

The Etymology of the PNs *Artimas* and *Arteimas* from Asia Minor: a New Explanation¹

Mariona Vernet

Universitat de Barcelona

mvernet@ub.edu



Reception: 28/11/2012

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 **Rtima-*). However, some researchers defended the position that *Artimas* was presumably constructed on the basis of the Greek-epichoric GN Ἄρτεμις/*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, epichoric. This explanation will be made in the light of the correspondence between the Aram. PN ʾrtym ‘*Artimas*’ and the Aram. GN ʾrtmwš ‘*Artemis*’, as well as between the Lyd. PN *Artimas* ‘*Artimas*’ and the GN *Artimus* ‘*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*

L’etimologia dels antropònims *Artimas* i *Arteimas*, documentats en llengües anatòliques del primer mil·lenni a. C., ha estat discutida. Inicialment, *Artimas* es considerà un préstec d’origen irànic (a partir de l’air. **Rtima-*). Tanmateix, alguns investigadors van defensar la posició que *Artimas* s’hauria format a partir del teònim epicòric Ἄρτεμις/*Ertemi*. D’altres són partidaris d’analitzar conjuntament *Artimas* i *Arteimas*, com si fossin variacions del mateix nom. La discussió roman oberta encara. El propòsit d’aquest article és justament el d’intentar proposar una nova solució, assumint que *Artimas* i *Arteimas* haurien tingut dues etimologies diferents: l’una, d’origen irànic, i l’altra, epicòric. Aquesta explicació es basa en la correspondència entre l’antropònim aram. *Artimas* ‘*Artimas*’ i el teònim *Artimus* ‘*Artemis*’, i també es prenen totes les fonts i llengües de l’Àsia Menor en què apareixen documentats aquests noms propis.

Paraules clau: lingüística indoeuropea; llengües anatòliques; irànic; etimologia.

1. This paper was written thanks to a Juan de la Cierva postdoctoral Fellowship from the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (Convocatoria 2010) and to the research project *Hacia una gramática histórica de la Lengua Licia* (Ref. FFI2009-08835) granted by the same organism. I am also indebted to Prof. Heiner Eichner for his comments, and to the Oesterreichische Austauschdienst for an Ernst-Mach-Stipendium grant that was awarded to me during my research period at the Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Wien (February-October 2012). Abbreviations: Aram. = Aramaic; comm. = common gender; GN = God(dess) Name; Gr. = Greek; Lyc. = Lycian; Lyd. = Lydian; OIran. = Old Iranian; PN = Personal Name.

Table of Contents

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Proposed etymologies for <i>Artimas</i> and <i>Arteimas</i> : a state of the research | 4. The Lycian PNs <i>Artimas</i> and <i>Arteimas</i> : a new proposal for an Iranian and an epichoric etymology |
| 2. Instances of the PN <i>Artimas</i> | 5. Conclusions |
| 3. Instances of the PN <i>Arteimas</i> | Bibliographical references |

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.² Zgusta does not mention the fact that OIran. **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 Ἄρτεμις/*Ertemi* ‘Artemis’ (LIPINSKI 1975: 164 ff.; WÖRRLE 1995: 407), although an Iranian origin (from OIran. **Rtima-*) 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 OIran. origin is supported by the fact that there is extensive documentation of the expansion of the OIran. 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), OIran. **Rt-ima-* would be a hypocorism of the widely documented **Rta-*compound PNs. It is appreciable in compounds such as OPers. **Rta-manah-*, **Rta-manyu-*, **Rta-miça-*, **Rta-pāta*, which are still visible in Gr. Ἀρτάμης, Aram. [ʔr]tm and Gr. Ἀρταπάτης, Ἀρταβύτης (SCHMITT 1972: 87 ff., MAYRHOFER 1973: 163, No. 8.572; ZWANZIGER 1973: 66 ff.).³ The OIran. 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 *Arta-*, u. ä. ähnlichen Namen handelt”.
3. Gr. Ἀρτάμης is documented in Aeschylus (*Pers.* 38), Aram. [ʔr]tm in Persepolis (RAYMOND-BOWMAN 1970: 112, No. 43, 3).

As already mentioned, the OIran. PN **Rtima-* was extended into other ancient languages: Elam. *Ir-ti-ma* (MAYRHOFFER 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. *ʔrtym* (in the Aramaic inscription from Limyra and in a cylinder-seal from Asia Minor).

However, Lipiński suggests that the PN Aram. *ʔrtym* (Gr. Ἀρτι[...]) 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-*.⁴ 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. *ʔrtym*. They would be derived from the GN Artemis (LIPÍŃSKI 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.⁵

Lastly, Lipiński bases his hypothesis on the fact that Aram. *ʔrtym* 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 Létôon (N 320c, 24), the Aramaic word for Artemis is *ʔrtmwš*, which is different from the Aram. PN *ʔrtym* 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

4. It is in fact the Lydian word for ‘Artemis’, since Lyc. shows *Ertemi* (for the Lyd. form, cfr. GUSMANI 1964: 63-65; for Lyc. *Ertemi*, see MELCHERT 2004: 17 and NEUMANN 2007: 72).
5. Moreover, when the scholar affirms that “the name of the goddess appears in Babylonia as a feminine name: *Ar-ti-im*. The use of divine names of a goddess could hardly designate a man. A hypocoristic suffix was required in such cases, as in *Artima*”, he is making a mistake, since *Artima* is masculine, and according to his hypothesis, as a loanword from *Artimu-* (and not from OIran. **Rt-ima-* as suggested by Mayrhofer *et alii*) this PN has no hypocoristic suffix (which the PN *Irtim-aka-* has). He does not even explain the Aram. PN *ʔrtym*, which is masculine and has no suffix according to his hypothesis.

case, the PN *ʔrtym* ‘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 *ʔstwdnh*: ‘ossuary, bone-container’ (< Ir. *astō-dāna*) and PN m. *ʔrzpy* ‘Arzapiya’. Both names, together with *ʔrtym* ‘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 Ἀρτίμας and Ἀρτείμας may be a variation of the same PN (SCHMITT 1972: 89; ZWANZIGER 1973: 66 ff.; WÖRRLE 1995: 407). According to Wörrle (ibid.), the spelling Ἀρτίμας should be considered as the old orthography, whereas Ἀρτείμας, 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):
 - Ἀρτίμας Τροκονδου Ὀλυμπηνός (*TAM* II.3, 1025 [Olympos])
 - Aram. *ʔrtym* ‘Artim’⁶
 - b) From the Cibyratis region comes a dat. form Ἀρτίμαδι (*IGR* 3, 478, see ZGUSTA 1964: 101).
 - c) Ἀρτίμας 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), Ἀρτίμας was an ἄρχων Λυδίας. This passage by Xenophon gives us a list of satrap
6. *TAMI*, 94 and *KAI* II 309 dated the Aramaic inscription between the 5th and 4th centuries B.C.E., although other scholars prefer the middle of the 4th century B.C.E. (LIPINSKI 1975: 163). This PN is also documented as Ἀρτίμας in the Greek version of the bilingual inscription (*TAMI*, 152), which was written about four generations later.

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 ZGUSTA (1964: 101) suggests. On the contrary, since this derivative has been generated on the basis of *Artimu-* (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 *ʔrtym* also occurs in the Aramaic legend *l-ʔrtym* on a cylinder-seal from Asia Minor published several times (see BIVAR 1961: 119, who rightly corrected the old reading *lkntgm*; LIPÍŃSKI 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 *lʔrtym* on a small bronze coin of disputed origin. But, according to some scholars, this reading is far from being certain (see LIPÍŃSKI 1975: 16 ff., who proposes another reading), and therefore it will not be taken into account.

Lastly, one finds an Ἀρτιμας 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 (LIPÍŃSKI 1975: 167).⁷

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 Ἀρτιμας in a list of slave-names from Eleusis in 329/8 B.C.E. In Aramaic, this PN *ʔrtym* occurs with certainty twice (in the Aramaic inscription from Limyra 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 *ʔrtym* 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. Ἀρτιμας occurs in a Greek inscription of Lydia (Ἀρτιμας Παγρω, referring to a man from Sardis) and in a Greek inscription from Caria (Ἀρτιμα[ς Μ]ἄνεω). Ἀρτιμας is the name of a Phrigan slave (for all these instances, see ZGUSTA 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.⁸ 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, Cibiratis, 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).
- Ἀρτείου (gen.): *TAM* II.1, 176 a (Sisyma); 78 (Telmessos); *TAM* II.2, 551, 601a, 604 (Tlos); 689 (Kadyanda); *TAM* II.3, 722 & 886 (Akalisos); 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) Cibiratis (9 times):

- Ἀρτείμας: PETERSEN-VON LUSCHAN 1889: 200, 222.
- [A]ρτείμα[ς], Ἀρτείου (gen.): *SEG* 17, 742.
- Ἀρτείου: 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.
- Ἀρτείου (gen.): *CIG* 4367 d; *TAM* III.1, 14, 19, 56, 59, 132, 159, 238, 242, 270, 278, 305, 306, 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 *ʾrtym* could be epichoric as well, as some scholars suggested (LIPINSKI 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):

— Ἀρτεϊμας: *SEG* 6, 658 (Attaleia).

In accordance with these data, the PN *Arteimas* occurs 127 times in the Greek inscriptions from Anatolia.⁹ 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. Ἀρτίμας, 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 *l^ortym* that appears on a cylinder-seal from Asia Minor. This name also occurs in the Aramaic inscription from Limyra (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 *l^ortym* was a senior official under Cyrus the Younger and established a local rule in Limyra, as SHAHBAZI (2011) suggests, seems to me excessive. This scholar bases his hypothesis on the fact that the Aramaic inscription contains the PN *l^orzpy*, 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 *l^orzpy* and Artyphius is far from being certain: the Aram. *l^orzpy* 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 *Arzâp* mentioned in the Syriac text of Ezra (IV, 13, 45). And finally, LIPIŃSKI (1975), sees in this PN a typical compound of epichoric origin, formed by a first member *arza-* or *arsa-* plus the

9. Ἀρτεϊμος and Ἀρτεϊμης occur also in some few inscriptions from Phrighia-Lycia, Pisidia, Karia, Lycia and Pnygia-Pisidia (see ZGUSTA 1964: 101).

ending *-piya-* ‘to give’ or ‘gift’. To this scholar, *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 (*ʔrtmwš*) and the PN *Artimas* (*ʔrtym*), 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. **Rtima-* was extended into other languages, among which is the Aram. *ʔrtym* (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 *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 DONNER-RÖLLIG (*KAI* II 304-309),¹³ therefore very near to the regions and places where *Artim* is seen in Greek inscriptions.

The other variant, Ἀρτεμιας, much more documented as I have shown, may have had an epichoric origin based on the divine name Ἄρτεμις / *Ertemi*. In Lycian, this divine name appears as *Ertemi/Ertēmi* in a few inscriptions (MELCHERT 2004: 17 & NEUMANN 2007: 72):

- Dat. sg. *Ertēmi* (NEUMANN 1979: 311, 1) and *Ertemi* (NEUMANN 1979: 312, 5); maybe in NEUMANN (1979: 325, 5).
- Gen. adj. nom. sg. *Ertemehi*, 44c, 8.

According to NEUMANN (2007: 72), ‘die lyk. Lautung kann auf dorisch Ἄρταμις oder attisch/Koine Ἄρτεμις zurückgehen’.

In the Lycian inscriptions the equivalent PN Ἀρτεμιας (which is a derived PN of Ἄρτεμις/*Ertemi*) does not occur. However, it occurs in the Trilingual Stele of Létōn (N 320a,5), PN *Ertimele* (Gr. Ἀρτεμη-λις): it would be the only PN derived from *Ertemi* that appears in Lycian inscriptions. *Ertimele* would be the equivalent of Lyd. *Artimulis* (see § 1).

For the Gr. Ἀρτεμ-α-ς one should admit a metathesis of *i*: *Arteim-a-s* < **Artemi-a-s*. In Greek this kind of metathesis was frequent when *i* originally followed a liquid or a nasal: ἀγείρω ‘versammle’ < **ἀγερίω* < pres. **h₂ger-y-* < **h₂ger-* ‘sammeln, (zusammen)holen, nehmen’ (*LIV* 276); βαίνω ‘gehe’ < **βανίω* < pres. **g^wm-y-* < **g^wem-* ‘(wohin) gehen, kommen’ (*LIV* 209), **τείνω* ‘spanne, dehne aus’ < **τενίω* < pres. **ten-y-* < **ten-* ‘sich spannen, sich dehnen’ (*LIV* 267), etc. The ending *-α-ς*, which one should not expect in a PN coming from Ἄρτεμις/*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 (*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 *Arteimas* 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 Ἀρτεμηλις 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 *Artimúš* ‘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 Ἀρτεμ-ας. In fact the Lyd. *Artimas* and Lyd. *Artimúš* could be interpreted as the counterpart of the Gr. Ἀρτιμας and the Gr. Ἀρτεμ-ας respectively.

The same occurs in Aramaic, which, as it has been explained (§ 2), uses two different words to refer to these PN: *ʔrtym* ‘Artimas’ and *ʔrtmwš* ‘Artemis’. *ʔrtym* would have been the equivalent to the Gr. Ἀρτιμας and the Lyd. *Artimas*, whereas *ʔrtmwš* is the equivalent to the Lyc. *Ertēmi*, Ἀρτεμ-ας and the Lyd. *Artimu-š*.

In my opinion, the clear formal differentiation that Aramaic and Lydian show between these two names is crucial to understanding and clarifying the two different origins of these PN, 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	Origin
form		PN m. Ἀρτιμας	PN m. <i>Artimas</i>	PN m. <i>ʔrtym</i>	IRANIAN
deriv.			<i>Artima-li-</i>		
form	GN f. <i>Ertēmi</i> ‘Artemis’	PN m. Ἀρτεμ-ας	GN f. <i>Artimúš</i>	GN f. <i>ʔrtmwš</i> ‘Artemis’	EPICHORIC
deriv.	PN <i>Erttime-li</i>	PN Ἀρτεμη-λις	PN <i>Artimu-li-s</i>		

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 documented 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 Ἀρτεμιας 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 *ʔrtym* (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 Cibyratis 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 *lʔrtym* that appears in a cylinder-seal and the name *ʔrtym* from the funerary inscription from Limyra. The PN *ʔrtym* should be considered as being Iranian in origin and not indigenous (from the GN *Artemus* ‘Artemis’), as some scholars have suggested. Since Aramaic uses two different words to refer to the PN *Artimas* (*ʔrtym*) and the GN *Artemis* (*ʔrtmwš*), *ʔrtym* 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 Ἄρτεμις/*Ertemi* ‘Artemis’. The same occurs in Lydian, where an *Artimas*, from a clearly Iranian origin, is mentioned by Xenophon, whereas a GN *Artimus* ‘Artemis’ also occurs, this one with a clearly Greek-indigenous etymology. Since Lyd. *Artimas* and *Artimus* and Aram. *ʔrtym* and *ʔrtmwš* 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.

Bibliographical references

ABS = *Annual of the British School at Athens*.

An St = *Anatolian Studies. Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara*.

BCH = *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*.

BIVAR, A.D.H. (1961). «A ‘Satrap’ of Cyrus the Younger». *The Numismatic Chronicle*, 7th ser., 1, p. 119-127.

- BRANDENSTEIN, W. (1929). «Die lydische Sprache I». *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 36, p. 263-304.
- BUCKLER, W.H. (1924). *Sardis*, vol. VI, part II: *Lydian Inscriptions*. Leiden.
- CIG = *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, vol. II (ed. A. BOECKH), Berolini 1843; vol. III (ed. J. FRANZ), Berolini 1853.
- DARMESTETER, J. (1888). «L'inscription araméenne de Limyra». *Journal Asiatique* 8th ser., 12, p. 508-510.
- DITTENBERGER, W. (1915-22³). *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, vol. II. Leipzig.
- EVETTS, B.T.A. (1892). *Babylonische Texte*. Heft VI B, Leipzig.
- GUSMANI, R. (1964). *Lydisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
- HALLOCK, R.T. (1969). *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*. Chicago.
- HEBERDEY R.–KALINKA, E. (1896). *Bericht über zwei Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien*. Vienna.
- HINZ, W. (1975). *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*. Wiesbaden.
- IJR = CAGNAT, R. (1906). *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes*. Paris.
- JHS = *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.
- JUSTI, F. (1895). *Iranisches Namenbuch*. Marburg.
- KAI = DONNER, H.–RÖLLIG, W. (1969-73). *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*. Bd. I: *Texte*. Bd. II: *Kommentar*. Wiesbaden.
- LIPÍŃSKI, E. (1975). *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics*. Leuven.
- LIV = RIX, H. (2001²). *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.
- MAYRHOFER, M. (1971). «Neuere Forschungen zum Altpersischen». In SCHMITT-BRANDT, R. (ed.), *Donum Indogermanicum. Festgabe für Anton Scherer zum 70. Geburtstag*, Heidelberg, p. 62.
- (1973). *Onomastica Persepolitana. Das altiranische Namengut der Persepolis-Tafelchen*. Vienna.
- MELCHERT, C. (2004). *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor, Nova York.
- NEUMANN, G. (1979). *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*. Vienna.
- (2007). *Glossar des Lykischen*. Wiesbaden.
- PERLES, F. (1926). «Das Land Arzâph (IV Ezra 13,45)». *Archiv für Orientforschung* 3, p. 120-121.
- PETERSEN, E.–VON LUSCHAN, F. (1889). *Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibyris*. Vienna.
- RAYMOND, A.–BOWMAN, A. (1970). *Aramaic Ritual Texts from Persepolis*. Chicago.
- ROSENTHAL, F. (1968³). *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Wiesbaden.
- ROSENTHAL, F.–GREENFIELD, J.C.–SHAKED, S. (2011). «Aramaic». In YARSHATER, E. (ed.). *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (available online: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/aramaic-#pt1>).
- SACHAU, E. (1887). «Eine altaramäische Inschrift aus Lycien». *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 114, p. 3-7.
- SCHMITT, R. (1972). «Persepolitannisches III». *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 86, p. 82-92.
- (1982). *Iranisches Personennamenbuch*. Bd. V. *Iranische Namen in Nebenüberlieferungen indogermanischer Sprachen*. Fasz. 4. *Iranische Namen in den Indogermanischen Sprachen Kleinasien (Lykisch, Lydisch, Phrygisch)*, Vienna.
- SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. I sqq. Lugduni Batavorum 1923, Leiden.
- SHAHBAZI, A.SH. (2011). «Artyphios». In YARSHATER, E. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (available online: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/artypios-or-artypios-greek-rendering-of-an-old-persian-name-ardifiya-or-ardufiya-elamite-ir-tap-tup-pi-ya-the-varia>).

- SUNDWALL, J. (1913). *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier nebst einem Verzeichnisse kleinasiatischer Namenstämme*. Leipzig.
- TAM I = KALINKA, E. (1901). *Tituli Asiae Minoris*. Vol. I. *Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti*. Vienna.
- TAM II = KALINKA, E. (1920-1944). *Tituli Asiae Minoris*. Vol. II, fasc. 1-3. *Tituli Lyciae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti*. Vienna.
- TAM III.1 = HEBERDEY, R. (1941). *Tituli Asiae Minoris*. Vol. III, fasc. 1. *Tituli Pisidiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti. Tituli Termessi et agri Termessensis*. Vienna.
- WÖRRLE, M. (1995). «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens V. Die griechischen Inschriften der Nekropolen von Limyra». *Chiron* 25, p. 387-417.
- ZGUSTA, L. (1964). *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, Prague.
- (1970). *Neue Beiträge zur kleinasiatischen Anthroponymie*, Prag.
- ZWANZIGER, R. (1973). *Studien zur Nebenüberlieferung iranischer Personennamen in den griechischen Inschriften Kleinasiens. Ein Beitrag zu dem neuen Iranischen Namenbuch*. Unpublished Phil. Diss., Vienna.