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The campaigns of 2017 and 2018, which were undertaken within the scope of the field surveys conducted on the ancient road network around Fethiye\(^1\), included visits to Asarcık located at ca. 8 km to the north of Pinara (Fig. 1). A field research in this place, the ancient name of which was Aloanda, resulted in the discovery of new epigraphic materials, two Greek inscriptions introduced below and one Lycian inscription\(^2\).
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\(^2\) For the Lycian inscription from Aloanda see Onur – Tekoğlu 2020, 17-22.
Aloanda is on the eastern route from Pinara to Telmessos. It is located ca. 3 km to the northwest of modern Kabaağaç. Gilbert Davies visited the place, described the remains and published materials from the site in 1895.\(^3\) The elevation of the hill of Aloanda (Fig. 2) is ca. 600 m and its acreage is ca. 25-26 ha, while several ancient remains scattered within 85 ha. Davies’s description of remains (see fn. 3 above) is accurate in many respects, though what we have seen may be less, since illegal excavations or destructions can also be seen in several sections on and around the hill. There are not many definable building remains on the hill, except for some walls and foundations (Fig. 9-Fig. 11), which were described as a “medieval fortress” by Davies, though the walls seem to date from an earlier period. To the west of the hill at the foot of the opposing hill is a classical rock cut tomb without inscription or special decoration except for its traditional Lycian façade (Fig. 12). To the west of the rock-cut tomb is a retaining wall lying to the south. A Hellenistic funerary inscription (see fn. 4 below; today lost), the only inscription known from the site until our discoveries, enabled Davies to tentatively suggest that the name of this settlement was Aloanda, as the owner of the tomb was an Ἀλοανδέυς.\(^4\) Ruge and later Robert thought that Aloanda might have belonged to Pinara.\(^5\) Schweyer, accepting the localization of Aloanda at Asarcık within the territory of Pinara, emphasized that the settlement looks towards an interior valley, which might have provided a certain autonomy, but she did not find total independence from Pinara conceivable.\(^6\) Hellenkemper and Hild noted that the settlement seems to have been a

---

3 Davies 1895, 104-105: "From Kaba-agach, a village on the most frequented road between Makri and the southern Xanthos valley, a track leads up a steep ravine in a W.N.W. direction to a plateau, where it reaches a tiny hamlet after about an hour’s climb. Not far beyond this rises to an elevation of 2,000 feet a wooded hill, known locally as Assar-jik, on the summit of which is a considerable mediaeval fortress. On its N.E. slope are several sarcophagi, for the most part broken and overthrown, on one of which was the preceding inscription (see below fn. 4). Further search revealed traces of a ring-wall, double on the N.W. side, and apparently of dwelling-houses. In a depression between this and a higher hill on the west is a single Lycian rock-tomb without inscription, and beyond this fragments of an ancient sustaining wall running along the side of the second hill. We followed this wall and found on the ridge behind it further to the S.E. the ruins of a building composed of large squared blocks: it seemed too small for a fort, and its purpose remains for the present uncertain. In descending northward to rejoin the road to Makri we noticed further traces of ancient inhabitation. We may conclude provisionally that the name of this little town was Aloanda, though the name is not mentioned by any ancient writer, and the evidence of the inscription is of course inconclusive."

4 Davies 1895, 104 no. 9 (TAM II 526): Ἐρμοας Μεννέου Ἀλοαν[(δεύς] ἑαυτῶι καὶ τῆι γυναικὶ τὸν τάφον κατεσκεύασα[το καὶ τὼι τέκνοις ἄλλ][ωι δὲ μηθεν ἐξέστω | ταφῆναι ἐν τῶι προγεγραμμένωι τάφῳ· ἢ ἀποτισάτω ὁ θάψας τῶι τέ ιτοι νυν ἐγ τῆι δίκῃς καὶ τῶι δήμῳ]. For the legal formula καθάπερ ἐγ δίκης, see Parker 2010, 109 and fn. 20.

5 Ruge 1903, 63; Robert, Doc. Asie Min. mérid., 15; cf. Zgusta, Ortsnamen, 64 §47-1 Αλοανδα and 342 §715 Λοανδα.

kome, with reference to its smallness and to the fact that the tomb fine on the inscription mentioned above was to be paid to the demos. Since there was until now only one inscription known from Asarcık, Pleket expressed his doubt that the site’s ancient name was Aloanda noting that “the explicit mention of the ethnikon may well imply that the deceased was not buried in his native city”.

The name of the ancient settlement can now with certainty be acknowledged as Aloanda since the new Greek texts, both dated to the Hellenistic period, also include the ethnicon, or perhaps demoticon Ἀλοανδεύς. We cannot be certain about the political status of Aloanda, as current evidence does not provide a clear picture. The archaeological remains at the site indicate that Aloanda was a small rural settlement. In that case, Aloanda might have been a demos of Pinara, as already suggested in the earlier scholarship, or, perhaps of Telmessos, because the territory of Telmessos might have reached into this area as the ancient road connections on the Monumentum Patarense might indicate. In fact, we would expect to see the name of Aloanda within a road connection from Pinara, Telmessos or Tlos, if it had been a polis in the Early Imperial Period. On the other hand, we cannot rule out the possibility that Aloanda was a very small polis in the Hellenistic period before it may have been attached to one of the neighbouring poleis. This

---

7 Hellenkemper – Hild 2004, II, 433-434, s.v. Aloanda; Hild 2004, 121.
8 See in SEG 43 983.
9 For the ancient routes around the vicinity see Onur – Tekoğlu 2020, 2-9. It is not likely that Aloanda was an autonomous demos, a status that is not attested in Lycia but is known from different parts of Asia Minor. For autonomous demoi, of which we know very little, see Magie 1950, 1024-1026 and Schuler 1998, 41-42.
possibility is perhaps supported by the use of the ethnicon in both of the Hellenistic funerary inscriptions from the site (fn. 4 and ins. no. 2 below). The practice to mention the civic status in funerary context within the polis of origin became widespread only in the imperial period, therefore it is highly unusual that we have this practice at Aloanda already in the Hellenistic period, which might be due to the special need of members of this small community to express their collective identity and to assert their community as a polis at the time of these inscriptions.10

The Inscriptions

No. 1) The Foundation of Pokomas

Quadrangular stone, all four sides of which are inscribed in Greek (Fig. 3). Face C has been preserved well, though it is broken from the right bottom. Face B has been preserved intact, but its inscription is quite worn. Most of Face D is broken and lost, while Face A retains only a small part of the inscription due to a large carving for a secondary use. There are also three other fragments belonging to the inscription.

The inscribed block stands near the remains of a monumental tomb (Fig. 18), from which it might have been dragged, as evidence of the illegal excavation of the tomb can still be observed. The stone seems to have been used for a different purpose at a later time, which suggests that the removal of the stone from its original place was much earlier. Probably a large sarcophagus stood upon the foundations of the monument, since a large lid seems to have been thrown right to its south (Fig. 18). This monument and the sarcophagus might have belonged to Pokomas, who appears to have been a prominent figure at Aloanda, and to his family. Just to the north in the same area are a few other rock-cut tombs (Fig. 15-Fig. 16). There is an old well of drinkable water (Fig. 17) close to the tomb, almost in the center of the hill, in front of a rocky place. A natural water way leaves the well and reaches a circular watery place, at the eastern edge of which are these other tombs. The Lycian inscription mentioned above (fn. 2), which cannot be completely deciphered but certainly contains some religious rituals including animal sacrifice, was found ca. 10 m to the west of the tomb and the inscribed block. The second inscription presented below was also found in the same vicinity. Thus, the find spot is actually a burial site, where possibly religious rituals could also have been performed.

Dimensions (cm): H L D LH Notes

| Frg. 1 | 78 | 81 | 52 | 1,5-1 | Main body; Faces A, B and C. The letters are smaller on the Face A, esp. at the end of the lines. The face C is framed from top, right and left. Frame width: 11 cm. |

Photos Fig. 19, Fig. 21-Fig. 25

10 In a funerary inscription from Sidyma, the tomb owner Hoplon is recorded as a Καλαβαττιανός. The dating of the inscription is disputed, but the palaeography indicates a date in the Hellenistic or Early Roman periods. The use of ethnicon by Hoplon at Sidyma should indicate that Kalabatia was a polis at the time of the inscription. However, Hoplon might have wished to highlight his ethnicon since he was not interred in his hometown Kalabatia, see the details on the inscription Takmer 2010, 120, no. 3 (SEG 60 1565); for dating the inscription to an earlier period see Onur 2016, 108 and Onur 2019, 265.
The Text

**Face A**

(Frg. 1 + Frg. 4) 
23 lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ΙΟΥΘ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ΑΝΔΕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OK ΟΚΡΑΤΗ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[δ Α]γραφο[ς] Α παρά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[εἰς τὸν ἀπαγόρευτον] ΣΙΝΔΕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ΝΟΥΟΙ[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>υ και φθό... νι? OΝΙΕΡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>γ δε και</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>και έπιτε-λέο[ουσιν κατά τα] άθλα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>των την μερίδα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ανομοίουν παρεχέτω-σαν... ναι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Face B**

(Frg. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>[α]ι[ρείσθωσαν δ(ε) και] καθ' έκαστον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>[ρ]αθιδότω[σαν τό [ά]γείροντον [ά]υτο[ς] κα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ται η μη παραδώσαν, αυτοί ορειλέτω-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>και [η] πρά[ξε]σαν καθ' αυτών καθό-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Face C**

(Frg. 1 + Frg. 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>έπαν δε τόν λιβανωτόν έπιθύσωσιν, ἂναγορ[ευ] τωσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ανομοίουν Ερμεδεπιμιος θαλλ[οῦσαν] κα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>τρεις επί την ευωχίαν, εάν παρεπιθημώσαν· η διδό[τω] σαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>δε Ποκομαι, εως η ξη, των θυμόνων ιερεών [κ]ολεό[ν] σαν ἄξῃ, διδότωσαν τοῖς ἐγγίσταν... λαμ[βανέ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation

**Face B (l. 24-31)** Let them [choose] five brabeutai every year and hand over the money to them, according to what has been written above. If they do not choose (the brabeutai) or do not hand over (the money), let them owe half as much again as the amount they did not hand over, and let the exaction of money be made against them, according to what has been written above.

**Face C (l. 32-51)** When they burn the frankincence, let them proclaim in the drinking-bout as follows: “the demos of Aloandeans crowns Pokomas, son of Ermedepimis, with a wreath of olive branch”; let them invite three men from the kinsfolk of Pokomas to the banquet, if they are present (at Aloanda); let them give one thigh of the back leg(?) from the sacrificed victims to Pokomas, as long as he lives; after Pokomas passes away, let them give (it) to his children, always to the elder one; after the children pass away, let them give (it) to the closest relatives. Let the brabeutai take every year 10 drachms, reserving it (?) for themselves for a drinking bout(?); if they are not able to perform the sacrifices at the prescribed time due to war, they shall perform the sacrifice that was due in the previous year in the [following] year too, according to what has been written above; let them spend
all [the revenue] on the sacrifices and festivities. If anything remains over, let them allocate it [to the next festival], but to nothing else; if they neglect [these (rules) and do not] sacrifice and do not do the rest in accordance with the will (of Pokomas), [let them pay]

**Face D (l. 52-66-)**

[a penalty of] thousand drachms to [the *demos*] of Aloandeans and [let anyone who wishes] prosecute [them for a half/third? share], .... the money.... of [Pokomas .... Po[komas] .... Po[kom]as ... if they destroy, [let the exaction of money be made by Pokom]as or [his] heirs [from o]ne and from several [and from all] ....

**Palaeography, Orthography and Dating**

Since there is no reference to a date in the inscription, the palaeographic features become more important. The alphas have usually broken cross-bar, though sometimes rounded. The sigmas are with flat cross bars and their middle strokes do not reach far to the right. Pis have slightly short right strokes and horizontal bars do not protrude beyond the vertical strokes. Right vertical bars of nys are sometimes inscribed higher. The cross-bars of kappas are short. Omegas are inscribed plain, but the ends of the circles are fairly close to each other. The middle bars of thetas are short and do not touch to the circle. These basic features suggest a date during or after the mid-2nd century B.C. (see Fig. 4). The letters are sometimes smaller, and the kerning is narrowed, especially at the ends of some lines on Face A. These differences were most probably because of a special effort taken to fit certain sections of the text into the spaces on the faces. The stone does not seem of high quality and the inscriber seems to have cut the letters deep to keep their durability.

![Fig. 4) Characteristics of some letters](image)

This dating is also supported by the orthography employed. The imperative ending -σαν is seen from the 3rd century B.C. onwards in both papyri and inscriptions. The iota adscript is always employed in the related dative forms of the articles and nouns (e.g. C 33: ἐν τῶι πότωι, Fig. 5a; C 43-44: ὑπ’ ἐν τῶι)ν τεταγμένωι χρόνοις, Fig. 5c), except for one example: πρεσβυτέρῳ in C 39 (Fig. 5b), which might perhaps be corrected to πρεσβυτέρωι, if the inscriber omitted it unwittingly, while we cannot see them in the subjunctive forms of the verbs (e.g. C 38: μεταλλάξῃ; C 48: περισσεύῃ, Fig. 5d). This is also the case in the foundation inscription of Symmassis. The cessation in use of iota adscript in dative singular forms is usually before the 1st c. A.D. In one case, a superfluous iota is input in the imperative (C 48: κατατασσέτωσαν, Fig. 5d), which is not uncommon from


12 The funerary foundation of a certain Symmassis, son of Sortias, from western Lycia (Tlos or Xanthos), dated to 200 – 100 B.C., is one of the similar examples in terms of phrasing, orthography and content. The inscription was first published by Köse – Tekoğlu 2007 (SEG 58 1640; BE 2008, no. 484), then revised by Parker 2010 (SEG 58 1640) and Arnaoutoglou 2012 (SEG 62 1497).

the 3rd century B.C. onwards. All these indicate typical features of the transition period from the Classical and early Hellenistic eras into the late Hellenistic era (see also fn. 35 below).

a) C 33: ἐν τῶι πότωι
b) C 39: τῶι πρεσβυτέρῳ
c) C 44: τεταγμένωι χρόνωι
d) C 48: ἐὰν δέ τι περισσεύῃ, κατατασσέτωισαν

Fig. 5) Some orthographic details

Textual Critics

Face A

I. 6: ΟΚΡΑΤΗ.: possibly a personal name, such as Ἐρμοκράτης, Ἱπποκράτης etc.
I. 8: the subject of γεραίροντε[ς], a participle of the verb γεραίρω, which means “to honour, reward, present as an honorary gift or celebrate” (see LSJ s.v.), is not clear in the text.
I. 9-10: perhaps ἐπ[υ]μον ἡμέραν εἰς (τὸν) ἅπαντα χρόνον. The stone is broken directly after Ω, but there seems to be a vertical line to its right with some distance, which could perhaps be the right leg of a N.
I. 11 – ΣΙΝΔΕ: perhaps [ου]σιν δὲ or [...][ε]ιν δὲ
I. 13-14: line 13 might have contained several personal names in the nominative, the last one being perhaps [Ἀπολλων]ίδης or a similar name with the preserved ending, followed perhaps by a common patronymic extending to line 14, which would indicate that these persons were siblings. It is possible that these siblings would be the children of Pokomas, thus one could tentatively restore: [---ca.15--- Ἐρμεδεπιμ?][καὶ --ca. 12-- καὶ Ἀπολλων?ίδης οἱ | [Ποκομο?]. However, OI at the end of the line 13 may also have been the first two letters of a personal name such as Oikonomos, Oindeme, Oinedis, Oineus etc.
I. 15 – ΟΝΙΕΡ: perhaps [τ]ὸνἱερ[έα], but there might also be a very uncertain trace of M before the O.
I. 14-15 – ... ν καὶ φθό|[ιν?]: φθό[i]ς is a kind of round cake attested in sacrificial rituals and it may be the word we are looking for. If that is the case, it should have stood in the accusative in the text, but we do not know whether it was given in singular or plural. The N before καὶ may have been the final letter of a singular noun that also stood in the accusative and its article may also have

---

14 This use of the imperatives can be observed in several inscriptions, see e.g. I.Beroia 1 (2nd c. B.C.), I. B 74-75 (παρεχέ|τωσαν); Historia 7 (1933) 577, 1 (Karpathos Isl., Arkasia); 2nd c. B.C.), I. 8 (ἐπ[με]λη-θήσωσαν); Hicks 1891, 233-236 no. 16 (Kanytelleis, Cilicia; Augustan Period), I. 6 (ἐστωι) and I. 15 (ἐξ-έστωι).
15 For these names, see LGPN VB s.vv.
16 E.g., CGRN 76; 80; 86; 188.
applied to φθόϊς. In that case, we would restore φθό[ιν]. However, it is also possible that φθό[(i)v] was given in plural and was followed by a numeral as e.g., in IG XII,4 1:278 (Kos, CGRN 86) ll. 30-31: ἔπειτα ἀγοντὶ τ'[όμ β]ον καὶ τόγ καυτόν καὶ φθό[ιας ἐπτὰ καὶ μέλι καὶ στέμμα.

l. 19 – [tà] άθλα or perhaps [tà ἐπ]αθλα: the traces on the stone before Θ may only have belonged to an Α, Δ or Λ, and one obviously expects a vowel before ΘΑΛ, therefore Α is the only remaining option. It is hard to restore ΑΘΑΛ in another way than as [tà] άθλα or [tà ἐπ]άθλα, prizes of contest.

ll. 20-21 – [τὴν μ]ερίδα | ὠμ[ήν]: in inscriptions concerning sacrifices, usually the meat (κρέας) or a certain part of the animal (e.g. σκέλος) is designated as raw17 rather than the portion, and we could not find a parallel for a “raw portion/share”. However, this seems to us as the most plausible reading and restoration. One also thinks of the noun ὦμος (shoulder), but there is a very clear vertical line near Μ, thus the remaining word cannot be a declension of this noun.

ll. 22-23 – παρεχ[έ]τω|σαν: since imperatives are always used at the beginning of the sentences in the text, we assume that a new sentence begins with παρεχ[έ]τωσαν, regardless of whether it was preceded by a subordinate clause or not. Its object and subject – if it had had one – should have followed it. The stone is broken on the left from Ν onwards, but before the vacat on the right, there is space for around 30 letters. In an inscription from Mylasa παρεχέτωσαν is used in a context of providing sacrificial animals and other necessities.18

Face B
l. 30 – καθ’ αὑτῶν: this is a rare use19, perhaps in the sense of “against the violators themselves” referring to the “same” individuals to be fined. Thus, this is either a detail to point the exact target of the fine, or perhaps a simple error for κατ’ αὐτῶν.

Face C
l. 34: the name of the honorand, Pokomas, is so far attested only in Lycia and in the Kibyratis. Two inscriptions from Xanthos in western Lycia, both dated to the Hellenistic period, altogether record 6 men bearing this name.20 The father’s name of a Xanthian woman recorded in TAM II 391 as Εἰρήνη Μοκομου is possibly also Pokomas.21 A Hellenistic allotment list from Balboura in the Kibyratis records two individuals identified as Ποκομου.22 The name is listed in LGPN VC as Pokomos, but should rather be understood as Pokomas. The name of the honorand’s father,

17 E.g., CGRN 43, l. 24; CGRN 84, ll. 23-24; CGRN 225, A l. 34; B l. 39.
18 I.Mylasa 914 = CGRN 183, l. 1-4: [— λαβόντες π]αρὰ τῶν ταμίῶν | [τὸ] ἀργύριον | [π]αρεχέτωσαν τά τε ἱερεῖα | [κ]αὶ τά λοιπά πάντα τά νομίζόμενα ἐν ἑ|κάστῃ ἑορτῇ: ([... having received] the money from the treasurers, let them provide the sacrificial animals and all the remaining things which are customary during each festival. CGRN).
19 See some examples in IG II² 1113, l. 16; IG IV², 1 68, l. 49; I.Erythrai 503, l. 6.
20 LGPN VB s.v.
21 Eirene’s father provides the sole example for the name Mokomas in LGPN VB s.v., and the name is not documented anywhere else in the ancient world.
22 SEG 40 1268 C l. 5 and 20.
Ερμεδεπιμις, is known from several inscriptions in Lycia in various forms, such as Ερμαδαπειμις, Ερμαδαπειμις, Ερμαδαπειμις and Αρμαδαπειμις.23

l. 36 – παρεπιδημέω: the use of the verb παρεπιδημέω concerning the kinsmen of Pokomas may imply that they did not reside at Aloanda.24 A parallel case is attested in a decree from Kula in Lydia25: a certain Lykinos, who did not reside at Kula, was to be honoured annually with a wreath and a leg from animal sacrifices. While his share was to be sent to him during his lifetime, his descendants would receive Lykinos’ share after his death, but only ὅταν ἐπιδημῶσ[ι]. In our text, there is no mention of sending Pokomas’ share to himself or to his descendants after his death. In fact, the use of the verb δίδωμι indicates that their presence in the ritual was expected. We can assume that Pokomas himself resided at Aloanda, and he was most probably an Αλοανδεύς, but the fact that the verb παρεπιδημέω is used in relation to his kinsmen makes it possible that Pokomas was not originally from Aloanda.

ll. 37-38 – [κ]ωλεός κειλείον: a similar construction is used in an unpublished inscription from the Letoon, but in the usual feminine form (κωλέαν σκελείαν).26 The reason for this gender switch into masculine in our inscription is not clear. The different forms of the word ὁ κωλέας (“ham; thigh”) are ἡ κωλή, ἡ κωλέα or τὸ κῶλον in Attic Greek. Athenaeus provided examples of masculine form (see also fn. 29 below) used by Epicharmus.27 Several forms of the word are attested in the inscriptions not only as κωλή, but also as κωλέα28, κωλεός29 and κωλεόν30. The adjective σκελείος, -εία, -ον is not attested anywhere else other than in the above mentioned inscription from the Letoon. It should broadly mean “of the leg” deriving from σκέλος (-εος, τό), but should have a more precise meaning than that, since it is used together with a word that means thigh. In such a constellation, the adjective σκελείος might perhaps refer to a back leg or to a foreleg. Since both terms are mainly used for the back leg as noted by Ekroth31, the adjective in our text might be denoting the back leg, thus [κ]ωλεός κειλείον would mean “thigh of the back leg”.

l. 40 – ἔγγιστα γένος: this phrase is a synonym of ἀγχιστεῖς, a terminus technicus that denotes the “next of kin”, who were entitled to inherit intestate from the deceased, but also had various legal responsibilities towards him.32 Unfortunately, we do not know which relatives the technical phrase ἔγγιστα γένους covered in Lycia, and in which order, but it certainly included direct

23 See LGPN s.v.v.; For Erm/Arm- names in southern Asia Minor, see Balzat 2014.
24 See the discussion by Jones 2003, 157-160, who argues that the verbs παρεπιδημέω and ἐπιδημέω are only used in cases of a visit, regardless of the length of the stay (SEG 53 2259).
25 TAM V 234. See the relevant commentary on the text by Carbon 2018, 363-364.
26 We thank Denis Rousset for providing this information.
27 Athen., deipn., 9.1 (366a-b); see the frgs. 71 and 81 of Epicharmus in Kassel – Austin 2001.
28 Arena, Iscrizioni I² 53 (Selinus, Sicilia, 5th c. B.C; SEG 43 630); I.Pergamon 40, 3rd c. B.C.; I.Kalkhedon 13 (3rd c. B.C.), l.5-6; SEG 29 1088, l. 6-11; SEG 44 505, l. 9-11 (Amphipolis, Macedonia).
29 I.Mylasa 942, l. 6-7 (Hellenistic period); CIRB 105, l. 26 (Phanagoria, N. Black Sea, 2nd c. A.D.)
30 I.Mylasa 304, l. 3-5.
32 Thalheim 1894; Harrison 1968, 143-149; Lacey 1968, 28-29; Thür 1996.
descendants. Thus, once the children of Pokomas died, their children and grandchildren would receive his honorary share from the sacrificed animals. In case these did not have any offspring, then collaterals would step in, following an order pre-defined by law, the details of which remain unknown to us.

II. 42-43 – [διὰ πό]λεμον: it is a phrase used in a few Hellenistic inscriptions from Lycia and in other Hellenistic foundations from the ancient world. It should rather be understood as a legal clause inserted in a professionally prepared legal document than being linked with specific military conflicts in Lycia.

II. 44-45 – ἐν τὸ ἔπειτα: in the restoration, ἔπειτα, which was used as τὸν ἔπειτα ἐνιαυτόν in an inscription from Isinda (TAM I 65), is preferred due to the remaining space on the stone. See also SIG 931 (ἐν τῷ ἔπειτα συλλόγῳ). An alternative restoration would have been ἐκοιμένως, which is much more prevalent, but it exceeds the remaining gap. On the other hand, another alternative, ἔξης, is too short.

I. 45 – τὴν προσοφειλομένην: it is surprising that the related noun of the participle was not used. Though it might be a nominalization, the associated noun might also have been omitted by the scribe or the inscriber. The implied noun should probably have been θυσία, which is mentioned in l. 43 although the word is given there in plural as τὰς θυσίας.

II. 48-49 – εἰς τὴν ἑξῆς ἑορτήν: the restoration is based upon the space of 11-12 letters. The remaining three letters, ΤΗΝ, results in nothing but ἑορτή.

II. 50-51 – [ἀποτινέτω]σαν: here we need an imperative verb referring to the payment of fine such as ὀφειλέτωσαν, ζημιούτωσαν or ἀποτινέτωσαν, the last of which fits best with the gap, where there is space for around 9-10 letters. The long vacat after ΣΑΝ in the last line of Face C is curious, but the sentence apparently continues on Face D (see more in p. 16-17 below).

Face D

I. 52: for the remaining space of ca. 10 letters after [Ἀλο]άνδεων τῶι δήμωι, we have restored [προστείμου]. Other alternatives would be [ἀργυρίου] or the currency of drachme such as [κιθαρηφόρους].

33 Kılıç-Aslan (in preparation), Chapter IV. “A. Terminology and Phraseology Related to Rights of Inheritance”.

34 TAM II 1 (Telmessos, 240 B.C.), l. 34; The foundation of Symmasis (fn. 12 above) l. A 49-54. See also Wörrle 2015, 291 l. 3 (SEG 65 1469. Limyra, ca. 250 – 200 B.C.); Culasso-Castaldi – Samitz 2019, 161 l. 15 (Antiphellos, ca. mid-2nd c. B.C.) for similar references to the possibility of war in Hellenistic inscriptions.

35 On the phrase in the foundation of Symmasis (fn. 12 above), see Köse – Tekoğlu 2007, 64: “some lines in the inscription mention some political obstacles and the risk of war during the feasting and sacrifices organized by the koinon. Such expressions may be better understood in the historical context of Lycia in the 2nd part of the 2nd century B.C.”. Contra this comment, Harris 2008, 81 fn. 8 states “the phrase only mentions the possibility of war and is similar to clauses found in contracts exempting one party from payment or completion of work in the event of war. See III G no. 9, lines 13-17; III G no. 12, lines 152-54; IG ii² 2492, lines 12-14”.

In a similar manner, Parker 2010, 110 with fn. 22 links the use of the phrase with the professionalism of the text. However, Arnaoutoglou 2012, 206-207 fn. 8 connects the phrase to a possible outbreak of war, reminding of the unrests in 165-140 B.C. with references to several inscriptions, although he states that Harris has drawn his attention to the standard use of the phrase.
ll. 53-54: the first part of the restoration, \([\delta \rho \alpha \chi][\acute{\alpha} \varsigma] \chi \lambda[\iota \varsigma \acute{\alpha} \varsigma]\), seems secure. The remaining letters \(\varepsilon \Gamma \Delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \kappa \alpha \varepsilon\) in line 54 imply that the penalty clause continues after the clarification of the fine that should be paid, and it apparently concerns volunteer prosecutors, who would get a certain share from the fine. There are two different formulae attested in Lycian epigraphy that would be relevant for restoring the lacuna in our text. The first one is ἔστω ἐγδικασία τῶι βουλομένωι, which is attested in the foundation of Symmasis.\(^{36}\) The second one is ἐξέστω τῶι βουλομένωι ἐγδικάξεσθαι, which is to our knowledge attested four times in Lycia to date.\(^{37}\) Although less common, we have tentatively preferred the former in our restoration in a slightly different order (καὶ ἐστω τῶι βουλομένωι ἐγδικασία) since καὶ ἐξέστω τῶι βουλομένωι does not fit in the available space before \(\varepsilon \Gamma \Delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \kappa \alpha \varepsilon\). Even our preferred restoration only fits with difficulty and one could perhaps omit καὶ, but we would normally expect it to be there. Another alternative would be καὶ τῶι βουλομένωι ἐγδικασία ἔστω, which would better fit in the available space even though the syntax in this form would be unusual. Or perhaps, the amount of the fine was not 1000 drachms but higher, e.g. \([\delta \rho \alpha \chi][\acute{\alpha} \varsigma] \chi \lambda[\iota \varsigma \pi \varepsilon \tau \kappa \alpha \sigma \iota \varsigma \iota \varsigma]\), and the part concerning the voluntary prosecutor started only towards the very end of the line 53. We cannot be sure about what exactly stood there, but it should most probably have been followed by the share of the voluntary prosecutor, which in most cases is a half or a third of the penalty (ἐπὶ τῶι ἡμίσει/τρίτωι).

ll. 56-57: perhaps τ[ο]ञ ἀργυρίον κατὰ τὸ τοῦ Πο[μο]ῦ πιτ[άκιον]. The meaning of \(\textit{pittakion}\) is not very specific and given in LSJ s.v. as “tablet for writing on, label, ticket, written message, receipt, votive tablet, promissory note, account book etc.”. The term is attested in Greek papyri from Egypt already in the 2\(^{nd}\) c. B.C. even though most attestations come from the Christian period.\(^{38}\) It is so far documented once in Lycia (at Myra): the edict of the Roman governor Q. Veranius from A.D. 43 deals with \(\textit{pittakia}\) admitted to the archives despite interpolations and erasures on them.\(^{39}\) The testament of Attalos Adrastos from Aphrodisias, dated to the 2\(^{nd}\) c. A.D., bears a reference to the testator’s \(\textit{pittakion}\) twice.\(^{40}\) This benefactor bequeathed a substantial sum

\(^{36}\) Fn. 12 above, see ll. C 12-13; The second part of the penalty clause in TAM V 1316 ll. 14-16 from Tyana(los) in Lydia: ἐὰν δὲ τ[ις] παραβῇ τι τῶι, ἀποτεισά|τωσαν τῇ κατοικίᾳ ἱερὰς ἀπαραιτήτου δραχμὰς φʹ καὶ ἡ ἐκδικία ἔστω τῷ βουλομένῳ if the additional two letters fit on the stone. We have not found any epigraphic evidence for ἡ ἐκδικία ἔστω τῷ βουλομένῳ.

\(^{37}\) The Foundation of Symmasis (fn. 12 above, see ll. A 45-49); TAM II 520 (Pinara); Schweyer 2002, 236 Corba 30 (καὶ ὑπόδικος ἔστω | τοῖς ἀνχιστεῦσι καὶ ἄλ|ῳ τῷ βουλομένῳ ἐγδικάζεσθαι …); Corsten 2008, 100 l. 8 (Myra).

\(^{38}\) 2\(^{nd}\) c. B.C.: Sijpesteijn 1979, 274-280 (SB XVI 12375); Gronewald – Hagedorn 1981, 289-293 (SB XVI 12677). For the other attestations of \(\textit{pittakion}\) in Greek papyri from Egypt, see Rupprecht 2000, s.v.

\(^{39}\) Wörrle 1975, 255-256, l. 10 and l. 41 with a brief discussion on the term on p. 258 fn. 511 (SEG 33 1177). Wörrle acknowledges its use in the text rather as an emphasis on the material of the \(\textit{Schriftträger}\), which was probably not a wooden tablet but was a papyrus or a parchment. Cf. Meyer 2004, 184-185 with fn. 68, who argues that \(\textit{pittakia}\) at that date would mostly be tablets made of wood.

\(^{40}\) I.Aphrodisias 2007 12.1007 (Laum 1914, 106-107 no. 102), ll. 21-27: γεγραφόμενον ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ δηλ. καὶ τῷ πιττακίῳ τ[ο]φ | ενελῃμ[ής] ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ τῶι δαν(ε)κάς ἀσφαλείας καὶ τὴν ποσότητα τοῦ[ι] | ἀργυρίου ὃς καταλέλοιπη διὰ τῆς διαθήκης τῇ γλυκουτάτῃ μου πατρίδι εἰς | τὰς αἰωνίους γυμνασιαρχίας καὶ στεφανηφορίας καὶ σηκατοντάηλ ποιός καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοῦ πιττακίου γράφαμε τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ χείρι ἡ καὶ τῇ διαθήκῃ γέγραψα τὰ ὀνόματα τῶι χρεωστῶν | καὶ τῇ ἐκατοστοι αὐτῶν ὀφείλει ἀρχαίον καὶ τόκου, καὶ ἐστὶν καθὼς υπογεγράται. ("I declare, having written in
of money to the city for the gymnasiasiarchia and stephanephoria by means of a testament (διαθήκη), and as is usual in other similar cases, he wanted to secure his foundation and the money he left behind through certain measures. Hence, he apparently supplemented his testament with a codicil, referred to in the text as a pittakion, and repeated in there (and possibly also included more) details about the money he bequeathed as well as the people who owed him money (some of the money he bequeathed would perhaps come from his debtors). However, it should be pointed out that even though Attalos Adrastos was not a Roman citizen (at least he presented himself as a non-Roman), the pittakion of his testament seems to have been an allusion to a specific and technical issue (testamentum and codicillum) of Roman hereditary law, and therefore cannot be directly compared with Pokomas’ pit[takion], which obviously cannot be understood as a Roman codicillum. As the relevant part is so badly preserved, we cannot be certain about what the pit[takion?] of Pokomas exactly included or even in which exact meaning the word was used in the text. On the other hand, since Face D includes overall penalty clauses, it was apparently brought up in a context that dealt with the protection of Pokomas’ foundation.

l. 58: possibly […τωσ] αν δὲ κ[αὶ] or [ἐ] αν δὲ κ[αὶ], followed by the subject of the sentence, which should be the officials responsible for the foundation, such as ο[ἱ βραβευταί . . . . . . . .], or perhaps some other officials that are not mentioned in the preserved parts of the text. If this is a conditional clause, it might be the beginning of the sentence containing the verb ἀπόλλυμι in l. 61, but in that case, its subject would probably not be the brabeutai, since the penalty clause there does not seem to address them (see below p. 22).

l. 61 – ἀπόλλυμι[iv]: (act. aor. subj. 3rd pl. of) ἀπόλλυμι. This verb was used quite rarely in the meaning of “destroying” or “extinguishing” legal documents, public records, decisions or enacted practises. One Athenian example, a well preserved copy of which was found in Eleusis, from late 2nd c. B.C. records a similar use: “ἐὰν δὲ τι μὴ παραδῶσιν, εἰσπραττέσθωσαν ὑπὸ τῶν τεταγμένων ἐπ’ αὐτούς κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα, καὶ [ἐάν τινα ἀπολέσωσιν, κατασκευάζέσαν ἀντὶ τῶν ἀπολομένων ἐτερα τοιαῦτα·” 41 In our text, it might be referring to the destruction or the extinguishment of legal documents of Pokomas’ foundation or of the foundation itself. Another possibility is that Pokomas’ gift was in the form of or included real estate, and the verb refers to its destruction. Or it may be referring to “losing” it as a result of negligence and long term lease, which could in fact happen.42

41 I.Eleusis 237 (= IG II² 1013), ll. 50-52; Agora XVI 322, ll. 1-3; translation by Doyen 2015, who revised the text, is as following: “if they do not transmit them, it shall be required by those who supervise them according to the decree, and if standards (σύμβολα) are destroyed], other [standards (σύμβολα)] shall be established in place of the destroyed ones”.

42 Such a situation is documented in an inscription from Heracleia in Lucania in southern Italy concerning the leasing of the sacred estates of Dionysos and Athena (Pernin 2014, 459-460 no. 259 I ll. 39-46 with the relevant commentary on p. 475).
ll. 63-64: the restoration is based on the formula attested in the penalty clause of a late 3rd c. B.C. inscription from Orchomenos in Boiotia concerning the back payment of a loan.\(^{43}\) A shorter version of this formula is documented in the partially preserved penalty clause of a foundation inscription from Lampsakos in Troas in the 2nd c. B.C. as καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ ἐκ πάντων.\(^{44}\) A fragmentary inscription from Galatia dated to the Roman imperial period should probably also be restored in line 17 as καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ [ἐκ] πά[ντων].\(^{45}\)

l. 64-66: perhaps ἐστ[άθη | κατὰ τὴν δόσ|ιν | [τὴν Ποκομο]υ.

The Content and the Order of the Texts on the Faces

This inscription documents the foundation of a certain Pokomas, son of Ermedepimis, from Hellenistic Aloanda in Lycia. It is preserved best on Face C, where the text is surrounded by a frame. However, the text on this face is clearly not the beginning of the foundation document. Both side faces (B and D, of which the latter is to a great extent broken) contain penalty clauses, but not the beginning of the inscription either. There remains today extremely little text from Face A, which makes the construction and the grasp of its content very difficult. Some conjectures are discussed below on the basis of a few remaining letters or words. However, these alone do not allow us to answer the question of whether the beginning of the text may have been inscribed on this face or not.

As a matter of fact, one does not expect to find the beginning of an inscription on the unframed face (Face A) instead of the framed one (Face C). Furthermore, it attracts notice that the letters are in part a bit smaller and closer to each other on this side – it contains 3 more lines than the framed face – pointing to an effort to fit the text into the existing space. This would normally happen towards the end of the text or in the case that this text was inscribed at a somewhat later date than the original inscription. However, considering all the uninscribed space on Face B and possibly also on Face D, the former seems less likely. Would the stone-cutter really make such a bad planning in using faces of the stone? Moreover, the imperative παρεχετοσαν in the final two lines of Face A, which is followed by maximum of around 38 letters before the vacat, also makes it unlikely in terms of content that Face A would be the end of the inscription. Things that shall be provided, apparently for the purposes of the foundation, should rather come up in the main part of the text. If the latter is the case, that is, if the text on Face A was inscribed at a later date, then it may have contained arrangements that were subsequently made, similar to the cases in some other foundations.\(^{46}\) However, we must note that we do not recognise a difference in letter

\(^{43}\) IG VII 3172 (Orchomenos, 3rd c. B.C.) ll. B 29-35: ἡ δὲ πρᾶξις ἔστω ἐκ τε | αὐτῶν τῶν δανεισαμένων | καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔγγυων, καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς | καὶ ἐκ πλειόνων καὶ ἐκ πάντων, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων | αὐτοῖς, πραττούσην ὁδὲ τρόπον βούληται (“Let the exaction apply to the borrowers themselves and to the guarantors, to one of them, to many of them, and to all of them, and to their properties, in what way she (scil. Nikareta) desires” trans. Erdas 2018, 336). For the process of praxis and the praxis clauses, see Rubinstein 2010 and p. 207 fn. 44. which refers to the cited inscription from Orchomenos.

\(^{44}\) I.Lampsakos 9, l. 82.

\(^{45}\) I.North Galatia 4 l. 17: [— — —]οις καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς κακ[ .πα[— — —].

\(^{46}\) E.g., the foundation of Diomedon in Kos, who dedicated a sacred precinct to Heracles Diomedonteios in ca. 310 B.C., comprises of three texts, which were not all inscribed at the same time. The first text is dated to ca. 310 B.C. Second and third texts were appended with further regulations, the former being from ca. 300 B.C., while the latter is a little later, dated to sometime before 275 B.C. (for the inscription see IG XII 4,
forms on Face C that would suggest that they were inscribed by a different hand. Clearly, if we assume that the text on the unframed face equally or chronologically comes after that on the framed face, then the beginning of the text should have been inscribed on another stone. However, this stone cannot have been directly attached to our block. The frame on Face C makes it rather unlikely that there would have been another stone with text directly above it. It cannot have been directly under it either, because the text on Face C apparently continues on Face D as discussed in more detail below. Besides, in that case, there would have been too much uninscribed space on Face B, which only consists of 8 lines, and possibly also on Face D, thus a second stone below would have been useless for the side faces.

On the other hand, there are a few clues, like the order and the content of the texts on the other faces, suggesting that the unframed Face A may have contained the beginning of the text on the quadrangular stone. First of all, it seems that the text on Face D directly follows that on Face C. This creates in fact a rather curious situation since the final line (l. 51) on Face C solely consists of three letters (ΣΑΝ), and then there is a long vacat. Thus, one would normally expect that the text on this face would finish with these three letters. However, considering the content of the text, this can hardly be the case. There comes from l. 49 onwards till the end of l. 51 the penalty clause (ἐὰν δὲ παραλείπωσιν [ταῦτα καὶ μὴ] | θύωσιν καὶ τ’ ἄλλα μὴ ποιῶσιν κατὰ τὴν δόσιν, [--- ca. 9-10---]) | [σαν vac.], and it is highly unlikely that the penalty clause would be so short as to consist of around only 12-13 letters. The three letters in l. 51 clearly belong to an imperative in the 3rd person plural. Therefore, we have restored the lacuna in our edition as [ἀποτινέτω]σαν. Perhaps, one or two more letters could fit in the lacuna, and hence, one could perhaps restore it alternatively to include before the verb also the amount of the due penalty, e.g. as [Lexer, ὁφειλέτω]σαν. However, it would be very unusual if the amount of the penalty preceded the verb since it is normally the other way around, and even then, the penalty clause would still be too short. Other crucial aspects, such as to whom or to which institution the penalty shall be paid to, would be missing. While we have such problems with the final lines of the text on Face C, the beginning of the text on Face D is also not without problems. It is rather unusual that "the demos of Aloandeans" – if our restoration is correct – appears in the dative at the very beginning of the text, whereas one would normally expect it to be in the nominative. The dative requires a grammatically matching verb, and one thinks of, for example, ἔδοξεν or δεδόχθαι. However, this again brings us to a syntactic problem. The verb ἔδοξεν or δεδόχθαι would usually precede [Ἀλονδ]έων τι[ῆι δήμῳ]. Returning to the text on Face C, the imperative restored as [ἀποτινέτω]σαν that requires a noun in the dative, perfectly matches with the dative on Face D that requires a preceding verb. Furthermore, there are remaining letters in the following line on

348; see also more in CGRN 96; Carbon – Pirenne-Delforge 2013, 68-70); In the foundation of Poseidonios of ca. first half of 3rd c. from Halikarnassos, there are two parts, but probably inscribed at the same time. The first is a pledge of bequest prompted by an oracle he consulted. The second part is a decree containing the legal documents and later arrangements (see the newest edition made by J.-M. Carbon in: Carbon – Pirenne-Delforge 2013, 99-114; CGRN 104); The foundation of Epikteta from the island of Thera, who, in ca. 210/193 B.C., composed a testament addressing the management of financial issues of the cult of the Muses in Museion, is composed of two texts, the second of which might have been arranged after Epikteta’s death. Though the time span between the texts is uncertain, the texts belong to the period from 210 to 193 B.C. (for the inscription see IG XII 3, 330; Ricci 1981, 72-81, no. 31; Wittenburg 1990, 21-37; also, BE 1990, 507-508 no. 426. For a description of the content see Carbon – Pirenne-Delforge 2013, 71-73; CGRN 152).
Face D that can be restored as the amount of the fine, as we would typically find in a penalty clause. The word ἐγδικα[σία] (or ἐγδικά[ζεσθαι]) also acts as a keyword to understand the first lines of the text on Face D as a penalty clause. Thus, it appears that, despite the vacat at the end of Face C, the text continues on Face D.

If the texts on the four faces of our stone flow from left to right, as usually is the case, and since the text on Face C is clearly not the beginning of the inscription, it is then possible that the text on Face B preceded that on Face C, and hence, the text on Face A preceded that on Face B: The text on Face B concerns the annual election of brabeutai and the handing the necessary money over to them (so that they can fulfill their duty), followed by a penalty clause directed at those who would fail to elect the brabeutai or to hand the money over to them. The text on Face C refers to certain rituals before moving onto regulations ensuring their continuity, again followed by a penalty clause. However, it does not deal with technicalities such as when or where these rituals shall take place, what kind of an animal or animals shall be sacrificed etc., which would be expected to come up quite early in the text, but to a great extent with the privileges and perquisites of a selected group of people, i.e. Pokomas himself, his relatives, descendants and next-of-kin, and the brabeutai, the importance of whose election is mentioned on Face B.\footnote{See below p. 23 on why 10 drachms should be understood as the perquisite of the brabeutai.} Even though the text on Face B does not syntactically continue on Face C (unlike the syntactic continuity from Face C to Face D), on the basis of their content, the former should have preceded the latter. Returning to Face A, it is then also possible that, as mentioned above, it preceded Face B.

There does in fact seem to have been a continuity from Face A to Face B in terms of content. Even though there is extremely little left from Face A, ll. 18-21 possibly refer to agones, to their organisation and perhaps, to the distribution of portions of raw meat as a prize or one of the prizes.\footnote{For sacrificial meat as a prize in agones, see Tsoukala 2009, 10-11.} We can imagine that brabeutai would also be mentioned somewhere in this part as those responsible for the games (for more on brabeutai, see below p. 20-21). Therefore, it would make sense if this part were followed by the text recapturing some details about the election of the brabeutai and the handing over the necessary money to them as well as the relevant penalty clause for failure to do so.

Another argument for Face A containing the beginning of the text on the stone is the content of the lines 61-64 on Face D. Here, the penalty clause deals with some kind of a “destruction” (ἀπόλλυμι), perhaps of legal documents/practices of the foundation, or with “destruction” or “loss” of real estates belonging to it (see p. 14 above), and such a concern would probably come up towards the end of the document.

But if Face A really is the beginning of the text on the stone, how do we explain the fact that the letters are smaller and closer to each other there? The “strange” vacat in l. 51 on Face C may offer the needed explanation. It appears that the stone cutter wanted to emphasize, presumably following the wish of his client, the penalty clause by writing it separately on a side face. Therefore, he moved to Face D instead of continuing on Face C. In fact, Face B, the other side face, contains a penalty clause too and is not fully inscribed. Even though Face D is broken at the bottom, it seems, on the basis of the vacat in ll. 64-65 (perhaps 66?) that it was not fully inscribed either. Thus, the penalty clauses, which were vitally important for the preservation and continuity of...
Pokomas’ foundation, were emphasized individually on both side faces. We can imagine that the text on the framed Face C was also very important for Pokomas. After all, it contains his privileges and the stipulations for the continuity of the sacrificial rituals. Hence, he might have wanted to emphasize this part on an individual face, where it is surrounded by a frame. Due to this kind of a distribution of the text on the four faces of the stone, the stone cutter may have ended up with a lot of text to fit in on Face A and therefore already in the beginning used smaller letters.

Unfortunately, not having access to the text on Face A, we cannot know for sure which one of the above discussed scenarios was true. Besides, Greek foundation inscriptions do not always follow a very clearly organised narrative sequence. However, we have preferred to proceed based on the scenario that the unframed longside face contained the beginning of the inscription on the stone – therefore named Face A –, and the distribution of the text on the stone depended on the prioritisation of certain pieces.

To broadly and tentatively recap the possible content of the text on Face A, the second half of it seems to deal with sacrificial rituals and agones. We may have the word φθό[ϊς] in ll. 14-15 and perhaps τ[ὸ]ν ἱερ[έα] in ll.15-16. Ll. 18-21 possibly pertain to agones, as already mentioned above. It is not clear what τ[ά]παρ[όν|τα in ll. 21-22 refer to, but since the participle is neutrum, it may be referring to things being present or available in the rituals. Then there comes the phrase κατὰ τὸν ν[όμον] in l. 22, which should be related to a stipulation that the actions or rituals referred to in the relevant lines should be undertaken in accordance with the law or regulations of the institution in charge of the foundation. This is followed by the imperative παρεχ[έ]σαν (they shall provide) in ll. 22-23, whose noun is not preserved, but the things that shall be provided presumably should also be related to the rituals. It is quite possible that a deity, one of the missing components of Pokomas’ foundation in the preserved parts of the text, was also mentioned somewhere in this part in relation to these rituals.

The first half of the text should then have covered other missing critical information, such as what the δόσις of Pokomas included. Pokomas must have dedicated a capital sum of money or a piece of land etc. that would have generated income in perpetuity for the purposes of his foundation. He must also have clarified how and by whom his δόσις had to be managed. We seem to have a personal name in l. 6, and this man may have belonged to the group of persons responsible for managing Pokomas’ foundation. In l. 10, we apparently have [εἰς τὸν ἀπα]ντα χρόνον or a similar expression referring to an infinite period of time, which is typical for the purposes of a foundation.

On the other hand, we should remember too that some of the information given on Face B and Face C with the clause καθότι προγέγραπται (Face B ll. 26-27; 30-21; Face C l. 44) should also have been mentioned in the text earlier, and one can be certain that all this repeated information together with the missing details about Pokomas’ foundation would not fit on Face A. Therefore, we could assume that the original foundation document was not fully copied on the stone, but only certain parts or excerpts were taken from it. Or perhaps, there really was another inscribed stone somewhere around our block that included the very beginning of the foundation document.

---

49 The clause καθότι προγέγραπται should normally refer to what was written earlier in the same document, but one wonders whether it would have been used in an acceptance document referring to the original bequest of the founder.
This possibility, however, does not necessarily contradict with the way we preferred to order the texts on each face. For all the reasons discussed above, the text on Face A may still be the first one of them in the row even if it was the case that it did not include the very beginning of the foundation document.

The Foundation and the Rituals

Unfortunately, we cannot learn all the details concerning the foundation of Pokomas, and there remain many questions that cannot be answered with certainty since the inscription is not fully preserved. However, based on the phrase κατὰ τὴν δόσιν (Cl. 50), it is at least certain that we are dealing with a foundation, one that was initiated by Pokomas himself.50

The nature of Pokomas’ foundation is not perfectly clear. Since the findspot seems to have been a burial site, and the monumental tomb nearby may have belonged to Pokomas as discussed above, one wonders whether the nature of Pokomas’ foundation may have been funerary. In that case, an important parallel would be a Hellenistic inscription from western Lycia (Xanthos or Tlos) recording the funerary foundation of a certain Symmasis (fn. 12 above), son of Sortias, which contains animal sacrifice.51 However, the Aloandean text, or to be more precise what remains from it, does not include any concrete hints pointing to a funerary context. There is mention of sacrifices on Face C and that Pokomas receives an honorary share from them. This honorary share is to be given to his descendants and next-of-kin following his death, always to the eldest one, a practice that has quite a few parallels in Greek inscriptions, including the case of Symmasis.52 However, the Aloandean text does not clarify the context of these sacrifices or their addressee. That there may be mention of one’s “own ancestors” (τοῖς γενέ&τες ἰδ[ίοις?]) in A. 11 does make one think of a family cult, but the reading and the restoration is not certain. We have the remaining words τῆς γυν&κός α[ὐτοῦ] in A. 9, who may have been Pokomas’ wife, but it cannot be put in context. There may have been several siblings in A 1.13, who may have been Pokomas’ children, but that is again by no means certain (see above p. 9). The foundation surely has a commemorative aspect and includes persons from Pokomas’ family circle, but the remaining text does not allow us to call it a funerary foundation in a narrow sense. Besides, the proclamation in the potos that the demos of Aloandeans crowns Pokomas places Pokomas’ foundation in the public sphere. The foundation rather seems to have had public benefit, and possibly even included an agon as part of the annual rituals, whereas we cannot exclude the possibility either that Pokomas may have founded these annual events for the commemoration of himself and his family in eternity. For instance, an inscription from Amorgos of the 2nd c. B.C. records a foundation initiated by a certain Kritolaos, son of Alkimedon, who donated a capital sum of money to the

50 Otherwise, one could also suspect that the text is an honorific decree for Pokomas by the demos of Aloandeans (honorific decrees, mostly from the Hellenistic period, where the honorand is granted a share from sacrificial meat, are thoroughly discussed by Carbon 2018). For δόσις as a keyword referring to a foundation, see Laum 1914, 125. The phrase κατὰ τὴν δόσιν is also attested in an inscription from Thessalonike (1st c. A.D.) regarding the consecration of a piece of land by a certain Iulius Besartes(?) for the celebration of annual banquets (see SEG 30 622).

51 For animal sacrifice in Lycia within the context of tomb cult, see Parker 2010, 116-117.

52 For the principle of male primogeniture, see Carbon – Pirenne-Delforge 2013, 74-79. In the Aloandean text, the gender-neutral word τέκνοις was used to denote Pokomas’ offspring (C II. 38-39: [τ]οῖς τέκνοις αὐτός ἀεὶ τῶι πρεσβυτέρῳ), but it probably also refers to Pokomas’ sons.
polis to establish annual rituals including an agon and a public banquet in honour of his deceased son Aleximakhos.53 Similarly, a certain Mouas, son of Stasias, endowed a foundation at Lyrboton Kome near Perge for the organisation of annual games and a public banquet in remembrance of himself, his mother and brother.54 In this respect, the tentative restoration ἐπώνυμον ἠμέραν εἰς (τὸν) ἄπαντα χρόνον proposed above for ll. 9-10 would suit well with such an intention of Pokomas (see above p. 9).

As mentioned above, the most important clue for the games in our text is the word ἄθλα (prizes of contest) in A l. 19 (see above p. 10 and 17). Moreover, C ll. 48-49 most probably contain the word [ἑορτή, which could be used for agonistic festivals as well (see below p. 24). The fact that the officials responsible for organising the annual rituals are designated as brabeutai may also be related to the games.

Brabeutai, also known as brabeis (sing. βραβεύς) in classical literature55, were annually elected officials, as made explicit in our inscription as well. The evidence for brabeutai in Asia Minor comes from Lydia, Phrygia, Karia, Pisidia and Mysia, while the current text together with an unpublished Hellenistic inscription from Limyra provide the first documentations of brabeutai in Lycia.56 The title can apply to village officials, but also to officials of associations.57 It is quite significant for us that brabeutai can be attested in the context of agones.58 An inscription from Beroia (Macedonia), of the early 2nd c. B.C., containing regulations to restore the rules in the gymnasion, reads that gymnasiarkhes should appoint the brabeutai in order to conduct the torch-race of Hermaia, the long distance race and all other races.59 Some inscriptions from Lydia represent them as responsible for crowning the honorand.60 In some, again from Lydia, brabeutai

53 IG XII.7 515 (Laum 1914, II no. 50; LSCG Suppl. 61). Even though the foundation was set up with the capital sum of money donated by Kritolaos, it demanded financial support from the epimeletai, who were chosen from wealthy citizens, in case of necessity. In this regard, Harter-Uibopuu 2011, 127 notes: “It is fascinating how Kritolaos was able to persuade wealthy citizens of his hometown to accept the obligation to finance the heroization of his son eternally. Obviously the honour of being part of this new foundation and the new festival was attractive enough and the conditions of the lease were not too harsh, but we do not have any sources on the duration of the trust-fund”).

54 I.Perge 77.

55 E.g., Soph., El. 690-691 and 709; Pl., Leg. 949.a.3.

56 Schuler 1998, 238-240 (Lydia, Phrygia, Karia, Pisidia); Müller – Wörrle 2002, 191-193 and 213-214 (Pergamon/Mysia); See in this volume: Akyürek Şahin – Uzunoğlu 2021, 179-181 no. 1 (Phrygia). We thank M. Wörrle for sharing the unpublished Limyrean inscription with us. He noted that the brabeutes documented at Limyra is not a “Lycian” brabeutes but is that of a club of soldiers of a Ptolemaic garrison.

57 Schuler 1998, 238; cf. also Ramsay 1906, 312.

58 The connection between agones and brabeutai is well known from both literary (e.g., see fn. 55 above and Polyb. Hist. 1.58.1; Plut., symp. 638.E.8-F.2, amat. 749.F.3-750.A.6, praec. ger. reip. 817.B.1-7, de stoic. rep. 1045.D.3-9; Poll. 3.1452.2-9) and epigraphic evidence (see fn. 59 below), as well as from vase paintings (e.g., Fig. 30). See esp. Robert 1982, 263-266 and Schuler 1998, 238-239 for a detailed analysis of the connection between agones and brabeutai.

59 I.Beroia 1 (SEG 54 602,1). For a comment on brabeutai in this inscription, see Arnaoutoglou 2008, 92.

60 TAM V,2 903 (Thyateira); TAM V,2 1269 (Hierokaisareia); TAM V,1 515 (Maionia).
were given responsibility for whole procedure of sacrificial deeds, including sending gifts to
honoran and to his family and erecting *stelai*. An inscription from Hylarima (Caria) reads that
the honorand should be crowned each year, following the announcement fulfilled by *brabeutes*,
who was also commissioned to give the due portion of sacrifices to him, together with the ἐπιμήνιοι
(officers responsible for monthly offerings). In the Tekmoreian inscriptions from Antioch in
Pisidia, of the 3rd c. A.D., *brabeutai* are documented as eponymous officers. The term survived
into the 5th -6th c. A.D.

There are two ways of understanding the *brabeutai* in our text. They could be village officials,
which would allow us to acknowledge the political status of Aloanda as a village community
(*demos*) at the time of our inscription. This would also fit in with the involvement of the *demos* of
Aloandeans in the foundation of Pokomas. We could assume that the *demos* received Pokomas’
gift, and the proclamation in the *potos* (C. ll. XX) was the community’s answer to its benefactor.
However, the penalty clause on Face B makes this possibility not very likely, because we need a
clearly defined group of persons, who would pay a fine for failure to elect the *brabeutai* or to hand
over the money to them. Can the *demos*, in other words, the *Aloandeis* who constituted the *demos*,
be the addressee of such a stipulation and a fine?

The other and more plausible way of understanding the *brabeutai* in our text is that they were not
related to the *demos*, but were annually elected officials of an association responsible for Pokomas’
foundation. Their designation in this way would fit in with the presumed existence of an *agon* as
part of the annual activities. In that case, we have to assume that the persons addressed on Face B
were members of some kind of a “management board”, which received and administered
Pokomas’ fund, elected the *brabeutai* every year, gave them the necessary amount for the annual
rituals from the annual income (that is most probably the meaning of ἀργύριον in l. 26. It would
have been a rather complicated process if the total fund had to change hands every year), and were
at the same time liable to pay a fine for neglecting their duties. One can rarely find out about the
exact number of *brabeutai* in a certain text, but their number is explicitly given as five in the
Aloandean inscription, which perhaps points to the large scale of activities that had to be
performed every year. In this scenario, the proclamation in the *potos* can be explained with the
fact that Pokomas was a prominent figure and a benefactor at Aloanda, who was honoured by the
*demos* of Aloandeans, since his foundation had a public benefit. Perhaps, the *demos* had a support
role too in the foundation of Pokomas, but more on that cannot be said.

---

61 TAM V,1 234 (Kula, see above fn. 25); TAM V,2 1316 (Hyrkanis).
62 Cousin – Deschamps 1887, 308-309 no. 2.
63 Ramsay 1906, 319 no. 2, 329 no. 4, 330 no. 12, 331 no. 5, 335 no. 14, 339 no. 17, 340 no. 18, 343 no. 20
and 344 no. 23; Ramsay 1912, 158 no. 12, 162-163 no. 26; see also now I.Antioche Pisidie Ramsay nos. 14-25
and 35-37 (new fragments); Wallner 2016 (a new fragment); Hallmannsecker 2018 (Ramsay no. 12).
64 E.g., IG X,2 2 152 (I.Chr. Macédoine 267; Herakleia, Macedonia).
65 As in e.g., I.Nordkarien 401.
66 To our knowledge, one of the Tekmoreian inscriptions from the 3rd c. A.D. records with three *brabeutai*
the highest number of *brabeutai* attested in a certain text/association before the Aloandean inscription
(Hallmannsecker 2018. See above fn. 63).
We systematically come across imperatives in the 3rd person plural in the preserved parts of the text. However, it appears that these imperatives do not consistently address the same group of persons throughout the inscription. While those on Face B apparently address members of the “management board”, the instructions on Face C, perhaps all, but definitely at least some of them, address the brabeutai. First of all, based on the above given general picture of brabeutai, it is well thinkable that they would be responsible for the ceremony in the *potos* as well as for the sacrifices mentioned on this face. Within this framework, they would also organise the invitation of three kinsmen of Pokomas to the feast.

The imperative in ll. 40-42 explicitly addresses the *brabeutai* that they shall take every year 10 drachms εἰς κώθωνα. Since Face B already states that the *brabeutai* should be handed over each year (a certain amount of) money –no doubt more than the unsubstantial sum of 10 drachms – to fulfill all their duties, and the first part of the text on Face C does not in its essence deal with the rituals themselves but with privileges and perquisites of a selected group of persons (see above p. 17), we can assume that 10 drachms was the perquisite of the *brabeutai* that they would have for themselves within the scope of the *kothon*, which is also supported by the medium participle [ἐξαι]ρούμενοι.

The penalty clause starting on Face C and continuing on Face D seems to address the *brabeutai* too. The second penalty clause on Face D in ll. 61-64, on the other hand, probably does not address the *brabeutai*, but those who were responsible for Pokomas’ foundation and the total fund at the highest level, i.e. those addressed in the penalty clause on Face B.

As regards the events or rituals taking place under Pokomas’ foundation, we encounter four different terms on Face C apart from the sacrifices: respectively πότος, εὐωχία, κώθων and [ἑορ]τή. Since the text provides us with extremely little information on the rituals themselves, and the nature of Pokomas’ foundation is not perfectly clear as discussed above, we cannot be sure about their exact context or scale, but probably, these events or rituals were distributed over several days. The first one mentioned in the text, *potos*, means “drinking-bout, carousal” (see LSJ s.v.). In the classical Greek banquet, the drinking-bout, also called “symposion”, where mixed wine was drunk, was the conclusion following the main course. Certain rituals took place during the transition from the main course to the drinking party, such as water being passed around for guests to wash their hands, or sometimes also wreaths and nice smelling perfumes. A *potos* is mentioned in the famous gymnasiarchal law of Beroia from the 3rd c. B.C. under the Hermaia of the *hieropoioi* following apparently the consumption of the sacrificial meat: The law regulates that “the *hieropoioi* (members of the gymnasium, young men) and the gymnasiasiarch shall introduce no performance during the drinking”.

---


68 I.Beroia 1 B ll. 60-67: ἀγέτωσαν | δὲ τὰ Ἐρμαία καὶ οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ λανβάνοντες παρ’ ἑκάστου τῶν φοιτώντων | [ε]ἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον μὴ πλείον δραχμῶν δύο καὶ ἱστιῶντων ἐν τῶι γυμνασίωι ἄγαυ|ς ἰδιοβόλωσαν δὲ ἀνθ’ αὐτῶν ἑτέροις αἵτινες εἰς τούπον ἱεροποιήσουσιν ἑ[ρμ]ο[ν] με|[ε]ὶ, συντελεῖτοσαν δὲ τὴν θοσίαν τῶι Ἐρμεῖ καὶ οἱ παιδοτρίβαι ὅταν καὶ οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ, | [λ]αμβάνοντες παρὰ τῶι παιδῶν μὴ πλείον δραχμῆς παρ’ ἑκάστου καὶ ποιεῖτοσαν | μηδέρας τῶι τυθέντων τὰ κρέα ὠμά, οἱ δὲ ἱεροποιοὶ καὶ ὁ γυμνασιαρχὸς ἀκράμα | μηθην παραγέτωσαν εἰς τὸν πότον (“The *hieropoioi* too shall hold the Hermaia, collecting from each of the visitors to the gymnasium not more than two drachms, and hold a meal in the gymnasium. They shall designate others to replace them as *hieropoioi* for Hermes in the following year. The *paidotribai* too shall
precaution to preserve discipline amongst the young men. In a recently published inscription from Lyrboton Kome near Perge dated probably to the 2nd c. A.D., we read that a brotherhood (φράτρα) was under the obligation to organise apparently a onetime πότος for a certain Hermaios in funerary context. The text does not mention any sacrifices or a banquet, hence the πότος to be organised for the commemoration of Hermaios may have been an individual ritual. As for Pokomas’ foundation, the potos, where frankincense was burned and the crowning of Pokomas was proclaimed, should probably also be understood as a “drinking-bout” or more broadly as a “drinking ceremony”. This ceremony may have been the concluding part of the annual banquet where sacrificial meat was consumed, but we have another term on Face C that could also refer to a drinking party, i.e., κώθων. Kothon was originally a highly valued Spartan cup for drinking, used by the soldiers and easy to carry, as Critias recorded. These drinking-vessels are attested in inventory lists from the Acropolis in Athens. Similarly, in Lycia, a 3rd c. B.C. inventory list from Patara includes alongside other objects also, 40 drachms worth of kothon donated by a certain Serotallas. However, the word can also denote a drinking-bout, carousal or a religious banquet (see LSJ s.v.). In the Aloandean text, kothon certainly refers to an event rather than the cup itself. However, epigraphic evidence for a such use of the word is extremely rare. To our knowledge, a 2nd c. B.C. decree from Thasos cited in LSJ s.v. for the meaning “religious banquet” provides the only example. It is not perfectly clear in the Aloandean inscription whether it refers to the banquet in a broader meaning or specifically to the drinking-bout. However, since 1) the word originates from a drinking-vessel, 2) there is to our knowledge so far only one inscription where its meaning has been interpreted as “religious banquet”, whereas its meaning as “drinking-bout” is attested in ancient literary sources (see LSJ s.v.), 3) it comes directly after the mention of an euochia, which we understand more specifically as “banquet” (see below), and of sacrificial animals, it seems to us more plausible to understand the kothon in our text as the drinking-bout following the consumption of sacrificial meat. In this case, potos recorded in the beginning of the text on Face C should have been a separate event, probably on a different day, if potos and kothon do not refer to the very same event, which is not very likely, or kothon may have been the actual “drinking” part of the potos, i.e., of the drinking ceremony in a broader sense,

celebrate the sacrifice to Hermes at the same time as hieropoioi. They shall collect from the boys not more than a drachma each and divide the sacrificed (victims) into portions of raw meat. The hieropoioi and the gymnasiarch shall introduce no performance during the drinking.” trans. Lupu 2004, 249-268 no. 14 with commentary).


71 We thank J.-M. Carbon for drawing our attention to the broader sense of πότος as “drinking ceremony” in the text.

72 Crit. Frg. 34.4-6; Plut. Lyc. 9.4.8-5.1.

73 Makres 2010, 67.

74 Schuler – Zimmermann 2012, 568-573, no.1 l.17 (SEG 63 1331).

75 IG XII Suppl. 365 (Seyrig 1927, 220-221), ll. 17-20: καὶ ἐν τῷ κάθωνι συνομόψηφος ἔσται μετὰ τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ τὸν γραμματέα καθότι καὶ ἐκείνως προσέταξε ἐκ τῶν νόμων. The text is available now also in I.Thasos III (no. 102) with commentary. Hamon translates ll. 17-20 as follows: “dans le banquet (kôthon), il aura même vote que la prêtre et le secrétaire, comme il est prescrit pour ceux-ci dans la loi”.
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perhaps with some sort of entertainment. In this context, oinoopsia known to us from various places in Asia Minor, especially from rural Bithynia but now also from a village of Xanthos in Lycia, should also be mentioned.76 These cultic “wine drinking” events had a public character and could be accompanied by music, games or animal sacrifice as well.

Another pertinent term on Face C is εὐωχία, whose meaning is “good cheer, feasting”, plr. “festivities” (LSJ s.v.). Slater defines euochia as “the merriment, i.e. the entertainment, wine and sacrificial food”.77 The term can be used both for private and public banquets.78 In Aloandean text, it appears first in l. 36 concerning the invitation of Pokomas’ kinsmen to the euochia. The word probably means here more specifically banquet. We do not know the scale of this banquet and who exactly was eligible to attend it, but it may have been a public one, and it is possible that visiting foreigners (ξένοι) were excluded from it with the exception of three kinsmen of Pokomas, who were perhaps not resident at Aloanda but visiting at the time.79 The word euochia appears also in l. 47, where it is stated that all the [revenue] shall be spent εἰς τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς εὐωχίας. The use of the two words in this manner should be a hendiadys,80 thus can be understood as “sacrificial festivities”. However, since all the [revenue] should be spent on them, we can assume that the meaning here covers all the events that shall take place under Pokomas’ foundation, not just the banquet. In fact, the word [ἐορ]τή comes up in the following lines, where it is stated that if any (money) remains, it shall be allocated to the [next ἑορ]τή. The meaning of heorte is given in LSJ s.v. as “feast, festival, holiday”. The term is used also for agonistic festivals81, and Chaniotis notes in the context of the Hellenistic ruler cult that “der Ausdruck pompe kai thyssia kai agon ist gewissermaßen ein Synonym des Wortes heorte”.82 Hence, this sentence too concerns all the events

76 For oinoopsioi/oinoopsia, see Schmitt-Pantel 1992, 278-279; Mitchell 1993, 187; Schuler 1998, 269. For the recent attestation of oinoopsia in a rural settlement of Xanthos, see Baker – Thériault 2020, 161-164 (the publication does not include the full Greek text, which is a list of contributors to oinoposia, but an extract from it as well as a general introduction of the inscription), also mentioned by Cavalier – des Courtils 2020, 152; Another recent attestation of oinoopsia is in the katoikia of the of the Lydomouandeitai in the Cayster Valley (see Uzunoğlu 2019, 429-430 with commentary on the term on p. 433-434).

77 Slater 2007, 23.

78 Schmitt-Pantel 1992, 275-276. In the small settlement of Kirandağ in Lycia, euergetic priests of Zeus regularly made donations for religious celebrations including bouthysia, euochia, glykismos and aleimma as recorded in a donation list (Schuler 2003, 166-167 no.1). In the foundation of Symmasis (see above fn. 12), euochia is a private banquet where sacrificial meat is consumed.

79 See above the comment on παρεπιδημέω on p. 12. Xenoi were not by default eligible to attend public feasts. They could, for instance, attend the feast organised under the foundation of Kritolaos as explicitly specified in the inscription (see above fn. 53, l. 56), but we read in a sacrificial regulation from Koresia(?) on Keos dated to ca. 205-180 B.C. that an invitation by the polis was necessary to attend the feast for those other than citizens, metics and freedmen paying their taxes to Koresia, see IG XII,5 647 (CGRN 105) ll. 9-11: ἑστιᾶν δὲ τούς τε πολίτας καὶ οὓς ἡ πόλις κέκληκεν καὶ τοὺς μετοίκους καὶ τοὺς ἀπελευθέρους ὅσοι τὰ τέλη φέρουσιν εἰς Κορησίαν (“He has to provide a feast for the citizens, for those invited by the city, (10) for the resident foreigners and all freedmen who pay their taxes to Koresia” trans. CGRN).

80 See Slater 2007, 23 fn. 19.

81 As in IG XII,5 647 (CGRN 105). See above fn. 79.

82 Chaniotis 2003, 6; Slater 2007, 21 fn. 4.
that shall take place under Pokomas’ foundation, and the choice of the term *heorte* is apparently a deliberate one.\footnote{Note that *heorte* can sometimes designate just a sacrifice as well (see Chaniotis 1995, 149), but this is certainly not the case in the Aloandean inscription.}

It is admittedly problematic that *agones* are not explicitly mentioned on Face C, if Pokomas’ foundation really included games. An explanation of this problem may be that amongst all the rituals under his foundation, sacrifices were the most important ones for Pokomas. It is stated in ll. 42-46 that if sacrifices cannot be performed in the prescribed time due to war, they shall be fulfilled the following year together with the sacrifices of that year. Based on this statement, we could think that the foundation was only about sacrifices. However, an alternative way of seeing this is that sacrifices were the only part of the festivity that had to be restrospectively fulfilled in case they could not be fulfilled in the due time. The fact that *agones* are not explicitly mentioned in the penalty clause in C ll. 49-51 can also be explained with Pokomas’ prioritisation of rituals. Perhaps, Pokomas chose to name only the most important aspect from his point of view, i.e. the sacrifices where he would receive an honorary share, and covered all the other topics under τ’ ἄλλα. Moreover, we could assume that the *agones* were covered also under the term [ἕορταί] in ll. 49-50.

**No. 2) Epitaph of Trokondas, son of Apollonios**

A plain rectangular block, of which exact finding spot is unknown. But it was brought to a nearby garden from the burial area, where the inscription of Pokomas was found, as the locals narrate.

---

\footnote{Note that *heorte* can sometimes designate just a sacrifice as well (see Chaniotis 1995, 149), but this is certainly not the case in the Aloandean inscription.}
2 Apollonios, son of Apollonios, son of
Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλωνίς ἢ: 38; L: 57; D: 49,5; Lh: 2-3
2 Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλωνίς ἢ: 38; L: 57; D: 49,5; Lh: 2-3
2 [ο]ν Ἀλλοανδέας τῶι ἐ-
[α]υτοῦ υῖος Τροκονδᾶς
[κ]αὶ Ἀπα Ερμοου τῷ ἑαυ-
[τ]ῆς ἀνδρὶ καὶ Μις καὶ Ἀ-
[τ]ῶι Τροκονδᾶς
[τ]ῷ ἑαυτῶι πα[τ]ρὶ Τροκον-
δᾶς.

The palaeographic features of the letters do not present much difference from those of no. 1 (Fig. 7). The alphas are with broken cross-bar. The sigmas are with flat cross bars and their middle strokes do not reach far to the right. Pis have slightly short right strokes. The cross-bars of kappas are short. Omegas are inscribed quite plain, smaller and with no calligraphic significance, which might indicate a date slightly earlier than that of no. 1. The last line contains smaller letters and represent slight deviations in their shapes, most probably because the inscriber wished to fit the end of the text onto the stone.

The use of iota adscript is on and off, and there is no order in its employment like the ones in no. 1 (see fn.13 and p. 13 above for the relevant comments). In the dative singular articles, two times with iota adscript (ll. 2 and 7: τῶι; Fig. 8a-b), one time without (l. 4: τῷ; Fig. 8c). In nouns, the dative is employed two times without iota adscript (l. 3: υἱῷ Τροκονδᾶς; Fig. 8d). We restored the last word of the inscription (l. 7: Τροκονδᾶς; Fig. 8e) without iota, as there is no space for I. Again, like no. 1, these show the transition into the late Hellenistic Period. The lost funerary inscription of Ermoas (see fn. 4 above), which was tentatively dated to the 1st c. B.C., employs the iota adscript invariably, indicating a somewhat earlier date.

The personal names represent a mixture of Greek and Anatolian names. While the father, grand-father and one of the sons of the deceased Trokondas were given the Greek name Apollonios, his
own name and most probably those of his wife, one of his children Mis\textsuperscript{84} and his father-in-law Ermoas are indigenous. The name Ermoas is attested also in TAM 526 (see fn. 4 above), the only inscription found at Aloanda prior to the two inscriptions published here. Ermoas, son of Menneas, attested in TAM II 526 may perhaps be in some way related to the Ermoas of this inscription. Ermoas is not a particularly common name documented till now only 6 times in Lycia, and only in the western part of the region\textsuperscript{85}. A variant of this name is attested at Arsada as Armoas and now at Tlos as well, thus also in western Lycia\textsuperscript{86}.

l. 2 – Αλλοανδεύς: Amongst three inscriptions mentioning the ethnic/demotic of the settlement, this is the sole one recording the name with double lambda.

l. 4 – [?]ΚΔΤΑΠΑ: Based on the flow of the text, the line should start with a καί followed by the personal name of Trokondas’ wife in the nominative, but ΔΤ, which create the difficulty for a resolution, can clearly be read. One solution might be a reading of the section as κ´αι´ Απα, accepting that the letters ΔΤ were erroneously inscribed instead of ΑΙ. Then the name of Trokondas’ wife might have been Απα, which is a name unattested formerly except for a dubious reading in an inscription from Hierapolis\textsuperscript{87}, but which might be another variant of a name such as Απη, Αππα/Αππας, Αππη or Αππαια.\textsuperscript{88} Another option, though weak, might be another native name such as [,]υδταπα or [,]ιδταπα, but then there remains no room for the necessary καί.

\textsuperscript{84} The personal name Mis is known from Pamphylia (LGPN VB s.v.), Pontos (LGPN VA s.v.) and Karia (Paton – Myres 1896, 228 no. 27), Syria (L.Syrie 6 2947). Paton – Myres 1896, 228 claims that Μις is a form of Μῦς (for the latter see also LGPN VB s.v.); cf. also Μεις, Zgusta, Personennamen, 308, §891-1-2 and LGPN VB s.v.

\textsuperscript{85} LGPN VB s.v.

\textsuperscript{86} For attestations of the name at Arsada, see LGPN VB s.v. At Tlos, the name is documented on a recently published altar, where line 2 was transcribed by the editor of text as Ἐρμακότας καὶ Ἰάσων οἱ Αρμοο[υ] (Ermakotas and Iason, sons of Armoas) as can be read on the photo. For Erm/Arm- names, see above fn. 23.

\textsuperscript{87} ΑνΗ 114: ἡ σορὸς Ἀπολλωνίου. See also Zgusta, Personennamen, 71, § 66-5 fn. 175.

\textsuperscript{88} See the examples in LGPN VA and VC s.v. See also the similar names in Zgusta, Personennamen, 71-74.
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Aloanda’dan (Lykia) Yeni Yazıtlar

Özet

Bu makale Lykia’da yer alan Asarcık’ta bulunmuş iki yeni Eski Yunanca yazıtın tanıtmaktadır. Söz konusu yazıtlar sayesinde Asarcık’ın antik dönemdeki adını Aloanda olduğu kesinlik kazanmıştır. 1 numaralı yazıtta, Ermependimis oğlu Pokomas adına bir şahsın Hellenistik Dönem’de kurduğu bir vakıf kaydedilmiştir. Yazıt bütün olarak günümüzde ulaşamamış olduğundan, Pokomas’ın vakfının içeriği net olarak anlaşlamamaktadır.Ancak yazının kalan kısımlarında, her yıl 5 adet brabeutes’in seçilmesi ve bunlara para aktarılması gerektiği yer almaktadır. Söz konusu brabeutes’lerin, C yüzünde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’in soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu oldukları düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kapsamında agon’larının da organize edildiği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Potos (içme şöleni) esnasında Aloanda halk meclisinin Pokomas’ı taçlandırduğu şeklinde duyuru yapılmış, Pokomas’ın Aloanda’da önde gelen bir kişi ve bir hayırsever olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu duyuru, aynı zamanda, vakıfın matbaa ve Kvaskevi şeklinde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’ın soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu oldukları düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kapsamında agon’larının da organize edildiği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Potos (içme şöleni) esnasında Aloanda halk meclisinin Pokomas’ı taçlandırduğu şeklinde duyuru yapılmış, Pokomas’ın Aloanda’da önde gelen bir kişi ve bir hayırsever olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu duyuru, aynı zamanda, vakıfın matbaa ve Kvaskevi şeklinde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’ın soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu oldukları düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kapsamında agon’larının da organize edildiği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Potos (içme şöleni) esnasında Aloanda halk meclisinin Pokomas’ı taçlandırduğu şeklinde duyuru yapılmış, Pokomas’ın Aloanda’da önde gelen bir kişi ve bir hayırsever olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu duyuru, aynı zamanda, vakıfın matbaa ve Kvaskevi şeklinde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’ın soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu oldukları düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kapsamında agon’larının da organize edildiği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Potos (içme şöleni) esnasında Aloanda halk meclisinin Pokomas’ı taçlandırduğu şeklinde duyuru yapılmış, Pokomas’ın Aloanda’da önde gelen bir kişi ve bir hayırsever olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu duyuru, aynı zamanda, vakıfın matbaa ve Kvaskevi şeklinde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’ın soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu olduğu düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kapsamında agon’larının da organize edildiği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Potos (içme şöleni) esnasında Aloanda halk meclisinin Pokomas’ı taçlandırduğu şeklinde duyuru yapılmış, Pokomas’ın Aloanda’da önde gelen bir kişi ve bir hayırsever olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu duyuru, aynı zamanda, vakıfın matbaa ve Kvaskevi şeklinde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’ın soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu olduğu düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kapsamında agon’larının da organize edildiği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Potos (içme şöleni) esnasında Aloanda halk meclisinin Pokomas’ı taçlandırduğu şeklinde duyuru yapılmış, Pokomas’ın Aloanda’da önde gelen bir kişi ve bir hayırsever olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu duyuru, aynı zamanda, vakıfın matbaa ve Kvaskevi şeklinde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’ın soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu olduğu düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kapsamında agon’larının da organize edildiği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Potos (içme şöleni) esnasında Aloanda halk meclisinin Pokomas’ı taçlandırduğu şeklinde duyuru yapılmış, Pokomas’ın Aloanda’da önde gelen bir kişi ve bir hayırsever olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu duyuru, aynı zamanda, vakıfın matbaa ve Kvaskevi şeklinde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’ın soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu olduğu düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kapsamında agon’larının da organize edildiği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Potos (içme şöleni) esnasında Aloanda halk meclisinin Pokomas’ı taçlandırduğu şeklinde duyuru yapılmış, Pokomas’ın Aloanda’da önde gelen bir kişi ve bir hayırsever olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu duyuru, aynı zamanda, vakıfın matbaa ve Kvaskevi şeklinde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’ın soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu olduğu düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kapsamında agon’larının da organize edildiği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Potos (içme şöleni) esnasında Aloanda halk meclisinin Pokomas’ı taçlandırduğu şeklinde duyuru yapılmış, Pokomas’ın Aloanda’da önde gelen bir kişi ve bir hayırsever olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu duyuru, aynı zamanda, vakıfın matbaa ve Kvaskevi şeklinde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’ın soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu olduğu düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kapsamında agon’larının da organize edildiği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Potos (içme şöleni) esnasında Aloanda halk meclisinin Pokomas’ı taçlandırduğu şeklinde duyuru yapılmış, Pokomas’ın Aloanda’da önde gelen bir kişi ve bir hayırsever olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu duyuru, aynı zamanda, vakıfın matbaa ve Kvaskevi şeklinde bahsi geçen ve Pokomas’a, onun ölümünden sonra ise, Pokomas’ın soyununda gelen kimSELere bu kurbanlardan onur payı verilecek olan kurban törenleri ve ziyafetlerden sorumlulu olduğu düşünülebilir. Metindeki bazı ipuçları, Pokomas’ın vakfı kao
New Inscriptions from Aloanda in Lycia

Abstract

This paper introduces two Greek inscriptions from Asarcık, the ancient name of which can now securely be acknowledged as Aloanda, in western Lycia. Inscription no.1 documents the foundation of a certain Pokomas, son of Ermedepimis, dating from the Hellenistic period. The nature of Pokomas’ foundation is not entirely clear as the text is not fully preserved, but we read in the remaining parts of the text inscribed on four sides of the block that every year 5 brabeutai shall be elected and handed over a certain amount of money. It can be assumed that these brabeutai were responsible for the organisation of annual sacrifices, from which Pokomas and after Pokomas’ death his descendants were to receive an honorary share, and feasts mentioned on Face C. It is possible that Pokomas’ foundation also included an agon as can be inferred from several hints in the text. Pokomas was apparently a prominent figure and benefactor at Aloanda, which is indicated by the proclamation in the potos that Pokomas is crowned by the demos of Aloandeans with a wreath of olive branch. This proclamation also indicates that Pokomas’ foundation had public benefit, and therefore, even though the scale or the context of the sacrificial festivities to be held under Pokomas’ foundation is not clarified in the preserved text, it is possible that these were public events. Yet, alongside this public benefit, Pokomas may explicitly have founded these events or rituals for the commemoration of himself and his family in eternity. Inscription no. 2 is the epitaph of a certain Trokondas, son of Apollonios, set up by his father, his wife and children, also dating from the Hellenistic period.

Keywords: Aloanda, Lycia, foundation inscription, offering, sacrifice, feast, brabeutes, funerary inscription.
Fig. 9) The walls belonging to a probable defensive structure on Asarcık Hill

Fig. 10) The walls belonging to a probable defensive structure on Asarcık Hill
Fig. 11) Outer wall of the probable defensive structure on Asarcık Hill

Fig. 12) The rock-cut tomb to the west of Asarcık Hill
Fig. 13) A lid of a sarcophagus to the west of Asarcık hill

Fig. 14) An oil press on Asarcık Hill
Fig. 15) A tomb to the West of inscription no. 1

Fig. 16) A tomb to the West of inscription no. 1
Fig. 17) The well nearby the inscription no.1

Fig. 18) The find spot of the inscription No. 1 (the foundation of a monumental tomb is to the left amongst bushes)
Fig. 19) Face A of the inscription no. 1 (Frg. 1)

Fig. 20) Face A of the inscription no. 1 (Frg. 4, the left bottom)

Fig. 21) Face A of the inscription no. 1 (Frg. 1, middle section)
Fig. 22) Face A of the inscription no. 1 (Frg. 1, right top)

Fig. 23) Face A of the inscription no. 1 (Frg. 1, right bottom)

Fig. 24) Face B of the inscription no. 1 (Frg. 1)
Fig. 25) Face C of the inscription no. 1 (Frg. 1)

Fig. 26) Face C of the inscription no. 1 (Frg. 2, right top)

Fig. 27) The squeeze (Fig. 26), reverse image
Fig. 28) Right side of Face C of inscription no. 1 (Frg. 1 and Frg. 2 combined)
Fig. 29) Face D of inscription no. 1 (Frg. 2 and Frg 3 combined)
a) Wrestlers with a paidotribes/ephedros (trainer; on the right) and a brabeus (adjudicator; on the left)

b) The brabeus/brabeutes

Fig. 30) Panathenaic prize amphora, signed by the potter Kittos.
© The Trustees of the British Museum. Asset number: 34629001 (left) and 1613270658 (right); Museum number: 1866.0415.248;
Date: ca. 365-360 B.C.; Found in Cyrenaica, Taucheira; https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/G_1866-0415-248

Fig. 31) Back side of Inscription no. 2