

New approaches on Anatolian linguistics

José Virgilio García Trabazo, Ignasi-Xavier Adiego,
Mariona Vernet, Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach,
Susana Soler (eds.)



New approaches on Anatolian
linguistics

BARCINO MONOGRAPHICA ORIENTALIA

Volum 22
2023



Institut del Pròxim Orient Antic (IPOA)
Facultat de Filologia
Universitat de Barcelona

New approaches on Anatolian linguistics

José Virgilio García Trabazo, Ignasi-Xavier Adiego,
Mariona Vernet, Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach,
Susana Soler (eds.)



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA

Edicions

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Foreword</i> | 9 |
| José Virgilio García Trabazo | |
| <i>A new Lycian ruler</i> | 13 |
| Ignasi-Xavier Adiego | |
| <i>Updated corpus of the Lycian coins from Kandyba</i> | 31 |
| Manuela Anelli | |
| <i>The grammatical function of Lycian enclitic -ti in the light of Greek sources</i> | 49 |
| Birgit Christiansen | |
| <i>The wood for the trees: on Lydian laqriša and Aramaic drḥt</i> | 65 |
| Diego Corral Valera – Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach | |
| <i>A new Sidetic coin legend: revisiting an unnoticed specimen from the Gazipaşa hoard</i> | 77 |
| Gem Ferrer Pérez | |
| <i>Hittite tarai^{-bhi}, dariija^{-mi} ‘to become weary, to weary oneself, exert oneself’, Greek τέιπο/ε-, Latin tero/e-</i> | 97 |
| José Luis García Ramón | |
| <i>New interpretations in Lydian phonology</i> | 115 |
| Alwin Kloekhorst | |
| <i>Again on the Xanthos Pillar hātahe. Between combinatory analysis and Greek epigraphic interference</i> | 135 |
| Elena Martínez Rodríguez | |
| <i>The Syntax of Universal Quantifiers in Luwic (and Hittite)</i> | 151 |
| H. Craig Melche | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>hi-Konjugation und imperfektiver Aspekt im Luwischen und Hethitischen</i> | 175 |
| Norbert Oettinger | |
| <i>The Anatolian glosses in the Akkadian medical texts from Boğazköy and the sociolinguistic situation of the late imperial Hattuša</i> | 183 |
| Valerio Pisaniello – Federico Giusfredi | |
| <i>Luwian /w/ and ⟨p⟩: Second Thoughts</i> | 201 |
| Elisabeth Rieken | |
| <i>Some terms for the funerary monuments of Lycia in the Classical period 2: ñtipa</i> | 217 |
| Martin Seyer – Mariona Vernet | |
| <i>Egyptian in Carian transmission: Towards a better understanding of Carian vocalism</i> | 241 |
| Zsolt Simon | |
| <i>A Lycian-Greek bilingual funerary Inscription from Tlos</i> | 253 |
| Recai Tekoglu – Tamer Korkut | |
| <i>Drive for power and the Indo-European source of Luwian muwa-</i> | 265 |
| Miguel Valério | |
| <i>The theonym ‘King of Kaunos’ revisited: A comparative analysis from epigraphic sources</i> | 293 |
| Mariona Vernet | |
| <i>Changing colour as pollution in Hittite and Luwian incantations: From metaphor to semantic shift</i> | 317 |
| Ilya Yakubovich | |
| <i>Word Index</i> | 335 |
| <i>Citation Index</i> | 353 |

Foreword

This volume brings together the culmination of the philological and linguistic work undertaken by a wide range of experts in Anatolian languages. These works are framed by the following coordinated projects, funded by the Spanish State Research Agency: *Los dialectos lúvicos del grupo anatolio: escritura, gramática, léxico, onomástica* (PGC2018-098037-B-C21), coordinated by the Universitat de Barcelona; and *Los dialectos lúvicos del grupo anatolio: gramática, léxico* (PGC2018-098037-B-C22), coordinated by the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.

The research papers published here cover practically the entire linguistic and chronological spectrum of the Anatolian group of Indo-European languages, without neglecting the important interactions with languages from another cultural environment, among which the Semitic group stands out. Valerio Pisaniello and Federico Giusfredi's contribution on Anatolian glosses in Akkadian medical texts clearly illustrates the sociolinguistic importance of this interaction between different traditions. In the context of the first millennium, the article by Diego Corral Valera and Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach on trees associated with funerary monuments in the light of the Lydian-Aramaic bilingual inscription LW 1 provides us with another valuable example of Anatolian-Semitic interaction.

Many articles address linguistic and etymological problems in Anatolian languages in the second millennium. Elisabeth Rieken's contribution deals with the systematic treatment of an (ortho-)graphic anomaly that had already intrigued G. Neumann 25 years ago: the occurrence of <p> in several Luwian terms in places where a graphic reflection of the glide /w/ would generally be expected; the solution adopted has far-reaching consequences for the assessment of historical Luwian phonetics. José Luis García Ramón examines the Indo-European etymology of

Hitt. *tarai-^{hhi}*, *darija-^{mi}* ‘to weary oneself, become worn, exert one-self’, providing strong reasons for its derivation from PIE **terh₁-* ‘to rub’. Norbert Oettinger discusses the relationship between the assignment of Anatolian verbal themes to the *hi*-conjugation and the morphological expression of the imperfective aspect in Hittite and Luwian, arguing that reduplicated verbal themes play a decisive role in this process. H. Craig Melchert’s work presents a pioneering analysis of the syntax of universal quantifiers in Hittite and Luwian, based on the observation that a different predicative order of these quantifiers indicates a functional difference. Melchert argues that the anteposed predicative position has the same intensifying value as in Classical Greek. Two further works on Anatolian in the second millennium increase our understanding of ‘subjective culture’, particularly in the domains of power and sacredness. Miguel Valério undertakes an in-depth study, assessing all relevant philological data, of the origin and Indo-European etymology of Luw. *muwa-*. His suggestion helps to clarify the evolutionary history of terms of major importance in the fields of onomastics, royal power and kinship. Ilya Yakubovich, bringing forth his research on Luwian incantations embedded in Hittite instructions, presents a study of the Luwian abstract noun *halliš-*, hitherto translated as ‘sickness, pain’. Examining Mesopotamian ritual parallels, Yakubovich argues that it must be understood as ‘defilement’ or ‘pollution’. The etymological analysis agrees with the ritual context to metaphorically associate the colours black and yellow with these harmful concepts.

Most of the studies in the volume are devoted to research on Anatolian languages in the first millennium, reflecting the great expansion of the field in recent years. The articles dedicated to the Lycian language and its cultural context are particularly noteworthy. The contribution by Ignasi-Xavier Adiego addresses the interpretation of the name of a Lycian ruler recently attested in coin inscriptions. The correct reading, *Arssāma*, points to a Persian name, but an autochthonous origin of the ruler cannot be completely ruled out. Manuela Anelli presents an update of the Lycian coin corpus from Kandyba, examining in depth epigraphic and morphological issues associated with the toponymy attested in the inscriptions. Birgit Christiansen continues her previous research on Lycian funerary inscriptions, discussing earlier interpretations of the grammatical function of the enclitic *-ti*. In her perspective, the enclitic must be interpreted as a reflexive particle, in parallel with those found in Anatolian languages in the second millennium. Elena Martínez Rodríguez reviews the most recent epigraphic and linguistic research on the trilingual pillar of Xanthos (Lycian, Milyan, Greek). She suggests analysing the locative plural *hātahe* through a lexicalised adjective **hātahi* ‘burial ground, cemetery’, an issue that has significant implications concerning interactions with the

Greek cultural sphere. The study by Taner Korkut and Recai Tekoğlu on a bilingual Lycian-Greek funerary inscription from the acropolis of Tlos concerns the same Greek-Anatolian interface. The authors provide transcription, translation, and commentary, with emphasis on the analysis of personal onomastics. Lycian funerary inscriptions are paid attention by Martin Seyer and Mariona Vernet, who thoroughly examine previous proposals for the etymological and semantic interpretation of the term *ñtipa*. Considering the archaeological context, the authors defend the interpretation of *ñtipa tezi* as ‘added burial place’. In another contribution, Mariona Vernet examines the theonym ‘King of Kaunos’ in all relevant epigraphic contexts. After discussing previous interpretations, she concludes that the theonym in fact refers to the Carian deity /Kandawats Kabidš/, whose name would be based on the common appellative of ‘king’ or ‘lord’, in the manner of the Canaanite *Baʿal*. Alwin Kloekhorst’s contribution is a critical update of recent research on the phonology of the Lydian language. Although the author defines his work as a synchronic analysis, his new proposals, for both the vowel system – which considerably simplifies the system of tonic vowels presented by Melchert in 1994 – and the consonant system – with between 14 and 19 phonemes – are based both on diachronic analysis and on external onomastic comparison, especially from the Greek tradition. Two other ‘minor’ Anatolian languages are paid attention in the volume: Zsolt Simon observes the behaviour of Carian orthography vis-à-vis the Egyptian terms it transmits, concluding that Carian preserved the stressed vowels and left the unstressed ones unnoted, except for the [i] in the posttonic syllable. Finally, the Sidetic language is addressed by Gem Ferrer Pérez, who presents an exhaustive study of a Sidetic coin legend found in a hitherto unpublished specimen from the Gazipaşa hoard.

This volume can therefore be regarded as a valuable contribution to Anatolian and Indo-European studies, reflecting the constant and sustained efforts of a group of researchers with a wide range of interests, some of whom have many years of research behind them and are well known in the field. They have now been joined by new scholars, who enable us to foresee a promising future for our disciplines, despite the uncertainties that threaten us.

I would not like to end without expressing by deepest gratitude to the authors for their contributions, and the co-editors Ignasi-Xavier Adiego, Mariona Vernet, Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach and Susana Soler for their unwavering enthusiasm and courage in bringing this work to completion.

José Virgilio García Trabazo
Santiago de Compostela, February 2023

A new Lycian ruler

Ignasi-Xavier Adiego

Institut Universitari del Pròxim Orient Antic (Universitat de Barcelona)

§ 1. In a recent auction by DEMOS (Auction 5, lots 151 and 154, 30/10/2021), two specimens of the same coin were sold. Both specimens were presented as having originated in Xanthos because the legend on the reverse, written in Lycian, was interpreted as ARNNA, i.e., *arñna*, the Lycian name for Xanthos.

Below we present the photos and a description of the coins, together with an interpretation of the coin legend (the description on both coins is identical and seems to have been created by the same obverse and reverse dies):



Fig. 1. DEMOS, Auction 5, Lot 151



Fig. 1. DEMOS, Auction 5, Lot 154

“LYCIA. Dynast of Xanthos (Silver 0.87 g, 12 mm) Obol, circa 410–400 B.C.

Head of Athena right in crested helmet, border of dots.

Rev: Head of Apollo right, behind head diskeles left, the whole in dotted incuse circle.

Lycian legend around (Lycian legend ARNNA). BMC Xanthos 106 125-3.

Arnna [sic] (Xanthos) means sunlight in the Lycian language; the Lycians called Xsanthos [sic] in their language Arnna. Xanthos is a Greek name.”¹

Upon examination of the reverse of both coins, it is clear that the reading *arñna* must be ruled out. The correct reading, beyond any doubt, is *arss()ãma*. *Arssãma* is a name that is clearly Iranian in origin. See Old Persian *Ršãma-* (*a-r-š-a-m-*) < **Rša-ama-* “with the strength of a hero” (Schmitt 2014: 238 and references), attested in Greek as Ἀρσάμης and present in two Lycian inscriptions, as we will see later.

To my knowledge, this is the first time the name *arssãma* has been identified on a Lycian coin. As is not unusual, however, this coin legend had previously been examined, but was erroneously read and interpreted. Two trihemioobols appear in Müseler (2016: 158), VII, 35 and VII, 36, which are both attributed to the city of Xanthos and show exactly the same iconography on both sides. Müseler’s reading of both coin legends is “arNn – xma (??)”:

1. This etymological interpretation of Arñna as meaning “sunlight” lacks any linguistic basis. Most probably it is a free interpretation of the Hittite deity’s name “the Solar Goddess of Arinna” (as is well known, Arinna is a place name without etymology).



Fig. 3: Müseler 2016, VII, 35 and 36

Müseler does not provide a transcription, and the question marks indicate doubts about the meaning of the legend. Transcribed directly, it is *arñn – xma*, in which the four first letters could be interpreted as an abbreviation of *arñna*, Xanthos. It is impossible to read the text from the photos and I have no other images, so I can only speculate, but I am quite convinced that the legend is exactly the same as on the two above-mentioned coins, i.e., *arssāma*. Compare:

ΠΠΕΝ – VMP
 ΠΠΣΣ VMP

As far as I can deduce from the photos, the specimens are different from those of the Demos auction, but it is possible that the same dies were used, at least in the case of the reverse bearing the legend.²

In a 2016 auction by Numismatik Naumann, a coin also showing the helmeted head of Athena and the laureate head of Apollo, identified as having originated in Xanthos, shows an “uncertain Lycian legend around” that can now also be interpreted with some certainty as *arssāma*, despite the fact that the four letters on the left are damaged. We can therefore read it as *arss()āma*:

2. Note that, despite the different denominations attributed to the coins (obol in Demos, trihemibol in Müseler), we are dealing with the same weight types (0.87 g in Demos coins; 0.86 g in Müseler VII, 35 and 0.85 g in Müseler VII, 36). In line with Müseler, we will consider all of them to be trihemibols.



Fig. 4. Numismatik Naumann. Auction 48, 268, 20/11/2016

“LYCIA. Xanthos(?). Obol (Mid–late 5th century BC).

Obv: Helmeted head of Athena right.

Rev: Laureate head (of Apollo?) right; uncertain Lycian legend around.”

§ 2. Certainly, there are coins with the same iconography and bearing the name of Arīna-Xanthos, which has possibly contributed to the erroneous interpretation of the legend of the *arssāma* coins. This is the case of a coin kept at the British Museum (Hill 1897: 23), coin no. 106, Babelon (1910: 287–290), coin no. 391. Here are the photos in Babelon (1910) and on the British Museum website, (https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_BNK-G-674):



Fig. 5. Babelon (1910), no. 391



Fig. 6. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_BNK-G-674

The coin was read as *arñnahe* by Hill (1897), and this reading was maintained by Babelon (1910) and Mørkholm-Neumann (1977: 29) M 240b. The reading of the last letter is exceedingly difficult. Although Hill (1897) gives the reading arNaha *arñnahe* on p. 23, he offers a drawing in the introduction to his catalogue in which only one stroke of the last letter is visible (Hill 1897: xxxvi). Note also that he offers a reading of *arñnaha* for a different coin, also showing Athena on the obverse but Leto rather than Apollo on the reverse (the coin is listed in Babelon, 1910, as 392):

(21) **APENP+ ^** (IV. Q), no. 106, Pl. vi. 7; *Six*, 185-190.

The coin here catalogued is remarkable as the earliest with any representation of the Lycian Apollo. The legend is APENP+P on a stater in the possession of Dr. Imhoof-Blumer, the types of which are: *Obv.* head of Athena; *Rev.* head of Leto (?), with diskeles behind and the legend in front.

Other specimens of the same type of coin (Athena-Apollo) show *arñnaha*. This is the case of SNG von Aulock 4197 and Müsseler 2016, VII, 32. In both cases, the respective editors read arNaha as *arñnaha*, and this is the clear reading from the photos. We can also see this reading in an excellent photo of a coin auctioned in 2006, perhaps the same specimen examined by Müsseler:



Fig. 7. Classical Numismatic Group, Inc. Electronic Auction 150, 139, 18/10/2006

One could suspect then that the reading *arñnaha* could also apply to the British Museum coin, but this may be too hasty a conclusion; in the case of other types of coins showing Athena on the obverse and a different deity on the reverse, there are specimens with both *arñnaha* and *arñnahe*. This is the case of the above-mentioned Athena-Leto coin type: Babelon no. 392 shows *arñnaha*, while Babelon no. 393 shows *arñnahe*. Moreover, in coins showing Athena and Hermes, the readings *arñnaha* and *arñnahe* are both attested. For this reason, a similar situation could be imagined for Athena-Apollo coins. Only if the die for the reverse was the same for the British Museum coin and for one (or both) of the coins showing *arñnaha* could one conclude that the British Museum coin must also be read as *arñnaha*. In fact, the images look very similar, but this must be decided by a specialist in numismatics.

§ 3. Müseler (2016) attributes all the above-mentioned coins showing Athena on the obverse and Apollo or Leto on the reverse, including *arssāma* coins, to the “times of Wexssere II,” a chronological timespan of 400–380 BC. This attribution to Wexssere II is based on the fact that, although *arñnaha/arñnahe* coins do not feature a personal name, they bear a *diskeles* on the reverse, a symbol closely related to the two Wexsseres (Müseler 2016: 23).³ Significantly, the coins bearing the

3. Wexssere I and Wexssere II (400–380) is the conventional denomination of two alleged dynasts that issued coins in different cities of Lycia. Now, a better interpretation of the coin legends and some new specimens that have been sold have allowed to recognize four different names