ See those collected by L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (Prague, 1964) §108, though at §108-11 he perhaps discriminates too strongly between an Anatolian and a Greek origin for the occurrences in Asia Minor.

of the fifth century in many of the cities of Ionia and Aiolis and in some of their colonial offshoots in the Propontis and Black Sea, the names of public officials were inscribed, mostly in full, on the silver and much of the bronze coinage. In a few places, such as Erythrai and Magnesia, the official's patronymic was also added. Although, for a variety of reasons, the quantity in many places declines in the later Hellenistic period, the practice continues on a much wider, if less intense, scale in the Imperial period with the establishment of mints for bronze coinage in many of the smallest cities, especially in Lydia and Mysia, dated by the local eponymous magistrate, which only comes to an end with the general cessation of local coinage in the later third century AD.

The scale of the numismatic contribution is most vividly illustrated in the case of Ionia, where more than 2,200 individuals have been recorded (almost 12% of the total for Ionia). No fewer than 806 personal names are known from the coins of Ephesos alone (11% of its total), filling an important gap in our knowledge of the onomastics of the city in the late fifth and fourth centuries BC when epigraphic evidence is comparatively scarce. For some of the smaller cities the figures are even more telling. Thus, all the 28 people known from the small and short-lived city of Leukai are attested on coins. For the small city of Lebedos, 54 of the 120 people attested (45%) are known from coins, while for a larger city such as Klazomenai 114 out of 250 people (46%) are known to us in this way. The numismatic evidence is also considerable in Aiolis and the Troad, as well as in Mysia and Lydia mainly in the Imperial period. With the exception of the later Classical coinages of some of the Ionian colonies (notably Kios, Sinope and Amisos), it is much less significant in Bithynia and Pontos.

Amphora stamps

In the regions covered in this fascicle, the Pontic cities of Herakleia and Sinope produced amphoras on a large scale, their handles marked with stamps recording the names of the relevant magistrates (the *astynomoi* at Sinope), at times including their patronymic, and of the manufacturer. Normally few problems of attribution arise and, in contrast to the men named on amphoras from Rhodes and Kos in *LGN I*, the potters can be assumed to be of local origin. However, the material is by its nature diffuse and difficult for the non-specialist to assimilate, largely on account of the fact that the majority of publications and specialist studies have appeared in Russian. Even now there are no systematic and comprehensive corpora or studies of this important body of archaeological material, though a major advance has been made in Y. Garlan's thorough publication of the stamps on Sinopean amphoras found in excavations at Sinope itself.³¹ For the stamps on Herakleian amphoras there is no such help. We have therefore very much relied on the experience and advice of A. Avram regarding the correct readings of names, the suppression of false readings and the chronological framework in which the personal names should be placed.

City Territories and their Divisions

Concerning the attribution of individuals to a region, a city, or the territory or environs of a city, the reader is referred for guidance to pp. viii–ix of *LGN IV*. It should be noted, however, that in the Imperial period a significant relaxation in the criteria for the exercise of public office occurred which allowed members of the wealthy elites to hold civic offices in cities other than their own, doubtless with the aim of securing their financial assistance in the intense rivalry between the leading cities in the first to third centuries AD. Likewise, marriages between members of the same wealthy provincial class from different cities became increasingly common.³² Situations such as these create inevitable difficulties in the identification of the individuals concerned and their correct civic affiliation.

The following rules have been applied in the present fascicle, based on the fact that, in the Imperial period, most of the land in the provinces was deemed to belong to the territory of one or other of the cities, in accordance with the familiar *polis* model referred to above, a situation clearly attested for Bithynia and Pontos in Pompey's *lex provinciae*.³³ If a name is attested in a city or its immediate surroundings (where, for example, a cemetery of the city can be assumed to have been located), the name of the city alone is given. In those cases where a civic subdivision (e.g. a tribe or phratry) or a subordinate village are mentioned in an inscription, this information is provided as well. In some cases, where an inscription has been found outside the immediate periphery of the city but still within what might be considered as its home territory, this has been indicated by the addition of '(nr.)', to mean 'near'. However, wherever an inscription has been found at a greater distance at an ancient site (e.g. a *kome* or *katoikia*) to which no ancient toponym can be assigned or in an isolated context which clearly belonged to the territory of a particular city, this has been indicated by reference to the city followed by '(territ.)'.

Chronological Limits

Whereas the upper chronological limit is easily defined to coincide with the earliest attestations of personal names written in Greek script in the second half of the eighth century, or the earliest, and roughly simultaneous, 'historical' figures known to us from later written sources, it has been difficult, as in previous volumes, to comply with the lower limit which was set in the early seventh century AD to coincide with the radical reshaping of the eastern Mediterranean world in the aftermath of the Arab invasions. The main uncertainty lies in the notorious difficulty of dating early Byzantine inscriptions with any precision and, in our particular case, of distinguishing sixth-century texts from those of the seventh and eighth centuries. So, it may well happen that people who can subsequently be shown to belong to the period before the emperor Heraclius, have not been included, whereas others of later date have inadvertently found a place in this fascicle.

³¹ Y. Garlan, *Les timbres céramiques sinopéens sur amphores et sur tuiles trouvés à Sinope* (Paris, 2004).

³² For an example see P. Hertmann, 'Eine berühmte Familie in Teos. Epigraphische Nachlese', in C. Işık (ed.), *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens und des ägäischen Bereiches. Festschrift für Baki Ögün zum 75. Geburtstag* (*Asia Minor Studien*, 39, Bonn, 2000) pp. 87–95.

³³ Cf. W. Ameling, 'Das Archontat in Bithynien und die Lex Provinciae des Pompeius', *Epigr. Anat.* 3 (1984) pp. 19–31; S. Mitchell, *Anatolia. Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*, I, *The Celts and the Impact of Roman Rule* (Oxford, 1993) pp. 31–2.

reflecting the importance of the respective cults in this part of the Greek world.⁴⁷

Table 1. Frequency of sixteen male theophoric names in *LGPN* I–VA. Totals include dialect variations and syncopated forms.

	I	II	IIIA	IIIB	IV	VA
<i>Names Total</i>	66,489	62,361	43,261	43,456	33,724	51,293
Ἀπολλώνιος	534	574	170	105	399	1354
Διονύσιος	615	1103	317	389	660	903
Δημήτριος	508	786	172	217	394	737
Ἀρτεμίδωρος	171	103	80	42	245	677
Μητροδωρος	100	103	14	44	105	590
Ἀσκληπιάδης	144	344	69	58	122	576
Ἐρμογένης	55	75	31	25	48	364
Ἡρακλείδης	207	265	180	160	270	381
Μηρόφιλος	42	71	25	6	25	354
Ἀπολλόδωρος	237	263	93	229	180	314
Διογένης	195	183	89	40	164	262
Ἀπολλωνίδης	141	67	48	53	72	259
Διόδωρος	125	209	60	141	65	232
Ἀρτέμιον	57	138	42	24	37	221
Μηρόδωρος	39	93	10	8	25	212
Ποσειδώνιος	75	89	17	7	125	196

Another interesting theophoric component, if not so common, are those names derived from the great rivers of western Asia Minor which form such significant features in the natural landscape and endowed the respective regions with their natural fertility and agricultural productivity. Thus individuals are found named after the Maiandros (e.g. *Μαιάνδριος*, *Μανδρόδωρος*, *Ἀναξιμανδρος*),⁴⁸ the Kaystros (e.g. *Καῦστριος*, *Καῦστρόδικος*), the Hermos (e.g. *Ἐρμόδωρος*),⁴⁹ the Kaikos (e.g. *Καΐκος*, *Καϊκόδωρος*) the Skamandros (e.g. *Σκαμάνδριος*, *Σκαμανδρότιμος*) the Aisepos (e.g. *Αἰσηπόδωρος*), the Rhyndakos (e.g. *Ῥύνδακος*) and the Sangarios (e.g. *Σαγγάριος*). Among the other commonest names are those which can perhaps be traced to the widespread settlement of Macedonians in parts of the region following Alexander's conquests, notably *Ἀλέξανδρος* itself (646), *Μένανδρος* (448) and *Ἄτταλος* (285), though the last of these no doubt owed some of its popularity to the Attalid dynasty of Pergamon.

This pattern seems not to be repeated among the feminine names, in which not a single theophoric name is found among the twenty five most frequently attested. While they account for a similar proportion (10%) of the repertoire of female names, only 12% of the women known to us had names of this type, among which only those based on the elements *Ἀρτεμ-* and *Μητρ-* are attested in significant numbers. The commonest female name is *Στρατονίκη* (151), a name with a strong Macedonian flavour that perhaps owed its popularity to the Seleucid presence in western Asia Minor. But much more notable is the frequency of *Lallnamen*, some of Greek (more specifically Macedonian) origin such as *Ἀμμιον* (131), *Ἀμμιάς* (99) and *Ἀμμία* (84) and others which may be regarded as indigenous such as *Τατιάς* (83), *Τατία* (62), *Ἀμφιάς* (51), *Ἀμφία* (45), *Εἶα* (42) and *Ἀμφιον* (41). However,

names of this type are very rare before the Imperial period and their apparent popularity is in large part due to the ample documentation of female names in the sepulchral inscriptions of Lydia with their frequent elaborate detailing of members of the extended family of the deceased.

It should therefore be emphasized that raw figures such as those noted above conceal wide variations in the geographical distribution of the onomastic evidence across the whole period from c. 700 BC to 600 AD, as well as the sources from which the evidence is drawn. Generally speaking, with the exception of a small number of names attested for people known from literary sources and from the graffiti dedications on pottery from Naukratis in Egypt, there is very little evidence earlier than the fourth century, much less, indeed, than for any other volume so far produced. The epigraphic habit took hold in the fourth century and from that time there is an abundance of material from Ionia, the Ionian and Megarian colonies on the Hellespont, in the Propontis and in Pontos (e.g. Lampsakos, Kyzikos and Sinope), Aiolis and the Troad. It is not until the third century that there is any significant body of evidence from other parts of Mysia, Bithynia and Pontos, while in Lydia, with the exception of Sardis and one or two other cities, very little is known before the later Hellenistic period, with the vast bulk of the material being of Imperial date.

As far as the geographic regions are concerned, the most prolific source of onomastic evidence is Ionia, doubtless on account of its long history of organized civic life and continuing affluence. For this region, 19,161 attestations of personal names have been recorded (37.5%), a figure which would have been further accentuated had Miletos been included in the fascicle. Ionia is dominated by its large cities which yield 18,948 names (99%). Of these, Ephesos and its enlarged territory contribute by far the largest number, 7,112, which, outside Athens, is one of the biggest in any of the regions so far surveyed. Other significant totals are found at Smyrna (2,877), Priene (2,241), Kolophon (1,496), Magnesia (1,462) and Erythrai (1,392). The vast bulk of the evidence is derived from the urban centres or their immediate vicinity, with the exception of Ephesos whose large territory extending inland up the Kaystros valley contained a number of subordinate villages. Small cities such as Phygela, Anaia, Dioshieron, Oroanna and Myonnesos are represented by a small handful of names. A similar kind of pattern, on a smaller scale, occurs in Aiolis (total 1,194—2%), a region whose history mirrors that of Ionia in many respects, and the Troad (total 1,907—4%), where there was, at least in origin, a rather larger number of small cities, many of which were swallowed up by the enlargement of Alexandria Troas in particular and also of Ilion.

A rather different situation is found in Mysia (total 9,470—18.5%), a region with a large, sparsely populated interior. Here there is a far greater degree of dominance by two cities, Kyzikos (4,080) controlling much of the rich coastal plain of Hellespontine Phrygia, and Pergamon (2,876) occupying most of the equally rich lower Kaikos valley and between them accounting for 73% of the total. In the case of Kyzikos, a substantial number (almost 600—

⁴⁷ Interpretation of the *Μηνο-* names is not universally agreed, though they have generally been understood to refer to the cult of the moon-god Men (*Μήν*), well attested in Phrygia, Pisidia and parts of eastern Lydia and inner Pontos (e.g. Bechtel, *HPN* p. 316 and a slightly more nuanced view expressed by Masson, *OGS* II pp. 325–8).

⁴⁸ See P. Thonemann, 'Neilomandros. A Contribution to the History of Greek Personal Names', *Chiron* 36 (2006) pp. 11–43.

⁴⁹ These names cannot easily be distinguished from those derived from the god Hermes.

known.⁴¹ Since the name of the Greek goddess Artemis bore a close similarity with these names and had been used to form Greek personal names from an early date,⁴² it was natural for the two to fuse in the particular onomastic environment of Asia Minor.

A problem arises with some of the people of Iranian origin. Achaemenid officials with responsibility for the administration of the satrapies and for the collection of tribute and other forms of taxation in Asia Minor were based at Daskyleion in northern Mysia and at Sardis, the respective capitals of the satrapies of Hellespontine Phrygia and Lydia. People of this kind, like the personnel of the Roman Imperial administration centuries later, are treated as foreigners and therefore not included here. However, not infrequently their posts became, officially or by practice, hereditary, so that from a certain point those involved come to be considered as part of the resident population and therefore qualify for inclusion. The family of the Mithradatids on the north coast of Asia Minor may be cited as an example. Somehow related to the satraps of Hellespontine Phrygia, by the fourth century they had apparently become hereditary dynasts in or 'sub-satraps' of parts of the Persian satrapy. It was from this family that the royal house of Pontus, with its distinctively Iranian names, originated.⁴³ It may also be added in this context that there had been a significant degree of Achaemenid settlement in certain parts of the region, notably in Hellespontine Phrygia and Lydia.⁴⁴ Descendants of these settlers, not all of whom were dislocated following the conquests of Alexander, naturally became part of the permanent population of the regions concerned and this Iranian element entered into the local onomastic repertoire (e.g. *Εὐμάνης*, *Μιθραδάτης*, *Σισίνης*). However, there is some disagreement concerning the scale of these Persian survivals and it is anyway hard to distinguish between this element and the bearers of Iranian names which entered into local usage during the Persian ascendancy, through the same processes of assimilation with the ruling power that later led to the adoption of Greek and Roman styles of nomenclature.⁴⁵

For the accentuation of non-Greek names we refer the reader to the relevant part of the Introduction to *LGPN* IV (p. x). Some names have nevertheless had to be left unaccented, in particular those which do not follow Greek rules of inflection or whose nominative forms are doubtful or which are altogether uncertain.

The varied rendering of Latin names in Greek often constitutes a problem as to the forms in which they are to be entered in the *Lexicon*. An instance of this which occurs very often is Latin -v-, which in Greek could be written either as -ου- or as -β-, and for many Latin names both spellings are attested, as, for example, *Valerius* which may be written *Ὀυαλέριος* or *Βαλέριος*. For the sake of uniformity, and to avoid the unnecessary proliferation of variant forms of the

same name, all names of this type have been entered in the main heading with the spelling -ου-, even those which are attested only with -β-; the attested form, if different from that in the heading, is given in the final brackets. Similarly, the Greek spelling of the Latin *Quintus* and names derived from it have been standardized to *Κόϊντος* etc., with the attested form, if different (e.g. *Κύϊντος*), in the final bracket. *Quartus* and derivatives are found under *Κουα-*.

In contrast to this practice, we have preserved the variant spellings of many other names as separate forms, especially among the category of *Lallnamen* ('baby' names), for example *Ἀφία* and *Ἀφφία*, and other names derived from this root, as well as truly indigenous names such as *Καδαύας*, *Καδοας*, *Καδύς* and *Κάδως* or *Πληρεις*, *Πληρι* and *Πληρι*, where we have no means of determining what might be regarded as a normal form.

Statistics

This fascicle contains a total of 51,293 attestations of personal names, a figure that cannot be equated with the total number of individuals represented, given the large number of people who had more than one name, whether as nicknames (*Spitznamen*) or *supernomina*, double names (particularly common in Asia Minor), or even, in the Imperial period and especially among the civic elites, triple names (e.g. the famous second-century Ephesian magnate *Μ. Κλ. Π. Οὐήδιος Ἀνωϊνὸς Φαῖδρος Σαβιναῖος*). Of these, 44,795 are masculine, 6,479 feminine; 19 cannot be assigned their gender. This total is made up of 8,096 separate names, though as has been explained in the previous section some of these are mere dialect variants or simple shortenings. Out of this total, 6,375 are masculine and 1,752 feminine.⁴⁶ A large proportion of names is attested just once, 4,386 in all, of which 3,325 are masculine, 1,055 feminine and 6 of uncertain gender.

Among the masculine names, the commonest are, in order, *Ἀπολλώνιος/ις* (1,354), *Διονύσιος/ις* (903) and *Δημήτριος/ις*—*Δαμάτριος* (744). Other theophoric names also figure prominently, notably *Ἀρτεμίδωρος* (678), *Μητρόδωρος*—*Ματροδωρος* (598), *Ἀσκληπιάδης* (576), *Ἡρακλείδης/δας* (381), *Ἐρμογένης* (364), *Μηνόφιλος* (354), and *Ἀπολλόδωρος* (314), evidence for an apparent predilection for names of this kind in this part of Asia Minor. This becomes even more apparent when comparisons are made with other regions of the Greek world where the sheer quantity and diversity of theophoric names found in Asia Minor finds no match (see Table 1). Although only about 11% of the male repertoire of names can be classified as theophoric, roughly a third of all males (34%) were given names of this type. Besides the remarkable numbers of names based on the theophoric elements *Ἀπολλ-*, *Ἄρτεμ-*, *Διονυσ-* and *Ἐρμ-*, particularly noteworthy is the frequency of compounds and *simplicia* based on *Ἀσκληπ-*, *Ἐκατ-*, *Μητρ-* and *Μην-*,

⁴¹ See Brixhe (above n. 38) pp. 77–8.

⁴² See R. Parker, 'Theophoric Names and the History of Greek Religion' in S. Hornblower and E. Matthews (edd.), *Greek Personal Names: their Value as Evidence* (Oxford, 2000) p. 53.

⁴³ See A. B. Bosworth and P. V. Wheatley, 'The Origins of the Pontic House', *JHS* 118 (1998) pp. 155–64.

⁴⁴ See N. V. Sekunda, 'Achaemenid Colonization in Lydia', *REA* 87 (1985) pp. 7–30; 'Persian Settlement in Hellespontine Phrygia', in A. Kuhrt and H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (edd.), *Achaemenid History*, III, *Method and Theory* (Leiden, 1988) pp. 175–196; 'Achaemenid Settlement in Caria, Lycia and Greater Phrygia', in *Achaemenid History*, VI, *Asia*

Minor and Egypt. Old Cultures in a New Empire (Leiden, 1991) pp. 83–143; P. Debord (above n. 4) pp. 193–8; P. Briant (above n. 3) pp. 500–2.

⁴⁵ See P. Briant, 'Les Iraniens dans l'Asie mineure après la chute de l'empire achéménide. À propos de l'inscription d'Amuzon', *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 11 (1985) pp. 167–95; S. Mitchell, 'Iranian Names and the Presence of Persians in the Religious Sanctuaries of Asia Minor', in E. Matthews (ed.), *Old and New Worlds in Greek Onomastics* (Oxford, 2007) pp. 151–71.

⁴⁶ It should also be noted that both masculine and feminine names may appear under a single name heading, undifferentiated by accent, notably the compounds in -πολις.

15%) are attested outside the urban centre in subordinate settlements from the third century BC onwards. A somewhat similar pattern also occurs in Bithynia (total 5,669), where Nikomedeia (1,098) and Nikaia (1,474) account for almost half the total number of names (45%). Even more significant among these cities is the very large proportion attested outside the urban centres in the villages that constituted their large territories, 432 in the case of Nikomedeia (39%) and no fewer than 1,021 for Nikaia (69%). The fragmented coastal strip of Pontos (total 2,619—5%), where for most of its length the mountains descend directly to the sea, does not lend itself to such large territories and for the most part the Greek cities were confined to small enclaves and functioned more like *emporía* than cities proper. Two cities, Sinope (1,091) and Herakleia (827), dominate the region, contributing almost three-quarters of the attested names (73%).

A very large number of names is known for Lydia (total 11,272—22%), the only land-locked region included in this fascicle, and their distribution reflects well the pattern of settlement and structures of civic and communal life that differentiate this region from all the others treated here. There is a much more even spread of people across the region, without any of the cities having such dominant positions as observed elsewhere, and this presumably correlates with its fundamentally agrarian character. Substantial numbers are recorded for Sardis (1,330), Saittai (1,374), Philadelpheia (930), Maionia (941), Thyateira (858), and Iulia Gordos (870) but these account for only slightly more

than half of the total (56%). Even here, as for example in the cases of Saittai and Maionia, many of the names attested are associated with subordinate villages rather than the urban centre; 397 (29%) at Saittai, 571 at Maionia (61%). Substantial numbers of people are attested in other settlements throughout most of the region, many of them in the small villages that made up districts such as the Katakekaumene and the upper Kaystros valley under the name of the Kilbianoí. This pattern is more obvious in the eastern parts of Lydia whose cultural associations were closer to Phrygia than in the more hellenized western parts where urbanization had a longer and continuous history. It is also significant that there is a large body of people (553) who cannot be assigned any more precise affiliation than NE Lydia, a reflection of the dispersed nature of the population in small settlements whose names are at present unknown.

Note

Two important works unfortunately came to our attention too late for their contents to be thoroughly absorbed in this fascicle; V. N. Bardani and G. K. Papadopoulos' monumental *Συμπλήρωμα τῶν ἐπιτύμβιων μνημείων τῆς Ἀττικῆς* (Athens, 2006) and N. M. Dimitrova's *Theoroi and Initiates at Samothrace. The Epigraphic Evidence* (Princeton, 2008). We have, however, tried to include the names of people from the region covered here who are attested in the inscriptions published for the first time in these two works.