

# The Ancient History Bulletin

---

VOLUME TWENTY-SEVEN: 2013

NUMBERS 3-4

---

## **Edited by:**

Edward Anson ✦ David Hollander ✦ Timothy Howe  
Joseph Roisman ✦ John Vanderspoel ✦ Pat Wheatley ✦  
Sabine Müller



**ISSN 0835-3638**

# ANCIENT HISTORY BULLETIN

Volume 27 (2013) Numbers 3-4

Edited by:

Edward Anson, David Hollander, Sabine Müller,  
Joseph Roisman, John Vanderspoel, Pat  
Wheatley

Senior Editor: Timothy Howe

Editorial correspondents

Elizabeth Baynham, Hugh Bowden, Franca  
Landucci Gattinoni, Alexander Meeus, Kurt  
Raaflaub, P.J. Rhodes, Robert Rollinger, Carol  
Thomas, Victor Alonso Troncoso



## Contents of volume twenty-seven

### Numbers 3-4

- 86     Jeremy LaBuff, *Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity*
- 108    Gabriel Baker, *Sallust, Marius, and the Alleged Violation of the Ius Belli*
- 130    Andrew W Collins, *Alexander the Great and the Kingship of Babylon*
- 149    Nikos Karkavelias, *Phrynichus Stratonidou Deiradiotes and the Ionia Campaign in 412 BC:*  
*Thuc. 8.25-27*
- 162    Vincent Rosivach, *Funding Jury Pay in Athens c. 461 BC*
- Review Article:**
- 168    Thomas A. J. McGinn, *Hire-Lease in Roman Law and Beyond*

## NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS AND SUBSCRIBERS

The Ancient History Bulletin was founded in 1987 by Waldemar Heckel, Brian Lavelle, and John Vanderspoel. The board of editorial correspondents consists of Elizabeth Baynham (University of Newcastle), Hugh Bowden (Kings College, London), Franca Landucci Gattinoni (Università Cattolica, Milan), Alexander Meeus (University of Leuven), Kurt Raaflaub (Brown University), P.J. Rhodes (Durham University), Robert Rollinger (Universität Innsbruck), Carol Thomas (University of Washington), Victor Alonso Troncoso (Universidade da Coruña)

AHB is currently edited by: Timothy Howe (Senior Editor: [howe@stolaf.edu](mailto:howe@stolaf.edu)), Edward Anson, David Hollander, Sabine Müller, Joseph Roisman, John Vanderspoel and Pat Wheatley.

AHB promotes scholarly discussion in Ancient History and ancillary fields (such as epigraphy, papyrology, and numismatics) by publishing articles and notes on any aspect of the ancient world from the Near East to Late Antiquity. Submitted articles should normally be in English, but the journal will consider contributions in French, German, Italian or Spanish.

### SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

AHB adheres to the usual North American editorial policies in the submission and acceptance of articles but imposes no House Style. Authors are, however, asked to use the abbreviations of *L'Année philologique* (APh) for journals, and of the *Thesaurus linguae latinae* (TLL) for Latin authors. Please send submissions to the editor most closely identified with your field of enquiry or, in case of doubt, to Timothy Howe ([howe@stolaf.edu](mailto:howe@stolaf.edu)). Articles must be submitted in electronic format, preferably generated by MS Word. Greek font or other special characters must convert such to Unicode and should be accompanied by a PDF version. Authors will receive PDF offprints of their contributions. Copyright is retained by the author. Books for reviews and enquiries concerning book reviews should be directed to Joseph Roisman ([jsroisma@colby.edu](mailto:jsroisma@colby.edu)).

### SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The subscription rate for Volume 28 (2014), for individual and institutional subscribers is USD 25.00. Detailed instructions about subscriptions and access to digital content can be found on the AHB website: <http://ancienthistorybulletin.org>

### PAYMENT

Payment may be made via the subscription portal on the AHB website: <http://www.ancienthistorybulletin.org/subscribed-users-area/membership-levels/>

*Cover image courtesy of The Nickle Arts Museum, University of Calgary*

# Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity<sup>1</sup>

Jeremy LaBuff

The ancient region of Karia in southwestern Asia Minor has recently become the target for a flurry of exciting scholarly research. This is at least in part due to the consistent flow of new discoveries occasioned by intense excavation at sites like Iasos, conducted by the Italian Archaeological Mission, and Stratonikeia, under the direction of the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism, as well as survey work around Aphrodisias and in the Karian “*hautes terres*.”<sup>2</sup> This material has attracted a host of scholars and led to two recent international conferences, each resulting in an edited volume, that have vastly increased our understanding of Karia in antiquity.<sup>3</sup> A major focus of these efforts, as indicated by the title of F. Rumscheid’s assemblage, *Die Karer und die Anderen*, is the question of Karian identity and the extent to which Karians underwent “Hellenization” over time. Central to the exploration of this subject is the attempt to identify what constitutes an expression of identity (whether Karian, Greek, or otherwise) in Karia. The problem is notoriously thorny when dealing with purely archaeological evidence. Some are justifiably cautious, as is C. Ratté in his appraisal of the Lydian (burial customs) and Karian (rural settlements) elements in the Morsynos valley. The evidence, he maintains, could suggest Lydian influence or Lydian immigration, and he questions whether we are justified in calling the local inhabitants, as distinct from any Lydian element, “Karian.”<sup>4</sup> This wariness is directed against what might be called the danger of conflation. The risk is of two types. First, there is a temptation to conflate the use of terms that can either serve a purely descriptive function or represent the self-perception of groups under study.<sup>5</sup> For example, we call certain burial customs “Lydian” because they occur predominantly in the region of Lydia; the term serves to categorize similar phenomena and is

---

<sup>1</sup> This article would not have been possible without the generous financial and institutional support of the Institut für Epigraphik und Alte Geschichte in Munich, and Christof Schuler in particular. My gratitude also extends to Lela Urquhart, whose patience and insight prevented many infelicities from surviving in what follows.

<sup>2</sup> While the publications from these projects are too numerous to cite here, a relatively comprehensive bibliography can be obtained by consulting the works cited below that are relevant to the current article. For the survey work around Aphrodisias, see esp. C. Ratté, “New Research on the Region around Aphrodisias,” in R. van Bremen and J. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia* (Bordeaux 2010) 253-267. For the investigations of the “highlands” of Karia, see G. Debord and E. Varinlioglu, *Les hautes terres de Carie* (Bordeaux 2001).

<sup>3</sup> F. Rumscheid (ed.), *Die Karer und die Anderen* (Bonn 2009) and Van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia*. Also deserving of mention are the contributions in the more linguistically focused *Kadmos* 37 (1998; edited by W. Blümel and C. Marek) and, quite recently, O. Henry (ed.), *4<sup>th</sup> Century Karia: Defining a Karian Identity under the Hekatomnids* (Paris 2013).

<sup>4</sup> C. Ratté, “The Carians and the Lydians,” in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 135-48; cf. Ratté in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 265-66.

<sup>5</sup> The distinction is often treated in terms of “emic” versus “etic” discourse, for example in J. Siapkis, *Heterological Ethnicity* (Uppsala 2003). See also J. Hall, *Hellenicity* (Chicago 2002) 106 *et passim*, who speaks of a “gap between contemporary internal and chronologically-distanced external perceptions.”

necessary for speaking coherently about material culture. Such description is different from, but potentially elided with, a claim about the self-perception of those engaging in similar burial customs. Thus, one might assume an ancient awareness that these customs were distinctly “Lydian,” and conclude that all who participated in them either identified themselves as Lydians or were self-consciously adopting Lydian practices. Ratté rightly warns against making such an assumption without any basis in the evidence for doing so.<sup>6</sup> Without any link between this evidence and the self-perception of the people behind it—i.e., without any indication of an ancient “Lydian” or “Karian” awareness that a certain set of practices distinguished them from other peoples—such studies do not speak to identity as an ancient phenomenon.<sup>7</sup>

By distinguishing description and self-perception, it should be clear that I understand (and make use of) “identity” to denote expressions of a sense of belonging to a social group. This definition encompasses a broad range of possible ways that an individual might relate to others in terms of commonalities, and points to a second type of conflation that occurs in discussions of identity. Most commonly, one speaks inconsistently of ethnic and cultural identities, or equates the latter with the ethnic name of the people in question.<sup>8</sup> The habit seems to be an extension of the assumption that all identities are to be equated with ethnic and cultural identity; we can perhaps also link it, at least among scholars of Greek antiquity, to the argument espoused most prominently by J. Hall about the development of Greek identity from an ethnic into a purely cultural identity in the Classical period.<sup>9</sup> If Greek identity should be considered cultural at this point, then the encounter between Greek and other identities, and the adoption of Greek identity and subsequent loss or reconceptualization of indigenous identity must all be understood only in cultural terms. At the same time, the application of ethnic labels to every culture is made without question. The status of ethnic identity is, accordingly, forgotten, or rather assimilated to, discussions of cultural identity in a terminologically sloppy fashion, in part due to a privileging of the point of view generally

---

<sup>6</sup> This hypothetical assumption is often made in actual studies of Karian identity. So A. Carstens, “Tomb Cult and Tomb Architecture in Karia from the Late Archaic to the Hellenistic Period,” in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 377-95, who operates on the premise that burial customs and tomb architecture were conscious expressions of ethnic identity by those who participated in these customs, yet her logic and language makes clear that she is constructing an externally imposed notion of what is Karian. The assumptions underlying her study are common to most archaeologically based investigations of the topic. See also *Idem.*, *Karia and the Hekatomnids* (Oxford 2009), whose advocacy of seeing the material culture of Karia as a process of creolization still depends on the assumption that the material signs of this process are originally representative of ethnic identities (Greek, Karian, and Persian); W. Held, “Die Karer und die Rhodische Peraia,” in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 122, who concludes from the presence of Karian-type graves in the Rhodian-held Chersonesos that the inhabitants here “fühlten sich also offenbar zugleich als Karer und als Rhodier.”

<sup>7</sup> It of course speaks to how we as moderns identify various cultures in the past, hence my use of scare quotes (“”) when referring to inhabitants of Karia (defined geographically), since we cannot talk about Karian practices before establishing who they were.

<sup>8</sup> This is true for most of the studies in Rumscheid, *Die Karer*, but also applies to A. Bresson, “Les cariens ou la mauvaise conscience du barbare,” in G. Urso (ed.) *Tra Oriente ed Occidente. Indigeni, Greci, e Romani in Asia Minor* (Pisa 2007) 209-28.

<sup>9</sup> Hall, *Hellenicity* 173-228.

## Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity

thought of as “Greek.” Yet to accept Hall’s argument for Greek identity does not justify a similar move for other peoples.<sup>10</sup> Such groups have not been subject to the same level of analysis that scholars have devoted to the Greeks with respect to how they articulated their identity at an ethnic level, and how this evolved over time. What does it mean to talk about Karian cultural identity as distinct from Karian ethnic identity? Most likely, it means revisiting the first type of conflation, and equating similar material culture and the practices this implies with identity. At the same time, it is by no means clear that ethnic identity constituted a primary sense of belonging in these contexts. We need to dispense with such an assumption in considering other types of identity, in particular that associated with the *polis*-community, and how this related to ethnic and cultural identities.<sup>11</sup>

I have engaged in this admittedly broad consideration of the study of ancient identity in order to better frame the discussion of what constitutes the focus of this essay. I propose to rethink two highly “self-marking” acts that we can witness in ancient Karia—written language and onomastics—in terms of what identity they express, and with a mind to avoiding the types of conflation common to treatments of these phenomena. The use of the language of public inscriptions in Karian communities and the naming practices of Karian individuals to talk about Karian identity goes back to S. Hornblower’s wide-ranging monograph on Mausollos.<sup>12</sup> Since then, new discoveries have vastly increased the evidence that informs such discussions, and the argument has been taken up anew by several scholars.<sup>13</sup> All note the basic trend whereby the Karian language and Karian names disappeared from the epigraphical record, with the advent of the Hellenistic period, in favor of Greek language and names. And only Adiego avoids the conclusion that Karians were deeply Hellenized by the end of the third century, if not sooner, although there is less clarity on exactly what this meant for the identity

---

<sup>10</sup> There are reasons for questioning the purely cultural nature of Greek identity from the fourth century onward as well. The topic is too extensive to be treated here, but requires a more serious consideration of the continued validity of notions of kinship in diplomatic contexts during the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, on which see O. Curty, *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques* (Genève 1995), C.P. Jones, *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge 1999), and A. Erskine, “Distant Cousins and International Relations: *syngeneia* in the Hellenistic World,” in K. Buraselis and K. Zoumboulakis (eds.), *The Idea of European Community in History* (Athens 2003) 205-216. For a similar critique, see E. Dench’s review of Hall (*CR* 55.1 (2005): 204-07).

<sup>11</sup> Such observations are similar in spirit to U. Gotter’s attempt to rehabilitate “acculturation” as a valid model for describing historical encounters. The first two of his four necessary aspects of this concept emphasize a group’s internal definitions of self and other. In essence, establishing identity is the prerequisite for talking about cultural change. Gotter, “‘Akkulturation’ als Methodenproblem der historischen Wissenschaften,” in W. Essbach (ed.), *Wir/Ihr/Sie: Identität und Alterität in Theorie und Methode* (Würzburg 2000), 396-399.

<sup>12</sup> S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (Oxford 1982). See esp. 341-50.

<sup>13</sup> Bresson, “Les Cariens” 217-28; D. Piras, “Der archäologische Kontext karischer Sprachdenkmäler und seine Bedeutung für die kulturelle Identität Kariens,” in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 229-250; *Idem*, “Who Were the Karians in Hellenistic Times? The Evidence from Epichoric Language and Personal Names,” in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 217-23; I. Adiego, “Carian Identity and Carian Language,” in Henry, *4<sup>th</sup> Century Karia*, 15-20. Piras inexplicably fails to cite Hornblower’s study, despite the methodological similarities.

of those concerned.<sup>14</sup> Piras argues that “the choice of the language used in written communication is in fact a signifier of self-perception” and “the selection of a name should be read as a conscious statement of self-definition.”<sup>15</sup> This is undoubtedly true, but the move to hail these statements as expressions of a specifically Greek or Karian identity—and it is not always clear whether she is making this move—is unsubstantiated. Whether we call such labels “ethnic” or simply “cultural,” their use belies a confusion between what we today identify as distinct in Karia and what those who called themselves “Karian” thought made them so, and more generally betrays an oversimplified way of thinking about identity as instinctively ethnic. One has become so accustomed to the category “Karian” that this has assumed a reality of its own, one that is in danger of obscuring our picture of how the inhabitants of Karia understood themselves. I hope in what follows to demonstrate a very real distinction between practices like naming or language choice and strategies of articulating Greek and Karian identities.<sup>16</sup> In the first section, I will treat language choice in both coin legends and on public inscriptions, before turning in the second section to naming decisions with regard to locations and, above all, individuals. I argue that more careful consideration of the shift linguistically from Karian to Greek, and from “Karian” names to “Greek” names, reveals different types of identity at play that cannot be subsumed under the convenient labels “Greek” and “Karian.” Insofar as such practices implied a sense of belonging to a shared community, they constituted expressions of a cultural identity, but an identity better understood in terms of the *civic community*. As such, neither the opposition nor the *rapprochement* between Greek and Karian identities is *directly* relevant to a discussion of such expressions, though I will also consider how linguistic and onomastic assimilation created conditions that made possible a discourse in which Karian communities could be negotiated “into” the Greek world.<sup>17</sup>

### *Karian Inscriptions and Identity*

---

<sup>14</sup> Bresson hints at an evolution of Karian identity through its relationship to “Hellenism,” concluding that Karians came to base their sense of ethnic belonging on a reconstructed past that lacked “une véritable forme de continuité” and thus effaced an authentically Karian past (228), without establishing the authenticity of this lost past in the minds of ancient Karians. Piras in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 249 ends her study of the epigraphical “switch” to Greek with two unanswered questions about the implications of this development for Karian identity. Adiego warns against seeing Greek names in Karia as due to Hellenic influence, seeing it instead “simply as a result of contact language (18). Hornblower, to be fair, was not primarily concerned with the question of identity.

<sup>15</sup> Piras in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 218.

<sup>16</sup> For ethnicity as a strategy, see Siapkis, *Heterological Ethnicity* 22-25 & 282.

<sup>17</sup> This is not to insist that civic and ethnic identities are mutually exclusive, as they are often complementary (cf. J. Skinner, *The Invention of Greek Ethnography* (Oxford 2012), 44). Rather, my point is that we cannot assume this connection in every case, and that many inferences of ethnic identity from language and names rest more on assumption than proof.



## Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity

Two observations are worth noting from the outset about Karian language inscriptions: they are rare, and they are even rarer as publicly inscribed documents. Of the approximately 250 Karian inscriptions extant, only fifty come from Karia, and of these the majority are private—graffiti or grave—inscriptions. Only fourteen were inscribed as public monuments, sixteen if one counts the two “para-Karian” cliff inscriptions on the sacred road to Labraunda.<sup>18</sup> This scarcity, coupled with the fact that only the script, not the language itself, has been deciphered, makes conclusions of a general nature challenging.<sup>19</sup> Chronologically, the material dates from the second half of the 7<sup>th</sup> century to the early 3<sup>rd</sup> century, with ceramic inscriptions predominating in the archaic period, mostly in ritual contexts, and coinage in the Classical period.<sup>20</sup> The fourth century witnessed a number of grave inscriptions and almost all of the public documents enumerated above (two of which are bilingual), with several being recorded in the early third century.<sup>21</sup> After this, the Karian language virtually disappears, with but one graffito appearing in late Hellenistic Iasos.<sup>22</sup> Finally, the geographical distribution of the finds is concentrated in two areas: central Karia (which may be loosely defined by the epicenters of Mylasa and the valley that Stratonikeia overlooks) and southern Karia (Kaunos and its surroundings).<sup>23</sup>

Before drawing any conclusions from this general picture, we should look more closely at the groups of evidence suggested by the chronological, geographical, and material distribution of the finds. Inscriptions set up by individuals, whether archaic ceramic dedications or fourth-century grave inscriptions, are difficult to analyze because Karian has only been deciphered as a script, not a language and, as a result, we lack any point of reference against which to measure a given individual's expression. For instance, we do not know where

---

<sup>18</sup> Piras in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 230-231 and Piras in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 244-48. The Karian inscriptions outside Karia mostly come from Egypt, with isolated examples from Athens, Ephesos, and Sardis as well. See note 55 for further discussion of the material from Egypt. On the para-Karian script, see P. Meriggi, “Zur neuen parakarischen Schrift,” *Kadmos* 5 (1966) 61-99 and I. Adiego, *The Carian Language* (Leiden 2007) 22-29.

<sup>19</sup> See, however, Adiego, “Carian Identity” 15-20. For a summary of the most recent developments in the decipherment of Karia, see *idem*, “Recent Developments in the Decipherment of Carian,” in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 147-176. For a full account, see *idem*, *Carian Language*.

<sup>20</sup> See Piras in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 232-40 for references. The inference of the ritual setting of archaic Karian inscriptions is based on find spots at Didyma and sanctuaries to Zeus, Hera, and Artemis Astias at Iasos.

<sup>21</sup> Piras in Rumscheid, *Die Karer*, 241-48 and Piras in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 219-21. There has been a recent trend of down-dating several of the 4<sup>th</sup> century inscriptions, with as many as half being, then, early 3<sup>rd</sup> century. In addition to the two unquestionably Hellenistic documents from Stratonikeia, the three lists of names found at Hyllarima are late 4<sup>th</sup>/early 3<sup>rd</sup> c. D. Schürr, “Spätkarisch: Regionalisierung und Lautentwicklungen,” in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 187-205 argues that some of the 4 Kaunian inscriptions may be 3<sup>rd</sup> century as well.

<sup>22</sup> F. Berti and L. Innocente, “Due nuovi graffiti in alfabeto cario da Iasos,” *Kadmos* 37 (1998) 140.

<sup>23</sup> These distinctions I adopt from Piras in Rumscheid, *Die Karer*, although I would hesitate to label Didyma and Iasos as outlying areas.



the dedicants who inscribed Karian on vessels were from, what they said,<sup>24</sup> or how familiar they were with the Greek language (could they speak it but not write? could they write it but chose to write in Karian?). It is likewise impossible to make inferences from grave inscriptions, especially since Greek language epitaphs do not appear in locations where the Karian language is attested until the Imperial period.<sup>25</sup> We simply do not have enough information to state anything more than the obvious fact that these individuals had access to someone (possibly themselves) who was able to write in Karian. Whether they saw the decision to do so as a mark of ethnic distinction is much less clear.

### *Karian Coin Legends*

More suggestive are the Classical period coins. At Keramos, Mylasa, Kaunos, and several unknown sites, coins were minted with Karian legends bearing the name of the respective town in the late 5<sup>th</sup> century, but replaced soon thereafter (usually by the end of the same century) by coins with Greek legends.<sup>26</sup> One might infer from this evidence a conscious decision by the community to represent itself in the Greek language *as opposed to* Karian.<sup>27</sup> This inference, however, would be misleading on several counts. First, the find spots of the coin hoard within hilltop strongholds corroborate our image of the political map of Karia at this time as a land ruled by a number of local dynasts.<sup>28</sup> Though the coins seem to bear the name of each town, it is probable that these dynasts were responsible for the minting, since no other representative of the community is identifiable at this early period. Thus, any statement made by the shift in language from Karian to Greek cannot be assumed to have been shared by most of the inhabitants using the coins.<sup>29</sup> Second, enough individuals were at this time bilingual in Karia to give outside observers the impression that inland communities in the region were versant in both languages, as demonstrated by Bresson.<sup>30</sup> Finally, and most importantly, the minting of coins *by a city*, regardless of who was behind the minting, was an inherently “Greek” practice, by which I mean a practice engaged in by mostly Greek speakers. Given the symbolic function of coins, it would have made sense to mint in Greek once circulation began to include

---

<sup>24</sup> A. Herda, “Karkisa-Karien und die sogenannte Ionische Migration,” in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 100 gives a reading of the graffiti but does not suggest an interpretation.

<sup>25</sup> Although most of the grave inscriptions in the relevant *I.Kleinasien* volumes remain undated, they usually bear Roman names, which would suggest a first-century BC date at the earliest. See, e.g., *I. Mylasa* 426-93 & 25; *I. Keramos* 44-49; *I. Tralles* 175-238. *I. Mylasa* 924, however, contains no Roman name.

<sup>26</sup> See Piras in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 236-39 for references.

<sup>27</sup> Piras in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 236 suggests for Keramos that the switch to Greek may indicate the increasing significance of Greek speaking users of the currency. This reasonable yet open-ended conclusion rightly does not identify who these Greek speakers were, and thus does not speak to the question of identity. Piras’ claim that the coins from Kaunos bearing a Nike- or Iris-like figure are a sign of “Selbsthellenisierung” is based on an unsubstantiated interpretation of these figures that ignores our ignorance of the local mythology of the city.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> It is worth questioning whether they would have even noticed such a shift and, if so, whether they would have identified with it.

<sup>30</sup> “Les Cariens” 217-218.

## Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity

users who did not know Karian, in order to most clearly advertise the authority behind the currency. This pragmatic argument is even further strengthened by the fact that many Karian letters looked like Greek symbols. For instance, the bronzes of Keramos bear a legend of the city's name: ΔΥΟ.<sup>31</sup> One can imagine how this would have created confusion for a Greek-speaker illiterate in the Karian script.<sup>32</sup>

The broader context of numismatic practice in the southwest Aegean, then, seems the best explanation for the shift from Karian to Greek on the coins of Karia.<sup>33</sup> The inhabitants of Karia, or at least their dynasts, were simply adapting to how most other communities minted coins in order to increase the utility of their coinage. In one sense, this is indeed Hellenization, if we use the term to describe the process by which a local practice became indistinguishable from a broader practice dominated by peoples we identify as Greeks. The value of this evidence for the question of ethnic identity, on the other hand, is dubious. The minting of legends in Karian was short-lived, and thus never became an established practice around which identity would have formed. Continuity was achieved more through the images on the coins, which were not altered with the switch to Greek. Moreover, the first coins minted in Karia bore Greek legends. The dynasts of Termira on the Halikarnassian peninsula had minted such coins since the early fifth century.<sup>34</sup> So the inhabitants of Karia lacked a tradition of minting coins in their native language that would have lent significance to a change in this practice in terms of language. Community (and dynastic) identity, rather than ethnicity, is what found expression on these coin issues.

### *Karian Public Inscriptions: The Kaunian Bilingual*

It remains to look at the public inscriptions of Karia. Again, we are limited by our ignorance of what the texts say, with the exception of the two bilingual inscriptions, from Kaunos and Sinuri, as the other three bilingual stones display Karian and Greek texts that bear no relation to each other.<sup>35</sup> In the Kaunian bilingual, the city honors two Athenians, Nikokles and Lysikles, as *proxenoi* and *euergetai*. The decision to record the decree in two languages makes sense, given that the honorees probably did not speak or read Karian. At the same time, the position, larger letter size, and greater space given to the Karian text above its Greek

---

<sup>31</sup> K. Konuk, "Coin Evidence for the Karian Name of Keramos," *Kadmos* 39 (2000) 159-64.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Adiego, "Carian Identity" 18f. for the relationship between the Greek and Karian alphabets.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Konuk, "Coin Evidence" 214-215 for the contemporary usage of coins by Greeks and Karians.

<sup>34</sup> *Idem*, "Influences et éléments achéménides dans le monnayage de la Carie," in O. Casabonne (ed.), *Mécanismes et innovations monétaires dans l'Anatolie* (Istanbul 2000) 174f.

<sup>35</sup> Adiego, "Carian Identity" 15; Kaunos: P. Frei and C. Marek, "Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos. Ein neues Textfragment," *Kadmos* 37 (1998) 1-18; Sinuri: L. Robert, *Le Sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa* (Paris 1945) nos. 74-75 and I. Adiego, "La inscripción greco-caria de los Hecatómnicas en el santuario de Sinuri," *Kadmos* 39 (2000) 133-57.

counterpart indicates its primacy.<sup>36</sup> We can envision two scenarios to explain the positioning of the two texts: both languages were meant for the entire target audience, minus the Athenians, or each language was used with different groups in mind.<sup>37</sup> According to the first scenario, Kaunian literate society (as distinct from the illiterate majority) could read both Karian and Greek, and the pragmatically useless publication of the Karian text would seem an intentional assertion of difference, constructing a divide between Kaunians and foreign Greek-speakers. Yet we can just as easily assume that the Karian text was inscribed for a segment of the literate population who could only read Karian.<sup>38</sup> Insofar as the diplomatic act implicated the entire community, to ensure that all literate or semi-literate persons concerned could access the information of the decree would have been a pragmatic decision. Of course, in this scenario we can still detect an expressed difference—between those literate only in Karian and those literate in Greek—with a preference for the former. Yet even in this case the Kaunians are laying claim to both languages as modes of expression.

The only clear expressions of identity in the text (beyond individual names, on which see below) are those of “Kaunian” and “Athenian,” i.e., as members of political communities. Because the Greek language is also a Kaunian mode of expression, such identities do not map onto the distinction drawn by the separate languages of the inscription. For us, this assertion of distinctness and commonality obfuscates one difference that divided Greeks from “barbarians,” but for the Kaunians and their Athenian benefactors such a moment presumed a history of Greek language acquisition and implementation based on the practicalities of communication. Such communication in turn was motivated by a desire to foster commonality, but between two cities, not between Greeks and Karians.<sup>39</sup> Nikokles and Lysikles are identified as Athenian, and the Kaunians assert their status as a *polis* with the opening formula ἔδοξε Καυνίοις. It is true that this commonality was defined by practices that we identify as Greek, but there is no evidence that such practices were conceptualized in antiquity along ethnic lines, at least not in the fourth century. Instead, Kaunos’ interactions with these Athenians, and the practice of publicizing these interactions on stone, helped develop the city’s identity as a *polis*.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Piras in Rumscheid, *Die Karer* 244-49.

<sup>37</sup> I take it as given that the Greek text was not *only* intended for (and thus authored by) the Athenian envoys.

<sup>38</sup> Clearly the friendly relationship that was possible between the two Athenians and Kaunos presumes a proficiency in Greek among the Kaunians, but this says nothing about their generalized ability to read and write in Greek.

<sup>39</sup> The speculations of P. Funke, “Athen und Kleinasien im 4. Jh. v. Chr. Überlegungen zum historisch-politischen Kontext eines neuen Proxenedekretes aus Kaunos,” *Kadmos* 37 (1998) 211-28 concerning the potential role of improved relations between the Hekatomnids and Athens in the *proxenia* decree, while interesting, remain too hypothetical to pertain to the current discussion. Cf. P. Frei and C. Marek, “Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos. Eine zweisprachige Staatsurkunde des 4. Jh.s v. Chr.” *Kadmos* 36 (1997) 53-89.

<sup>40</sup> Evidence is entirely lacking that Greeks in later periods connected *polis* identity to τὸ Ἑλληνικόν as defined by Hdt. 8.144.2, and specifically with the ἥθεά...δμότροπα. Nevertheless, see below for a discussion of the suggestion that certain forms of differentiation from other communities in fact helped to define Hellenism, and thus would implicate communities like Kaunos in this broader community.

## Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity

### *Karian Public Inscriptions: A Hekatomnid Bilingual*

Such practices were likely introduced, or at least significantly developed, by the cultural interests of the Hekatomnids, as is suggested by the number of Greek inscriptions that are contemporary with the Karian decrees, as well as our other extant bilingual inscription at Sinuri. With respect to the latter, it is interesting to note that the texts, which contain a decree of the satraps Idrieus and Ada, were inscribed with the Greek version above.<sup>41</sup> Since presumably the setting up of the decree also originated with the satraps, any self-expression we might deduce should be attributed to them rather than the intended audience, though certainly such an act (*qua* an expression of the rulers' identity) would also have impacted the self-understanding of their subjects. Accordingly, we could conclude that the bilingual is evidence for Idrieus' self-perception as a Hellenized and Hellenizing ruler, self-consciously altering the environment in which his Karian subjects understood their religious and political community/-ies to resemble Greek behavior. This conclusion, however, conflates description and self-perception. Publishing a decree in Greek (and *polis*) language is a Hellenic practice as externally defined by the modern observer, but we cannot *prima facie* assume such a self-conscious motivation behind the satrap's activity. The link between what we identify as Greek (that is, things that Greeks did) and what made one Greek ethnically must be demonstrated. Was Idrieus (and the Hekatomnid dynasty more broadly) trying to act Greek to be Greek (and make his subjects more so)?

Such a strong claim misinterprets the broader context of epigraphical activity involving the Hekatomnids. These satraps were rulers of a region that included more than just Karians, or Karian-speaking peoples for that matter.<sup>42</sup> Most significantly, they exercised authority over several Greek-speaking cities that had a fairly well established epigraphical tradition prior to the assumption of power by Hekatomnos. The best example for this is Iasos, where recent finds include a number of honorary decrees that were set up as early as the fifth century.<sup>43</sup> Maussollos' interactions with the city were likewise expressed with respect to the institutions of the *polis*, and accordingly recorded on stone and set up in public.<sup>44</sup> The satraps also adapted this medium of communication abroad. Both Maussollos and Idrieus fostered ties with Erythrai through benefaction and the subsequent honors bestowed upon them by the Erythraians.<sup>45</sup> Unsurprisingly, their mode of interaction with political communities was

---

<sup>41</sup> Adiego, *Kadmos* 39 (2000) 133-157.

<sup>42</sup> See Her. 1.171 for the distinction between Karians and non-Karian speakers of the Karian language. Carstens' belief that "Labraunda was the key sanctuary for the Hekatomnids" neglects the non-Karian communities under their power in assuming that it was only the Karian subjects of the dynasty that mattered (Carstens, *Karia and the Hekatomnids*, 100. Cf. *Ibid.* 75-100).

<sup>43</sup> G. Maddoli, "Epigrafi di Iasos. Nuovi Supplementi I," *PP* 62 (2007) nos. 1-9.

<sup>44</sup> *I. Iasos* 1.

<sup>45</sup> *I. Erythrai* 9 and E. Varinlioğlu, "Inscriptions from Erythrae," *ZPE* 44 (1981) 45-47. The assumption of P. Gauthier, *Les cités et leurs bienfaiteurs* (Athènes 1985) 159 that Maussollos' language of self-representation involves

applied in inland Karia as well. Maussollos advertised the privileges granted to the Knossians, which were valid throughout Karia by the authority of the satrap, in a public inscription at the important sanctuary of Labraunda.<sup>46</sup> Idrieus followed suit, as we have seen, with a decree at Sinuri. This practice was adopted by the communities themselves, whether influenced by the satraps or through interaction with coastal cities. The Mylaseans, like Iasos, published decrees relating to the punishment of certain conspirators against Maussollos.<sup>47</sup> Numerous *poleis* in Karia, including Iasos and Halikarnassos, recorded their dealings with each other on public inscriptions.<sup>48</sup> What we see, then, is the development in fourth-century Karia, both by its rulers and its communities, of an institutional language that typified contemporary *polis* action and interaction. Whether the impetus for this development lay in the intentional policy of the Hekatomnid satraps or in a more gradual adaptation to the practices and norms of fellow and neighboring *poleis* with a more entrenched habit of using such language, this behavior was the logical consequence of the lack of any alternative to this means of communal self-expression.

To describe these developments as the “Hellenization of Karia” rings true from a certain perspective—if by this we mean the increasing exhibition of behavior that resembles those whom we identify as Greek—yet it also assumes that the distinction between “Greek” and “Karian” played a role in the way such assimilation was understood by the agents and audience of this process.<sup>49</sup> The implications that emerge, however, from the context in which the inhabitants of Karia developed the epigraphic habit contradict such an assumption. If the publication of visible reminders of the decisions of the community was itself an inherently political activity—i.e., characteristic of the *polis*—then the choice to do so, whether in Karian or Greek, was already an act that claimed belonging in the world of *poleis*. On the other hand, the Karian script and language was never an *established* medium of public communication *prior* to the adoption of Greek. As we have seen, the number of public inscriptions in Karian is rather small, and all are contemporary with similar documents in Greek.<sup>50</sup> Because Greek was being used at the same time, and far more extensively, the indigenous language became functionally superfluous as a means of public communication once the intended audience for such documents had achieved literacy in both languages. Yet since knowledge of Greek among the inhabitants of Karia well predates these fourth-century developments, and since inscribing public monuments even in Karian presumes a knowledge of Greek, the decision to attain literacy in Greek rather than Karian would not have been ethnically charged, but constituted a

---

his acceptance as a Hellene takes for granted the very link between *polis* language and Greek ethnic language that I claim is unjustifiable.

<sup>46</sup> J. Crampa, *Labraunda: the Greek Inscriptions* (Swedish Excavations and Researches, vol. 3. Uppsala 1975), no. 40.

<sup>47</sup> I. Mylase 1-3.

<sup>48</sup> Bresson et al. “Les inscriptions grecques et latines,” in Debord & Varinlioğlu, *Les hautes terres*, nos. 90 and 91.

<sup>49</sup> The classic formulation of this view is Hornblower, *Mausolus*, 341-342, but it also strongly informs the discussion in Bresson, “Les Cariens.”

<sup>50</sup> I. Adiego, “Les indentifications onomastiques dans le déchiffrement du carien,” in M. Giannotta et al. (eds.), *La decifrazione del cario* (Rome 1994) 59-63. Compare the 18 Karian documents (not counting the inscription from Athens) with the hundreds of texts from Egypt.

## Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity

response to practical considerations inherent to the desire to appear as a *polis* and interact with fellow *poleis*. Greek was the established medium for doing so and allowed for more extensive participation in claims of belonging.

### *The Primacy of Polis Identity*

The primacy of *polis* identity is also suggested by the non-uniform nature of the various Karian alphabets. As Adiego puts it, Karian writing is a metaphor for Karian identity: “all the local alphabets were unmistakably Carian, insofar as they shared a common origin and held the same aberrant values assigned to Greek letters, but at the same time each locality stated its singularity by using its own and recognizable form.”<sup>51</sup> The metaphor speaks well to the conflation of types of identity that surrounds discussions of Karian identity. The various scripts are “unmistakeably” Karian to us (i.e., from an etic perspective), since common origin, as Adiego’s commentary shows, must be deduced from careful comparative analysis of the alphabetic forms. The aberrance from Greek letters that all these scripts shared also represents our point of view, since the Greek script is our starting point for analyzing the Karian alphabets. On the other hand, the uniqueness of each local script constitutes an expression of differentiation at the level of the community. This mode of self-perception could accommodate a broader regional identity (as Adiego implies), but could also supersede it. As Herodotos tells us, the Karian-speaking Kaunians were *not* Karian (1.172).

What the above discussion suggests is that boundaries were indeed being negotiated through the assimilated and assimilating behavior of political communities throughout the Aegean, but that this negotiation involved processes of differentiation that sought to define the relationship between individual *poleis*.<sup>52</sup> In other words, the “other” here was not a non-Greek but a non-Athenian, non-Kaunian, non-Iasean, etc. Of course, if Skinner’s suggestion that political and cultural disunity “formed an intrinsic part of Hellenism” is borne out, then the involvement of Karian communities in such a discourse of fragmentation would imply their Hellenization from an emic perspective, though still not in terms of a Greek-non-Greek polarization.<sup>53</sup> This possibility, however, demands further and broader exploration than is possible for an article of this scope; at the same time, as I have already argued, the negotiation of boundaries that the behavior of these communities implies does not seem to place importance on the language chosen for such discourse.

Why, then, did the inhabitants of Karia not set up inscriptions exclusively in Greek? Although Karian was not an entrenched mode of publication, it had existed as a medium for written communication since the seventh century, and one assumes some level of continuity

---

<sup>51</sup> “Carian Identity” 19.

<sup>52</sup> For differentiation as essential to identity construction, see Siapkis, *Heterological Ethnicity* 12ff.

<sup>53</sup> Skinner, *Greek Ethnography* 28. Cf. M. Scott, *Delphi and Olympia. The Spatial Politics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (Cambridge 2010), 260ff.



in the region between the archaic graffiti at Didyma and the fourth-century stelai. In this light, it is plausible that the decision to record decrees in Karian was due to the survival of literacy in Karian at a level superior to that attained in Greek, and that as this discrepancy disappeared, it made little sense to continue inscribing in Karian rather than in Greek. This is the implication of the coexistence of Greek and Karian, followed by the “triumph” of the former, and it is also strongly suggested by the rapid, and earlier, switch from Karian to Greek on the coins of the region. The Karian legends were used so briefly because only a basic level of literacy in Greek was needed to decipher the letters on a coin. The longer process of Greek fully replacing Karian on public inscriptions can thus be explained by the higher level of literacy needed to compose such documents. In the end, there is, therefore, little basis for thinking that language was a visible symbol of Karian identity.

*“Karian” Names and Identity*

If it is indisputable that the “selection of a name should read as a conscious statement of self-definition,” it is less clear that such a statement was made in relation to “the linguistic patrimony from which these names derive.”<sup>54</sup> Rather than taking for granted that ancient inhabitants of Karia were aware of the connection that we make between the linguistic origins of a name and ethnicity, the onus should be upon us, who so comfortably make this connection ourselves, to demonstrate such an awareness in the minds of the people under examination. That names can refer to a whole range of different identities can be shown from a simple example, which is effective for being unremarkable. The act of naming one’s child “Daniel” could suggest an affinity for Hebrew, French, or American cultures (among others), or indicate an admiration for a Christianized Biblical hero, a British actor in a series of fantasy films, or a close friend of the family. These suggestions represent the tiniest fraction of the total number of possible motives behind such a choice, and also make clear how the interpretation of these motives depends on a specific context that is virtually unknowable for the ancient world. The above example also shows how, on the one hand, the many possible meanings of a name depend on processes of cultural interaction, assimilation, and appropriation, and on the other hand, how these processes create senses of identity that, while containing the potential to evolve into a common sense of belonging at a “national” cultural level, just as much retain feelings of kinship to more locally, regionally, or even individually defined groups. Of course, there are important differences between Hellenistic Karian and twenty-first century naming practices, the most notable being the stronger preference among the former for ancestral (especially grandpaternal) names.<sup>55</sup> Yet such a preference, if universally followed, would make impossible the adoption of “new” names, and since this adoption did occur, and rather frequently, we must think more carefully about the factors behind a decision to name a child

---

<sup>54</sup> Piras in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 218.

<sup>55</sup> This preference is suggested by the list of Pidean ambassadors in *Milet* I.3.149 (which includes Hermias son of Polites and Polites son of Hermias) or the prosopography of Mylasa (e.g., Hermias son of Antipatros son of Hermias (*I.Mylasa* 806) and Melas son of Aristas son of Melas (*I.Mylasa* 803, 815, 883)).

## Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity

something other than a family name, rather than simply assuming that this was fueled primarily by a desire or claim to be Greek.<sup>56</sup>

### *Name-Changing*

Since the chief treatments of the onomastic evidence in Karia, by Hornblower, Piras, and Adiego, respectively, have a somewhat distinct focus, it makes sense to discuss each of them in turn. Hornblower makes much of the change of place and individual names to more Greek forms in the fourth century and particularly during the Hellenistic period. It is, for him, the exemplary Hellenizing process. Syangela became Theangela, Hyromos became Euromos, and Kyllandos became Kallipolis, while for individuals the *Tiername* “Mys” became popular—perhaps a “Hellenized” form of Examyas, Panamyas, Kheramyas, and/or Hekamyas—Samôuos became Samôos, and Kondmalas evolved into Kondalos.<sup>57</sup> Yet the examples of changes in nomenclature that Hornblower marshals require more careful scrutiny, keeping in mind that languages are inherently dynamic structures and in constant flux. The change from Syangela to Theangela is too drastic to be explained by natural sound change, and the prefix “sou-/sy-” does not seem to mean “god,” so neither can we attribute the change to Greek translation.<sup>58</sup> The opaque nature of this change should prevent us from assuming Hellenization without any explanation. Moreover, the development in the names Samôos and Kondalos could simply be the result of sound change internal to the Karian language.<sup>59</sup> This possibility is strengthened by the fact that Samôos is likely a name taken from the Egyptian T3j-jm.<sup>60</sup> On the other hand, if

---

<sup>56</sup> See 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), 199-232 for a similarly cautious approach to the value of names as culturally or ethnically representative. Although Piras in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 222 admits that the “Karian perception of what qualifies as an indigenous name...may not follow modern linguistic criteria,” her conclusion in the same paragraph that the “striking change in onomastic habits in the entire region...may be seen as a break in the cultural traditions of Karia” assumes a general equivalence of the two.

<sup>57</sup> Hornblower, *Mausolus*, 346-50. Cf. Bresson, “Les Cariens” 225.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Adiego, *Carian Language*, 306-307 for the probable word for “god,” “mso-.” The meaning of “sou-/sy-” is entirely obscure.

<sup>59</sup> I thank Don Ringe for this suggestion. Because of a lack of evidence, we cannot speak securely of what type of sound changes occurred naturally (i.e., regularly) in Karian, so the above is still speculation.

<sup>60</sup> Adiego, *Carian Language*, 251. The community of Karians in Egypt, as well as their choice of language and names in this context, offers a much better case for seeing processes of assimilation as contributing to identity negotiation, although one in which Karian and Egyptian identities seem to often co-exist. The value of this material, however, for the issue of ethnicity in Karia itself is questionable, both because much of it dates to the Archaic period and due to the unclear influence of the two geographical contexts on each other, since expressions of a conceptual connection between them (i.e., by calling both groups “Karian”) are found always (and only) in the mouths of outside observers. That Karians worshipping at the cult of Zeus Labraundeus in Memphis conceived of themselves as ethnically similar to Karians who worshipped the same deity in Labraunda itself is unproblematic, but were Karians in Karia itself familiar with Egyptian Karians (*Karomemphitai*) in a way that

there is a link between the name “Mys” and names with a suffix of “-myes,” then it is more probable that we have a Karianization, in linguistic terms, of the Greek word for mouse, since -μυς seems to mean “might” in Karian.<sup>61</sup> We would do well, however, to question the popularity of a name that is only attested three times over a span of 600 years.<sup>62</sup> Of course, Kallipolis is a clear example of a “Hellenized” form (or rather, a renaming), though this is not so surprising for a city in the Rhodian Peraia. Euromos could be a change based on a Greek folk etymology (εὖ ῥωμή = “good strength”),<sup>63</sup> though we should note that Herodotos (8.133) calls the city “Europos.” at roughly the same time as the earliest mention of Hyromos in the Athenian Tribute Lists, making it questionable to grant one variant the status of authenticity. In sum, to infer from these cases, few of which are in any way determinate, an inherently Greek “renaming” process goes beyond the evidence.

For Piras, more general onomastic trends in the areas around Mylasa and Stratonikeia are indicative of a “desired Hellenization.” Whereas in the fourth century, inscriptions from these areas contain many Karian names and only few Greek ones, texts from (probably the second half of) the third century onward display a preponderance of Greek names. From this, she infers a process of “abandonment” of Karian names driven in part by a “deliberate choice of Greekness” and in part by the increased presence of Macedonian/Seleukid settlements.<sup>64</sup> Yet the displacement of Karian names with Greek ones over time is less suggestive of a Greek-Karian dichotomy than this picture seems to indicate. First of all, we must remember that the individuals named on stone were in most cases prominent members of their community, and as such participated in a broader culture that influenced name-choices in vastly different ways than less visible persons.<sup>65</sup> Second, and far more importantly, the coexistence of Greek and Karian names as early as the fifth century in Dorian Halikarnassos, and at times within the same family, suggests that the distinction that we are making as modern observers (between Greek versus Karian nomenclature) was not drawn in antiquity along ethnic lines.<sup>66</sup> The

---

impacted their own self-perception? Cf. D. Thompson, *Memphis under the Ptolemies* (Princeton 2012), 90-92; G. Vittman, *Ägypten und die Fremden in ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend* (Mainz am Rhein 2003), 155-179.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.* 335f., based off the Hittite word (muwa-) meaning “might.” It should be noted that such a possibility was not available to Hornblower in 1982.

<sup>62</sup> Of the three cases mentioned by Hornblower (see *Mausolus*, 347 for citations), the earliest comes from Herodotos and the latest from the third century AD!

<sup>63</sup> Again, I express my gratitude to Don Ringe for this suggestion.

<sup>64</sup> Piras in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 222-31. The evidence for 4<sup>th</sup>-century names comes mostly from Bresson et al. in Debord and Varinlioğlu, *Les hautes terres*, nos. 90 and 91 and *I. Mylasa* 1-3, as well as the Karian inscriptions discussed by W. Blümel & A. Kızıl, “Eine neue karische Inschrift aus der Region von Mylasa,” *Kadmos* 43 (2004) 131-138. For the Hellenistic period, the majority of evidence is collected by Blümel 1994. For both Mylasa and Stratonikeia there is a gap between the documents in which Karian names predominate and those in which Greek names are the norm. For Mylasa the gap is probably at least 80 years (assuming that the decrees from the third century date to the time after Mylasa was granted freedom in 246), but most of the Hellenistic evidence comes from second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC according to Blümel. For Stratonikeia, the gap is larger, over 100 years, and covers the period from before the city’s founding to the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC.

<sup>65</sup> A point emphasized as well by Piras in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 224.

<sup>66</sup> G. Bean and J Cook, “The Halicarnassus Peninsula,” *ABSA* 50 (1955) 96; W. Blümel, “Über die chronologische und geographische Verteilung einheimischer Personennamen in griechischen Inschriften aus Karien,” in Giannotta

## Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity

Dorian, and hence Greek, identity of Halikarnassos survived frequent intermarriage with and inclusion of indigenous populations, and while we may label names “Karian” and “Greek,” there is no indication that onomastic difference translated into separate, mutually exclusive identities within the civic body of the city.<sup>67</sup> This is not just an argument from silence: in successive sections, Herodotos identifies Histiaios and Damasithymos as Karian (7.98), and Lygdamis the Halikarnassian as Dorian (7.99). Evidently, one could bear a “Karian” name while possessing Greek identity, which is precisely the implication of the phenomenon of “Karian” names with Greek patronymics noted by Hornblower.<sup>68</sup> Yet the examples of Karians (as identified by Herodotos) with Greek names are also interesting. If one could have a linguistically Hellenic name without being considered Greek, then it would seem that “Greek” and “Karian” nomenclature intermingled outside the Greek colonies even before the “Hellenizing” process of the Hekatomnid era.<sup>69</sup>

If “name-types” did not indicate ethnic identity in the fifth century, then the predominance of Greek names in the Hellenistic period cannot suggest that the inhabitants of Karia became Greek at the expense of their regional identity. As Piras argues, the Greek names of Hellenistic Karia and the few “Karian” names that survived reveal both “a particular connection to the Karian environment,” as well as participation in the Hellenistic *koine*.<sup>70</sup> Naming choices continued to be influenced by local trends, but these trends became more and more affected by interaction with and participation in a broader social and cultural world. Yet this adaptation to internal and external environmental factors was only conscious from the perspective of the moment of selecting a name. Whether this conscious moment involved an awareness of the associations of a name that are more discernible from a centuries-long perspective—in particular a “Greek” or “Karian” nature—is highly debatable.

Piras’ supposition that most of the names inscribed on stone were those of local elites points to a more grounded explanation for the shift in naming trends. The participation of individuals from Karia in the social world of the Aegean elite since the Classical period, and

---

et al., *Decifrazione*, 65-86; cf. Hornblower, *Mausolus*, 348: “It has been estimated that of the more than 250 names, including patronymics, of Halikarnassians in the two generations after 480 BC, Greek names are in a majority of only about sixteen; and that there are seven Greek names with sons whose names are barbarian [sic], whereas about thirty-one bearers of Greek names have barbarian [sic] patronymics.”

<sup>67</sup> *pace* Hornblower, *Mausolus*, 349 n. 161, whose assertion that Halikarnassos was “only half Greek” is an entirely modern judgment, based on an explanation of the city’s expulsion from the Dorian Hexapolis that rejects Herodotos’ statement that the expulsion was due to a violation of the sacred law of Triopian Apollo (1.144). To discount the ancient evidence because of the historian’s personal ties to the city is to ignore our own subjective commitment to seeing the issue of ethnicity at play in this passage. Cf. Herodotos’ proof that the Milesians are of no purer Ionian stock than their mainland counterparts, because they took Karian wives when they founded their city (1.146). This intermarriage in no way detracted from the essentially Ionian identity of Miletos.

<sup>68</sup> *Mausolus* 347.

<sup>69</sup> Thus the notion of “a Karian name *stricto sensu*” (Hornblower, *Mausolus* 349) becomes meaningless.

<sup>70</sup> Piras in van Bremen and Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia* 232-33. The non-Greek names that survived into the Hellenistic and imperial period are mostly those of the fourth-century Hekatomnid dynasts.

probably before, created conditions that were unfavorable to a distinction of name-types based on ethnicity. The expansion and intensification of this social world in the Hellenistic period logically led to greater conformity in naming practices, yet insofar as elites always retained ties to their local communities, we would expect this conformity to take on a local flavor, as the evidence confirms. That this social world was (from our perspective) dominated by Greeks and conducted in Greek does not mean that it was always, or even usually, conceptualized according to such categories. Instead, the unsuitability of a Greek-Karian dichotomy to explain naming practices in Karia suggests that much of the discourse that constituted and defined interaction between the region and the outside world involved notions of belonging that did not immediately implicate Hellenicity (or Karianicity).

### *Double Naming*

Adiego's treatment of Karian onomastics reinforces this conclusion. Observing the paucity of linguistically Greek names in Karian language texts, he infers a process of "double naming" from the few exceptions, although, unsurprisingly, given the rarity of bilingual inscriptions, we lack instances where Greek and Karian names are paired. For example, Karian *wliat/wljat* is connected to the popularity of Οὐλιάδης in Greek texts from Karia (likewise *ybrs* finds equivalence with Ὑβρέας, as do the pairs *artimi*-Ἀρτέμων and *kt*-Ἐκατ-). From these examples, Adiego assumes an attraction of the Greek names by the Karian ones, a result of language contact rather than "slavish" absorption of Greek influence.<sup>71</sup> His conclusions suggest a natural process of onomastic assimilation that was not conceived of in terms of ethnic (or even linguistic) labels. Greeks and Karians (as we identify them) interacted frequently, and such interaction led to the development more similar behaviors and ways of self-identifying as individuals and communities. Yet this development was predicated on a prior similarity that mattered more than the minor difference between *wliat* and Ouliades, a difference that we may understand as that between Karian and Greek, but which clearly did not bear such ethnic implications to those involved in the "double naming" process. Instead, the decisions behind such developments were no doubt aimed at expressing less detectable identities and the associations they implied.

### *Karian Identity and the Question of Becoming Greek*

I have argued that the concepts of Greek and Karian identity were not at play in the decision to inscribe a coin or stele in Greek or Karian, nor in the onomastic trends of the region, but this does not mean that such practices bear no relation to such identities. If thinking oneself Greek did not just involve self-differentiation from non-Greeks, but was as much, if not more, about negotiating the internal boundaries that divided Athenians, Spartans, and countless other peoples while at the same time defining them together through this division, then the types of relationships that were facilitated by the assimilating behaviors of

---

<sup>71</sup> Adiego, "Carian Identity" 16-18. Cf. C. Brixhe, "Etymologie populaire et onomastique en pays bilingue," *Revue de Philologie* 65 (1991): 77-78.

## Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity

Karian communities would have implicated them in an “intrinsic part” of Greekness. If, on the other hand, this hypothesis is going too far—I for one would like to see an expression in antiquity of the importance of fragmentation to Hellenism—it is safe to say that constructions of Greek identity could and had to accommodate internal differences. In this case, the way in which Greek-speaking communities differentiated themselves from Karian communities became very similar to the way in which the former differentiated amongst each other. In this view, similar behaviors do not constitute a shared identity, but they serve as a precondition for it. Both interpretations find a suitable parallel in the process identified and elaborated by J. Hall, by which various identities aggregated to form Greek identity in the archaic period without ceasing to exist. Just as the impetus for Ionians, Aiolians, and Dorians to identify together was the prior development of common cultural and social ties—or, alternatively (and complementarily), as an important part of the way in which these groups identified together was the relationships that differentiated (and connected) them—so would a shared socio-cultural community between Greek and Karian communities likely form the basis for any shared sense of identity that might arise between them.<sup>72</sup> I have discussed how such a larger community is the prerequisite for understanding the epigraphical habits and naming practices of the communities of Karia in the late Classical and Hellenistic periods. I emphasized how this community must be understood not along ethnic lines—if we call it “Greek” it is as outside observers—but in terms of the civic culture of the *polis*. From an ancient perspective, the set of common behaviors that defined this culture was not inherently bound to a notion of Greek identity, and it is precisely because of this that the preconditions for (or processes of) ethnic assimilation—i.e., shared social and cultural values—took shape. The settlements of Karia strove to emulate and become *poleis* because such a form of community did not imply the insurmountable difference of ethnic otherness.<sup>73</sup> Instead, this desire (if such it may be called) was only possible due to a certain amount of similarity between these communities and the “Greek” *poleis* with which they increasingly interacted and developed common values and practices. To return to the analogy of the formation of Greek identity in the Archaic period, whatever ties existed among Aiolians, Ionians and Dorians, which were to ultimately inspire the creation of a common Hellenic identity, came to be because of shared values and practices that had more to do with shared social and cultural behavior.

Thus the shared experiences and practices that increasingly typified interactions between communities in and outside of Karia created the conditions and, one might say, the

---

<sup>72</sup> The terms “Greeks” and “Karians” here refer to those who self-identified with these respective ethnic groups, and “Karian” in particular does not necessarily include, as we have seen, every community of the geographical region of Karia, nor even every city in which the Karian language was found. While a precise demarcation of where “Karians” began and ended is impossible, in part because such lines were never static, the area around Mylasa, especially those cities who were members of the Chrysaorean League, which is named as a subset of the *Kareis* in the third century BC (Crampa, *Labraunda* III.1 #5), are securely identifiable.

<sup>73</sup> Insurmountable at that moment. As I explain below, this difference was indeed surmountable, but only when the basis for this difference (unshared ancestry) was altered in a context separate from consideration of a Greek-Karian dichotomy.



incentives necessary for assimilation at an ethnic level of discourse. The question of whether these conditions in fact led to such assimilation is a topic that requires a fuller study than is suitable here. Yet it is worth briefly considering what should constitute this study. In particular, careful consideration of three types of evidence would help determine the extent to which self-identifying Karian communities and/or individuals were able to enter the genealogical gambit of Hellenicity. First, the “authenticity” of the many assertions of *syngeneia* in diplomatic contexts between Greek and Karian communities must be evaluated. Scholars have fallen on both sides of this issue.<sup>74</sup> Second, the collection of local historians of Karian history (*Karika*), who survive only in fragments, also has bearing on the way in which Karians were understood, and understood themselves, against and within the complex web of identities that made up what we call the Greek world.<sup>75</sup> Finally, the importance of participation in certain regional sanctuaries to Karian identity, and vice versa, most famously attested by Herodotus (1.171), points to potential of religious iconography to express and fashion ethnic identity.<sup>76</sup> It is in these terms and in consideration of such evidence that Karian, and indeed Greek, identity must be discussed.

In making the case for the primacy of community identity in evidence that has been traditionally read through the lens of a Greek-barbarian polarity, this paper has argued negatively against the use of naming practices and the choice of language on (mostly) public inscriptions to speak about ethnic identity in Karia. To understand these decisions in terms of the opposition between “Greek” and “Karian” is more a product of our analytical categories than of the way in which the ancient inhabitants of Karia, and the neighbors with whom they interacted, conceptualized them. There is no indication that the linguistic quality of a name was in any way connected with ethnic identity. In fact, the identification by Herodotos of Karians with “Greek” names and Greeks with “Karian” names argues for the opposite conclusion. On the other hand, the Karian language, while marking a real difference between those who spoke it and those who did not, failed to serve as a locus for Karian identity for two reasons. First, many non-Karians spoke the language, according to Herodotos, and so it could not serve as a marker that distinguished Karians from all other peoples. Second, interaction between native Greek-speaking communities and those in Karia presumed that the latter possessed a familiarity with the Greek language that made irrelevant a distinction between the two languages in terms of the ethnic identity of one group or another. Yet the implication of these negative statements is a positive argument about the kind of identities that did matter in the evidence under investigation. The practices of setting up public inscriptions, minting coins, or even scribbling one’s name on a piece of dedicated pottery assumed and continued to develop the set of shared experiences that defined the life of the *polis* and the *politês*. This

---

<sup>74</sup> Interpretations of this body of evidence range from calling them mere “preliminary protocol” (Hall, *Hellenicity*, 223f.) or largely figurative expressions (S. Lücke, *Syngeneia: epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Diplomatie* (Frankfurt 2000)) to an acceptance of their literal force (Curty, *Les parentés légendaires* and Jones, *Kinship Diplomacy*).

<sup>75</sup> Alexandros Chersonitos: FrGH 739; Leon of Alabanda: FrGH 278; Philippos of Theangela: FrGH 741; Apollonios of Aphrodisias: FrGH 740.

<sup>76</sup> This is the claim of Carstens, *Karia and the Hekatomnids*, but she assumes rather than attempts to demonstrate the connection between iconography (and style) and identity.

## Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity

common milieu increased the number of names available to parents who lived in Karian communities, hence the rising popularity of “Greek” names here, which in turn served to reinforce the ties between Karian and Greek communities. The way in which communities most explicitly and primarily distinguished themselves from others, the association with one’s *polis* that I have called “civic identity,” thus formed the basis for a sense of commonality among them that discursively ignored ethnic distinctions.

The suggestion that ethnic identity was not a primary, or at least a highly infrequent, category of self-identification among those whom we identify as ancient Greeks and Karians also lays the groundwork for speaking properly about Greek and Karian identity. Even if, and precisely because, these were not at play in most of the exchanges between those whom we would identify as Greek and Karian, we can better understand and articulate the processes of assimilation that occurred, for it is the lack of expression of an ethnic self-consciousness in most contexts that have traditionally been described as Hellenizing moments which enabled the negotiation of difference in terms other than a Greek/non-Greek dichotomy. Contacts between “Greeks” and “Karians” began to involve a form of differentiation that was familiar to Greek-speaking communities in interaction with each other and *may* have even been a way of thinking about others as Greek. More cautiously, I have seen the development of these relationships as a precondition for thinking about Karians as something other than simply not Greek.

Finally, if we expand our horizons beyond Karia, then similar processes are equally possible for other non-Greek peoples in close contact with Greek communities, in particular where the history of this interaction was considerable and the political landscape was conducive to the development of *polis* structures. This includes above all the peoples of Asia Minor, but it may also be profitable to investigate other areas at the “periphery” of the Greek world, however that is defined. In this way, we can gain a more accurate understanding of what it meant to be Greek, what it meant to be non-Greek, and how groups of the latter category could participate in the former identity without necessarily sacrificing their previous sense of ethnic belonging.

JEREMY LABUFF  
NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

## Bibliography

- Adiego, I. “Les identifications onomastiques dans le déchiffrement du carien.” In M. Giannotta et al. (eds.) *La decifrazione del cario* (Rome 1994), 59-63.
- . “La inscripción Greco-caria de los Hecatómnicas en el santuario de Sinuri.” *Kadmos* 39 (2000), 133-157.
- . *The Carian Language*. (Leiden 2007).

- . “Recent Developments in the Decipherment of Carian.” In van Bremen & Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia*, 147-176.
- . “Carian Identity and Carian Language.” In O. Henry (ed.), *4<sup>th</sup> Century Karia: Defining a Karian Identity under the Hekatomnids* (Istanbul 2013), 15-20.
- Bean, G. & J. Cook. “The Halicarnassus Peninsula.” *ABSA* 50 (1955), 85-174.
- Berti, F. & L. Innocente. “Due nuovi graffiti in alfabeto cario da Iasos.” *Kadmos* 37 (1998), 140.
- Blümel, W. “Über die chronologische und geographische Verteilung einheimischer Personennamen in griechischer Inschriften aus Karien.” in Giannotti et al., *Decifrazione*, 65-86.
- Blümel, W. & I. Adiego. “Die karische Inschrift von Kildara.” *Kadmos* 32 (1993), 87-95.
- Blümel, W. & A. Kızıl. “Eine neue karische Inschrift aus der Region von Mylasa.” *Kadmos* 43 (2004), 131-138.
- Bresson, A. “Les Cariens ou La mauvaise conscience du barbare” G. Urso (ed.), *Tra Oriente ed Occidente. Indigeni, Greci, e Romani in Asia Minore* (Pisa 2007), 209-228.
- Brixhe, C. “Etymologie populaire et onomastique en pays bilingue.” *Revue de Philologie* 65 (1991), 67-81.
- Carstens, A. “Tomb Cult and Tomb Architecture in Karia from the Late Archaic to the Hellenistic Period.” In Rumscheid, *Die Karer*, 377-395.
- Carsens, A. *Karia and the Hekatomnids: the Creation of a Dynasty*. (Oxford 2009).
- Crampa, J. *Labraunda: the Greek Inscriptions*. 2 vols. (Uppsala 1975).
- Curty, O. *Les parentés légendaires entre cites grecques: catalogue raisonné des inscriptions contenant le term syngeneia et analyse critique* (Genève 1995).
- Debord, G. & E. Varinlioğlu. *Les hautes terres de Carie* (Bordeaux 2001).
- Erskine, A. “Distant Cousins and International Relations: syngeneia in the Hellenistic World.” In K. Buraselis & K. Zoumboulakis (eds.), *The Idea of European Community in History*, (Athens 2003), 205-216.
- Frei, P. & C. Marek. “Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos. Eine zweisprachige Staatsurkunde des 4. Jh. v. Chr.” *Kadmos* 36 (1997), 53-89.
- . “Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos. Eines neues Textfragment.” *Kadmos* 37 (1998), 1-18.
- Funke, P. “Athen und Kleinasien im 4. Jh. v. Chr. Überlegungen zum historisch-politischen Kontext eines neuen Proxeniodekretes aus Kaunos.” *Kadmos* 37 (1998), 211-238.
- Gauthier, P. *Les cites et leurs bienfaiteurs*. (Athènes 1985).

## Who(')s(e) Karian? Language, Names, and Identity

- Gotter, U. "‘Akkulturation’ als Methodenproblem der historischen Wissenschaften." in W. Eßbach (ed.) *wir/ihr/sie: Identität und Alterität in Theorie und Methode* (Würzburg 2000), 373-406.
- Hall, J. *Hellenicity*. (Chicago 2002).
- Held, W. "Die Karer und die Rhodische Peraia." in Rumscheid, *Die Karer*, 121-134.
- Herda, A. "Karkisa-Karien und die sogenannte Ionische Migration." in Rumscheid, *Die Karer*, 27-108.
- Hornblower, S. *Mausolus*. (Oxford 1982).
- Jones, C.P. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge 1999).
- Lücke, S. *Syngeneia: epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Diplomatie* (Frankfurt 2000).
- Konuk, K. "Coin Evidence for the Karian Name of Keramos." *Kadmos* 39 (2000), 159-164.
- . "Influences et elements achéménides dans le monnayage de la Carie." in O. Casabonne (ed.), *Mécanismes et innovations monétaires dans l'Anatolie* (Istanbul 2000).
- Maddoli, G. "Epigrafi di Iasos. Nuovi Supplementi I." *Parola di Passato* 62 (2007), 193-372.
- Meriggi, P. "Zur neuen parakarischen Schrift." *Kadmos* 5 (1966), 61-99.
- Piras, D. "Der archäologische Kontext karischer Sprachdenkmäler und seine Bedeutung für die kulturelle Identität Kariens." in Rumscheid, *Die Karer*, 229-250.
- . "Who Were the Karians in Hellenistic Times? The Evidence from Epichoric Language and Personal Names." in van Bremen & Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia*, 217-233.
- Ratté, C. "The Carians and the Lydians." In Rumscheid, *Die Karer*, 135-148.
- . "New Research on the Region around Aphrodisias." In van Bremen & Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia*, 253-267.
- Robert, L. *Le Sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa*. (Paris 1945).
- Rumscheid, F. (ed.) *Die Karer und die Anderen* (Bonn 2009).
- Sartre, M. "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), 199-232.
- Schürr, D. "Spätkarisch: Regionalisierung und Lautentwicklungen." in van Bremen & Carbon, *Hellenistic Karia*, 187-205.
- Scott, M. *Delphi and Olympia. The Spatial Politics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. (Cambridge 2010).
- Siapkas, J. *Heterological Ethnicity: Conceptualizing Identities in Ancient Greece*. (Uppsala 2003).

Skinner, J. *The Invention of Greek Ethnography*. (Oxford 2012).

Thompson, D. *Memphis under the Ptolemies*. (Princeton 2012).

Van Bremen, R. & J. Carbon, (eds.) *Hellenistic Karia* (Bordeaux 2010).

Varinlioğlu, E. "Inscriptions from Erythrai." *ZPE* 44 (1981), 45-47.

Vittman, G. *Ägypten und die Fremden in ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend*, (Mainz am Rhein 2003).