H. Craig Melchert, décembre 2018

The Trilingual Inscription of the Létôon

Lycian Version

Lycian Text

1. ẽke: trm̃misñ: xssaθrapazate: pigesere: katamlah: tideimi:
2. sẽ=ñne=ñte=pddẽ=hadẽ: trm̃mile: pddẽnehm̃mis: ijeru: se=natrbbijẽmi:
    se(j)=arñna: asaxlazu: erttimeli:
3a. me=hñti=tubedẽ: arus:
3b. se(j)=epewẽtlm̃mẽi: arñnãi: m̃maitẽ: kumezijẽ: θθẽ: xñtawati: xbidẽñni:
    se(j)=arKKazuma: xñtawati:
4. sẽ=ñn=aitẽ: kumazu: mahãna: ebette: eseimiju: qñturahahñ: tideimi:
5. se=de: eseimijaje: xuwati=ti:
6. se=i pijẽtẽ: arawã:
7. ehbijẽ: esi=ti:
8. s=ed(e)=eliñ=tãtẽ: teteri: se(j)=epewẽtlm̃mẽi: hrm̃mada: ttaraha:
9. me=xbaitẽ: zã:
10. ese=xesñtedi: qñtati«=ti»: se=pigrẽi:
11a. sẽ=ñte=ñte=km̃mẽ:
11b. se(j)=ẽti: θθẽ: sttati=teli:
11c. se=tahñtãi «x»ñtawatehi: xbidẽñnehi: se(j)=arKKazumahi:
12. se=i=pibiti: uhazata: ada: H00: ẽti: tllaxñta: arñna:
13. se=sm̃mati: xddazas:
14. epi=de arawa: hãti km̃mẽtis:
15. me=i=pibiti: sixlas:
16. se=wa(j)=aitẽ: kumaha: ẽti sttali: ppuweti: km̃mẽ: ebehi: xñtawataha:
    xbidãñnaha: se=rKKazumaha:
17. me=ije=sitẽni=ti: hlm̃mipijata
18. m=ede=te=wẽ: kumezidi: nuredi: nuredi: arã: kumehedi:
    se=uhazata: uwadi: xñtawati: xbidẽñni: se(j)=erKKazuma:
19. me=kumezidi: seimija:
20. se=de: seimijaje: xuwati=ti:
21. se=ije=hri(j)=aitẽ: tasa: mere: ebette: teteri: arñnas: se(j)=epewẽtlm̃mẽi: arñnãi:
22. me=t=epi=tuwẽti: mara: ebeija:
23. ẽti: sttali: ppuweti=mẽ: ebehi:
24. se=we=ne: xttadi: tike: ebi=ne=ñtewẽ: mahãna: ebette:
    ebi=ne: ñtewẽ: kumazi: ebehi:
25. xttade=me(j)=ẽ: tike:
26. me=pddẽ: mahãna: sm̃mati: ebette: se(j)=ẽni: qlahi: ebijehi pñtrẽñni:
    se=tideime: ehbije: se(j)=elijãna:
27. pigesereje: me=i(j)=eseri=hhati:
28. me=hriqla: asñne: pzziti=ti

Translation

1. When Pigesere, son of Katamla, began to rule Lycia as satrap,
2. And he installed as rulers before the Lycians Iyera and Natrbbiyemi
    and as governor for Xanthos Erttimeli,
3ab. The *oligarch(y)* __ed, and the Xanthian perioikoi *built*, a sacrificial installation/dedication

to the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma the king.
4. And they made priest to these gods Eseimiya, son of Qnturahi,
5. And whoever *is close to* Eseimiya.
6. And they gave to him freedom
7. (Of) whatever is his.
8. And the city and the perioikoi transferred/ceded land-sections belonging to the city,
9. And *bound over* a plot
10. «that» Xesntedi and Pigrei shall *till*.
11a. And however much (is) therein
11b. And (the spot) where the (sacrificial) installation is set down
11c. And the buildings/structures are of/belong to the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma.
12. And they shall give as a yearly offering for Xanthos 120 adas *according to the payment standard*.
13. And they shall oblige the slaves,
14. As many as they release into freedom,
15. (That) they shall give shekels.
16. And they made sacred as belonging to the King of Kaunos and to Arggazuma however much is written on this stele.
17. And what lies therein as *a surplus gift*
18. One shall sacrifice monthly as a rite with a sacrificial sheep and as a yearly offering with a steer to the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma.
19. Seimiya shall serve as priest,
20. And whoever *is close to* Seimiya.
21. And the city of Xanthos and the Xanthian perioikoi have sworn oaths for these regulations.
22. (that) they shall *execute* these regulations
23. As they are written on this stele.
24. And no one shall do violence (to them?), neither with respect to these gods nor with respect to this priest.
25. If someone shall have done violence (to them?),
26. He shall be responsible before these gods and to the *pntreñni* mother of the local sanctuary and to her children and to the Eliyana.
27. They shall defer (authority) to Pigesere.
28. The supreme *temple* authority is to do what he *decrees*.

Notes

There can be no pretense to cover here all the secondary literature on this text that has appeared since my translation of 2000. I have tried to take account of the most important contributions known to me. I am indebted to Diether Schürr for important corrections of some readings. All interpretations not explicitly attributed are mine. New clause divisions and new readings of words are marked above in red. See below for justifications.

2. As seen by Laroche (1979: 62&93), the second clause in the Lycian is a subordinate temporal clause coordinated with the first, while the third clause is the apodosis (in contrast to the Greek).

For detailed arguments that in both texts the protasis and apodosis represent sequential and causally linked events (against Briant [1998] 323-4) and that the Greek version is not based on an error (against Blomqvist [1982: 14-15] and Rutherford [2002: 207-8]) see Storme (2014: 125-35).

Contrary to my earlier analysis, *pddẽhadẽ pddẽnehm̃mis* is not a *figura etymologica* 'appointed appointees' or 'deputized deputies.' As argued by Schürr (2010: 151-2), *ñte pddẽ ha-* is a univerbation meaning 'install before (the Lycians)', where the preposition *pddẽ* 'before' has been "incorporated" into the verbal complex as a preverb (cp. below on *hrij=aitẽ: tasa: mere: ebette* 'swore an oath for these regulations' and Hittite *kuedanikki anda...ištamaš-* 'hear in (the mouth of) someone' > *kuedanikki...anda ištamaš-* 'overhear in (the mouth of) someone'). The noun *pddẽnehm̃mis* must be taken as *pddẽ(n)= ehm̃mis* 'fore-sitters', a univerbation of *pddẽ* 'before' (with hiatus-filling -n-) and *ehm̃mis*, the predicted participle of Lycian **eh-* 'sit', cognate with Hittite *eš-* 'sit', effectively German *Vorsitze(nde)*. My rendering 'rulers' is influenced by the Greek; clearly the word refers specifically to someone appointed to rule over a foreign territory.

Ijeru is accusative singular of an *a*-stem *Ijera-* vs. Greek Ἱέρων (Laroche 1979: 61).

3ab. My new analysis of these clauses as coordinated subject-verb plus single direct object (or with "gapping", if one prefers) follows the compelling arguments of Schürr (2014: 13-15) against all others (including now Adiego 2015: 10-11). Schürr shows that based on the other usage of this text one cannot take *arus: se(j)=epewẽtlm̃mẽi: arñãi:* as coordinated subjects of the singular verb *hñti=tubedẽ* nor *m̃maitẽ* etc. as an asyndetic subordinated clause "that...". See the similar arguments by Storme (2014: 135-7). The fact that the Greek version does not reflect two separate actions by the *arus* and the perioikoi is simply one of several instances where the Greek ignores fine distinctions made in the Lycian.

3a. Schürr (2014: 18) is also surely correct that *arus* belongs to the root of *aruwãt(i)-* 'exalted' and refers to some higher authority in the city, either collectively to the nobility or to an individual. I cannot follow Schürr (2014: 15-16, 18-21) in his analysis of *hñti=tubedẽ*. As per Laroche (1979: 62), the stem *tube-* is surely derived from a nominal stem *tube-* seen elsewhere and cannot directly be compared with *tub(e)i-* 'to strike.' An ultimate connection cannot be excluded, but is at best indirect. The precise sense remains indeterminate, but given the likely meaning of the subject *arus*, something like 'authorized' or 'proposed' (cp. *perhaps* German *vorschlagen*) seems in order.

3b. For an analysis of Lycian *epewẽtlm̃me-* see Adiego (1993). The verb *m̃maitẽ* was interpreted by Eichner (1983: 59-60) as 'built' and compared with HLuvian *tama-* 'build.' Given the location of the Létôon, this remains a good possibility (thus also Storme [2014: 138]), but it is not assured. See Schürr (2014: 21) for a contrary opinion.

The context makes clear that *θθẽ* refers to a concrete installation. *Pace* Schürr (2016), the Hieroglyphic Luvian designation of 'stele' /tasa-/ and Lydian *tasẽv*, which refers to a dedicatory stele to Athena, are cognate: on the latter see now Payne-Sasseville (2016). However, Sasseville-Yakubovich (forthcoming) have shown that Palaic *tašūra-* means 'pen' (in context specifically 'kennel'), *not* 'sacrificial table'. Removal of the latter sense eliminates the compelling evidence for an inherently sacralized meaning for this set of cognates (*contra* Melchert 1997: 49-50 *et alibi*). Several of these objects are sacred only because they are *dedicated* to deities or the dead, a

sense easily derivable from a form of *dheh₁- (Schürr: 2016: 128). That there is no inherent meaning 'sacralized' is now confirmed by Palaic tašūra-, which represents *'a place where one puts (animals)'. Likewise also with Schürr (2016: 126) tahñta- 'installations': see below. The adjective kumezije- in the present Lycian context is not redundant, but specifies the thing dedicated (θθẽ) as 'sacrificial', thus 'altar' (with Schürr 2016: 125).

The discrepancies between ArKKazuma xñtawati of the Lycian and the equivalents in the Greek and especially the Aramaic remain puzzling. Carruba (1990) makes a persuasive argument that the name contains the Carian ethnicon suffix -uma- (see also Carruba *SMEA* 41 [1999] 177-178), but his further analysis of the word is problematic both formally and semantically. More likely is a transferred epithet from a true Carian ethnicon, and it is tempting to connect this with the attested Carian place-name Αργασα (see Zgusta 1984: 90). The discrepancy in voicing vs. Greek Ἀρκεσιμα(ς) is not a serious obstacle in view of other evidence for voicing fluctuation next to *r* (cf. the Lycian names *Pigrẽi* and *Pixre*). For a very different view see Neumann (1979: 269).

5. The interpretation of *xuwati* as 'follows' and comparison with Hittite *ḫuwāi-* contemplated by Laroche (1979: 66) and accepted by others is impossible on both formal and functional grounds. In particular, the Hittite verb and its Luvian cognate mean 'walk; flee (from)' and are *never* construed with a dative expressing a goal. A more likely comparison is with the Luvian hapax *ḫuwayalli-* in Hittite context parallel to *kutruwan-* 'witness.' The basic sense would be 'stand by, attend, be close to.' See most recently on the problem García Ramón (2015: 128-30).

8. The verb complex has now been persuasively analyzed by Rieken-Yakubovich (forthcoming) as *eliñ=tãtẽ*, where *eliñ* reflects **aliyan < *alei+en* 'into the sphere of another', thus 'to alienate', here in the sense of Latin *alienāre* 'cede the rights to, transfer to the possession of another'.

9. As argued by Schürr (forthcoming), that *xbaitẽ* means 'irrigated' (e.g., Melchert 2004: 82, after Laroche 1979: 68) makes no sense. A connection with CLuvian *ḫap(a)i-* 'to bind' is semantically apt, but formally problematic (perhaps we are facing parallel but distinct denominative stems). Context requires merely that *xbaitẽ* express donation of a plot of land.

10. As per Schürr (forthcoming), it seems hard to avoid assuming that this clause contains a *ti* that is the object form of the relative pronoun, referring back to *zã*, as in the Greek. He emends to *qñta<tẽ>=ti* following Eichner (1983: 62), but cultivation of the plot donated to the sanctuary surely is to continue (it is to be a source of income), and scribal error is much easier to motivate if one assumes haplography of the second <ti> in **qñtati=ti*. Schürr plausibly derives the expected 'cultivate, till' from an extension **qñt(a)-* of *qã(n)-* 'to strike'. The Lycian in 8-10 describes the donation of land and what belongs to it to the deities in *two* steps, a nuance the Greek unsurprisingly dispenses with.

11abc. First, Storme (2014: 130) argues against the analysis (in my previous translation of 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* (*sic*!) refers to buildings or structures (= Greek οἰκήματα!) associated with the altar θθẽ (both mean essentially

'installation'). Second, this means that the two preceding relative clauses are *embedded* as noun phrases *coordinated* with *tahñtãi* and these *together* form the subject of the main predicate.

11c. The inscribed text actually has an erroneous <ã> for intended <x>. See Rix 2015: 244.

12. For the interpretation of the numeral H00 as '120' and the relationship of the expressions for payment in the three versions see Frei (1976: 7-9) and (1977: 66-75). Given the issues he discusses there of how payment might actually have been made, I find it likely that *ẽti tllaxñta* refers to the standard of payment, in which case *-xñta* would mean 'monetary standard/titre/ Währung.' While I have followed the Greek and translated *Arñna* as an independent dative 'for/on behalf of the city,' it is possible that *Arñna* is an adjective modifying *tllaxñta*: 'according to the Xanthian payment standard.'

15. I follow the very attractive analysis of Frei (1977: 71) by which the plural expression 'they shall give shekels' means 'each shall give (a) shekel,' thus accounting for the otherwise surprising absence of a number (note the puzzlement of Laroche [1979] 101). For discussion of the further consequence that one *sixla* equals two drachmas see Frei.

16. As per Adiego (2012: 94), the reading of the adjective is *xbidãñnaha*, with umlaut.

17. For *sitẽni* as literally 'lies' cf. Melchert (1992: 194-5). In this example the more productive ending with *-t-* (cf. Hittite *kittari*) has replaced that without (Lycian *sijẽni* and Cuneiform Luvian *zīyar*). The precise meaning of *hlm̃mi-* remains elusive. I tentatively follow Carruba (1977: 306) in assuming a core meaning 'growth, increase,' from which one may derive the sense (unauthorized) 'addition' (prohibited in tomb inscriptions) as well as a sense such as 'income, profit, surplus,' which seems to fit the present instance and those in *TL* 29.

21. For the important corrected reading *se=ije=hri(j)=aitẽ* see Adiego (2012: 95), but his understanding of the parallel Hittite construction X *šer link-* is seriously flawed. In Hittite as in Lycian one swears only *to* deities. The object of *šer* (and in Lycian of *hri*) is the person or thing for/with respect to which one swears. One swears the oath to the deities specifically for/about someone or something. Likewise here. What is unexpected, but paralleled elsewhere in Lycian, is the "incorporation" of the preposition into the verb complex as a preverb. *Pace* Schürr (2014: 30), this treatment of *hri* 'for' as a preverb is entirely in order: compare above N320, 3 *ñte=pddẽ=hadẽ: trm̃mile:* "installed before the Lycians", where *pddẽ* 'before' is treated as a preverb. For *pddẽ* as 'before' see also *pddẽ: mahãna* in 26 below.

22. The combination *epi tuwe-* is attested elsewhere only in the concrete sense of 'erect' a statue or other standing object. Laroche (1979:74) renders *epi tuwẽti* here as a present-tense verb 'on instaure' but then must assume a "redundancy" in the Lycian text. More seriously, *all* other references to actions taken by the Xanthians and their perioikoi are expressed by preterites, while formal presents represent (prescriptive) futures. It seems more likely that this clause depends on the preceding (cf. the relationship of clauses 13 and 15) and that Lycian *epi tuwe-* is used here in a sense close to that of Greek ποιήσειν ἐντελῆ, with *epi* having a "telicizing" force. It is of some importance in trying to understand the differences in the Lycian and Greek of the following clause 24 to note that the Greek clause matching 22 has no equivalent of *mara ebeija* 'these

regulations', but *does* add τοῖς θεοῖς τούτοις καὶ τῶι ἱερεῖ 'for these gods and the priest', which is missing in the Lycian.

24. As they stand, the Lycian and Greek seem to diverge rather seriously: the Lycian has a general formula '*No one* shall do violence...', and the threat appears to be directed at <u>the gods and the priest</u>. The Greek prohibits modifying of the <u>provisions of the text</u> *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 an apparently different expressed target), and the sense 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: 74-5) 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). 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 (cp. *epi tuwẽti*). His rendering 'ändern' for *xttaiti* is based solely on the supposed 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* in TL 118,2, nor *xtta* 'violence' from CLuvian *ḫatta* 'violence' and Hittite *ḫatta-* 'to strike; pierce'. The discrepancy between the Lycian and Greek versions is thus serious and not easy to explain. I have tentatively tried to account for it by supposing that Lycian *xtta-* 'to do violence' had a use like Hittite *ḫulle/a-* 'to smash, defeat', which is used of stipulations in the sense 'to repudiate', including in contexts directly parallel to *waḫnu-* 'to change, alter'. Compare KBo 6.28 Ro 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 remains surprising, but perhaps could be inferred from context in the Lycian. One must further assume that the translator of the Greek on his own authority altered the general 'No one shall do violence/repudiate...' to a construction where the oath-takers are made the potential violators. These discrepancies leave this solution less than assured.

26. Schürr (2010: 150-54) has solved the apparent discrepancy between the Lycian and the Greek and the puzzling syntax of the Lycian: *sm̃mati* here is not a finite transitive verb as elsewhere, but a noun derived from it: *der Verpflichtete* to the verb *sm̃ma-* to oblige, make responsible for' (*verpflichten*). Only the context provides the specific sense 'guilty'.

27-28. The translation given follows the view that the final clauses of the text are meant to express that the Persian satrap is to stand as guarantor of the provisions established by the Xanthians and the final authority on their interpretation. As properly emphasized by Briant (1998: 333ff.), this is quite distinct from claims that the satrap is to "ratify" the provisions. For *eseri=ha-* as 'hand over to, defer' (compare Latin *de-ferre*) see Neumann (1998: 517).

28. For the syntax see now Neumann (1998) and Melchert (1999). It is also possible that *hri-qla* is in the dative: 'It is for the supreme temple authority to do...'. Still unresolved is the precise status of the *hri-qla-*. The word is transparently a compound of *hri-* 'over' and *qla-*, which elsewhere appears to mean something like 'precinct, temenos.' What seems tolerably clear is that the word is used in this context in the sense of an authority (as in 'the palace decrees'). Laroche (1979: 76) renders the term as *Oberhof*, interpreting it in context as referring to the

acropolis of Xanthos. This is quite reasonable, but in every other clear instance Lycian *qla-* refers to a religious institution. It is thus not certain whether the institution referred to is civil or religious and in the latter case whether it refers to the chief administration of the Létôon or to some higher authority in Xanthos. I now interpret *pzzi-* as a verbum dicendi, thus 'decree, declare' or the like, rather than 'wish', because in the Milyan passage *TL* 44c 41ff. it appears to be followed by imperative second singulars *pibi* and *slãma* (similarly Eichner [1993: 145])

Bibliography

Adiego, Ignacio Javier. Licio *epewẽtlm̃mẽi*. *Aula Orientalis* 11.139-49.

Adiego, Ignasi-Xavier. 2012. Two Reading Notes to the Lycian Text of the Létôon Trilingual Stele. *Kadmos* 51.93-8.

Adiego, Ignasi-Xavier. 2015. Lycian nasalized preterites revisited. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 120.1-30.

Blomqvist, Jerker. 1982. Translation in Greek in the Trilingual inscription of Xanthos. *Opuscula Atheniensia* 14.11-20.

Briant, Pierre. 1998. Cités et satrapies dans l'Empire achéménide: Xanthos et Pixôdaros. *Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (142ème année) 305-47.

Carruba, Onofrio. 1977. Commentario alla trilingue licio-greco-aramaica di Xanthos. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 18.273-318.

Carruba, Onofrio. 1990. AR/ᵂ/ᵂAZUMA. *Kadmos* 38.50-58.

Eichner, Heiner. 1983. Etymologische Beiträge zum Lykischen der Trilingue. *Orientalia* 52.48-56.

Frei, Peter. 1976. Die Trilingue vom Letoon, die lykischen Zahlzeichen und das lykische Geldsystem. 55.5-16.

Frei, Peter. 1977. Die Trilingue vom Letoon, die lykischen Zahlzeichen und das lykische Geldsystem. *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau* 56.66-78.

García Ramón, José Luis. 2015. Licio, Griego, Indoeuropeo: I. Lic. *epñnẽne/i-* « hermano menor », lat. *opiter*, aaa. *aftero*, IE *$*h_1op(i)$-* « después, detrás ». II. Lic. *tuu̯e-* « poner (en pie) », IE *$*(s)teh_2u$-*. III. Lic. *Malija hrixuwama-* « Malia supervisora » (: Atena ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπιήρανος, ἐπίκουρος), hit. *šēr ḫuu̯ai-*, hom. ἐρι-ούνιος. In E. Dupraz and W. Sowa (eds.), *Genres épigraphiques et langues d'attestation fragmentaire dans l'espace méditeranéen*, 117-38. Rouen: Presses universitaires de Rouen et du Havre.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1979. L'inscription lycienne. In *La stèle trilingue du Létôon* (Fouilles de Xanthos 6), 49-127. Paris: Klincksieck.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1989. New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. *Historische Sprachforschung* 102.23-45.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1992. The Middle Voice in Lycian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 105.189-99.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1997. Luvian *tāna-* 'sanctified, inviolable'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 110.47-51.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1999. Once More on the Conclusion of the Lycian Trilingual of the Létôon. *Historische Sprachforschung* 112.75-7.

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

Metzger, Henri. 1979. L'inscription grècque. In *La stèle trilingue du Létôon* (Fouilles de Xanthos 6), 29-42. Paris: Klincksieck.

Neumann, Günter. 1979. Namen und Epiklesen lykischer Götter. In *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, 259-71. Bocard: Paris.

Neumann, Günter. 1998. *Zur Trilingue vom Letoon: Der letzte Satz der lykischen Version*. In Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Lisi Oliver (eds.), *Mí Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, 513-20. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Neumann, Günter. 2007. *Glossar des Lykischen: Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von Johann Tischler*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Payne, Annick and David Sasseville. 2016. Die lydische Athene: eine neue Edition von LW 40. *Historische Sprachforschung* 129.66-82.

Rieken, Elisabeth, and Ilya Yakubovich. Forthcoming. Zu den Reflexen der Wurzel **al-* in den anatolischen Sprachen. In H. Fellner, T.-S. Illés and Melanie Malzahn (eds.), *Zurück zur Wurzel – Struktur, Funktion und Semantik der Wurzel im Indogermanischen: 15. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, September 16, 2016*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Rix, Emma. 2015. Tombs and Territories: The Epigraphic Culture of Lycia, C. 450-197 BC. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oxford.

Rutherford, Ian. 2002. Some Patterns in Lycian-Greek Bilingualism. In J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, 197-219. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sasseville, David, and Ilya Yakubovich. Forthcoming. Palaic Words for Domestic Animals and their Enclosure. *Historische Sprachforschung*.

Schürr, Diether. 2005. Das Pixre-Poem in Antiphellos. *Kadmos* 44.95-164.

Schürr, Diether. 2010. Eine lykische Fluchformel mit Zukunft. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 43.149-58.

Schürr, Diether. 2014. Ein lykischer Volksbeschluss? *Incontri Linguistici* 27.13-26.

Schürr, Diether. 2016. Zu lykisch *ϑϑẽ* und seiner etymologischen Interpretation. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121.123-30.

Schürr, Diether. Forthcoming. Zum lykischen Lexikon.

Storme, Benjamin. 2014. The Beginning of the Lycian and Greek Versions of the Létôon Trilingual: Syntax and Semantics. *Historische Sprachforschung* 127.125-40.

Zgusta, Ladislav. 1984. *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen*. Winter: Heidelberg.