

LIBRI

www.libridergi.org

Epigrafi, Çeviri ve Eleştiri Dergisi

Journal of Epigraphy, Reviews and Translations

Issue X (2024)

Notes on some Honorary Inscriptions from Kibyra

Selen KILIÇ ASLAN

 0000-0002-1921-5971



The entire contents of this journal, *Libri: Journal of Epigraphy, Translation and Review* is open to users and it is an 'open access' journal. Users are able to read the full texts, to download, to copy, print and distribute without obtaining the permission of the editor and author(s). However, all references to the articles published in the e-journal *Libri* are to indicate through reference the source of the citation from this journal.

Libri, is a peer-reviewed journal and the articles which have had their peer reviewing process completed will be published on the web-site (journal.phaselis.org) in the year of the journal's issue (e.g. Issue X: January-December 2024). At the end of December 2024 the year's issue is completed.

Responsibility for the articles published in this journal remains with the authors.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Citation Kılıç Aslan S. 2024, "Notes on some Honorary Inscriptions from Kibyra". *Libri* X, 1-7. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10491720

Received Date: 10.11.2023 | Acceptance Date: 24.12.2023

Online Publication Date: 26.01.2024

Article Type: Research Article

Editing: Phaselis Research Project
www.libridergi.org



Notes on some Honorary Inscriptions from Kibyra

Kibyra'dan Bazı Onurlandırma Yazıtları Üzerine Notlar

Selen KILIÇ ASLAN *

Abstract: This article revisits a few honorary inscriptions from Kibyra and discusses the identities of the persons mentioned in these inscriptions. In particular, it rediscusses how the name of the honouree in inscription *IKibyra* 40 could be restored and then shows that a posthumous honorary inscription for a Flavia Tata, published in 2019, does not, contrary to its editor's argument, confirm the existence of a person named Krateros, son of Flavius Krateros, supposedly honoured in *IKibyra* 40. Furthermore, it is argued that the inscription honouring Flavia Tata should be dated to the 1st century A.D. or to the beginning of the 2nd century A.D. at the very latest, not to the end of the 2nd century A.D. Finally, the adjective ἄγνός, ἡ, ὅν, which is only rarely used for women in the honorary inscriptions of Asia Minor, is examined, and the possible reasons why the *demos* chose this adjective to describe the qualities of Flavia Tata are explored.

Keywords: Kibyra, Flavius Krateros, Flavia Tata, asiarch, Xouamoas/Souamoas, ἄγνός

Öz: Bu makalede Kibyra'dan bazı onurlandırma yazıtları yeniden ele alınmakta ve bu yazıtlarda bahsi geçen kişilerin kimlikleri tartışılmaktadır. Özellikle *IKibyra* 40 numaralı yazıtta onurlandırılan kişinin isminin ne şekilde tamamlanabileceğine dair fikirler yeniden gündeme getirilmektedir. Ardından, 2019 yılında yayımlanmış olan, Flavia Tata adında bir kadının ölümünden sonra onurlandırıldığı bir yazıtın, editörünün yorumunun aksine, *IKibyra* 40'ta onurlandırıldığı varsayılan Flavius Krateros oğlu Krateros adlı bir şahsın varlığını hiç bir şekilde konfirme etmediği gösterilmektedir. Bunun yanı sıra, Flavia Tata'nın onurlandırıldığı yazıtın tarihlenmesi tartışılmakta ve ilgili yazıtın MS II. yüzyılın sonuna değil, MS I. yüzyıla ya da en geç MS II. yüzyılın başlarına tarihlenmesi gerektiği öne sürülmektedir. Ayrıca Flavia Tata'nın onurlandırılmasında seçilen ἄγνός, ἡ, ὅν sıfatı irdelenmekte ve Küçük Asya onurlandırma yazıtlarında kadınlar için son derece az kullanılan bu sıfatın *demos* tarafından neden tercih edilmiş olabileceği tartışılmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Kibyra, Flavius Krateros, Flavia Tata, *Asiarkhes*, Xouamoas/Souamoas, ἄγνός

In an appendix to a 2018 paper, I briefly dealt with an honorary inscription from Kibyra and proposed an alternative restoration, which mainly concerns the name of the honouree¹. In my view, the name of the honouree in lines 2-3 of *IKibyra* 40 could not be restored as

* Dr., Commission for Ancient History and Epigraphy of German Archaeological Institute, Munich. Selen.Kilic@dainst.de | ☎ 0000-0002-1921-5971

¹ Kiliç Aslan 2018, 510-511.

Κρά[τερον (?) Φλαβίου]ν Κρατέρου, since I could see the traces of two round letters on the photo of the inscription (*IKibyra* p. 55) in line 2 before ΥΚΡΑ, which were preceded by a letter that looked almost certainly to be a Μ². This observation led me to suggest that the name preceding Κρατέρου could have been Χουαμοας since a Χουαμοας was attested in *IKibyra* 64, also an honorary inscription, as the father of a Krateros (– – – Κράτερου Ξουαμοου). Hence, I tentatively reconstructed the name of the honouree in *IKibyra* 40 as Krateros, son of Χουαμοας³, grandson of Krateros. I mentioned that this man could have been an ancestor of Flavius Krateros, twice asiarch, while explicitly emphasising that Krateros was a relatively common name at Kibyra.

This restoration proposal has not been accepted by E. Alten Güler, who herself published a new posthumous honorary inscription from Kibyra for a certain Flavia Tata, who is attested in the epigraphic record for the first time, and is introduced in the text as the daughter of Claudius Nearchos and wife of Flavius Krateros⁴. In her argumentation, E. Alten Güler does not express her own views on the remains of the letters visible on the photo of *IKibyra* 40, but merely notes that I read a Μ in the inscription, albeit doubtfully. Subsequently, she writes “Zira yukarıdaki yazıtta Flavius Krateros ismi ve oğul Krateros ismi açıkken bu durum Corsten’in tamamlamasını doğrular niteliktedir”. It is unfortunately not clear which “inscription above” she is referring to, where the names of Flavius Krateros and his son Krateros are clearly documented, confirming the original restoration of the honouree’s name in *IKibyra* 40. The new inscription published by her only records a Flavius Krateros, but not a son of his⁵. E. Alten Güler also refers to *IKibyra* 64 and argues that my restoration cannot be accepted since Χουαμοας’ father’s name, that is, Krateros’ papponymic, is not included in that

² *IKibyra* 40 (Petersen & Luschan, *Lykien* 250): vac. [‘Ο δῆμος ἐτείμησεν vac. | Κρά[τερον (?) Φλαβίου]ν Κρατέρου [υἱὸν εὖς]εβῆ κτίστην | γενόμενον σωτήρα καὶ εὐ[]⁵ vac. εργέτην. vac. | ἐπιμεληθέντος τῆς μετακομιδῆς καὶ ἀναστάσεως τοῦ ἀνδριάντος κατὰ τὰ δόξαντα τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ · Μ(άρκου) · Κλ(αυδίου) · Φιλοκλέους ||¹⁰ Κασιανοῦ τοῦ γραμματέως | τῆς πόλεως ἔτους · ζμρ’ μηνὸς | Γορπιαίου εἰκάδι. ([*Das Volk ehrte*] Craterus [?], den Sohn des Flavius Craterus, den frommen Gründer, Retter und Wohltäter. –Für den Transport und die Aufstellung des Standbildes hat gemäß dem Beschluß des Rates und des Volkes M. Cl. Philocles Casianus gesorgt, der Schreiber der Stadt, im Jahre 147, am zwanzigsten Tag des Monats Gorpaios [German translation by Th. Corsten]).

³ *IKibyra* 40 ll. 1–5 as proposed by myself: vac. [‘Ο δῆμος ἐτείμησεν vac. | Κρά[τερον Ξο(?)υα]μοου Κρατέρου [τὸν εὖς]εβῆ κτίστην | γενόμενον σωτήρα καὶ εὐ[]⁵ vac. εργέτην. vac. ([*The demos honoured*] Kra[teros], son of [Xoua]moas, grandson of Krateros, the pious founder, saviour and benefactor). I noted in my paper that the name ending with –moas could also have been Souamoas rather than Χουαμοας, following *LGPV VC s.v.*, which was published in 2018 and I had access to only very shortly before submitting my paper for print (see p. 510 n. 39). Today I would restore the name as Souamoas (on this name, see Brixhe 2013, 188 n. 6). In order not to create any confusion though, I will continue with the name Χουαμοας in the following.

⁴ Alten Güler 2019, 336–338 no. 1 (*AE* 2019, 1604): ὁ δῆμος vac. ἐτείμησε | Φλαουίαν Ταταν, θυγατέρα | Κλαυδίου Νεάρχου, γυναῖκα | δὲ Φλαουίου Κρατέρου, ||⁵ ἀγνὴν φίλανδρον ἡρωίδα. E. Alten Güler mistakenly writes on p. 337 that my proposed restoration concerns *IKibyra* 64 (correct as *IKibyra* 40).

⁵ Therefore, the brief note in *AE* 2019, 1604 that “L’a. note que cette nouvelle inscription peut confirmer la restitution du nom proposée par T. Corsten pour *IKibyra* 40, qui n’avait pas été acceptée par S. Kiliç Aslan” should be disregarded. For the dating of this new inscription, given in *AE* 2019 as “2^e moitié du II^e s. p. C.”, see below.

text. Obviously, however, this is not a valid argument. It was not a standard practice to employ a papponymic in the epigraphic record. One and the same person could be recorded in one inscription with a papponymic and in another without one⁶. To be able to argue that two particular persons cannot be identical, one must see that they bear different papponymics. It is of course possible that my reading and restoration proposal based on an observation of the photo printed in *IKibyra* is incorrect⁷, and we certainly do not know what future finds may reveal⁸. At present, however, neither the new text published by E. Alten Güler, nor her vague argumentation refutes this proposal.

As a matter of fact, the new text even strengthens the possibility that the honouree in *IKibyra* 40 was *not* called Krateros, son of Flavius Krateros, since the son of two Roman citizens would also be a Roman citizen himself as he would be born of a *matrimonium iustum* and would carry his father's gentilicial name. If he were already born prior to the enfranchisement of his parents, he would most probably have received Roman citizenship alongside them⁹. As such, the son of a Flavius Krateros and a Flavia Tata would most probably be a Flavius Krateros (if Krateros were his personal name), and not simply a Krateros¹⁰. Although gentilicial names were not always employed in epigraphic material, one would not normally drop the son's *nomen gentile* and keep only that of the father's in the former's nomenclature, provided that the son was also a Roman citizen¹¹. As a matter of fact, in the case of an honouree, we can be absolutely certain that this would not happen. It is therefore contradictory that E. Alten Güler both accepts the name in *IKibyra* 40 as Krateros, son of Flavius Krateros, but at the same time identifies the father Flavius Krateros of this inscription with the man recorded in the new text as the husband of Flavia Tata¹².

⁶ For instance, a certain Pigres from Idebessos in Lycia is attested in one inscription as "Pigres, son of Pigres", in another one as "Pigres the second", and in a third inscription as "Pigres, son of Pigres, grandson of Kondosas" (*TAM* II 835; 836; 859 respectively. See also *LGPN* VB s.v. no. 24; Kılıç Aslan 2023, 129).

⁷ Although I have carefully examined the photo, I have neither seen the stone itself nor the squeeze of the inscription preserved in Vienna.

⁸ Note, however, that even though I did not agree with the restoration of the honouree's name in *IKibyra* 40, I did not argue against the possible existence of a son of Flavius Krateros (see Kılıç Aslan 2018, 508 with n. 35).

⁹ See, e.g., the case of Licinnius Thoas and Licinnius Mousaios from Oinoanda, who were certainly enfranchised alongside their father Licinnius Mousaios the elder (*IGR* III 500 B ll. 7–12). For the enfranchisement of *peregrini* in the Roman East and the marriages of enfranchised provincials, see Kılıç Aslan 2023, 176–192.

¹⁰ In fact, we know that Flavius Krateros' daughter Tlepolemia was a Roman citizen, but unfortunately, her gentilicial name has not been fully preserved (see n. 15 below).

¹¹ In cases where we find persons who did not bear a gentilicial name themselves but only their fathers did, this most probably implies that the father had married a *peregrina*, thus did not enter a legal Roman marriage and could not extend his Roman status to his children (see Kılıç Aslan 2023, 185–187 with further bibliography on this topic).

¹² On another note, E. Alten Güler's identification of Xouamoas of *IKibyra* 64 with the father of the asiarch Flavius Krateros is on present evidence very doubtful. I deliberately refrained from making such an identification in my 2018 paper even though I proposed to restore the honouree's patronymic in *IKibyra* 40 as Xouamoas.

E. Alten Güler's dating of the new honorary inscription and her chronological reconstruction of events is erroneous. She dates the new text to *ca.* end of the IInd century A.D. on the basis that *IKibyra* 40 is dated to A.D. 170 (correct as A.D. 171, see Th. Corsten's precise dating in the Kibyran corpus). However, only the events mentioned in the second part of *IKibyra* 40, that is, the relocation and re-erection of the honouree's statue (ll. 6–12), are dated to A.D. 171, as already discussed by Th. Corsten and myself¹³. The honouree, whose identity is the subject of the appendix in my 2018 paper, had already been paid honours before this date. His honorary inscription (ll. 1–5) was simply rewritten on the new statue base in the IInd century A.D. when his statue was relocated. However, we do not know exactly when he had been honoured. Th. Corsten tentatively dated this to the end of the Ist century A.D., apparently based on the restoration of the honouree's patronymic as Flavius Krateros, while I tentatively suggested the Ist century B.C.¹⁴.

Flavius Krateros, twice asiarch, with whom E. Alten Güler identifies the Flavius Krateros of the new inscription, was active in late Ist century A.D.¹⁵. Hence, if we have the same man here as she suggests, the new text can only be from the Ist century A.D. (but from after A.D. 69)¹⁶ or early IInd century A.D.¹⁷ at the very latest. The letter forms (e.g., the almost semi-circular omega, mu with sloping outer strokes, and fine apices) also point to an earlier period in the Roman era than the end of the IInd century A.D.¹⁸. In fact, there is also one other chronological hint in the text. The father of Flavia Tata was named Claudius Nearchos. Thus, the father and the daughter had differing *nomina gentilia* although we would expect the daughter of a Claudius to be a Claudia. On the other hand, the daughter had the *nomen gentile* of her husband: she was a Flavia. As I argued elsewhere, such cases can most plausibly be explained on the assumption that the husband and wife had married while they were still *peregrini* and acquired Roman status together¹⁹. As such, Krateros and Tata will have married sometime in the Ist century A.D. but before they became Flavii, while Tata's father Nearchos

¹³ For the relevant discussion, see Th. Corsten's commentary to *IKibyra* 37; 40, and Kiliç Aslan 2018, 510–511.

¹⁴ See previous note.

¹⁵ See Herz 1992, 95–100; Friesen 1993, 217; Hall *et al.* 1996, 135–136. E. Alten Güler (p. 337 with n. 14) cites and presents *IKibyra* 40 (for the Greek text, see n. 2 above in this paper) as the inscription that gives us a broad generational information on the lineage of Flavius Krateros. However, the only information that one could get from this inscription about Flavius Krateros' lineage is that he had a son named Krateros, if, of course, we follow the restoration in *IKibyra*. The Greek inscriptions that *do* provide information on the identities of the descendants of Flavius Krateros are *IKibyra* 63 and 69. Reitzenstein 2014, 583 no. 10 can also be added to this list as it records Flavius Krateros' daughter [Flav?]ia/[Marc?]ia Tlepolemis even though Krateros himself is not mentioned in the text.

¹⁶ This more precise dating is based on the gentilicial name Flavius.

¹⁷ Early IInd century A.D. comes into question especially due to the typically large age gap between husband and wife in antiquity and the fact that the inscription was carved after Flavia Tata's death.

¹⁸ It should be emphasised that the difference between the palaeographical features of *IKibyra* 40, which was demonstrably carved in late IInd century A.D., and those of the honorary inscription for Flavia Tata (see Alten Güler 2019, 337 Fig. 2) is quite significant.

¹⁹ See Kiliç Aslan 2023, 189–190. For a more detailed discussion of this topic with various examples from Lycia, see Kiliç Aslan (forthcoming).

will have become a Roman citizen only after his daughter married away. Thus, the persons recorded in the new honorary inscription can plausibly be dated the Ist century A.D. On this basis, we can indeed assume that the Flavius Krateros of the new inscription is identical with Flavius Krateros, twice asiarch, even though it is somewhat problematic that such a high office was not mentioned in the new text. There may be two explanations for this. One is that Flavia Tata died before her husband held the high-priesthood of Asia. Another is that the statue base, which was not found *in situ*²⁰, was originally set up together with other statues honouring Flavius Krateros and some other members of the family, so that it was not necessary to repeat the offices held by Flavius Krateros in the honorary inscription for Flavia Tata.

One further detail in the new inscription is also worth discussing here, that is, the adjective ἄγνός, ἡ, όν, (pure, chaste, holy)²¹ that was used to describe the qualities of Flavia Tata. At Kibyra, it is attested only in one other inscription, namely in *IKibyra* 75, although in the form of an adverb as ἄγνῶς, and is used there to emphasise that the honouree, a man whose name has not been preserved, had held the office of an *agoranomos* in an honest and incorruptible manner, as discussed by Th. Corsten²². In fact, in honorary inscriptions of Roman Asia Minor, the adjective (also in the superlative form as ἄγνότατος) is often used to stress the honesty and integrity of a magistrate or a Roman official²³. On the other hand, there are very few inscriptions from Asia Minor, where the adjective is used in reference to a woman²⁴. One of these is a Hellenistic inscription from Philadelphia in Lydia about the regulations of a private cult, where it literally has the sense “chaste” and signifies sexual fidelity to a husband²⁵. Yet, better parallels for the Kibyran text are offered by honorary inscriptions from the Roman period. At Herakleia Salbake, the benefactress Ammia, daughter of Charmides, who had acted as a *prytanis* and *stephanephoros* alongside her husband, is described in her honorary inscription by the *demos* (in the following order) as ἄγνή, σώφρων, κεκοσμημένη πάσῃ ἀρετῇ ἥθεσι καὶ φιλανδρίᾳ²⁶. A very similar case from the same city concerns Tate, daughter of Glykon²⁷. Tate’s father was a *stephanephoros* twice, gymnasiarch, priest of Herakles and a leading member of the *boule* (προγραφείς τῆς βουλῆς). Tate herself was a *stephanephoros*, gymnasiarch and the first woman (apparently at Herakleia Salbake) to enter the most sacred *gerousia*²⁸. There is no reference to a husband of hers in the text, but she is also described as ἄγνή. At Aphrodisias, Tata, daughter of Diodoros, is praised by the *boule*,

²⁰ See Alten Güler 2019, 336.

²¹ See *LSJ s.v.* E. Alten Güler translates it into Turkish as “aziz, temiz, namuslu”.

²² See the commentary to *IKibyra* 75 and Alten Güler 2019, 337 n. 11.

²³ Robert, *OMS* VI 293 with n. 8. See more recently Heller & Suspène 2019, 509–516; Fröhlich 2020, 22.

²⁴ Inscriptions where the adjective was used in reference to a Goddess are obviously not particularly relevant (e.g., *IAssos* 26 l. 20; Merkelbach & Stauber 1996, 26 no. 11 l. 16).

²⁵ *TAM* V 1539 ll. 35–36: γυναῖκα ἐλευθέραν ἄγνήν εἶν[αι καὶ μὴ γινώσκ]ειν ἄ[λ]λου ἀνδρὸς πλὴν τοῦ ἰδίου εὐνή[ν ἢ συνουσίαν].

²⁶ Robert, *Carie* 66 (*MAMA* VI 119).

²⁷ Robert, *Carie* 67 (*BE* 1955, 202).

²⁸ For this woman, see also Cluzeau 2021, 212–213.

demos and *gerousia*, as the ἄγνή priestess of Hera for life²⁹. Tata had also performed as a priestess of the imperial cult twice and a *stephanephoros*. At Phokaia, Flavia Ammion *alias* Aristion, daughter of Moschos, who had held the office of a high priestess of Asia of the temple in Ephesos, *prytanis*, *stephanephoros* twice, priestess of Massalia and an *agonothetis*, is honoured by the *phyle* of the Teuthadeis ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸν βίον κοσμιότητός τε καὶ ἄγνείας³⁰. At Thyateira, Claudia Ammion, daughter of Metrodoros Lepidas, a priestess of the imperial cult, high priestess of the city for life, and an *agonothetis*, who performed this office λαμπρῶς καὶ πολυδαπάνως, was honoured by the dyers (οἱ βαφεῖς)³¹. The text ends by praising her for excelling in ἄγνεία and σωφροσύνη. It is a well-known fact that women were usually praised in honorary inscriptions for “female” virtues such as being modest or for their love for their husbands and children³². Therefore, ἄγνός/ἄγνεία may well have been used in these cases to stress the purity or chastity of these women. However, the context of its use seems to go beyond the familial setting, at least in the above discussed honorary texts from Asia Minor, and apparently refers to the integrity of these women’s character, which must have been an important asset also for the offices they held³³. Turning back to the new inscription, it is in fact possible that being an elite woman and the wife of Flavius Krateros, Flavia Tata also assumed certain public roles, even if this was not mentioned in the current text as in the case of her husband, and this may be one of the reasons why the adjective ἄγνός was chosen by the *demos* in posthumously commemorating her.

We may now briefly summarise the main points raised above. Firstly, the new posthumous honorary inscription for Flavia Tata does not confirm the restoration of the honouree’s name in *I.Kibyra* 40 as “Krateros, son of Flavius Krateros”, but rather weakens it. Secondly, it is indeed highly possible that the Flavius Krateros of the new inscription is identical with Flavius Krateros, twice asiarch, so that we are now informed about the identity of his wife, Flavia Tata. Thirdly, the new text should be dated to the Ist century A.D. (after A.D. 69) or early IInd century A.D. at the very latest, but certainly not to the end of IInd century A.D. Finally, while this must remain for the time being just a hypothesis, the adjective ἄγνός used to describe Flavia Tata in the inscription may perhaps imply that she took on certain public roles.

²⁹ *I.Aphrodisias* 2007 12.29 ii (*MAMA* VIII 492b). See also Cluzeau 2021, 212.

³⁰ *IGR* IV 1325.

³¹ *TAM* V 972.

³² See Mantas 2000, 218. A detailed study of virtues attributed to men and women in Greek honorary inscriptions in the Hellenistic and Roman periods can now be found in Siekierka *et al.* 2021, 73–82; 112–122 (for the epithet ἄγνή, see p. 113 with n. 418).

³³ In this respect, see also Heller & Suspène 2019, 511–512, who note, on the basis of the afore-mentioned inscriptions Robert, *Carie* 66 and 67, that “L’usage public du titre *hagnos* au féminin est donc possible, mais bien plus rare que son équivalent masculin”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY*

- Alten Güler E. 2019, “Kibyra’dan Yeni Onurlandırma Yazıtları”. *Libri V*, 335–340. Source: <http://www.libridergi.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/lbr.201944.pdf>
- Brixhe C. 2013, “La Pamphylie. Peuplement et dialecte : 40 ans de recherche”. *Kadmos* 51/1, 169–205.
- Cluzeau F. 2021, “Karia’da Kadınların Kamusal Rolünü Artıran Unsurlar”. *Cedrus IX*, 197–218. DOI: 10.13113/CEDRUS.202110
- Friesen S. J. 1993, *Twice Neokoros. Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 116). Leiden/New York/Köln.
- Fröhlich P. 2020, “*Philanthropia* in Context: Civic Virtues and Praise of Officials in the *Poleis* of Hellenistic Asia Minor”. Eds. O. Tekin, Ch. H. Roosevelt & E. Akyürek, *Philanthropy in Anatolia through the Ages. The First International Suna & İnan Kıraç Symposium on Mediterranean Civilizations - March 26–29, 2019, Antalya: Proceedings*. İstanbul, 13–28.
- Hall A. S., N. P. Milner & J. J. Coulton 1996, “The Mausoleum of Licinnia Flavilla and Flavianus Diogenes of Oinoanda: Epigraphy and Architecture”. *AS* 46, 111–144.
- Heller A. & Suspène A. 2019, “C. Asinius Gallus *hagnos* à Temnos : la rhétorique civique face au pouvoir romain”. Eds. A. Heller, Ch. Müller & A. Suspène, *Philorhōmaios kai philhellèn: hommage à Jean-Louis Ferrary*. Genève, 501–520.
- Herz P. 1992, “Asiarchen und Archiereiai. Zum Provinzialkult der Provinz Asia”. *Tyche* 7, 93–115.
- Kılıç Aslan S. (forthcoming), “Some Chronological Considerations about the Marriage of C. Licinnius Thoas and Licinnia Tation from Oinoanda”. Eds. Ch. Schuler & F. Onur, *Proceedings of the Symposium on New Research on Greek Epigraphy in Lycia. Antalya, Turkey, 28–30 March 2022*.
- Kılıç Aslan S. 2018, “Elite Lycian Families and their Matrimonial Alliances with Distinguished Houses of Kibyra. Some Notes on an Honorary Inscription from Lydai”. Eds. M. Arslan & F. Baz, *Arkeoloji, Tarih ve Epigrafi’nin Arasında: Prof. Dr. A. Vedat Çelgin’in 68. Doğum Günü Onuruna Makaleler*. İstanbul, 501–512.
- Kılıç Aslan S. 2023, *Lycian Families in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods. A Regional Study of Inscriptions: towards a Social and Legal Framework* (Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy 19). Leiden/Boston.
- Mantas K. 2000, “Public and Private”. *Polis: revista de ideas y formas políticas de la Antigüedad* 12, 181–228.
- Merkelbach R. & Stauber J. 1996, “Die Orakel des Apollon von Klaros”. *EA* 27, 1–54.
- Reitzenstein D. 2014, “Neue Inschriften aus Tlos: Kronoskult, Agonistik und Euergetismus”. *Chiron* 44, 551–613.
- Sickierka P., K. Stebnicka & A. Wolicki 2021, *Women and the Polis: Public Honorific Inscriptions for Women in the Greek cities from the Late Classical to the Roman Period* (2 Volumes). Berlin.

* Abbreviations of epigraphical editions and reference works follow the “Liste des abréviations des éditions et ouvrages de référence pour l’épigraphie grecque alphabétique (GrEpiAbbr – Version 02, Janvier 2022)” developed by the *Association Internationale d’Épigraphie Grecque et Latine*.