Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 295

Annick Payne / Šárka Velhartická /
Jorit Wintjes (eds)

Beyond All Boundaries

Anatolia in the First Millennium BC

PEETERS

BEYOND ALL BOUNDARIES

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

Founded by Othmar Keel

Editorial Board: Susanne Bickel, Catherine Mittermayer, Mirko Novák,
Thomas C. Römer and Christoph Uehlinger

Published on behalf of the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies and the Bible+Orient Foundation

in cooperation with
the Institute of Egyptology, University of Basel,
the Institute of Archaeological Sciences, Near Eastern Archaeology section, University of Bern,
the Department of Biblical Studies, University of Fribourg,
the Institut romand des sciences bibliques, University of Lausanne,
and the Department of Religious Studies, University of Zurich

Volume editors

Annick Payne is a lecturer in Ancient Near Eastern languages at the University of Bern as well as an associated researcher of its Center for Global Studies. Her research focuses on Anatolian languages and writing systems, especially Anatolian hieroglyphic and alphabetic writing. She is the epigrapher of the excavations at Sirkeli Höyük and Adana-Tepebağ. Her books include *Hieroglyphic Luwian Texts in Translation* (2012), *Hieroglyphic Luwian: an Introduction with Original Texts* (2014), *Schrift und Schriftlichkeit: die anatolische Hieroglyphenschrift* (2015) and (with J. Wintjes) *Lords of Asia Minor: An Introduction to the Lydians* (2016).
Email: annick.payne@iaw.unibe.ch

Šárka Velhartická studied Languages and Archaeology of the Ancient Near East at the Freie Universität Berlin, and Comparative Linguistics and Ethnology at Charles University in Prague (PhD 2011). She is based at the University of Hradec Králové (Philosophical Faculty, Centre of Interdisciplinary Research). Her research topics deal mainly with preclassical Anatolia, comparative linguistics and multilingual education. Her books include *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová* (2016), *Bedřich Hrozný and 100 Years of Hittitology* (2015), *Justin Václav Prášek a Bedřich Hrozný. Počátky české staroorientalistiky a klínopisného bádání* (2019) and *Dopisy Bedřicha Hrozného literárním osobnostem* (2015).
Email: velharticka@centrum.cz

Jorit Wintjes is a professor for Ancient History in the Department of History at Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg. He holds an MA in contemporary history (1998) and a PhD (2004) as well as a *Habilitation* (2013) in Ancient History from this institution. He also works as a guest lecturer at the German armed forces staff academy (*Führungsakademie*) in Hamburg. His research interests include the history of ancient Lydia, Roman military history, 19th c. military history and the history of wargaming. His books include *Das Leben des Libanius* (2005), (with A. Payne) *Lords of Asia Minor: An Introduction to the Lydians* (2016), *Das Kriegsspiel des Wilhelm von Tschischwitz* (2019) and *Die Römische Armee auf dem Oceanus. Zur römischen Seekriegsgeschichte in Nordwesteuropa* (2020).
Email: jorit.wintjes@uni-wuerzburg.de

Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 295

Beyond All Boundaries

Anatolia in the First Millennium BC

edited by

Annick Payne, Šárka Velhartická and Jorit Wintjes

Peeters
Leuven - Paris - Bristol, CT
2021

Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis publishes monographs, multi-author volumes and conference proceedings in the fields of Biblical Studies (Hebrew Bible and Septuagint), Ancient Near Eastern Studies and Egyptology broadly understood (including archaeology, history, iconography and religion). The editorial board and affiliated institutions reflect the series' high academic standards and interdisciplinary outlook. Manuscripts may be submitted via a member of the editorial board. They are examined by the board and subject to further peer review by internationally recognized scholars at the board's discretion. The series is committed to worldwide distribution, notably through open access publication (Gold or Green). Past volumes are archived at the digital repository of the University of Zurich (www.zora.uzh.ch).

Senior editor: Christoph.Uehlinger@uzh.ch

The open access publication of this book has been facilitated by the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-429-4884-6
eISBN 978-90-429-4885-3
D/2021/0602/188
© 2021, Peeters, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage or retrieval devices or systems, without the prior written permission from the publisher, except the quotation of brief passages for review purposes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface IX

Marks on arrowheads from the Konya Ereğli Museum
Signs of native Anatolian production?
Selim Ferruh Adalı 1

Debating Anatolian Hieroglyphic in Victorian England
A fresh look at an old question
Silvia Alaura 25

Un soldat phrygien qui parle grec dans l'armée perse
Timothée de Milet, *Perses*, 140–161
Milena Anfosso 44

Argaios: A Bronze Age mountain-god in Greco-Roman Anatolia
Alexis Belis 71

Zur Interpunktion in lykischen Inschriften
Anja Busse 102

Linguistic and archaeological criteria for dating Lycian tombs and tomb inscriptions
A critical re-evaluation of former approaches
Birgit Christiansen 119

Art history within Anatolian studies
An approach to Lycian images
Fabienne Colas-Rannou 148

An inscribed amulet or stamp seal from Sirkeli Höyük
Gabriele Elsen-Novák – Annick Payne 174

The population, the language and the history of Yadiya/Sam'al
Federico Giusfredi – Valerio Pisaniello 189

Kroisos, König des Landes Mira?
Das Königreich Lydien und Ephesos – eine besondere Beziehung und ihre Ursache
Winfried Held 224

Between Amorges and Tissaphernes
Lycia and Persia in the Xanthos Stele
John O. Hyland 257

The bestowing of wreaths on the tombs of Merehi and Pajawa
Tamás Péter Kisbali 279

The settlement dynamics of Larisa (Buruncuk) and their references to the Bronze Age legacy
Ilgın Külekçi 297

Pisidian toponymy
Method and results
Lauriane Locatelli 319

The Anatolian words for ‘son’ and the semantics of *muwa-*
Elena Martínez Rodríguez 337

Bilingual texts in first-millennium Anatolia
H. Craig Melchert 349

Les monuments lithiques de Phrygie
Archéologie d’un paysage
Patrick Maxime Michel 379

Azatiwada, Awariku from the “House of Mopsos”, and Assyria
On the dating of Karatepe in Cilicia
Mirko Novák and Andreas Fuchs 397

Überlegungen zu lydisch *ora-* ‚Monat‘ und dem Vokal *o*
Norbert Oettinger 467

Signs beyond boundaries
The visual world of Azatiwataya
Aslı Özyar 476

La Lycie et l'historiographie grecque
Ménecratès de Xanthos et Alexandre Polyhistor
Simone Podestà 517

When the Great King encounters white marble
A material perspective on Western Anatolia
Alessandro Poggio 535

Geminate consonants in Lycian
A twofold interpretation
Florian Réveilhac 551

News from Side
Alfredo Rizza 576

From Phrygian to Greek
The decline of the Phrygian alphabet in 1st-millennium BCE Anatolia
Lynn E. Roller 590

A rhetoric of accumulation
The multi-ethnic identity of Halikarnassos in antiquarian and public discourse
Marco Santini 604

Rhotacism in 1st-millennium BC Anatolia
Comparative Luwian and Lydian phonology
David Sasseville 636

Caves as cult places in Cilicia
Mustafa H. Sayar 651

401 BC – The year the Neo-Hittite statehood ended
Zsolt Simon 675

Phrygian onomastic notes
Near Eastern and Aegean interfaces
Maya Vassileva 689

Towards a historiography of Anatolian hieroglyphic research during the 1930s
Šárka Velhartická 702

List of abbreviations 729

Indices 737

List of authors 759

BILINGUAL TEXTS IN FIRST-MILLENNIUM ANATOLIA[1]

H. Craig Melchert

Abstract: It is typically assumed that one version of a bilingual is the primary text, from which the other is translated. I argue based on the Greek and Lycian versions of the Létôon trilingual and the Phoenician-Luvian bilingual of Karatepe that we should entertain another model, by which the commissioner of an inscription dictated to those responsible the desired content, entrusting textual composition to writers fluent in the respective idioms—not precluding that they also had familiarity with the other language. Rather than one version being primary and the other dependent on it, we may be facing parallel, but independent compositions, whose commonality consists in their content and discourse structure, but only partially in their diction.

Keywords: bilingual, Greek, Karatepe, Létôon, Luvian, Lycian, Phoenician

1 INTRODUCTION

The standard premise by which one version of a bilingual text is primary ("original") and the other a translation of it is surely often correct. The Lycian-Greek tomb inscriptions TL 6 and 117 are, based on word order and lexical substitutions, translations from Lycian to Greek, while the votive text N 312 is more likely a translation from Greek to Lycian. However, in some cases evidence is inconclusive. Witness the controversy over priority and directionality in the Akkadian-Hittite bilingual "Acts of Hattušili I". Some have argued for Hittite to Akkadi-

1 The present text incorporates several revisions vis-à-vis the oral version. I thank all colleagues who offered comments during the subsequent discussion, Federico Giusfredi, Diether Schürr, and Zsolt Simon for respectively sending me pdfs of very helpful and relevant articles, David Goldstein and Stephen Colvin for help with Greek matters, K. Lawson Younger on KARATEPE 1, and above all Dennis Pardee for truly invaluable help with the Phoenician. I of course remain solely responsible for the contents.

an (Melchert 1978: 3–5 and *passim* with references to previous claims for both directions). De Martino (2003: 24–28) after a thorough review stated no opinion. Devecchi (2005: 28 and 113–127) made compelling arguments for the *literary structure* of the text as reflecting Akkadian influence and *tentatively* supposed an Akkadian original. See also van den Hout 2009a: 29–35 and 2009b: 94–95 with general arguments for Akkadian originals for all pre-Telipinu Hittite texts.

I will plead here for consideration of an alternative model—parallel, in tandem creation of texts, with more than one possible scenario. First, the commissioner of the text (typically for public display) dictates, directly or through an intermediary, the desired content to authors most competent in each language. I stress that in a multilingual environment (at least in terms of written texts) each would know the topoi and typical phraseology from both traditions. Second, both texts may be created by a single bilingual author, either a full bilingual (i.e., a pre-adult learner of both languages) or someone for whom one of the two languages is a second language. This alternative presupposes a genuinely multilingual speech community. Unavoidably, a single author must compose one text before the other, but one need not be directly modeled on the other. My idea of an alternative to direct translation is not new: see Amadasi Guzzo/Archi 1980: 86–87 and Giusfredi 2018: 117–118 for a similar viewpoint. In assessing the relationship of the two texts to one another, we should also bear in mind that the respective versions were likely directed at different audiences: various members of the community, visitors, and higher authorities not in residence. The author(s) may have thus adjusted both the content and its expression accordingly.

2 FIRST CASE: THE LYCIAN AND GREEK VERSIONS OF THE "LÉTÔON TRILINGUAL" OF XANTHOS

2.1 Translation from Greek to Lycian

Was a Greek original translated into Lycian? This has to my knowledge not been seriously considered, but it is easily disproven by multiple instances of elaborated Lycian content absent in the Greek version (citations after Laroche 1979: 53–54 and Metzger 1979: 32–33):

(1) N 320, Lycian 5–9 = Greek 5–8
me=hñti=tubedẽ: arus: se(j)=epewẽtlm̃mẽi: arñnãi: m̃maitẽ: kumezijẽ: θθẽ: xñtawati: xbidẽñni: se(j)=arKKazuma: xñtawati:
"The __ *authority t*-ed, and the Xanthian perioikoi *m*-ed, the sacred installation for the King of Kaunos and King Arggazuma."
ἔδοξε δὴ Ξανθίοις καὶ τοῖς περιοίκοις ἱδρύσασθαι βωμὸν Βασιλεῖ Καυνίωι καὶ Ἀρκεσιμαι,
"It pleased the Xanthians and the perioikoi to erect an altar for Basileus Kaunios & Arkesimas."

Schürr (2014: 13–15) compellingly argues that the previous syntactic analysis of this passage with a conjoined subject of the first verb and a "dependent" reading of the second is impossible by the facts of Lycian syntax. Adiego's objection (2015: 11 n. 7) is wholly unjustified: the assumed structure is not "chiastic", but shows merely "gapping". See independently Storme (2014: 135–137) for similar arguments. Despite the efforts of Schürr (2014: 19–21) the sense of the two verbs remains elusive ('to build' for *m̃m(a)-* remains possible, but unproven), but *arus* surely belongs with *aruwãt(i)-* 'high' and refers to some high authority of the city of Xanthos (Schürr 2014: 17–19). The Greek formulaic ἔδοξε collapses the distinct collaborative roles of the city and the perioikoi clearly delineated in the Lycian.

(2) N 320, Lycian 12–18 = Greek 12–16
s=ed(e)=eliñ=tãtẽ: teteri: se(j)=epewẽtlm̃mẽi: hrm̃mada: ttaraha: me=xbaitẽ: zã: ese=xesñtedi: qñtati<=ti>: se=pigrẽi: sẽ=ñte=ñte=km̃mẽ: se(j)=ẽti: θθẽ: sttati=teli: se=tahñtãi xñtawatehi: xbidẽñnehi: se(j)=arKKazumahi:
"And the city and the perioikoi transferred land plots belonging to city. They *bound over/established* the portion <that> X. and P. cultivate, and however much is therein, and where the installation is put down, and the buildings (shall) belong to the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma."
καὶ ἔδωκαν ἡ πόλις ἀγρὸν ὃγ Κεσινδηλις καὶ Πιγρης κατηργάσατο καὶ ὅσον πρὸς τῶι αγρῶι καὶ τὰ οἰκήματα εἶναι Βασιλέως Καυνίου καὶ Ἀρκεσιμα,
"And the city has given the field that K. and P. have cultivated, and whatever adjoins the field, and the buildings, to belong to Basileus Kaunios and Arkesimas."

For *eliñ=tãtẽ* as 'ceded the rights to, transferred to another' (cf. Latin *alienãre*) see Rieken/Yakubovich (forthcoming). Schürr (forthcoming) emends to *qñta<tẽ>* following Eichner 1983: 62, but cultivation of the plot donated to the sanctuary surely is to continue, and scribal error is much easier to motivate if one assumes haplography of the second <ti> in **qñtatiti*. Schürr plausibly derives the expected 'to cultivate' from an extension **qñt(a)-* of *qã(n)-* 'to strike'. As he argues, that *xbaitẽ* means "irrigated" (e.g. Melchert 2004: 82, after Laroche 1979: 68) makes no sense. A connection with Cuneiform Luvian *ḫap(a)i-* 'to bind' is semantically apt, but formally problematic. The context requires merely that *xbaitẽ* express the donation of everything to the deities. Storme (2014: 130) refutes the analysis (Melchert 2000) that *se=t=ahñtãi* is predicatival 'also as the property'. Against Laroche (1979: 68) and Melchert (2004: 2) there is no motivation for a local particle *=te* and an alleged †*ahñtãi* as a calque on Greek τὰ ὄντα or ἡ οὐσία. As per Schürr (2016: 125), *tahñtãi* refers to the buildings (NB τὰ οἰκήματα!) associated with the altar *θθẽ* (both mean essentially 'installation'). The crucial point for present purposes is that the Lycian describes the donation of land and what belongs to it to the deities in *two* steps, a nuance the Greek unsurprisingly dispenses with.

(3) N 320, Lycian 40–41 = Greek 35
pigesereje: me=i(j)=eseri=hhati: me=hriqla: asñne: pzziti=ti
"To Pixodaros they shall defer (authority). The supreme *temple* authority is to carry out whatever he *decrees/wishes*."
Πιξώταρος δὲ κύριος ἔστω
"Pixodaros shall have authority."

For the syntax of the last two Lycian clauses see Melchert 1999, but the essential understanding is owed to Neumann 1998. The Lycian recognizes the supreme authority of the satrap expressed by the Greek formula, but adds a role for some authority in the Xanthian religious administration, a detail reasonably omitted in the Greek. It is hard to imagine that someone translating the Greek text would or could have made the extensive elaborations that are present in the Lycian. A Greek to Lycian translation may be definitively rejected.

2.2 Translation from Lycian to Greek

Was a Lycian original translated into Greek? This is the standard view: Metzger 1979: 42, Laroche 1979: 79 (with typical caution), Frei 1981: 359, Blomqvist 1982, Bryce 1986: 52–53 n. 14 and 21, Rutherford 2002, especially 207–208 and 217. However, not all the arguments presented as evidence for a translation are equally valid. Storme (2014: 127–130) has refuted those of Blomqvist (1982: 14–15) and Rutherford (2002: 207–208) that the Greek of the opening clauses is due to an error of the Greek translator. Storme (2014: 131–135) also shows that the opening in both versions is part of the narrative, not a framing device, leaving open (2014: 139) the question of a Lycian to Greek translation versus two parallel texts. Also false is the claim of Metzger (1979: 42) of a peculiar use of μετακινεῖν calqued on the Lycian (see below).

Nevertheless, most discrepancies between the Lycian and Greek are entirely compatible with a Lycian to Greek translation. Many are explainable as omissions and simplifications viewed as dispensable for a Greek readership. These include the passages treated above in section 2.1, as well as the following:[2]

(4) N 320, Lycian 16–18 Greek 14–16
sẽ=ñte=ñte=km̃mẽ: se(j)=ẽti: θθẽ: sttati=teli: se=tahñtãi x^{i}*ñtawatehi: xbidẽñnehi: se(j)=arKKazumahi:*
“And as much as is inside (the plot of land), and (the place) where the installation (altar) is put down, and the buildings (shall) belong to the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma.”
καὶ ὅσον πρὸς τῶι αγρῶι καὶ τὰ οἰκήματα εἶναι Βασιλέως Καυνίου καὶ Ἀρκεσιμα
“And as much as is at the field and the buildings shall belong to the King of Kaunos and Arkesimas.”

Here the omission is mildly substantive, since the property to be given to the two deities includes in the Lycian the space where the altar was erected, but the author of the Greek may have felt it to be self-evident that the altar could hardly be dedicated without the ground on which it

2 The clause in the Lycian lines 29–30 specifying that Simias and those close to him are to perform the rites is reasonably omitted in the Greek, since this may be inferred from his appointment as priest in the Lycian lines 9–10, duly matched in the Greek lines 8–11.

stood. By the illuminating analysis of Schürr (2010: 150–154), the syntax of the sanction formula in the two versions is also compatible with a translation Lycian to Greek:

(5) N 320, Lycian 37–38 = Greek 33–34
me=pddẽ: mahãna: sm̃mati: ebette:
"He will be the one responsible before these gods."
ἀμαρτωλὸς <ἔ>στω τῶν θεῶν τούτων
"He will be guilty before these gods."

As per Schürr, Lycian *sm̃mati* here is a noun *der Verpflichtete* to the verb *sm̃ma-* 'to oblige, make responsible for' (*verpflichten*). Only the context provides the specific sense 'guilty'.[3]

Just one extended passage raises serious questions about a Lycian to Greek translation:

(6) N 320, Lycian 30–38 = Greek 27–34
se=ije=hri(j)=aitẽ: tasa: mere: ebette: teteri: arñnas:
se(j)=epewẽtlm̃mẽi: arñnãi: me=t=epi tuwẽti: mara: ebeija: ẽti: sttali:
ppuwẽti=mẽ: ebehi: se=we=ne: xttadi: tike: ebi=ne=ñtewẽ: mahãna:
ebette: ebi=ne: ñtewẽ: kumazi: ebehi: xttade=me(j)=ẽ: tike: me=pddẽ:
mahãna: sm̃mati: ebette:
"The city of Xanthos and the perioikoi of Xanthos have taken oaths regarding these regulations, that they will carry out these regulations as one has written down on this stela. And no one shall do violence (to them?), neither with respect to these gods nor with respect to this priest. If anyone will have done violence (to them?), he will be the one responsible before these gods..."
καὶ ἐποιήσαντο ὅρκους Ξάνθιοι καὶ περίοικοι ὅσα ἐν τῆι στήληι ἐγγέγραπται ποιήσειν ἐντελῆ τοῖς θεοῖς τούτοις καὶ τῶι ἱερεῖ, καὶ μὴ μετακινήσειν μηδαμὰ μηδ' ἄλλωι ἐπιτρέψειν · ἂν δέ τις μετακινήσηι, ἀμαρτωλὸς <ἔ>στω τῶν θεῶν τούτων
"And the Xanthians and the perioikoi have taken oaths to carry out whatever has been written on the stela for these gods and the

3 The added specification in the Greek lines 10–11 that appointment of Simias and those close to him is τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον 'for all time' is also trivial, intended to clarify that the reference is to a (perpetual) successorship to Simias' priesthood, not to a contemporary collaboration.

priest, and not to modify anything nor to allow another (to do so). If anyone makes a modification, he shall be guilty before these gods..."

For the crucial new reading *se=ije=hri(j)=* instead of *se=i(j)=ehbij(a)=* in the first Lycian clause see Adiego 2012: 95–98, but his interpretation is erroneous, based on a misunderstanding of the matching Hittite phraseology. The Hittites swore oaths only to/before *gods*; *šer* (and Lycian *hri*) indicates the person or thing regarding which the oath is made. *Pace* Schürr (2014: 30), the treatment of *hri* 'for' as a preverb is entirely in order: cf. N 320, 3 *ñte=pddẽ=hadẽ: trm̃mile:* "installed before the Lycians", where *pddẽ* 'before' is treated as a preverb (for this analysis of *pddẽ* see Schürr 2010: 151–152, against Melchert 2000 and 2004: 48). Greek has telescoped the Lycian to merely "have taken oaths". Its added specification of "for these gods and the priest" could conceivably be a replacement for "regarding these regulations".

However, the following text shows a fundamental disagreement: the Lycian has a general formula "No one shall do violence...", and the threat is to *the gods and the priest*. The Greek prohibits modifying the *provisions of the text by the Xanthians and the perioikoi* or their authorizing anyone else to modify them. Against Metzger (1979: 42) μετακινεῖν cannot be a calque on the Lycian, which has 'to do violence' (with a different expressed target), and the sense of the Greek verb is the usual one of 'modify, alter, change' (also in Thucydides V, 21 by every modern translation, *pace* Metzger 1979: 39). The attempt of Laroche (1979: 74–75) to bridge the gap between the Lycian and Greek by supposing a sense 'to remove' for *xtta-* is entirely *ad hoc* (see the objection by Neumann 2007: 134).[4] But Schürr (2005: 151) points to the juxtaposition of *mara ebeija* and *se=we=ne xttaiti* in TL 45B, 4–5, and perhaps also the use of *tusñti* with *mara* ibid. 11 (cf. here *epi tuwẽti*). His rendering 'ändern' for *xttaiti* is based entirely on the alleged match between *xtta-* and μετακινεῖν in our passage, which is otherwise totally unsupported. One cannot separate the denominative verb *xtta(i)-* from the phrase *xtta...adi* 'does *xtta*' in TL 118,2, nor *xtta* 'violence' from CLuvian *ḫatta* 'violence' and Hittite *ḫatta-* 'to strike; pierce'. The discrepancy in the Lycian and Greek versions is thus serious and not easy to explain.

4 The Aramaic text does use *nṣl* 'to take away' (see Dupont-Sommer 1979: 137 and 153), but this merely shows that the Aramaic author did not know the true sense of Lycian *xtta(i)-* in the context.

One possible account presents itself: to assume that Lycian *xtta-* 'to do violence' had a use like Hittite *ḫulle/a-* 'to smash, defeat', used of stipulations in the sense 'to repudiate', including in contexts directly parallel to *waḫnu-* 'to change, alter'. Compare KBo 6.28 Vo 29 *kuiš=ma=an ḫullai* "But whoever repudiates it..." and KBo 1.28 Vo 8 *kuiš=ma=an=kan waḫnuzi* "But whoever alters it...", in both cases referring to the word of the king that is immutable. The absence of any overt object in the Lycian remains surprising, but perhaps could be inferred from the context, if we assume that *mara xtta(i)-* was in fact a collocation. The translator of the Greek rendered this freely but correctly with μετακινεῖν. One must further assume that on his own authority he altered the general "No one shall do violence/repudiate..." to a construction where the oath-takers are made the potential violators. This is a reasonable reformulation, since they as the chief interested party would in fact be the likeliest to seek to alter the provisions. There are sufficient discrepancies between the Lycian and Greek to leave this solution less than entirely assured, but I find it plausible enough that I tentatively conclude that this passage is also compatible with a translation from Lycian to Greek.

2.3 Summation

If we pose the apposite questions regarding the composition of a bilingual suggested by Giusfredi (2018: 117), the answer to the first is straightforward: there is no reason to doubt that the inscription was commissioned by those who established the cult it describes—the Xanthians, specifically the authority called an *arus* and the perioikoi.

The answers to the second and third questions—what scribe composed the text, and was there more than one scribe involved—are more difficult to answer. One must first stress that both the Lycian and Greek appear to be grammatical and mostly idiomatic (bearing in mind the limitations on our knowledge of what is "idiomatic" in Lycian!). This fact might suggest that indeed a Lycian native speaker composed the Lycian version, and a native (or at least very fluent) Greek speaker translated that into Greek. As already argued above, it is entirely in order that the latter might have simplified or abridged some passages, omitting niceties felt to be dispensable for a Greek readership.

However, one must acknowledge that whoever composed the Greek text must also have had a very strong command of Lycian, in order to render various Lycian expressions as freely and correctly as he did.

In the second clause of the Lycian *ñte=pddẽ=hadẽ trm̃mile* means "installed (*ñte=hadẽ*) before (*pddẽ*) the Lycians (*trm̃mile*)" (Schürr 2010: 151–152, *contra* Melchert 2000). Note the complication that the preposition *pddẽ* has very idiomatically been incorporated into the compound verb as a second preverb! Against Melchert 2000 *pddẽn-ehm̃mis* is not a figura etymologica with the verb, but is a compound '(ones) sitting-in front', comparable to German *Vor-sitz(end)e* 'chair(person)s'. The Greek accurately but freely renders all this as κατέστησε ἄρχοντας Λυκίας 'appointed (as) rulers of Lycia', with a genitive construction and a loose but contextually appropriate equivalent of the noun. In line 7 the Lycian collocation *kumezijẽ θθẽ* 'sacred/sacrificial installation' is correctly matched by the single Greek word βωμόν 'altar'. The Lycian two-clause construction with a relative clause *se=i pijẽtẽ arawã ehbijẽ esi=ti* "and they gave to him freedom (of) what is his" in lines 11–12 appears in the Greek as simply καὶ ἔδοσαν αὐτῶι ἀτέλειαν τῶν ὄντων "and they gave him freedom of his property". We do not yet know the precise sense of Lycian *hlm̃mi-pijata* in line 25, but it clearly is a compound of *pijata-* 'gift' with a first member meaning something like 'addition, extra-'. What is also clear is that the Greek of lines 23–24 καὶ ὅ τι ἄν ἐχφόριον ἐκ τούτων γίνηται "and whatever income may result from these (preceding provisions)" is a very free rendering of the Lycian *me=ije=sitẽni=ti hlm̃mipijata* "and the *addition*-gift that lies therein". As I have already discussed at length, the only way to reconcile the use of Greek μετακινεῖν 'to alter (improperly)' for Lycian *xtta(i)-* 'to do violence to' is to suppose that the author of the Greek understood that the Lycian in context referred to the act of repudiating the provisions of the text.

On the other hand, the Greek text is not entirely free of unidiomatic features. For Lycian *epi tuwẽti* "they shall carry out/execute" of lines 32–33 the Greek of line 29 has ποιήσειν ἐντελῆ "to bring to completion", a circumlocution unattested elsewhere in Greek before Lucian (2nd century CE). One might have expected ἐπιτελεῖν (found in Thucydides and Herodotus). It is important to stress that the Greek cannot be a calque of the Lycian (at least not the Lycian of our text!). There are also three instances of unusual Greek word order. This fact *per se* would hardly be significant, given the relative freedom of constituent order in Greek. However, it is highly suspect that in each case a different unusual word order matches the Lycian:

(7) N 320, Lycian 1 = Greek 1–2 (OVS)
ẽke: trm̃misñ: xssaθrapazate: pigesere: katamlah: tideimi
"When Pigesere, son of Katamla, began to rule Lycia as satrap..."
Ἐπεὶ Λυκίας ξαδράπης ἐγένετο Πιξώδαρος Ἑκατόμνω ὑός,
"When Pixodaros, son of Hekatomnos, became satrap of Lycia..."

(8) N 320, Lycian 12–14 = Greek 12–13 (VSO)
s=ed(e)=eliñ=tãtẽ: teteri: se(j)=epewẽtlm̃mẽi: hrm̃mada: ttaraha
"And the city and the perioikoi transferred/ceded land-sections belonging to the city."
καὶ ἔδωκαν ἡ πόλις ἀγρὸν
"And the city gave land."

(9) N 320, Lycian 30–32 = Greek 26–28 (VOS)
se=ije=hri(j)=aitẽ: tasa: mere: ebette: teteri: arñnas: se(j)=epewẽtlm̃mẽi: arñnãi
"And the city of Xanthos and the perioikoi of Xanthos made oaths regarding these regulations."
καὶ ἐποιήσαντο ὅρκους Ξάνθιοι καὶ περίοικοι
"And the Xanthians and the perioikoi made oaths."

Such an "interference" effect on the Greek syntax might be taken to be confirmation that the Greek is a translation of the Lycian. However, we have seen above that the author of the Greek text had a very strong command of Lycian. I therefore submit that the Greek and Lycian may well have been composed by a single author, a native speaker of Lycian with an excellent knowledge of Greek,[5] but who in several instances carried over Lycian word order into the Greek (in the Lycian of examples (7)–(9) the word order undoubtedly had a discourse-information function, even if we cannot determine what it was). If we are dealing with a single Lycian author, he surely did compose the Lycian first.

The relationship of the two versions may be still more complicated. I cited above several cases where the idiomatic and rather free Greek rendering of the Lycian presupposes a thorough knowledge of the latter, but careful examination of some of them suggests that the author, who knew very well what the text(s) should convey, may have had to

5 In Xanthos in the mid-4th century BCE (on the dating of the text see Storme 2014: 131 with references) such bilingualism is a reasonable possibility. On the general topic see Rutherford 2002: especially 201–203.

create Lycian expressions for concepts that have straightforward exponents in Greek: *hlm̃mi-pijata* has the look of a neologism invented to convey 'income' (ἐχφόριον), as does *kumezijẽ θθẽ* 'sacred/sacrificial installation' for 'altar' (βωμόν); *pddẽn-ehm̃mis* for appointed rulers/overseers (ἄρχοντας) may be one as well. Finally, the structure of the relative clause *se=i pijẽtẽ arawã ehbijẽ esi=ti* "and they gave to him freedom (of) what is his" is decidedly awkward, since the syntactic relationship of "what is his" to 'freedom' must be inferred. I readily concede that the almost total absence of any comparable text in Lycian leaves the above assertion unverifiable (TL 45, probably a decree of Pixodaros, unfortunately is very fragmentary).[6] However, this argument cuts both ways: the dearth of decrees in Lycian (with or without accompanying Greek) may not be entirely an accident of transmission, and the author of the Lycian version of the Létôon text in part may have had to invent suitable phraseology for which Greek had ready-made collocations and vocabulary that were familiar to him. While proof is impossible, I believe that Occam's Razor justifies taking seriously the possibility that the author of the Lycian displayed his knowledge of such Greek diction in his own composition of the Greek version.

3 SECOND CASE: THE LUVIAN-PHOENICIAN BILINGUAL OF KARATEPE

3.1 Translation from Luvian to Phoenician

This is the predominant expressed opinion: see the references in Yakubovich 2015: 44. As Yakubovich correctly objects, this conclusion has been based mostly on sociolinguistic premises, not on a close linguistic analysis (but see Amadasi Guzzo/Archi 1980: 100–102 and Pardee 1987: 138 cited below!). Note also the dissenting opinion in Bron 1979: 173–174 and Schmitz 2008: 6.

6 I do note that the VSO word order of the opening of the Greek version appears to imitate the VS of the Lycian. The absence of a full nominal direct object in the Lycian, with only an enclitic accusative singular pronominal *-ẽ* "it" in a discourse-initial clause, remains puzzling.

3.2 Translation from Phoenician to Luvian

A translation from Phoenician to Luvian has now been proposed by Yakubovich (2015: 44–48) on linguistic grounds. He cites four types of evidence: (1) calquing of the Phoenician word order of major constituents, violating the elsewhere quite regular SOV pattern of Luvian, plus three instances of the non-Luvian order noun+demonstrative (§§ 63, 65, 66);[7] (2) expansion of Phoenician noun phrases into clauses in Luvian to avoid unidiomatic syntax; (3) mistranslations of the Phoenician; (4) lexical discrepancies more easily explainable by translation from Phoenician to Luvian than from Luvian to Phoenician. I will treat these issues in turn.

The calquing argument regarding non-SOV order needs refinement, but remains cogent. First, one must note that the fronted verb in §§ 5, 7, 25, 51, 52 and 59[8] marked by additive focus *=ha* or contrastive *=pa* is required by *Luvian* syntax and is thus not evidence for calquing. Second, it is noteworthy and likely not coincidental that instances of true calquing are not randomly distributed throughout the text: 53 of 65 relevant clauses (81 %) obey Luvian word order; seven examples of word-order calquing involve cases where a Luvian verb plus a preverb is used for a Phoenician simplex verb; finally, the three sure instances where Luvian simplex verb order is directly calqued on the Phoenician occur in the blessings-curses section: §§ 49, 55 and 63 (as do all three examples of noun+demonstrative). The last point is meaningful, since the blessings-curses portion of the text has by far the most formulaic and stereotyped diction, much of it being "boiler-plate" phraseology similar to that of other contemporary inscriptions.[9]

---

7 On this point see Bauer 2014: 58–59. This feature requires no further comment. I follow the convention of using § to number clauses in the KARATEPE 1 inscription.

8 If one follows Yakubovich 2015: 46 in supposing that REX-*ta-ti-i=pa=wa/i* in § 59 contains a denominative verb "rules as king", but see Hawkins 2000: 56 for the alternative "if someone from among kings...". For the Phoenician of § 51 see Younger 1998: 20 with note 55.

9 *Contra* Yakubovich 2015: 45 there is no compelling evidence that the position of the simplex verb in §§ 26 and 37 is patterned on the Phoenician, since it may easily be motivated by native Luvian discourse structuring. In § 26 it likely marks a contrastive topic: "(And I also smote strong fortresses to the west), which prior kings *had not smitten*." In § 37, where the Luvian formulation differs markedly from that of the Phoenician (Phu/A II 7–8), the initial position of the adverb in BONUS+*RA/I-ya-ma-la=ha=wa/i* "And also peacefully..." is again required by the use of *=ha*, and the verb SOLIUM+*MI-ta* "dwelt" may easily be a fronted topic, as

The two most compelling examples of such calquing are not actually cited by Yakubovich:[10]

(10) § 21 (Hu) = Phu/A I, 15–16
NEG$_2$-*wá/í kwa/i-zi* |SUB-*na-na* PUGNUS.PUGNUS-*la/i-ta* |*mu-ka-sa-sa-na* |DOMUS-*ní-i*
"Those who had not *remained/been held* under the house of Muksas…"
ʾš bl ʾš ʾbd kn l-bt mpš
"None of whom had been servant to the house of MPŠ."

Calquing of the Phoenician word order *plus* the decision to render *ʾbd kn* 'be a servant to' as 'to __ under' (on which problem see Melchert 2014: 136 with references) results in an entirely ungrammatical "right dislocation" of *muksassan parni*, the object of the adposition *annan*.

(11) § 48 (Hu) = Phu/A II 19–III 2
wa/i-na |*i-zi-sa-tu-na ta-ya* ("FLUMEN")*há-pa+ra/i-sá* |OMNIS-*MI-i-sá* |(ANNUS)*u-si mara+ra/i* BOS.ANIMAL)-*sá* (*486)REL-*tu-na-ha* (OVIS.ANIMAL)*há-wa/i-sá* |"VITIS"()*há+ra/i-ha* OVIS.ANIMAL-*wa/i-sa*
"And every river-land shall begin to honor him: annually an ox, and at the *harvest*? a sheep, and at the vintage a sheep."
w-ylk zbḥ l kl h-mskt zbḥ ymm ʾlp 1 *w-bl-ʿt ḥ]rš š* 1 *w-b-ʿt qṣr š* 1
"And every *district* has brought to him an offering: an annual offering (of) one ox, at the time of plowing one sheep, and at the time of harvest one sheep."

The analysis of the Phoenician follows Amadasi Guzzo (2000: 79) against all others (cf. Younger 1998: 36–40 for extended discussion). Despite use of the Luvian idiom of 'to stand' plus infinitive to mean 'to begin to' and the culturally bound word 'river-land', the Phoenician must be primary. First, the fronted position of the *combined* infinitive+auxiliary *izistuna tai* would be inexplicable in standard Luvian.[11] Second, the use of 'to

in similar structures in Hittite. See below on § 58.

10 I cite the Luvian after Hawkins 2000: 48–58 and the Phoenician after Röllig 1999: 50–57.

11 It is conceivable that the infinitive alone might be "fronted" to mark some sort of saliency (though I know of no parallels), but fronting of the two-word syntagm would be unparalleled in Iron Age Luvian.

honor (the deity)' in the Luvian, with no direct object 'offering' as in the Phoenician, turns the offering list (in the Phoenician an extraposed apposition) into an awkward and strange *nominativus pendens* in the Luvian, and its relationship to the preceding clause must be inferred. The ungrammaticality of examples (10) and (11) thus justifies regarding the examples of "fronted" preverb+verb combinations also as attempts to imitate the order of the simplex Phoenician verb: §§ 4, 30, 63, 66, 71, 72 and 73.[12] However, in §§ 4 and 30 the preverb is marked with *=ha* 'also', so its fronted position is required in Luvian—only the accompanying fronting of the verb is motivated by the Phoenician. In the last five the Luvian word order appears to be purely an imitation of the Phoenician simplex verb. One should note, however, that in other instances the regular Luvian order with clause-final preverb plus finite verb is retained, despite the clause-initial Phoenician verb: §§ 13, 47, and 64. There is no obvious rationale for the differing treatment in these cases. In sum, Phoenician interference effects on the word order of the Luvian text of Karatepe are undeniable, but their concentration in the blessings and curses section (8 of 12 examples, 67 %) should be taken into account in any evaluation of their significance.

Yakubovich's second point (2015: 45–46) is that due to a language-internal constraint Luvian must necessarily expand into full clauses various instances of "gapping" in the Phoenician: §§ 9, 10, 37, 50, 52 and 75. The constraint definitely seems valid—the one example of "gapping" in the Luvian in § 72a involves a single constituent, whereas all the other instances appearing in the Phoenician either contain two constituents or a structure unattested in Luvian.[13] However, this difference by itself does not prove that the Luvian is translated from the Phoenician, since the Luvian would necessarily have whole clauses even if had it been composed independently.

Yakubovich's third argument (2015: 46) is that the Luvian shows instances of infelicitous or erroneous translations of the Phoenician. Besides (10) and (11) cited above there is clearly another failed attempt to adapt a Semitic literary figure to a Luvian one:

12 The clause-final position of Luvian *a-ta* AEDIFICARE-*ri+i-i* in § 71 is likely only an apparent exception, since the Phoenician *ʾm b-ḥmdt ysʿ* (Phu/A III 17) is also verb-final.

13 The Phoenician of § 75 uses a preposition 'like'. It is not clear that Luvian had any means to express such a comparison except a clause with the conjunction *kwari* 'as'.

(12) §§ 59–61 (Hu) = Phu/A III 12–13
REX-*ta-ti-i-pa-wa/i kwa/i+ra/i kwa/i-sa-há*
"If anyone rules as king/if anyone from (among) kings," (Yakubovich 2015: 46; Hawkins 2000: 56)
w-ʾm mlk b-mlkm
"If (there is) a king among kings,"
[No matching clause in Luvian!]
w-rzn b-rznm
"or a prince among princes"
ní-pa-wa/i-sa [1]CAPUT-*ti-sá* [1]CAPUT-*ti-ya-za-ha-wa/i-tu-ta á-la/i-ma-za*
"or he is a man, who also has a manly name..."
ʾm ʾdm šʾdm šm
"If (there is) a man who is a man of name..."

With Yakubovich, following Röllig (sic!) 1999: 60, the Phoenician reflects a Semitic rhetorical device with three potential perpetrators in a descending social hierarchy. The Luvian has destroyed this coherence, but not as per Yakubovich. One cannot (against Hawkins 2000: 56 and 60 and Yakubovich, *loc. cit.*) equate *ní-pa-wa/i-sa* [1]CAPUT-*ti-sá* "or he is a man" with *w-rzn b-rznm* "or a prince among princes", because *ní-pa-wa/i-sa* [1]CAPUT-*ti-sá* matches precisely *ʾm ʾdm* (thus correctly Pardee 1987: 141–142). This is confirmed by § 73, the apodosis to the long set of protases §§ 59–72: ("May Tarhunzas of Heaven... delete) *á-pa-sá* REX-*ta-hi-sa* |*á-pa-há-´* |REX-*ti-na* |*á-pa-há-wa/i* CAPUT-*ti-na* "that kingdom and that king and that man" = *h-mmlkt hʾ w-ʾyt h-mlk hʾ w-ʾyt ʾdm hʾ šʾ ʾdm šm* "that kingdom and that king and that man who is a man of renown". But Yakubovich's major claim stands: the Luvian has replaced the triple hierarchical figure with a merism "king" plus default "man", leaving out "prince among princes" entirely. The decorative epithet "who has a manly name" was kept in the protasis (mistakenly, since it makes no sense in the Luvian merism), but omitted in the apodosis.[14] Compare TOPADA §§ 35 and 37 "If he is a king... but if he is a lesser man..." and likewise ANKARA §§ 7 and 8 (Hawkins 2000: 454 and 560). More complex hierarchical lists of perpetrators do exist: e.g. MALPINAR § 19–22 and KULULU 5 §§ 7a–f (Hawkins 2000: 342 and 485), but none matches

14 For the third member of the hierarchy "a man of renown" (thus with Pardee 1987: 142 and Amadasi Guzzo/Archi 1980: 100) compare the Phoenician Aḥiram inscription.

that of the KARATEPE 1 Phoenician, which clearly was foreign to Luvian.

Yakubovich also points out that in § 32 the Luvian text repeats the gist of § 5, which in context is less felicitous than the Phoenician of Phu/A II 1–3. He also notes that neither version of the Luvian text has any clause matching § 17 of the Phoenician, describing Azatiwada's making peace with every king. One must agree that both discrepancies argue against a translation from Luvian to Phoenician, but I must insist again that they do not prove a translation from Phoenician to Luvian. They are equally compatible with separate Luvian and Phoenician compositions.

I cite here one more likely syntactic calque in the Luvian of the Phoenician, not involving word order:

(13) § 24 (Hu) = Phu/A I 17–18
("Indeed I built fortresses in those places,") |*á-TANA-wa/i-sa=wa/i*(URBS) *kwa/i-ti* |(BONUS)*wa/i+ra/i-ya-ma-la* |SOLIUM-*MI-i*
"so that Adanawa might dwell peacefully."
l-šbtnm dnnym b-nḥt lbnm
("And I built walls in those places,) in order that the Danunians might dwell in peace of their heart."

The Luvian shows regular SOV word order, but it is well known that the Indo-European Anatolian languages have no dedicated marker for final clauses. They use rather parataxis, with the final clause introduced by the respective clause conjunction marking progression: one must infer the sense from context. The only exception known to me is the present example, where uniquely in the Iron Age Luvian corpus the subordinating conjunction *kwadi* 'as' marks a final clause. This strongly suggests that the Luvian syntax is a calque on the Phoenician use of *l-* (for which see Bron 1979: 71).

I will not treat in full the arguments of Yakubovich (2015: 47–48) regarding lexical equivalents, since they only argue against a translation from Luvian to Phoenician and in no way prove a translation in the opposite direction. To cite only one example, Luvian had a word for 'city' (a common gender stem in *-n(i)-*, always written URBS(*+MI*)*-n(i)-*), distinct from (CASTRUM)*harnis(a)-* 'fortress'. If the author of the Luvian of KARATEPE 1 used consistently the latter, he may have had some reason for the choice.[15] One must agree that it would be very odd that

15 Hittite distinguishes between simple URU 'city' (*ḫappir(iy)a-*) and URU.BÀD 'forti-

the author of the Phoenician would introduce a distinction if he were depending on the Luvian, but nothing precludes that the author of the Luvian went his own way.

We turn now to the question of whether there is any evidence *against* a translation from Phoenician to Luvian. Most additions in the Luvian versus the Phoenician are trivial: "all" is added in §§ 10 and 15, and only the Luvian in § 31 has an explicit *zi-ta* (/zin=ta/) "from here" referring to the resettlement of Adanaweans "there", i.e., in empty occupied territory of forcibly relocated conquered inhabitants.

Four passages present serious challenges for a translation from Phoenician to Luvian, which I take up in ascending order of gravity:

(14) § 11 (Hu) = Phu/A I 8
kwa/i-pa=wá/í |(*255)*mara+ra/i-ya-ní-zi* |*ARHA* |*ma-ki-sa*ʔ*-há*
w-šbrt mlṣm

Despite attempts to interpret *šbrt* as a noun construed with the preceding clause (see the references in Bron 1979: 51 and Younger 1998: 31–32), it is generally taken as a finite verb "I broke", and *mlṣm* as its object 'rebels' or similar (Bron 1979: 52–53, Schwemer 1996: 32–33, Younger 1998: *loc. cit*., Röllig 1999: 51). The hapax Luvian verb is lexically quite unclear, but a "telicizing" *arha* is suitable for a verb of violence. The tentative suggestion by Hawkins (2000: 60) of a connection of /mariyannintsi/ with second-millennium *mariyannu* is unsatisfactory semantically and faces a serious time gap. Better is the ingenious derivation by Schwemer (1996: 34–35) from a rhotacized Iron Age Luvian cognate of Hittite *mad-* 'to resist'.

But as per van den Hout (2010: 236), the shared determinative L 255/256 of (*255)*mara+ra/i-ya-ní-zi* with words for 'granary' and a cereal measure is irreconcilable with 'rebel' or the like. He argues for an *iya*-derivative of a cognate of Hittite $^{A.ŠÀ}$*mariyana/i-* interpreted as 'grain field', 'that which belongs to the *mariyana*-field' > '*mariyana*-field crops'. He takes the verb *makisa-* (or *maki(ya)-*) as denominative to a **makk-* = Hittite *mekk(i)-* 'much', thus 'to exceedingly (*arha*) increase'. However, his account of Phoenician *šbrt* as a contamination of *ṣbr* 'to heap up' and *šbr* 'to buy grain' is less than compelling. However one

fied city' (**ḫappir(iy)a- šaḫešnant-* or simply **šaḫeššar* 'fortress'?). The author of the Luvian may have wished to underscore in §§ 38 and 51 that Azatiwadaya was the latter.

judges van den Hout's specific interpretation, what is most crucial is his observation (ibid. 240): the Iron Age Luvian asseverative adverb /k^{w}ipa/ 'indeed' (Goedegebuure 1998) has a climactic or resumptive function in KARATEPE 1 (see Hawkins 2000: 60, 62, and 66). Thus clause § 11 must go with the *preceding* boasts of ameliorative activities, *not* with the contrasted (=*pa*) removal of evils in §§ 12–13. Oreshko (forthcoming) makes the same point, but offers an alternative by which the reference is to the reclamation of land (expressed as "I drained the marshes/swamps"). The unavoidable conclusion is that by either intepretation, the association with the preceding ameliorative (mostly agricultural) activities precludes any match with the Phoenician as now analyzed.

I must stress, however, that other clauses in the Phoenician that were initially cruces have through the efforts of several scholars now been clarified, sometimes in light of the Luvian text (cf. Younger 1998: 28–35, but not all examples cited remain valid, and others have been elucidated since 1998). The current analysis of *šbrt mlṣm* in the Phoenician of § 11 is less than assured on internal grounds, especially the sense of *mlṣm* (cf. Bron 1979: 51–53). It is possible that Semiticists, presented with the new very different analyses of the Luvian, may yet explain the Phoenician in a way that it could be the basis for the Luvian.

This is unlikely for the remaining passages, the first of which is the following:

(15) §§ 68–69 (Hu) = Phu/A III 16
|*a-wa/i za-ri+i* |*á-sa*$_5$*-za-ya*
"and says thus:"
[No equivalent in the Phoenician!]
wa/i+ra/i-la-ya-wa/i "PORTA"*-la-na i-zi-i-wa/i*
"I will make (my) own gate."
w-ypʾl l šʾr zr
"and he makes for himself another gate."

Note first that the Luvian introduces the threatened violation with a verb of speaking, putting the threat in the mouth of the perpetrator in the first person (likewise in § 62). This obviously cannot be a translation of the Phoenician of Phu/A. However, as noted by Pardee (1987: 142), the Phoenician inscription C on the statue, which otherwise matches the wording of the two versions on the upper and lower gates (aside from necessarily replacing "from this gate" with "from this statue of

the god") differs in saying (IV 17–18): *w-yʾmr ʾpʿl sml zr w-št šmy ʿly* "and says: 'I will make another statue, and I will put my name on it'." The following threats continue in the first person (see Röllig 1999: 66). Thus the author of the Luvian texts may well have known of this Phoenician conceit, although he could not have translated it from the text of the Phoenician gate inscriptions.[16]

More serious is the role of *l* in the Phoenician of *w-ypʿl l šʿr zr*. Röllig (1999: 60–61 with reference to Gibson) interprets *l* as "for it", referring to the city, but as already argued by Pardee (1987: 142), the use of "(my) own" in the corresponding Luvian makes it more likely that the Phoenician means "for himself". This interpretation is strengthened by the matching clause *zy . qnt . ly* "who made for myself (this) stele" in the Aramaic inscription of Zincirli (see Pardee 2009: 53). Furthermore, Hogue (2019: 199) has presented strong arguments that the reflexive use of *l* (found only in Karatepe and Zincirli in Northwest Semitic inscriptions of this period) is a calque on Iron Age Luvian usage, where a reflexive "for myself/himself" precisely with the claim of having personally "made" a monument is attested at Carchemish (KARKAMIŠ A1*a* 25 and A15*b* § 11), also with the synonymous verbs "built" (KARKAMIŠ A15*b*+*c* § 6 and § 15) and "erected" (KARKAMIŠ A30 § 4).[17] However, the Phoenician of (15) can hardly be a direct translation of the Luvian, given that the latter is in the first person and uses the adjective /waralla/i-/, not a clitic reflexive pronoun.

An even more serious instance of primacy of the Luvian version is:

(16) §§ 56–58 (Hu) = Phu/A III 9–11
|ma-wa/i-za |ha-sá-tu-´
"May they beget plentifully for us,"
w-brbm yld
"And may they beget exceedingly,"
ma-pa-wa/i MAGNUS+*ra/i-nú-wa/i-tu-´*
"And may they raise/rear plentifully for us,"
w-brbm yʾdr

16 Existence of this rhetorical device in the Phoenician of the statue inscription relativizes the claim in Melchert 2019: 367, but the usage does exist in Iron Age Luvian: see MARAŞ 14 § 11. It is thus less than clear whether this diction is borrowed, and if so, in which direction.

17 See for the passages Hawkins 2000: *passim*, but he often mistranslates them with an emphatic reflexive instead of the proper self-benefactive "for my/himself". See also MARAŞ 14 § 3 and ÇİFTLİK § 22, with "buildings" as object.

"And may they be(come) exceedingly powerful,"
ma-pa-wa/i (CRUX)*pa+ra/i-na-wa/i-tu-u* (LITUUS)*á-za-ti-wa/i-tà-ya mu-ka-sa-sá-há-´* DOMUS-*ní-i* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-ta-*[*ti*] DEUS-*na-ti-há*
"And may they furnish households plentifully for Azatiwada and the house of Mopsos by Tarhunza and the gods."
w-brbm yʾbd lʾztwd w-l-bt mpš bʾbr bʿl w-ʾlm
"And may they exceedingly serve Azatiwada and the house of Mopsos by Baal and the gods."

The Luvian, whose true structure has been misunderstood, is rhetorically very coherent. In the preceding §§ 54–55, the inhabitants of Azatiwadaya and surrounding regions are to achieve wealth in sheep, cattle, grain and wine. The Luvian completes and brings to a climax the picture of idealized prosperity by wishing that they also beget many children, raise them to adulthood, and supply the needed human resources for Azatiwada and the house of Mopsos. Rendering the verb /uranu(wa)-/ as "let them make great" (Hawkins 2000: 57, et al.) is a non-sequitur and leaves the unexpressed object obscure; likewise interpreting /parnawantu/ as "let them be in service" is a slavish imitation of the Phoenician. We must assume rather that here /uranu(wa)-/, just like Hittite *šallanu-*, means 'to rear/raise to adulthood', as attested in KARKAMIŠ A15*b* §§ 13 and 15 (Hawkins 2000: 131). Furthermore, since the two preceding verbs are transitive, one expects the same for /parnawa-/, a denominative from /parn(a)-/ 'house'. This is confirmed by Hittite *parnaw(a)iške-*, certainly a loanword from Luvian. Against Güterbock/Hoffner 1995: 177 the Hittite verb does not mean 'to make into the property of the royal house' (for which Hittite would have used a collocation with LUGAL-*(w)aš per* 'house of the king').[18] Luvian /man/ 'much' is syntactically an adverb, not a direct object noun, hence my free translation 'plentifully', but it is quite clear that the reference is to the unexpressed direct objects.[19] Pardee (1987: 138) had already sug-

18 Both Hittite examples are more compatible with a sense like that in the Luvian: KUB 1.1 iv 62–63 "...Tarhuntassa, the place that my brother Muwattalli furnished with house(hold)s" and KUB 21.38 Ro 19–20 "And let them take the resettled persons, cattle, and sheep that they have with them and make them (into) households". Forming new households for the Hittite crown is the primary role of forcibly resettled people from conquered cities, and Puduhepa would have envisioned the same use for those sent to the Pharaoh.

19 As to the word order of § 58, the fronting of /man/ is required by the /=pa/, and

gested that the Phoenician *brbm* is an adverb calqued on the Luvian. Since primacy of the Luvian is confirmed by the mistranslation of transitive /uranuwantu/ "may they rear" by intransitive *y'dr* "may they be powerful" and the very vague "let them serve" for the quite specific "let them furnish households", Pardee's analysis of *brbm* as a calque on the Luvian is likely also correct.[20]

Primacy of the Luvian is also undeniable in the very first clause of the text (thus already Amadasi Guzzo/Archi 1980: 100–101):

(17) § 1 (Hu)
|EGO=*mi* [i](LITUUS)*á-za-ti-i-wa/i-tà-sá* (DEUS)SOL-*mi-sá* CAPUT-*ti-i-sá* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-ta-sa* SERVUS-*la/i-sá*
"I am Azatiwada, a man of the Sun-god (Tiwad), a servant of the Storm-god (Tarhunt/Tarhunza)."
ʾnk ʾztwd h-brk bʿl ʾbd bʿl
"I am ʾZTWD, the blessed of Baal, the servant of Baal."

There is no doubt about the sense of the second phrase: as everywhere in KARATEPE 1, the Luvian Storm-god Tarhunt/Tarhunza = Phoenician Baal, and /xudarlis/ (thus with Rieken/Yakubovich 2010: 205–206) = *ʾbd* 'servant'. *Pace* Yakubovich (2015: 42), *h-brk bʿl* cannot mean 'steward of (his) lord', following Goedegebuure (2009), but must have the same meaning as in ÇİNEKÖY § 1: 'the blessed of Baal' (thus with Bron 1979: 28, Hawkins 2000: 48 and 58, and tentatively Younger 1998: 33–35).[21] The already inherently implausible analysis by Goedegebuure of /tiwad/ramis/ as a continuant of the Hittite royal title [d]UTU=*ŠI* 'My Sun' = 'His Majesty' is entirely precluded in the present context.[22] Both

as in § 37 (see note 9) the fronted verb may be a new topic. While raising the offspring is a natural consequence of begetting them, their service to the house of Mopsos is not, but since it is the main point of the entire sequence, it is unsurprising that it is marked as salient.

20 As he remarks, the attempt to analyze *b-rbm* as a plural with a "beth essentiae" (e.g. Bron 1979: 109–110) leads to misinterpreting "many" in the second and third clauses as referring to the subject, not the object (see the translations of Bron 1979: 24 and Röllig 1999: 53).

21 Yakubovich himself, *loc. cit*., concedes this sense for ÇİNEKÖY § 1. For an extended discussion and references to the opposing interpretation of *h-brk bʿl* as 'steward of Baal' (thus also Pardee 1987: 140 and Röllig 1999: 58) see Younger 1998: 33–35. The latter would distance the Phoenician further from the Luvian, unless one takes it in a very general sense, not as a title of office.

22 The equation is inherently implausible because Hittite [d]UTU=*ŠI* (= Hittite *Ištanu(š)=mi(š)* 'My Sun') is a delocutory title, in origin a form of address in which

/tiwad/ramis t^{s}idis/ 'man of the Sun-god' (thus with Arbeitman 1980) and /tarxuntas xudarlis/ 'servant of the Storm-god' are *religious* honorifics (with Hawkins 1979: 153). The *human* lord of Azatiwada (Awariku the Adanawean king) is expressed in the appended relative clause! All examples of /tiwad/ramis t^{s}idis/ express the piety of the person, thus with Arbeitman 'devotee of the Sun-god', entirely parallel to 'servant of the Storm-god'. That a person named Azatiwada ('The Sun-god favors/has favored'!) declares himself both a devotee of the Sun-god and a servant of the Storm-god (in that order!), two chief male Luvian deities, is not merely self-evident, but trivial. The primacy of the Luvian here is unquestionable.

But the Phoenician cannot be an error of translation. The author of the Phoenician knew who Tiwad was. See § 73 CAELUM (DEUS)SOL-*za-sá* = *šmš ʾlm* 'Sun-god of Heaven' = 'Eternal Sun' as one of the punishing deities in the apodosis cited above. If there were a translation from Luvian to Phoenician, one would have to assume a willful suppression of any mention of the Luvian Sun-god. It is far more likely that the Phoenician text was independently composed with a West Semitic readership in mind, for whom 'blessed of Baal' (probably matching (DEUS)TONIT[RUS]-*hu-t*[*a-ti* (LITUUS)*á-za-mi-sa*] 'loved/favored by Tarhunt' in Luvian in ÇİNEKÖY § 1, as per Yakubovich 2015: 43) was far more resonant than 'man/person of the Sun(-god)'. What strikes us as a glaring redundancy in *h-brk bʾl ʿbd bʾl* 'blessed/steward of Baal, servant of Baal' versus the Luvian would hardly have been viewed by the author of the Phoenician as a fault.

I have above referred to Tiwad, the Luvian Sun-god, as one of two chief male Luvian deities, but this characterization is colored by the facts of the Empire period and may be anachronistic for Iron Age Cilicia. A cursory search of the Iron Age Luvian corpus found less than two

---

the king is equated with the Sun-god. It is thus always and only a noun, usually standing in apposition to the king's name and other titles. On the other hand, *tiwadam(i)-* 'of the Sun-god' is, like *tarrawann(i)-* 'just, upright', primarily an adjective, an epithet, that only secondarily appears as a noun 'the one of the Sun-god', hence 'devotee of the Sun-god'. In six of ten occurrences it modifies *zidi-* 'person, man'. In no occurrence is the lord allegedly called "His Majesty" ever named. Furthermore, we know how the real title 'My Sun' was written in hieroglyphs: SOL$_2$, reflecting the equation of the king and the Sun-god. This is found not only in the Empire texts EMİGAZİ altars § 33a and YALBURT § 1, but also in the transitional texts of KIZILDAĞ 2, 3, and 4 and KARADAĞ 1. See Hawkins 1995: 130.

dozen mentions of the Sun-god versus more than 130 of the Storm-god.[23] Perhaps more significantly, despite the pride of place in the opening clause, the Sun-god plays almost no role in the rest of the KARATEPE 1 text (the punishing role as one of several deities in § 73 and the status as one of two eternal heavenly bodies in § 75 are quasi-universal). In § 3 it is the Storm-god who made Azatiwada "mother and father to Adanawa"; in §§ 10 and 58 the operative divine agents are the Storm-god and (all) the gods; in § 40 it is the Storm-god and the Stag-god who incited Azatiwada to build the eponymous fortified city Azatiwadaya; finally, in § 51 it is the Storm-god and the gods of the fortified city who are to bless Azatiwada with a long and prosperous life. It is thus understandable that the author of the Phoenician would mention only the Storm-god (in the guise of Baal) in the opening clause, either being unfamiliar with the purely religious epithet /tiwad/ramis t^{s}idis/ or not fully appreciating its significance for the commissioner of the text.

3.3 Summation

If we again pose the questions of Giusfredi (2018: 117) regarding the composition of a bilingual, once more the answer to the first seems straightforward: the one who commissioned the text was Azatiwada, a local ruler in Que (in Cilicia Pedias) bearing a culturally freighted Luvian personal name. However, he indicates that he was promoted to his position by a King Awarku of Adanawa (§ 2) and that the ruling house of Que was the "house of Mopsos" (Phoenician *bt mpš* in §§ 21 and 42, matched in the first by Luvian /muksassa/i- parna-/). This reference and other considerations have led several scholars to infer a significant presence of Greeks in Early Iron Age Cilicia (see Yakubovich 2015: 35–41 with references to other proponents and to opposing opinions). Most adherents of this viewpoint have argued that Greek speakers migrated into Cilicia in the period of upheaval following the fall of the Hittite Empire (early 12th century BCE) as part of the movements of the "Sea Peoples" (cf. e.g. Yakubovich 2015: 38), but as argued by Simon (2018: 314–318 with references), none of the evidence for Greek presence in Iron Age Cilicia actually proves this particular scenario. The inscriptional evidence supporting a Greek dynasty in Que dates from the 8th

23 It is also worth noting that the Storm-god frequently appears alone and almost always first when in the company of other deities, while the Sun-god mostly appears in lists and never first.

to 7th centuries BCE, and the name **Mok^{w}so-* was surely transmitted to Anatolia and Syria by Greeks, but the name is not analyzable as Greek and is better characterized as pre-Greek Aegean. The question of just when and from where the Greeks arrived in Cilicia remains open.

As to how many scribes took part in the composition of the bilingual text and their role(s) therein, the possibility of a single bilingual author, proposed above as a possibility for the Lycian-Greek text of the Létôon, may be definitively dismissed. There is simply no evidence for a significant presence of Phoenicians in Cilicia at the time of the composition (see Yakubovich 2015: 36 and Simon 2018: 320–323, both with references). Thus there is no basis for supposing a genuine bilingual speech community (a point also stressed by Yakubovich in the discussion of the oral version of this paper). We must therefore unavoidably conclude that the authors of the Phoenician and Luvian versions were different individuals.

As to the author of the Phoenician, there are sharply divergent opinions. Yakubovich (2015: 36) entertains two scenarios: (1) Luvian was still the principal official language of Que, and the use of Phoenician an attempt "to accommodate the international lingua franca of the time, the simpler and more accessible form of writing"; (2) if Luvian speakers were no longer the ruling elite, then the written use of Phoenician could be interpreted to "be the assertion of a separate cultural identity by the new elites, in contrast to the rulers of the neighbouring states". He opts (2015: 48) for the second alternative, based on his arguments for the primacy of the Phoenician version and the evidence for a Greek presence in Que, supposing that the dynasty of Mopsos of Greek origin "chose to engage Phoenician scribes for chancery purposes in the principality of Que". The last statement clearly implies that the scribes were native Phoenician speakers. Yakubovich does not address the question of how the Que elites (or those of Sam'al) acquired them.

Simon (2018: 321–326) objects that in the absence of evidence for any presence of Phoenicians in Que (or Sam'al) no one has presented a plausible account of where the Phoenician scribes came from or how they got to Que and Sam'al. He then presents a series of arguments (2018: 326–332) that it was Greeks from Cyprus who brought knowledge and use of Phoenician with them to Cilicia (and eventually to Sam'al). His argument that the Phoenician texts of Cilicia were produced by non-native speakers (2018: 320) is not compelling: one possible rendering of a Greek word in KARATEPE 1 § 47 (*krntryš* for unattested Greek

**korynētērios* 'mace-bearing') and the very arguable interpretation of *wlwy* in the Cebelireis Dağı inscription (Simon 2018: 314 after Röllig) are hardly sufficient to speak of "code-switching" in the Phoenician texts.[24] However, nothing precludes that Greeks from Cyprus brought with them Phoenician scribes, whose presence on Cyprus cannot be doubted (cf. Simon 2018: 321 and Giusfredi 2018: 118).

We need not choose between these alternatives: it is enough to state that with the cumulative progress made in the understanding of the Phoenician text there is no reason to doubt that the author had a native or near-native command of Phoenician. The suggested calquing of the reflexive use of *l* on Luvian is exceptional.

As to the Luvian text, there is also ample evidence for native-speaker competence: all constituents marked with "additive focus" *=ha* ('also') and contrastive *=pa* are properly "fronted" to the beginning of the clause, and their respective use is entirely idiomatic (not always fully expressed in the translation of Hawkins 2000: 48–58). The text of KARATEPE 1 is also our most extensive illustration of the use of the asseverative adverb REL-*ipa* (see Goedegebuure 1998). In clause § 40 the infinitive phrase shows the idiomatic use of the dative-locative for the object of the infinitive. As already noted, § 48 employs the periphrasis infinitive plus 'to stand' in the sense 'to begin/undertake to'. Finally, the peroration of §§ 74–75 shows a complex syntax in the service of rhetorical impact that only a native speaker could have produced (see Melchert 2006: 294).

I have affirmed Yakubovich's arguments against a translation from Luvian to Phoenician and added others. However, some of his arguments for a translation from Phoenician to Luvian are less than compelling, since their force depends on the unproven presumption that one version must unavoidably be a translation of the other. I also must insist that the Luvian of clauses § 1 and §§ 56–58 cannot be a translation of or even modeled on the Phoenician. I believe that these contradictions preclude a direct translation in either direction.

Nevertheless, there is clearly more evidence for Phoenician interference in the Luvian than vice-versa. Furthermore, Yakubovich (2015: 48) and Simon (2018: 326–327) argue persuasively that the respective

24 For an alternative interpretation of *bʾl krntryš* comparing *bʾl kr* in ÇINEKÖY, lines 16–17 and other evidence for a deity Kur(r)a see Younger 2009: 12–18. The resemblance of *wlwy* to Hittite *wellu-* 'meadow' carries no weight for Luvian, where *u*-stems are vanishingly rare.

positioning of the Phoenician and Luvian indicates that the former was intended to be more prominent. It would be unexpected that Azatiwada entrusted composition of the Luvian text to a provincial scribe who was clueless about how such a monumental display text should be formulated, and the prominence given to the Phoenician texts suggests that in late 8th-century/early 7th-century Que the relevant stylistic rules for such a composition were primarily those of Phoenician, not Luvian. See further Amadasi Guzzo/Archi 1980: 92–100 for the Phoenician/Semitic background of much of the specific phraseology of the text.

In favor of this supposition I cite a further linguistic argument. Anyone familiar with the Iron Age Luvian inscriptional texts knows that the protases of the sanction clauses in all regions are exclusively formulated as so-called "indeterminate" (better "conditional") relative clauses: "whoever does x to...". I have already stressed that the calquing of Phoenician word order in the Luvian version is concentrated in the blessings and curses section. I assert that the absence of the relative clause formulation in the Luvian sanction formulas and the use of *kwari* 'if' in § 51 to introduce the long following series of conditional clauses (marked as continuing the conditional force of § 51 by *nipa* 'or') are directly modeled on the Phoenician conditional formulation with *ʾm* 'if'. Therefore, while I believe a direct mechanical translation of the Luvian from the Phoenician gate texts is excluded, I see no reason to doubt that the many interference effects from Phoenician in the Luvian version are due to the author of the latter taking much of the phraseology from the multiple(!) Phoenician versions or similar models known to him.

However, the author of the Luvian version was surely keenly aware of the importance to his patron of highlighting the latter's special devotion to Tiwad, after whom he was named, and cast the opening clause accordingly. Nor is it likely that any Phoenician scribe in the employ of Azatiwada was wholly ignorant of the standard phraseology of Luvian inscriptions of the Early Iron Age, hence his calquing of the use of a reflexive with the verb 'to make' a monument, despite its absence in the Luvian text of KARATEPE 1. I also see no way to explain §§ 56–58 as anything other than a faulty translation from the Luvian to the Phoenician.

4 CONCLUSION

A reexamination of these two famous bilinguals has led to differing results. The Greek version of the Létôon inscription may well be a direct translation from the Lycian as commonly assumed, but the depth of knowledge of Lycian shown by the author of the Greek and a few unidiomatic usages in the latter justify entertaining the alternative of composition of both versions by a single bilingual Lycian author with a very strong command of Greek. In the case of the Karatepe bilingual, neither a single author nor a direct translation in either direction is credible. We are facing parallel texts whose shared features reflect the common cultural context in which they were created (thus already Amadasi Guzzo/Archi 1980: 87). The more extensive interference effects from Phoenician in the Luvian argue that the Luvian author was heavily influenced by Phoenician models, likely including those of Karatepe, but it also seems clear that the Phoenician author had knowledge of Luvian phraseology, in at least one instance that of the Luvian of Karatepe. Active consultation between the two authors or at least mutual sharing of each other's work seems probable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adiego, Ignasi-Xavier 2012: Two reading notes to the Lycian text of the Létôon trilingual stele, Kadmos 51, 93–98.

— 2015: Lycian nasalized preterites revisited, IF 120, 1–30.

Amadasi Guzzo, Maria Giulia 2000: MSKT à Karatepe, Or. NS 69, 72–80.

Amadasi Guzzo, Maria Giulia/Archi, Alfonso 1980: La bilingue fenicio-ittita geroglifica di Karatepe, VicOr. 3, 85–102.

Arbeitman, Yoël 1980: E Luvia Lux, JANES 12, 9–11.

Bauer, Anna H. 2014: Morphosyntax of the noun phrase in Hieroglyphic Luwian (= Brill Studies in Indo-European Languages and Linguistics 12).

Blomqvist, Jerker 1982: Translation Greek in the trilingual inscription of Xanthus, Opuscula Atheniensia 14/2, 11–20.

Bron, François 1979: Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe.

Bryce, Trevor 1986: The Lycians: A study of Lycian history and civilisation to the conquest of Alexander the Great. I. The Lycians in literary and epigraphic sources.

de Martino, Stefano 2003: Annali e *Res Gestae* antico ittiti (= StMed. 12).

Devecchi, Elena 2005: Gli annali di Ḫattušili I nella versione accadica (= StMed. 16).

Dupont-Sommer, André 1979: L'inscription araméenne. In: P. Demargne (ed.), La stèle trilingue du Létôon (= Fouilles de Xanthos 6), 133–177.

Eichner, Heiner 1983: Etymologische Beiträge zum Lykischen der Trilingue vom Letoon bei Xanthos, Or. NS 52, 48–66.

Frei, Peter 1981: Review of P. Demargne et al. (ed.), La stèle trilingue du Létôon (= Fouilles de Xanthos 6, 1979), BiOr. 38, 354–371.

Giusfredi, Federico 2018: On Phoenicians in Ptolomeic Cyprus: A note on CIS I 95, VicOr. 22, 111–120.

Goedegebuure, Petra 1998: The Hieroglyphic Luwian particle REL-*i*=*pa*. In: S. Alp/A. Süel (ed.), III. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum, 16–22 Eylül, 1996/Acts of the III[rd] International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16–22, 1996, 233–245.

— 2009: *hbrk b'l* or *tiwadamis zidis*, the steward of the king in Luwian and Phoenician society. Paper presented at the Midwestern Branch of the American Oriental Society meeting (Bourbonnais, February 2009).

Güterbock, Hans G./Hoffner, Harry A. 1995: The Hittite dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. P/2.

Hawkins, J. David 1979: Some historical problems of the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions, AnSt. 29, 153–167.

— 1995: The hieroglyphic inscription of the sacred pool complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG) with an archaeological introduction by Peter Neve (= StBoT, Beih. 3).

— 2000: Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions. I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age (= UISK 8/1= CHLI 1/1–3).

Hogue, Timothy 2019: *Abracadabra* or 'I Create as I Speak': A reanalysis of the first verb in the Katumuwa inscription in light of Northwest Semitic and Hieroglyphic Luwian parallels, BASOR 381, 193–202.

van den Hout, Theo P. J. 2009a: A century of Hittite text dating and the origins of the Hittite cuneiform script, Incontri Linguistici 32, 11–35.

— 2009b: Reflections on the origins and development of the Hittite tablet collections in Hattuša and their consequences for the rise of Hittite literacy. In: F. Pecchioli-Daddi/G. Torri/C. Corti (ed.), Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite period. New perspectives in light of recent research (= St. Asiana 5), 71–96.

— 2010: The Hieroglyphic Luwian signs L. 255 and 256 and once again Karatepe XI. In: I. Singer (ed.), Ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian

and Hittite studies presented to J. David Hawkins on the occasion of his 70th birthday, 234–243.

Laroche, Emmanuel 1979: L'inscription lycienne. In: P. Demargne (ed.), La stèle trilingue du Létôon (= Fouilles de Xanthos 6), 49–127.

Melchert, H. Craig 1978: The acts of Hattušili I., JNES 37, 1–22.

— 1999: Once more on the conclusion of the Lycian trilingual of the Létôon, Historische Sprachforschung 112, 75–77.

— 2000: The trilingual inscription of the Létôon. Lycian version, <www.achemenet.com/pdf/lycian/lyletoon.pdf> (December 2000).

— 2004: A dictionary of the Lycian language.

— 2006: Indo-European verbal art in Luwian. In: G.-J. Pinault/D. Petit (ed.), La langue poétique indo-européenne, 291–298.

— 2014: The Hieroglyphic Luvian verb PUGNUS.PUGNUS. In: C. Brosch/A. Payne (ed.), *Na-wa/i*-VIR.*ZI*/*A* MAGNUS.SCRIBA: Festschrift für Helmut Nowicki zum 70. Geburtstag, 133–138.

— 2019: The Anatolian hieroglyphic signs L 41, L 172 and L 319 = L 416. In: N. Bolatti Guzzo/P. Taracha (ed.), "And I knew twelve languages": A tribute to Massimo Poetto on the occasion of his 70th birthday, 356–377.

Metzger, Henri 1979: L'inscription grecque. In: P. Demargne (ed.), La stèle trilingue du Létôon (= Fouilles de Xanthos 6), 29–42.

Neumann, Günter 1998: Zur Trilingue vom Letoon: Der letzte Satz der lykischen Version. In: J. Jasanoff/H. C. Melchert/L. Oliver (ed.), Mír curad: Studies in honor of Calvert Watkins, 513–520.

— 2007: Glossar des Lykischen: Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von Johann Tischler (= DBH 21).

Oreshko, Rostislav (forthcoming): Swampy places in ÇİNEKÖY and KARATEPE.

Pardee, Dennis 1987: Review of J C. L. Gibson, Textbook of Syrian Semitic inscriptions. Volume 3. Phoenician inscriptions including inscriptions in the mixed dialect of Arslan Tash (1982), JNES 46, 137–142.

— 2009: A new Aramaic inscription from Zincirli, BASOR 356, 51–71.

Rieken, Elisabeth/Yakubovich, Ilya 2010: The new values of Luwian signs L 319 and L 172. In: I. Singer (ed.), Ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite studies presented to J. David Hawkins on the occasion of his 70th birthday, 199–219.

—/— (forthcoming): Zu den Reflexen der Wurzel **al-* in den anatolischen Sprachen. In: H. Fellner et al. (ed.), Zurück zur Wurzel – Struktur, Funktion und Semantik der Wurzel im Indogermanischen: 15. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, September 16, 2016.

Röllig, Wolfgang 1999: Appendix I – The Phoenician inscriptions. In: H. Çambel, Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luvian inscriptions. II. Karatepe–Arslantaş, 50–81.

Rutherford, Ian 2002: Some patterns in Lycian-Greek bilingualism. In: J. N. Adams/M. Janse/S. Swain (ed.), Bilingualism in ancient society: Language contact and the written text, 197–219.

Schmitz, P. C. 2008: Archaic Greek words in Phoenician script from Karatepe, Newsletter of the American Society of Greek and Latin Epigraphy 12/1, 5–9.

Schürr, Diether 2005: Das Pixre-Poem in Antiphellos, Kadmos 44, 95–164.

— 2010: Eine lykische Fluchformel mit Zukunft, Epigraphica Anatolica 43, 149–158.

— 2014: Ein lykischer Volksbeschluß?, Incontri Linguistici 37, 13–26.

— 2016: Zu lykisch ϑϑẽ und seiner etymologischen Interpretation, IF 121, 123–130.

— (forthcoming): Zum lykischen Lexikon.

Schwemer, Daniel 1996: Hethitisch *mad-* "widerstehen" und hieroglyphenluwisch *mari:aninzi* "Rebellen" in der Karatepe-Inschrift, WO 27, 30–35.

Simon, Zsolt 2018: Die Griechen und das Phönizische im späthethitischen Staat Hiyawa: Die zyprische Verbindung. In: P.-A. Mumm (ed.), Sprachen, Völker und Phantome: Sprach- und kulturwissenschaftliche Studien zur Ethnizität (= Münchner Vorlesungen zu Antiken Welten 3), 313–338.

Storme, Benjamin 2014: The beginning of the Lycian and Greek versions of the Létôon trilingual: Syntax and semantics, Historische Sprachforschung 127, 125–140.

Yakubovich, Ilya 2015: Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia, AnSt. 65, 35–53.

Younger, K. Lawson Jr. 1998: The Phoenician inscription of Azatiwada: An integrated reading, JSS 43/1, 11–47.

— 2009: The deity KUR(R)A in the first millennium sources, JANER 9/1, 1–23.