

From Iranian to Greek via Aramaic: A Proposal for ‘odrogos’ (Metropolis, Ionia)

Bartomeu OBRADOR-CURSACH – Diego CORRAL VARELA*

Abstract: The term *odrogos* designates some kind of office associated with to the cults of Ares and Zeus Krezimos in the city of Metropolis (Ionia) from the Hellenistic period to the 2nd century CE, although its origin has so far eluded identification. This paper presents a first linguistic analysis of the term, arguing for an Iranian etymology **adranga-*. The phonetic differences observed suggest that the loan did not pass directly into Greek. Instead, it likely entered Greek through Aramaic, where several forms related to the same Iranian etymon are attested. Based on this new identification, some proposals are offered as to its function and the time of its adoption. Thus, the hypothesis defended here is that the figure of the *odrogos* is related to the practice, reasonably well known in Asia Minor, of the purchase of priesthoods. The conjunction of all the preceding data, including the term’s attestations and proposed linguistic analysis, makes it feasible to place the contact scenario within the period of Seleucid control over Ionia.

Type: Research Article

Received: 07.11.2024

Accepted: 16.12.2024

DOI: 10.37095/gephyra.1580661

Language: English


Keywords: Iranian loanword; Aramaic transmission; Greek linguistic contact; priesthood sale; Ares worship.


Gephyra 29 (2025), 9-26

1. Introduction

1.1. ὀδρωγός in its setting

The religious history of the Hellenistic and Imperial Metropolis in Ionia presents very stimulating traits for the researchers because of the particularities of the local pantheon. To begin with, the name of this Greek city, still preserved in its Turkish rendering Torbalı, derives from Μητήρ and associates the city with the Anatolian Mother Goddess. The presence of a cave near the city dedicated to the worship of the goddess confirms this statement. However, the most relevant peculiarity of local religiosity is the presence of a temple devoted to Ares on the acropolis of the city and its representation on local coins. Refining some prior thoughts, Alexander T. Millington¹ suggested a syncretism between this Greek god and Iyarri, the Luwian god of war and plague. Whatever the Greek theonym hides in Metropolis, the tutelary role of this god confers him an elevated status in this city, only comparable with that of Halikarnassos (if Mars in Vitruvius 2.8.10-11 is indeed the same god through the Roman *interpretatio*).² The third god attested in the city with a public cult is Zeus Krezimos. We do not know the antecedents of this god: its unparalleled epithet has been suggested to be Greek, but the explanation is not easy to assume, so it possibly hides

* **Dr. Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach**, Universitat de Barcelona, Institut Universitari del Pròxim Orient Antic (obradorcursach@gmail.com |  0000-0001-6515-2855).

Dr. Diego Corral Varela, University of Salamanca, Faculty of Philology (diego.corral@usal.es |  0000-0001-5517-6909).

Acknowledgement: The authors are very grateful to Elena P. Hernández Rivero (SCI - USal), who carried out the painstaking task of correcting the English text and improving its style. This revision was funded by the Vice-Chancellery of Investigation of the University of Salamanca. We would also like to thank anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments, which helped to improve this paper. Needless to say, any remaining errors are the sole responsibility of the authors.

¹ Millington 2013.

² *in summa arce media Martis fanum habens statuam colossicam acrolithon nobili manu Leocharis factam; hanc autem statuam alii Leocharis, alii Timothei putant esse* ‘at the top of the hill, in the centre, is the temple of Mars, containing a colossal acrolithic statue by the famous hand of Leochares. That is, some think that this statue is by Leochares, others by Timotheus’ (translation by M. H. Morgan).

another origin.³ As can be seen, whether Krezimos is etymologically Greek or not, the city evidences a religious fusion of different traditions.

The organization of the worship of the two male gods, Ares and Zeus Krezimos, is known through several inscriptions detailing the annual offices at each temple between the Hellenistic period and the 2nd century CE. Within these lists, another distinctive feature of Metropolis emerges: after the identification of the priest (ἱερεὺς), followed by a priestess (ἱέρεια) and attendants (διάκονοι), there appears, always in the same order, an unparalleled title, οδρογος. While early scholars working on the epigraphic corpus considered it a possible personal name, ulterior findings led B. Dreyer and H. Engelmann⁴ to conclude that this was another office of the temple.⁵ The lists of the religious personnel are quite simple: each title is followed by the name of the person or people occupying it. See the following example, which can be representative of the whole corpus (EDEN num. 082):

ἱερεὺς Ἄρεως·	8	ρίων Ἀρτεμιδώ-	<i>Priest of Ares: Artemidoros (son)</i>
Ἀρτεμίδωρος		ρου, Ἑρμόλαος,	<i>of Artemidoros. Priestess: Meltine</i>
Ἀρτεμίδωρου		Παπαρίων κὲ Ἀρ-	<i>(daughter) of Beryllos. Attendants:</i>
4 ἱέρηα·		τεμίδωρος οἱ Πα-	<i>Paparion (son) of Artemidoros,</i>
Μελτίνη Βη-	12	παρίωνος· Μητράς	<i>Hermolaos, Paparion and</i>
ρύλλου. διά-		Ἑρμίου· οδρογος·	<i>Artemidoros (sons) of Paparion,</i>
κονοι· Παπα-		Ἀρτεμᾶς Ἀττάλου	<i>Metras (son) of Hermias. Odrogos:</i>
			<i>Artemas (son) of Attalos.</i>

There are about thirty inscriptions⁶ attesting οδρογος, which is followed (when preserved) by these male personal names: Ἀρτεμᾶς Ἀττάλου (EDEN num. 82), Φιλίσκος Εὐκλέους (83), Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀγαπωμένου (84), Πρωτογένης Ἄγνου (85, 92), Σεραπᾶς Εὐκλέους (87, 88, 91, 94, 106, 120, 121a, also in 114, where *odrogos* is lost), Λεωνίδης Λεωνίδου (89), Ἀτταλος Ἀρτεμᾶ (95), Ἀλέξανδρος (98, 99, 100, 104, 128, 129 and 132), Τυχικός (101 and 102) and [--- Θε]ογένου (num. 118).⁷ Dreyer (in EDEN) infers from the inscriptions that the οδρογοι were appointed every year (with some exceptions), so it seems like their post was distinct from the more obvious worship positions. Some οδρογοι (such as Protogenes) were active for several years and some families can be identified: for example, Serapas and Philiskos (who is also attested in the corpus as διάκονος) were Eucles's sons. Moreover, two personal names, attested in Roman-era inscriptions, occur

³ B. Dreyer (apud Aybek – Gülbay 2019, 248) has suggested, without developing the idea, a connection with the Latin verb *cresco* for Κρηζιμος (attested always in the genitive), and it compares with the ancient Κρήσιον, a mountain on the border of Tegea, Sparta and Argos (Aybek – Gülbay 2019, 247). In classical Greek, the form Κρήσιος, α, ον is a regular ethnic for 'Cretan' (cf. Suda s.v. Κρήσιος : Κρητικός or LSJ s.v. Κρής). Although considered unsatisfactory for the mountain, a connection with Κρηζιμος is morphologically difficult to assume because of the presence of -ζ-. The comparison with Latin *cresco*, i.e. a derivation from the PIE root **kerh3-* (LIV² 329, with some conflictive points), is also problematic: the root is productive in Greek, but again the presence of a consonant ζ between the root Κρη- (in plain full grade) and the suffix -ισμός cannot be explained.

⁴ Dreyer – Engelmann 2009, 175.

⁵ This identification is now beyond any doubt. See also, Sponsel 2017, 50-52 and Aybek *et al.* 2018, 75.

⁶ EDEN nums. 82-89, 91-92, 94-95, 98-102, 104, 106, 109, 118, 120, 121a, 128-129 and 132.

⁷ In the last inscription only the patronymic is partially retained. EDEN prefers to be more cautious here editing it as: οδρο[γος· - - - - - Θε-]||ογε[ν-]||[- - - - -].

without patronymic (Ἀλέξανδρος and Τυχικός), which may indicate that these people were slaves (see all these observations in EDEN).

However, there is no guarantee that this is the case, as there are examples of free people recorded without a patronymic. This is sentenced, for example, in Bradley H. McLean's introduction to Greek epigraphy: "[i]n inscriptions, it is often impossible to distinguish between free men, freedmen, and slaves",⁸ "the omission of the patronymic in contexts where one is expected may indicate servile status. However, even this is not conclusive, since eminent persons are also known to have omitted their patronymic [...] There are, in fact, no absolutely reliable onomastic indicators to determine servile status in the absence of such a term as δούλος or θρέπτος".⁹ In addition, there are famous people whose name suffices as identification: neither the Pope nor Madonna needs a surname.

As to the functions of this office, the inscriptions do not provide any explicit information. Dreyer (in EDEN) assumed that the Metropolitan οδρογοί might be compared to the Ephesian hierophants, who assisted the priests (who were not specialists) with their cultic knowledge. However, this assumption is not based on positive data. Therefore, identifying the origin of οδρογος is the first step in delving deeper into its function in the cult of Ares and Zeus Krezimos in Metropolis. According to Dreyer, the word is "ein Relikt aus der vorgriechischen Zeit dieses Kultes für den ursprünglich einheimischen Gott" (EDEN s.v. Ares). Our attempt, then, is to identify the original language of this word and to see to what extent its etymology allows us to delimit the functions associated with the title and when it entered the local Greek lexicon.

1.2. οδρογος' noun class: patterns and distribution

In the scholarly literature on odrogos, this term has been unanimously regarded as one of the titles listed in the contexts where it appears, with the sole exception of Zgusta (KPN 370, § 1071). For one of the inscriptions (erroneously located in Lydia, and not in Metropolis), he listed it with doubts among his influent compilation of Anatolian proper names. The sole example offered by him pertains to the first list of the well-known inscription EDEN 1:

ἱερεὺς Μεγάλου Διὸς	Ἑρμᾶς Γάϊος Οἰκεῖο[ς]· διακων Σύν-
Κρηζίμου [Τ]ερτυλ-	εσις· διάκονοι Οἰκεῖος Διονυ-
λιανὸς Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ	σίου καὶ Δημήτριος· Τ(ίτος) Φλ(άουιος) Τατια-
Μητροδώρου· ἱέρ[ει]α Περιγε-	10 νός· οδρογος· Ἀλέξαν-
5 νις ἢ μήτηρ τοῦ ἱερέως· ὕδρο-	δρος
βάφος Μοσχίον Τερτυλλιανο(ῦ)	

It is true that, if we leave aside the editor's punctuation, one might assume here (as in many other inscriptions in which it appears) that, being an unrecognizable term, it represents yet another

⁸ McLean 2014, 129.

⁹ McLean 2014, 103.

personal name and that both ^(*)Odrogos and Alexandros are simply additional διάκονοι. However, in support of Boris Dreyer's conclusions on this matter,¹⁰ there are several elements that allow us to exclude *odrogos* from the list of personal names.

First, *odrogos* appears exclusively within the corpus of this city and specifically within the cult of Ares and Zeus Krezimos, with up to 25 attestations. This would suggest that it is an anthroponym uniquely tied to this cult and never used outside of it, which is highly unusual. Furthermore, it always appears in the same position, as if bearing this supposed name precluded the individual from fulfilling any other role.

Additionally, it is notable that in many inscriptions, with the exception of the priest (ιερεύς), personal names typically consist of a single component, usually followed by a patronymic. It would be highly suspicious, then, that precisely in this position and uniquely with this name, we consistently find a bipartite personal name.

The most compelling argument, however, for interpreting *odrogos* as a title rather than a personal name can be drawn from the syntax of certain inscriptions. Although names are often listed asyndetically, in some examples, the presence of a conjunction allows us to exclude *odrogos* from the preceding list, often that of the διάκονοι:¹¹

	διάκονοι	
8	Ἀσιατική · καὶ Ἀθη-	<i>Diacons: Asiatike and</i>
	ναγόρας · οδρογος	<i>Athenagoras. Odrogos:</i>
	Ἀλέξανδρος	<i>Alexandros</i>

2. In search of an etymology: Anatolian and Greek (no) data

Once the lexical category of οδρογος is established, its greatest challenge lies in the fact that it is not an intelligible term for modern researchers. Since the word appears in a Greek text, one might initially assume that it is a term in the Greek language, albeit one unique to this city. However, the word lacks any features that could link it to Greek, a language that is, of course, well-known. Attempts to interpret it within the framework of Greek have proven unproductive.

Zgusta (KPN 370, § 1071), as an alternative to identifying it as a personal name, suggested that it might be the result of a scribal error involving the gamma, proposing that *odrogos* could instead represent a Greek Beiname: ὁ δρόσος. He supported this hypothesis with a parallel from an inscription from Notion (Ionia): Γναῖ(ος) Κοσσοῦτιος Δρόσος Γναί(ου) Κοσσοῦτιου Δρόσου.¹² However, this interpretation faces significant issues. The presumed presence of a definite article is already unusual in the lists from Metropolis, as well as in the parallel offered. Furthermore, the consistency in spelling across all known attestations of οδρογος categorically excludes the possibility of a scribal error, and thus its equivalence with Δρόσος. In Zgusta's defense, it is worth noting that he seems to have been aware of only a single instance of the term.

¹⁰ “Odrogos n'est pas un nom d'individu indigène, ce que L. Zgusta avait supposé dans le passé, en raison du petit nombre de listes contenant ce nom. Odrogos est plutôt le nom d'une charge dans le culte d'Ares ainsi que dans d'autres cultes.” (Dreyer 2008, 413).

¹¹ Cf. Aybek *et al.* 2018, 86-87, no. S, lines 7-10.

¹² Macridy 1905, 164.

Greek lacks plausible alternative explanations unless one assumes a vocalic confusion between /o/ and /i/, another between /a/ and /o/, and a form of haplography leading to ὕδραγωγός > οδρογός, considering the documented form ὕδραγέω (*PCair.Zen.* 380.6), a variant of the more common ὕδραγωγέω. However, each of these phonetic shifts would be highly unusual in the Ionic context (despite being documented in some papyri from other regions), and their simultaneous occurrence to produce a consistently spelled word renders this scenario entirely implausible.

Once any Greek interpretation is ruled out, the native languages of Anatolia become a potential source to consider, despite the limitations of their corpora. Due to geographical proximity, Carian might be a language worth examining. However, the lists of priests written in this language do not feature anything comparable. In the bilingual inscription from Hyllarima (*C.Hy* 1, containing several lists of priests), dating to the Hellenistic period, only the term *qmolš* ('priests') appears, with no other title or term that could be associated with οδρογός.¹³ Similarly, neither Lydian nor Lycian, nor the other fragmentary languages of Anatolia from the first millennium BCE and/or the Roman period, offer any terms or sequences that could be related to the word in question. None of the words documented in the limited Sidetic corpus¹⁴ or in Pisidian,¹⁵ the most recent of the Anatolian languages, offer any possibility, nor does the language from the Balkans in central Anatolia, Phrygian.¹⁶ Even extending the scope further in time and space, Hittite and Luwian provide little opportunity for comparison. While a word like Hittite *uddar/n-* and Cuneiform Luwian *ūtar/n-* ('word, spell') might appear to bear some resemblance to the beginning of the enigmatic term from Metropolis, any derivational chain leading to the documented form would be entirely arbitrary and lack any known parallels. The same can be adduced for any speculative connection with Hittite *watar* ('water'), although water played a role in Metropolis, as evidenced by the title ὕδροβάφος ('dipped in water') in EDEN 1.¹⁷

3. Another perspective: from Iranian **ādranga-* to Greek οδρογός (via Aramaic)

Since the Anatolian corpora (including the Phrygian language) offer no parallel to this word, alternative candidates can be found in the languages introduced into Anatolia during and after the Achaemenid period. The presence of Aramaic in Anatolia during this period is well known: inscriptions in Official Achaemenid Aramaic were found in Saraydın (*KAI* 261), Gözne, Meydancıkale, Kесеcek Köyü, Hemite, Bahadırli, Hedioiren, Yukari Bozkuyu, Göller, Kumkulluk (Cilicia), Agaça Kale (Cappadocia, a bilingual inscription), Xanthos (including the outstanding trilingual inscription and a bilingual fragment), Limyra (Lycia), Sardis (Lydia), Gordion (Phrygia), Daskyleion and Sultaniye Köy (Hellaspontic Phrygia). The presence of this language lasted for several centuries. Inscriptions in Aramaic from the post-Achaemenid period have been found at Arebsum and Faraşa, in Capadoccia. Moreover, while minting with Aramaic legends was also quite common in Cilicia during the Achaemenid period, it survived, at least in Tarsus, for some years after the Macedonian conquest.¹⁸ In addition, sporadic remains of Aramaic are found in

¹³ Adiego 2019, 33–34 and 35–41.

¹⁴ In Pamphylian, the Greek dialect of that region, the personal name Ορδοῦτος (genitive of Ορδοῦς) exists, whose root Brixhe (1996, 80–81) locates in other Anatolian names. However, it cannot be related to the word we are concerned with here.

¹⁵ Brixhe 2016.

¹⁶ Obrador-Cursach 2020.

¹⁷ Aybek *et al.* 2018, 75.

¹⁸ cf. Mørholm 1991, 46.

Anatolia during and after the Hellenistic period, including personal names, theonyms, and some nouns, usually related to religious spheres similar to the one studied here.¹⁹ In what follows, we will argue that the origin of οδρpoyoc is ultimately Iranian **ādranga-* through Aramaic, as a first attempt to explain the hypothetical origin of this word.

Leaving aside the Aramaic attestations, which will be discussed below, the Iranian term **ādranga-* is also attested, for instance, in Avestan *adrən̄jayeti* ('to attach something to')²⁰ and Khotanese *hamḍrrī(š)-* ('to hold together'). It derives from the root **dra(n)j-* ('to fix, fasten, hold'), according to an initial proposal by Bernhard Geiger (apud Kraeling 1953, 243), with the component *ham-*,²¹ which in turn goes back to Proto-Indo-European root **dregʰ-* 'to hold, fasten' (LIV² 126).

3.1. **ādranga*'s attestations in the Aramaic corpora

Like many Old Persian terms, **ādranga-* has not come down to us in direct attestation, but its recovery is due to the painstaking analysis of other materials.²² In such a situation, **ādranga-* has so far been found in three different sources, all of them Aramaic.

First, *ḏdrng* appears with certainty five times in four of the official Aramaic texts recovered in Egypt; specifically, they are all documents from the archive of ʿānanyāh dated around 400 BCE (404-402 BCE). These documents correspond to the work of two scribes, Ḥag-gay bar Šemʿaya (TAD B3.10 18r, B3.11 12r, B3.12 27r) and Šaweram son of Ešemram (TAD B3.13 9r twice). The term appears in the so-called 'non-recovery clauses'²³ and its use can be exemplified with:

whn mḏtt wlšd šlmt wyhbt lk kspḏ zylk zy mnšl ktyb ḏḥr bny / wḏdrngy yšlmwn lk kspḏ zy mnšl ktyb (TAD B3.13 8r-9r) 'and if I die and have not yet paid you nor given you the silver which is yours and which is above written, then my sons / and my *ḏdrngs* shall pay you the silver which is above written'.

A further occurrence should be added to this: the result of the highly probable restoration of a lacuna, in TAD B4.6 10r, an acknowledgement of debt confidently attributed to the scribe Ḥag-gay bar Šemʿaya by palaeographic, orthographic, morphosyntactic, and lexical criteria (Folmer 1995, 777-779):

[wḏšlmn lky] ḏ[nty] slwḏh [wlbny]ky wḏ[drn]gyky '[and I will repay you,] y[ou,] Sal-luah, [and] your [children] and your *ḏ[drn]gs*'.

J. de Menasce²⁴ collects some interesting possible Iranian cognates – many of which will come up again in the analysis of S. Shaked²⁵ – but ends up opting for interpreting *ḏdrng* as 'creditor', which is impossible in the light of the texts.²⁶ Conversely, Reuven Yaron,²⁷ disregarding any linguistic or

¹⁹ For a recent identification see Obrador-Cursach – Corral Varela 2023, where βαvovaς, a title of priests from Tamaşalık (ancient Isauria), is considered a borrowing from Aramaic *bānōyā* 'builder, architect'.

²⁰ Bartholomae 1904, 772.

²¹ Cheung 2007, 76; On the adverb *ā* functioning as a prefix, see Bartholomae 1904, 300-303 and Kent 1950, 164. Shaked 1991, 167-168 briefly discusses the prefixes *ā* and *ham* with which this root occurs.

²² See, in general, for the Achaemenid period, Tavernier 2007.

²³ See Porten 1968, 216.

²⁴ de Menasce 1954, 161.

²⁵ Shaked 1991.

²⁶ P. Grelot (1972, 245) tries to offer a translation of the texts assuming this meaning.

²⁷ Yaron 1971, 243-244.

etymological speculation, interprets it as a 'kinsman' or 'heir' exclusively based on the context. Later on, B. Porten and J. C. Greenfield identified *ʔdrng* as an equivalent of the Aramaic term *ʕrb* 'guarantor', which appears in TAD A2.3 9v.²⁸ This interpretation has been generally accepted by the scientific community with little or no dissent.²⁹ Shaked³⁰ expands the number of terms originating from this root and discovers related terms that have entered Aramaic, such as *ʔdrktʔ* 'document of authorization to collect a debt' and hence 'document of indictment' (CAL: s.v.). As Margaretha Folmer³¹ has not failed to point out, *ʔdrng* must be a legal technicality of 'late' incorporation in the Aramaic texts of Egypt rather than an individual feature of 'style' even though it is only documented in two scribes.³²

The texts from Egypt are not the only Aramaic sources that have allowed us to recover the Iranian term **adranga-*. Aramaic texts from the 4th century BCE, now belonging to the famed Khalili Collection, illustrate administrative life in Achaemenid Bactria.³³ In them, we find two occurrences of the term *ʔdrng* in connection with Bagavant, a *paḥtā* or 'governor'. The first instance occurs in an undated letter sent to him by his superior, Akhvamaz.

ʔp ʕbwrʔ wšmšmn ṯmknšʔ zy / hyb bgwnt lhnʕlh ʕl byt <wsm zy> mrʔy lʔ mhnʕl šṭr <mn> ʔdrng 'Also the corn and the sesame, (for) sowing as seed, which / Bagavant is under duty to bring in to the <granary> building of my lord, he does not bring (them) in, although (he is) obliged' (ADAB A6.3-4, trans. 113).

The editors, Joseph Naveh and Shaked, whose translation is reproduced, prefer to understand *ʔdrng* here as an adjective, 'obliged, indebted', perhaps closer to its original Iranian formation, but the usual interpretation of *ʔdrng* is probably still valid.³⁴

The second occurrence of the term is in a note recording some kind of financial obligation. Again, according to the editors, the text and its translation are as follows:

ʔdrng ʔhry / bgwnt ʕl dtšʔprn / g 1 s 3 / kl g 1 s 8 'Liable (and) responsible / is Bagavant to Dathushafarnah / (concerning) 1 *gun*, 3 *seʔa*. / Total: 1 *gun*, 8 *seʔa*' (ADAB A10.1-4, trans. 125).

²⁸ cf. Porten – Greenfield 1969, 154; see also TAD B8.1 B15.

²⁹ Hinz 1975, 22-23 with cognates in other Iranian languages; Greenfield 1986, 257; Muraoka – Porten 1998, 370; Tavernier 2007, 442; Stadel 2020, 325; CAL: s.v.

³⁰ Shaked 1991, 167-170; 2003, 123 n. 13.

³¹ Folmer 1995, 778.

³² Note, however, that Botta 2009, 40-44 argues for the possibility that several scriptural traditions coexist in the Aramaic legal texts of Egypt. The findings in Bactria (see below), however, seem to support Folmer's judgment.

³³ The close connection that these Bactrian texts show with the Western testimonies of the Achaemenid administration has been highlighted by P.T. Daniels 2020, with particular attention to the script. This convergence reveals once again the efficient scribal training system in force in the Achaemenid Empire. A more detailed comparison between the letters of Arsames and those of Akhvamazda can be found in Folmer 2017, where not only similarities but also differences are pondered.

³⁴ It is not pertinent on this occasion to develop the full argumentation, which is the subject of a work in progress. For this reason, the translations offered by Nave and Shaked have been taken without changes. Admittedly, the passage is difficult, and its exact meaning is uncertain. If one prefers to cautiously discard this testimony, the core of the argument will remain unchanged.

The same editors, Naveh and Shaked, point out that Bagavant can be both a guarantor and a debtor, which is certainly compatible with the content of the note. Now, given the other attestations of the term, hesitation is unnecessary: Bagavant must be acting as a guarantor to Daθušafarnah –for the benefit of someone else– or for Daθušafarnah –for the benefit of Daθušafarnah himself.³⁵ Again, Naveh and Shaked prefer an alternative translation to ‘guarantor’ but it is not justified. As the parallels provided by the same authors (ADAB: 128), *ʔdrng ʔhry* seems to be the same formula that in other texts appears as:

wʔnh ʔhry wʔrb l[k] (XHev/Se 8.11) ‘and I am responsible and guarantor for y[ou]’.

ʔrbʔ wʔhryʔ lk (Mur. 32.4) ‘guarantor and responsible for you’.

As in the Egyptian texts, here *ʔdrng* functions as a synonym/substitute for *ʔrbʔ*, as had already been pointed out by Porten and Greenfield.³⁶ Thus, ADAB A10.1-2 is easily translatable as ‘Guarantor and responsible / is Bagavant to Dathushafarnah’.

To conclude this review, more recently, B. J. Noonan³⁷ has convincingly identified the term **ādranga-* in a compound within the corpus of Biblical Aramaic. In the famous list of offices of the Achaemenid administration found in duplicate in the biblical book of Daniel (Dan. 3:2 and Dan. 3:3), we find the title *ʔāḏargāzəray-yā*, morphologically a masculine plural noun. This list, as might be expected, contains a good number of borrowings from Old Persian, such as *ʔāḥašdarpnay-yā* ‘satraps’ (< Median **xšaθra-pāna*,³⁸ cf. Hinz 1975, 136; Tavernier 2007, 436) or *ʔāḏāḥray-yā* (< Old Persian **ganda-bara*, cf. Hinz 1975, 102; Tavernier 2007, 422) ‘treasurers’, which almost always led to think of an Iranian origin also for *ʔāḏargāzəray-yā* given the difficulty of finding a viable Semitic etymon. Throughout the research, two candidates have enjoyed popularity among scholars. First, **handarza-kara-* ‘counsellor’ (from **handarza-* ‘instruction, order’ and *kara-* ‘maker’) was proposed by C.F. Andreas (apud Marti 1896, 51*) and is collected in reference works such as Vogt 2011, s.v. or HALOT, s.v.. Later, Frithiof Rundgren³⁹ proposed **hadārgāzar-* ‘chiliarch’ (from **hadār-*, presumably ‘thousand’ in Old Persian and **gāzar-* ‘to cut’ > ‘to decide’).⁴⁰ However, both Shaked⁴¹ and Noonan⁴² point out the impossibility of reconciling these proposals with the regular phonetic representation of Iranian loanwords in Aramaic, as well as showing some scepticism about the existence in Iranian of such a root **gāzar-*.

³⁵ The editors (ADAB: 128) opt for the latter option on the grounds that such a function is marked with *l-* in some texts of the Judean Desert. Now, the parallel is tenuous. First of all, it is not exactly the same preposition, as is evident, but, in addition, the economic – and syntactic – scenario is different: in the Judean Desert texts, the seller is at the same time the guarantor of the purchase, that is, instead of three participants in the transaction, there are only two. See Gross 2008, 176-177.

³⁶ Porten – Greenfield 1969, 154.

³⁷ Noonan 2018.

³⁸ As is well known, the form documented in Old Persian *xšaçaḡpāvan* is not the same form from which all borrowings in other languages seem to originate. The not less known opposition between ProtoIranian **θr* > Old Persian *ç* : Median *θr* (Kent 1950, 31; de Vaan – Lubotsky 2011, 207) points to dialectal variation as the source of that divergence. On this title and its different forms, see Schmitt 1976.

³⁹ Rundgren 1963, 93.

⁴⁰ Interestingly, Rundgren (1963, 93 n. 1) includes the possibility that this term is itself a borrowing of the “echtsemitische” root *gʕzr*, with the same meanings (see CAL, s.v.).

⁴¹ Shaked 1991, 168.

⁴² Noonan 2018, 13-15.

Both authors, based on a previous proposal by O. Szemerényi,⁴³ identify the term **ādranga-* as the first part of the compound *ʔāḏargāzəray.yā*,⁴⁴ but differ in the second: while Shaked⁴⁵ thinks of a root **āzar-* 'to injure, to oppress' – hence he would understand the title as 'who oppresses debtors' –, Noonan⁴⁶ rejects such a proposal by correcting that **zar-* means, rather, 'to anger'. His proposal goes on to understand the second term of the compound as **āžara-* 'announcer' and, thus, **ādrangāžara-* would mean 'announcer of financial obligation'.⁴⁷ The economic function of such an alleged office fits well with its position in the list of magistracies, immediately before *ḡāḏāḡray.yā* 'treasurers', but it is worth drawing attention to the necessary phonetic arrangement. The absence of *-n-* is easily explained by the strong tendency in Aramaic to its assimilation⁴⁸ as, on the other hand, the term *ḡāḏāḡray.yā* itself also illustrates even in loanwords. The rest of the Iranian consonants present their regular equivalents in Aramaic, but there seems to have been a metathesis of **-dra-* to *-dar-* and the initial long vowel **ā* has been reduced to the ultrashort *ā*. The last can be understood as an adaptation to the target code: the occurrence of the ultrashort *ḥaṭef pataḥ* corresponds better to the Tiberian orthographic tradition vocalizing the biblical text. Thus, Noonan's etymological proposal fits well with the form and context of the title in the Aramaic tradition, even if the interpretation of the office was not entirely accurate.⁴⁹

3.2. A possible contact scenario (i): the linguistic adaptation

As shown, Iranian **ādranga-* is certainly found in three subcorpora belonging to Official Aramaic; οδρογος may be now the latest addition to the list of its indirect attestations. However, as far as we know, a loanword directly from Old Persian to Greek would be difficult to defend in phonetic terms.⁵⁰ Not without some difficulty, it is easier to think that the Iranian term came into Greek through Aramaic as a necessary mediator.

Contextually, it is a far from implausible scenario. It is not necessary to recall that Aramaic was one of the languages of the Achaemenid Empire, indeed it was probably the primary means of communication within the imperial machinery.⁵¹ It is perhaps worth emphasizing that this makes Aramaic the main, if not the only, channel of contact of the languages and cultures of Asia Minor

⁴³ Szemerényi 1975, 387 n. 281.

⁴⁴ Strictly speaking, although it is true that Szemerényi isolates **ādranga-*, he interprets it as "companion" or "Festsetzung".

⁴⁵ Shaked 1991, 169.

⁴⁶ Noonan 2018, 15 n. 21.

⁴⁷ Noonan 2018, 17-18.

⁴⁸ Since Old Aramaic, *-n-* is regularly assimilated in Aramaic – with the exception of Tell Fekherye inscription – (cf. Folmer 2011, 134). However, the spelling ⟨n⟩ survives for a long time and even the group ⟨nC⟩ appears as a degeminating spelling in contexts where *n* is not etymological, without phonetic reality (see, among many others, Spitaler 1954, Beyer 1984, 91, Folmer 1995, 74-94 or Muraoka – Porten 1998, 10-12 and 13-16). Therefore, it would not be strange that *-n-* had already been assimilated even in the cases when it appears written *ʔdrng* in the Egyptian and Bactrian texts.

⁴⁹ As is evident, Noonan takes **ādranga-* not as the *nomen agentis* we have seen so far in the Aramaic texts of Egypt and Bactria, but as a noun closer to the Pahlavi cognates *ērang* 'blame, condemnation' (see MacKenzie 1986, 30) or Christian Sogdian *ptžnq* (< **pati-dranga*, according to Shaked 1991, 167) 'pledge, surety' (Sims-Williams 2021, 158). The English term *surety* shows that it is compatible for the same word to designate the thing ('guarantee') and the person ('guarantor').

⁵⁰ For a synthesis of the possibilities of rendering Iranian words in Greek, see Brust 2008, XXVIII-LII.

⁵¹ Dusinberre 2013, 253.

with Persian during the Achaemenid period. While we lack inscriptions in Old Persian in Anatolia,⁵² we find a corpus of epigraphic texts in Aramaic, often bilingual or trilingual.⁵³ Aramaic penetrated Asia Minor as a vehicle of Achaemenid authority and Persian culture, as the link with Iranian religion has shown (see Lemaire 2014, 328). Ionia is no exception, even if the contact is less well documented. An example is the letter from Darius I to Gadatas concerning the tax exemption for the Garden of Apollo. Preserved in a copy recorded in Roman Imperial times (ca. 2nd century CE) at Magnesia on the Maeander, the letter appears to be a Koine rewrite of an earlier Ionian text which most authors believe to be an Aramaic original.⁵⁴ The usual practice of the Persian chancellery of sending official letters in Aramaic is well attested by other sources, such as the so-called Letter of Pherendates, of which we know a not-very fluent translation into Demotic.⁵⁵ Another example is the testimony of Thucydides in the context of the Peloponnesian War, in which a letter from the Great King addressed to the Lacedaemonians was written in Ἀσσυρίων γράμματα (Thuc. 4, 50, 1-2), that is, in Aramaic script. Thus Aramaic, at least in its imperial standard, also reached the distant Ionia, in the westernmost part of Anatolia.

This was probably not the only way, although in this case, the evidence is even more elusive. In a list collecting the participants in a Milesian association of Τεμενεῖται we find a Σαβίων Ἀλεξάνδρου (*I.Milet* 795 l. 10). Σαβίων is a hypocoristic of the name Σαμβατίων / Σαββατίων which ultimately comes from the Hebrew anthroponym יְהוֹשָׁבֵב *Šabəṭay*, related to the Sabbath,⁵⁶ and its expansion is linked to that of the Jewish communities.⁵⁷ As has not gone unnoticed, the name Σαβίων speaks of “seiner jüdisch-aramäischen Provenienz” and functions as an indication of “Präsenz von Levantiner im griechischen Bereich”.⁵⁸ Whether Σαβίων was Jewish or not, his presence is relevant to our topic insofar as it attests to the existence of an Aramaic linguistic component in Ionia outside of Imperial Aramaic.

Leaving aside for a moment the particular history of the noun under scrutiny, one should consider the possible parallels for the presence of a Persian word in western Anatolia. Far from exhaustivity, one can adduce the presence of *stwn* ‘stele’ in Aramaic inscriptions found in this area (Lyd-Bil ll. 2 and 4 of Schwiderski 2004), and as for the Greek corpus, παράδεισος ‘garden, park’ is a nice example. This last noun is well-known after Xenophon in literary Greek sources. However, its epigraphic use before the Christian era is almost reduced to eastern Anatolia.⁵⁹ Titles and offices are not lacking either: σατράπης occurs for well-known historical reasons (specially in Caria,

⁵² Even the inscriptions on the “Persian seals” are documented only in local languages and in Aramaic.

⁵³ A superb overview can be found in Lemaire 2014.

⁵⁴ Schmitt 1996 collects the Aramaisms present in the text, in contrast to Briant 2003, 113-120, who doubts that such an original ever existed.

⁵⁵ Hughes 1984; see also the annotated translation by Martin 1996, 290-291.

⁵⁶ See Levinskaya – Tokjtas'yev 1996, 60-63 with extensive bibliography.

⁵⁷ The classic work on Jewish communities in Hellenistic and Imperial Anatolia is Trebilco 1991, which, despite its merits, is hopelessly outdated. Gruen 2004, 84-104 deals with the Jews in Ionia, but only from the late-Republican period onwards. The epigraphic corpus of W. Ameling (2004, 145-196, especially for the Jewish community in Ionia) can also be consulted.

⁵⁸ Günther 1995, 46.

⁵⁹ In Caria, Labraunda 40, *I.Mylasa* 83; in Ionia *I.Didyma* 577*5; in Lydia, *I.Sardis* I,1.1; in Mysia, *I.Pergamon* 245, comm.

to the south of Ionia), while the famous μάγοι are found in several regions, including Ionia (e.g., SE 2102*1).

The evolution of **ādranga-* to οδρωγος has to be understood within the framework of Western Aramaic, whose features begin to be perceived in the post-Achaemenid Aramaic languages – although it is likely that they were already present in other registers earlier.⁶⁰ The sequence of phonetic changes can be traced back as follows. The first change that Iranian **ādranga-* undergoes in Aramaic is the already mentioned assimilation of *-n-*, a phenomenon well documented since Old Aramaic and present everywhere in Official Aramaic (see above). Thus, it only remains to explain the vocalization of the term.

The etymological *ā* vowel is reflected in Western Aramaic as *ō*,⁶¹ which would account for the first *ā* of **ādranga-*. Perhaps also for the second. If *ādranga-* has been so integrated into Aramaic as it seems (assimilation of the nasal as in *ʔāḏargāzəray.yā*, inflexion according to the internal patterns of the language as in *ʔdrngy* and *ʔdrngyky*),⁶² it is also likely that the stress has been adapted to the patterns of the target language⁶³ so that it in Aramaic it would be pronounced **ādrāg-ga*. In that regard, the stress may have lengthened the vowel, as in the reading tradition of Biblical Aramaic,⁶⁴ obtaining an intermediate state **ādrāga* or even **ādrāgā*, with morphological levelling.⁶⁵ A Western Aramaic realization of the proposed **ādrāgā* could already account for the term οδρωγ(-ος) as we find it.

However, rather than thinking of a phonological change, what this form probably evidence is a realization of *ā* and *a* as [ɔ(:)] in Aramaic, which is represented in Greek as an *o*. This would explain the alternation of some Greek transcriptions (κορβωνας,⁶⁶ Joseph. BJ. 2,175: κορβανας Matt. 27,6, < *qorbānā*) and the influence, without constituting a rigid phonetic law, of the environment (labials, *n*, *r*, *l*).⁶⁷

There are some secondary indications of the realization of *a* as [ɔ].⁶⁸ As has been continually shown, the Tiberian reading tradition of the biblical text was established jointly for Hebrew and the sparse Aramaic portions. Benjamin Suchard's excellent recent study has succeeded in pinpointing the emergence of this reading tradition in Roman Palestine in the first century CE.⁶⁹ Thus, the vocalization offered by the Masoretes must be taken with admitted caution as far as the

⁶⁰ See Beyer's "Altwestaramäische" (Beyer 1984, 49).

⁶¹ It is not only a feature of the Western (so-called Jacobite) pronunciation of Syriac (Nöldeke 1904, 31-32; Daniels 1997, 135 among many others), but of Modern Western Aramaic languages in tonic syllables (Fassberg 2019, 634).

⁶² Already Porten 1996, 253 n. 21 seemed to be surprised by the high level of borrowings in Aramaic morphology.

⁶³ Little is known about stress in Old Persian, according to Brandenstein – Mayrhofer 1964, 27; still in Brust 2018, 45.

⁶⁴ Khan 2013, 95; 2020, 245-256; Suchard 2019, 55.

⁶⁵ οδρωγος would point precisely to this second scenario, see below.

⁶⁶ Also κορβονας in the manuscript tradition.

⁶⁷ See Beyer 1984, 137 for Greek transcriptions and particularly Fassberg 1990, 69-70 for more examples regardless of the vowel length in Aramaic dialects.

⁶⁸ Bauer – Leander 1962, 42 also point out some other unexpected appearances of *o* by *a* in Biblical Aramaic and note that these are Canaanisms. However, they may be better explained on morphological grounds as distinct nominal formations and are therefore not of interest here at this time.

⁶⁹ Suchard 2021, 115.

biblical text is concerned, but it testifies to the pronunciation of another dialect, one in which the *qamatz* is unanimously recognized as an *ā* realized as [ɔ:].⁷⁰ Also B. P. Kantor has shown that the Hexaplaric *Secunda* is compatible with [ɔ],⁷¹ which is relevant considering that the Hebrew pronunciation seems to have been filtered by that of the local Aramaic. All these small pieces of evidence, once put together, allow us to imagine how an Iranian term like **ādranga-* could end up being reflected in Greek as ὀδρωγός after passing through one of the Western Aramaic languages.⁷²

Finally, the term seems to have adapted to the Greek nominal morphology (-ός). This is not surprising. The same morphological adaptation of a borrowing from Old Persian is found in κάρανος ‘chief of the army’, coming from Iranian **kārāna* (< *kāra-* ‘army’).⁷³

3.3. A possible contact scenario (ii): cultural and historical context

After these remarks, an observation stands: since the phonetic approach impels us to assume that ὀδρωγός must have entered the local lexicon during the Hellenistic period, and it is not an ancient relic of a pre-Greek culture, one wonders in what context the word might have been adopted by the Metropolitan Ionians. Although more explicit evidence is needed, a possible answer can be found in the Seleucid control of the area (281-188 BCE), yet it should be noted that Seleukos Nikator’s patronage of the Ionian oracle of Didyma predates his territorial expansion by some years.⁷⁴ It is well known that during this period, the Iranian hero Vərəθrayna / Bahrām was interpreted in the Greek manner as Ares and as Herakles.⁷⁵ The syncretism of these gods is explicitly expressed sometime later in the impressive heads at the monumental Nemrut Dağ sanctuary, promoted by Antiochus I of Commagene, which were accompanied by some commemorative inscriptions two of which proclaim the following equation: Ἀρτάγνης Ἡρακλῆς Ἄρης ‘Artagnes Herakles Ares’ (*I.Syrie* 1 1 and 1 35).

4. The office: a proposal for ὀδρωγός’ functions and parallels

At this point, it is worth reconsidering whether the meaning of this supposed loanword fits the Greek context of Metropolis. A rare term such as ὀδρωγός does not necessarily designate a strange position or office. The existence of magistracies of similar functions with endemic names only attested in a city or a limited area is not unusual in the context of Asia Minor. Within the associations of Τεμενεῖται, for example, there appears an office of χρυσονόμος (lit. ‘gold-distributor’) which, apart from existing in Miletus, is only documented in Leros, precisely a Milesian colony; therefore, without too much trouble, the χρυσονόμος has been interpreted as a treasurer.⁷⁶ For the same cultic association, the prosaic charge of the γραμματεὺς ‘secretary’ is also attested. A

⁷⁰ Khan 2013, 95.

⁷¹ Kantor 2017, 278-279.

⁷² As has been recognized, “Achaemenid Official Aramaic itself thus basically seems to have acted as a written variety” (Gzella 2015, 167), which leaves room for speculation about interactions with vernacular Aramaic languages, including those that share the features of what we have ended up calling Western Aramaic and that will make its progressive appearance in writing especially after the disappearance of Imperial Aramaic.

⁷³ The etymology, however, is not unanimously accepted by scholars. See Rung 2015, 336-340 for a comprehensive discussion of the term.

⁷⁴ Fontenrose 1988, 16.

⁷⁵ Gnoli – Jamzadeh 1988, 510-514.

⁷⁶ On the cultic association of the Τεμενεῖται and its funerary ties, see Herrmann 1980, with the corpus updates and contributions by Günther 1995, Bresson 1997, 501-505, Carbon 2013, 27-33 and Harland 2014, 285-287.

similar figure is found in other cultic associations such as the ἀναγραφεύς (another word for 'secretary'), who appears at the top of the Ξένοι Τεκμόρειοι lists from Pisidia.

Leaving aside Dreyer's previous approach, which regarded the οδρογος as a kind of hierophant, it is possible that the office was, as its original meaning suggests, the 'guarantor' of the trade in priestly offices. It is known that priesthoods were regularly sold. A contemporaneous well-known example from Anatolia is the Hyllarima Carian-Greek bilingual inscription (July / August 196 BC), where this kind of sale is explicitly attested:⁷⁷ ἐπ' ἱερέως Ἀγλουμβρότου, Πανάμου εἰκάδι· ἐπὶ τοῖσδε ἐπρίατο τὴν ἱερωσύνην Λέων Θευδώρου παρὰ Ὑλλαριμέων, διὰ βίου, δραχμ[ῶν (?)] Διὸς Θαλοῖνου, Ἡρακλείους, Γῆς... 'In the year of the priest Agloumbrotos, on the 20th of Panamos. Leon, son of Theudoros, bought the priesthood from the Hyllarimeis on the following conditions: for life, for the price of [...] drachmae, of Zeus Thaloinos (?), Heracles, Ge...' (Face A, l. 1-6).⁷⁸ The practice (called simply πρᾶσις 'sale' in Greek) is also found in Ionia, where, for example, three priest lists from two different cities⁷⁹ attesting the prices of such sales constantly record the figure of the ἐγγυητής, the Greek word for 'guarantor'. See, for example, some random lines (68-72) taken from the long list Erythrai 60 (dated to 300-260 BCE):

Ἑρμοῦ Ἀγοραίου· XXXX[Ⓜ]H, ἐπώνιον ΔΔΔΔ· Μολίων Διονυσίου, ἐγγυητής Φανόπολις Μενεκλείους· Ἀπόλλωνος ἐν Σαβηρίδαις· H[Ⓜ], ἐπώνιον Γ· Φαναγόρας Ἀπολλοδότου, ἐγγυητής Ἀπολλόδοτος Φαναγόρου

'(priest) of Hermes Agoraios: 4600 (drachmae), loan 40: Molion the son of Dionysios, guarantor Phanopolis the son of Menecleios; (priest) of Apollo en Saberidais: 600 (drachmae), loan 40: Phanagoras the son Apollodotes, guarantor Apollodotes Phanagoras'.

A similar case is found in Miletus concerning the priesthood of Asclepius:

οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῆς π<ό>λε[ε]ως [...] πωλοῦντες ἱερωσύνην Ἀσκληπιοῦ πρὸ πόλεως καὶ τῶν ἐντεμενίων αὐτοῦ θεῶν πάντων, χωρὶς εἴ τι προπέπραται ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου, νόμον τίθενται τῇ πράσι τόνδε, ἐφ' ᾧ ὁ πριάμενος ἱέρειω ἀπογράψει παραχρῆμα πρὸς τοὺς ταμίας καὶ βασιλῆς...

'the chief magistrates of the city [...], selling the priesthood of Asclepius, protector of the city, and that of all the gods honoured with him in the shrine, excluding whatever has already been sold by the People, they promulgate for the sale the following law: the buyer will immediately register before the treasurers and the archon [the name] of a priest...' (*I. Milet* 14, l. 1-11, 14-15 CE).

An interesting point here is that the purchaser (πριάμενος) is not necessarily the same person who registers as a priest (ἱέρειω).

An important difference between the Erythrai and Metropolis lists which could affect the likelihood of our alleged interpretation for οδρογος is the absence of the payment accounts for the

⁷⁷ Adiego *et al.* 2005, 621.

⁷⁸ See also useful reading, remarks and commentaries focused on the Greek text by Carbon *et al.* in CGRN 193.

⁷⁹ *I. Erythrai Klazomenai* I 57*5 and 60 (Erythrai) and II 2 (Klazomenai). On the particular case of Erythrai, see the detailed study by F. Graf on sales and the cost of the worships (Graf 1985, 149-155) and Ares's priesthood (Graf 1985, 265-269), valued in 1070 drachmae.

alleged sales of priesthoods in the second corpus.⁸⁰ However, we know that the prices paid for the charge are not always indicated. This is the case of the abovementioned Hyllarima bilingual inscriptions: the Carian and the first Greek text only register the names of the priest,⁸¹ although we know from other lists that the charge was paid.

Moreover, the Metropolis inscriptions attest another economic feature of the priesthoods, since a banker appears in a decree related to Ares' worship (*I.Metropolis* 3, l. 1-6):

[--- ἐκ]άστου ἔτου[ς] ἀπὸ ἱερείων μὴ ἔλασσ[ον] τεσσάρων καθότι καὶ ὁ τραπεζίτης Ἡγησί[ας] Δημητρίου παρακληθεὶς ὑπὸ τε τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δή[μ]ου καὶ διακείμενος εὐσεβέστατα πρὸς τὸ θεῖον συνενδόκησεν βουλόμενος ἐπαύξεσθαι τὰς τοῦ Ἀ[ρε]ως τιμὰς

‘...of the sacrificial animals no fewer than four each year and the banker Hegisias Dimitrios, summoned by the council and the people and standing reverently before God, consented to increase the honours of Ares’.⁸²

5. By way of conclusion: the linguistic history of ὀδρογος and its implications for the study of the cult of Ares in Metropolis

In sum, **ādranga-* is a plausible candidate as an etymon for the – hopefully now less – obscure tittle ὀδρογος. The Iranian term is comparatively well represented in Official Aramaic and the phonetic evolution is feasible in light of the well-documented changes of *a > ʔ o* even if they had been thought to be sporadic. This first linguistic proposal also makes it possible to delimit with some foundation the semantics of the term and opens the door to a more exhaustive study of the religious life of Hellenistic and Roman Ionia.

At this point, a final hypothesis on the cult of Ares in Metropolis can be proposed: if we accept that ὀδρογος is a word of Persian origin transmitted via Aramaic in Hellenistic times, as indicated by its phonetics, perhaps we should also date the worship dedicated to Ares to this period. Thus, his strange presence in this city would not be due to a millenary continuity of the Iyarri divinity, as had previously been proposed, but rather to the religious policies of the Hellenistic kings. The Seleucid religious policy could explain why this word appears in a territory where no Aramaic inscriptions have been documented (the closest ones being those of Lydia), as the cult itself would have originated following a religious tradition foreign to Ionia. In any case, much information is still missing, and both theories are not entirely exclusive.

⁸⁰ An institution similar to Attic liturgies could explain the lack of prices, but there are some reasons to avoid such comparison: euergetism, an institution by which rich people control their generosity, totally replaced the state-controlled contributions in the Hellenistic period, liturgy is unknown in Ionia.

⁸¹ See, e.g., “Face principale colonne A” in Adiego *et al.* 2005, 621.

⁸² For the whole inscription, see Sponsel 2017, 35-38.

Bibliography

- ADAB = Naveh, J. – Shaked, S. 2012. *Aramaic Documents from Ancient Bactria (Fourth Century B.C.E.)*. London: The Khalili Family Trust.
- Adiego, I.-J. – Debord, P. – Varinlioglu, E. 2005. "La stèle caro-grecque d'Hyllarima (Carie)." *REA* 107/2: 601-653.
- Adiego, I.-X. 2019. "A Kingdom for a Carian Letter." In: I.-X. Adiego – J. V. García Trabazo – M. Vernet Pons – B. Obrador Cursach – E. Martínez Rodríguez (edd.), *Luwic dialects and Anatolian: inheritance and diffusion*, Barcelona: Edicions Universitat de Barcelona, 11-50.
- Ameling, W. 2004. *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis. Band II: Kleinasien*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Aybek, S. – Gülbay, O. 2019. "The Cult of Zeus Krezimos at Metropolis. Previous Observations on the Sacred Area and Cult." In: B. Engels – S. Huy – C. Steitler (edd.), *Natur und Kult in Anatolien*, Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 241-252.
- Aybek, S. – Dreyer, B. – Sponsel, Ch. 2018. "Der Kultplatz des Zeus Krezimos in Metropolis in Ionien." *Gephyra* 15: 71-94.
- Bauer, H. – Leander, P. 1962. *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Beyer, K. 1984. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Botta, A. F. 2009. *The Aramaic and Egyptian legal traditions at Elephantine: an Egyptological approach*. London: T&T Clark.
- Brandenstein, W. – Mayrhofer, M. 1964. *Handbuch des Altpersischen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Bresson, A. 1997. "De Marseille à Milet: lettres lunaires et associations culturelles." *REA* 99/3-4: 491-506.
- Briant, P. 2003. "Histoire et archéologie d'un texte, La Lettre de Darius à Gadatas entre Perses, Grecs et Romains." In: M. Giorgeri – M. Salvini – M. C. Trémouille – P. Vannicell (edd.), *Licia e Lidia prima dell'ellenizzazione, Atti del Convegno internazionale Roma 11-12 ottobre 1999*, Roma: Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà dell'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente, 107-144.
- Brixhe, C. 1996. "Corpus des inscriptions dialectales de Pamphylie. Supplement IV." *Kadmos* 35: 72-86.
- Brixhe, C. 2016. *Stèles et langue de Pisidie*. Nancy: Association pour la diffusion de la recherche sur l'Antiquité.
- Brust, M. 2008. *Die indischen und iranischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen. 2., verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Brust, M. 2018. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Altpersischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Kulturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- CAL = Kaufman, S.A. et al. *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon* [<https://cal.huc.edu>; consulted 04/04/2024]).
- Carbon, J. M. 2013. "Dolphin-Pillars." *EA* 46: 27-34.
- CGRN 193 = Carbon, J.-M. – Peels, S. – Pirenne-Delforge, V. 2017. CGRN 193: Two records of sales of priesthoods at Hyllarima, in *Collection of Greek Ritual Norms (CGRN)*, 2017-, consulted on July 15, 2024. URL: <http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be/file/193/>; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54510/CGRN193>.
- Cheung, J. 2007. *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden: Brill.
- Daniels, P. T. 2020. "Aramaic Documents from Achaemenid Bactria: Connections to the West—and the East—and the Future." In: A. Kaplony – D. Potthast (edd.), *From Qom to Barcelona*. Leiden: Brill, 3-23.
- Daniels, T. E. 1997. "Classical Syriac phonology." In: A. S. Kaye (ed.), *Phonologies of Asia and Africa*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 127-140.
- Dreyer, B. 2008. "Le culte civique d'Arès et le panthéon de Métropolis (Ionie)." *REA* 110/2: 403-416.
- Dreyer, B. – Engelmann, H. 2009. "Neue Dokumente zum Kult des Ares in Metropolis." *ZPE* 168: 161-176.
- Dusinberre, E. R. M. 2013. *Empire, Authority, and Autonomy in Achaemenid Anatolia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- EDEN = Dreyer, B. (ed.), *EDEN. Epigraphische Datenbank Erlangen Nürnberg (Abteilung 1: Die Inschriften von Metropolis)*. Available at: <<http://wisski.cs.fau.de/eden/metropolis>> (last consult: 02/03/2022).
- Fassberg, S. E. 1990. *A grammar of the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Genizah*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Fassberg, S. E. 2019. "Modern Western Aramaic." In: J. Huehnergard – N. Pat-El (edd.), *The Semitic Languages*, Abingdon: Routledge, 632-652.
- Folmer, M. L. 1995. *The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period: A Study in Linguistic Variation*. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies.
- Folmer, M. L. 2011. "Old and Imperial Aramaic." In: H. Gzella (ed.), *Languages from the World of the Bible*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 128-159.
- Folmer, M. L. 2017. "Bactria and Egypt: Administration as Mirrored by the Aramaic Sources." In: B. Jacobs – W. F. M. Henkelman – M. W. Stolper, *Die Verwaltung im Achämenidenreich - Imperiale Muster und Strukturen / Administration in the Achaemenid Empire - Tracing the Imperial Signature*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 413-454.
- Fontenrose, J. E. 1988. *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, cult, and companions*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gnoli, G. – Jamzadeh, P. 1988. "BAHRĀM (Vərəθraγna)." In: *Encyclopaedia Iranica* III/5, 510-514, available online at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/bahram-1> (accessed on June 29, 2023).
- Graf, F. 1985. *Nordionische Kulte : religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia*. Rome: Schweizerisches Institut in Rom.
- Greenfield, J. C. 1977. "On some Iranian Terms in the Elephantine Papyri. Aspects of Continuity." *AAntHung* 25: 113-118.
- Greenfield, J. C. 1986. "Iranian Loanwords in Early Aramaic." In: E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 2. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 256-259.
- Grelot, P. 1972. *Documents araméens d'Égypte*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Gross, A. D. 2008. *Continuity and Innovation in the Aramaic Legal Tradition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gruen, E. S. 2004. *Diaspora. Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Günther, W. 1995. "Zwei neue Temenitenverzeichnisse aus Milet." *Chiron* 25: 43-53.
- Gzella, H. 2015. *A Cultural History of Aramaic*, Leiden: Brill.
- HALOT = Koehler, L. – Baumgartner, W. 1994-2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill.
- Harland, Ph. A. 2014. *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations and Commentary. II. North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Herrmann, P. 1980. "Urkunden milesischer Temenitai." *MDAI(I)* 30: 223-239.
- Hinz, W. 1975. *Iranische Sprachgut der Nebenerlieferungen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Hughes, G. R. 1984. "The so-called Pherendates correspondence." In: H. J. Thissen – K. Th. Zauzich (edd.), *Grammata Demotica. Festschrift für Erich Luddeckens zum 15. Juni 1983*. Würzburg: Gisela Zauzich Verlag, 75-88.
- Kantor, B. P. 2017. *The second column (secunda) of Origen's Hexapla in light of Greek pronunciation*. Ph.D. diss., University of Texas Austin.
- Kent, R.G. 1950. *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Khan, G. 2013. *A short introduction to the Tiberian Masoretic Bible and its reading tradition*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.
- Khan, G. 2020. *The Tiberian Pronunciation Tradition of Biblical Hebrew, Volume I*. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0163>
- KPN = Zgusta, L. 1964. *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*. Prag: Verlag Der Tschechoslowakischen Akademie Der Wissenschaften.
- Kraeling, E. G. 1953. *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Lemaire, A. 2014. "Anatolia." In: H. Niehr (ed.), *The Aramaeans in Ancient Syria*. Leiden: Brill, 319-328.
- Levinskaya, I. A. – Tokhtas'yev, S. R. 1996. Jews and Jewish Names in the Bosphoran Kingdom. In: B. Isaac – A. Oppenheimer (edd.), *Studies on the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Tel Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, Ramot Publishing, 55-73.
- LIV² = Rix, H. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- MacKenzie, D. N. 1986. *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Macridy, Th. 1905. "Altertümer von Notion." *JÖAI* 8: 155-173.
- Marti, K. 1896. *Kurzgefasste Grammatik der biblisch-aramäischen Sprache: Literatur, Paradigmen, kritisch berichtigte Texte und Glossar*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.
- Martin, C.J. 1996. "The Demotic Texts." In: B. Porten (ed.), *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-cultural Continuity and Change*. Leiden: Brill, 277-375.
- McLean, B. H. 2014. *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine (323 B.C.–A.D. 337)*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- de Menasce, J. 1954. "Mots d'emprunt et noms propres iraniens dans les nouveaux documents araméens." *BO* 11: 161-162.
- I.Milet = Herrmann, P. 1998 – 2006. *Inschriften von Milet*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Millington, A. T. 2013. "Iyarri at the Interface: The Origins of Ares." In: A. Mouton – I. Rutherford – I. Yakubovich (edd.), *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Leiden: Brill, 543-565.
- Mur = Benoit, P. – Milik, J. T. – de Vaux, R. 1961. *Discoveries in the Judean Desert, II: Les grottes de Murabba'ât*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Muraoka, T. – Porten, B. 1998. *A Grammar of Egyptian Aramaic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nöldeke, Th. 1904. *Compendious Syriac Grammar* [translated by J. Crichton]. London: Williams & Norgate.
- Noonan, B. J. 2018. "A (New) Old Iranian Etymology for Biblical Aramaic 𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤂𐤀𐤌 [adargazar]" *Aramaic Studies* 16: 10-19.
- Obrador-Cursach, B. 2020. *The Phrygian language*. Leiden: Brill.
- Obrador-Cursach, B. – Corral Varela, D. 2023. "Σταλλῶ [Stallō] γ βανοῦας [banouas] (Tamaşalık, Isauria)." *Glotta* 99/1: 240-250.
- Porten, B. 1968. *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of An Ancient Jewish Military Colony*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Porten, B. 1996. "The Aramaic texts." In: B. Porten (ed.), *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-cultural Continuity and Change*. Leiden: Brill, 74-276.
- Porten, B. – Greenfield, J. C. 1969. "The Guarantor at Elephantine-Syene." *JAOS* 89/1: 153-157.
- Rundgren, F. 1963. "Ein iranischer Beamtenname in Aramäischen." *Orientalia Suecana* 12: 89-98.
- Rung, E. 2015. "Some Notes on *karanos* in the Achaemenid Empire." *IA* 50: 333-356.
- Schmitt, R. 1976. "Der Titel 'Satrap'." In: A. Morpurgo – W. Meid (edd.), *Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-European Linguistics: Offered to Leonard R. Palmer on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday, June 5, 1976*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 373-390.
- Schmitt, R. 1996. "Bemerkungen zu dem sog. Gadatas-Brief." *ZPE* 112: 95-101.
- Schwiderski, D. 2004. *Die alt- und reichsaramäischen Inschriften*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- SE = Alpers, M. – Halfmann, H. (edd.). 1995. *Supplementum Ephesium*. Hamburg: Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.
- Shaked, Sh. 1991. "Irano-Aramaica: On Some Legal, Administrative and Economic Terms." In: R. E. Emmerick – D. Weber (edd.), *Corolla Iranica: Papers in Honour of D. N. MacKenzie*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 167-175.

- Shaked, Sh. 2003. "Between Iranian and Aramaic: Iranian Words Concerning Food in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, with Some Notes on the Aramaic Heterograms in Iranian." *Irano-Judaica* 5: 120-137.
- Sims-Williams, N. 2021. *A Dictionary: Christian Sogdian, Syriac and English*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Spitaler, A. 1954. "Zur Frage der Geminantendissimilation im Semitischen." *IF* 61: 257-266.
- Sponsel, Ch. 2017. *Der Areskult in Metropolis (Ionien)*. Erlangen: Friedrich-Alexander University Press.
- Stadel, Ch. 2020. "Old and Imperial Aramaic." In: R. Hasselbach-Andee (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 319-336.
- Suchard, B. D. 2019. "Sound Changes in the (Pre-)Masoretic Reading Tradition and the Original Pronunciation of Biblical Aramaic." *Studia Orientalia Electronica* 7: 52-65.
- Suchard, B. D. 2021. "The Origins of the Biblical Aramaic Reading Tradition." *VT* 71/1: 105-119.
- Szemerényi, O. J. L. 1975. "Iranica V (Nos. 59–70)". In: J. Duchesne-Guillemin (ed.), *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg*, vol. 2. Téhéran – Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi, 313-394.
- TAD A = Porten, B. – Yardeni, A. 1986. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*, vol. 1. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University.
- TAD B = Porten, B. – Yardeni, A. 1989. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*, vol. 2. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University.
- Tavernier, J. 2007. *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550-330 B.C.)*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Trebilco, R. P. 1991. *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Vaan, M. – Lubotsky, A. 2011. "Old Persian". In: H. Gzella (ed.), *Languages from the World of the Bible*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 194-208.
- Vogt, E. 2011. *A lexicon of Biblical Aramaic: Clarified by Ancient Documents*. Trans. and revised by J.A. Fitzmyer. Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press.
- XHev/Se = Cotton, H.M. – Yardeni, A. 1997. *Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek Documentary Texts from Haḥal Hever and other sites*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Yaron, R. 1971. Review: Porten, B. 1968. *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of An Ancient Jewish Military Colony*. Berkeley: University of California. *JSS* 16: 240-244.

Farsçadan Aramice Aracılığıyla Yunancaya: 'Odrogos' (Metropolis, Ionia) İçin Bir Öneri **Özet**

Odrogos terimi, Hellenistik dönemden MS 2. yüzyıla kadar Metropolis (Ionia) kentinde Ares ve Zeus Krezimos kültleriyle ilişkili bir tür makamı tanımlar, ancak kökeni şimdiye kadar tespit edilememiştir. Bu makale terimin ilk dilbilimsel analizini sunmakta ve İran kökenli *ādranga- etimolojisini savunmaktadır. Gözlemlenen fonetik farklılıklar, bu sözcüğün Yunancaya doğrudan geçmediğini göstermektedir. Bunun yerine, Yunancaya muhtemelen aynı İran etimonuyla ilişkili birkaç formun bulunduğu Aramice aracılığıyla girmiştir. Bu yeni tanımlamaya dayanarak, işlevine ve benimsenme zamanına ilişkin bazı öneriler sunulmuştur. Dolayısıyla, burada savunulan hipotez *odrogos* figürünün Küçük Asya'da oldukça iyi bilinen rahiplik satın alma uygulamasıyla ilişkili olduğudur. Terimin kanıtları ve önerilen dilbilimsel analiz de dahil olmak üzere önceki tüm verilerin bir araya getirilmesi, sözcüğün bölgeye giriş senaryosunu Seleukosların Ionia üzerindeki kontrolü dönemine yerleştirmeyi mümkün kılmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İranca alıntı sözcük; Aramice aktarım; Yunanca dilsel temas; rahiplik satışı; Ares tapınımı.