HAL
open science

Observations on the Xanthos Trilingual: syntactic structure of TL 44a, 41-55 and the Lycian terminology of art and war

Rostislav Oreshko

▶ To cite this version:

Rostislav Oreshko. Observations on the Xanthos Trilingual: syntactic structure of TL 44a, 41-55 and the Lycian terminology of art and war. Hungarian Assyriological Review, 2021, 2, pp.95 - 144. 10.52093/hara-202101-00015-000 . hal-03880018

HAL Id: hal-03880018

https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-03880018v1

Submitted on 30 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

HAR - HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW • VOLUME 2 (2021) • 95–144
HU ISSN 2732-2610 • https://harjournal.com

Observations on the Xanthos Trilingual: Syntactic Structure of TL 44a, 41–55 and the Lycian Terminology of Art and War

Rostislav Oreshko*

* – CNRS/UMR 8167 'Orient et Méditerranée'/Center for Hellenic Studies (Washington, DC). Email: rostislav.oreshko@cnrs.fr

Abstract: The paper offers a new analysis of the passage of the Xanthos trilingual containing a detailed description of the military exploits of the author of the inscription (TL 44a, 41–55). The first part (§§1–2) discusses the overall structure of the passage and the meaning of the key term of the text, *hãtahe*, for which an interpretation 'victory' (gen. sg.) is proposed. The subsequent paragraphs discuss separate words and particularities of the syntax of the passage. The new proposals include, among others: *tupelija-* 'script, writing(s)', *tupa* 'images, reliefs', *axa-* 'deed, exploit', *ahata-* 'foundation, platform' (§3); *hẽmen-* 'shooting, hunting' (§3); *terñ* 'when' (adverb with temporal function) (§4); *zẽm̃tija* 'formidable' (§5); *nele* 'acropolis' (§5); *ese … tebe-/taba-* 'join with' (§6); *tarbi* = *trbbi* 'against' (§7); *hbãt-* 'hoplite' (§8); *uwe* 'day' (§8). The most important historical implications of the new analysis concern *Trbbẽnimi* and *Xerẽi*, who are argued to be allies (not enemies) of the author, as well as *Herikle*, who is identified as a governor (*sehaxlaza-*) of Kaunos, connected with the Persian king. The resulting translation of the text is proposed in §11.

Keywords: Xanthos trilingual, Lycian, Luwian, Anatolian languages

Cite as Oreshko, R. 2021: Observations on the Xanthos Trilingual: Syntactic Structure of TL 44a, 41–55 and the Lycian Terminology of Art and War. *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 2: 95–144. https://doi.org/10.52093/hara-202101-00015-000

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

The passage TL 44a, 41–55 represents one of the best-known sections of the Xanthos trilingual.[1] This part of the text is almost perfectly preserved, having only several small gaps with only one or two letters lost, and even if not all the lexical and grammatical details of the text are transparent, the passage as a whole gives a fairly clear idea of the story related here: numerous toponyms and personal names as well as certain verbs leave no doubt that the passage concerns *military exploits* of the author of the inscription. Even a simple listing of the personal and place names in the order they appear in the text suggests the general outlines of the narrative: while the initial part of the passage (ll. 41–50) concerns events in Lycia proper, its latter part (ll. 51–55) touches upon the episodes taking place in Caria, Rhodes and Ionia. However, despite a few more or less detailed discussions of the text and references to it in the literature,[2] one cannot say that the

[1] The bulk of the paper has been finished in July 2018 as a part of the project 'The Trojan Catalogue (Hom. Il. 2.816–877) and the Peoples of western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age' (for fuller information see 'Acknowledgments' at the end of the text). At later stages I was able to make only relatively minor additions and changes in some parts of the text (notably section 3), and could integrate the discussion of the recent literature only to a limited extent.

[2] For a philological/linguistic discussion of the passage in general see Schürr 1998, 151–155 and 2009, 163–170; Melchert 2002; Martínez Rodríguez 2021; Sasseville (this volume), *cf.* also notes in Borchhardt

passage received all the attention it deserves: not only many specific details of the text remain rather vaguely understood, but also there seems to be no agreement on both the overall structure of the passage and the syntactic building of its separate parts. The present contribution aims to fill this gap. In the first part (§§1–2) I will try to clarify the overall structure of the passage and the meaning of the key term of the text, *hãtahe*, adding some considerations (in §2) also on the structure and interpretation of the preceding part of the text on side A of the pillar (esp. ll. 36–40). In the second part of the paper I will analyze a grammatical construction with *terñ* (§3) and the grammatical structure and vocabulary of the eight separate sections into which the passage can be divided (§§4–10), concluding with a final translation of the entire passage (§11). Before proceeding to the discussion, it seems appropriate to reproduce the text of the whole passage for the sake of easy reference:[3]

> [41](*[pr]ulija*) *epi=de: izredi: zẽm̃tija: ehbije*[42]*di: Zagaba: nele=de: hãtahe: Ẽtri: Tumine*[43]*hi: nele=de: hạ̃tahe Pttara: Malijehi: hãt*[44]*ahe: Xbane: ese: Trbbẽnimi: tebete: terñ se* [45]*Milasãñtrã: pddẽneke: Xbãnije: izredi* [46]*ehbijedi: hãtahe: Tlãñ nele: nele: tarbi*[47]*=de: Xerẽi: qastte τerñ: Tlahñ: erbbedi: h[ã]*[48]*tahe: Medbijahe: ese: Xerẽi: tebete: ṭeṛ[ñ]* [49]*se Waxssepddimi: ẽti: zehi: hbãti: CII: uẇ*[*e*] [50]*ñtepi: xlaina terñ hãtahe: ãka: Herikle* [51]*sehaxlaza: pabra=ti: Xbide: hrixñtawa*[52]*tahi: ese tabãna: terñ: Ijãnã: Ijalusas* [53]*Ḳrzzạ̃nase: hãtahe: Mukale: tewẽtẹ: Sãma=*[54]*ti: trbbetẽ: Turaxssi: zxxãna terñ: es*[55]*e: Humrxxã: tebãna terñ: hãtahe*

1. Structure of the passage and the semantic function of *hãtahe*

One has to start from the question where the passage properly begins. There is every reason to see it in the element *epi=de*, a combination of a local adverb with an enclitic *=de*. This may be literary interpreted as 'on top of that' or taken to mean 'moreover' or 'henceforth'.[4] Whichever interpretation one prefers (*cf.* below), it appears to be an appropriate marker for a new and syntactically relatively independent part of the text, which still *may* be semantically more or less immediately connected with the preceding section. *Contra* Schürr[5] it is quite impossible to separate the last letter from *irijẽm̃m* in the preceding line (l. 40) making out of it a sentence-initial *m*[*e*] (for the word see below); consequently, *prulija* does not belong to the first clause of the passage.

As already noted, many things in the passage are clear. There are six *personal* names in it: *Trbbẽnimi*, *Xerẽi* and *Waxssepddimi* are Lycian names referring to regional rulers ('dynasts'); *Milasãñtrã* (acc.) is a rendering of the Greek name Μελήσανδρος known from Thucydides (2.69) as an Athenian *strategos* and *Herikle* is commonly interpreted as a reference to the Greek hero Ἡρακλῆς (see, however, below); and *Humrxxã* (acc.) represents a Lycian rendering of the name known to Greeks as Ἀμόργης (< OPers. **Humarga*). There are as many as twelve place names: *Zagaba* (Lagbos), *Ẽtri Tuminehi* (Lower Tymnessos), *Pttara* (Patara), *Xbane* (Kyaneiai), *Tla* (Tlos), *Medbijahe*, *Xbide* (Kaunos in Caria), *Ijalusa* (Ialysos on Rhodes),[6] *Krzz[ã]nase* (Chersonesos in Caria), *Mukale* (Mykale, mountain ridge in Ionia, mod. Samsun Dağı), *Sãma* (island Samos), *Turaxssi* (Mount Thorax, just to the north-east of Mykale). There is also one ethnonym: *Ijãnã*

et al. 1997–1999, 17–56. For a historical discussion *cf.* Childs 1981; Keen 1998, 125–147; Thonemann 2009.

3 For justification of the reading *sehaxlaza* in l. 51 (instead of *se haxlaza*) and *uw*[*e*] in l. 49 see below.

4 *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. *epi* and Neumann 2007, s.v. *epide*.

5 Schürr 2009, 163–164.

6 There can be no doubt that the correct reading of the place name is *Ijalusas* and not the phonetically odd **Ijaeusas* as thought earlier, as already pointed out by Schürr (1998, 153 and 2009, 169 with ref. to Savelsberg). Moreover, it is not even a scribal mistake as assumed by Savelsberg: an excellent photo of the respective spot sent to me by Dieter Schürr – for which I use this opportunity to thank him once again – clearly shows that the two oblique hastas of the fourth letter are *long* and reach the *bottom* of the line, which corresponds to Λ, while in ↑ the hastas reach only slightly below the middle height of the line; on the other hand, what was taken for a vertical stroke between the two hastas represents merely a later accidental damage of the stone.

(acc.) which refers either to Ionians or to the Greeks in general (*cf.* below). It is obvious that the place names build the framework of the narrative. Some expressions of the passage can also be interpreted with reasonable certainty: *izredi ehbijedi* (ll. 41 and 45–46) is 'by his (own) hand' and *erbbedi* (l. 47) is something like 'by (or in) a (hard) battle'; *Malijehi* (l. 43) certainly refers to goddess *Malija* (Athena), although the precise interpretation of the form is disputed (*cf.* below); lastly, the word commonly read as *haxlaza* but possibly to be taken as *sehaxlaza* (*cf.* below) may be interpreted as a title in a way connected with *asaxlazu* in N320, 5.

However, in spite of this rather favorable situation, the passage eludes complete interpretation. The difficulty lies in the *verbs*, and it has two aspects. First, there are only a few verbs in the passage and their distribution in the text is quite unusual. One can identify only *eight* verbs in *fifteen* lines: *ese … tebete* (44), *tarbide* (46–47), *qasste* (47), *ese … tebete* (48), *xlaina* (50), *ese tabãna* (52), *zxxãna* (54), *ese … tabãna* (54–55) (or nine if one interprets *pabrati* as 3sg. pres., *cf.* the discussion below). It seems quite impossible to see in *nelede* (42 and 43) a verb, as was sometimes assumed earlier:[7] the passage leaves little doubt that it represents a close counterpart of *nele nele* (46) which is well attested elsewhere and whose meaning may be with reasonable certainty defined as a '*specific place (in the city)*' be it 'agora' or something different (*cf.* below). This means that the first *three* lines of the passage mentioning four place names and one personal name contain *no* verb whatsoever; only a little shorter is the verbless sequence between 44–46 which mentions two place names and one personal name or that in 52–54, which mentions six place names. The second problem is that *four* of these verbs are, as far as one can see, infinitives. These are concentrated in the final part of the passage: *xlaina* (50), *ese tabãna* (52), *zxxãna* (54), *ese … tabãna* (54–55); it is noteworthy that the final *four* lines of the text contain *only* infinitives. It is not immediately clear how *action* can be rendered by infinitives. Given this picture, it is obvious that the passage represents something quite different from a *usual narrative*. However, as long as one proceeds from the interpretation of the passage as a sort of account of military campaigns, one has to assume that some element of the text should encode – directly or indirectly – an *action* in the long verbless sequences of the text.

There are several reasons to suspect that this element is *hãtahe*. There are *eight* attestations of the word in the passage, while outside of it the word is found only once in the text (side B, 56) and, at least in this form, in no other text of the Lycian corpus. It would be logical to assume that *hãtahe* is a term connected specifically with the description of military exploits. No less important is the distribution pattern of *hãtahe*. First, the word is distributed on average more evenly in the text than the verbs are, occurring first already in the second line of the passage (42) and last in its last line. Second, there is a clear correlation between the distribution of *hãtahe* and the place names, around which, as already noted, the narrative is organized. The pattern becomes visible when one divides the passage into eight sections (clauses) ending in *hãtahe*, its clause final position being indicated by the last line of the text *ending* with the word:

1) *izredi: zẽm̃tija: ehbije*[42]*di: Zagaba: nele=de: hãtahe:*

2) *Ẽtri: Tumine*[43]*hi: nele=de: hạ̃tahe*

3) *Pttara: Malijehi: hãt*[44]*ahe:*

4) *Xbane: ese: Trbbẽnimi: tebete: terñ se* [45]*Milasãñtrã: pddẽneke: Xbãnije: izredi* [46]*ehbijedi: hãtahe:*

5) *Tlãñ nele: nele: tarbi*[47]*=de: Xerẽi: qastte τerñ: Tlahñ: erbbedi: h*[ã][48]*tahe:*

6) *Medbijahe: ese: Xerẽi: tebete: ṭeṛ*[ñ] [49]*se Waxssepddimi: ẽti: zehi: hbãti: CII: uẉ*[*e*] [50]*ñtepi: xlaina terñ hãtahe:*

---

7 *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. *nele-*[2] and Neumann 2007, s.v.

7) *ãka: Herikle* [51]*sehaxlaza: pabra=ti: Xbide: hrixñtawa*[52]*tahi: ese tabãna: terñ: Ijãnã: Ijalusas* [53]*Ḳrzzạ̃nase: hãtahe:*

8) *Mukale: tewẽtẹ: Sãma=*[54]*ti: trbbetẽ: Turaxssi: zxxãna terñ: es*[55]*e: Humrxxã: tebãna terñ: hãtahe*

Although the clauses are quite different in length, each of them concerns *one* toponym or *one interconnected group* of toponyms; in six out of eight cases the clause *begins* with a toponym. In the initial part of the passage comprising six clauses the structure is very simple, with one clause mentioning only one toponym: 1): *Zagaba*, 2): *Ẽtri Tuminehi*, 3): *Pttara*, 4): *Xbane*, 5): *Tla*, 6): *Medbijahe*. It is noteworthy that in the case of *Xbane* and *Tla* the correlation is especially clearly visible: in each of the clauses the respective toponym is attested twice (in different forms) but appears in no other clause. In the final part of the passage, the structure becomes more complex. In 7) we find not one but three toponyms: *Xbide* (Kaunos), *Ijalusa* (Ialysos) and *Krzzãnase* (Chersonessos), which are further associated with the Ionians/Greeks (*Ijãnã*). However, all of them lie outside Lycia and very close to each other, so that one can easily imagine a single military event (campaign) associated with all of them together and involving Greeks. Lastly, in 8) one finds Mykale, Samos and Thorax, which are again situated within a distance of several dozens of kilometers from each other.

The resulting picture suggests that *hãtahe* as the key term of the passage should somehow mark the *crucial action* in a single military campaign or, given the final position of the word, probably even a *general (positive) result* of a campaign – while the verbs contained in some clauses would refer, one may assume, rather to some *particular* military actions leading to it. The simplest assumption would be that *hãtahe* renders, in one way or another, the idea of a *victory*. This preliminary conclusion proves to be in agreement with the interpretation of the word *hãtahe* in 44b, 56 tentatively suggested by Eichner ('Siege'),[8] but runs counter the interpretations suggested by Schürr and Melchert.[9] Schürr did recognize the pattern of occurrences of *hãtahe* in the passage, but did not pay proper attention to the problem of the verbs and the logical structure of each section, interpreting the word as an adverb 'gloriously' or 'greatly' ('herrlich'), which hardly sheds much light on the text. Melchert analyzed the word primarily from the phonetic perspective connecting it with the Luwian war god Šanda and assuming a dedicatory context for a part of the passage in question; however, considered in the context of the whole passage, which, *contra* Schürr and Melchert, should be taken as a single whole associated with military action, the interpretation 'to/for Šanda' again makes little sense.

2. Formal interpretation of *hãtahe* and the meaning of *prulija*

The next question is how precisely *hãtahe* functions in the passage and what its grammatical form is. The word does not look like a verbal form; taken in the face value, *hãtahe* is an ordinary genitive in *-he*. Accordingly, it should be based on a noun *hãta-* for which one may suggest a meaning 'victory'. There are two possibilities to reconcile the grammatical form and the presumed meaning of *hãtahe*, depending on how one interprets the general structure and/or function of the text of side A. If one takes the passage in question still as a sort of *narrative*, *hãtahe* may be interpreted as a *free standing* genitive functioning either as a (substantivized) adjective 'victorious' or as a noun 'victor' < '(man) of the victory'. In either case, one should assume that the verb 'to be' remained unexpressed. The general structure of each clause would then follow the scheme: 'at

8 Eichner 2005, 34 with n. 187, *cf.* below.

9 Schürr 1998, 151–155; 2009, 163–170; Melchert 2002. For the earlier interpretation of *hãtahe* as 'personal, one's own' (*vel sim.*) based on the comparison with *hãta* attested in TL 84, 3 see Neumann 2007, s.v. with further refs. and a critical assessment by Melchert (2002, 245–246). As for *hãta* in TL 84, 3 it has in all probability nothing to do with victory, but is a participle of *ha-* 'release, let (go)', which could possibly mean also 'leave (behind)', and *hãta* could mean, consequently, 'left (behind)' > '(body) remains, relics'.

such and such place after such and such action(s) he was victorious'. There is nothing improbable in such a scheme, although it looks somewhat artificial.

However, there is another possibility, which may lead to a more coherent interpretation of the passage. One may interpret the recurrent *hãtahe* as a row of usual genitives depending on one word which stands just before the beginning of the passage: *prulija*. This makes good sense, as *prulija*, representing in all probability a collective plural, may be interpreted as 'trophies'[10] or a similar type of *monument* (*cf.* below), which in any case produces a plausible interpretation of *prulija … hãtahe* as 'trophies (*vel sim.*) of the victory (there and there)'. This interpretation implies that the whole passage is not a narrative *strictu sensu*, but basically a *list* of victories won at different locations, or, more precisely, a narrative embedded in a row of genitival constructions organized in a list.

This interpretation may be corroborated by several further considerations. Possibly the clearest indication comes from the passage which contains the last attestation of *hãtahe*, the only one outside the present passage, 44b, 55–57:

urublijẽ [56]*hãtahe: tubehi prñnezi: se lihbeze: eh*[*b*][57]*ije: se dewẽ: zxxaza: se ñtuweriha: ade*.

The passage appears in the part of the text which clearly describes different installations (*ade* 'he made'), both of cultic and profane character; the immediately preceding lines (51–55) describe sacrifices (*kumezija*) in different cities (*τere τere*)[11] for the Storm-God (*Trqqñti*, dat.) and Aphrodite (*Padritahi*, gen. adj.), to whom also a statue (*tukedri*) is dedicated. However, the clause beginning with *urublijẽ* '(a sort of) monument' contains no indications that it picks up the cultic topic. In contrast, there are two indications that the new clause deals with a military theme: the noun *tubehi* (a noun in gen.) may be naturally connected with the verb *tub(e)i-* 'strike, attack', well-attested also in Hieroglyphic Luwian (*tuba-*) in military contexts; and *zxxaza* represents a derivative of the root *zxxa-* 'fight'. The context perfectly agrees with the interpretation of *urublijẽ hãtahe* as 'monument of the victory' and this interpretation has been in fact already tentatively proposed by Eichner,[12] as already noted above. Moreover, it appears quite sensible to include the following *tubehi* into the same syntactic group interpreting it straightforwardly as 'fighting' (< *tub(e)i-* 'strike, fight'). Now, the combination *urublijẽ hãtahe: tubehi* 'the monuments of victory(ies) (and) fighting' proves to be rather reminiscent of how the author defines his monument in the Greek text (44c, 23): [ἔρ]γων καὶ πολέμου μνῆμα τόδε 'this monument of (martial) deeds and war'.[13] It is clear that ἔργοι in the given context refers to the *res gestae* – military exploits – of the author, which are here by definition successful and thus semantically virtually identical to 'victories'. It seems likely that the Greek text represents an attempt to translate the Lycian syntagm, adjusting

[10] See Melchert 2002, 249–251.

[11] For *τere* as 'city' see below, §3 with n. 129.

[12] Eichner 2005, 34 with n. 187. Eichner takes, however, *tubehi* as a personal name connecting it with the following *prñnezi* 'household members' ('Hausstand').

[13] In the reconstruction of the Greek text I follow Bousquet (1975, 139 with n. 6, *cf.* 1992, 159–161) against Kalinka's reading [νικ]έων. Bousquet already pointed out two important facts which speak for the reading [ἔρ]γων: this form fits better both into the hexameter meter and into the stoichedon scheme of the inscription. It is true that both these points do not present absolute proof: some examples show that the scribe could sometimes squeeze a combination of a letter with the following iota in a single grid cell (*cf.*, e.g., ΟΙΣ of ἔργοις in line 31 corresponding to ΟΠ of τροπαῖα in line 30) and, in theory, one can scan νικέων as two longs with synaeresis of -έω. What is, however, decisive for the case is the actual traces of the first preserved letter in line 23, which I was able to verify with the help of a good photo sent to me by Heiner Eichner (for which I once again express my warmest thanks). The letter is still seen very clearly and there is only one roundish damage at the very bottom of the letter. There can be no doubt that if the letter were E one would be able to clearly see the second horizontal hasta of the letter. Furthermore, the upper horizontal hasta of the letter is slightly longer than it is usual for E used by the scribe of the Greek text. Lastly, one may mention that references to ἔργοι are in general found more frequently in the laudatory epigrams; in particular, the word is attested in two texts which were cited as parallels to the Greek text of the Xanthos pillar already by Kalinka (see TAM I, 47).

it to the requirements of the meter and space. As for the rest of the Lycian passage, it seems to further develop the topic, adding details absent in the short Greek text.[14]

Next, it seems to be possible to identify one more attestation of the word in the text. The form *hãtẽ* appears in the clause 44c, 4 following a passage which undoubtedly concerns fightings:

> *se Parzza: Xbide: se Sp*[*part*]*ali*[*j*]*ahe*: [3]*trbbi: Atãnas: zxxãte: terñ*: *me*=[4]*ñ[n]e=(e)mu: axagã: maraza: me ubu hãtẽ: Kbijẽti: se* [5]*Utãna: sttati: sttala: …*

The initial part of the passage can be interpreted as 'when the Persians at Kaunos and the (troops of the) Spartan(s) fought against the Athenians, I became *maraza*' (for *terñ* and *trbbi* see below). *Contra* Melchert,[15] an interpretation of *maraza* as 'judge' or 'arbitrator' is highly improbable: in the context of the Peloponnesian War and the following period, marked by the equally uneasy relationships between Athens, Sparta and the Persian Empire, it is impossible to ascribe to a warlike Lycian dynast under the more or less direct Persian authority any sort of peacemaking activities. More logical is to see in *maraza*, which is clearly based on *mar-* 'order, command', simply a '(military) commander',[16] linking *-ñ*[*n*]*e-* ('for/to them') of the enclitic chain specifically with *Parzza*. In other words, the author of the Lycian text boasts that he was a commander of the Lycian military contingent which fought for Persians against Athenians – in all likelihood, quite successfully. In this context, the appearance of a word for 'victory' in the next clause looks entirely expected.

The question is how exactly the clause is constructed. Melchert interprets *ubu* as acc. sg. of **uba-* 'grant, offering'.[17] If accepted, this would define *ubu hãtẽ* as 'grant/offering of the victories (gen. pl.)' in which one might plausibly see 'trophies' dedicated to temples or the like. However, this perception of *ubu* produces a rather serious syntactic inconsistency: the clause *me ubu hãtẽ* remains without a verb. The verb *sttati* 'install, set up'[18] which follows *Kbijẽti se Utãna* – in which there is every ground to identify two toponyms (Τυινδα and Ὕτεννα)[19] – is clearly connected with *sttala*, as it is the case in the two clauses further in the text: *se Xbide sttati mẽ: sttala:* (44c, 6-7) and

---

[14] The analysis of the clause is impeded by the fact that *lihbeze* and *ñtuweriha* are attested nowhere else. Given the attested meaning of *prñnezi(je)-* as 'household member', which might correspond to συνγενέσιν (dat. pl.) 'to the kinsmen' of the Greek version (44c, 27), and the probable meaning of *zxxaza* as 'soldier' (*zxxa-* + suffix *-za* building names of professions) the likeliest syntactic analysis of the clause would be: 'Monuments of victories and fighting/war *for* the kinsmen and their (i.e. 'of the kinsmen') *lihbeze* and gifts for the soldiers and for *ñtuweriha* he made'. It is, however, not excluded that *ñtuweriha*, which may be taken as acc. pl. n., represents a further *direct* object of the verb to be taken parallel with *urublijẽ* and then refers indeed to some sort of 'memorial installation' (*cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v.).

[15] Melchert 1992, 190 with n. 4.

[16] *Cf.* further considerations on *marazija* in Oreshko 2019a, 108–100.

[17] Melchert 2004, s.v. *uba-*.

[18] For interpretation of the verb *stta-* as transitive 'install, set up' (in the present context impersonal) as against usual perception as intransitive 'to stand, remain, be erected' see below.

[19] For *Kbijẽti* see Neumann 2007, s.v. referring to a personal communication by Schürr. Besides the present context, the identification of *Kbijẽti* as a toponym is made very likely by the attestation in N309b, 3 of the form *Kbijẽtezi*, which looks like an ethnic adjective derived from *Kbijẽti*. It is noteworthy that this interpretation has an important bearing on the interpretation of *sidi*, which appears in the same clause: *m=ene=ñtepi=tãti: Xatm̃mã: se sidi:* [3]*ehbi: Kbijẽtezi Huzetẽi:* 'And they put inside (=bury) Xatamma and his/her Tyindean *sidi* Huzeteni'. *Sidi* (attested also in TL 35, 14–15 and possibly in N342 as *sedi*) is clearly the Lycian counterpart of Luwian *zida/i-* 'man' and is also likely attested as a part of the PN *Ipre-sida* (TL 29, 1 and 69, 1). However, the meaning 'husband' is clearly excluded by the context (the husband of Xatamma is *Ddepñnewe* named in line 1). Moreover, now even its interpretation as a kinship term (*cf.* 'son-in-law' in Melchert 2004, s.v. with further refs.) is made unlikely by it appearance in combination with *Kbijẽtezi*. One may assume that 'Tyindean man' refers either to a friend or a guest-friend (ξένος) of the tomb-owner. A less likely, but still not impossible interpretation would be that it refers to a servant who virtually achieved the status of a family member (it would remain, however, unclear why he is still referred to by his place of origin).

se Ddewe: sttati mẽ urublijẽ (44c, 9).[20] No less importantly, no other acc. sg. in *-u*, which is arguably a secondary form developed from a more labial realization of *ã* > **ũ* (with or without nasalization loss), is found in the inscription, while there are a number of clear acc. sg. in *-ã*, e.g. *tupelijã* in 44a, 38 and 39, *Milasãñtrã* in 44a, 45, *Ijãnã* in 44a, 52, *θrm̃mã* in 44b, 44 or *wawã* in 44b, 45 etc. In view of this, it seems better to take *ubu* as a verbal form, namely 1sg. pres., which well correlates with *axagã* (1sg. pret. mid.), on the one hand, and with the present tense used further in the text (*sttati*), on the other. Given this interpretation, it is hardly possible to see in *hãtẽ* something other than acc. sg. and the context strongly suggests that *me ubu hãtẽ* means 'I win/achieve a victory'.

The usage of the verb *ub(e)-* proves to be strikingly reminiscent of the Luwian verb ("CAPERE") *u-pa-* regularly found in similar contexts associated with victories and trophies, *cf.*, e.g. KARKAMIŠ A1a §§9–10:

|(*349)*á-la-ta-ha-na-ha-wa/i*(URBS) |*ARHA* |DELERE-*nú-wa/i-ha*

|**a-wa/i-tú* |*pa+ra/i-i-ha-'* (SCALPRUM.CAPERE$_2$)*u-pa-ní-na* |(CAPERE$_2$)*u-pa-ha*

which can be interpreted as 'And I destroyed the city of Alataha and I fetched the trophies over here for him (scil. the Storm-God)'.[21] *Contra* Yakubovich,[22] there is little reason for separating (CAPERE$_2$)*u-pa-* and (PES$_2$)*u-pa-*, for which he assumed the (traditional) connection with Hitt. *uppa-* 'bring': in fact, all contexts featuring verb (CAPERE$_2$)*u-pa-* perfectly agree with its interpretation as 'fetch, furnish', which is strongly supported as by the determinative CAPERE$_2$ as by the pre-verbs combined with it, *ARHA* 'away' (KARKAMIŠ A2 §7) and *a-tá* (/anda/) 'in(to)' (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §13 and İSKENDERUN §4), the first of which directly contradicts the meaning 'erect, found'. On the other hand, the meaning 'fetch, furnish, provide' equally well agrees with the meaning which can be supposed for Lycian *ube-* found in N311 and for Carian *ýb-* found in C.xx 1 in clearly dedicatory contexts.[23] As a result, the clause *me ubu hãtẽ* can be interpreted as 'I gained a victory'.

---

20 The interpretation of *Ddewe* as a toponym is strongly suggested by the context and, as in the case of *Kbijẽti* (*cf.* previous footnote), is supported by the attestation of the ethnic *Ddeweze* in TL 65, 19–20 and 24, both times applied to a temple precinct, in all appearances that of the Storm-God (*cf.* ll. 19–20: … *Trqqñti: se* [*q*]*laj=ebi: Ddewe*[*ze/i*] '…for the Storm-God and in the temple precinct of *Ddewe*…'), *cf.* Neumann 2007, s.v. *ddewe*. Given that the spelling with the geminate consonant in the word-initial position is probably a graphic convention used to indicate a combination of a reduced vowel *ə* plus consonant (/əd/ in this case), which means, *inter alia*, that PN *Ddxuga-* (TL 44d, 19) likely corresponds to the Carian name attested as *Dquq* in Carian alphabet (E.Th 44) and as Ἰδαγυγος in Greek (see Oreshko 2019a, 201–202, n. 14), one may tentatively compare *Ddewe* with Lycian toponym Ἰδεβεσσός (attested also as Ἐδεβησσός and Ἐλεβησσός) localized to the north of Rhodiapolis (*cf.* Zgusta 1984, 192). Even if *Ddewe* is not identical with Ἰδεβεσσός, both names are likely based on the same root.

21 For other examples see Yakubovich 2005, 243.

22 Yakubovich 2005.

23 N311: [1][*Erb*]*bina(j)=ẽne ubete xruwata Ertẽmi*: [2][*Xer*]*igah tideimi se(j)=Upẽneh*: 'Erbbina, son of Xeriga and Upeni, dedicated/furnished these gifts for Artemis'. *C.xx 1: Šrquq* | *Qtbelemś* | *ýbt* | *snn* | *orkn* | *Ntro* | *pjdl* 'Sharigygos, son of Kytbelemis, dedicated this *bowl* as a gift to Apollo-Natri' (for the inscription see Adiego 2007, 160 and for the verb 432–433 with further refs). Likewise, HLuw. *uba-* (for the contexts *cf.* Yakubovich 2005, 246) has the same meaning 'fetch, furnish, provide' and Luw. *ubadid-* is a 'land-grant' or 'land-donation' (not an 'establishment'). Carian *upe*/*wpe* 'funerary stela'/'monument' or 'tomb' has probably nothing to do with *ube-* (*cf.* Adiego 2007, 429–430) and there are no other contexts in any way corroborating the meaning 'establish' for the verb. One should also note that *contra* Melchert (2004, s.v. *ube-*) it is highly unlikely that the passage in 44c, 13 (*erbbedi ñtube*) contains the same verb: given the obvious parallel in 44b, 19 (*m=en=erbbedi: tubei*[…]) and the clear military context, *ñtube* can be interpreted as a phonetic variant of *tube-* 'strike'. The spelling likely reflects voicing of the initial dental in sandhi with the preceding *erbbedi*. It is noteworthy that a similar variation in the spelling of the initial dental is found also in the case of *ñtuweriha* (44b, 57), which is likely based on the same root as *tuweri(se)* in TL 84, 5, and *ñtewẽ* (/dewẽ/) 'before'. The parallelism between 44b, 38: *ñtewẽ: n-emu* 'before me' (note the sandhi realization of the nasal) and *dewẽ emu* of the next line clearly suggests that *dewẽ* is a graphic variant of *ñtewẽ* (*cf.* Neumann 2007, s.v. *ddewe* for a similar idea expressed (but later dismissed) by Carruba 1969, 31 n. 14). The parallelism between *dewẽ: zxxaza*: of 44b, 57 and *ddewẽ: zxxazãi* of 44c,

Now one can revisit the attestations of *prulija* in order to verify its interpretation as 'trophies' suggested by Melchert and clarify the difference between *prulija … hãtahe* and *urublije- hãtahe*. The only other attestation of *prulija* besides 44a, 41 is found in the passage of the Xanthos trilingual which immediately follows the *hãtahe* passage, 44b, 1–2:[24]

[1]*ebei: kbija: prulija: ẽti pddãt*[…] [2]*ijãna=tija …*

The initial part of the passage may be interpreted as 'The other/second *prulija* here, which (is) in the place/precinct …'. It is quite obvious that there is a connection between the *prulija* mentioned in 44a, 41 and the 'other *prulija*' in the present passage, but otherwise, the passage hardly gives any additional clue on the nature of the *prulija*. Such a clue, however, seems to be produced by a proposal by Schürr to restore at the transition between lines 1–2 [*er*]*ijãna* interpreting it as a form of verb *eri(ja)-* 'raise'.[25] Although Schürr's discussion of the verb does not look equally convincing in all parts and his own interpretation of the lines 44b, 1–2 as 'Hier andere *prulija* am Platz …ten sie, welche zu *erheben* (waren)' is far from being immediately illuminating, there are good reasons to accept this restoration. First, Schürr's restoration and interpretation of *pddãt*[*e*] as a verb is quite unconvincing: *pddãt-* is well attested as a noun with the general meaning 'place, precinct'. A restoration *ẽti pddãt*[*i*] 'in the precinct' is obviously suggested by the parallel in 44c, 5: *ẽti: Malijahi: pddãti* which means apparently nothing other than 'in the precinct of Malija'. Consequently, *eri(ja)-* is the verb of the clause, while *prulija* is either its direct object or, if one assumes a passive construction, its subject.[26]

Moreover, there is every reason to recognize the same verb also with the first attestation of *prulija* in 44a, 41, identifying it in the (*se) irijẽm̃m*[.] at the end of line 40, as was suspected by Neumann and considered as a possibility by Schürr.[27] However, *contra* Schürr, a better restoration would be *irijẽm̃ m*[*a*], a collective plural form of the participle in agreement with the following *prulija*. The change *e* > *i* at the beginning of the word represents either a regressive vowel-harmonic change

6 further implies that also *ddewẽ* is a different spelling of *ñtewẽ*. Note that these considerations virtually eliminate the entry *ddewe-*[1] in Melchert 2004. The status of the remaining *ddeu* in 44c, 10 is unclear, but it may be the same form as *ddawu* (1sg. pres.) probably found in N323c (*cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v.) and be based on the same root as *ddewite* in TL 21, 3–4.

24 In the recent publication of a new Lycian inscription from Aloanda (see Onur – Tekoğlu 2020, 17–22), Recai Tekoğlu proposed to read a form :*prulij*[in the first line of the text. This reading appears unlikely. *Contra* Tekoğlu, the letter following Λ cannot be E, as it clearly has no long horizontal stroke at the bottom (*cf.* fig. 42 on p. 31). Moreover, while the identifications of the first letter as Γ and of a word-divider before it seem likely, the reading of the second letter as P is highly dubious: one can see no traces of the lower part of the 'loop' of P and, more importantly, the distance between this letter and the preceding one implies that to the left of the vertical hasta there should be a further element of the letter. Given the picture, one may suggest reading the second letter as T (for seemingly drooping ends of the horizontal hasta *cf.* the last T in the next line) and the entire sequence as :*Pṭulẹ*[, identifying in it a variant spelling of the name *Pttule*, attested in TL 35, 1 and 65, 8. This reading appears all the more sensible, as TL 35 comes from Üzümlü-Kadyanda, the northern neighbour of Aloanda, and *Pttule* is the name of a *king* which appears here also in the first line of the text as a part of a dating formula (ỊIII *uhi xñtawati Pttule* 'Year four, king *Pttule…*'). It is possible that the text from Aloanda features at the beginning a similar structure, and the word preceding :*Pṭulẹ*[which probably ends in *-i* (*contra* Tekoğlu's reading *-a*) should be restored as [*xñtawat*]*i*.

25 Schürr 2007b, 118–122.

26 Formally, *erijãna* has an appearance of an infinitive, which, however, makes little sense unless one assumes some special grammatical construction. In fact, a much simpler interpretation would be to see in the form a preterite medio-passive form cognate with the forms in *-ẽni* (as in *sijẽni* 'he lies'). *Prulija* is inanimate (coll. pl.) and one would expect with it a verb in singular, so the form may be identified as the 3rd person singular of *hi*-verbs (the class to which *eri(je)-* belongs) rather than a *plural* counterpart of *-ẽni* (although this is finally not quite excluded). Whether one should identify *erijeina/erijeine in* TL 29, 4 and 7 as the same form or still as infinitives remains an open question. Accordingly, the clause [1]*ebei: kbija: prulija: ẽti pddãt*[*i eri*][2]*ijãna=tija …* may be interpreted as 'The other/second *prulija* here, which were raised in (this) precinct'.

27 Neumann 2007, s.v. *irijẽm̃m*[.]); Schürr 2009, 162–163.

or results from the crasis with *se*. This evidence quite obviously suggests that *prulija* is something that can be *raised* or *erected*.

The recognition of this fact introduces a nuance in its interpretation. It means that the word cannot refer to 'trophies', at least in the sense 'things gained in a victory', as the latter would be dedicated in a temple rather than 'raised' somewhere. An interpretation as a 'victory monument' would be not impossible for *prulija*, but even if so, it would be not quite the same as Greek τρόπαιον, as the latter was usually set up directly on the battlefield. On the other hand, one may dismiss an interpretation of *prulija* as an abstract term for 'heroic deeds' (*res gestae*) suggested earlier by Meriggi[28] or a description thereof as text.[29] The use of the verb *eri(ja)-* suggests that *prulija* is something rather high. Combining it with the fact that *prulija* may contain a description of military exploits and with the indication on '(the) other/second *prulija* in *this* precinct', it would be tempting to see in *prulija* the name for the *pillar (monument)* itself.[30] The 'other/second *prulija* 'in this precinct' may refer just to the *present* pillar bearing the text, and the indication *ẽti pddãt*[*i*] may be immediately compared with the indication of the Greek text (44c, 22) that the monument was erected in the 'holy precinct' (ἐν καθαρῶι τεμένει).[31] Consequently, *prulija* mentioned in 44a, 41 should refer to a similar monument erected *elsewhere*. This assumption presents a logical explanation of the peculiar mode of the narrative imbedded in genitival constructions: it represents only a brief summary of a longer text presented in full on a *different* monument.

However, this interpretation faces one serious difficulty: it runs counter the common restoration at the beginning of the very first line of the text in which the present monument should be mentioned as *ebẽñni*[: *stta*]*l*[*ã: m=e*]*n=ad*[*ẽ:*] which is interpreted as 'This stele (acc.) made (PN) …'. It is clearly impossible to discuss here in full the vexed question of restoration of the beginning of the text, on which also the question of the authorship of the text is immediately bound, but one may briefly point out several facts which speak against the traditional restoration. The clues for restoration of *stta*]*l*[*a*] are more than subtle: on the fragment nr. 203 one can see in the upper part only one letter (Λ) and something which *may* be a part of Ψ, but may be simply the broken edge of the stone.[32] Moreover, the attribution of the fragment to the first line of the text is finally just a guess. However it may be, the fact is that both technically and functionally the pillar monument is *anything but a stele*. It is a colossal and complex monument, which included not only the pillar – which is at least three times wider and thicker than an ordinary stele – but, essentially, also a highly elaborate structure put on the top of it, which consisted, at the least, of different statues, smaller figures and carved reliefs – as suggested by the text itself (*cf.* below) – but quite probably contained also the grave chamber of the author of the text.[33] One could imagine that this sort of monument could be called by the same name which is usually applied to the rock-tombs *prñnawa-* 'building' or be designated as *arawazije-*, which seems to be a general word for 'monument'[34], but to call it a '*stele*' would a pretty much the same as to call an Arch of Triumph a 'gate.'

[28] See ref. in Neumann 2007, s.v.

[29] *Cf.* also interpretation of *prulija* as 'Siegestaten' considered as a possibility by Eichner (2005, 23 with n. 121).

[30] If this interpretation is correct, one wonders if the word can be distantly cognate with Latin *pīla* 'squared pillar or column', a word of quite uncertain etymology (*cf.* de Vaan 2008, s.v. with further refs.).

[31] This disproves Schürr's (in Dönmez – Schürr 2015, 144–146) attempt to see 'holy precinct' in *nelde*, *cf.* discussion below, §4.

[32] For photos see Demargne 1958, pl. XLIV (upper left) (or Laroche 1953, pl. X, fig. 1), *cf.* the drawing in Eichner 2006, 238, fig. 2. For restoration of the first line *cf.* Borchhardt *et al.* 1997–1999, 21 or Eichner 2006, 234.

[33] See, e.g. Borchhardt *et al.* 1997–1999.

[34] *Cf.* especially *arawazija: me(j)=adẽ:* in TL 128, 1, which employs the same verb as is supposedly present in the first line of TL 44.

There are other subtler, but still significant linguistic details. First, the verb supposedly used in the first line to describe the installation of the monument *a-* 'make' poorly agrees with 'stele' as an object. The word *sttala* is attested in this form only in 44c, 5 and 7 and both times is used in combination with the verb *stta-* which is clearly etymologically connected with it and, whether one takes it transitively or intransitively (*cf.* below), in any case, describes an *upright setting* of the stele, which closely corresponds to the Greek verb usually used with στήλη, ἵστημι 'make to stand' (*cf.*, e.g., Hom. Il. 13.437 or 17.434). It seems quite possible that the verb *ta-* 'put, pace' would be used with *sttala*, just as Greek τίθημι is used with it (e.g. Pi.N.4.81), but *a-* 'make' sounds odd in this context. Second, there are some doubts that *sttala* represents a noun in nom. sg. and that a form **sttalã* could exist at all. This interpretation was suggested on the basis of the combined evidence of the verb used with it in both occurrences in 44c, 5 and 7, *sttati*, which is the 3rd *singular*, and by the assumption that it is a borrowing from Greek στάλα (the Doric form of στήλη). However, both points are not quite conclusive. From a purely formal point of view, *sttala* may be nom.-acc. of *neutral collective plural*. In fact, this interpretation of *sttala* is unequivocally supported by both contexts. The first passage names *two* different cities in which *sttala* shall be set up in the respective temple precincts of Malija (*Kbijẽti: se Utãna*) and the second passage names in all probability *four different* temples in Kaunos (*Xbide*): *ẽti: qlahi 'bijehi: se Malị*[8]*jahi: se[j]=Ertemehi: se Xñtawatehi: Xbidẽñ*[*e*][9]*hi* 'in the (precinct) of (the Mother of?) the local temple, and (that) of Malija, and (that) of Artemis, and (that) of the Kaunian King'.[35] If *sttala* would be *nominative* neutral collective plural, the verb would have a singular form, as this type of agreement is normal for the Anatolian languages. Consequently, the form should be *accusative*. This interpretation rather compellingly follows from the parallelism between (1) *Kbijẽti: se Utãna: sttati: sttala*, (2) *Xbide sttati mẽ: sttala:* and (3) *Ddewe: sttati mẽ urublijẽ* (44c, 9), since *urublijẽ* clearly represents acc. sg. The verb should be then interpreted as *transitive* 'make to stand, set up', thus corresponding to the *transitive* meaning of Greek ἵστημι, and should be taken as an impersonal form 'one will make stand', which finds an immediate parallel in the subordinate clause following *urublijẽ: me=i=ti: puwe*[10]*ti: azzalã* 'on which one will write a decree'.[36] Re-interpreting *sttala* as nom.-acc.

[35] Despite its seemingly clear structure, the passage is quite problematic from a syntactic point of view. The main two difficulties are that one has gen. *qlahi* 'of the temple' instead of dat.-loc. required by the context (*cf. pddãti* in line 5) and that *'bijehi* (< *ebijehi*) 'local', which syntactically clearly represents the first member of the list of different deities connected by *se*, looks quite senseless in the given context, since all the temples named in the clause should be the *local* temples of Kaunos. The problems can be solved by the assumption that the scribe has omitted one or two words, having been confused by similarity of *ẽti* and *ẽni*. Indeed, the combination *qlahi 'bijehi* is very reminiscent of *ẽni: qlahi: ebijehi:* 'Mother of the local temple' – who can be identified on the basis of the Letoon trilingual as Leto – which appears in many inscriptions (*cf.* Neumann 2007, s.v. *qlahi-*). Admitting that the first deity in the list was Leto, one may assume that the original clause was *ẽti: (pddãti:) ẽnehi: qlahi 'bijehi: se Mal[i]jahi:* etc. 'In (the precinct) of the Mother of the local temple, (that) of Malija etc.' (*pddãti:* might in theory be elliptically absent) and the scribe, having written only *ẽti* already had in mind *ẽnehi* and proceeded with *qlahi*.

[36] This interpretation of the verb *stta-* is well compatible with three other attestations. First, the verb appears in N320, 16–17 in a clause *sẽ=ñte=ñte=km̃mẽ: sejẽti: θθẽ: sttat*[17]*i=teli:* which corresponds to καὶ ὅσον πρὸς τῶι ἀγρῶι in the Greek part. The combination *θθẽ sttati* can be naturally taken as a transitive verb plus object in acc. sg. and this interpretation is in fact preferable for *θθẽ*, since from the synchronic point of view it would be the *only* Lycian noun for which one may claim a nasal ending in nom. sg., which looks rather suspicious (the only other possible parallel *pddẽ* represents in all probability an adverb roughly corresponding to Greek πρός 'in the direction of, at, before etc.', *cf.* below). The whole Lycian clause may be interpreted as 'And however much lies (*sejẽti*) within (the territory) where they set the altar' (*contra* previous interpretations and Melchert [online], I take *sejẽti* as a verb (3pl. pres.) which may be interpreted as a phonetic variant of *si-* 'lie'; this interpretation better agrees with the syntax of the Lycian clause and better corresponds to the *twofold* contrast present in the Greek text: ὅσον πρὸς τῶι ἀγρῶι vs. τὰ οἰκήματα). The impersonal usage of the verb finds parallels elsewhere in the text, *cf. ẽti sttali: ppuweti: km̃mẽ:* (ll. 22–23): 'however much one writes on the stele' and *mara: ebeija: ẽti: sttali: ppuwẽti=mẽ* (ll. 33–34) 'these regulations as they write them down on the stele'. The second attestation is found in TL 93, 1–2: *hrppi ladi: ehbi: se tideime:* [2] *sttati=ti*. The relative *ti* refers quite probably to *xupã* (not to *ladi* or *tideime*), and the verb can be interpreted in the present context as 'he (scil. *Upazi*, the builder of the tomb) 'establishes/sets up for' (his wife and children) (*cf.* semantics of Lat. *pōnere* or German *zur*

pl. n. one should postulate its nom. sg. form as *sttale-* (*cf.*, e.g. nom. sg. *arawazije* in 44a, 21 and 44b, 46 vs. nom.-acc. pl. n. *arawazija* in 44b, 38); this would be **sttalẽ* in acc. sg. and would, in any case, be incompatible with the alleged traces of 𐤅 on the fragment nr. 203.

As for the first word of the text, *ebẽñni*, there are strong doubts that it is simply a variant of *ebẽñnẽ*, as it is usually taken.[37] The form *ebẽñni* is assuredly attested only in five inscriptions,[38] as contrasted with about nine dozens of attestations of *ebẽñnẽ*. The nasal auslaut of the latter form represents in all probability ending of acc. sg. corresponding to the respective ending of the following noun (*xupã*, *prñnawã* etc.), which is obviously not the case with *ebẽñni*. An alternative interpretation of *ebẽñni* is suggested by 44b, 1 which begins with *ebei* 'here'. *Ebẽñni* may well represent an emphatic variant of *ebei*, just as *ebẽñnẽ* may represent in its origin an emphatic variant of the rarely attested *ebẽ*, which does not demonstrate any semantic difference from *ebẽñnẽ* (*cf.*, esp. *ebẽ: prñnawã* in TL 61, 1 as contrasted with usual *ebẽñnẽ prñnawã*). Thus, the form *ebẽñni* is not diagnostic for the form of the following noun.

As a result, the restoration of [*stta*]*l*[*ã*] in 44a, 1, once proposed *faute de mieux* and with the course of time turned to be regarded almost as an established fact, is not only uncertain but rather unlikely. In contrast, there is at least one more argument, besides those discussed above, for the assumption that the name of the pillar monument, which was once present in the very first line of the inscription, is in fact *prulija*. This is the possible parallelism between the first line on side A and that of side B. Given the fact that side A ends with a blank space, one may regard the text on side A as a whole as in a way contrasted with the text on side B continued on side C. This implies that the first line on side B, which may be read as a sort of *heading*, may be contrasted with the analogous heading on side A, i.e. the first words of the side B *ebei: kbija: prulija* 'the other/second *prulija* here' picks up not only – or even not so much – the *prulija* described in ll. 41–55, but also the *prulija* possibly named in the first line of side A.

3. General structure of the text on side A: description of the parts of the pillar monument (ll. 33–40)

3.1. In order to further support the suggested interpretation of the text, it is appropriate to take a glance at the broader context of the *hãtahe* passage. The first rather fragmentarily preserved part of the text (ll. 1–27/28) contains, as far as one can judge, a description of building/setting up different monuments (*cf. prñnawã* 'building' in 14, *tukedri tuwete* 'set the statue' in 20, *arawazije* 'monument' in 21, *prñnawate* 'built' in 22 etc.). In ll. 24–27, which heavily uses spatial adverbs/prepositions *ñtewẽ* 'in front of' and *ñtepi* 'in, into', the description seems to be quite specific in terms of space and concerns probably the position of (a) particular monument(s) of the author in relation to the earlier monuments of his family. One may identify at least three reference points: *ñtewẽ: Erbbinahe: tezi: xu*[*gahi: ehbije*]*hi* (ll. 25–26) can be interpreted as 'in front of the monument

Verfügung stellen). The last attestation is found in 44b, 35 (*sttãti*). I interpret the verb as referring to the setting up a monument (or several monuments in different cities), as it is the case in 44c, 5, 7 and 9. The name of the monument is in all probability *pisba*[*s*] in l. 30 (either nom.-acc. pl. n. or acc. pl. c. depending of the presence or absence of the final *s*), which may be identical with *pasba* in the Lycian B part, as was suggested earlier (*cf.* Neumann 2007, s.v.; the interpretation of Lycian B *pasba* as 'sheep' < PIE **péḱu-* preferred in Melchert 2004, s.v. is no more than an etymological guess). If this identity is valid, then *pisba*[*s*]/*pasba* may represent the same word (either as a borrowing or a cognate) as Hittite *paššu-* 'an elevated structure, podium or the like' (*cf.* CHD P, s.v.). The long row of the forms in instr. which follow *pisba*[*s*] in ll. 31–34 represent quite probably the elements of the structure, possibly reliefs or figurines, as the structural parallel in 44a, 36–38 suggests (see below). The monument was dedicated to the Storm-God, as *pri: Trqqas* in line 34 shows. The following *hexis* represents possibly a geographical epithet of the Storm-God and [....]°*m̃ mezezi: erbbi:* in line 35 may be his further characterization, something like 'who gives support in the battle'. As for the status of the verb *stta-* in Lycian (borrowing or inherited), *cf.* the recent discussions by Schürr 2014b; Melchert 2018 and Oreshko 2020, 31–32, 35–36.

[37] *Cf.* Neumann 2007, s.v. *ebe-* and Melchert 2004, s.v.

[38] *Cf.* Neumann 2007, s.v. *ebe-*.

of Erbbina, his ancestor' (for *tezi* as 'monument' see below) and *se ñtewẽ: mahãna: neleze* (l. 27) as 'and in front of the *neleze*-gods'); the clause in l. 26 can be quite probably restored as *se ñtewẽ: teθθi*: *ehbij*[*ehi arawazije*]: 'and in front of [the monument] of hi[s] father'.[39]

The content of the following section (28–34) is more obscure. Usually, it is connected with animal sacrifices, which is based on the interpretation of *wawadra* (nom.-acc. pl. n.) in line 32 and *uwadraxi* in line 33 as 'bovine sacrifice' or 'herd, collection of cattle'.[40] However, given that lines 31–32 again contain the word for 'monument' ([*araw*]*azijedi*, instr. sg.), it is quite possible that the passage goes on with the description of the monuments, which makes the suggestion by Heiner Eichner[41] to interpret *wawadra* as 'bull protomes' quite attractive. This interpretation perfectly agrees with the actual presence of bull protomes in the upper part of the pillar monument itself as well as with the morphological structure of the word. As already noted by Neumann,[42] *wawadra* finds a close parallel in Lycian *tukedri-* 'statue' which is based on the Anatolian word for 'body' (< **tw(e)ka-dar-*). The latter is in turn structurally parallel with words for different cultic effigies attested in Hittite texts,[43] as DINGIR^{LIM}*-niyatar* (**šiuniyadar*) 'divine image', ḪUR.SAG-*tar* and KUR-*tar-* 'mountain effigy', which is quite probably to be interpreted phonetically as *wattadar-*, also attested in the descriptions of cultic statues,[44] and, especially appropriate for the present case, UR.MAḪ-*tar* (**walwa-dar*) 'lion effigy'.[45] Given this interpretation, one may analyze *ẽñne* in line 32 as *ẽñn=e*, i.e. < *ẽnẽ+e* 'below them', with the pronoun referring to the parts of the monuments referred above in the text, in all probability the statues installed on the top of the column.[46] The verb *xistte* following *ẽñn=e*, attested also several lines above in the text (l. 29), represents possibly a technical term referring to the execution of statues/figures ('carve out' or the like); it is not impossible that the root is present in the final part of the compound *uwadra-xi*.[47]

The text in the next section (33–40) can now be almost completely restored thanks to the recent find of a new fragment.[48] The section is crucial in a number of respects for understanding the whole second part of the text on side A, and it is worth reproducing its full text here:[49]

---

39 The syntax of the clause clearly suggests that the rest of the line should contain the name of the monument associated with 'his father'. Together with *-ehi*, *arawazije* takes twelve letters, thus precisely fitting into the space available for the rest of the line (*cf.* the reconstructed stoichedon-grid in Lotz 2017, 167 fig. 1).

40 *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. *wawadra*.

41 *Cf.* Borchhardt *et al.* 1997–1999, 36 and Neumann 2007, s.v. *wawadra*.

42 Neumann 2007, s.v. *wawadra*.

43 *Cf.* Neumann 2007, s.v. *tukedri-*.

44 For the convincing reading of the Luwian word for 'mountain' as *wata/i-* see Gérard 2006, esp. 250 on *wattadar*.

45 In contrast, in the arguably sacrificial contexts one uses simple *wawa-*, e.g. 44b, 44–45: *kumez*[*e*]*ine: uhazata: wawã: trisñni:* 'to sacrifice as a year-offering a three-year old bull' or N320, 26–28: *kumezidi … se=uhazata: uwadi* 'will sacrifice … and a year-offering as (lit. 'by') a bull' (*cf.* further TL 318, 3–4 and TL 26, 18).

46 For reconstruction of the general appearance of the monument see Borchhardt *et al.* 1997–1999, 93, pl. 2.1.

47 Thus *contra* its usual perception as 'make an animal sacrifice', *cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v. with further refs. *Cf.* CLuw. *ḫizza(i)-* which in theory may be an iterative of **ḫi-*; its interpretation 'hand over' (*cf.* Melchert 1993, s.v.) is not assured. Note that the verb *xurz-* attested in 44b, 43–44 seems to have a similar meaning as *xi-*.

48 Dönmez – Schürr 2015, 132–144.

49 I read *hqqdaiḍ/ḷe-* at the end of line 37 instead of Schürr's *hqqdaime-* (Dönmez – Schürr 2015, 133–134). *Contra* Schürr, the last but one letter hardly can be ᴍ (*cf.* Dönmez – Schürr 2015, 133, fig. 15a): the left oblique hasta of the letter seems to go a bit too far down for an ᴍ and there is not a trace of the further oblique hasta to the left of it, which one should see, if it would be ᴍ, as there is enough stone surface preserved (thus *contra* what the drawing in fig. 15b seems to suggest). Moreover, the triangle of the letter in question looks like a perfect isosceles triangle, while it is mostly not the case with the two triangles of ᴍ, i.e. the oblique hastas of ᴍ diverge from the upper point at slightly different angles to the virtual horizontal (*cf.*, e.g. ᴍ preserved on the other side of the same stone fragment). The letter can be thus only Δ or Λ. The very acute angle of the triangle strongly speaks for the former possibility, as Lycian Λ has a

przz[*e/ẽ*...][34]*ehetehi: axã: ara: nele=de Arñna: me=ti p*[*rz*]*ze* [35]*axã Trm̃mile izredi: pededi: ñterez*[*e:*] *xu*[36]*base: tupa*: *esbedi: hm̃menedi: Trm̃mil*[*i*]*je*[37]*di: se Medezedi: padrãtahedi: hqqdaiḍ/ḷe*[38][*d*]*i: se mrbbẽnedi: tupelijã: Trm̃milis*[. (.)][39][. . *qa*]*Kadunimi: puwejehñ: tupelijã: sḷ/m̩̃n*[(.)][40][. . .]: *qaKadunimi: puwejehñ*

The entire section was recently discussed by Schürr.[50] He convincingly argued for interpreting lines 35–38 with their reference to 'by hand and foot' (*izredi pededi*), a 'horse' (*esbedi*, inst.) and something 'in Lycian and Median (style)' (*hm̃menedi: Trm̃mil*[*ije*]*di: se Medezedi*, inst.) as a description of the virtues and skills of the author (~ ἀριστεία), which finds correspondence in the Greek text (44c, 24–25) and has good parallels elsewhere, including Old Persian inscriptions, which might have served as a model for imitation. However, a number of points in his interpretation are not quite convincing and the meaning of several terms remain quite obscure (*cf.* below). Schürr's discussion of lines 38–40[51] also failed to produce any comprehensible interpretation of the text. Even the common perception of two words that appear twice in the passage, *qaKadunimi* and *puwejehñ*, as personal names is very dubious, since it is difficult to imagine why a name with a patronymic would be repeated as a whole in two successive lines.[52]

However, the most curious word of the passage is *tupelijã* (acc. sg.), which appears here twice and may well give the key for the understanding of the whole section. The word practically exactly corresponds to HLuw. word for 'writing, script' which may be reconstructed as **tupaliya-*.[53] The word is attested four times in KARKAMIŠ A15b §19 in the form SCRIBA-*li-ia-* and, being modified by different toponymic adjectives, has here a meaning 'writing/script'; the context of its appearance in KARATEPE 4 §2 (in the form SCRIBA.*LA-li-ya-*) suggests, on the other hand, a more concrete meaning 'writings, written text'.[54] The logographic reading of the sign SCRIBA as **tup(p)a/i-* is quite certain in view of the joint evidence of its attested phonetic value <tù>[55] and the cuneiform title *tup(p)alanura-* 'chief scribe' (< **tup(p)ala(n)* + *ura-* 'big, great'), which presupposes **tup(p)ala-* 'scribe' – which clearly corresponds to HLuw. SCRIBA-*la-* 'scribe' – a professional name derived with the suffix *-al(l)a/i-* from *tuppi-* '(clay) tablet' (< Sumerian DUB 'tablet').[56] **Tupaliya-* repre-

somewhat squatter shape. And yet, this distinction is not absolute and sometimes the upper angle of Δ and Λ correspond very closely (*cf.*, e.g. Λ in *Trm̃milis* at the end of line 36 and Δ in *hqqdai-* just above it), so it is not excluded that the letter in question is still Λ (which is supported by a possible Luwian comparandum, *cf.* below). For the reading *sḷ/m̩̃n* - at the end of line 39 instead to Kalinka's *se-* see below, n. 61.

50 Schürr 2009, 157–161, *cf.* Dönmez – Schürr 2015, 132–144.

51 Schürr 2009, 161–163.

52 In this perception Schürr follows Melchert (2004, s.vv. *Kadunimi* and *Puwẽje*), arguing only for taking *qaKadunimi* as a single word, which is very likely, since one can still clearly discern the interpunction sign (:) before *qaKadunimi* in line 40, but there seems to be no such sign between any other letters in the sequence. Neumann (2007, s.vv. *Kadunimi* and *puweje-*) takes Kadunimi also for a personal name and remains agnostic about *puweje-*, pointing out a possibility to see the basis of it in *puwẽi* (44b, 42). Interpretation of *puwej*[*e*]*he* in 44a, 24 and *puwẽi* in 44b, 42 is equally dubious: in all probability they represent, as *puwejehñ*, a derivative of the root *p(p)uwe-* (*cf.* below).

53 This possibility was also tentatively noted by Eichner 2005, 26 n. 140.

54 See Hawkins 2000, 69–70 and 130–133. It is noteworthy that KARATEPE 4, §2 mentions *two* scribes responsible for the text, Masanis and Masanazamis ([1]DEUS-*ní-i-sá* [1]DEUS-*na-*(OCULUS)*á-za-mi-sá*), which are both good Luwian names. There is no corresponding scribal signature in the extant Phoenician text. Given the fact that KARATEPE represents a *bilingual*, it would be logical to suppose that one of the scribes worked on the Phoenician version and the other one on the Luwian one. But even if they worked jointly on both versions, the probability is that it was a *Luwian* scribe who incised the Phoenician version of the text. This consideration has a certain influence on the question of primacy of either Luwian or Phoenician version (see for a recent discussion Yakubovich 2015).

55 *Cf.* Hawkins 2000, 33.

56 For a discussion of *tuppalanura-* and *tuppi-* see Tischler 1991–1994, s.vv., *cf.* also Yakubovich 2017, 41–43. The title SCRIBA-*la-* is well attested both on the Empire Period seals (*cf.*, e.g., Herbordt 2005, 308) and in the later HLuw. corpus (*cf.* KARABURUN §14, BOYBEYPINARI 1, §11, KULULU 3, §1, MEHARDE §9 (SCRIBA-*la/i/u-*) and SHEIZAR §8). It is also noteworthy that the pictographic form of the sign also agrees well with its reading as *tuppa/i-*, as it seems to render a foldable wooden tablet (diptych) of the type depicted

sents, accordingly, a derivative with the suffix *-ya-* from **tupala-* 'scribe' and means 'that of the scribe' > 'art/production of the scribe'; there is every reason to think that the form attested in KARATEPE 4 §2, SCRIBA.*LA-li-ya-*, conceals the same form (and not ***tupalaliya-*): the latter form would be rather senseless from a morphological point of view and a similar practice of frozen combinations of a logogram with a phonetic complement, which creates an impression of double phonetic marking of certain syllables, is found elsewhere in HLuw., *cf.*, for instance, such spellings as (TERRA+*LA*+*LA*)*wa/i-li-li-t-* for /walilid-/ 'territory, field' (e.g., KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §8) or AEDIFICARE+*MA/I-ma-* for /tama-/ 'build' (e.g., KARATEPE 2 §1).

The possibility to identify in Lycian *tupelija-* the word for 'writings' or 'script' – which may be recognized as a *borrowing* from a Luwian dialect (or from Hittite) – is supported by several other clues. First, a title *tupelezije* attested twice in 44b, 62–64 is linguistically obviously connected with *tupelija-* and may be now interpreted as 'scribe', being apparently a specifically Lycian formation replacing older **tuppala-*.[57] Given that *tupelezije* is characterized as 'of the king' (*xñtawatije*) and that something is taking place 'before' or 'in front of' (*ñtewẽ*) him, the interpretation as 'scribe' makes fairly good sense.[58]

Second, the form *puwejehñ* which appears in ll. 39–40 in close association with *tupelija-* may naturally be taken as a derivative of root *p(p)uwe-* commonly defined as 'write'; the possibility of the spelling of the root with non-geminate *p-* is confirmed by an attestation in 44c, 9–10 in combination with *azzalã* 'decree' (or the like).[59] It looks like *tupelijã* is agreed with *puwejehñ* which makes

on the Assyrian reliefs and actually found in Kalhu and the Uluburun shipwreck.

57 The word *tupazalije* found in TL 35, 5 represents in all probability the same word, being a scribal slip for *tupalazije*. Note that the text is neither a usual tomb inscription nor a *res gestae*, but quite probably a sort of official document, as it starts with a dating formula (ḲIII *uhi xñtawati Pttule*).

58 The whole passage reads: *me=sitẽni: eb*[62][*e*]*ija garãi: zeusi: ñtewẽ: xñtawati: sber*[63]*ide: xñtawati: tupelezije: se ñtewẽ: suxinaje: tupelezije: xñtawatije: sppart*[44c1][*azi*(*je*)-. The passage eludes complete interpretation due to several unclear words and not quite transparent syntax. However it is, there is every ground to consider it in the context of the previous lines (58–62), which mention a decree (*azzalã*, acc. sg.) of the Persian kings Darius (59: *Ñtarijeusehe*, gen. adj.) and Artaxerxes (59–60: *Ertaxssirazahe*, gen. adj.), who are apparently Darius II (423–405/404 BC) and Artaxerxes I (died in 425 BC), Lycia (60), a Lycian dynast *Teθθiweibi* (60–61) and a temple/precinct of Leto (61: *leθθi: qlã*, acc. sg.). This all clearly suggests that the present passage deals with political agenda. The final part of the passage seems to be reasonably clear: 'and before *suxinaje* scribe of the king of Sparta' (inclusion of *sppart*[*azi*(*je*)] is not completely assured, but quite possible). *Suxinaje* may be a personal name, as it is commonly taken (*cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v.). The probable context of dealings with Achaemenid administration in Anatolia, brings to mind a passage of Herodotus (3.128) which, touching upon the court of Oroetes at Sardis, attests the presence of the 'royal scribes' (γραμματισταί βασιλήιοι) there, as was the case with all Achaemenid satrapal courts. Furthermore, taking into consideration the crucial significance of the satrapal seat at Sardis for diplomatic relations between the Persians and the Greeks, and the fact that Amorges (*Humrxxa*), the satrap of Lydia, played a role in the event described in the text (for details *cf.* below), one wonders if the unclear *sberide* may refer just to the Lydian capital. The original Lydian form of the name was probably **Sfar*(*i*)-, on which an adjective *Sfarja* (/Sfarða/) 'Sardian' was based, which was used as general name for 'Lydians' and was adopted as *Sparda* in Old Persian, *Sprd* in Aramaic (LW 1) and *Sĕfārad* in Hebrew (*cf.* Oreshko 2019b, 198–199). Lycian *Sberide* (phonetically /Sβeriðe/), possibly a form in locative (*cf.* loc. *Xbide* or *Wedre*), represents a fairly exact phonetic match of the name, with substitution of *f* absent in Lycian by *b* (/β/), rising of *a* > *e* (or simply neutralization of the sound) before *r*, and epenthetic *i* to break the sequence *-rð-* untypical of Lycian; for alternative way of doing this with the epenthetic vowel *ə cf.* two personal names, Persian *Wataprddate-* = /u̯ataprəðate-/ = Αὐτοφραδάτης (TL 61, 2) and (possibly local) *Prddewã* = /prəðeu̯ã/ (TL 126, 1), for the phonetic interpretation see Oreshko 2019a, 201–202 n. 14). It is also noteworthy that in the Lycian B part of the text one finds forms *sbirte* (44c, 32, the very first word of the text) and *sbirtẽ* (44c, 41 and 49). Neither the context nor the number of the phonological discrepancies nor the morphology of the word support its identity with *Sberide*.

59 For a recent treatment of the root see Giusfredi 2009. However, *contra* Giusfredi (and earlier Neumann 2007, s.v. *ppuwe-*) a connection of *ppuwe-* with CLuw. *pūwā(i)-* and Hitt. *pūwae-* usually defined as 'to pound, to grind' seems to me unlikely, as the production of written text is connected not with 'pounding' or 'crushing' wooden writing tablets, stone or papyrus, but with 'cutting or 'carving' it or 'painting' on it, *cf.* γράφω 'write' vs. OE *ceorfan* = NE *carve* (PIE <**gerb*^{h}-); γλύφω 'engrave, incise' vs. OHG *klioban* 'cleave, split' and Lat. *glūbō* 'peel' (< **gleu̯b*^{h}-); Lat. *scribō* vs. Latv. *skrīpât* 'to scratch, scribble, write down'

it quite probable that the words between them make part of the same syntactic group, which discards the interpretation of *qaKadunimi* as a personal name. The repetition of *tupelijã … puwejehñ* in two successive lines proves to be quite reminiscent of the repetition of SCRIABE-*li-ia-* in KARKAMIŠ A15b §19, and the parallelism suggests that *Trm̃milis[…]* should be taken as a geographical modifier, i.e. 'Lycian'.[60] Accordingly, in the gap between the lines 39–40 one should expect a second toponym modifying the second *tupelijã*, which likely refers to the text written in another language, in which one would most readily see Lycian B or 'Mylian'. The initial part of this putative toponym possibly begins with *Sl- or Sm̃-* (*contra* earlier reading as *se-*) and, if one adopts the former reading, it would be seducing to see in it a reference to the Σόλυμοι, the people inhabiting the northern part of Lycia, who were, according to Herodotus (1.173), the same people as Μιλύαι.[61] It is noteworthy that, unlike KARKAMIŠ A15b §19, *tupelijã* seems to refer not to the abstract 'script' but the concrete 'writing(s)', i.e. 'text', as it is the case in KARATEPE 4 §2. The meaning 'script/writing' may be rather ascribed to *puweja-* – otherwise, the construction would seem tautological – and the clauses may be interpreted accordingly as 'text in Lycian/in Sl[…] … writing/script'. The interpretation of *qaKadunimi* remains elusive; formally, it represents a participle or a relational adjective in *-mi*.[62]

and OIc. *hrifa* 'scratch, tear' (< PIE *(*s)kreiḇ*^{h}-); OCS *pisati* 'write' and Toch AB *pik-* 'write, paint' vs. Lat. *pingō* 'to color, paint' (< PIE **pinḱ-*). In Luwian, one used for rendering the idea of 'carving'/'writing on stone' the root *kwanz-* ((CAPERE+SCALPRUM)*kwa/i-za-*) which in all probability goes back, as Hittite *gulš-* 'to carve, to engrave, to inscribe', to PIE **k*^{u}*els-* 'to draw furrows' (Yakubovich 2013–2014, *cf.* Kloekhorst 2008, s.v. *gulš-*). Instead, one may connect the root *puwa-* with Hitt./Luw. *puwatti-* which corresponds to Akk. *šimtu*, *šindu* 'mark(ing), color' in the trilingual lexical list IZI (KBo 1.42 iv 46) and possibly designates a red dying pigment, such as 'madder' (*cf.* CHD P, s.v. *puwatti-* with further refs.). In fact, the connection of Lyc. *puwe-* with CLuw. *pūwā(i)-* and Hitt. *pūwae-* may be maintained under an assumption that the core semantics of the latter was not 'pound', which presupposes 'striking', but rather 'grind, rub', which presupposes *lateral* motion, and the semantic development was 'rub in' > 'paint' > 'write' (*cf.* Greek τρίβω 'rub' and ἐντρίβω 'rub in (cosmetics) > paint').

60 The form represents quite probably a derivative with the ethnic suffix *-s-*, for which *cf.* below, §9.

61 At present one can see only a part of an oblique stroke at the end of the line. Fellows (1842) draws an entire ↑, but one should hardly put much weight on it, as there are many small inaccuracies in his drawing, *cf.* e.g., his *qamaeunimi* instead of *qaKadunimi* in l. 40, *xñnahñ-* instead of expected *xñnah*[*i*] in line 29 or already discussed *Ijaeusas* (n. 5). In fact, the position of the stroke and its inclination speak against the identification as a part of ↑: as far as one can see, the stroke descends somewhat lower in the line than it is usual for ↑ (*cf.* above n. 6 on the *Ijalusas*) and seems to be inclined at an obtuser angle to the imaginary vertical. Moreover, the letter is set unusually far from ᔑ, while in all the cases of ᔑ↑ observable on side A the letters are set closer to each other. All these indications agree much better with the identification of the letter as Λ. However, an identification as X cannot be completely excluded (in contrast, ⊀ and ᗰ are rather out of question). The possibility to recognize here a reference to Σόλυμοι is suggested by Neumann's (2007, s.v. *slm̃mewe*) proposal to connect PN *Slm̃mewe* attested in TL 12, 2 with this ethnic name; for the Solymians and their relationship to the Lycians *cf.* Frei 1993. Given this more than slim evidence, one cannot expect any final proof, but it is striking that a restoration *Sl̥*[*m̃*]^{40}[*mis*]: exactly fits into the space available in the gap.

62 Very tentatively one may hazard a guess that *qaKaduni-* may refer to *graphical* or to *metrical* organization of the text, i.e. either indicate that the text is written *stoichedon* (as the present inscription) or that it is a versed (or rhymed) text. Given the fact that the Lycian letter ᔕ (transcribed as K) renders a tectal sound, which is established beyond doubt by the equation of the Letoon Trilingual *ArKKazuma* = Ἀρκεσιμα, and that ⊀ (q) renders predominantly (or exclusively) a sound going back to PA **Hu* (*cf.* Lyc. *Trqqñt-* = Luw. *Tarḫunt(a)-*) one may reconstruct the preform of the stem as **ḫu(w)aḫḫaduni-*. The form looks like a reduplicated formation structurally comparable with such Luwian forms as *ḫuwaḫu(wa)rdi-* 'throat' and *ḫu(wa)ḫḫu(wa)rdalla-* 'necklace' (< **ḫu(wa)-ḫu(wa)r(d)-*), or *ḫu(wa)ḫḫuršant-* '?' (< **ḫu(wa)-ḫu(wa)rs-*). The similarity is not quite trivial and one wonders if **ḫu(w)aḫḫaduni-* may have approximately the same meaning as *ḫu(wa)ḫḫu(wa)rdalla-*, i.e. 'necklace', 'beads' or the like. Given the fact that 'necklace', 'beads', 'garland', 'wreath' are frequently used metaphorically for metrically organized text (*cf.*, e.g., Skr. *mālā-* 'wreath, garland, row, line, series etc.'), this interpretation of *qaKaduni-* looks rather appropriate. The final part of the word is comparable with *kñtuni* in TL 29, 8 which might represent the same word as HLuw. *ka(n)tuni-* (("*314")*ka-tú-ni-*) attested in KARKAMIŠ A6, §§14–15, which seems to refer to a sort of instrument.

It is noteworthy that the suggested interpretation of *tupelija-* allows the function of *epi=de* to be specified and introduces a nuance into the interpretation of the text in the following lines. The context clearly implies that the *prulija* is the material carrier of the *tupelija-*, the immaterial text, i.e. that *tupelija-* is *on* the *prulija*, which suggests that *epi=de* should be taken literally 'on it/them'. Furthermore, now it appears likelier that the genitive *hãtahe* is connected with *tupelija-* rather than with *prulija*. As a result, the lines in question may be now interpreted as: '… (made) writing(s) in Lycian … script (and) writing(s) in … script and (put them) onto the erected pillar(s): (the writing) of the victory at …, (that) of the victory at … etc.'.

The suggested interpretation of *tupelija-* may further shed some light on the preceding text and first of all on the clause in ll. 36–38 which begins with *tupa* and contains a long row of instrumentals in *-edi*. As already mentioned, the section can be plausibly connected with a description of the author's skills in different fields. The question is what is *tupa*. Given the appearance of *tupa* and *tupelija-* so closely in the text, it seems possible that they are connected in a way. One may suggest that *tupa*, which is quite probably neuter plural (like *prulija*), reflects the word which ultimately underlies Luw. **tupaliya-* and Lyc. *tupelija-* and is attested in cuneiform as *tuppi-* 'tablet'. However, its meaning here should be more general than a '(writing) tablet', and one may assume that it refers, as Greek πίναξ or Latin *tabula (picta)*, to a 'picture' or 'image'.[63] On the other hand, the presumed meaning of the word proves to be very close to if not identical with Greek τύπος which, besides original 'blow, impression', means also 'engraving, carved or relief figure, image'. It is quite possible that the semantics of Lyc. *tupa*, if it indeed came from *tuppi-* 'tablet', was influenced by the Greek word; however, it is possible that the Lycian word simply represents a borrowing from Greek. At any event, this means that the passage in ll. 36–38 is actually not a narrative of the virtues of the author *per se*, but again an *imbedded* narrative, this time a description of the *images* on the pillar.

3.2. At this point, it is appropriate to make an excursus on the terminology of the passage describing the images. First, it seems that Schürr's guess that *hẽmenedi* is connected with *archery* hits the target quite closely.[64] The word can be interpreted as a derivative with suffix *-men-* = Luwian *-m(m)an-*, which derives neutral action nouns, from a root **he-* in which one can readily identify the Lycian counterpart of Hittite *šai-/šiye/a-* 'impress; shoot' (along with several other meanings).[65] The root is also attested in both meanings in Luwian. In the reduplicated form, it serves as the basis for HLuw. *sasan-* 'seal' and for the word *sasaliya* ((*262)*sa-sa-li-ia*, probably nom.-acc. pl.

---

[63] It is noteworthy that the word is probably attested in one more text (TL 57) in a derivative *tupm̃me* which appears in a clause [4]*se=i pijẽtẽ* [5]*pijatu: miñti: ẽtri: xupu: sixli: aladehxxãne: se hrzzi* [6]*tupm̃me: sixla: hrzzi prñnawi*. This may be roughly interpreted as 'They gave as a gift for the community (*mindis*) for *aladehxxãne* in the lower chamber-tomb (*xupu*) a shekel; and in the upper … shekel(s) in the upper building. The word *tupm̃me* is usually taken with *sixla* and interpreted as 'two-fold, pair' (see Neumann 2007, s.v. with further refs.). This interpretation, *faute de mieux*, might seem not quite senseless, but regarded from a linguistic perspective, it appears extremely doubtful. It is rather difficult to reconcile root *tup-* even with the Lycian B form of the numeral 'two' *tbi-* (in *tbi-su* and possibly *tbi-plẽ*, *cf.* Melchert 2004, s.vv., *cf.* HLuw. ('2')*tu-wa/i-*), as it is not clear how *u̯* of the PIE **duu̯-i/o-* might develop to voiceless labial. This interpretation is, however, even less credible in view of the normal Lycian A form of the numeral, *kbi-* (with the regular Lycian development *dw* > *kb*) and there is otherwise no evidence that the Luwic forms of the numeral 'two' go back to something other than PA **du̯i*. Lastly, a formation with a suffix *-m̃me* is unique for numerals, and finally it is not clear why the scribe would bother at all to write *tupm̃me sixla* instead of writing *sixla* II. In fact, the syntax of the clause suggests quite a different interpretation of *tupm̃me*: it should be a noun agreed with *hrzzi* 'upper' or a further adjective characterizing elided *xupu*, building a certain contrast with *ẽtri xupu* 'lower tomb-chamber' and *hrzzi prñnawi* 'upper tomb-building'. The word may be interpreted as 'decorated with paintings' and refers either to a separate *painted* part of the tomb or, if one takes two *hrzzi* as dittography, it represents the epithet of the *hrzzi prñnawa-*. *Sixla* represents probably a dual or plural form of *sixli* (*cf. sixlas* in N320, 22 = δύο δραχμάς in 320G, 20).

[64] Schürr 2009, 161. Thus *contra* Hajnal's (1995, 51 with n. 53) connection with Hitt. *šāmana-* 'foundation(s)'.

[65] For the Hittite root see Kloekhorst 2008, s.v.

n.) attested in the epigraphs to the reliefs MALATYA 1 and MALATYA 3, which should mean, judging from the accompanying reliefs depicting chariot hunting scenes, either 'shooting' or 'hunting'.[66] Moreover, it is quite possible that Luwian also preserves further derivatives of verb **s(i) ya-*. The first one is probably *šama-* (*sà-ma-ia*, possibly dat. sg.) attested in BOHÇA §5: the context associated with the 'wild beasts' and the favors of the Stag-God *K(u)runtiyas*, well known as a deity responsible for good fortune at the hunt, makes an interpretation of *sà-ma-ia* 'at the hunt' or the like quite plausible.[67] The second is *šaman-* (*sà-ma-za* = /ʃaman-tˢa/, nom.-acc. sg. n.) attested in KARABURUN §5 and KULULU 2 §2 which quite probably means not 'sealed document', as usually assumed, but rather 'shooting/hunting' and thus exactly corresponds to Lycian *hẽmen-*.[68] As a result, the clause *esbedi: hẽmenedi: Trm̃mil[ije]di: se Medezedi* may be interpreted as '(images) with shooting/hunting on the horse-back in the Lycian and Median (Persian) style.'

The interpretation of the following sequence, *padrãtahedi: hqqdaiḍ/ḷe*[*d*]*i: se mrbbẽnedi*, is much more difficult. The first two words are not found, at least in this form, elsewhere in the Lycian corpus and the existence of cognates in other Anatolian languages is questionable.[69] However, the last word of the passage, *mrbbẽnedi*, is attested two more times in the corpus. Besides a second

---

66 For the texts see Hawkins 2000, 319 (MALATYA 3) and 321 (MALATYA 1). Morphologically, the word *sasaliya* seems to represent an exact counterpart of **tupaliya-* discussed above: it may be analyzed as a substantivized *ya*-adjective from **sasala/i-* 'shooter/hunter', a derivative with suffix *-al(l)a/i-* from **sasa-* 'shoot (repeatedly)'.

67 *Cf.* Hawkins 2000, 478–480 with a ref. to the personal communication by G. Neumann, who proposed an interpretation 'for shooting'.

68 See Hawkins 2000, 480–483 (KARABURUN) and 487–490 (KULULU 2). A meaning 'sealed document' or 'compact' adopted by Hawkins by the association with **sa-* 'seal' is in no way compelling for either context. KULULU 2 §2 (a funerary stele) relates only that 'My children made here *šaman-za* and *la(la)man-za* (|*wa/i-mu-u* |*á-mi-zi-i* |INFANS.*NI-zi-i* |*za-ti-i* |*sà-ma-za* |CAPERE-*ma-za-'* |*i-zi-ia-ta*) and an interpretation 'sealed document' sheds little light on the text, in a way contradicting the fact that the word for 'seal' found further in the text (§7) is spelled differently ((“SCALPRUM.SIGILLUM”)*sa-s*[*a*]*-za*). There is nothing impossible in the assumption that the author simply relates that his children 'made here hunting and catching', which would well agree with the mention of a *feast* in the next clause (note that the interpretation of “CAPERE”-*ma-z*[*a*] in BULGARMADEN §13 as 'contract' is also rather dubious, as is its semantic connection with CLuw. *lalami-* 'list, receipt' which means simply 'received (items)'). The author of the text has died during this feast, in his own words, and might have been buried on spot. Similarly, the context of KARABURUN does not necessarily imply that §5 is immediately connected with §4, and in any case it is not quite clear what sort of 'sealed contract' should be done *after* building a fortress. Again, nothing speaks against an assumption that the two Sipis (the authors of the inscription) simply went on hunting in this place, in the course of which they found the boulder (§6: “SCALPRUM”-*wa/i wa-mi*-OCULUS$_2$-*ta*) on which they made an inscription to commemorate their cordial relationships (*cf.* Yakubovich's translation in ACLT, s.v.).

69 Adopting a viewpoint that the passage picks up the description of military scenes, one may tentatively compare the root underlying *padrãtahedi*, **padra-* with the Hittite word *pattar* which is attested in a description of a statue of the War-God Yarri in KUB 17.35 ii 35 (*cf.* CHD P, s.v. *pattar* C). The phonetic correspondence is not perfect, as to link the forms one needs to assume a contraction and subsequent voicing of the dental in the cluster *-tr-* > *-dr-*. The meaning of *pattar* is not unequivocally defined by the context, but it may be a *protective* piece of armor, for which the simplest assumption would be 'shield'. The word may be then identical with the other *pattar* which designates different things made of wickerwork, as 'tray', 'basket' and 'sieve' (*cf.* CHD P, s.v. *pattar* B), since simple shields were made just from this material. Accordingly, *padrãt(i)-* may be interpreted as 'shield-bearer', finding a structural correspondence in such terms as *esbẽt(i)-* 'horseman, knight' and, possibly, *hbẽti* ~ ὁπλίτης (*cf.* below); its semantic correspondence in Greek would be probably πελταστής 'light-shield-bearer' (rather than ὁπλίτης 'large-shield-bearer'). The assumption of a scene with 'shield-bearers' would find a ready support in the preserved parts of the reliefs of the present pillar (see, e.g., Borchhardt *et al.* 1997–1999, Tafel 1:2 and Tafel 3:1). However, the genitival form of the word has no ready explanation. The next word, *hqqdaiḍ/ḷedi* may be based on the same root as Lyc. personal name *Ahqqadi* attested in TL 36, 2; a connection with obscure *haqaduwe-* in TL 26, 13 cannot be excluded either. On the other hand, if one proceeds from the reading *hqqdaiḷe-*, the word proves to find an almost exact formal correspondence in CLuw. *šāḫuidala-* (*šaḫuidara-*), demonstrating only slight difference in vocalism. Unfortunately, the Luwian word is attested only in a few broken or obscure contexts and does not shed any new light on the Lycian text (for attestations see Melchert 1993, s.v.).

attestation in the Xanthos trilingual (44b, 5) in a partly broken and rather obscure context,[70] the word is attested in TL 28, 3 in a sequence *mlttaimi mrbbanada*[...]. The first word, *mlttaimi*, can be interpreted as 'honey-sweet' and corresponds to Luw. *malirim*(*m*)*is* (('PANIS')*ma-li-ri*‹+*i*›*-mi-i-sá*) attested as an epithet of a king in MARAŞ 1, §1i.[71] This peculiar meaning of *mlttaimi* already implies rather positive associations for *mrbbanada-* and with good probability excludes military interpretation of the sequence *padrãtahedi: hqqdaiḍ/ḷe*[*d*]*i: se mrbbẽnedi*. Schürr interpreted *mrbbana-* as 'goodness/excellence' (ἀρετή),[72] which is, however, just a guess. In fact, two texts recently discovered in Tlos[73] shed some new light on the meaning of *mrbbana-*. Both texts (now N356a and b)[74] are inscribed on the same stone block and, as far as one can see, are largely – but not completely – parallel to TL 28. This parallelism allows TL 28 and N356a on the new block be restored almost completely:

TL 28:	N356a:
[1]*ñte=ne Putinezi tuw*[*ete*]	[1][*ñte=ne*] *Putin*[*e*]*zi tuwete*
[2]*Prijabuhãmah kbatru n(?)*[...]	[2][*Prija*]*ḥuhãmah kbatru ehbi*
[3]*mlttaimi mrbbanadạ*[...]	[3][...]*ṭiweh tezị*[75] *puẉẹjẹḥñ*
[4]*ladu Uwitahñ xahb*[*u*]	[4][*lad*]*u Uwitahñ xahbu*
[5]*Apuwazahi p*[*r*]*ñnezijehị*[76]	[5][*Apuwa*]*zahi prñnezijehi*

Tekoğlu interpreted all three texts as referring to 'a collective burial',[77] thinking that the texts refer to as many as four different individuals (all women) not connected with each other who were buried in the same grave; he also took *mrbbanada-* and *puweje-* to be personal names. This interpretation does not look very credible. First and foremost, there is every ground to think that the texts are not funerary inscriptions at all. Against this speaks already the number of inscriptions: what is the sense to write as many as three nearly identical funerary inscriptions on two different stone blocks which do not look like parts of a grave monument? Further, the verb *ñte ... tuwe-* used in the first lines of the inscriptions does not imply exclusive funerary associations. The verb *tuwe-* 'set up' (lit. 'place, put') is not a usual verb connected with constructing a tomb or burying, for which *prñnawa-* and *ñtepi ta-* 'put inside' are used respectively. In a

---

70 The passage in ll. 4–5 reads [4]*se=τετeris: erizãna: ti(j)* [5][...]°*iked*[*i*]: *se=mrbbẽnedi: xbihñ: hñ*°. Given the correspondence in the grammatical form and in syntactic position, one may assume that *mrbbẽnedi* has the same function as in 44a, 38, which implies that *erizãna* may be a functional counterpart of *tupa*. On the other hand, it looks suspiciously close to *erijãna* discussed above and one wonders if Kalinka's copy correctly renders the fourth letter as I. The word *xbihñ* (acc. sg. of gen. adj.), which in all appearances belongs to the next clause, may be quite probably interpreted as 'of the river', as *xbi-* seems to exactly correspond to Luwian *ḫāba/i-* (*cf. xba(i)-* 'irrigate' and *Xbide-* < **ḫābada/i-* 'river-valley'); *xbahñ*: in 44b, 14 represents probably its phonetic variant.

71 *Cf.* already Schürr 2009, 161 with further refs.

72 Schürr 2009, 161.

73 See Tekoğlu 2017, 64–65.

74 For numbering of the new inscriptions *cf.* Christiansen 2019. I express my warmest thanks to her for sending me the manuscript before its publication.

75 Christiansen 2019, 125–129 doubts the reading of the letter after *tez-* as E and pleads rather for Ξ (*ñ*), pointing out that the appearance of the word *tezi* which she, following Melchert (2004, s.v.), interprets as 'sarcophagus' is inappropriate in the non-funerary context of the inscription. However, the form of the letter as seen on the photo of the squeeze (Tekoğlu 2017, 67, pl. 6) rather corroborates the reading as E and, on the other hand, *tezi* does not mean 'sarcophagus', but 'monument' (see below).

76 In Kalinka's drawing (TAM I, 26) the final E is shown far to the right of + (after a gap equal to approximately two letters), and, as it seems, beyond the right limit of the inscription. In all probability, the drawing is based on some mistake, as N356a shows that that *prñnezijehi* should be the last word of the inscription.

77 Tekoğlu 2017, 64–65.

number of contexts the verb *tuwe-* arguably refers to *dedications*, which is a usual meaning also for Luw. *tuwa-*, *cf.* esp. TL 44b, 51–52: *tuwetẽ: kumezija: … Trqqñti:* 'they set up sacrifices … for the Storm-God' or *ebeis: tukedris: … tuwetẽ:* 'he set up these statues' in TL 25, a bilingual dedication to Apollo.[78] There can be thus little doubt that the three inscriptions in question are *dedications* on different occasions.[79]

Second, there is every reason to think that the inscriptions concern only two closely related persons: a father and a daughter.[80] The absence of a demonstrative pronoun *ebẽñne* at the beginning of the inscription speaks against the perception of *Putinezi* as a term for the monument, as suggested by Tekoğlu;[81] rather, it is the name of the dedicator. The dedication is made on the behalf of 'his daughter' (acc. sg. *kbatru ehbi*), the usage of accusative in this function finding an exact correspondence in the dedication TL 25 (ll. 3–4: *atru: ehb*[*i*] *se ladu: ehbi:* 'for himself and his wife'). Consequently, *Prijabuhãmah* can only be interpreted as patronymic of *Putinezi* with an elided *tideimi* 'son'. Lines 4–5 of both inscriptions provide further information about the family ties of the daughter. As *prñnezijehi* 'household member' is definitively the last word of N356a and it is a *genitive* apparently agreeing with *Apuwazahi* – but not with *kbatru*, *ladu* and *xahbu* – the only possibility to make sense of the lines is to assume that instead of usual construction [gen.+nom.] used in similar formulae elsewhere, we have an *inverted* construction ([nom.+gen.]), i.e. the daughter of *Putinezi* is 'the wife of *Uwita*, the grand-child of *Apuwaza*, the household member'.[82] This means that in both inscriptions we are dealing with one and the same daughter of *Putinezi*. Her name should have stood at the end of line 2 in TL 28 and thus begin with *N-* (if the letter is drawn by Kalinka correctly) and is completely or partly lost in line 3 of N356a.

Now, the question is what information the respective third lines of the inscriptions contain. N356a is clearer in this respect, as the meaning of *tezi* is established with reasonable certainty by the bilingual TL 72 as 'monument' (= μνῆμα).[83] The next word, *puwejehñ* (gen. adj. acc. sg.), can then only be an adjective describing it, which can be now connected, as already discussed above, with the root *puwe-* 'write' or 'paint'. This produces an 'inscribed/painted monument'. This means that *mrbbanada-* in TL 28, 3 refers most probably also to a sort of *material object(s)* intended as a dedication, even if some uncertainty remains due to the broken end of the line. This interpretation well agrees with the morphological properties of *mrbbanada-*: as suggested by Melchert,[84] the final *-da-* of the word likely represents a collective suffix found also in *hrm̃mada* contrasted with *hrm̃ma* elsewhere. As far as one can judge, *mlttaimi* is not agreed with *mrbbanada-* grammatically. It may well be an affectionate epithet applied by *Putinezi* to his daughter, but, as we are possibly dealing with a dedication to a deity, it is not excluded that *mlttaimi* is the name or rather an epithet of a deity. If so, then, given its honey associations and the connection of the monument

[78] Dedicatory context can also be assumed for TL 51 (which, as N356a, uses *ñte tuwe-*); TL 44a, 20 (*tukedri: tuwete*) and fragmentary N318. However, the verb *ñte tuwe-* could arguably be used also in funerary contexts, *cf.*, e.g., TL 72 or N332, both of which feature the verb with *τezi* (or *tṭ*[*e*]*zi* in N332) as direct object. The combination *tezi ñte tuwe-* means simply 'set up (this) monument' and could be used apparently in any context. In the collocation *hlm̃mi … tuwe-* attested TL 88, 4 and TL 93, 2–3 the verb has probably a general sense 'put, place'.

[79] TL 28 is incised on a stone block (found in a field) which, according to the description, does look like a statue basis, see TAM I, 26. The reference by Kalinka to Benndorf 1892 is, however, false, as one finds there neither description nor a squeeze nor a copy of the inscription.

[80] A similar interpretation is envisaged for TL 28 also by Schürr (2009, 161).

[81] Tekoğlu 2017, 64–65.

[82] It is noteworthy that this unusual syntax correlates with two other unusual features of the inscription: elision of *tideimi* 'son' and the absence of word-dividers in all the three inscriptions.

[83] Neumann 2007, s.v. Thus *contra* Melchert 2004, s.v. who defines it as 'sarcophagus, coffin'. This meaning is refuted not only by TL 72, but also by the usage with *tezi* in TL 78 of verb *prñnawa-* 'build, construct' and the fact that it is intended for several persons (as long ago pointed by Torp, *cf.* Neumann 2007, s.v.), which is also true for TL 88, in which *tezi* is intended both for *Ddaqasa* and his wife.

[84] Melchert 2004, s.vv. *mrbbẽn-* and *hrm̃ ma-*.

with a girl, it would be hardly possible to see in *mlttaimi* any other deity than Aphrodite, stirrer of the 'sweet desire' (γλυκὺς ἵμερος). If *mlttaimi* is indeed Aphrodite, then the word in gen. sg. partly preserved in line 3 of N356a ([...]*tiweh*) may be a part of the name of another deity.[85] Lastly, one should note a curious parallelism in the usage of *mrbbanada-* as a counterpart of *tezi puwejehñ* 'inscribed/painted monument' in the dedications by *Putinezi* and the appearance of *mrbbẽnedi* and *tupelijã* ... *puwejehñ* in the successive lines of the Xanthos trilingual.

These considerations open up two directions in the further interpretation of the passage. First, the possible associations of *mrbbanada-* with the cult of Aphrodite raise the question if the goddess herself can be present in the present passage. Indeed, *padrãtahe* clearly represents gen. of *padrãta-*, which is strikingly close to the Lycian name of Aphrodite attested as *Padrita-* somewhat further in the Xanthos trilingual (44b, 53 in the gen. form *Padritahi*) or as *Pedrita* in N307a. The phonetic discrepancy between *padrãta-* and *Padrita-*/*Pedrita* is in itself not very significant and may be explained by the fact that the name is a borrowing in Lycian, as this type of word is not infrequently associated with a certain fluidity of form. As a parallel one may adduce a similar discrepancy in the rendering of the name of Alexander, which is attested as *Alaχssãṇtra* in TL 29, 9, but as *Alixssã*[*ñtra*] in N307b. The presence of the name in a different form in the trilingual itself presents an additional difficulty, even if it at the same time shows that the goddess' domain is not alien to the text. If one still accepts the connection, *padrãtahe-* can be literally interpreted as 'Aphroditean'. Although the precise meaning of *mrbbẽnedi* still remains elusive, the connection with Aphrodite confines its semantics in general to the sphere associated with sensual life. Given the fact that the passage likely refers to a sort of figurative representation, one might tentatively connect it with festivals, dances, choruses etc.

The other direction would be to look for possible cognates of *mrbbanada-* in other Anatolian languages. The final *-na-* of *mrbbana-* quite probably represents a suffix. Given regular reflection of PA *-w-* in the postconsonantal position as *-b-* in Lycian (*cf.*, e.g., Lyc. *esbe-* 'horse' = Luw. *azu(wa)-*), the root **mrbba-* proves to rather straightforwardly correspond to *mar(u)wa-* which is well attested in cuneiform Luwian in different derivatives, such as *mar(r)uwai-*, *mar(r)uwašḫa*, ^{D}*Marwāinzi*, perhaps also *marušam(m)a/i-* and *marušaša-*.[86] Recognized long ago as a root connected with *color*, it was earlier taken as referring to 'red', which now appears rather unlikely. The correspondence of ^{D}*Mark(u)waya-*, which refers to a class of minor deities with underworld associations, to Luw. ^{D}*Marwāinzi*, the deities who accompany the Plague-and-War God Šandaš, suggests an etymological connection with PIE stem **merg^{w}-* 'dark, murky'.[87] However, contrary to usual perception, the name of ^{D}*Marwāinzi* can be interpreted not simply as 'Dark Ones', but rather as 'Those-of-the-Darkness', as it represents a suffixal derivative from a noun **marwā-* (< **merg^{w}-éh$_2$-i̯o-*). The separation of a noun **marwā-* is supported by a further derivative attested in KAYSERİ §8: here an epithet *marwawana/i-* is applied to the deity Nikaruha/Nikarwa ((“DEUS”)*ma-ru-wá/í-wá/í-ni-sa*... (“DEUS”)*ní-ka*-[...-*s*]*a*), who represents, as far as one can see, also a rather sinister figure.[88] Formally, *marwawana/i-* represents a derivative with the ethnic suffix *-wana/i-*, which at the first glance appears rather strange, but can be naturally explained by an assumption that

[85] In view of this, it is quite likely that the gap at the end of line 1 of TL 25 contained the Lycian counterpart of Ἀπόλλωνι (dat.) of the Greek part. The last letter partly seen before the gap is rendered by Kalinka (TAM I, 24) as 𐊗, but, as far as one can judge from the drawing, it may well be 𐊘 and thus the form is probably *Natri*. As the gap seems to comprise 5-6 signs, one may suggest to restore after the name of Apollo the relative pronoun *=ti*: *ebeis: tukedris: Ṇ[atri=ti] tuwetẽ: Xssbezẽ:* '(This are) the statues which *Xssbezẽ* set up for *Natri*'.

[86] For the words see CHD L–N, s.vv. with a detailed discussion.

[87] *Cf.* Kloekhorst 2008, s.v. *maru̯āi-*.

[88] The deity is attested in KARKAMIŠ A6 §31: *á-pa-pa-wa/i-'* (DEUS)*ni-ka+ra/i-wa/i-sá* CANIS-*ni-i-zi á-pa-si-na* |CAPUT-*hi-na* | *ARHA* EDERE-*tú* 'Let the dogs of Nikarwa devour his head!' and in BULGARMADEN §16: (DEUS)*ni-ka-ru-ha-sa-pa-wa/i-na AR*[*HA*] EDERE-*t*[*u*] 'Let Nikaruha devour him!'.

marwa- 'darkness' refers to a 'dark place', the Netherworld. This interpretation is supported by the determinative DEUS which hints at the divine/supernatural character of *marwa-*.

The appropriateness of the connection of Lycian *mrbbana-* with the Luwian material is not immediately obvious. It is clear that neither *mrbbana-* nor *mrbbanada-* can have here an abstract meaning 'darkness'. However, the general association with *color* seems to be appropriate for both contexts. If one unties the exclusive association of *marwa-* with 'black' and takes it in a more generic sense 'colored', then *mrbbanada-* in TL 28 may be interpreted as 'colored/painted stuff', i.e. probably 'paintings', which would make a good counterpart with *tezi puwejehñ* 'inscribed/painted monument'. On the other hand, one may see in the passage *padrãtahedi: hqqdaiḍ/ḷe*[*d*]*i: se mrbbẽnedi* a reference to the *technic of execution* of the figures in the upper part of the column: if *mrbbẽnedi* is something like 'painted' then *hqqdaiḍ/ḷe*[*d*]*i* might be, as its counterpart, 'carved' or 'executed in bas-relief'. A semantic shift from 'paint in a particular color' to generic 'paint' is common (*cf.* Lat. *fūco* 'paint, dye' < *fūcus* 'red orchella-see-weed' or Russ. *krasnyj* 'red' > *krasit'* 'paint'), the underlying color word is usually 'red'. Whether Anatolian for some reason generalized 'black' or the meaning of the root **marw-* was still broader, is unclear. Given the number of uncertainties associated with either interpretative line, the overall meaning of the passage remains an open question.

3.3. The interpretation of the text as a description of the monument proves to be quite sensible also for the preceding lines (ll. 33–36), allowing several further forms to be elucidated. First, in the combination *ñterez*[...] *xubase:* one may identify *ñterez*[...] as a further term referring to the relative position of a part of the monument – in all likelihood just the following *tupa*. The word may be interpreted as an adjective derived from *ẽtre/i* 'lower, below' (= HLuw. *andara*) following the pattern *hri* 'up, on' > *hrzzi* 'upper' and *pri* 'forth, in front' > *przzi* 'frontal'. Accordingly, one may restore the word as *ñterez*[*e:*], the final *-e* (loc. sg.) being suggested both by possible agreement with the following *xubase* and by the likely parallel of *p*[*rz*]*ze* in the preceding line (*cf.* below).[89] Although it is quite possible that *ñterez*[*e*] might elliptically refer to the 'lower part', a different way to indicate a lower position without a reference to a specific part in line 32 (*ẽñn-e*) makes it still likelier that *ñterez*[*e*] stands in apposition with *xubase*, which implies that the latter is the name of some further part of the pillar monument. Tentatively one may compare *xubas-* with Hittite and Luwian ^{GADA}*ḫūp(p)ara-*/^{GADA}*ḫūpra-* which designates a type of cloth, quite probably 'sash'.[90] The derivational history of *ḫūp(p)ara-* is not quite clear, as there is no immediately obvious semantic correspondence with any of the roots of comparable phonetic form.[91] However,

[89] As far one can see, there is only one letter lost in the gap (*cf.* Dönmez – Schürr 2015, 135 and Lotz 2017, 167, fig. 1), which precludes restoration of **ñterezze* which one might expect on the analogy with *hrzzi* and *przzi*. However, the form *ñterez*[*e*] perfectly agrees with the interpretation of the clusters $C_1C_2C_2$ as standing for C_1əC_2 (see Oreshko 2019a, 201–202 n. 14): while *hrzzi* and *przzi* stand for /hrəzi/ and /prəzi/, which come from **hri-zi* and **pri-zi* respectively, *ñtere-z-* preserves a non-reduced vowel *e* before the suffix. A similar phenomenon is seen, e.g., in spelling *xalxxa* (TL 29, 5) or *zexisxxaje* (TL 29, 10) as contrasted with *telixa* (twice in 29, 6), *hrmazaxa* (29, 8), *-ajaxa* (29, 9), which all seem to represent analogous formations (for the suffix *-xa-* see below).

[90] For attestations see Puhvel 1991, s.v. *ḫup(p)ai-*). The clearest attestation is a clause in the Ritual of Zarpiya available both in Luwian and Hittite: Luw. ^{D}*Lūlaḫinz=aš=tar ḫūpparanza kuinzi ḫišḫiyanti* (KUB 9.31 ii 24) = *ḫūpruš kuēš išḫiyanteš* (KUB 9.31 i 38) 'the Lulahi-Gods who bind (on) *ḫūp(p)ara-*'s' = (for the text see now the on-line edition by Görke 2014–2015). The verb *ḫišḫiya-/išḫai-* means literally 'bind', which suggests that *ḫūppara-* is something which can be literally 'bound on', i.e. something which has a rope-like form, as 'sash' or 'girdle' (*cf.* Melchert 1993, s.v.), *cf.* also Hitt. *išḫiyal-* 'bond, band, belt' and *išḫiman-* 'string, cord, rope'. If *ḫūp(p)ara-* were 'mantles', as it is interpreted by Görke (2014–2015), one would rather expect *anda išḫai-* which means 'wrap into'.

[91] Puhvel (1991, s.v. *ḫup(p)ai-*) connected *ḫūp(p)ara-* with *ḫup(p)ai-/ḫuppiya-* which he defined as 'interlace, entangle, mingle, mix etc.'. However, neither of this meanings is really supported by the available contexts and the entry itself seems to 'entangle' several – possibly as many as three – different roots: (*katta*) *ḫuwapp-* 'cast, hurl (down)', *ḫūppā(i)-* 'heap together', *ḫuppiya-* 'play the music instrument *ḫuḫupal*' (in addition to *ḫuwapp-* 'do evil against'), see analysis of the verbs in Melchert 2007.

it may well be a derivative of a root **ḫūp(p)(a)-* with the suffix *-ra-*, in the same way as CLuw. *ḫattara-* 'hoe' (or the like) is a derivative of **ḫatt-* 'chop, hack'.[92]

On the other hand, it is quite probable that *ḫūp(p)ara-* represents the same word as *ḫūbala-* (*ḫūpala-*), reflecting an early oscillation between *r/l* more often found in the later Luwian dialects.[93] The latter word is attested only once in KUB 6.29 ii 34 in a clause: *appūn=ma=kan* ^{D}IŠTAR ^{URU}*Šamuḫa* GAŠAN-*YA* KU$_6$-*un* GIM-*an* :*ḫūpalaza* EGIR-*pa ištapta n=an išḫiyat* 'Ištar of Šamuha, my Lady, caught him as a fish with a *ḫūbala-* and bound him' and on the basis of this context is usually defined as '(fishing) net'. In fact, Ištar-Šauška – who is, as a matter of fact, not a professional fisherwoman – might catch somebody as 'a fish' with her 'belt/sash' as well, which, as her figural representations show, she quite probably indeed possessed.[94] The presence in the clause of the verb *išḫai-* 'bind', which may well express a further action with *ḫūbala-*, supports this interpretation and the identity with *ḫūp(p)ara-*, which is also used precisely with this verb (*cf.* n. 90). *Ḫūpala-* is clearer morphologically, being in all probability a derivative with a frequent suffix *-la-* from the root **ḫūb-* whatever its original meaning is.[95] If right, this opens a possibility to consider Lycian *xubas-* as an alternative derivative of the same root and assume a similar meaning for it. A meaning 'belt' or 'girdle' fits almost perfectly into the context, as it may be naturally taken as referring to the *band* of reliefs encircling the upper part of the pillar. The meaning of *xubas-* may then well correspond to Greek ζώνη or διάζωμα which are used as architectural terms to designate 'frieze'.

Adopting the interpretation of *ñterez*[*e:*] *xubase* as 'lower frieze', it is difficult not to see in *przze* which appears two times in two preceding lines a term functionally similar to *ñtereze*, which dismisses its direct grammatical connection with *Trm̃mile* and interpretation as 'foremost' > 'noble' suggested by Schürr.[96] However, unlike *ñtereze*, *przze* in line 34 should be a noun, since it is followed by the incongruent *axã*. The term can be literally interpreted as 'front, frontal part' and refers probably to the protruding upper part of the monument adorned with statues and represents an architectural feature functionally close but not quite identical to the fronton (pediment) of the Greek temples. This interpretation makes the structure of the text in 44a, 34–35 much clearer and allows to isolate a clause *p*[*rz*]*ze axã Trm̃mile izredi: pededi* in which all elements except *axã* are clear: 'On the frontal part: *axã* in Lycia (or: among Lycians) with hand and foot'.

---

92 *Cf.* Melchert 1993, s.v.

93 For this phenomenon in the 2nd millennium BC *cf.* e.g., CLuw. *šaḫuidāla-/šaḫuidara-* mentioned above or *ušantaliy(a)-/ušantariy(a)-* 'bringing gains, blessings'.

94 *Cf.* Herbordt 2009, 103–104. This feature Ištar-Šauška shares with Aphrodite who possessed a magic girdle called in the Homeric text ἱμάς (Hom. Il. 14.214 and 219). It is noteworthy that the latter word was also used as an architectural term ('planks laid on rafters').

95 It is probably better to take the absence of geminate spelling in *ḫūbala-*, sporadically found also in *ḫūp(p)ara-*, seriously and count with a derivation from a PIE root containing **b* or **b^h*. From a semantic point of view, a connection with Skr. *ubh-* 'bind, fetter', Greek ὑφαίνω etc., usually reconstructed as PIE **u̯eb^h-* (e.g., LIV^2, s.v.) and earlier suggested for the entire (now obsolete) entry *ḫup*(*p*)*ai-* (*cf.* Puhvel 1991, s.v.), looks very attractive. Formally, this connection presents a problem, as an expected outcome of **h$_2$ub^h-* which may be suggested on the basis of the Hittite evidence would be rather **αὐφαίνω*. One may, however, point out that the initial αὐφ- is impossible in Greek and this may be the factor which triggered an alternative development of the initial **h$_2$u-* (or a subsequent re-modeling of the root) in Greek. It is noteworthy that a hypothesis of the development PIE **h$_2$u-* > Greek **hu-* would well explain the non-etymological spiritus asper in ὑφαίνω. It is noteworthy that Beekes (2010, s.v. ὑφαίνω) considers a possibility of the reconstruction of the root as **h$_1$u̯eb^h-*, basing on the evidence of Myc. *e-we-pe-se-some-na*, allegedly /ewepsēsomena/ 'which are to be woven'. This is rather dubious, as the precise meaning of Myc. form cannot be ascertained. On the other hand, the existence of a Hitt. verb *wep-* 'weave' and a noun *wepa-* based on in, which is also sometimes connected with the family of Greek ὑφαίνω (*cf.* Kloekhorst 2008, s.v. *u̯ep-*), is all but certain, as it is attested only once in a *figura etymologica uepus uēpta* whose connection with 'weaving' is just a guess.

96 Dönmez – Schürr 2015, 136.

Schürr[97] is certainly right that the clause should in a way refer to the *athletic* contests, which definitively precludes its interpretation as 'animal sacrifice'.[98] Schürr interprets *axã* as 1sg. pret. of *a-* 'make'.[99] This is formally possible, but still does not produce an entirely satisfactory sense. No less importantly, the appearance of the form of 1sg. is very unlikely in this part of the text. All identifiable verbs on side A have the forms of the 3sg./pl. (or the infinitive) and there is no indication of a subject switch in the lines preceding 34–35. On the other hand, the general structure of the clause and the parallel of the following clause featuring *tupa* with a row of instrumentals suggest that *axã* may be a *noun* in acc. sg. and refer to what is actually done 'with hand and foot'. In this context, the random guess of Conder[100] that the word, which he read back then as *âgô*, may represent Greek word ἀγών might seem to be quite appropriate. Indeed, ἀγών, although etymologically meaning 'gathering', is first of all 'contest for a prize' and was used as a term for any kind of contests staged during festival games in the Greek world, which included, of course, both competitions in the 'foot strength' (στάδιον, δίαυλος, δόλιχος etc.) and those in the 'hand strength' (πυγμαχία and the mixed πένταθλον). As a term reflecting a specifically Greek institution, ἀγών would be a good candidate for borrowing. However, the phonetic correspondence between *axã* and ἀγών is, on a closer glance, quite imperfect. Greek *o*, even the short one, is regularly rendered as *u* in Lycian (*cf.*, e.g. *Ijetruxle* = Ἰητροκλῆς or *Musxxa* = (possibly) Μόσχος) and it is somewhat unlikely that the final *-n* of ἀγών would have been simply dropped in such a short word. If borrowed, one would rather expect that ἀγών would be reflected in Lycian as ***agun(e)-*/***axun(e)-* (nom. sg., or ***aguna*/***axuna* in plural).

On the other hand, it is possible to explain *axa-* as a genuine Lycian formation.[101] Even if the interpretation of *axã* as a final verb of 1sg. pret. is unlikely, its connection with the root *a-* 'make' seems to be entirely sensible: taking *axa-* as a noun, one can interpret it as 'deed, action', which, like Greek ἔργον, might have quite a broad semantics and designate specifically 'heroic deeds', be it in an athletic contest or a battle.[102] Alternatively, *axa-* may be a gerund. There are several strands of evidence that support the identification of a *nominal* suffix *-xa-* in Lycian. At least in two further texts, the forms in *-xã* hitherto interpreted as finite verbs in 1sg. pret. likely represent nominal formations. The first is TL 149, 13 which attests a form *pijaxã* in a partly broken and in general obscure context. However, its interpretation as 1sg. pret. is rather directly contradicted by the fact that the text is clearly formulated in the *third person* perspective, as it is the case with the absolute majority (if not all) of the known tomb inscriptions, and in the lines preceding line 13 there is no explicit indication of a person switch (such as pronoun 1sg. *amu/ẽmu*). As usual, the inscription is opened (ll. 1–2) by the usual formula: *ebẽñnẽ: prñnawã m=ene: prñnawatẽ Ijamara* 'This building (is the one) which Ijamara built'. In lines 3–4 the action of 'giving/granting' performed by Ijamara on behalf of his 'household members and the city' is expressed by a verbal

97 Schürr 2009, 159–160; *cf.* Dönmez – Schürr 2015, 136–137.

98 Melchert 2004, s.v. *axa-*.

99 Dönmez – Schürr 2015, 137.

100 Conder 1891, 665.

101 The considerations put forward below have been briefly presented in Oreshko 2019a, 101–105.

102 The word *axãti/axuti* and its derivative *axãtaza*, either of which Melchert (2004, s.vv.) defines as 'priest of animal sacrifice', are probably not related. A connection of *axãtaza*, clearly a *nomen agentis* with the suffix *-za* and thus probably a title, with cultic sphere is made likely by TL 149, 2–3: *Malijahi*: *Wedrẽñnehi*: *axãtaza* '*axãtaza* of Malija of Rhodiapolis'. The attestations of *axãti/axuti* are less clear: the only thing which can be said about it is that it is connected with animals, *cf. axuti: uwehi* (TL 29, 3) and *axã*[*t*]*i u*[*we*]*hi* (TL 92, 2) '*axãti* of the bulls/cows' and *axãti: esbe[h]i* '*axãti* of the horses' in TL 128, 1 (*cf.* also *axãti: uz*[...] in TL 30, 2). In fact, the very peculiar '*axãti* of the horses' speaks rather against the perception that *axãti* is a priest, as it is difficult to imagine the existence of a special 'horse-sacrificer', even if one assumes that the horse sacrifice existed in the 4th century BC Lycia. A simpler assumption would be that *axãti* is a 'herder', which does not contradict the evidence of TL 149. However it is, it is difficult to demonstrate any direct semantic connection with *axa-*. Formally, *axãti* may represent either an *nt*-formation or go back to **axa-want-*; a connection with obscure CLuw. *āḫḫašā-/āḫšā-* (*cf.* Melchert 1993, s.v.) is not excluded (> **axha* > *axa-*).

form in 3sg. (*me pibijeti prñnezi: se=tteri: adaijẽ*). *Adaijẽ* (acc. sg.) is apparently connected with the unit of weight *ada-* used in financial stipulations and thus means probably simply 'money'. The next clause (ll. 4–5) seems to indicate the fact that Ijamara makes the grant publicly: *me=i=ne ñtawãtã pibijeti: tere ebehẽ* can be interpreted as 'And he gives his field *in front of* (*ñtawãtã*) it (the city)'.[103] Then follows a part of the text (ll. 5–11) specifying punishment for a non-authorized burial in the tomb, which is formulated in the 3sg./pl. and uses 3sg. pronoun when referring to Ijamara's wife (l. 6: *ladi: ehbi*). From line 11 on, the text describes different annual sacrifices to be performed by the 'household members and the city' (ll. 11–12: *se kumezeiti:* [*prñnezi*] *se teteri : uhazata*). In this context, there is no sense to interpret *pijaxã* in line 13 as 'I gave'. In contrast, one may naturally interpret the form as a noun (acc. sg.) 'grant, donation' which picks up one of the actions mentioned in ll. 3–5, either the monetary donation to be used for procuring sacrificial stuff or the land donation. Interpretation of *pijaxã* as acc. sg. c. of *pijaxa* is supported by the appearance of the latter form in line 17.

Similar arguments may be advanced for the interpretation of *prñnawaxã* in TL 40c, 8 as a noun/gerund 'building' rather than a finite verb 'I built'. Both in 40a and the identical 40b, the fact of the building of the funerary monument is formulated in the standard 3sg. perspective: *Pajawa: manaxine: prñnawate: prñnawã: ebẽñne* 'Pajawa, the *manaxine*, built this building'. At the beginning of 40c, Pajawa fully identifies himself by a patronymic (now almost completely lost in a gap), apparently in a usual external perspective. The text in ll. 3–6 is damaged, but the forms *uwete* (l. 5) and *-ijetẽ* may be reasonably identified as verbs in 3sg. pret. There is thus every ground to interpret *prñnawaxã* as a non-final verbal form, in all probability a sort of verbal noun in acc. sg.[104] Besides that, one may mention many other forms ending in *-axa* whose interpretation as 1sg. pret. is quite problematic, *cf. hijãnaxã* in 44b, 24[105] or an entire row of such forms in TL 29: *xalxxa*

[103] The meaning of *ñtawãtã* is not entirely clear and the interpretation of the clause crucially depends on the interpretation of the clitics. I interpret them as indirect object in dative *singular* (=*i*) plus direct object in accusative singular (=*ne*) referring to the city and to the field respectively. The interpretation of *ñtawãtã* as an adverb/adposition (and not as a noun, as it is usually taken, *cf.* Neumann 2007, s.v.) is suggested by the context of TL 52, 1–2 and the interpretation of *miñti* as 'people/community' (=δῆμος) which I elaborated in Oreshko 2019a. The passage *s=ẽ pijętẽ Wazijeje se(j)=ẽni: se pi[j]etẽ: miñti ñtawãtã* as 'and he gives it (scil. *xupã*) to *Wazija* and (his) mother; and he gives it in front of the people', the last clause serving to indicate that the people of the city publicly witness the act of granting the tomb to Wazija and the mother of the owner. Etymologically, *ñtawãtã* may be connected with *ñtewẽ* 'facing, opposite, toward' and interpreted as an univerbation of *ñta* and **tawã(n)-* 'eye' with a further suffix *-ta*.

[104] One can propose several emendations for the reading of the following text as compared with TAM I, 35, based on the photos of the monument (now in the British Museum). First the number is OO<, i.e. '25': the sign < '5' can be still rather clearly seen after the second O '10'; the first O is now almost entirely effaced, but can be with certainty restored taking into consideration the position of the signs in the line (the second O is approximately one sign to the right of the normal beginning of the line in this part of the text). Second, after *uhahi:* one can read *ñti* instead of Kalinka's *.iti*: although the left part of the sign is somewhat damaged, one still can see the upper and the lower horizontal hastas. As a result, the final part of the text can be read as: *m=e prñnawaxã* [9] OO< *uhahi: ñti: ah*[10]*ãmadi: Arñnadi.* The combination OO< *uhahi* means apparently 'of 25 years' and is connected with the preceding *prñnawaxã*. The following *ñti* is found nowhere else. Tentatively, one may suggest two interpretations: it may be either **in* + relative *ti* 'in which' and then refer to *prñnawaxã* or a phonetic variant of *ñte* 'in(side)', and may be then taken together with OO< *uhahi* ('building within 25 years'), which seems, however, to be contradicted by the fact that Ξ of *ñti* is much larger than the preceding letters and is put significantly lower, making an impression that it begins a new clause.

[105] The (partly broken) context of the form is quite obscure and does not lend any real support for the speculative interpretation of the form *hijãnaxã* as 'I unified' by Serangeli (2016). In fact, there is no indication that the narrative, represented here, as far as one can see, from the objective 3rd person perspective (*cf.* 44b, 19: *erbbedi: tubei*[*t-*] 'he/they stroke by battle'), would have switched for some reason to 1sg. in this particular passage. Given the possible maritime context of the passage and the involvement of the Greeks in the events described (*cf. trijerẽ: Kijezẽ* 'Chian trireme(s)' in l. 22 and once again *trijere* in l. 23), one cannot exclude that *hijãna-* is a just a variant spelling for *Ijãna-* 'Ionian(s)' who are mentioned both several lines below (44b, 27: *Ijãnisñ*) and somewhat earlier in the text (*Ijãnã* in 44a, 52); the initial *h-* may be an intrusive breathing to prevent hiatus between *merehi* and *hijãnaxã*, which finds a possible parallel in the case *ahata ha*[*de/ẽ*] (44b, 47–48) < **ahata ade* 'one made *ahata*' (see below). If right, this would

(l. 5) and *xlxx(e)* (l. 7: *xlxx(e)=ebẽñti*), *telixa* (twice in l. 6), *hrṃazaxa* and *θẽjubexu* (l. 8), *ajaxa* (l. 9), *texisxxu* (l. 10), *ajãxa* (l. 16) and]*lxxa* (l. 18). Lastly, the same suffix may be assumed in the form *aladehxxãne* (TL 112, 4 and TL 57, 5) to be analyzed as *aladehxxã=ne* (*aladehxxã* + enclitic 3sg. 'him/her').

3.4. Lastly, one may propose here some considerations on *ehetehi* attested in ll. 33–34. There are three other passages in Lycian texts which feature the word. The first is found in TL 29, 3–4 in a context which, despite its somewhat obscure sense, seems to correspond rather close to the present one: *ñtẽmlẽ: przze: astte teli* [4]*se(j)=ahata: astte:* 'where one made the front *ñtẽmle-* (or: *ñtẽmle-* in the front part), one also made *ahata*'.[106] The exact meaning of *ñtẽmle-* is not entirely clear, but it obviously represents a sort of construction or installation which can be also 'put/set', *cf.* N324, 25: *ñtẽmlẽ tadi* 'one puts *ñtẽmle-*'.[107] The parallelism of *ñtẽmlẽ* (*przze*) and *ahata* in the passage suggests that *ahata* may be a similar term referring to a sort of physical structure, which fits rather well into the context of the monument description in TL 44a. The second attestation is found in TL 118, 4 in a structurally transparent clause: *se=ije: ahatahi: ñtata me ñtepi: ta[s]ñti* '(There is) a burial chamber of *ahata-* for him and they put (him) inside (it)'. Again, the context leaves little doubt that *ahata-* has a concrete physical meaning and refer quite probably to a specific part of the tomb in which the chamber is found. Lastly, the word appears thrice in the following passage of the Xanthos trilingual (44b, 47–50):

> *se=d(=)de: ahata ha*[48][*de/ẽ:(?)*] *ẽnẽ: qla 'bi: ehetehi: se mahãna: ehete*[49][*hi*] *Arñna: Tuminehi: Kerθθi: Xãkbi: epi=d*[50][*e ñ*]*temlẽ sitãma:*

The overall interpretation of the passage is far from clear, due to the gap at the beginning of line 48 and the uncertainty regarding the element *=dde* and *si(-)tãma*.[108] Schürr proposed to separate at the end of l. 47 *ahata* and interpreted the following *ha-* as the initial part of the verb *hade/ẽ*,[109] which means, however, not 'put/set' ('setzen'), as he translated, but 'let (go)'. This analysis looks likely, as otherwise the passage seems to lack a finite verb.[110] Also, a certain parallelism of the passage with TL 29, 3–4 which mentions *ahata* and *ñtemle-* in a close combination supports the separation of *ahata*. On the other hand, the combination of *ahata* with the verb *a-* 'make' in TL 29 suggests an alternative possibility of interpretation: the verb used in the clause may be not *hade*, but *ade* 'he/one made' and the *h* after *ahata* may be simply a mistake instead of the interpunction mark (:) or, more likely, an intrusive breathing which emerged in the process of auto-dictate to avoid the hiatus phonetic sequence /ahata-ade/. Accepting this, one may tentatively interpret the passage as: 'And … one made *ahata* under/below the temple (precinct) of *ahata* and for the gods of *ahata* (dat. pl.) in Xanthos, Tymnessos, Kride and Kandyba (and) thereon a *ñtemle-* …'.

---

mean that the suffix *-xa-* is not an exclusively de-verbal suffix, but may function possibly as a sort of collective formant.

106 For improved readings of the text see Tekoğlu 2006. One cannot quite exclude that in the given context *przze* means 'earlier'.

107 *Cf.* 'sacrificial installation' in Melchert 2004, s.v.

108 The analysis of *sitãma* as *(e)si tãma*, i.e. the verb 'to be' (3sg. pres.) plus *tãma*, proposed by Neumann (1984, 95) and accepted by Melchert (2004, s.vv. *es-* and *tama*), looks rather unlikely for three reasons: *ñtemlẽ* is clearly an acc. sg. and requires a *transitive* verb; it is highly dubious that Lycian might preserve the sibilant of PIE $*h_1es$-, since, as far as one can see, Lycian demonstrates an *unconditioned* development of PIE/PA **s* > *h*; the expected result of a combination *ñtemlẽ* + *esi* would be rather ***ñtemlẽnesi*. In view of this, it seems preferable to take *sitãma* as one word. Its grammatical form and meaning are quite opaque. Very tentatively, one may take it as a form based on the verb *si-* 'lie' (possibly secondary derivative (**site-*) with a transitive sense 'place (upon)'?), which makes good sense in the context (*cf.* below), *cf.* also the form *sitẽni* in 44b, 61.

109 Schürr 1997, 65.

110 The sequence *se=d(=)de*, whatever it is, can hardly contain a verb: exactly the same sequence re-appears several lines below (l. 51) just before a finite verb: *se=d(=)de tuwetẽ: kumezija.*

Besides that, there are two supplementary pieces of evidence from outside the Lycian corpus. The Lycian A *ehetehi* clearly corresponds to Lycian B *esetesi* found in TL 44d, 12–13 as one of two epithets of the Storm-God: *Trqq*[*i*]*z: esetesi*=[*k*]*e er*[*b*]*besi=ke* 'Tarḫunt(as) of the *esete*- and of the battle'. An exact match is found also in Luwian: *aššattašši*- (gen. adj.) appears in KUB 2.1 iii 44 also as an epithet of a deity, but this time of a goddess, ^{D}Ala, a female consort of the Tutelary Deity (the Stag-God K(u)runtiyas).

The clear contexts of TL 29 and especially TL 118 exclude an interpretation of *ahata* as 'peace, rest' suggested by Melchert[111] on the basis of possible etymological connection with Hittite *aśś*- 'remain, abide' or 'victory'[112] and other etymological guesses proposed so far.[113] *Ahata*- is clearly something more material, which can also be man-made, although the use of the word as an epithet of different deities seems at the first glance to run counter it. The key piece of evidence for a more precise definition of the nature of *ahata* is TL 118. The 'burial chamber of *ahata*-' (*ahatahi: ñtata*) in l. 4 is contrasted here with the 'upper burial chamber' mentioned in ll. 1–2: *hrzzi: ñtat[ã Xu]ñnijeje: s[e] ladi: [ehb]i* 'The upper burial chamber is for *Xuñnije* and his wife'. These indications can be compared with the physical realities of the tomb which is still found standing high in the necropolis of Limyra (tomb P II/3).[114] The tomb indeed possesses two chambers: the upper one, which is clearly the *main* burial chamber, found in the superstructure – the grave-house proper which emulates the form of a Greek temple – and the lower one, found in the substructure or the foundation of the tomb, which has a side entrance. The 'burial chamber of *ahata*' should clearly refer to the lower, secondary burial chamber and its location obviously suggests that *ahata* is 'foundation, basis, pedestal' or the like. This interpretation proves to be immediately sensible for 44b, 47–50, where *ahata* is made *under* (*ẽnẽ*) a *qla*, and *ñtemle*- is put/built *on it (epi=de*). It is noteworthy that this interpretation implies that *qla* is not a temple precinct, i.e. a parcel of land belonging to a temple with different structures on it,[115] but rather one single physical structure, i.e. *temple* itself. *Ahata* in this context appears to be the Lycian counterpart of Greek κρηπίς/κρηπίδωμα (Lat. *crepido),* the platform on which the temple itself was built.

The interpretation may be further supported by etymological considerations. A rather straightforward connection within Luwic is HLuw. root *as(a)*- 'to be seated, to dwell' ((SOLIUM)*á-sa-*, *cf.*, e.g., KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §10) which is thought to correspond to Hitt. *eš-/aš*- 'to sit down, to seat oneself; to sit, to reside; to settle'.[116] The verb is especially frequently used in the causative form *išnuwa*- ((SOLIUM)*i-sà-nu-wa/i-*) to render the general idea of 'establishment' or 'foundation' of something. Moreover, one also finds in Luwian a term for some sort of (architectural) structure derived from this root, ("MENSA.SOLIUM")*á-sa-*. Despite the underlying semantics of the root and the presence of the ideogram MENSA,[117] HLuw. *asa*- it is not just a 'seat'. Its usage in connection with the verb *tama*- 'build' (*cf.* KARKAMIŠ A6 §§8 and 24 or HAMA §6) and the mention of two of its main constituents in KARKAMIŠ A6 §§ 27–28 – 'stones' (SCALPRUM = *asu*-) and 'stone blocks'

[111] Melchert 2004, s.v.

[112] Neumann 1984, 89–91.

[113] *Cf.* Neumann 2007, s.vv. *ahata*, :*ahatahi*-.

[114] See Mühlbauer 2007, 69–71 with figs. 102–105.

[115] As in Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v.

[116] *Cf.* Kloekhorst 2008, s.v. Note, however, that both the general meaning and spelling of HLuw. *as(a)*- would be also compatible with Hitt. *āśś*- 'to remain, to stay, to be left'. The connection of the Hitt. verbs *eš-/aš*- and *āśś*- is ambiguous: although semantically obviously close, if not practically identical, they demonstrate fine and, as it seems, rather consistent differences in spelling, which precludes their simple identification (*cf.* Kloekhorst 2008, s.v. *āśś*- with further refs.). Given that one can propose for *āśś*- no good PIE etymology other than PIE *$*h_1es$-/h_1e-h_1s*- 'sit', albeit the root should obviously belong to the inherited stock, a connection, even if indirect, between the two roots remains a possibility.

[117] The Latin name of the sign is misleading: there can be no doubt that the sign depicts not a 'table', but a 'stool' corresponding in form to ^{GIŠ}*šarpa*- 'a stool covered with skins' and rather similar to *sella curulis*, *cf.* (DEUS)MONS.MENSA in EMİRGAZİ §§26, 29, 37 referring to the Mount Šarpa (*cf.* Forlanini 1987).

(*tasa-*)[118] – indicates that it is a bigger and a more complex structure.[119] ('MENSA.SOLIUM')*á-sa-* may well represent a sort of 'pedestal' or a complex altar-like structure. Lycian *ahata* represents then a further derivative of **aha-* = *asa-* with a dental suffix *-t(a)-*.[120] The meaning 'foundation, basis' or 'platform' would be both appropriate for *ehetehi* in the description of a pillar monument in 44a, 32–41. The question is, however, which part it *exactly* refers to. The mention of *wawadra* and *uwadraxi* in the preceding lines makes it likely that the description in ll. 33–34 is focused on the top part of the monument. If right, then *ahata* should refer not to the 'basis' of the column, as one might think, but rather to the 'platform' which lies on the column itself and on which statutes and probably the grave-house itself were set: i.e. basically to the foundation of the grave house and not that of the column.[121]

Summarizing the observations put forward above, one may describe the overall structure of the text on side A as follows. From line 32 on, the text may be interpreted as a description of a monument identical or very similar to the present pillar monument. The description goes from top downwards: *wawadra* and *uwadraxi* (32–33) quite probably refer to bovine protomes, together with which one could also see either reliefs or figures depicting 'heroic deeds' (*axa-*), possibly athletic in character (*izredi: pededi:*). Below it, in the 'lower frieze' (*ñterez*[*e:*] *xubase*), there were set reliefs (*tupa*) depicting scenes of horse hunting (*esbedi: hẽmenedi*) and either battle scenes or some festival-like events. Lastly, the 'writings' (*tupelija*) on the *prulija* refer to the text on the column itself, whose contents is specified in the *hãtahe* passage (38–55).

4. Temporal construction with *terñ*

The suggested interpretation of the overall structure of the *hãtahe* passage significantly clarifies the structure of its separate parts. One of the immediate effects of the recognition that each section is an extended genitival group concerns the interpretation of the verbs. It is clear that each part should describe *circumstances* under which each of the victories has been won. However, there are only a few final verbs in the whole passage. As already noted, the final part of the passage is characterized by heavy usage of infinitives: as far as one can see, it is the only verbal form which is used in sections 7) and 8) (for *pabra=ti cf.* below); and in 6) it appears with what also looks like a final verb (*ese … tebete*, 3sg. pret.). A striking feature of all the attestations of the infinitival forms is that they are followed by an element *terñ*, which appears, however, in three cases also after forms in *-te* (44: *tebete: terñ*, 47: *qastte τerñ* (for the latter form see below), 48: *tebete: ṭeṛ[ñ]*).

---

[118] The HLuw. *tasa-* represents apparently the same word as Lyc. *θθe-* 'altar' (< **tehe-* < *tasa-*), but it is not a 'stele', as it often erroneously translated (*cf.*, e.g. Neumann 2007, s.v. *θθe-* with further refs.). The word *tasa-* is never written with the logogram STELE, which was used with two other terms, *wanid-* ((STELE) *wa/i-ni-za*) and *tanis(a)-* ((STELE)*ta-ni-sà-*), *cf.* already in Hawkins 2000, 418. Instead, in KULULU 2, §6 the word is found with the logogram *256 ((“*256”)*tà-sá-za*) which depicts a *square* object, suggesting that *tasa-* is a 'stone block', which agrees well with the meaning of Lycian *θθe-*. In all appearances, (“MENSA. SOLIUM”)*á-sa-* consisted of large stone orthogonal blocks on which smaller, possibly polygonal or unworked stones (*asu-*) were put.

[119] *Cf.* Hawkins 2000, 126.

[120] One may note HLuw. (“*460”)*á-sa-ta-ri+i* attested in ASSUR letter *e*, §10 in quite an obscure context. *Contra* Melchert 2003, 196 the word can hardly correspond to HLuw. *ašta-* '(evil) spell, charm', as for it one would expect a spelling **á-sà-ta-*. Given exact formal correspondence, it is not excluded that (“*460”) *á-sa-ta-* corresponds to HLuw. *aššatta-* (in *aššattašši-*) and Lyc. *ahata* also semantically.

[121] However, it is not the only possibility with which one may reckon. It seems likely that the meaning of *ahata* in the combination 'gods of *ahata*', who apparently abided in the 'temple of *ahata*', and the sense of the epithets of the Storm-God and Ala, is more specific than just a 'foundation, base'. The 'deities of the foundation' may be 'primordial deities' or those of the 'Earth foundation', i.e. the Netherworld deities. If right, it is not excluded that *ehetehi* in combination with the word lost in the gap at the end of 44a, 33, referred to figures of some *creatures*, associated with the primordial world or Netherworld. Taking into consideration the imagery of the 'Harpy Tomb' set nearby on the acropolis of Xanthos, female winged figures which are likely connected with the Netherworld sphere, one wonders if similar figures could be present in the form of statues on the upper platform.

As infinitives lack exponents of time and person and alone cannot serve as an indication to circumstances, it would be logical to assume that we are dealing with a special temporal or circumstantial construction with *terñ*; it is quite obvious that its interpretation either as 'army' or as 'territory, district' suggested earlier[122] is quite impossible in the context.[123] The construction may be purely temporal, i.e. indicate a victory 'when' something happened, or it may also have a resultative aspect, i.e. indicate a victory 'after' or 'as a consequence of' some happening.

However it is, there is every ground to connect *terñ* with *teri* 'when' which represents the Lycian counterpart of the Luwian *kwari* (*kwa/i+ra/i*) having the same temporal meaning.[124] The final nasal of *terñ* may be then compared with the nasal element in such Luwian adverbs as *annan* (as contrasted with adposition *anni*) or *andan* (vs. *anda*) or Hittite adverbs *āppan* (vs. *āppa*) or *kattan* (vs. *katta*).[125] This allows a conclusion to be made that Lycian *terñ* is, first of all, a *temporal* adverb and as such finds close structural parallels in *ẽnẽ* 'under' = Luw. *annan*, *ñtewẽ* 'in front of' < **en-tewe-n* (< **tewe* 'eye') ~ Luwian *tawiy-an(ni)*, *trbbẽ* 'opposite'[126] and probably also *pddẽ* whose exact meaning is not quite clear.[127] The difference in the appearance of the final nasal element (*-ñ* vs. *-ẽ*), can be naturally explained by the fact that while the forms in *-ẽ* etymologically reflect old *a*-stems (e.g., *ẽnẽ* < **anna-n*, *terñ* is based on an *i*-stem *teri* (< **teri-n*)).[128]

A curious problem represents the form *τerñ* which appears in section 4 and is the only one (of six attestations in the present passage) with the initial τ. Comparable forms with the initial *τ-* refer elsewhere to 'city' (*τeri-* < *tteri-* < *teteri-*, *τeτeri-*).[129] The passage is obviously parallel to other

---

122 Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v.

123 A re-interpretation of *terñ* as temporal *conjunction* was independently proposed by David Sasseville at the same workshop in Munich (see his contribution in the present volume).

124 It is dubious that *kwari* 'when' represents simply a rhotacized form of *kwadi* as sometimes assumed (*cf.* Melchert 2003, 207), given the fact that *kwa/i+ra/i* is regularly attested already in HLuw. inscriptions of the Empire Period, *cf.*, e.g., YALBURT, block 10, §3 or SÜDBURG §1 (the latter quite probably dates to as early as ca. 1350-1330 BC, i.e. early in the reign of Šuppiluliuma I, *cf.* Oreshko 2016, 9–49). Also CLuw. *k(u)wār(i)* represents probably the same word (for attestations see Melchert 1993, s.v., *cf.* also *k(u)wāri-ḫa*).

125 *Cf.* the recent detailed treatment of the Hittite and Luwian local adverbs by Boroday – Yakubovich 2018 with further refs.

126 The form *trbbẽ* is attested once in 44a, 23. Given that the likely context – a description of the mutual spatial position of different monuments (*cf.* *ñtewẽ* in ll. 26–27) – it refers to a position of something 'opposite' or possibly 'on the other side of' something contrasting in a way with *ñtewẽ* (thus *contra* Eichner 2005, 29 n. 156 who pleads for an interpretation as 'instead, again' ('hingegen, wiederum')).

127 For *pddẽ* see Boroday – Yakubovich 2018, 18 with further refs. The authors follow Schürr favoring the derivation of *pddẽ* from *pede-* 'foot', which finds a certain structural correspondence in *ñtewẽ* (< **tewe* 'eye'); if right, it would define the meaning of the adverb as 'at the foot of' > 'below'/'close to'. However, a derivation from the root *pdde-* 'place' seen in *pddẽt-/pddãt-* 'place, precinct' (= Hitt. *peda(n)-*) appears to be no less likely (*cf.* also the form *pdde=ñne* in N318, 3) and formally is still better, as the forms match each other in the spelling. This derivation would define the etymological meaning of *pddẽ* as 'at the place of' > 'near/beside'.

128 For the phonetic interpretation of Lycian *ñ* and *m̃* as syllabic nasals – quite probably in *all* cases, including *-VñC-/-Vm̃C-* – see, e.g., Adiego 2005 with further refs.

129 The confusion of the forms beginning with *ter-/τer-* goes even beyond the inclusion of the adverb *terñ* into the entry conventionally defined by both dictionaries as 'territory, district' (see Melchert 2004, s.v. *tere-* and Neumann 2007, s.v.). In fact, the entry *tere-/τere-* 'territory, district' appears to be erroneously defined as a whole, since a part of the forms listed therein may be interpreted as forms belonging to *teteri-/τeτeri-* 'city' and another part represents the word meaning rather 'field, land parcel'. After the elimination of the adverb *terñ* 'when' (besides the *hãtahe* passage, the adverb is likely attested in 44b, 12 and 44b, 36; *cf.* also [...*t/τ*]*erñ* in broken context in 44a, 15), there remain only a few attestations of *τere-* and *tere-* which seem to refer to a *place*. First, there is an iterative form *τere τere* (clearly, a *locative*) attested in 44b, 3 and 51. *Contra* common perception, the context does not support an interpretation 'district' or 'territory': in the first case the passage concerns *building* activities (*puna*[*te*] *τere τere tãmade: zaxxazije* 'in every *τere* he/one built' [monuments?] of the warrior(s)), which speaks for 'city' rather than 'district' in general (the restoration *puna*[*te*] 'every, all' may be suggested on the basis of HLuw. *pūnata/i-*, while the restoration *puna*[*me/a*] 'totality' suggested by Eichner (2005, 24 n. 129) does not fit well into the

passages with *terñ* and its interpretation as the temporal adverb is beyond doubt. However, this interpretation leaves the following *Tlahñ* which is formally acc. sg. of the relational adjective *Tlah-* 'Tloan' without a noun. This is not a severe problem, as it may be a substantivized adjective referring to a Tloan ruler or army. However, given the strange spelling with the initial τ, another explanation seems likelier: the form represents in all probability a haplographical writing for *terñ: τerñ: Tlahñ*.

The definition of the meaning of *terñ* raises the question of what is the difference between the usage of *terñ* with infinitives and the forms in *-te* and whether the latter are indeed *final* forms or they represent another type of *non*-finite forms of the Lycian verb, as, e.g. a verbal noun, a sort of Lycian counterpart of Latin supines in *-tum* or of the English gerund. As for the first question, at least the formal difference between the construction with the infinitives and form in *-te* is quite transparent: in all three cases of the usage with *-te* the verbal form is preceded by a personal name which may be identified either as the subject of the respective verb or its direct/indirect object (for discussion of the meanings see below), *cf.* 44: *ese: Trbbẽnimi: tebete: terñ*; 47: *Xerẽi: qastte τerñ*; 48 *ese: Xerẽi: tebete: [t]er[ñ]*. In contrast, there are no personal names before the infinitives, and the subject is here by default the author of the inscription (the possessor of the 'victories'), *cf.* esp. *ese: Trbbẽnimi: tebete: terñ* vs. *ese tabãna: terñ*. The picture seems to imply that the forms in *-te* are used in cases when there is an explicitly expressed subject or an animate object. In general, this would favor the interpretation of the forms in *-te* as final forms (i.e. simple 3sg. pret.), as they are more specific in indicating person. A slight confirmation of the fact that the usage of *terñ* was not strictly bound to the non-finite forms comes from another attestation of the adverb in the text (44b, 36) where it appears after broken […] *mejese*. Lastly, one may note that the temporal construction with *terñ* is contrasted in the passage with another such construction which employs temporal conjunction *ãka* 'when' and introduces in all probability a separate subordinate clause giving a more detailed description of circumstances (for details see below).

5. Sections one to three: *zẽm̃tija, nele(=de)* and *Malijehi*

1) *izredi: zẽm̃tija: ehbije*[42]*di: Zagaba: nele=de: hãtahe:*

2) *Ẽtri: Tumine*[43]*hi: nele=de: hạ̃tahe*

3) *Pttara: Malijehi: hãt*[44]*ahe:*

The first section may now be approximately interpreted as 'of the victory by his own hand (at) *zẽm̃tija:* (at) Zagaba, *nelede*. The term *nelede* appears also in the short second section: 'of the victory at Lower Tymnessos, *nelede*'. There are two points to discuss: the meaning of *zẽm̃tija* which so far remained without persuasive interpretation and the exact meaning of *nele/nelede* for which neither *agora* nor '*Agora-Temenos*' (for refs. see below) look like entirely satisfactory solutions.

context; the restoration also better agrees with the traces indicated in Kalinka's drawing (TAM I, 40): the lower part of the vertical hasta of the letter following 𐌉 is seen significantly farther than one would expect for 𐌌, perfectly agreeing with the expected position of 𐌕). In the second case, *τere τere* may be also naturally taken as referring to the *cities* listed below (53–55: *Arñna Tuminehija … Xãkbija … Kerθθi*; it is not excluded that either *qñnãkba* or *xrssẽni* represents a toponym as well). The accusative of the same word (*τerñ*) is quite probably found in 44a, 47 (if one accepts the haplographical explanation, *cf.* above) and in 44c, 13 (*erbbedi ñtube: τer[ñ?]*); it is not excluded that the form *terñ* found in TL 26, 6 in a broken context (*tibe=i terñ terñ* […]) also represents the same form (or again is a confused spelling for **τerñ terñ* …). These two forms (*τere* and *τerñ*) represent quite probably simply spelling variants of the word for 'city' *teteri-* or *τeτeri-* (the meaning is ascertained by the bilingual N320, 13 and 31), attested also as *tteri-* (TL 149, 4 vs. *teteri-* in line 12). On the other hand, in two texts (TL 149 and N324) one finds forms *tere* (149, 5, 16, and 324, 24, 26, possibly loc.) and *terẽ* (149, 14, acc. sg.). As far as the context of TL 149 allows one to judge, the word refers to a *land parcel* connected with the tomb; the word may be naturally connected with Hitt. *kuera-* 'field, land parcel' (< *kuer-* 'cut'). As a result, one may define an *e*-stem *tere* (acc. *terẽ*) 'land parcel, field' and an *i*-stem *teteri-/tteri-/*τeri-* (acc. *τerñ*) 'city'.

In the short section 3 – 'of the victory at Patara *Malijehi*' – the meaning of *Malijehi* 'of Malija-Athena' will be addressed.

As for *zẽm̃tija*, Schürr proposed to analyze the form as *zẽm̃=tija* seeing in the second part a relative pronoun and in *zẽm̃* a participle of the verb *ze-* with quite obscure meaning.[130] This analysis does not lead to any clarification of the passage and is not quite convincing phonetically; moreover, the position of the word between two words making a single syntactic unit *izredi: ehbijedi:* plainly runs counter the separation of a relative pronoun. In fact, there is absolutely no necessity to divide the word into any parts, as its exact counterpart is attested both in hieroglyphic and cuneiform Luwian as an adjective *zammant-/zamnant-*. An interpretation as *zẽm̃tija* as an adjective fits well into the context, as it may naturally be taken as an epithet of Zagaba.

The meaning of Luwian *zammant-* remained so far rather obscure,[131] so a closer glance of the contexts is worthwhile. There are five attestations of *zammant-* in four different cuneiform texts plus a related form *zammaniya-*. The attestation of the word in KBo 4.11, although found in an obscure context, sheds some light on its phonetics and morphology. The text features two phonetically close forms in two successive lines: *zamnan*[*t*]*in* (acc. sg.) in line 58 and *zammaniyan* (acc. sg.) in line 57. The forms are obviously related, which suggests that the form *zammant-* attested elsewhere is in fact a secondary form resulting from assimilation from *zamnant-*; the form can be interpreted as the contracted variant of **zamman-ant-*, a derivative of *zamman-* with suffix *-ant-*, while *zamman-iya-* represents an alternative derivative with suffix *-iya-*. The underlying root *zamman-* is well attested elsewhere in the Cuneiform Luwian corpus and refers to something with (predominantly) negative connotations.[132] In KBo 12.137 iii 9 *zamnant-* appears in the clause *zappatta zamman-za utar-ša* 'he cut/slit the *zammant-* word'.[133] The combination *zamman-za utar-ša* appears also in KUB 35.54 ii 4 (partly damaged). Another line of the same text (ii 38) features also a clause *a=(a)ta zappatta attu[w]al-za utar-ša*. The parallelism obviously suggests that *zammant-* is an adjective with negative connotations comparable in sense with *ādduwāl-* (*ādduwān-*) 'bad'.

The two attestations of *zammant-* in the Pittei Birth Ritual (KUB 44.4+) confirm this meaning: rev. 6 tells about the birth of a '*zammant*-child' (*zammantiš* DUMU-*iš*) which causes terror in Ištar of the Field; in the same text (rev. 24) the child appears in a context of a magic spell as something to be 'seized' (*lalauna*) along with a lion to be 'bound' (GIŠ-*ruanzi*) and a wolf to be 'fettered' (*patalḫauna*).[134] It is noteworthy that a close parallel to the passage is found in KBo 3.8 iii 10–12 which reads: *ulipanan pargauei ḫamikta* UR.MAḪ *zamnišan ḫamikta* 'He tied the wolf on the high (place), he tied the *zamniša*-lion';[135] *zamniša-* is clearly connected with *zammant-/zamnant-* and the passage again implies that the stem is associated with something dangerous, wild and terrifying.

The only attestation in the Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus shows, however, that this was not always the case: in KARKAMIŠ 15b §23 the word characterizes a 'stone' ("SCALPRUM"-*su-na za-ma-ti-i-na* = /asun zamma(n)tin/, acc. sg.) found by the author of the inscription, which in all probability served him as the basis for his statue (or material for the statue itself).[136] The stem *zamna-* apparently does not have negative association also in personal names attested in cuneiform

[130] Schürr 2007b, 119. The analysis is also accepted in Eichner 2005, 24 n. 125. *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. *ze-* and Neumann 2007, s.v. *zeti-*.

[131] *Cf.* Melchert 1993, s.v.

[132] For attestations see Melchert 1993, s.v., *cf.* a brief discussion by Yakubovich 2013, 101.

[133] For a discussion of verb *zapp-* which could be used (with *arḫa*) also as sacrificial term ('butcher') see Poetto 2010.

[134] For a recent new edition and discussion of the text see Bachvarova 2013.

[135] For an on-line edition of the text see Fuscagni 2017, §37. The analysis of *zamnišan* as *zamni=šan* does not look credible given the mid-clause position of the word.

[136] For the text see Hawkins 2000, 130–133.

[f]*Zamna-wiya* and [m]*Zamna-zidi-*.[137] To reconcile these different aspects of the root *zamna-* one may suggest that it encompasses the complex feeling of 'fear', 'reverence' and 'awe' and semantically closely corresponds to Hittite *naḫšaratt-* < *naḫ(ḫ)-*.[138] Accordingly, *zammant-* is both 'fearsome, terrifying' and 'awesome', 'formidable', 'terrific'. It is noteworthy that in the Alaituraḫḫi Ritual (KBo 12.85 iii 6–7) the lion is associated just with 'fearsomeness' (*naḫšaratt-*). These considerations lead to the interpretation of *zẽm̃tija … Zagaba* as 'formidable Zagaba' which well fits into the military-boastful context.

As for *nele*, the discovery of the second part of the Greek-Lycian bilingual inscription TL 72[139] made it clear that *mahãi nelez*[*i*] correspond to Greek θεοί οἱ ἀγοραῖοι and consequently *nele* is an – at least approximate (*cf.* below) – counterpart of Greek ἀγορά, which disproves all earlier interpretations of the word, including 'settlement'.[140] As already noted, it is quite impossible to postulate a verb **nele-*, as the context of the *hãtahe* passage makes it quite clear that *nelede* in sections 1) and 2), which immediately follows a toponym (*Zagaba* and *Ẽtri: Tuminehi* respectively), roughly corresponds to *nele: nele* in section 5) which also follows a toponym (*Tlãñ*).[141] On the other hand, Schürr[142] observed that *nelede*, which he considers to be a *derivative* from *nele*, appears already in 44a, 19, where it might indicate the place where the present monument was set up and, consequently, might correspond to the 'holy precinct' of the Greek text (44c, 22: ἐν καθαρῶι τεμένει). Accordingly, he interpreted *nelede* as *Agora-Temenos*.

There are several problems with these interpretations. First, functionally ἀγορά, 'assembly and market place', and τέμενος, which is a 'plot of holy land dedicated to a deity (or deities)' *separated* from the profane area, are two very different notions, so that an '*Agora-Temenos*' is quite an impossible hybrid. Second, as the above discussion implies, there is every reason to think that the description on side A refers not to the present monument, but a different one erected at some other place. Instead, the present monument is referred to in all probability as *kbija prulija* 'the other/second pillar' in 44b, 1 which is erected 'in this precinct' (*ebei: … ẽti pddãt*[*i*]). The latter indication corresponds precisely to Greek ἐν καθαρῶι τεμένει, which disproves Schürr's considerations. There are thus no reasons to separate *nele* and *nelede*.

The problem is, however, that an interpretation 'assembly and market-place' looks rather senseless in the description of military events: it does not represent a place of any strategic importance worth of a special mentioning to emphasize the importance of the victory. What one would expect as a reference to a *specific* part of a city along with a *general* reference by its name is rather an 'acropolis', 'stronghold' or 'burg', i.e. the part of the city which is most difficult to capture and which is often remained unconquered even when the territory and the 'lower town' of the city have been ravaged. In fact, the Greek text (44c, 26–27) does explicitly mention just 'many acropolises' conquered by the author ([πο]λλὰς δὲ ἀκροπόλες … [π]έρσας), suggesting that *nele/nelede* may correspond to ἀκρόπολις. As for the equation ἀγορά = *nele*, it does look somewhat suspicious, since the former, in its political sense, is a very specific *Greek* notion, being the center of the public life in a *democratic* polis, whose existence in the 5th-4th century BC Lycia is at least dubious; from a purely topographical point of view, agora representing nothing more than a square (a market-place). Taking this into consideration, one may suggest that Lycia *nele* refers first of all to the central and by definition the best fortified part of the Lycian city, in which, quite naturally,

137 *Cf.* Yakubovich 2013, 100–101.

138 *Cf.* CHD N, s.vv.

139 For the publication of the fuller version of TL 72 see Neumann – Zimmermann 2003.

140 *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v.

141 *Cf.* already the interpretation of *nelede* by Eichner (2005, 20 n. 94 and 2006, 336) as dat.-loc. pl. and its connection with *nele* by Schürr 2007a, 31 (for further refs. see below).

142 Dönmez – Schürr 2015, 144–146. *Cf.* earlier Schürr 2009, 159.

were located other important places, including probably the central market. A translation 'acropolis' or 'fortress' would probably best reflect the Lycian realities.

As for the formal side of the relationship between *nele* and *nelede*, the simplest possibility would be to take the final *-de* as an enclitic picking up the place name, i.e. *Zagaba: nele=de* and *Ẽtri: Tuminehi: nele=de* may be interpreted '(victory) at Zagaba/Lower Tumnessos, (up to/including) *its* acropolis'. This interpretation is quite likely, as the same construction is found with *epi=de* (*cf.* above) and *tarbi=de* (*cf.* below). Less likely, but still not quite excluded, would be an interpretation of *nelede* as a derivative of *nele* with a suffix *-d-*, which may render a *collective* meaning, i.e. ~ 'fortifications'.[143] As for the interpretation of the plural *nele nele* after Tlos in section 5), it might represent a distributive variant of *nelede* referring to fortifications of Tlos. However, taking into consideration what was said above about the form *τerñ*, it seems better to take *nele nele* as referring to *different* fortresses in the *territory* of Tlos, contrasted with the 'city of Tlos' (*τerñ: Tlahñ*) itself. This correlates well also with the iterative form *qastte* (< *qã(n)-* 'strike/attack', *cf.* below) used in the clause.

As for *Malijehi* (gen. sg.) in section 3, its interpretation is suggested by the same line of the Greek text which mentions acropolises: σὺν Ἀθηναίαι Πτολιπόρθωι 'with (the help of) Athena, Sacker-of-Cities'.[144] Grammatically, genitive *Malijehi* is very probably connected with *hãtahe*, so it is actually a '*Malijean* victory' which the author won at Patara.

6. Section 4: *ese … tebe-/taba-* and *pddẽneke*

4) *Xbane: ese: Trbbẽnimi: tebete: terñ se* [45]*Milasãñtrã: pddẽneke: Xbãnije: izredi* [46]*ehbijedi: hãtahe:*

From section 4 on, the structure of the text becomes more complex and now besides toponyms it features also other actors. In the present section, there are two of them: *Trbbẽnimi* and *Milasãñtrã* (Μελήσανδρος). As for the latter, his role in the events was relatively clear from the beginning due to the brief report by Thucydides (2.69) according to which the Athenian general Melesander, after having come up (ἀναβὰς) to Lycia, died there in battle losing also a part of the Athenian troops under his command. This agrees with the information provided in the second part of the clause: 'of the victory … and over Melesander at/in *pddẽneke* of Kyaneiai with his (own) hand'. It is noteworthy that the indication ἀναβάς perfectly matches with the fact that Kyaneiai is located away from the coast on the foothills of the Lycian mountains.

The question is what is the role of *Trbbẽnimi* in the events, or, in other words, what is the exact meaning of verb *ese … tebe-*. The verb was taken unanimously as indicating some sort of *defeat* of the *opponent*, ranging from 'devincere' to 'humilier' to 'destroy', 'overwhelm' and 'conquer'.[145] Given the military context of the clause, such an interpretation, of course, does not look in any way strange. However, a military campaign does not consist *exclusively* of 'fighting' and 'crushing' an enemy, but may also involve joining forces with or providing support to allies – or parties able to pay for such a support – which would be especially the case with *small* military contingents of regional rulers, to which the author of the inscription belonged. In fact, there are several indications that the verb *ese … tebe-* refers not to a destructive action, but to something quite opposite: that of *joining* forces with an ally.

[143] For a collective suffix *-(i)d-*, *cf. mahanahid-*, *prezzid-*, *tubehid-*, possibly also **ased-* (for it, see below).

[144] There is no firm evidence for the existence of a temple of Athena in Patara (*cf.* Schürr 2007b with fn. 17). It is noteworthy that Lycian coins with the head of Athena (M 240–247 in Mørkholm – Neumann 1978: 29-31) were issued in different Lycian cities (Xanthos, Patara, Pinara, Tlos, Telmessos, etc.).

[145] *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v. with further refs.

First of all, it is the meaning of the element *ese* with which the verb is combined in all its occurrences in the text and elsewhere.[146] Its meaning is not established with all certainty, but a consensus seems to emerge that it has a *comitative* function '(together) with'.[147] Indeed, this function is clearly suggested by the attestation of *ese* in the Letoon Trilingual (N320), 14–15: *me=xbaitẽ: zã: ese=Xesñtedi: qñtati: se=Pigrẽi:* 'the field (which) *Xesñtedi* … and *Pigrẽi* irrigated' which corresponds to Greek (ll. 12–14) (ἀγρὸν) ὃγ Κεσινδηλις καὶ Πιγρης κατεργάσατο '(the field) which Kesindelis and Pigres cultivated', even if the meaning of *qñtati* is not quite clear. The meaning is further supported by a likely genetic connection of *ese* with the conjunction *se* 'and' and, less directly, by a possibility to recognize a derivative of *ese* in the first part of the compound *esedẽñnewi* 'consanguineal descendent' (**esede- being* possibly a *collective* with the suffix *-d-*).[148] *Contra* Melchert,[149] *ese* may function not only as preverb, but also as a *preposition*.

The *comitative* function of *ese* strongly speaks against the interpretation of the verbal root *taba-/tebe-* as 'defeat' or the like: in contrast, it should render some *constructive* action *together with*. This conclusion may be supported by further observations. First, as the action of 'defeating' an enemy or a city is expressed in the *hãtahe* passage by the final word itself, the other verbs of the clause should render only particular actions leading to the final defeat. Both in the *hãtahe* passage and elsewhere one can identify, however, *enough* terms which render aggressive military actions, *cf. tub(e)i-* 'strike', *zxxa-* 'fight', *qã(n)-/qas-* 'harass, hunt down', *xlai-* 'smite, kill' (*cf.* below), so that there is no real necessity to look for further terms with comparable meaning. Second, the assumption of a *constructive* meaning for *ese … tebe-* leads to a more cogent explanation of the structure of all four sections which feature the verb (in three cases in the *first* part of the clause) and at least *two* different actors (besides the author of the inscription): all of them may now be explained as describing the situation of *joining forces* with somebody in order to *defeat* somebody. Last but not least, the fourth attestation of the verb *ese … tebãna* in section 8) appears in combination with Amorges (*Humrxxã*). It is known that Amorges, the satrap of Lydia who led a rebellion against Darius II, was defeated by Tissaphernes and ended up in Carian Iasos (Thuc. 8.28), after the capture of which by the Spartans he was finally delivered to the Persians. It is clear that the events referred to in section 8) have no direct connection with the final episode of Amorges's career and should have taken place *earlier*. Thus, as a matter of fact, Amorges has not been *killed* by the author of the Xanthos trilingual and even the idea of an Amoros's defeat by a Lycian would look rather odd, if one takes into account that Amorges was a satrap of Lydia and quite probably had at his disposal much more significant military forces than a Lycian dynast could afford.

In sum, there are good reasons to interpret *ese … tebe-* as a verb rendering a *constructive* action *together with* somebody. The simplest assumption in the context would be that it means 'join with', which might indicate either a purely military action of 'joining forces' or have a more general

[146] The verb is attested also in TL 104b, 2–3: *ẽke: ese: Perikle: tebete: Artturñmparã* and TL 29, 10: *me=ñn=ese tebẽtẽ: abaqmãme: zexisxxaje*.

[147] *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v. with further refs. It is unclear on what evidence Melchert bases the claim for a *telicizing* function of *ese*. All clear attestations of *ese* directly contradict it, showing that the element is a *preposition* which is combined as a complement first of all with animate indirect objects. Besides the three clear attestations in the *hãtahe* passage with *tebe-* (*ese: Trbbẽnimi: tebete*; *ese: Xerẽi: tebete*; *ese: Humrxxã: tebãna*; the fourth attestation is indirect, *cf.* below) and one in TL 104b (*ese: Perikle: tebete*), note the clause in TL 21, 3–4: […]*imeh: tedi: ese Ijeri: Tlawa ddewite* 'father of … *with* Ijeri in Tlos dedicated'. The picture clearly implies that *ese* indicates the *indirect animated* object partaking in the action of the verb.

[148] It is fairly impossible to recognize in **esed(e)-* the Luwic word for 'blood' (*cf. asḫar-* in Luwian), as it was sometimes claimed (see refs. in Melchert 2004, s.v. *esedẽñnewi* and Neumann 2007, s.v. *esedẽñnewi*). A derivation of **esed(e)-* from *ese*, suggested already by Thomsen (1899, 60), is the only reasonable inner-linguistic alternative for Lycian and it makes a good sense defining the meaning of *esedẽñnewi* as '*co-descendant*' or 'descendant of together-ness'. *Cf.* also PN *Esede-plẽmi* (TL 114, 1; TL 85, 1 and TL 115, 1) or *Sede-plm̃mi* (TL 29, 8) contrasted with *plm̃m-adi* (instr. sg.) in TL 44b, 31.

[149] Melchert 2004, s.v.

sense 'make an alliance with'. One may naturally connect the root *tebe-/taba-* with Hittite *dapi-* (/*tabi-*/) and *dapiant-* (/*tabiant-*/) 'all, every, each, altogether' assuming an underlying meaning 'collect, gather, join'.[150] This interpretation significantly changes the perspective on the historical narrative of the inscription. Not only *Trbbẽnimi*, but also *Xerẽi*, *Humrxxã* and a certain *Herikle* (*cf.* below) prove to be the allies of the author.[151] As the first two bear Lycian names, one may tentatively assume that there is some connection between the joint enterprises mentioned in sections 4)–6) and the statement of the Greek text (44c, 27) that he 'gave a part of kingship to (his) kinsmen' (συνγενέσι δῶκε μέρος βασιλέας), i.e. that *Trbbẽnimi* and *Xerẽi* may be relatives of the author of the inscription (for the former see below).

The last element of the clause whose meaning is not quite clear is *pddẽneke*. One usually considered the word as a combination of several elements, analyzing it either as *pddẽne+ke*, seeing in *-ke* a connective, or *pddẽ-n+eke* and interpreting the first part either as 'place' or preverb *pddẽ* indicating a position in space (possibly 'close to', *cf.* above).[152] The word indeed looks like a derivative based on *pddẽ-*, but the separation of the preposition/adverb *pddẽ* is excluded by the fact that *pddẽneke* clearly makes a single combination with *Xbãnije*, which is an *adjective* in *-ije-* based on *Xbãne*, and consequently *pddẽneke* should be a noun. Interpretation of *-ke* as a connective is also quite unlikely, as *-ke* is not attested in this function elsewhere in Lycian and the grammatical connection of **pddẽne Xbãnije* (e.g., as hypothetical 'army of Kyaneiai') with the preceding *Milasãñtrã* does not make any sense: the context makes it sufficiently clear that Milesander did not have allies in Lycia. If one would still separate *-ke*, the only possibility would be to see in it the element *-ke* seen in the indefinite pronouns *ti-ke* 'someone' and *tisñ-ke* (acc. sg.) 'whatever' and cognate with Hittite *-ki*.[153] However, it is unlikely that the element could be attached to something other than pronouns and anyway this analysis hardly sheds any light on the meaning of *pddẽneke*. Consequently, it is preferable to take *pddẽneke* as a single word, which most probably serves as an indication of *place*. Given the context, one may suggest that it means either 'plain' or 'neighborhood/surroundings'. It is quite possible that the word is indeed a compound and contains in the second part *eke* attested elsewhere (TL 118, 7 and possibly TL 149, 14), whose meaning is, however, quite obscure. As a result, one may interpret the whole section 4 as: 'of the victory with his (own) hand over Milesander in the neighborhood/on the plain of Kyaneiai, when he joined forces with *Trbbẽnimi* at Kyaneiai'.

7. Section 5: *qas-* and *tarbi=de*

5) *Tlãñ nele: nele: tarbi*[47]*=de: Xerẽi: qastte τerñ: Tlahñ: erbbedi: h[ã]*[48]*tahe:*

Section 5 is the first of two sections mentioning *Xerẽi*. *Contra* Schürr,[154] it is absolutely impossible to take this name as that of the author of the inscription.[155] There is nothing in the context that might justify an urgent need to identify himself anew (after the initial identification at the beginning of the text) and, worse of that, to do this *twice* in two successive lines – and nowhere else in

[150] For the root see Tischler 1991–1994, s.v., *cf.* Kloekhorst 2008, s.v. Note *tabahaza: kumezija* in 44b, 53 which may be tentatively interpreted as 'collected/joint offerings'.

[151] It is noteworthy that the proposed re-interpretation of the verb has an effect on the reconstruction of the history of Pericle of Limyra: TL 104b, 2–3 which reads *ẽke: ese: Perikle: tebete: Arttuñmparã:* can now be interpreted as 'when Pericle joined with Artumpara' which disproves the perception of the two personages as enemies (for the reign of Pericle see Keen 1998, 148–170).

[152] See Melchert 2004, s.vv. *-ke* and *pddẽn-*; Neumann 2007, s.v. *pddẽneke*; Schürr 2009, 165–166.

[153] For a recent analysis of the Lycian pronouns see Sideltsev – Yakubovich 2016.

[154] See most recently Müseler – Schürr 2018, 383–388.

[155] For discussion of the identity of the author see, besides Müseler – Schürr 2018; Eichner 1993, 139–140 n. 117 (*cf.* 37–38 n. 115 for the Greek version) and Eichner 2006, 233–236, *cf.* Domingo Gygax – Tietz 2005. The two remaining options are *Xeriga* and *Merehi*, of which the former appears to be by far more likely (a more detailed discussion of the issue will be presented elsewhere).

the narrative part. Moreover, the clear parallelism of *ese: Trbbẽnimi: tebete* in section 5) and *ese: Xerẽi: tebete* in 7) leaves no doubt that *Xerẽi*, just like *Trbbẽnimi*, is the indirect object of the verb *ese … tebe-*. Now, the interpretation of the verb as 'join (forces) with' establishes *Xerẽi* as an *ally* of the author of the inscription. This interpretation agrees well with the contents of the present passage, which reports about a 'victory over the Tloan (city) in battle' ((*τερñ*) *Tlahñ erbbedi: h[ã] tahe:*) to which *Xerẽi* somehow contributed earlier, as implied by the clause *Tlãñ* (acc. sg.) … *Xerẽi* (nom.) *qastte τερñ*. As for the meaning of the verb *qastte*, its general aggressive sense is clearly established by the correspondence *qasstu* ~ ἐπιτρ[ί]ψ[ε]ι 'will crush, afflict' in the bilingual TL 56 and is corroborated, besides the present context, by that of the curse formula in TL 150: [6]*m=ene: qastti: Malija* [7]*Wedrẽñni: se itlehi: Trm̃mili* [8]*huwedri* 'Malija of Rhodiapolis and all the Lycian *spirits* will afflict him'.[156] Furthermore, the appearance in similar contexts of the verb *qãñ-* (*cf.*, e.g., TL 90, 5: *m=e*[*n*]*e: itlehi qãñti: Trm̃mili*) makes it likely that *qas-* is an iterative form of *qãñ-*, as suggested by Melchert,[157] despite the strange loss of nasalization. However, there are strong doubts that *qãñ-* and *qas-* mean 'destroy', as per Melchert, and that the root goes back to PIE *$*g^{wh}en$-* 'strike'. Although there are no certain examples of the development of PIE *$*g^{wh}$* in either Luwian or Lycian,[158] it is highly unlikely that it might reflect as *q* in Lycian, whichever of two possible scenarios of its development one adopts. First, one may assume that the development of PIE *$*g^{wh}$* went in Luwic in the same way as PIE *$*g^{w}$* which weakened to *w*. This is ascertained by a number of good examples, *cf.* Lyc. and Luw. *wawa-* 'cow/bull' < PIE *$*g^{w}ow$-* or Luw. *wāna-* 'woman' < PIE *$*g^{w}on$-*. This possibility looks quite likely from the systemic point of view and seems to find certain support in the possibility to derive CLuw. *winal* 'stick' from PIE *$*g^{wh}en$-* 'strike', as proposed by Starke.[159] However, even if one assumes that *$*g^{wh}$* for some reason underwent devoicing and coincided with *$*k^{w}$* in Proto-Anatolian, the resulting root *$*k^{w}en$-/*$*k^{w}an$-* would give in Lycian **ten-* or, under the assumption that zero-grade of the root was generalized, **kun-*.

In fact, the only absolutely certain clue for the origin of Lycian *q* supplied by the correspondence *Trqqñt-* = Luw. *Tarḫunt(a)-*, suggests that Lyc. *qãñ-* should go back to PA **Hu(w)an(V)-*. Such a root is not attested, but the onset of the root suggests a possible connection with the Luwian verb *ḫui(ya)-* (HLuw. (PES_2)*hu(wa)-ia-*) = Hitt. *ḫuwai-/ḫui-* 'to run'. This connection seems to be rather sensible under the assumption that Lyc. *qãñ-/qas-* represents a transitive (or causative) counterpart of Luw. *ḫui(ya)-* and means thus 'cause to run' > 'drive, harass'. From a semantic point of view, the verb would make a better correspondence of the Greek ἐπιτρίβω, which literally means 'rub on the surface' and designates thus a continuous action rather than such a *pointed* action as 'strike' or a *pointed* and *complete* (telic) action as 'destroy'. A transitivizing/causative suffix **-n-* is not attested either in Lycian or Luwian. The usual causative suffix well attested for Luwian is *-nu-* and one may suggest that *qãñ-* goes back to **qãnu-* < **Hu(w)anu-*. This interpretation finds support in the passage TL 110, 3–5: *me=t=ẽni qanuweti qla*[*h*]*i*: *eb*[*ij*]*ehi* 'the Mother of the local temple will *qanuwe-*', where *qanuwe-* corresponds to *qas-* found in an almost identical passage in TL 56, 4: *m=ene qasttu: ẽni: qlahi: ebijehi.* The proposed derivation explains, at least in part, the absence of nasal in the iterative form: it is not impossible that the iterative suffix *-s-* might have also transitivizing/causative effect and thus simply *replaced* the suffix *-nu-* in **qãnu-*. The

[156] For other contexts of *qas- cf.* Neumann 2007, s.v. *qas-*. The meaning of *itlehi* as 'foederatus, belonging to a league' (*cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v. with further refs.) appears highly dubious. *Itlehi*, just like *Malija*, should represent a sort of divine entities, as seen also by Savelsberg (1878, 107 and 122), who interpreted them as 'Landesgötter', or as a Lycian counterpart of Greek ἥρωες, which was preferred by Heubeck (1982, 109–110) and now also by Schürr (2014a, 135), who adduced further Greek parallels. The latter interpretation (ἥρωες) appears all the more likely, as *itlehi* may be explained as a derivative from *atla*, which probably means not only 'self', but also 'soul' and 'spirit', resulting from vowel-harmonic change **etlehi-* > *itlehi-*.

[157] Melchert 2004, s.v. *qã*(*n*)-.

[158] *Cf.* Melchert 1994, 254 and 303.

[159] Starke 1990, 313–316.

proposed explanation well agrees with the context of section 5: *Xerẽi* should have only 'prepared the ground' for the later victory over Tlos 'in battle'. In all probability, he 'harassed' it, i.e. 'made repeated raids against' the fortresses of Tlos, while only the intervention of the author of the inscription finally allowed the capital to be taken.

The only not quite clear element of the clause is *tarbide*. This is usually taken as 3sg. pret. of a verb *tarb(e)i-* 'overpower, conquer'.[160] This interpretation is dubious in several respects. First, the established syntax of the clause clearly speaks against it: if a second verb would be intended, one would expect something like **xerẽi: tarbide: se: qastte τerñ.* Second, *qas-* already renders the sense of an aggressive action and a second verb of a comparable semantics would be redundant. Moreover, the interpretation of other forms based on the same stem (as *trbbetẽ* in 44a, 54 and *trbbeite* in 44c, 10) is dubious as well (for the first see below). The evidence of the present passage suggests a different interpretation.

There are three reasonably clear attestations of a *preposition trbbi* in military context. The first is found in 44c, 2–3: *se Parzza: Xbide: se Sp*[*part*]*ali*[*j*]*ahe*: [3]*trbbi: Atãnas: zxxãte: terñ*: 'when both the Persians at Kaunos and the Spartan(s) (contingent) fought *against* the Athenians'. The second is found in 44b, 14: *se=Nagurahi: Pu*[*nam*][15][*u*]*wahe: trbbi: Trusñ: se Tuburehi: Stt*[*ra*][16][*t*]*ãni*[*da*]*he: trbbi*: *Ẽñnei* which may be interpreted as '(the troops of) Nagurahi (under the leadership of) Punamuwa *against* Trysa and (the troops of) Tyberissos (under the leadership of) Stratanida *against* Ennei …'.[161] It is noteworthy that the same preverb is attested in Hieroglyphic Luwian as *tarba* or *tarbi-wa* in the expression 'step against, oppose (somebody)'.[162] Given this evidence, one may naturally interpret *tarbide* as a form of *trbbi* combined with the enclitic *=de*, which apparently picks up *nele nele*. This case sheds additional light on *epi=de* and *nele=de* discussed above: all three cases represent, as far as one can see, an element used in *postposition* to its head noun which is picked up with an enclitic *=de*. Accordingly, *tupelija … prulija epi=de* may be re-interpreted as **tupelija … epi prulije* (dat. pl.) and *zagaba: nele=de* as **nele zagabah* (gen. sg.). In all appearances, it represents a sort of analytic construction that allows fronting of some elements. As a result, the entire section can be now interpreted as: 'of the victory over the Tloan (city) in battle, when (after) Xerẽi (had) made repeated raids against fortresses of Tlos'.

8. Section 6: *hbãti: CII* and *uṵ[e] ñtepi*

> 6) *Medbijahe: ese: Xerẽi: tebete: ṭeṛ[ñ]* [49]*se Waxssepddimi: ẽti: zehi: hbãti: CII: uṵ*[*e*] [50]*ñtepi: xlaina terñ hãtahe:*

Section 6 ends, as every other section in the passage, with *hãtahe* and has nothing to do with *Herikle* who belongs to the following section.[163] One may start from observations on the final damaged part of the line, which was probably the reason why one has paid so little attention to the interpretation of this curious section. Kalinka, following Fellows, read at the end of the line

---

[160] *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v.

[161] For the interpretation of the passage *cf.* Schürr 1998, 150, who interprets genitives of the personal names as 'in alliance with'. The interpretation of *Ẽñnei* as a toponym rather compellingly follows from the context.

[162] *Cf.*, e.g. (PES$_2$.PES)*tara/i-pa* (CRUS)*ta-* in BOROWSKI 1 §1; ("CORNU")*tara/i-pa* CRUS-i in ALEPPO 2 §25; (SCALPRUM)*tara/i-pi* CRUS in CEKKE §22; *tara/i-pa* CRUS in KULULU 5 §17; *tara/i-pi-wa/i* CRUS in KARKAMIŠ A5 §13. It is not quite clear whether the preverb has a direct connection with the verb *tarbi-* which is sometimes used in similar but still not quite identical contexts (*cf.*, e.g., KARKAMIŠ A2+3 §11: (DEUS)TONITRUS-*sa* |("*464")*ha-tà-ma* |(PES$_2$.PES)*tara/i-pi-i-tu*) or KARKAMIŠ A2+3 §15: (DEUS)TONITRUS-*sa* |(CORNU)*ki-pu-tà-ti-i a-tá* |(PES$_2$.PES)*tara/i-pi-tu-u*), but seems otherwise to mean 'trample' (e.g., in KARKAMIŠ A6 §11: |SUPER+*ra/i-´* |("PES$_2$+PES")*tara/i-pa-lá/í*). Given the variety of logograms used with *tarba*, the connection is at least not obvious.

[163] Thus *contra* Schürr 2009, 166–168.

ule, which is accepted in a recent discussion by Schürr;[164] Melchert dismissed this reading claiming instead either *un*[or *um*[.[165] Neither reading has led, however, to any sensible identification of the word. However, the excellent photo published by Schürr himself[166] suggests quite a different reading. The letter following O is only partly damaged and in the upper part one discerns *two horizontal strokes*, which are seen clearly enough to exclude any identification other than F.[167] Given the fact that the line contained probably only one more letter and the next line begins with a separate word (*ñtepi*), a likely restoration of *uẉ*[...] would be *uẉ*[*e*] which represents an element well-attested elsewhere (see below).[168]

The general sense of the passage is suggested by the numeral *CII* appearing in the middle of the clause. It was long ago compared with ἑπτά 'seven' in the Greek text which, if right, defines the clause as Lycian correspondence of the Greek clause (44c, 29): ἑπτὰ δὲ ὁπλίτας κτεῖνειν ἐν ἡμέραι Ἀρκάδας ἄνδρας '(the immortals granted him) to kill seven hoplites within one day, the Arcadian men', as was suggested long ago and mostly accepted in more recent studies.[169] The doubts of Melchert[170] in the interpretation of *CII* as 'seven' are unfounded: the idea underlying the graphic representation of the first numeral, a *half-circle*, is essentially the same as that of the numeral 'five' (∠) – an *open* circuit – and its realization as a more angular or a more rounded shape was probably simply a technical matter.[171] Very close rounded forms of 'five' are found in other inscriptions, *cf.* TL 26, 14 and TL 107a, 1.[172] In contrast, the Lycian symbol for '10' is O, i.e. a *closed* circuit. There is an obvious graphical logic in using a half-circle for 'five' and a full circle for 'ten'.

Looking for the expected Lycian correspondence for ὁπλίτας, one usually proceeded from the syntax of modern European languages and found it, accordingly, in the word *following* the numeral, i.e. **ule*.[173] However, this leaves *ñtepi* 'inside, within' in the next line, which is followed by the verbal form *xlaina*, without a referent. In fact, the syntax of numerals in Lycian texts suggests rather that the noun defined by '7' should precede it. Indeed, as far as the rather scarce evidence allows to judge, the nouns precede the numeral when they are in *nominative* or *accusative*, *cf. se tideimi: ehbi:* ∠ (TL 107, 1), *tideime ehbije* O (TL 124, 11–13), *ada* III (TL 4, 5) or *adai* O– (TL 11, 3); this seems to be contrasted with the inverted position when the noun is in *locative* or *genitive*, *cf.* ḲIII *uhi* (TL 35, 1, loc.) and OO– *uhahi* (TL 40c, 9, gen.), although the evidence is too scarce to be sure that it was always the case.[174] Thus, there is a good reason to identify the Lycian correspondence of Greek ὁπλίτης in *hbãti* preceding the numeral.[175] This assumption finds support in the morphology of the word: a structural parallel to it may be found in *esbẽt(i)-* 'horseman, knight'

164 Schürr 2009, 164 and 168.

165 Melchert 2004, s.v. [*ule*.

166 Schürr 2009, 167 Abb 3.

167 This reading was now independently argued for also by Martínez Rodríguez (2021, 303–304). Moreover, as she pointed out, the letter was read as F already by Meriggi (1936, 279 with n. 6), who based his reading, however, only on the drawing ('Kopie') by Kalinka in TAM 1, 40. In fact, also Neumann (2007, s.v. *uwe*) considered this restoration as an option.

168 Thus *contra* Martínez Rodríguez 2021, 304 who interprets *uwe* as the dat. pl. of *wawa-*/*uwa-* 'cow'.

169 Deecke 1888, 226–227, *cf.* Faucounau 1988, 165; Eichner 1993, 140 n. 120 or Schürr 2009, 174.

170 Melchert 2004, s.v. [*ule*.

171 The certain attestation of the numeral 'five' are found in five inscriptions: TL 6, 3; TL 26, 14; TL 107a, 1; TL 131, 4; TL 145, 5; *cf.* Frei 1976, 7 and 16 and Laroche in Metzger 1979, 100–101.

172 See drawings in Frei 1976, 7, fig. 1 (variants of C nr. 3 and nr. 6).

173 *Cf.* Borchhardt *et al.* 1997–1999, 36 with n. 88; Schürr 2009, 168a, and further refs. in Neumann 2007, s.v. :*u*[*le*].

174 *Cf.* also examples cited in Martínez Rodríguez 2021, 304. The numerals are also heavily used in TL 26, 13–15, but the lines are broken at the end and the meaning of the nouns is too unclear, *cf.* [13]*arailise*: HIII–: *haqaduwehe*: YII– t°[...] [14]*ppebẽñti*: OOII– *pagda*: O<III–: *purθ*°[...] [15]*mñnãtahi*: OIII–: *winbẽte*: OIII–.

175 Thus *contra* Martínez Rodríguez 2021, 299–300 who identifies in *hbãti* a verbal form (3pl. pres.) connecting its root with HLuw. *suwa-* 'fill'. The root etymology cannot be correct in any case, as the Luwian root corresponds to Lyc. *huwe-* seen in *huwedri-* 'all' < **suwatar-* 'fullness' (*cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v.).

which represents a derivative of *esbe-* 'horse' with a suffix *-(e)nt-* having apparently a possessive function (probably < **-went-*).[176] Given this parallel, *hbãti* may be interpreted as based on **hba* (< **saba-*?) which might correspond to Greek ὅπλον 'large shield' or 'heavy arms' from which the name of ὁπλῖται is derived. However, it is not excluded that *hbãt(i)-* means simply 'infantry-man', as opposed to *esbẽt(i)-* 'horseman, knight'.

Furthermore, the proposed analysis naturally suggests that *uẇ*[*e*] *ñtepi* ('(with)in *uwe*') may correspond to Greek ἐν ἡμέραι – which is an essential detail of the feat – which means that *uwe* is either Lycian 'day' or a similar indication for a short period of time.[177] This interpretation seems to agree fairly well with other interpretable attestations of *uwe*, which remained so far without a convincing interpretation.[178] The only reasonably transparent context of *uwe* is found in the protasis of a curse formula of several funerary inscriptions from Limyra (also one from Myra, TL 92); the clearest one is TL 139, 3–4: *se uwe: ti hrppi tãti tike m=ẽne tubidi h*[*p*]*pñter*[*us*] *mãhãi:* 'and *uwe* anyone will put somebody upon (i.e. 'in addition'), (then) the *hppñterus*-gods (will) strike him'.[179] The syntax clearly suggests that *uwe* somehow should express *condition* or *time*, i.e. correspond to either 'if' or 'when'. The latter possibility agrees well with the interpretation of *uwe* as an indication of time suggested by 44a, 49: a literary interpretation of *uwe* as 'the day (when)' is thinkable, although it represents quite probably already a frozen locative form used simply for 'when' (and, by extension, possibly for 'if' as well).

As for the verb of the clause *xlaina* (inf.), it should clearly correspond to Greek κτεῖνειν 'kill' of the Greek part and, as already seen by Schürr,[180] may plausibly be connected with Hittite *ḫulle-*/*ḫull-* 'smash, defeat'. Formally, an even more exact match to *xlai-* is HLuw. verb *hu-la-ia-* attested in the ANKARA silver bowl with the same meaning 'defeat'.[181] *Contra* Melchert and Serangeli,[182] the stem *xlai-* 'defeat, smash' has probably nothing to do either with *xal-* 'exercise control' or *asa-xla-za-* which is probably a derivative of the latter (*cf.* below). Lastly, the combination *ẽti: zehi* is, as already recognized by Schürr,[183] should be an indication of the place of the fight and a connection with *za-* for which N320 suggests a correspondence ἀγρός 'field' seems very likely. The precise semantic distinction between *za-* and *zehi-*, which looks like a gen. adj. of the former, is not quite clear, but possibly concerns the size of the land in question.[184] As a result, the entire section

[176] A further parallel might be found in *padrãt(i)-* which, as noted above (n. 69), may in theory be interpreted as 'shield-bearer' (possibly = Greek πελταστής). For the suffix *-nt- cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. who argues for its 'possessive' function, as contrasted to Hajnal's interpretation of the suffix as 'individualizing'. However, a possessive function is not typical for the *nt*-suffix in Anatolian (which is indeed rather individualizing) and the Lycian suffix may rather reflect the old Indo-European possessive suffix **-went-*. The disappearance of *-w-* is probably due to the contraction of the suffix and subsequent loss of *w* in a consonantal cluster: **-went-* > **-wnt* > **-nt-/-˜t-*; for the simplification process *cf.* Lyc. *la-* 'die' < **wla-* (*cf.* HLuw. *wa/i-la-* and HLuw. *walant(i)-/ulant(i)-*); Lyc. ethnic suffix *-ñne-* < **-wna/i-* < *-wana/i-*; or city name *Arñna-* < **Arwna-* < **Awrna-* < *Awarna-* (cun. ^{URU}*Awarna*). It is noteworthy that the forms *Tlãñ* and *Tlahñ* (TL 44a, 46–47), as contrasted with *Tlawa/i* (in 44b, 30 [possibly loc.] and elsewhere), represent, *contra* Melchert 2004, s.v., not a 'real base stem', but rather reflect the same process of the loss of *-w-* in a pre-consonantal position, as the form *Tlawa* is attested already in the 2nd millennium BC texts (cun. ^{URU}*T(a)lawa* and HLuw. *Tala-wa/i*(REGIO)), and it is hardly possible to assume that the toponym could exist synchronically in two different (non-extended and extended) forms.

[177] Note Faucounau's (1988, 165) suggestion to see in **ule* a word for 'day'.

[178] For previous suggestions see Neumann 2007, s.v., *cf.* also Lebrun 2006.

[179] *Cf.* further TL 128, 2: *se* [*l*]*ada: ti uwe hrppi tadi: tike:* 'and *uwe* anybody put upon (my) wife somebody'; 106, 2: *hri=be=uwe=(a)lahadi=ti:* '(anybody) *uwe* replaces with somebody'; TL 118, 2: *se=uwe=ni: hrppi: tatu: tike:* 'and let nobody *uwe* put upon (somebody)' … *me=uwe=hri: alaha*[…] 'and *uwe* replaces…'; TL 92, 3: [*hr*]*ppi ladi eḥbi hrpp*[*i*]*=uwe* […].

[180] Schürr 2009, 168 with n. 5.

[181] It is not excluded that the stem also makes part of the name *Ḫuliya-zalma-nu* ('*Ḫuliya*-protection') attested in a Western Anatolian context (with city Ḫappuriya), for the text see Süel 2014, 934–935.

[182] Melchert 2004, s.v. *xla*(*i*)-; Serangeli 2015.

[183] Schürr 2009, 167–168, *cf.* also Martínez Rodríguez 2021, 300.

[184] One may suggest that the word *za-* (phonetically /tˢa/) represents a contracted form of **tasa-* which

can be interpreted as: 'of the victory when he joined forces with *Xerẽi* at *Medbijahe* and killed *Waxssepddimi* in the field (together with) seven hoplites within one day'.

9. Section 7: Pseudo-Heracles, *sehaxlaza-* and *pabra=ti*

7) *ãka: Herikle* [51]*sehaxlaza: pabra=ti: Xbide: hrixñtawa*[52]*tahi: ese tabãna: terñ: Ijãnã: Ijalusas* [53]*Ḳrzzạ̃nase: hãtahe:*

The discussion of the present section one may start with the name *Herikle*, a prominent – and a prominently misleading – feature of the text. The name was early taken to refer to the mythical Greek hero Heracles, which found a certain support in the fact that the name is preceded by *ãka* which allows for an interpretation 'like, as': the combination was understood as a sort of literary topos used to underline the military prowess of the author of the inscription.[185] However, with the clarification of the syntax and the context of the *hãtahe* passage, this interpretation proves to be fairly nonsensical. On the one hand, it is quite impossible to connect *ãka: Herikle* with the feat of killing the seven hoplites, where it might seem at least distantly appropriate, since it is disproved not only by the fact of its appearance after *hãtahe*, but also by the very syntax of the clause in section 6: as an adverbial group the virtual 'like Heracles' would be expected *before* the verb (*xlaina*). On the other hand, a comparison with Heracles does not make any obvious sense in the context of section 7 which deals with the *administrative* title *(se)haxlaza*, Kaunos, the Supreme (i.e. Persian) King (*hrixñtawa-*) and with a battle (possibly naval) against the Greeks of Ialysos at Chersonesos. Lastly, one may point out that the very fact of appearance of Heracles in a *Lycian* text under his *Greek* name would be quite odd: the Greek hero was identified with the Anatolian war god *Šanda-* whose cult is well attested in the southern parts of Anatolia until the Roman period and the name *Santas* was known even in Lydia, where it represents in all probability an *imported* name possibly concealing a figure similar to that of Greek Heracles.[186]

All these inconsistencies disappear, if one interprets *Herikle* as a name of a *person*, just like all other names in the *hãtahe* passage.[187] The final part of the name (*-kle*) is quite reminiscent of Greek names ending in -κλῆς and it is not excluded that it is a Greek name connected with Heracles. However, even if so, it is dubious that it *exactly* corresponds to Greek Ἡρακλῆς. Although the name of Heracles is attested as a personal name and as such is found also in Anatolia, including one attestation in Tlos (imperial period),[188] it becomes popular only in the Roman period. Moreover, in Asia Minor it is found only in the Doric form Ἡρακλᾶς, for which one would expect in Lycian rather an *a*-stem **Herikla*, *cf.*, for instance, *Pulenjda* in TL 6, 1 which corresponds to Doric Ἀπολλονίδας rather than to Ionian Ἀπολλονίδης. It seems more probable that the name, if indeed Greek, would reflect either of two usual names based on the name of Heracles, Ἡράκλεος or Ἡρακλέων, both of which are attested from the early period on.[189] For simplification of the final parts of Greek names in Lycian *cf. Ijeri* (TL 21, 3) or **Ijera* (N320, 4: *Ijeru*, acc. sg.) for Ἱέρων or *Pa*[*r*]*mna* for Παρμένων (-οντος) (TL 117).

corresponds to the first part of the Hieroglyphic Luwian *taskwira-* ((TERRA)*ta-sà-kwa/i+ra/i-*), whose final part was plausibly compared with Hitt. *kuera-* 'field, land parcel' < *kuer-* 'cut' (see Hawkins 2000, 393 with further refs.). This would plausibly explain the Luwian compound as 'field-section, field-parcel'.

185 See Neumann 2007, s.v. *Herikle* with further refs.

186 For Anatolian Šandaš see Mastrocinque 2007 and Rutherford 2017 with further refs., *cf.* a brief summary in Hutter 2003, 228–229. For a discussion of the Lydian *Santas* see Oreshko forthcoming.

187 It is noteworthy that this variant was already suggested by Ševoroškin (pers. comm. referred to in Neumann 2007, s.v.), the reasons of which remain unclear. The stance of Melchert (2004, s.v. Herikle and Erikle) is perplexing: he interprets *Herikle* of the Lycian text as the name of the mythical hero, but takes *Erikle* of the Lycian B text (44d, 6 and 17) – which *clearly* corresponds to *Herikle* – as the name of a person.

188 *Cf.* LGPN V.A and V.B, s.v. Ἡρακλᾶς.

189 *Cf.* LGPN V.A and V.B., s.vv.

However, it is quite possible that *Herikle* represents a genuine Anatolian name, either Lycian or Carian. On the one hand, there are two factors that speak against its perception as a Greek name. First, it is quite odd – although not entirely impossible – that a governor of *Carian* Kaunos installed by the *Persian* king (*cf.* below) bears a Greek name. Second, a rendering of Greek *a* of Ἡρακλῆς by Lycian *i* is not something for which one can present a ready explanation. On the other hand, in a number of clear cases, the Greek element -κλῆς is regularly rendered in Lycian with *-xle/i*, *cf. Ijetruxle* (TL 38, 3) = Ἰητροκλῆς; *Terssixle* (TL 149, 2) = Θερσικλῆς or Τερψικλῆς; *Ñtemuxlida* = Δεμοκλειδης in N312 (corr. Δημοκλείδης). The only other comparable case is *Perikle*, the name of a dynast of Limyra, which is usually thought to be a Lycian adoption of Greek Περικλῆς. However, this case is again quite suspicious: why a Lycian dynast of the 4th century BC would take the name of the Athenian statesman who was active at least 30 years before he was born? This would be a rather strange step, given that Lycia was by his time for about 150 years under Persian cultural and political influence and the Lycians fought on the Persian side just *against* Athenians, of which the text of the Xanthos trilingual bears a clear witness. Moreover, not a single other Lycian dynast bears a Greek name.

In fact, both *Perikle* and *Herikle* can be explained as Anatolian names. Crucially, there are reasons to think that the element *-k(e)le-* was present in the Luwic languages of south-western Anatolia. One may point out, first of all, a form *hrkkeledi* /hrəkeleði/ (instr.) in N324, 11, which closely corresponds to *Herikle*, but hardly can be a personal name due to the case form. From a purely morphological point of view one may analyze it as **hrə-kele-ði* with **hrə-* going back to to *hri* 'up, on (top)' (< **séri*, *cf.* CLuw. *šarri*) 'on, up'. There are several other forms that contain the element *-kle-*, *cf. muni-klei-mẽ* attested in TL 107a, 2 as contrasted with *muneite* in TL 127, 2 and *muneita* in TL 44b, 20 and Lycian B *kllei-me* (*kllei-ma* in 44c, 45, *kllei-me* in 44d, 61 and *kllei-me-di* in 44c: 49 and 60. Lastly, one may point out a Carian name *Ursḱleś* (E.Me 15). It is noteworthy that the tectal in this name is rendered with a different letter (*ḱ*) than in the case with *Lysiklas* which arguably renders Greek Λυσικλᾶς in the Kaunos bilingual (C.Ka 1). The first part of the name has no obvious correspondence in Greek but seems to find a close correspondence in Lycian *Urrs-m̃*[*ma*] (TL 113). Given this evidence, one may tentatively suggest that Lycian *-kle-* and Carian *-ḱle-* may represent *genuine* Anatolian reflexes of PIE **ḱleu̯-* 'hear' > 'fame', with the retention of the tectal character of the stop in the position before *l*.[190] The first parts of the names *Heri-kle* and *Peri-kle* can also be unproblematically explained as Anatolian elements, reflecting respectively **séri* = Lyc. *hri* 'up, on (top)' and **péri-* = Lyc. *pri* 'forth, in front', *cf.* Luwian *pari(ya)*. Both elements are well attested in personal names, the first one being especially popular in Lycia, *cf. Hri-xm̃m*[a] (TL 89, 1–2 and 90, 1–2), *Hri-xttbili* (TL 22, 1), *Hr-m̃muwe* (TL 35, 10), *Hr-ppidube* (TL 59, 1), *Prija-buhãma* (TL 28, 2 and N356a) and *Prije-nube* (TL 25, 7) (vs. Luwian *Pariya-muwa* or *Pari-zidi*). It is noteworthy that this interpretation suggests that *Heri-kle* is a specifically *Lycian* name, as in Carian one would expect retention of the initial sibilant of **séri*, while in Lycian B, which stands phonetically closer to Carian than to Lycian, the name has the form *Erikle* and is thus the *adoption* of the Lycian *Heri-kle* with the loss of *h-*.

The re-interpretation of the name referent immediately affects the interpretation of two elements of the clause: *ãka* and (*se)haxlaza.* Now, there is no necessity to ascribe to *ãka* a sense 'like, as' and it may be naturally taken merely as a phonetic variant of conjunction *ẽke* 'when', which is its usual meaning. It may seem redundant in view of the presence of *terñ* further in the clause. However, this redundancy can be naturally explained by the length of the indirect object group depending on *ese tebe-* which consists of an entire relative clause (*cf.* below). In other words, *ẽke … terñ* may be considered as two elements framing the part of the clause indicating time (and circumstances) of the military events reported in its second part. On the other hand, the identification of

190 *Cf.* Luw. *K(u)rundiya-* < **ḱru-nt-* 'horned', for the *conditioned* twofold development of PIE **ḱ* in Luwian and Lycian see Melchert 2012.

Herikle as the name of a person calls for revision of the sequence which follows it. It was hitherto analyzed as *se haxlaza* and the noun was identified as a variant of the title attested in N320, 5 as *asaxlazu* (acc. sg.) where it corresponds to Greek ἐπιμελητής 'governor'. However, there can be no doubt that in the present clause the title should refer to *Herikle* and, consequently, separation of *se* 'end' makes no sense. The question is now whether *sehaxlaza* is still the same as *asaxlazu* or something different. In theory, one cannot exclude that we are dealing with two different titles built as compounds that contain the root *xla-* in the second part, but different roots in the initial part. However, the phonetic similarity of both is still remarkable and it seems possible to explain the difference – which is, in fact, easier than it was in the case with the pair *asaxlazu* vs. *haxlaza*. Indeed, if a correspondence *asa-* vs. *ha-* can be in no natural way explained by the rules of Lycian phonetics,[191] the correspondence *seha-* vs. *asa-* allows for such an explanation. A comparison of the two forms suggests for the first element of the compound a pre-form **eseha-* or **asaha-*, of which the latter is probably a secondary one produced by a regressive vowel-harmonic change (*cf. ahatahi/ehetehi*). Then one can assume that *asaxlazu* and *sehaxlaza* reflect two different outcomes of a contraction process that took place in the long five-syllabic compound **asaha-xla-za/*eseha-xla-za*: the former contracted *-aha-* to *a*, while the latter apocopated the initial *a*.[192]

A general sense of the title is suggested by its Greek correspondence ἐπιμελητής, literally 'care-taker', which has in Greek quite a broad range of meanings, but in the context of N320 may be interpreted as 'city governor' (*cf.* 4–5 *se(j)=Arñna: asaxlazu: Erttimeli* 'and as *asxlaza* of Xanthos (he appointed) Artemelis'). As suggested by Melchert,[193] the final part of the compound may be connected to the verb *xal(a)-* which appears to be connected with an administrative rule. This sense is implied first all by TL 29, 12 which features 'Lycia(ns)' as the direct object of the verb (*Trm̃misñ xalte*) and is further supported by TL 29, 5 which connects the verb with the term *wazzis-* (*wazzisñ: xalxxa*).[194] The administrative/controlling associations of the latter are made clear by 104a, 2–3 featuring a dating formula: *Lusñ[tr]e: ẽti wazisse* which may be interpreted as 'in the *wazzi*-ship of Lysander' and indirectly supported by 44b, 13, which features '*wazzi*-ship of the army' (*ẉazisṇ̃ [te]ḷẽzijehi*). The verb *xal(a)-* may have a meaning 'control' or simply 'rule'. However it is, it is unlikely that either *xal(a)-* or the title has anything to do with *xlai-* 'smash, defeat' (= *ḫull(iy)a-*), as already discussed above.[195]

As for the first part of the title **asaha-xla-za/*eseha-xla-za*, its connection with *ese* proposed by Carruba,[196] although formally possible, does not seem semantically especially illuminating. As *ese* can now likely be interpreted as 'with' (*cf.* above), the sense of the compound would be

---

191 *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. *haxlaza* and Neumann 2007, s.v.

192 *Cf.* Carruba 1977, 283–284 who reconstructed *asaxlaza* as **asa-(h)axlaza*. However, the root in the second part is almost certainly *xala-* 'rule, exercise control over' (*cf.* below). It is not quite clear on what evidence Carruba based his claim of the loss of *h* in the initial or the medial position. Cross-linguistically, the process is certainly a trivial one (and sporadically attested also in Anatolia, *cf.*, e.g. ^{É}*ḫalentuwa*/^{É}*alanduwa*), but the Lycian corpus does not give many reasons to think that it was a usual phenomenon in Lycian. However, Greek evidence does suggest that Lycian *h* was realized as a very light breathing (lighter even than the Greek *spiritus asper*), *cf.* PN *Purihimete/i* = Πυριματις/Πυριβατης (TL 6 and TL 25 respectively), *Hla* = Λα (TL 56) or *Hlm̃midewe* = Ελμιδαυαι (TL 139). For the apocope of the initial *e/a cf.*, e.g., PN *Sedeplem̃mi* = *Esedeplẽmi* (Ἀσεδεπλημος), *Eseimija* = *Seimija*, *Katamla* = *Ekatamla* (Ἑκατόμνας) or PN *Ahqqadi* in TL 36, 2 vs. *hqqdaime*[*d*]*i* in 44a, 37–38.

193 Melchert 2004, s.v. *xal-*.

194 The word *ñtepi* '(with)in' which immediately precedes *wazzisñ* should be taken together with the preceding word of the text which is badly weathered. Two clear examples found in the Lycian corpus show that *ñtepi* functions, when used with an indirect object, as a *post*-position, *cf. uẉ*[*e*] *ñtepi* 'within one day' in 44a, 49–50 discussed above and *Trm̃misñ*: *ñtepi*: *xñtawata: apptte teri:* 'when (Alexander) took authority in Lycia' (or 'among Lycians')' further in the present text (TL 29, 9). The latter context strongly suggests that the damaged word before *ñtepi* is the name of a place (possibly a toponym).

195 Etymological ties of *xal(a)-* within and beyond Anatolian remain unclear. *Contra* Serangeli 2015, a connection with PIE **$h_2$el-* 'feed, make grow' and with Hitt. *ḫalai-* 'set in motion' seems to me quite dubious.

196 Carruba 1977, 284.

something like *co-regens*, which is hardly compatible with the function of a 'city governor'. On general grounds, one would expect in the first part of the compound a term for the sphere which is controlled/ruled; however, it is not a 'city', which is *teteri-/τeri-* in Lycian (*cf.* above, n. 129). A different interpretation may be tentatively suggested basing on Luwian evidence. The protective function of a deity in the standard Hieroglyphic Luwian curse formulas is rendered by the term hidden by the logogram LIS, which may appear either as a noun with the suffix *-al(l)a/i-* in combination with the verb 'to be' or as a denominative verb derived from it (e.g., KARKAMIŠ A11a §26: LIS-*la/i/u-za-tú*). The fullest phonetic form of the noun is found in MEHARDE §6 as LIS-*za-sa-li-* and, given that Luwian *s* corresponds to Lycian *h* and *z* may correspond to *s*, one may suggest that the word is based on the Luwian counterpart of Lycian **asaha-/*eseha-* and its full phonetic reading is, accordingly, **azasal(l)a/i-*. Hawkins interprets the term as 'prosecutor',[197] but in the context of the curse formulas, translations like 'guarantor' or 'one who is in charge of' (~ ἐπιμελητής) would be no less appropriate. The administrative associations of the term **azasal(l)a/i-* are supported both by the title LIS.DOMINUS found on some Empire Period seals, which corresponds to GAL (LÚ.MEŠ)*MUBARRI* and designates some sort of legal officer, and by the form of the logogram LIS itself, which depicts 'two profiles over a seal' suggesting some legal and/or administrative associations.[198] One may note that a possible cognate of **eseha-* is found in TL 65, 17 and 25 in the form *esehi* (possibly nom. pl.). Curiously, it appears as the very last word of the inscription, which is the position in which LIS-*za-sa-li-* (or the verb based on it) appears in the curse formulas in Luwian inscriptions;[199] the final part of the parallel Greek text, although damaged, suggests that the respective part of the Lycian text was indeed a curse formula.[200] This connection, if right, would define the meaning of **eseha-xla-za-* roughly as 'administration-ruler' or the like.

As for the form *pabra=ti*, it was universally taken to be a final verbal form of 3sg.pres.[201] However, the present tense does not make much sense in the context, contradicting the fact that no other present forms are attested in the *hãtahe* passage. Instead, one may separate the final *=ti*, interpreting it as a relative pronoun. This makes the syntax of the clause more transparent, as now *pabra=ti: Xbide: hrixñtawatahi:* can be taken as a relative clause characterizing *Herikle:* 'who (was) *pabra-* of the Supreme King'. The context suggests that *pabra-* is a noun describing the relationship of Herikle to the Persian King. The simplest possibility would be to take it as 'representative', but a more specific meaning, for instance a military title, 'general' (στρατηγός) or the like, would also be thinkable. An alternative possibility is suggested by the form *pabla-* attested in TL 89: 4, which theoretically may be based on the same root. *Contra* usual perception,[202] the verb cannot mean 'chase', as it is connected with *tijãi* which can be interpreted as 'penalties' or simply as 'payments', as in all likelihood it is based on *ti-* 'pay'. Consequently, *pabla-* denotes an action of providing payments. Then the verb can be well connected with Luwian *pabra-* which Melchert recently connected with PIE **b^{h}er-* 'bear, carry'.[203] The noun *pabra-* can be interpreted as 'tribute-bearing, tributary'. This interpretation allows in fact to take *pabra-* together with *sehaxlaza* and to interpret the combination as a 'tributary city governor'. More evidence is needed, however, to decide between these possibilities.

---

197 *Cf.* discussions in Hawkins 2000, 279 and 418.

198 For LIS.DOMINUS and GAL (LÚ.MEŠ)*MUBARRI* see Hawkins in Herbordt 2005, 299–300 with further refs.

199 *Cf.* Oreshko 2013, 379–380 with n. 88–90.

200 The line is read by Kalinka as ....*sehi: Trm̃mili esehi*. However, it is not excluded that the broken word is *itlehi* as the 'Lycian *itlehi* (spirits, *cf.* above)' regularly appear in the curse formulas, *cf.*, e.g., TL 88, 5: *itlehi tubeiti Trm̃mili huwedri*. If correct, this enhances the chances that Lycian *esehi* corresponds to HLuw. LIS-*za-sa-li-*. However, one may note that the possible parallelism of the clauses may suggest that *esehi* corresponds in a way to *huwedri* 'all' implying that the former may be a derivative of *ese*.

201 *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v.

202 *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. and Neumann 2007, s.v.

203 Melchert 2016, 203–206.

Proceeding to the military part of the clause one may note that the indirect object of the verb *ese tabãna* can be nobody else than Herikle, which agrees well with the general historical context: as a governor of Kaunos connected with the Persian king, Herikle was a natural ally of a Lycian dynast under the Persian rule. As for the two toponyms and one ethnonym mentioned in the clause, *Ijãnã* (acc. sg.), possibly collective, clearly represent the virtual object of the military action and, as *Ijalusas* is a Greek city, it would be natural to perceive *Ijãnã Ijalusas* as a single unit, interpreting *Ijãnã* in general as 'Greeks' rather than specifically as 'Ionians' (Ialysos was a Doric city). It is quite unlikely that *Ijalusas* is acc. pl., as it is difficult to reconcile this form with the syntax of the clause. No more likely is that it is simply a Lycian rendering of the nominative form of Greek Ἰαλυσός. However, a close parallel to the combination is found in *teteri: Arñnas* (nom.) in N320, 31–32 which corresponds to Greek Ξάνθιοι. Given this correspondence and the form *Arñnase* in 44c, 19 one may interpret *Ijalusas* as a derivative of *Ijalusa-* with the ethnic suffix *-s-* corresponding to Luwian *-izza/i-*; the lack of any explicit indications of the case is due, as it seems, to its agreement with *Ijãnã*.[204] Accordingly, *Ijãnã Ijalusas* can be interpreted as 'Ialysian Greek(s)'. As for *Krzz[ã]nase* (possibly loc.), it serves most probably as an indication of the place of the battle. As a result, the entire section may be translated as follows: 'of the victory over the Ialysian Greek(s) at Chersonesos, when he joined with *Herikle*, the city governor, *pabra-* of the Supreme King at Kaunos'.

10. Section 8: *trbbetẽ*

8) *Mukale: tewẽtẹ: Sãma=*[54]*ti: trbbetẽ: Turaxssi: zxxãna terñ: es*[55]*e: Humrxxã: tebãna terñ: hãtahe*

The geographical context of this section is one of the most specific and curious ones of the whole *hãtahe* passage. One has long recognized that *Mukale* refers to Mount Mykale – a mountainous promontory halfway between Miletus and Ephesus – and *Sãma* to the island Samos lying just across the narrow strait. Given this geographical setting, the word between *Mukale* and *Sãma*, *tewẽtẹ*, could be naturally interpreted as 'facing',[205] i.e. 'Mykale facing Samos' (or vice versa). The last touch to this picture has been recently added by Thonemann and Burgin, who independently from each other proposed an identification of *Turaxssi* with Mount Thorax (Θώραξ) lying just to the north-east of Mykale (mod. Gürüş Dağ).[206] Now, the suggested re-interpretation of the verb *ese … tebe-* clarifies the last ambiguous element of the clause, *trbbetẽ*, and the entire sequence of the events described.

The last part of the clause (*ese: Humrxxã: tebãna terñ*) refers to *joining forces* with Amorges, the Persian satrap of Lydia, as already discussed above; given the fact that this action appears in the text *after* the mention of a fighting (*zxxãna*), it was apparently an important if not crucial event which led to the victory. The question is who was the opponent of the author and Amorges. It is clear that it can be neither *Turaxssi* nor *Mukale* as both represent not political entities (cities or regions) but geographical features. As *Turaxssi* is mentioned immediately before *zxxãna*, it can be naturally identified as the place of the battle ('at Thorax'). In contrast, Samos is both a geographical feature and political entity and in all probability, it was the *people* of Samos who

[204] *Cf.* Schürr (1998, 153), who takes the form to be acc. pl. Melchert (2004, s.v. *Arñnas-*) who interpreted it as 'Xanthos'. For different ethnic suffixes *cf.* Eichner 2005, 36. The clearest case of the ethnicon in *-s* is found in N312: *Zemuris* = Λιμυρευς. It may be further assumed for *Kerθθis* in TL 82; for *Medese* found in TL 29, 7 ('Median(s)') and for *Ijãnisñ* in 44b, 27, which (*contra* Melchert's [2004, s.v.] interpretation 'Ionia') should represent an ethnic name parallel to the following *Sppartazi*: *Atãna*[*zi*] (as well as preceding [.....]°*isñ*). Lastly, it is quite possible that *Trm̃mis-* 'Lycia' represents etymologically a similar derivative with suffix *-s-*. It is not excluded that both the forms on *-zi* and with *-s* belong to the same paradigm, but the origin of the formal difference is not quite clear.

[205] *Cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v.

[206] Thonemann 2009, 178; Burgin 2010.

fought against the author and Amorges at Thorax. However, *Sãma* itself cannot be taken as the direct object of *zxxãna* either syntactically or grammatically; semantically it is dubious either. Consequently, *trbbetẽ* can be only a *noun* in *accusative*.[207] The connection with the preposition *trbbi/tarbi* 'against' discussed above is quite obvious and the word can be interpreted accordingly as 'opponent, enemy'. Morphologically, we are dealing probably with a *collective* noun, for which a likely formal parallel in Lycian would be *xñtawata-* 'rule, kingship'; the suffix **-ta/e-* is either cognate with Luwian *-t(t)a-* or is a morphological variant of a simple dental suffix *-t/d-* cognate with Luwian *-id-* which is also attested in the formants with collective meaning.[208] Accordingly, the section may be translated as: 'of the victory when he fought at Thorax the enemy which is from Samos – (an island) facing Mykale – when (after) he joined forces with Amorges'.

11. Final translation of the *hãtahe* passage

Summarizing all the observations put forward above, one may propose the following final translation of the passage 44a, 44–55:

'… (he made) writing(s) in Lycian … script/language (and) writing(s) in Sol[ymian](?) script/language and (put them) onto the erected pillar(s):

1) '(the writing) of the victory with his (own) hand at the acropolis of the formidable Lagbos';

2) '(the writing) of the victory at the acropolis of Lower Tymnessos';

3) '(the writing) of the victory (with the help) of *Malija* at Patara';

4) '(the writing) of the victory with his (own) hand over Milesander in the neighborhood/on the plain of Kyaneiai, when he joined forces with *Trbbẽnimi* at Kyaneiai';

5) '(the writing) of the victory over the Tloan (city) in battle, when (after) *Xerẽi* made repeated raids against fortresses of Tlos';

6) '(the writing) of the victory when he joined forces with *Xerẽi* at *Medbijahe* and killed *Waxssepddimi* in the field (together with) seven hoplites within one day';

7) '(the writing) of the victory over the Ialysian Greek(s) at Chersonesos, when he joined forces with *Herikle*, the city governor, *pabra-* of the Supreme King at Kaunos';

8) '(the writing) of the victory when he fought at Thorax (against) the enemy which is from Samos – (an island) facing Mykale – and when he joined forces with Amorges'.

Acknowledgements

The paper is written as a part of the project 'The Trojan Catalogue (Hom. Il. 2.816–877) and the Peoples of western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age. A Study of the Homeric Text in the Light of Hittite Sources and Classical Geographical Tradition' (2015/19/P/HS3/04161), which has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 665778 with the National Science Centre, Poland.

Funded by
the European Union

[207] Thus *contra* earlier perceptions as a verb, *cf.* Melchert 2004, s.v. *trbbe-* and Neumann 2007, s.v.

[208] For the Luwian suffixes *cf.* Melchert 2003, 196 and 198. However, the picture as presented there is not free of confusion and the question of dental suffixes in Luwic needs further clarification.

Bibliography

ACLT = Yakubovich, I. (online): *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts*. http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/ (accessed: 12 October 2021).

Adiego, I. J. 2005: Licio *ñ* y *m̃*. In: Schweiger, G. (ed.): *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmidt. Indische, Iranische und Indogermanische Studien dem Verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*. Taimering, 1–13.

Adiego, I. J. 2007: *The Carian Language*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/86) Leiden – Boston. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004152816.i-526

Bachvarova, M. 2013: *CTH* 767.7 – The Birth Ritual of Pittei: Its Occasion and the Use of Luwianisms. In: Mouton, A. – Rutherford, I. – Yakubovich, I. (eds.): *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean*. (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 64) Leiden – Boston, 135–157. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004253414_008

Beekes, R. 2010: *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 10) Leiden – Boston.

Benndorf, O. 1892. Bericht über eine Reise im Orient. Nr. XVII–XVIII. *Anzeiger der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe* 29, 59–74.

Borchhardt, J. – Eichner, H. – Pesditschek, M. – Ruggendorfer, P. 1997–1999: Archäologisch-sprachwissenschaftliches Corpus der Denkmäler mit lykischer Schrift. *Anzeiger der Philosophisch-Historischen Klasse. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften* 134/2, 11–96.

Boroday, S. – Yakubovich, I. 2018: Hittite local adverbs in comparative perspective. In: Rieken, E. (ed.): *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen: Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 23. September 2015 in Marburg*. Wiesbaden, 1–22.

Bousquet, J. 1975: Arbinas, fils de Gergis, dynaste de Xanthos. *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 119, 138–150. https://doi.org/10.3406/crai.1975.13101

Bousquet, J. 1992: Les inscriptions gréco-lyciennes. In: Metzger, H. (ed.): *Fouilles de Xanthos IX*. Paris, 149–208.

Burgin, J. 2010: A Geographical Note on the Xanthos Stele. *Kadmos* 49, 181–186. https://doi.org/10.1515/kadmos.2010.011

Carruba, O. 1969: *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*. (Incunabula Graeca 32) Roma.

Carruba, O. 1977: Commentario alla trilingue licio-greco-aramaica di Xanthos. *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 18, 273–318.

CHD = Güterbock, H. G. – Hoffner, H. A. – van den Hout, Th. P. J. (eds.) 1980–: *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago.

Childs, W. 1981: Lycian relations with Persians and Greeks in the fifth and fourth centuries reexamined. *Anatolian Studies* 31, 55–80. https://doi.org/10.2307/3642758

Christiansen, B. 2019: Editions of Lycian Inscriptions not Included in Melchert's Corpus from 2001. In: Adiego, I.-X. – García Trabazo, J. V. – Vernet, M. – Obrador-Cursach, B. – Martínez Rodríguez, E. (eds.): *Luwic dialects and Anatolian: Inheritance and diffusion*. (Barcino Monographica Orientalia 12 = Series Anatolica et Indogermanica 1) Barcelona, 65–134.

Conder, C. R. 1891: The Lycian Language. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1891, 607–686. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00021353

Deecke, W. 1888: Lykische Studien IV. *Bezzenbergers Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 14, 181–242.

Demargne, P. 1958: *Fouilles de Xanthos I: Les piliers funéraires*. Paris.

Domingo Gygax, M. – Tietz, W. 2005: 'He Who of All Mankind Set up the Most Numerous Trophies to Zeus': The Inscribed Pillar of Xanthos Reconsidered. *Anatolian Studies* 55, 89–98. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066154600000661

Dönmez, A. – Schürr, D. 2015: Zum Agora-Pfeiler in Xanthos IV. Finding a new fragment of the inscription and evidence pointing to a temenos tomb. *Kadmos* 54, 119–149. https://doi.org/10.1515/kadmos-2015-0007

Eichner, H. 1993: Probleme von Vers und Metrum in epichorischer Dichtung Altkleinasiens. In: Dobesch, G. – Rehrenböck, G. (eds.): *Die epigraphische und altertumskundliche Erforschung Kleinasiens. Hundert Jahre Kleinasiatische Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Akten des Symposiums vom 23. bis 25. Oktober 1990.* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-historische Klasse Denkschriften 236 = Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris 14) Wien, 97–169.

Eichner, H. 2005: Die philologische Evidenz. In: Borchhardt, J. – Eichner, H. – Schulz, K.: *Kerththi oder der Versuch, eine antike Siedlung der Klassik in Zentrallykien zu identifizieren.* (Adalya Supplementary Series 3) Antalya, 19–37.

Eichner, H. 2006: Neues zum lykischen Text der Stele von Xanthos (TL 44). In: Dörtlük, K. – Varkivanç, B. – Kahya, T. – des Courtils, J. – Doğan-Alparslan, M. – Boyraz, R. (eds.): *III. Uluslararası Likya Sempozyumu. Sempozyum Bildirileri I. The IIIrd International Symposium on Lycia. Symposium Proceedings I.* Antalya, 231–238.

Faucounau, J. 1988: Quelques remarques sur inscription lycienne du pilier inscrit de Xanthos. In: Arbeitman, Y. L. (ed.): *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz. Studies in Anatolian, Italic and Other Indo-European Languages.* Louvain-la-Neuve, 163–177.

Fellows, Ch. 1842: Inscribed Monument at Xanthus. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom* 2, 27–49.

Forlanini, M. 1987: Le mont Sarpa. *Hethitica* 7, 73–87.

Frei, P. 1976: Die Trilingue vom Letoon, die lykischen Zahlzeichen und das lykische Geldsystem (1). *Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau* 55, 5–17.

Frei, P. 1993: Solymer – Milyer – Termilen – Lykier. Ethnische und politische Einheiten auf der lykischen Halbinsel. In: Borchhardt, J. – Dobesch, G. (eds.): *Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposions, Wien, 6.-12. Mai 1990 I.* (Österreische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-historische Klasse Denkschriften 234 = Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris 17) Wien, 87–97.

Fuscagni, F. 2017: *Rituale der Ayatarša, Wattitti und Šušumaniga* (*CTH 390*). hethiter.net/: CTH 390 (accessed: 12 October 2021).

Gérard, R. 2006: Le(s) nom(s) de la montagne en louvite. *Res Antiquae* 3, 245–251.

Giusfredi, F. 2009: Luwian *puwa-* and cognates. *Historische Sprachforschung* 122, 60–66. https://doi.org/10.13109/hisp.2009.122.1.60

Görke, S. 2014–2015: *Das Ritual des Zarpiya aus Kizzuwatna* (*CTH 757*). hethiter.net/: CTH 757 (accessed: 12 October 2021).

Hajnal, I. 1995: *Der lykische Vokalismus. Methode und Erkenntnisse der vergleichenden anatolischen Sprachwissenschaft, angewandt auf das Vokalsystem einer Kleincorpussprache.* Graz.

Hawkins, J. D. 2000: *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age.* (Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaften NF 8.1) Berlin – New York.

Herbordt, S. 2005: *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbullen aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa. Mit Kommentaren zu den Siegelinschriften und Hieroglyphen von J. David Hawkins.* (Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 19) Mainz am Rhein.

Herbordt, S. 2009: Šauška. B. Archäologisch. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 12, 103–106.

Heubeck, A. 1982: Zur lykischen Verbalflexion. In: Tischler, J. (ed.): *Serta indogermanica*: *Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*. Innsbruck, 107–119.

Hutter, M. 2003: Aspects of Luwian Religion. In: Melchert, H. C. (ed.): *The Luwians*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/68) Leiden – Boston, 211–280. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047402145_007

Keen, A. G. 1998: *Dynastic Lycia*: *A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C.* (Mnemosyne, Supplements 178) Leiden – Boston – Köln. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004351523

Kloekhorst, A. 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5) Leiden.

Laroche, E. 1953: Nouveaux fragments de la stèle xanthienne. *Revue hittite et asianique* 55, 30–31.

Lebrun, R. 2006: Les pronoms lyciens uwe et ije. In: Bombi, R. – Cifoletti, G. – Fusco, F. – Innocente, L. – Orioles, V. (eds.): *Studi linguistici in onore di Roberto Gusmani*. Alessandria, 985–987.

LGPN = Fraser, P. M. – Matthews, E. (eds.) 1987–: *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Oxford.

LIV² = Rix, H. (ed.) ²2001: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Wiesbaden.

Lotz, H. 2017: Xerẽi, der Errichter des Inschriftenpfeilers von Xanthos. *Kadmos* 56, 139–172. https://doi.org/10.1515/kadmos-2017-0007

Martínez Rodríguez, E. 2021: Lycian *hba-*. Towards the interpretation of TL 44a.49. In: Feliu, Ll. – Millet, A. – Vidal, J. (eds.): *« Sentido de un empeño ». Homenatge a Gregorio del Olmo Lete*. (Barcino Monographica Orientalia 16) Barcelona, 295–307.

Mastrocinque, A. 2007: The Cilician God Sanda and the Greek Chimaera: Features of Near Eastern and Greek Mythology concerning the Plague. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 7, 197–217. https://doi.org/10.1163/156921207783876413

Melchert, H. C. 1992: The Middle Voice in Lycian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 105, 189–199.

Melchert, H. C. 1993: *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. (Lexica Anatolica 2) Chapel Hill.

Melchert, H. C. 2002: The God Sanda in Lycia? In: Taracha, P. (ed.): *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Warsaw, 241–251.

Melchert, H. C. 2003: Language. In: Melchert, H. C. (ed.): *The Luwians*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/68) Leiden – Boston, 170–210. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047402145_006

Melchert, H. C. 2004: *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor – New York.

Melchert, H. C. 2007: Hittite *ḫuu̯app-*, *ḫŭppā(i)-* and *ḫuppiu̯a-*. In: Groddek, D. – Zorman, M. (eds.): *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 25) Wiesbaden, 513–519.

Melchert, H. C. 2012: Luvo-Lycian Dorsal Stops Revisited. In: Sukač, R. – Šefčík, O. (eds.): *The Sound of Indo-European 2. Papers in Indo-European Phonetics, Phonemics and Morphophonemics*. München, 206–218.

Melchert, H. C. 2016: New Luvian Verb Etymologies. In: Marquardt, H. – Reichmuth, S. – García Trabazo, J. V. (eds.): *Anatolica et Indogermanica. Studia linguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicata*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 155) Innsbruck, 203–212.

Melchert, H. C. 2018: Hittite *tit(ta)nu-*, *titti-*, and Lycian *stta-*. *Chatreššar* 1, 25–33.

Melchert, H. C. (online): The Trilingual Inscription of the Létôon. Lycian Version (version December 2018). http://www.achemenet.com/dotAsset/6fb8153b-1573-49f5-bb61-ef87a2d71c72.pdf

Meriggi, P. 1936: Der Indogermanismus des Lykischen. In: Arntz, H. (ed.): *Germanen und Indogermanen. Volkstum, Sprache, Heimat, Kultur. Festschrift für Herman Hirt*. Heidelberg, 257–288.

Metzger, H. 1979: *Fouilles de Xanthos 6. La stèle trilingue du Létôon*. Paris.

Mørkholm, O. – Neumann, G. 1978: *Die lykischen Münzlegenden*. Göttingen.

Mühlbauer, L. 2007: *Lykische Grabarchitektur. Vom Holz zum Stein*. Wien.

Müseler, W. – Schürr, D. 2018: Zur Chronologie in den Inschriften auf dem Agora-Pfeiler von Xanthos (TL 44), den betroffenen Dynasten und ihren Münzen. *Klio* 100, 381–406. https://doi.org/10.1515/klio-2018-0101

Neumann, G. 1984: Beiträge zum Lykischen VI. *Die Sprache* 30, 89–95.

Neumann, G. 2007: *Glossar des Lykischen. Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von Johann Tischler.* (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 21) Wiesbaden.

Neumann, G. – Zimmermann, M. 2003: Die lykischen Götter der Agora. Neulesung der griechisch-lykischen Bilingue TL 72a-b in Kyaneai. In: Kolb, F. (ed.): *Lykische Studien 6. Feldforschungen auf dem Gebiet der Polis Kyaneai in Zentrallykien. Bericht über die Ergebnisse der Kampagnen 1996 und 1997.* (Asia Minor Studien 48) Bonn, 187–192.

Onur, F. – Tekoğlu, Ş. R. 2020: The Ancient Routes and New Lycian Inscriptions around Fethiye. *Gephyra* 19, 1–32. https://doi.org/10.37095/gephyra.647750

Oreshko, R. 2013: Hieroglyphic Inscriptions of Western Anatolia: Long Arm of the Empire or Vernacular Tradition(s)? In: Mouton, A. – Rutherford, I. – Yakubovich, I. (eds.): *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean.* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 64) Leiden – Boston, 345–420. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004253414_017

Oreshko, R. 2016: *Studies in Hieroglyphic Luwian: Towards a Philological and Historical Reinterpretation of the SÜDBURG inscription*. Doktorarbeit (Freie Universität Berlin). Microfiche publication. Berlin.

Oreshko, R. 2019a: Luwian word for 'place, plot of land' and Lycian *alaha-, aladehal(i), *aladehxxa-* and *miñti-*. *Münchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 73, 81–120.

Oreshko, R. 2019b: Phonetic value of Lydian letter <d> revisited and the development of PIE **d* in Lydian. *Wékʷos* 4, 191–262.

Oreshko, R. 2020: Ethnic Groups and Language Contact in Lycia (I): the 'Maritime Interface'. *Journal of Language Relationship* 18, 13–40. https://doi.org/10.31826/jlr-2020-181-205

Oreshko, R. forthcoming: Gods of the Lydians and the Question of Lydian Ethnocultural Identity. In: Oreshko, R. – Cahill, N. (eds.): *Between Sardis and Gordion*: *Aspects of Culture and Society in pre-Hellenistic Lydia and Phrygia*.

Poetto, M. 2010: Un nuovo verbo luvio-geroglifico: *zapa-*, e la sua correlazione al luvio cuneiforme *zapp*(*a*)-. In: Kim, R. – Oettinger, N. – Rieken, E. – Weiss, M. (eds.): *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday.* Ann Arbor – New York, 296–302.

Puhvel, J. 1991: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary 3. Words beginning with H.* Berlin – New York. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110848106

Rutherford, I. 2017: Sandas in Translation. In: Mouton, A. (ed.): *Hittitology Today*: *Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100th Birthday. L'hittitologie aujourd'hui*: *Études sur l'Anatolie hittite et néo-hittite à l'occasion du centenaire de la naissance d'Emmanuel Laroche. 5èmes Rencontres d'Archéologie de l'IFÉA, Istanbul 21-22 novembre 2014.* Istanbul, 81–100. https://doi.org/10.4000/books.ifeagd.3488

Savelsberg, M. J. 1878: *Beiträge zur Entzifferung der lykischen Sprachdenkmäler. Zweiter Theil: Erklärung von 55 lykischen Inschriften*. Bonn. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112435403

Schürr, D. 1997: Luwisch-lykische Wettergottformeln. *Die Sprache* 39, 59–73. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-60511-6_2

Schürr, D. 1998: Kaunos in lykischen Inschriften. *Kadmos* 37, 143–162. https://doi.org/10.1515/kadm.1998.37.1-2.143

Schürr, D. 2007a: Formen der Akkulturation in Lykien: Griechisch-lykische Sprachbeziehungen. In: Schuler, Ch. (ed.): *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien*: *Eine Zwischenbilanz. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums München, 24.-26. Februar 2005*. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenchaften Philosophisch-historische Klasse Denkschriften 354 = Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris 25) Wien, 27–40.

Schürr, D. 2007b: Zum Agora-Pfeiler in Xanthos I. Anschluss eines weiteren Fragments. *Kadmos* 46, 109–124. https://doi.org/10.1515/KADMOS.2007.006

Schürr, D. 2009: Zum Agora-Pfeiler in Xanthos II. Selbstlob auf Perserart und Ordnung des Raumes. *Kadmos* 48, 157–176. https://doi.org/10.1515/kadmos.2009.009

Schürr, D. 2014a: Lykisch-Griechisches. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 47, 133–139.

Schürr, D. 2014b [2016]: Ist lykisch *stta-* ein Erb- oder ein Lehnwort? *Historische Sprachforschung* 127, 141–149. https://doi.org/10.13109/hisp.2014.127.1.141

Serangeli, M. 2015: Lessico e *Wortbildung* indoeuropea in licio. Il caso di *asaxlaza-*, *xal-*/*xla*(*i*)- 'avere controllo su, dominare' e *$*h_2el$-*. In: Dupraz, E. – Sowa, W. (eds.): *Genres épigraphiques et langues d'attestation fragmentaire dans l'espace méditerranéen*. Rouen, 165–176.

Serangeli, M. 2016: Lykisch *hijãnaxã*. *Münchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 70, 61–73.

Sideltsev, A. – Yakubovich, I. 2016: The Origin of Lycian Indefinite Pronouns and Its Phonological Implications. *Münchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 70, 75–124.

Starke, F. 1990: *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschriftluwischen Nomens*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31) Wiesbaden.

Süel, A. 2014: Tarhunnaradu/Tarhundaradu in the Ortaköy Texts. In: Taracha, P. (ed.): *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, September 5–9, 2011*. Warsaw, 932–942.

TAM I = Kalinka, E. 1901: *Tituli Lyciae lingua lycia conscripti* (Tituli Asiae Minoris 1) Vindobona.

Tekoğlu, R. 2006: TL 29: Una nuova proposta di lettura. In: Bombi, R. – Cifoletti, G. – Fusco, F. – Innocente, L. – Orioles, V. (eds.): *Studi linguistici in onore di Roberto Gusmani*. Alessandria, 1703–1710.

Tekoğlu, R. 2017: Old and Newly Discovered Lycian Inscriptions from Tlos. In: Mouton, A. (ed.): *Hittitology Today*: *Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100th Birthday. L'hittitologie aujourd'hui*: *Études sur l'Anatolie hittite et néo-hittite à l'occasion du centenaire de la naissance d'Emmanuel Laroche. 5èmes Rencontres d'Archéologie de l'IFÉA, Istanbul 21-22 novembre 2014*. Istanbul, 63–69. https://doi.org/10.4000/books.ifeagd.3472

Thomsen, V. L. P. 1899: Études lyciennes. *Oversigt over det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs forhandlinger* 1899/1, 1–77.

Thonemann, P. 2009: Lycia, Athens and Amorges. In: Ma, J. – Parker, R. – Papazarkadas, N. (eds.): *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*. London, 167–194.

Tischler, J. 1991–1994: *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar* III. T, D. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 20) Innsbruck.

de Vaan, M. 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 7) Leiden – Boston.

Yakubovich, I. 2005: Carian Monument. In: Kazanskij, N. N. (ed.): *Hṛdā̆ Mánasā: sbornik stateĭ k 70-letiju so dnja rozhdenija professora Leonarda Georgievicha Gertsenberga*. Sankt-Peterburg, 240–251.

Yakubovich, I. 2013: Anatolian Names in -*wiya* and the Structure of Empire Luwian Onomastics. In: Mouton, A. – Rutherford, I. – Yakubovich, I. (eds.): *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean.* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 64) Leiden – Boston, 87–123. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004253414_006

Yakubovich, I. 2013–2014: The Luwian deity Kwanza. *Aramazd* 8, 282–297.

Yakubovich, I. 2015: Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia. *Anatolian Studies* 65, 35–53. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066154615000010

Yakubovich, I. 2017: The Luwian Title of the Great King. In: Mouton, A. (ed.): *Hittitology Today*: *Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100th Birthday. L'hittitologie aujourd'hui*: *Études sur l'Anatolie hittite et néo-hittite à l'occasion du centenaire de la naissance d'Emmanuel Laroche. 5èmes Rencontres d'Archéologie de l'IFÉA, Istanbul 21-22 novembre 2014*. Istanbul, 39–50. https://doi.org/10.4000/books.ifeagd.3452

Zgusta, L. 1984: *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen.* (Beiträge zur Namenforschung, Beiheft 21) Heidelberg.

HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME 2 | ISSUE 1 | 2021

HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW

ON THE COVER:
The pillared sarcophagus and the Harpy Tomb, Xanthos
Photo: Diether Schürr.

HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME 2, ISSUE 1
2021

Institute of Archaeological Sciences
Institute of Ancient and Classical Studies
Eötvös Loránd University
Budapest

HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW

HAR – Hungarian Assyriological Review

Journal of the Institute of Archaeological Sciences and the Institute of Ancient and Classical Studies (Department of Assyriology and Hebrew Studies), Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

HAR is a peer-reviewed electronic journal (HU ISSN 2732-2610) published in two issues per year. The journal covers the philology and the archaeology of the Ancient Near East, publishing research articles, brief notes, and field reports.

Papers in HAR are published under the platinum open access model, which means permanent and free access in downloadable format (pdf) for readers and no publication fees for authors. The issues can be both downloaded for free and ordered as printed volumes at own cost.

For article submission guidelines, see https://harjournal.com/author-guidelines/

Editorial board

Editor-in-chief *(szerkesztésért felelős személy)*:
Gábor Kalla, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

Associate editors:
Zsombor J. Földi, *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München*
Zsolt Simon, *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München*

Editorial board:
Tamás Dezső, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*
Gábor Zólyomi, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

Technical editor:
Attila Király

Publisher *(kiadó és kiadásért felelős személy)*:
Gábor Kalla, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

Registered office *(a kiadó székhelye)*:
Institute of Archaeological Sciences, Múzeum krt. 4/B., 1088 Budapest, Hungary

Email address:
info@harjournal.com

Design and typesetting:
Attila Király (attila@litikum.hu)
using Noto font family by Google Inc., under the terms of the SIL Open Font License.

CONTENTS

Hungarian Assyriological Review

volume 2, issue 1, 2021

Vorwort 9
Zsolt Simon

Lycian *Wexssere*, *Waxssepddimi* and related forms 11
Ignasi-Xavier Adiego

Palaeographic dating of Lycian inscriptions.
A critical review of former studies and a new approach 27
Birgit Christiansen

Lycian relative clauses 65
H. Craig Melchert

The distribution of *-a-* and *-e-* in the Lycian genitival adjective suffix 77
Stefan Norbruis

Observations on the Xanthos trilingual: syntactic structure of TL 44a, 41–55
and the Lycian terminology of art and war 95
Rostislav Oreshko

Worttrennung in den lykischen Inschriften 145
Annick Payne

Die Deutung von lykisch *terñ* und ihre Konsequenz für die Kriegspolitik Lykiens 161
David Sasseville

Überlegungen zu lykischen Inschriften bei Kadyanda 173
Diether Schürr

Once again on the etymology of the Lycian personal name *Trbbẽnime/i-* 183
Matilde Serangeli

Ḫinduwa: Kindye oder Kandyba? 197
Zsolt Simon

Hungarian Assyriological Review author guidelines 205

Vorwort

Zsolt Simon*

* – Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. Email: zsltsimon@gmail.com

Die Erforschung der altanatolischen Sprachen findet an der Schnittstelle zwischen Altorientalistik und Indogermanistik statt und in beiden Disziplinen gehört dieser Sprachzweig zweifellos zu den Bereichen, in denen die Forschung besonders intensiv voranschreitet.

Dies zeigen auch die Entwicklungen der letzten Jahrzehnte, innerhalb derer sich die luwische Philologie von einem Nischenthema der Hethitologie zu einer der wichtigsten Teildisziplinen der Altanatolistik entwickelt hat.

Im Schatten des Luwischen, das seine Popularität innerhalb der Forschungsgemeinschaft u.a. auch spektakulären Inschriftenfunden verdankt, steht jedoch die ebenfalls schnell voranschreitende Erforschung seiner Schwestersprache, des Lykischen (und seiner Varietäten). Um den Austausch über die zahlreichen neuen Ergebnisse zu diesem Thema innerhalb eines angemessenen Forums zu fördern und der Forschung weitere Impulse zu geben, wurde dem Lykischen im Rahmen des Wörterbuchprojekts „*The Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*“ am Institut für Assyriologie und Hethitologie der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München ein zweitägiger internationaler Workshop („*Current Research on Lycian*“, 16.-17. Februar 2017) gewidmet.

Erfreulicherweise traf unsere Einladung auf positive Resonanz und der Workshop wurde durch viele interessante Beiträge von führenden Expertinnen und Experten des Lykischen und auch aus der jüngeren Generation der Wissenschaft bereichert.

Diese Ausgabe der *Hungarian Assyriological Review* enthält die überarbeitete Fassung eines Großteils der Vorträge dieses Workshops (einige Vorträge wurden bzw. werden aus unterschiedlichen Gründen an anderen Stellen veröffentlicht). Wie in der Altanatolistik üblich, besprechen die Beiträge nicht nur sprachwissenschaftliche Probleme, sondern befassen sich auch mit verwandten Fragestellungen u.a. der alten Geschichte, der Prosopographie, der historischen Geographie und der Numismatik. Daher hoffen wir, dass dieser Band nicht nur innerhalb der historischen Sprachwissenschaften, sondern auch für Interessierte aus benachbarten Disziplinen eine interessante Lektüre bieten kann. Ein vielversprechender Dialog ergibt sich zudem aus dem Umstand, dass einige im Band angesprochene Forschungsthemen gleich von mehreren Autoren aus unterschiedlichen Perspektiven behandelt werden.

Schließlich möchte ich meinen aufrichtigen Dank für diejenigen ausdrücken, ohne die der Workshop und dieser Band nicht hätten zustande kommen können. Hier ist zunächst die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft zu nennen, die durch die Finanzierung des *eDiAna*-Wörterbuchprojekts den dazugehörigen Workshop überhaupt erst ermöglicht hat. Für die Unterstützung bei der reibungslosen Organisation des Workshops danke ich außerdem meinen Kolleginnen Anja Busse und Tatiana Frühwirt sowie insbesondere der ehemaligen Institutssekretärin Regine Reichenbach. Des Weiteren bin ich meinen Mitherausgebern des *Hungarian Assyriological Review* dankbar, die freundlicherweise bereit waren, die Ergebnisse des Workshops in unserer Zeitschrift zu veröffentlichen. Nicht zuletzt gilt mein Dank allen Vortragenden und den Autorinnen und Autoren dieses Bandes, insbesondere für ihre Geduld während der langen Vorbereitungszeit vor der Veröffentlichung.