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Abstract

The etymology of the PNs *Artimas* and *Arteimas* has been disputed among scholars. Initially, *Artimas* was considered to be an Iranian loanword (from the OIran. PN *R̥tima-). However, some researchers defended the position that *Artimas* was presumably constructed on the basis of the Greek-epichoric GN Ἀρτεμις/Ertemi. Moreover, other scholars prefer to analyse *Artimas* and *Arteimas* together as being two variations of the same PN. The discussion remains open. The purpose of this article is to throw some light on the problem by assuming that *Artimas* and *Arteimas* would have had different etymologies, with one being Iranian, and the other, epicoric. This explanation will be made in the light of the correspondence between the Aram. PN ˀrtym ‘Artimas’ and the Aram. GN ˀrtmwš ‘Artemis’, as well as between the Lyd. PN *Artimas* ‘Artimas’ and the GN Artimuś ‘Artemis’, and taking into account all the sources and languages from Asia Minor where both PNs occur.

Keywords: Indo-European Linguistics; Anatolian languages; Iranian; Etymology.

Resum. L’etimologia dels antropònims Artimas i Arteimas d’Àsia Menor: una nova explicació
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1. Proposed etymologies for *Artimas* and *Arteimas*: a state of the research

The first scholars who mentioned a Persian etymology for *Artimas* were Sachau (1887: 7) and Darmesteter (1888: 508-510), apropos of the Aramaic-Greek bilingual from Limyra (tl 152). Some years later, Justi (1895: 39) described the Lyd. PN *Artimas* mentioned by Xenophon as being of Persian origin. However, in the 20th century, Sundwall (1913: 76) supported the idea of an indigenous etymology for the name. According to this scholar, PN *Artimas* would come from the epichoric PN *erte-me*. Zgusta (1964: 101) mentions both possibilities, while admitting that an epichoric provenance of the Lyd. PN *Artimas* would be more reasonable than that suggested by the Iranian etymology. Zgusta does not mention the fact that Olran. *Rta- was widespread in other languages such as Elamite and Akkadian, and probably did not know about this.

Since then, scholars have expressed themselves in favour of one of these two etymologies: some of them, following Sundwall and Zgusta, consider that *Artimas* was presumably built on the basis of the Greek-epichoric GN Ἀρτεμίς/Ertemi ‘Artemis’ (Litwis 1975: 164 ff.; Wörrle 1995: 407), although an Iranian origin (from Olran. *Rta-) continues to be plausible or at least not dismissed by others (Bivar 1961: 119-127; KAI II 310; Schmitt 1972: 88 & 1982: 30; Zwanziger 1973: 66-68; Hinz 1975: 218).

The idea of an Olran. origin is supported by the fact that there is extensive documentation of the expansion of the Olran. PN *Rtima*, at least into Elamite, Akkadian and Aramaic, provided that we do not take into account the PN documented in the Greek inscriptions from Asia Minor. According to Mayrhofer (1971: 62. s.v. *Rtama*) and Schmitt (1972: 88 & 1982: 30), Olran. *Rt-ima-* would be a hypocorism of the widely documented *Rt*-compound PNs. It is appreciable in compounds such as OPers. *Rta-manah-, *Rta-manyu-, *Rta-mica-, *Rta-pata*, which are still visible in Gr. Αρτάμης, Aram. *r't*tm and Gr. Άρταβάτης, Άρταβάτις (Schmitt 1972: 87 ff., Mayrhofer 1973: 163, No. 8.572; Zwanziger 1973: 66 ff.). The Olran. PN *Rt-ima-* would have been built with the suffix -ima from the OPers. PN *Rta-* ‘truth’.

2. “Der Name kann iranisch sein (thus Justi 1895: 39); es ist aber doch mehr wahrscheinlich, daß der Mann der einheimischen Bevölkerung angehörte und daß es sich um den einheimischen (Sundwall 1913: 76), nur zufällig den iranischen Namen auf Artu-, u.ä. ähnlichen Namen handelt”.

3. Gr. Άρταμης is documented in Aeschylus (Pers. 38), Aram. *r't*tm in Persepolis (Raymond–Bowman 1970: 112, No. 43, 3).
As already mentioned, the OIran. PN *Ṛtima- was extended into other ancient languages: Elam. Ir-ti-ma (Mayrhofer 1973: 170 § 8.657), Bab. Ar-ti-im, f. (< *-imā, with a feminine suffix, see Evetts 1892: app. 2:1, from a text dated from the reign of Xerxes), Aram. ʾṛtym (in the Aramaic inscription from Limyra and in a cylinder-seal from Asia Minor).

However, Lipiński suggests that the PN Aram. ʾṛtym (Gr. Ἀρτί[...] in the inscription from Limyra, which also occurs in a cylinder-seal from Asia Minor, would be an epichoric loanword borrowed from the name of the native south-west Anatolian goddess Artemis, called, according to him, Artimu-. Moreover, in contrast to the hypothesis put forward by Mayrhofer, Schmitt et alii, the scholar classifies the Elam. m. Ir-ti-ma and Bab. f. Ar-ti-im as a PNs of the same origin as Aram. m. ʾṛtym. They would be derived from the GN Artemis (Lipiński 1975: 165).

In my opinion, the hypothesis suggested by Lipiński has some weak points. If we consider the powerful influence exerted by the vast Achaemenid Empire over the languages of the territories it ruled, it is more reasonable to explain the PN Artim documented in Achaemenid Elamite, Akkadian and Aramaic (languages that show numerous Iranian loanwords: see Hallock 1969: 9-19; Rosenthal–Greenfield–Shaked 2011) as a loanword of Iranian origin than to accept the contrary hypothesis. If, according to Lipiński, the epichoric PN Artimu- may have been a loanword introduced into Achaemenid Elamite, Akkadian and Aramaic, the lingua franca of the Persian Empire, in that case, one would expect such an hypothesis to be justified and explained accurately, but Lipiński does not do it properly. Consequently, and for other reasons I will explain below, I think it is more reasonable to consider that the PN Artim may have been an Iranian loanword which was introduced to the languages that were in contact with the Achaemenid Empire, such as Babylonian and Elamite, with a great deal of Iranian loanwords, and in the case of Aramaic, with much more reason, because it was the international written language of the Achaemenid empire.

Lastly, Lipiński bases his hypothesis on the fact that Aram. ʾṛtym would be an epichoric loanword borrowed from the name of the native goddess Artemis, according to him, called Artimu-. But in the trilingual Lycian-Greek-Aramaic Stele of Létōon (n 320c, 24), the Aramaic word for Artemis is ʾṛtmwš, which is different from the Aram. PN ʾṛtym seen in the Aramaic inscription from Limyra and in the cylinder seal. As a consequence, in my opinion, these two different spellings could indicate two different origins. Whereas in the first case, the Aramaic word for Artemis clearly comes from the epichoric Artemus ‘Artemis’, in the second
case, the PN ‘rtym ‘Artimas’ shows another different origin, presumably Iranian. Regarding the writing system of Aramaic, since it only notes consonants, the presence (or absence) of the matres lectionis is important and indicative, since these letters were written in order to indicate that there was a vowel of a timbre similar to the consonant. In Imperial Aramaic, y was certainly used as mater lectionis, indicating the presence of vowels i and e (Rosenthal 1968: 8), and w was also used for u and o. Matres lectionis were particularly used in cases of loanwords and proper names, in order to avoid any kind of ambiguity. In the brief Aramaic inscription from Limyra, for instance, there appear two more loanwords ‘stwdnh: ‘ossuary, bone-container’ (< Ir. astō-dāna) and PN m. ‘rzpy ‘Arzapiya’. Both names, together with ‘rtym ‘Artimas’, are loanwords in the inscription and show matres lectionis that ensure their reading.

Apart from these two hypotheses regarding the origin of the PN Artimas, it has been suggested by some scholars that the PNs Αρτίμας and Αρτείμας may be a variation of the same PN (Schmitt 1972: 89; Zwanziger 1973: 66 ff.; Wörrle 1995: 407). According to Wörrle (ibid.), the spelling Αρτίμας should be considered as the old orthography, whereas Αρτείμας, documented in Lycian inscriptions of the Roman period, should be a later variation which was widely used in Lycia (for more details, see § 5).

2. Instances of the PN Artimas

Before explaining my point of view regarding the etymology of Artimas and Arteimas, I consider it essential to gather together the inscriptions, places and languages in Asia Minor where the PN Artimas and Arteimas occur in order to have a broad view of the problem and to acquire the precise information that is essential for clarifying the question and drawing further conclusions.

The PN Artimas is documented in Lycia, in the Cibyratis region (border area between northern Lycia and southern Phrygia), in Pisidia and in Lydia.

a) In Lycia it appears in a Greek inscription from Olympos and in the bilingual Aramaic-Greek inscription from Limyra (Zgusta 1964: 101):
— Αρτίμας Τροκονδοῦ Ὀλυμπηνός (TAM II.3, 1025 [Olympos])
— Aram. ‘rtym ‘Artim’

b) From the Cibyratis region comes a dat. form Αρτίμαδι (IGR 3, 478, see Zgusta 1964: 101).

c) Αρτίμας occurs in two Greek inscriptions from Pisidia (Zgusta 1964: 101 and 1970: 17).

d) This PN also appears in Lydia. According to Xenophon (An. 7.8.25), Αρτίμας was an ἄρχων Λυδίας. This passage by Xenophon gives us a list of satrap
governors in 401/400 B.C.E. and among them is mentioned the governor of Lydia, Artimas (see also Bivar 1961). Apart from the testimony provided by Xenophon, this PN does not occur any more in Lydian. However, the patronymic form *Artimal[i]-* (from a fragmentary PN °*ro-*, perhaps from [Ka]ro-, [Sa]ro-) is documented on a fragmentary Lydian stele from Emre (Maeonia: see Gusmani 1964: 63 & 264, No. 42, l. 3). According to scholars, this patronymic was derived from the PN *Artima*- (Buckler 1924:90; Brandenstein 1929: 297; Gusmani 1964: 63). In my opinion, the form [Ar]timulis that appears in some Lydian inscriptions (25, 5; 22, 9; 22, 11; 22, 12), should not be derived from PN *Artimas*, as Z gusta (1964: 101) suggests. On the contrary, since this derivative has been generated on the basis of *Artimus* (and not *Artima*), [Ar]timulis should be considered a derivative of the Lyd. GN *Artimus* ‘Artemis’ (as Gusmani 1964: 63-65 also admits), and therefore, from a different substantive (see § 5). Morphologically, the Lyd. comm. [Ar]timulis ‘der/des Artemis’ is a possessive adjective derived from *Artimus* ‘Artemis’. However, *Artimulis* is also documented as a PN in Inscription 25, 5 found near the acropolis of Sardis (Gusmani 1964: 64-65).

e) PN ‘rtym also occurs in the Aramaic legend l-‘rtym on a cylinder-seal from Asia Minor published several times (see Bivar 1961: 119, who rightly corrected the old reading lkntgm; Lipiński 1975: 165). It dates from the fifth–late fifth century B.C.E. Bivar (1961: 119-127) suggested that this seal belonged to the dignitary of Cyrus the Younger mentioned by Xenophon. Moreover, Bivar (1961: 124-125) proposed the new reading l‘rtym on a small bronze coin of disputed origin. But, according to some scholars, this reading is far from being certain (see Lipiński 1975: 16 ff., who proposes another reading), and therefore it will not be taken into account.

Lastly, one finds an Άρτιμας in a list of slave-names from Eleusis in 329/8 B.C.E. (Dittenberger 1915-1922, vol. II, No. 587). The man was listed between a Carian and a Cypriot, so that, according to some scholars, he was most likely a native of south-west Anatolia (Lipiński 1975: 167). In accordance with what we have already seen, the PN *Artimas* occurs six times in the Greek inscriptions from Anatolia (twice in Lycia, once in Cibyratis, twice in Pisidia and once in Lydia). We also find Άρτιμας in a list of slave-names from Eleusis in 329/8 B.C.E. In Aramaic, this PN ‘rtym occurs with certainty twice (in the Aramaic inscription from Lifyra and in a cylinder-seal from Asia Minor). Xenophon mentions the name of a satrap governor of Lydia named *Artimas* (which could be related to the ‘rtym of the cylinder-seal, although this affirmation is not hundred per cent reliable).

What is clear from these data, for the moment, is that the *Artimas* mentioned by Xenophon and the *Artimas* of the cylinder-seal, are at least non epichoric PNs since

7. Άρτιμας occurs in a Greek inscription of Lydia (Άρτιμας Πάγανο, referring to a man from Sardis) and in a Greek inscription from Caria (Άρτιμας Μάγεν). Άρτιμας is the name of a Phrigian slave (for all these instances, see Z gusta 1964: 101). It is possible that these PN are related to *Artimas*.
both come from a clear Achaemenid context. They are presumably PNs borrowed from Iranian. Were we to accept an epichoric origin for the PN Artimas, documented in different sources and languages in Asia Minor, even in this case, we should still have to admit that the Artimas mentioned by Xenophon and the one from the cylinder-seal would still be from another origin (Iranian). Such an observation seems not to have been expounded clearly enough by scholars.

3. Instances of the PN Arteimas

In comparison with Artimas, Arteimas appears to be much more widespread in use. It is documented more than hundred times in the Greek inscriptions from Lycia, Cibyratis, Pisidia and Pamphylia (see ZGUSTA 1964: 99-100):

a) Lycia (35 times):
   — Ἀρτείμας: TAM II.3, 811 (Arkyanda); 926 (Rhodiapolis); 992, 1001, 1057, 1116, 1121, 1164 (Olympos).
   — Ἀρτείμου (gen.): TAM II.1, 176 a (Sisyma); 78 (Telmessos); TAM II.2, 551, 601a, 604 (Tlos); 689 (Kadyanda); TAM II.3, 722 & 886 (Akalissos); 971, 973, 1031, 1072, 1157 (Olympos); SEG 6, 752 (Telmessos).
   — Ἀρτείμα (dat.): Tomb 13/17 from Limyra’s Necropolis III (see WÖRRLE 1995: 398); TAM II.2, 601 a (Tlos); TAM II.3, 1151, 1164 (Olympos).
   — Ἀρτείμαν (accus.): TAM II.3, 740.

b) Cibyratis (9 times):
   — Ἀρτείμας (gen.): Petersen–von Luschan 1889: 200, 220.
   — Ἀρτείμα (dat.): Heberdey-Kalinka 1896: II 75 (Oinoanda).
   — Ἀρτείμαν (accus.): IGR 3, 480.

c) Pisidia (81 times):
   — Ἀρτείμας: TAM III.1, 2 (II a); 14, 292, 293, 295, 296, 635, 938 (Termessos); IGR 3, 408; SEG 17, 548; ABS 16, 112 No. 3; JHS 8, 1887, 256 No. 40.
   — Ἀρτείμου (gen.): CIG 4367 d; TAM III.1, 14, 19, 56, 59, 132, 159, 238, 242, 270, 278, 305, 356, 352, 410, 416, 455, 588, 595, 608, 679, 705, 709, 720, 721, 722, 872 B III, 899, 901 (all of them from Termessos); IGR 3, 406; SEG 6, 621, 718; BCH 1, 1877, 337; BCH 16, 1892, 432 No. 63; BCH 24, 1900, 330; An St 10, 1960, 62 No. 106; An St 64 No. 112.
   — Ἀρτείμα (dat.): TAM III.1, 304; 721 (Termessos); SEG 6, 621.
   — Ἀρτείμαν (accus.): IGR 3, 408; SEG 6, 613; BCH 16, 1892, 433 No. 65; An St 10, 1960, 64 No. 114.

8. The PN of the Aramaic inscription from Limyra could also be interpreted in the same context, although it is not as clear as in these two cases, since ˀrtym could be epichoric as well, as some scholars suggested (Lipiński 1975: 164 ff.; Wörrle 1995: 407). For the moment, it will be prudent not to include it as an instance of an Iranian loanword (although see § 3).
d) Pamphylia (twice):
   — Αρτέιμας: SEG 6, 658 (Attaleia).

   In accordance with these data, the PN Arteimas occurs 127 times in the Greek inscriptions from Anatolia. In comparison with the PN Artimas, which only appears 6 times in the Greek Inscriptions of the same region, Arteimas is considerably more documented: whereas Artimas occurs only 4.72% of the times, Arteimas represents 100% of the times. Another important observation is that Arteimas is only documented in the Greek epichoric inscriptions from Asia Minor and it is seen a great deal in Termessos (Pisidia). Lastly, it does not occur in Aramaic, nor in any context suspected of having an Iranian origin.

4. The Lycian PNs Artimas and Arteimas: a new proposal for an Iranian and an epichoric etymology

In my opinion, the origin of the PNs Artimas and Arteimas should be considered as two different PNs with two different origins. Αρτίμας, which is older and much less documented, could be an Iranian loanword. This Iranian origin could have been introduced in Lycia and Lydia through the arrival of the Achaemenid governors and administrators, which used Aramaic as the written administrative language. That would explain the presence of an Achaemenid governor in Lydia named Artimas and the legend ʾrtym that appears on a cylinder-seal from Asia Minor. This name also occurs in the Aramaic inscription from Lomyra (tl 152), which is the only funerary inscription from Lycia written in Aramaic. The use of Aramaic in a context like this constitutes an exception among the other Lycian funerary inscriptions, which are written in Lycian or in Greek. The fact that it was written in Aramaic could be interpreted in the same context, and consequently it would be reasonable to think that it was written under Achaemenid influence. However, accepting that the Aramaic PN ʾrtym was a senior official under Cyrus the Younger and established a local rule in Lomyra, as SHAHBAZI (2011) suggests, seems to me excessive. This scholar bases his hypothesis on the fact that the Aramaic inscription contains the PN ʾrzpy, which, according to him, would be the Achaemenid prince Artyphius, a son of Megabyzus who conquered Egypt for Artaxerxes I, and a grandson of Xerxes through his daughter, Amestris. However, the connection between ʾrzpy and Artyphius is far from being certain: the Aram. ʾrzpy could have had other possible origins according to some scholars. ZGUSTA (1964: 97), followed by DONNER-RÖLLIG (KAI II 310), related this form to the Gr. gen. Ἀρσάπιος, dat. Ἀρσά[π]ει. Other scholars (SACHAU 1887: 7; DARMESTETER 1888: 508-10; PERLES 1926; BIVAR 1961: 121) suggested deriving this PN from the name place Arzāp mentioned in the Syriac text of Ezra (IV, 13, 45). And finally, LIPINSKI (1975), sees in this PN a typical compound of epichoric origin, formed by a first member arza- or arsa- plus the

9. Αρτέιμας and Αρτέιμας occur also in some few inscriptions from Phrigia-Lycia, Pisidia, Karia, Lycia and Prygia-Pisidia (see ZGUSTA 1964: 101).
ending -\textipa{piya-} ‘to give’ or ‘gift’. To this scholar, \textit{Arzapiya} would mean something like ‘Gift of the (sacred) Fire’.

In any case, what does seem reasonable, however, is the observation made in § 2. Since Aramaic uses two different words to refer to the GN Artemis (\textit{ʾrtmws}) and the PN \textit{Artimas} (\textit{ʾrtym}), it would be reasonable to think that these words have a different provenance: an epichoric and an Iranian origin respectively.

I have already mentioned that OIran. *\textit{Rtima-} was extended into other languages, among which is the Aram. \textit{ʾrtym} (documented twice in Asia Minor). The same name, as I have explained (§ 1), also occurs 6 times in the Greek inscriptions from Asia Minor (twice in Lycia, once in Cibyratis, twice in Pisidia and once in Lydia). It is interesting to observe that in those places in Anatolia where the PN \textit{Artimas} occurs in Greek inscriptions, one finds Aramaic inscriptions at the same time near these places, denoting at least an Aramaic presence of the Achaemenid influence in the area. The few Aramaic inscriptions that have been found in Asia Minor are in Sardis (No. 260), Limyra (No. 262) and Cilicia (No. 258),\(^{10}\) No. 259,\(^{11}\) No. 261;\(^{12}\) see \textsc{Donner-Röllig} (\textit{KAI} II 304-309),\(^{13}\) therefore very near to the regions and places where \textit{Artim} is seen in Greek inscriptions.

The other variant, \textit{Αρτειμας}, much more documented as I have shown, may have had an epichoric origin based on the divine name \textit{ARGV} / \textit{Ertemi}. In Lycian, this divine name appears as \textit{Ertemi}/\textit{Ertẽmi} in a few inscriptions (\textsc{Melchert} 2004: 17 & \textsc{Neumann} 2007: 72):

---

- Dat. sg. \textit{Ertẽmi} (\textsc{Neumann} 1979: 311, 1) and \textit{Ertemi} (\textsc{Neumann} 1979: 312, 5); maybe in \textsc{Neumann} (1979: 325, 5).

According to \textsc{Neumann} (2007: 72), ‘die lyk. Lautung kann auf dorisch \textit{Ἀρταμις} oder attisch/Koine \textit{Ἀρτεμις} zurückgehen’.

In the Lycian inscriptions the equivalent PN \textit{Ἀρτειμας} (which is a derived PN of \textit{ARGV}/\textit{Ertemi}) does not occur. However, it occurs in the Trilingual Stele of Létôon (n 320a,5), PN \textit{Erttimeli} (Gr. \textit{Ἀρτεμη-λις}): it would be the only PN derived from \textit{Ertemi} that appears in Lycian inscriptions. \textit{Erttimeli} would be the equivalent of Lyd. \textit{Artimulis} (see § 1).

For the Gr. \textit{Ἀρτειμ-α-ς} one should admit a metathesis of \textit{i}: \textit{Arteim-α-ς} < *\textit{Artemi-α-s}. In Greek this kind of metathesis was frequent when \textit{i} originally followed a liquid or a nasal: \textit{ἀγείρω} ‘versammele’ < *\textit{ἀγερω} < pres. \textit{hγερ-γ-} < *\textit{hγερ-} ‘sammeln, (zusammen)holen, nehmen’ (\textsc{Liv} 276); \textit{βάινω} ‘gehe’ < *\textit{βανω} < pres. \textit{gβαν-γ-} < *\textit{gβε-} ‘(wohin) gehen, kommen’ (\textsc{Liv} 209), \textit{τείνω} ‘spanne, dehne aus’ < *\textit{τενω} < pres. \textit{ten-γ-} < *\textit{ten-} ‘sich spannen, sich dehnen’ (\textsc{Liv} 267), etc. The ending -\textit{α-ς}, which one should not expect in a PN coming from \textit{Ἀρτεμις}/\textit{Ertemi},

10. Kesecek Köyü (ca. 35 km north-east of Tarsus).
11. Gözne (aprox. 20 km. north of Mersin port)
12. Saraidin (Lamas valley, south-east of Tarsus).
13. Inscription No. 263 was found in Abydos (Mysia), and inscriptions Nos. 264 and 265 in Cappadocia (\textit{KAI} II 310-312).
could have been introduced in order to make a change into masculine gender, since
the name of origin was feminine. As in the case of the Gr. and Lyd. Artimas, which
are masculine PNs and have an Iranian origin, in the case of Arteimas the ending
-as was used to indicate masculine gender as well. Moreover, the ending -a-s seen
in the PN Artimas could have been introduced to the stem under the influence of
the old PN Artim-a-s, which, as we have seen, is an older form. In Greek there still
exists the form without metathesis in the derivate PN Αρτεμιμας attested in the
Trilingual Lycian-Greek-Aramaic Stele of Létōon (Neumann 1979: 320, 5; 2007:
72), which would be the Lyd. equivalent to Artimuli-

The nominal stem present in the Lyd. GN Artimus ‘Artemis’ (with its derivate
Artimuli also documented as a PN 25, 5.), would be the Lydian equivalent of the
Greek stem seen in the PN Αρτειμ-ας. In fact the Lyd. Artimas and Lyd. Artimus
could be interpreted as the counterpart of the Gr. Αρτιμας and the Gr. Αρτειμ-ας
respectively.

The same occurs in Aramaic, which, as it has been explained (§ 2), uses two
different words to refer to these PN: ʾrtym ‘Artimas’ and ʾrtmws ‘Artemis’. ʾrtym
would have been the equivalent to the Gr. Αρτιμας and the Lyd. Artimas, whereas
ʾrtmws is the equivalent to the Lyc. Ertemi, Αρτειμ-ας and the Lyd. Artimu-ς.

In my opinion, the clear formal differentiation that Aramaic and Lydian show
between these two names is crucial to understanding and clarifying the two differ-
ent origins of these PNs, which could be outlined in the following table:

| Table 1. Distribution of the PN Artimas / Arteimas among the different languages from Asia Minor |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Lycian                                           | Greek                                            | Lydian                                           | Aramaic                                           |
| form                                             | PN m. Αρτιμας                                     | PN m. Artimas                                    | PN m. ʾrtym                                       |
| deriv.                                           | Artima-li-                                       |                                                 | IRANIAN                                           |
| form                                             | GN f. Ertemi ‘Artemis’                           | PN m. Αρτειμ-ας                                  | GN f. ʾrtmws ‘Artemis’                            |
| deriv.                                           | PN Ertimeli-                                     | PN Αρτεμη-λας                                    | PN Artimu-li-s                                    |
|                                                   |                                                  |                                                  | EPICHORIC                                         |

The fact that Lycian does not contain any instances of the PN Artimas makes
sense when one considers that it was an Iranian loanword that was very little docu-
mented in Asia Minor, and consequently not documented in Lycian.

The strikingly different degree of diffusion shown by both names could be
explained when one considers the two different provenances: the Iranian origin via
Aramaic would explain the few examples of Artimas, whereas the epichoric origin
would account for the extended use of Αρτειμας in Asia Minor. These two different
provenances would also explain why in the case of Artimas this PN is documented
in Imperial Aramaic sources from Asia Minor, whereas Arteimas only occurs in the
Greek epichoric inscriptions.
5. Conclusions

Although Artimas and Arteimas are almost phonetically identical PNs, they had two different origins.

In Asia Minor, Artimas appears twice in Aramaic ʾrtym (in an inscription from Limyra and in a cylinder-seal) and it is mentioned by Xenophon in reference to a Lydian satrap governor. The same name appears only six times in Greek inscriptions from Lycia, Pisidia, Lydia and the Cibyrratis region, areas where Aramaic inscriptions also occur and hence places that were under a clear Achaemenid influence. Artemias, in contrast, is far more extended than Artimas (127 times against 6 times), it is documented later, only in the Greek inscriptions from Asia Minor, and consequently in a clearly indigenous context.

In this paper I have emphasized that the places, languages and the occurrence in which both PNs occur should be taken into serious consideration because they speak indirectly about their provenance. In my opinion, Artimas was an Iranian loanword introduced into Lycia and Lydia as a result of the arrival of the Achaemenid governors and administrators. This would explain the presence of an Achaemenid governor in Lydia named Artimas, the legend ʾrtym that appears in a cylinder-seal and the name ʾrtym from the funerary inscription from Limyra. The PN ʾrtym should be considered as being Iranian in origin and not indigenous (from the GN Artemus ʿArtemis’), as some scholars have suggested. Since Aramaic uses two different words to refer to the PN Artimas (ʾrtym) and the GN Artemis (ʾrtmwš), ʾrtym should not be considered as being epichoric.

Arteimas, in contrast, much more widely used and later documented in Greek inscriptions, would have had an indigenous origin, from the GN Ἀρτέμις/Ertemi ʿArtemis’. The same occurs in Lydian, where an Artimas, from a clearly Iranian origin, is mentioned by Xenophon, whereas a GN Artimuś ʿArtemis’ also occurs, this one with a clearly Greek-indigenous etymology. Since Lyd. Artimas and Artimuś and Aram. ʾrtym and ʾrtmwš show two clearly different origins (Iranian and Greek-epichoric), the same situation could be applied in the case of Artimas and Arteimas.

Lastly, in my opinion, the strikingly different degree of expansion both names show could be explained when one considers the two different provenances: the Iranian origin via Aramaic would explain the few instances of Artimas, whereas the Greek-epichoric origin would account for the wide use of Arteimas in Asia Minor. These two different origins would also explain why in the case of Artimas this PN is documented in Imperial Aramaic sources from Asia Minor but not in Lycian, whereas Arteimas only occurs in Greek epichoric inscriptions.
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